

# CIVIL WAR IN THE *SATYRICON*

THE *BELLVM CIVILE* OF EUMOLPUS

TRAVIS EDWARD MOORE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Latin,  
The University of Auckland, 2012

## CIVIL WAR IN THE *SATYRICON*

The *Bellum Ciuile* is the longest piece of verse in the extant *Satyricon*, the prosimetric masterpiece of Petronius. It is a poem on the Civil War of 49–45 BC, recited during a long journey by the disreputable poet-character Eumolpus. The present study approaches this unique and intriguing specimen in the hope of appreciating its literary merits more fairly than has hitherto been the custom. It is found to be entirely possible to appreciate the *Bellum Ciuile* in a more charitable way, and the implications of such an appreciation for the usual discussions of Petronius are then discussed.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank first and foremost Marcus Wilson as my supervisor and for cultivating my interest in Roman fiction. The helpful comments of Bill Barnes and Maxine Lewis in the Classics department at the University of Auckland were also greatly appreciated. I am eternally indebted to my parents for their support, and to Alyx Fausett for her tireless proofreading and infinite patience. The shortcomings of the work are of course my own.

## CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i> .....	iii
Introduction.....	1
<b>ONE: POEMA QVA POEMA</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Metre .....	5
Metrical effects.....	9
Hyperbole .....	14
Simile and metaphor.....	15
Repetition and anaphora .....	19
Wordplay .....	21
<b>TWO: EUMOLPUS DE ARTE POETICA</b> .....	<b>23</b>
The target of Eumolpus' criticism.....	23
Eumolpus' literary models .....	27
Allusion.....	32
Diction .....	34
<i>Sententiæ</i> .....	35
Divine machinery.....	37
Fact and fiction .....	46
<b>THREE: IMPLICATIONS</b> .....	<b>53</b>
Length and occasion.....	53
Eumolpus' audience .....	57
Dead rat inside a python.....	59
Genre .....	65
Characterization .....	71
Conclusion .....	82
<i>Bibliography</i> .....	83

## INTRODUCTION

One of the most immediately striking aspects of the *Satyricon* of Petronius is that it is a *prosimetrum*, a mixture of prose and verse. The verse element has received some critical attention in its own right, not the least of which has focused on the longest extant verse specimen, the poem on the Civil War recited by the character Eumolpus (*Sat.* 119–124).<sup>1</sup> This poem (herein known as the *Bellum Ciuile*) certainly brings itself to the attention of the modern reader by virtue of its uniqueness amongst the fragmented remains of the text. At 295 verses it is the longest specimen of extant Petronian verse by far. But more than its length it is notable for its subject matter. The only other hexameter poem on the Civil War of 49–45 BC to have survived to modern times is Lucan's *Pharsalia*.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, of all the poems in the *Satyricon*, no other takes on such a political and historical theme. The *Bellum Ciuile*, then, has earned much attention not for its intrinsic worth but for its appearance within the text which frames it and for its allusion to another famous and probably contemporary text. This phenomenon is summed up in Connors' memorable image, comparing the poem to a dead rat: "outside a python ... nothing special to look at; inside, though, it exerts a horrifying fascination."<sup>3</sup> Too often, though, are commentators happy to work off the assumption that the poem is indeed a "dead rat" without first attempting to prove it. Others have found it worthwhile to appreciate the poem more positively, but without presenting a case for the poem's value *qua* poetry. The first chapter of the present study addresses the problem of objectively evaluating the text of the *Bellum Ciuile*.

Perhaps more interesting than the poem's quality is its relation to the comments which precede it. Eumolpus, the author of the poem in the narrative, prefaces his effort with his opinions on what makes good poetry (118). He adduces

1. Courtney (1991), Connors (1998) on the poetry in general; Baldwin (1911), Guido (1976), Grimal (1977), Connors (1989) on this poem in particular.

2. The present study, in keeping with convention in this matter, refers to Petronius' poem as the *Bellum Ciuile* and Lucan's as the *Pharsalia*.

3. Connors (1998) 100.

literary models, such as Homer and Vergil, and emphasises among other things the importance of retaining a divine machinery for historical epic. These comments are an important key to evaluating the purpose of the *Bellum Ciuile* in relation to the rest of the *Satyricon*. The second chapter of the present study evaluates how well Eumolpus' poem measures up against the guidelines with which he prefaces it.

It is usually recognized that the *Bellum Ciuile* is not altogether lacking in effect; rather the poem is often accorded the epithet 'mediocre'. It is sometimes also suggested that Eumolpus does not follow the very principles he sets out before reciting the poem, so that the whole episode works to characterize him as a miserable hack of a poet. But the findings presented here, while substantiating this view in some respects, show on the whole that the *Bellum Ciuile* is in fact not as bad nor even as mediocre as it is often said to be, and that the poet in fact adheres quite faithfully to his literary principles. The poem is not a work of genius, but it can be redeemed in the face of its harsher detractors. This has implications for some of the usual interpretations of the poem. The final chapter of the present study addresses the problems which arise from a more charitable appreciation of the *Bellum Ciuile*, and the concluding statement suggests a modified view of the purpose Petronius had in mind when he included the poem.

## ONE: *POEMA QVA POEMA*

Mr. Wilde's verses belong to a class which is the special terror of reviewers, the poetry which is neither good nor bad, which calls for neither praise nor ridicule, and in which we search in vain for any personal touch of thought or music.

*Saturday Review*, 23 July 1981, lii, 118.

The *Bellum Civile* is almost universally identified as a mediocre poem. If taken as some kind of comment on Lucan's *Pharsalia*, it could be intended as either a parodic travesty or an exemplary improvement upon that poet: but the poem is "neither bad enough nor so absurdly flawed as to rank as out-and-out parody or burlesque nor yet good enough to be taken as [a model] of superior composition."<sup>4</sup> If the poem is understood as an honest attempt on the part of Petronius, then he is to be excused "as a writer whose regular *métier* ... was as far as possible from epic poetry",<sup>5</sup> and if understood as contributing to the characterization of the poet figure, then it is a "deliberately mediocre [composition] which reflect[s] Eumolpus' mediocre talents."<sup>6</sup> Each of these arguments relies on the assumption that the *Bellum Civile* is a poetic specimen of only middling literary merit, yet the justification of that assumption is often either missing or inadequate. Part of the aim of the present study is to provide more comprehensive documentation of the evidence for the poem's literary value.

Perhaps one reason that the quality of the *Bellum Civile* is so rarely, and then only briefly, addressed is that assessing a poem's quality is not at all straightforward. There is really no objective way of doing it. In the case of the *Bellum Civile* the problem is compounded by a difference in language and the intervention of some two thousand years. Any interpretation of the poem inevitably involves a

4. Beck (1979) 241, cf. Arrowsmith (1959) 209.

5. Baldwin (1911) 35.

6. Walsh (1970) 95.

degree of comparison. Eumolpus presets the reader's expectations by mentioning Homer, Vergil, and Horace before reciting the poem (118.5), but who is to say that these are the appropriate comparison for what he goes on to recite? If the aim is to come to as objective an appreciation of the *Bellum Ciuile* as possible, then Eumolpus' preceding comments must be ignored for the time being. The impulse to adduce a "comparison text" must also be suppressed, at least for the moment. But even when a poem is isolated from its context and from the literary environment in which it was produced, assessing its quality is no less difficult, for a good poem is more than merely the sum of its parts. One cannot call a poem "good" simply by pointing out that it is made up of sufficient features which are somehow "poetic" (a particular diction, use of imagery, metrical effects, rhetorical effects, &c.), and yet every good poem has at least some of these "poetic" features. Before reciting the *Bellum Civile*, Eumolpus himself brings this to the attention of his audience on the point of language and metre:

*multos ... carmen deceptit; nam ut quisque versum pedibus instruxit  
sensumque teneriorem verborum ambitu intexuit, putavit se con-  
tinuo in Heliconem venisse.* (118.1)

The casting of refined thought into perfect verse does not in itself a good poem make; and yet every good poem, at least in the ancient world, does make use of fine ideas, and does scan well. On the other hand it is very easy to spot a few detriments such as bad metre, tired cliché, and loose structure, and from those, unless sufficient good qualities admit an "even Homer nods"-type defence, conclude that the poem is terrible. Indeed, even if it were possible to develop an objective judgement of a poem's worth by identifying certain good and bad features, this may still not be enough. One may, as Eumolpus does, hold a Vergil or a Horace up as a model of good poetry; but no one considers the schoolboy's imitation, however good an imitation it may be, anywhere near as good a poem as the original. An imitation in the end is just that; for a poem to be appreciated in its own right it must be capable of standing on its own merits.

As mentioned above, the appreciation of this poem in particular is complicated by its presentation: it follows on from a discussion of how poetry ought to be written, and, more generally, it is a poem delivered by a fictional poet character within

a large and unstructured prose frame. It will be as well to ignore this complication for the time being, in order to first gain a very basic grasp of the quality of the poem. For the purpose of the first chapter of the present work, which is to evaluate the poem as objectively as is possible, the *Bellum Ciuile* will therefore be considered in isolation; the implications of the poem's context are considered in the chapters which follow.

Indeed, this poem ought to be able to bear consideration on its own merits: it is after all presented, like no other verse in the *Satyricon*, as a poem in its own right. Most of the of the verse that appears in the work is presented as scraps, snippets, or quotations. Even the character who is a self proclaimed poet (*ego ... poeta sum*, 83.8) rarely delivers complete compositions. Rather, Eumolpus uses verse in the course of ordinary conversation (83.10, 93.2) and, like Trimalchio at the *Cena* (34.10, 55.3), composes in a symposium setting, *e tempore*, at the reconciliatory celebrations on board Lichas' ship (109.9–10). The *Troiae Halosis* (89), the second longest poem in the *Satyricon* as it survives, is also construed as the product of extemporizing, if Encolpius really was *totum in illa haerere tabula quae Troiae halosin ostendit*; for Eumolpus could not have known beforehand that this would be the case. This does not of course preclude a ready-made composition, but it is a composition whose subject matter is tied to the frame-story's narrative. The *Bellum Ciuile*, on the other hand, comes almost from nowhere. The reason for the poem itself is related to the frame-story's narrative (it serves to while away the long journey to Croton) but there is no reason this must be a poem on the Civil War. Because the *Bellum Ciuile* is presented as a poem in its own right, with an independently selected subject matter, it ought to bear at least a first pass appreciation in isolation from its context. The difficulties of an objective appreciation have already been mentioned. A good poem is more than the sum of its parts; nevertheless it may be useful to anatomize those parts. Such an analysis follows, in respect of several of the *Bellum Ciuile*'s poetic attributes.

The **metre** of the *Bellum Ciuile* has received some devoted attention.<sup>7</sup> The consensus seems to be that Eumolpus' prosody is competent and not more. As Baldwin puts it, his verses "are correct and vigorous but often monotonous and unmusical, and create an impression of having been hammered out with careful regard to the

7. Baldwin (1911) 55–63; Guido (1976) 293–332; Yeh (2007) 193–385.

fundamental rules, but without much feeling for subtler effects or perception of the variety of treatment which might be achieved within them.”<sup>8</sup> Indeed, as far as correctness is concerned there is only one verse which deviates from the basic rules, the fifth-foot-spondaic v. 279:

— u u/— u u/— u u/ — uu/— —/ — —  
*alta petit gradiens iuga nobilis Appennini*

If there is an effect being aimed at here it may be of a pulling up short of the four dactyls that race before, corresponding with Discordia’s sped arrival at the summit of her vantage point, though it is noted that the occurrence of the place name *Appenninus* at the end of the hexameter is common enough among other poets.<sup>9</sup> It also seems fitting that the only metrical discordance in the poem occurs in a description of the goddess of discord herself. Baldwin’s criticism seems to be that by sticking strictly to the rules of hexameter composition Eumolpus’ art suffers for want of variety, but his consistency does at least set him apart from the other characters in the *Bellum Ciuile* who speak in verse, as a real poet.

Probably the best comparison on this point is with Trimalchio. Besides his “quotation” of Publilius Syrus (55.6), Trimalchio comes up with two short compositions (34.10, 55.3), each usually presented as two hexameters followed by a pentameter. Edmunds notes that though this verse form has a history in epitaphs (suitably morbid, in keeping with the rest of the *Cena*) it is still a “sub-literary” form.<sup>10</sup> Textual problems confuse the matter, though (see at 55.3.1-2), so that Walsh reads all three of the verses in the second composition as pentameters.<sup>11</sup> Yeh also recognizes only the first two hexameters, and proposes both compositions be taken together as the same poem, resulting in a bizarre mixture of two hexameters and four pentameters.<sup>12</sup> Each of these three readings draws a contrast with Eumolpus in point of *ars metrica*. Under Edmunds’ reading Trimalchio can quote another poet’s *senarii* but when it comes to his own composition seems restricted to a single, rather lowly metre. Eumolpus by contrast can write his own *senarii* and demon-

8. Baldwin (1911) 56.

9. Baldwin (1911) 60, n. 1; Guido (1976) 308, n. 114; Yeh (2007) 269.

10. Edmunds (2009) 88.

11. Walsh (1970) 128.

12. Yeh (2007) 96-8.

strates an ability in several metres.<sup>13</sup> Under Walsh's reading Trimalchio succumbs to the novice versifier's fault of composing hexameters which are short one foot.<sup>14</sup> This is a neat explanation, clearing up the textual difficulties and appealing to the intuition that Trimalchio is only a pretender to literary ability. Trimalchio presents verses which are embarrassingly unmetrical; Eumolpus' contrasting fidelity to metrical rules characterizes the one as a fraud, the other as the genuine article. The contrast is starker when it is considered that both poems are part of Trimalchio's stage-managed performance: if the poems had been composed before the dinner then their failings cannot even be attributed to hasty improvisation.<sup>15</sup> Eumolpus, on the other hand, presents perfect verses both *ex tempore* and already prepared. Finally, under Yeh's reading Trimalchio attempts a virtuosic combination of metres; but the result is very uneven, with two verses in the first metre and four in the second, and Trimalchio seems to forget that pentameters do not usually occur consecutively. This is to be compared with Eumolpus' two metrical takes on baldness (109.9, 10), where the treatments are nearly symmetrical, with six verses in the first metre and seven in the second, and where each of the metres is a recognized form, the first elegiac couplets and the second hendecasyllabics. It seems that whatever way Trimalchio's offerings are read his versification is questionable and so his characterization not that of a real poet. If it is Petronius' aim to characterize Eumolpus also as a bad poet then he goes about it in this case in a different way, for Eumolpus' correctness in metrical matters on the contrary signals at least some poetic proficiency.

So much for the basics of versification, but what of the rhythm of Eumolpus' prosody? It has been suggested that "in keeping with the characterization of the conservative theorist of mediocre talent, the poem handles the theme of the civil war in a traditionalist manner, but in style echoes the stridency and monotonous versification of the poet whom Eumolpus is condemning."<sup>16</sup> The theory is that Petronius has his poet adhere to his own conservative precepts in terms of treatment and divine machinery, but that in terms of mannerisms and metre he has him

13. Hexameter in the *Bellum Civile* and at 83.10, senarii in the *Troiae Halosis* (89), hendecasyllabics at 93.2 and 109.10, and elegiacs at 109.9.

14. "A common experience in the early stages," Walsh (1970) 128 n. 1.

15. Courtney (2001) 85, 99 n. 39; Courtney sees Trimalchio's second composition as "a parody of the mini-genre of epigrams on non-fatal accidents," p. 99, and since the accident was probably staged, therefore pre-composed.

16. Walsh (1970) 50, a repetition of the thought at Walsh (1968) 210-211.

betray his tendency toward the practices of Lucan and poets like him. The purpose of this ironical characterization is either to parody Lucan or discredit Eumolpus' theorizing. Indeed it is true that Eumolpus, like Lucan, is fond of a pause in the third- or fourth-foot (or, penthemimeral or hepthemimeral) caesura, and that the overuse of this effect makes for a quite monotonous rhythm.<sup>17</sup> But Eumolpus is also fond of a pause at the bucolic diaeresis, a Vergilian practice.<sup>18</sup> In fact Sullivan lists several aspects of the versification of the *Bellum Ciuile* in which Eumolpus is closer to the practice of Vergil than that of Lucan, including frequent use of elision (and in the same place in the line as Vergil), similar repeat line-endings to Vergil, and the use of spondaic words at the beginnings of lines.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, the use of elision in the *Bellum Ciuile* is markedly increased in comparison to its use in Eumolpus' other poems, so that, at least in one respect, it may even be that the poet is striving for a Vergilian effect in his versification *in this poem specifically*.

These findings are confirmed by the statistical work of Duckworth, who finds many other differences between the versification of the *Bellum Ciuile* and that of the *Pharsalia*.<sup>20</sup> Lucan and Eumolpus show a different preference for verse patterns, and Eumolpus is unique among all poets in his frequent use of the line which is an alternation of spondees and dactyls, such as at v. 61:

— ∪ ∪ / — — / — ∪ ∪ / — — / — ∪ ∪ / — —  
*tres tulerat Fortuna duces, quos obruit omnes*

Contrary to Baldwin's statement that Eumolpus' rhythm lacks variety,<sup>21</sup> Duckworth finds a high degree of variation in the verse patterning of the *Bellum Ciuile*. Finally, a preference for slow, spondaic lines is noted by several commentators alike.<sup>22</sup> Duckworth concludes: "in some respects [Eumolpus'] procedure is an improvement [on Lucan] (less concentration on the same patterns, and more spondees), in others (high homodyne percentage and low percentage of change in fourth-foot texture) it is definitely inferior."<sup>23</sup> Rather than being "dominated by the

17. Baldwin (1911) 56; Walsh (1968) 211.

18. Baldwin (1911) 57; Sullivan (1968) 179.

19. Sullivan (1968) 178-9.

20. Duckworth (1969) 102-3.

21. Baldwin (1911) 57.

22. Baldwin (1991) 57-9; Sullivan (1968) 179; Duckworth (1969) 103; Yeh (2007) 224.

23. Duckworth (1969) 103.

stylistic vices of the man whom he condemns,” then,<sup>24</sup> Eumolpus strives to overcome those vices. He does not fully succeed, for there are indeed places where the rhythm is repetitive, and he does not attain the level of his model Vergil’s versification, but neither does he altogether fail.

Baldwin lists several verses where **metrical effects** may be said to have been achieved,<sup>25</sup> to which the following may be added:

*ecce aliae clades et laesae uulnera pacis,* (v. 13)

where the elision of *ecce* into the destruction it exclaims and the heavy spondees emphasize the deep wounds Peace endures/will endure (*pacis* could easily be rendered *Pacis* here);

*tres tulerat Fortuna duces, quos obruit omnes  
armorum strue diuersa feralis Enyo.  
Crassum Parthus habet, Libyco iacet aequore Magnus,  
Iulius ingratham perfudit sanguine Romam,  
et quasi non posset tot tellus ferre sepulcra,  
diuisit cineres,* (vv. 61–6)

where the wealth of spondees emphasizes the metaphorical weight of the three generals, except for the dactyls describing Pompey’s grave by the restless sea; Caesar’s grimly spondaic

*iamque omnes unum crimen uocat, omnibus una  
impendet clades. reddenda est gratia uobis,  
non solus uici;* (vv. 170–2)

the description

*sed postquam turmae nimbos fregere ligatos,* (v. 187)

24. Walsh (1968) 210.

25. vv. 1, 38, 58, 79, 82, 115, 128, 136, 176, 178, 272, 274 295; Baldwin (1911) 58–9.

where the slow line and the conflict of ictus and accent heighten the Lucretian image of bonds between atoms of frozen water being slowly broken; and

*unde omnes terras atque omnia litora posset,* (v. 280)

where the double elision, words flowing one into the other, corresponds with Discordia's continuous, panoramic view of the impending destruction.

But perhaps what best illustrates Eumolpus' ability to turn rhythm to poetic meaning is the divine conference of Dis and Fortuna (vv. 76–121). Dis' speech is fittingly weighed down with many heavy lines. He raises himself up (*extulit ora*, v. 76) into the land of the living with great effort in three largely spondaic lines and accosts Fortuna (*Fortunam uoce lacessit*, v. 79) with the grave, almost formal address, *rerum humanarum diuinarumque potestas* (v. 80). In his question,

*ecquid Romano sentis te pondere uictam  
nec posse ulterius perituram extollere molem?* (vv. 82–3)

he alludes to the conceit of vv. 61–6, mentioned above, where three great Romans proved too weighty for the earth. Here Rome herself is too heavy for Fortuna, by whom she has prospered. The first line of Dis' question is spondaic and heavy, focusing on the overwhelming weight (*pondere*); the second line focuses on the *perituram ... molem*, the great monument which is on the point of crumbling and slipping away, fittingly marked with two elisions. Dis' description of the Romans' invasion of his own realm groans like the caverns it describes, with many long syllables:

*perfossa dehiscit  
molibus insanis tellus, iam montibus haustis  
antra gemunt, et dum uanos lapis inuenit usus,  
infernī manes caelum sperare fatentur.* (vv. 90–3)

It is also perhaps due to Petronius' desire to weigh down Dis' speech with as many spondees as possible that the preferred form of address in the speech is *Fors* (vv. 80 and 94) and not *Fortuna*: the former word lends itself metrically to lines which are heavy. Finally, in perhaps the most visually dramatic moment in the poem, Dis

finishes his speech with an awkward attempt to reach out and embrace his interlocutor, but he fails, and the act results in another gaping hole in the earth, rendered in another spondaic line: *rupto tellurem soluit hiatu* (v. 101).

Dis' speech is marked with metrical heaviness, bookended by two five-spondee lines (vv. 77, 101) and containing another three (vv. 79, 82, 93); eleven of the speech's 21 lines contain more spondees than dactyls, and overall there are about three spondees for every two dactyls. Fortuna's speech, which follows and is only two verses shorter, has by contrast only one line with more spondees than dactyls, and one five-dactyl line; overall, the ratio of spondees to dactyls in Fortuna's speech is the inverse of that in Dis': about two spondees for every three dactyls. This is unlikely to be coincidence; the introduction to the second speech seems to say as much: *tunc Fortuna leui defudit pectore uoces* (v. 102). Fortuna's "light breast" certainly signifies the fickleness with which she is customarily associated, *quae noua semper amas* (v. 81). But *leui ... pectore* could just as well describe the bouncing, weightless dactyls which she goes on to pour out. Compare this with the introduction to the speech of Dis: *tali ... uoce lacessit* (v. 78) draws attention to the manner in which the first few words are spoken; it has already been noted that the first verse of the speech is spondaic; the poet therefore in effect alerts the reader to the fact that the weight and measure of the speech as a whole will follow in the suit of the first few heavy syllables which are uttered by the god. Eumolpus demonstrates an ability, then, to achieve useful effects by varying the rhythm of his verse. By characterizing the speech of Dis as heavy and slow and that of Fortuna as light and breezy, Eumolpus plays on the contrast between the underworld and the land of the living, the grave authority of the one god and the fickleness of the other.

In addition to such metrical effects as have just been described, two other poetic techniques which are only incidentally related to versification may as well be discussed here, namely: the use of elision, and the artful arrangement of words within a line of verse. In relation to the first technique, it has already been noted that Eumolpus is fond of ending a sentence or a thought at the caesura in either the third or fourth foot. This has the effect of forcing sense units to cross line boundaries. The technique is already at work in the poem's first couple of sentences:

*orbem iam totum uictor Romanus habebat,  
qua mare, qua terrae, qua sidus currit utrumque;*

*nec satiatus erat. grauidis freta pulsa carinis  
iam peragebantur; si quis sinus abditus ultra,  
si qua foret tellus, quae fuluum mitteret aurum,  
hostis erat, fatisque in tristia bella paratis  
quaerebantur opes.* (vv. 1-7)

The effect is somewhat jarring, and it throws the punctuation of the passage into question: there could as easily be a full stop after *utrumque*, for example, and a colon after *nec satiatus erat*. The stylistic motive behind the technique is to throw emphasis onto the element which is displaced to the beginning of the next line: *nec satiatus erat* and *hostis erat* are particularly forceful. Another example:

*uix nauita Porthmeus  
sufficiet simulacra uirum traducere cumba;  
classe opus est.* (vv. 117-119)

The splitting of syntactic units across a line-break is less common:

*ne desit belua dente  
ad mortes pretiosa* (vv. 15-16)

*destruet istas  
idem, qui posuit, moles deus.* (vv. 108-9)

*tu concute plebem,  
Curio.* (vv. 288-9)

The purpose of this type of enjambment is to mirror the disruption in the sense by disrupting the syntax: it will be noted that each of the examples given describes an act of violence.

Related to this last effect is the conscious placement of words within the same line of verse to reflect by their arrangement the sense of that verse. This is a common technique of the poets, and the relatively free ordering of words in Latin allows for quite striking effects. Eumolpus' usage focuses mainly on the interlacing of sets

of nouns and adjectives:

*praeterea gemino deprensam gurgite plebem* (v. 51)

*sed chaos et nigro squalentia pumice saxa* (v. 74)

*atque inter torto laceratam pectore uestem* (v. 276)

All three examples exhibit a parallel structure, with adjectives preceding nouns, and the elements in the ablative case coming first. Each of the images evoked by the words is strengthened by their intertwining nature: in the first example the words for the people are caught up in the words for the twin whirlpool which envelops them; in the second the mingling of the words for the different rocks emphasizes the sense of *tumulata* in the following line; and in the third example the words for Discordia's writhing breast peek out from between those for the tattered garments which cover it. But perhaps Eumolpus' supreme achievement in terms of this technique occurs at v. 58:

*hoc mersam caeno Romam somnoque iacentem*

Here all six words which make up the verse are involved in the pattern. There is constant alternation between the ablative and accusative tenses, three words in each, and, most importantly for the image, the word for Rome occurs in the middle of the line, surrounded by the nouns and adjectives representing that in which she is swamped.

Effects such as these contribute to the sense that Eumolpus has in fact gone to some effort in crafting his verse. The author of the *Bellum Ciuile* has not merely cast his words into verse (*uersum pedibus instruxit*, 118.1); he has, in spite of Baldwin's opinion to the contrary, demonstrated considerable "feeling for subtler effects [of versification, and a] perception of the variety of treatment which might be achieved."<sup>26</sup>

26. Baldwin (1911) 56.

To turn now to linguistic and rhetorical features, **hyperbole** pervades the *Bellum Ciuile*. The very first verse sets the theme of exaggeration which will run throughout the poem:

*orbem iam totum uictor Romanus habebat* (v. 1)

The phrase is naturally more hyperbolic to the modern ear, for it is now known how small a fraction of the earth was ever really under Roman control. But even to a Roman there must have been some sense of exaggeration, for even at the height of Empire there were always barbarians at the gate. Nevertheless the *imperium sine fine* was an accepted myth. By setting this bold and frankly untrue statement in the first line of his poem Eumolpus does not intend only to exaggerate; rather his implication seems to be that at a point where Rome could no longer expand outwards by war she had no option but to turn in on herself in civil war.

The catalyst for that war was the man who took the weight of the world on his shoulders. The words *totum ... orbem* next show up in a description of the mountainous *locus* where Caesar makes his appearance. In the grammar of the line it is the mountain that can bear the whole world, (*totum ferre potest umeris minitanti- bus orbem*, v. 151), but by association it is Caesar, who is atop that place. This connection is further strengthened by the association of the place with Hercules. In crossing the alps Caesar is depicted as another Hercules and another Atlas. On the point of his decision to march on Rome he takes on responsibility for the known world. The words turn up once more at the end of the poem, as the consequences of Caesar's actions are about to play out before Discordia. From her vantage point she can see *omnes terras atque omnia litora ... ac toto fluitantes orbe cateruas* (vv. 280-1). This repetition and shifting depiction of the *orbis totus* amounts to a measured insistence on the total influence of the Civil War.

Not only is the whole world involved in the Civil War, it is also doomed by it. The extent and mass of the destruction which results from the war is the second theme upon which Eumolpus is wont to wax hyperbolically. Not only is the earth unable to support the graves of the three great generals in one place (v. 65), the deaths will be so many that Charon and his leaky dinghy will hardly suffice for transporting their souls; *classe opus est*, a fleet is required! for the whole world will be torn apart, *laceratus ... orbis*, and led to the underworld (vv. 117-121). Further

hyperbole is to be found in the description of bloodshed: Caesar turned the Rhine red during his last campaign, and as they march on Rome his men are still drenched in the blood of Germans (*dum Rhenum sanguine tingo*, v. 160; *Germano perfusas sanguine turmas*, v. 214). This is exaggeration enough, but the hyperbole only truly finds its height when, at the end of the poem and on the point of the outbreak of the war, Discordia calls for a much larger body of water to run red: *Thesalicosque sinus humano sanguine tingue* (v. 294). Finally there are a couple of instances of hyperbole which describe the terrifying effect of the war, namely: *Iupiter horruerat* (v. 241) and *ipsa tremat tellus lacerataque tecta rebellent* (v. 287). Eumolpus makes pervasive use of exaggeration in his poem in order to emphasize the total devastation which the Civil War brought about. The technique is not overused, though neither is any example innovative: rivers running red, empire without end, and the burden of great men on the world were all common conceits.

**Simile and metaphor** are employed sparingly. Simile is often introduced by an “as though” word with a particularly colloquial and non-poetic feel, especially *putares*.<sup>27</sup> Comparisons introduced in this way usually describe a natural phenomenon, such as the disappearance of the sun (v. 129) or the illusion of the sky falling away from a precipice (v. 148). Such comparisons are often made in a rather forced way: the poet does not really expect the reader to believe the explanations which he puts forward, hence the use of a second-person subjunctive hedge. The addition of *iussa putares* (v. 190) lends further incredibility to what in Beck’s opinion is the “floundering and over-elaborate description in the *Bellum Civile* of the alternate thawing and freezing of the Alpine passes.”<sup>28</sup>

There are two places in the text where simile is employed in a more compelling way. The description of Caesar coming down from the Alps makes use of a double-barreled simile, comparing Caesar first to Hercules, then to Jupiter (vv. 205–8). The comparison with Hercules strengthens the associations already made between the demigod and the crossing of the Alps (*Graio numine*, v. 144; *Herculeis*, v. 146), while the comparison with Jupiter brings up the Gigantomachy (in which Hercules also participated) and so symbolizes the ordering of the cosmos, in the form of Empire, which the Civil War would ultimately bring.<sup>29</sup> The other simile of import is

27. *putares*, vv. 129, 190; *putes*, v. 148; *quasi*, v. 65; *ceu*, v. 258.

28. Beck (1979) 252.

29. Connors (1998) 122–3.

the closest Eumolpus gets to a classical epic simile; it compares the reactions of the Romans, who are threatened by civil war, to those of sailors threatened by a raging storm:

*ac uelut ex alto cum magnus inhorruit auster  
et pulsas euertit aquas, non arma ministris,  
non regimen prodest, ligat alter pondera pinus,  
alter tuta sinus tranquillaque litora quaerit:  
hic dat uela fugae Fortunaequae omnia credit.* (vv. 233-7)

The comparison does not quite achieve the multiple correspondences which characterize a true epic simile; rather it makes the point that the different reactions of the Romans were as many, as varied, and as useless as those of the sailors. The language of the simile is poetic, the various technical nautical terms described by metonymy: *alto* for the sea, *arma ministris* for the rigging, *regimen* for the rudder, *pinus* for the ship, *uela* for the sails. A simile to do with the weather is also a traditionally epic construct, and the vivid imagery brings to mind famous literary shipwrecks such as Aeneas' or Odysseus'. The description of the flight from Rome certainly represents a high point in Eumolpus' skilful use of the language of comparison.

Metaphor is not as well represented as simile, though there are a few examples of it. Indeed, of the two devices, metaphor often seems the more effective: the captured tiger is a powerful image; representing it as a "foreign hunger" (*fames ... aduena*, v. 16), cleverly evokes both the beast's defining characteristic and the decadent Romans' insatiable lust for the exotic. Another metaphor used to describe the sad state of affairs at Rome is the characterization of debt and usury as twin whirlpools:

*praeterea gemino deprensam gurgite plebem  
faenoris inluuies ususque exederat aeris.* (vv. 51-2)

The language of comparison is also used in the description of things which rage: usury is compared to a silently rampant disease (*ueluti tabes tacitis concepta*

*medullis / intra membra furens curis latrantibus errat*, vv. 54–5);<sup>30</sup> raging Fury is compared to a wild horse, *abruptis ceu liber habenis* (v. 258); and Fama strikes at the statues of the gods with a “Roman thunderbolt” (v. 212), a metaphorical use of language not unlike the English term “newsflash”.

In addition to simile and metaphor proper, Eumolpus also makes some use of the similar but more nuanced techniques of synecdoche, metonymy, hypallage, and personification. Synecdoche of the *pars pro toto* variety is very rare. In the phrase *sunt qui coniugibus maerentia pectora iungant* (v. 229) the word *pectora* stands for whole people and not only their chests, but this is a common enough device. Metonymy is more prevalent, as has already been noted in respect of the shipwreck imagery. To those examples may be added the following:

*orbem iam totum uictor Romanus habebat,* (v. 1)

where the Roman stands for Rome herself and her dominion;

*quaesitus tellure nitor certauerat ostro,* (v. 10)

where the sought-after glitter, *quaesitus ... nitor*, stands not for the glitter itself but for the precious material which produces it, and also where the purpleness of the earth, *tellure ... ostro*, represents not its colour but its richness; in the phrase

*fames premit aduena classes* (v. 16)

it is not hunger itself which presses the fleet, but greedy Romans hungering after exotic spoils; *Parthus* (v. 63) stands for *Parthia* just as *Romanus* (v. 1) stood for *Roma*; and *potestas* (v. 79) refers to Fortuna herself by one of her qualities, whereas *Iuppiter* (v. 140) is used to refer not to that deity but to his dominion, the sky, and by the implication of the word *descendit*, rain.

Hypallage, or the transferred epithet is frequently combined with prolepsis to colour a description with a sense of foreboding. The following examples are particu-

30. cf. Verg. A. 4.66–7.

larly striking:

*heu pudet effari perituraque prodere fata* (v. 19)

*praemia correptis miles uagus esurit armis* (v. 32)

*sanguineoque recens descendit Iuppiter imbre* (v. 140)

It is not the *fata* which are *peritura* but the Romans, not the *armis* which are *cor-reptis*<sup>31</sup> but the *miles*, and not the rain (*Iuppiter*) that is *recens* but the blood. By preventing the adjectives from agreeing syntactically with the nouns which they more appropriately describe, Eumolpus draws attention to his technique of foreshadowing. This contributes to the building up of a negative atmosphere around the subject of the Civil War.

Finally, personification, like metaphor, is used to create a more vivid image. Two examples have already been mentioned where a place is characterized as a person: the *Romanus* of the first verse comes across as particularly human when he is described as an insatiable conqueror (*nec satiatu*s, v. 3), and the image on the surface of *Crassum Parthus habet* (v. 63) is of a Parthian personally detaining Crassus. In the line which follows this last example, Roma is given a particularly human epithet: *ingratam* (v. 64). This is a simple and common device in poetry of which Eumolpus makes great use, so: wars are *tristia* (v. 6), structures are *insanis* (v. 91), and the slopes of the Appenine are *nobilis* (v. 279). In a similar way, non-human things sometimes perform actions usually reserved for humans, so: caverns groan (*antra gemunt*, v. 92), swords drink (*bibit ensis*, v. 98), the ground does not fight (*non pugnavit humus*, v. 186), and the earth feels (*sentit terra deos*, v. 264). In addition, the Alps are presented as having the human attribute of shoulders: *totum ferre potest umeris minitantibus orbem* (v. 151).

Eumolpus demonstrates an ability to use a wide range of metaphorical techniques. While his comparisons are for the most part unoriginal, at times they evoke a particularly striking and poetic image. Moreover, by drawing on a stock of effects which has a long tradition in epic, the poet remains true to his conservative tastes.

31. Or *corruptis*; Baldwin (1911) *ad loc.*

**Repetition and Anaphora** abound in the *Bellum Ciuile*. Anaphora is the principal feature of the first few verses of the poem, emphasizing the extent of Rome's command by the repetition of *qua* (v.2), and the variation *si quis/si qua* (vv. 4-5). This is followed by a section filled with the repetition and variation of terms for gold, purple, and price, emphasizing Rome's costly decadence.<sup>32</sup> The spread and relation of some of these come under the criticism of Baldwin, that "a particular weakness [of Eumolpus' style] is the repetition of a word within a few lines but in a different connection, and where nothing is to gain by it."<sup>33</sup> She cites the repetition of *eruta* eight lines apart (vv. 27, 35), but surely in both places that word is used in just the same connection, namely to emphasize the suffering inflicted by the rape of exotic delicacies. Baldwin likewise claims that the use of *moles* at v. 91 differs from that at vv. 83 and 109, but the structures which the Romans build from the materials excavated from the earth are exactly those which contribute to "the unwieldy bulk of Rome".<sup>34</sup> That both the *tecta* and the *pectora* of those fleeing Rome are *maerentia* is similarly not incongruous: on the one hand, *maerentia tecta* is a case of transferred epithet referring to the sadness of those fleeing their houses, and on the other hand, the subtle variation emphasizes the totality of the fear which makes not only the people of Rome grieve but the very buildings of the city itself. Baldwin is correct that repetition is at its most effective when it occurs in the same or consecutive lines, but another effect can be achieved by spreading repeated words across the work, emphasizing the pervading influence of the connotations of those words. Baldwin seems to suffer from the conviction that repetition is a defect unless it is very pointed, but this is a modern way of thinking: the device was highly regarded by Latin writers, in rhetoric, but also in poetry.

Besides the opening of the poem, one of the most concentrated uses of a repeated word is in the following passage:

*uicta erat ingenti tellus niue uictaque caeli  
sidera, uicta suis haerentia flumina ripis:  
nondum Caesar erat [uictus].* (vv. 201-3)

32. *aurum*, vv. 5, 14, 29, 44; *aurata*, v. 17; *ostrum*, vv. 10, 28, 35; *conchyli*, v. 35; *opes*, vv. 7, 43, 57; *aes*, vv. 9, 52; *pretio*, v. 42; *pretiosa*, v. 16; *praemia*, v. 32; *praeda*, vv. 40, 50; *uenalis ... uenalis*, v. 41; *merces*, v. 50.

33. Baldwin (1911) 47.

34. Baldwin (1911) 47.

The repetition is highly rhetorical. Eumolpus deliberately phrases his description of the freezing of the earth, sky, and water in terms of those elements being conquered, *uicta*, so that the contrast with Caesar's being unconquered is heightened, especially when the word *uictus* is then left as understood.

The remaining instances of repetition occur in the speeches. That this should be the case is not surprising: eloquent speeches are a stock element of epic poetry, and, especially for the poets of the post-Augustan era, a chance to show off the composer's rhetorical skill. It is important to note that by indulging in the techniques of oratory Eumolpus does somewhat undercut the distaste which he has expressed for the would-be lawyer-poet (118.1). But the speeches in the *Bellum Ciuile* nevertheless make up some of the finest sections of the work, and in several cases that is enhanced by the use of repetition or anaphora. Dis' repetition of *potestas* in consecutive lines (vv. 79, 80) is admittedly an example of the type of nonsensical repetition to which Baldwin alludes,<sup>35</sup> for in the first instance the word refers to Fortuna's supernatural powers and in the second instance to the power of man and state.<sup>36</sup> But Fortuna's repetition of *cerno* (vv. 111, 114), Caesar's of *ite* (vv. 168, 169), and Discordia's of both *sumite* (vv. 283, 284) and *tu* (five times in as many lines, vv. 288–292) are all most effective, especially in the case of Discordia's *sumite* which is placed emphatically at the beginning of consecutive verses. The technique known as polyptoton, whereby a word is repeated but the form of its ending varied, can also be effective. Caesar uses it in his speech in the course of a rhetorical question:

*quamquam quos gloria terret  
aut qui sunt qui bella uident? mercedibus emptae  
ac uiles operae quorum est mea Roma nouerca.* (vv. 164–6)

and also in calling his men to the cause:

*iamque omnes unum crimen uocat, omnibus una  
impendet clades.* (vv. 170–1)

35. Baldwin (1911) 47, discussed above.

36. Schmeling (2011) *ad loc.* suggests an emendation to avoid this ugly effect.

In the same speech there is much variation on similar terms for victory (*uincendo*, v. 162; *uindice*, v. 167; *uictores*, v. 168; *uici*, v. 172; *uictoria*, v. 173; *uinci*, v. 176). This technique, where the poet steadily refuses to use the same word twice, nevertheless produces an effect similar to that of repetition: it is clear that the overwhelming theme of Caesar's intent is victory. While the plethora of repeated words in the *Bellum Ciuile* may indeed betray a limited vocabulary and lend itself to monotony, it can also produce useful poetic effects. It is the combination of repetitiveness in both rhythm and diction that leads commentators to decry the "mediocrity" of Eumolpus' style and compare it to Lucan's,<sup>37</sup> but it ought not to go unnoticed that such a style has its benefits, especially when deployed in rhetorical set pieces such as the speeches of historical epic.

**Wordplay** is indulged in to some extent. A few instances are simple puns; so: *fax stellis comitata nouis incendia* (v. 139), a familiar play on the related etymologies of the word for hair and the word for a comet. Slightly more sophisticated is: *sunt qui coniugibus maerentia pectora iungant* (v. 229). This is a play on the derivation of *coniunx*: there is an echo of the *\*iug-* root in both *coniugibus* and *iungant*. A translation maintaining the link might run something like: "some join themselves to those with whom they are joined in marriage." In addition to these simply playful examples, Eumolpus demonstrates he can develop puns which are more innovative. Connors draws attention to the words *non uerno persona cantu / mollia discordi strepitu uirgulta locuntur* (v. 72-3), used to describe the birdless setting for the meeting of Dis and Fortuna. The pun is on the name of the place, Avernus, which was renowned for being birdless and whose name had been related to both the Latin word for bird, *auis*, and the Greek word for birdless, *αορνος*. "Though *non* negates *loquuntur* in the following line, the juxtaposition of *non* and *uerno* momentarily re-etymologizes the name of Lake Avernus."<sup>38</sup>

Other examples of wordplay contribute an additional hint of foreboding to their context. The "useless uses" (*uanos ... usus*, v. 92) which Romans find for construction materials point up the paradox of Roman excess. The words *onerata triumphis* (v. 157) hint at the great burden which success brings, recalling the conceit of vv. 63-6, where the earth could not bear the combined burden of the graves of Crassus, Pompey, and Caesar. That passage was also concerned with the concept of

37. Walsh (1970) 49.

38. Connors (1998) 122.

weight, and its sentential cap, *hos gloria reddit honores*, plays on the supposed connection between the words *honos* and *onus*.<sup>39</sup> The German blood which Caesar has spilt (*Germano perfusas sanguine turmas*, v. 214) foreshadows the brotherly blood to be spilt in the Civil War, punning on the adjectives *Germanus/germanus*.<sup>40</sup> Finally, Eumolpus' decision to have Discordia refer to the city Dyrrhachium by its former name in her exhortation of Pompey (*Epidamni moenia quaere*, v. 293) is surely due to the dark overtones to be got from the term 'Epidamnus'.<sup>41</sup> Lucan employs the same technique at *Phars.* 10.540–6;<sup>42</sup> the fact that Eumolpus breaks off here, just as Lucan breaks off his *Pharsalia*, lends the pun an even greater sense of foreboding. On the whole, the *Bellum Ciuile* demonstrates a range of wordplay, from conventional puns to the more innovative variety, and to those which are more sinisterly proleptic.

The preceding has shown that on several points of metrical, linguistic, and rhetorical technique the *Bellum Ciuile* produces useful poetic effects. Such achievements may not be testament to great originality, but after all that is not the aim of its author, who seeks to conserve, not innovate. Rather, an appreciation of the poetical attributes of Eumolpus' *magnum opus* ought simply to prove that the poem is not altogether without merit. Indeed, the findings presented here suggest that even "mediocre" is not as appropriate a label for the *Bellum Ciuile* as is usually accepted; that is, the poem's many good qualities seem to outweigh the bad. But before the implications of a better-than-mediocre Eumolpus can be dealt with, the poet's success ought also to be judged against the programmatic precepts which he helpfully offers.

39. Connors (1989) 70; Varro quotes the common saying: *onus est honos qui sustinet rem publicam*, *Ling.* 5.73.

40. Another popular pun, cf. *Germanum Cimber occidit*, *Cic. Phil.* 11.6.14; *Quint. Inst.* 8.3.29.

41. Perhaps the reason for the change of the city's name; *Plin. Nat.* 3.23.

42. Rose (1971) 65.

## EUMOLPUS *DE ARTE POETICA*

The interpretation of the *Bellum Ciuile* relies as much on the remarks which preface it as on the poem itself. If the poem stood on its own then it could be explained as simply a way of passing the time on the long journey to Croton. But by setting up certain expectations in a prefatory discourse on *ars poetica*, Eumolpus invites the reader to hold the *Bellum Ciuile* up to perhaps more scrutiny than it can bear. The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the degree to which the poet adheres to the principles of his literary manifesto. First the targets of his criticism and the models for his *exemplum* are identified, then the poem is evaluated against the set of poetic precepts set out by its author.

**The target of Eumolpus' criticism** is the man who would see poetry as a refuge (*portum feliciorum*) from more serious affairs (*forensibus ministeriis*, 118.2): that is, lawyers, officials, and other men of public life, who see the construction of a poem as simpler than that of a piece of rhetoric (*credentes facilius poema extrui posse quam controuersiam*, 118.2).<sup>43</sup> "Any one of them," complains Eumolpus, "as soon as he has arranged his line into feet and woven a subtler thought into the meaning of his words, fancies himself at once a poet!" (*nam ut quisque versum pedibus instruxit sensumque teneriorem uerborum ambitu intexuit, putavit se continuo in Heliconem uenisse*, 118.1). This criticism and complaint is lent extra resentment if Eumolpus' first sentence is read: *multos iuuenes carmen deceptit*,<sup>44</sup> in which case the youthful ignorance of these offenders is to blame. On the other hand, there is a sense that poetry here is the refuge of the older man who is retiring from public life. In any case the offender's inexperience is emphasized in the following sentence, where Eumolpus insists on the poet's being first saturated with the literature of others before attempting to produce his own: *neque concipere aut edere partum mens potest nisi ingenti flumine litterarum inundata* (118.3).

43. cf. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.27, where the relaxation of poetry is recommended as the antidote to a day of speeches in the forum.

44. So both Sullivan (1968) 166, and Rose (1971) 68.

This attitude recalls the first episode in the text, where Encolpius and Agamemnon discuss the failings of education. The advice in Agamemnon's poem to a young would-be orator (5) is particularly like Eumolpus' advice to a would-be poet. There Agamemnon recommends a similarly comprehensive curriculum, which includes poetry (5.11–12) and is also described in terms of water imagery (*Maeoniamque bibat ... fontem*, 5.12; *suffusa*, 5.16; *flumine largo / plenus*, 5.21–2). Indeed, even in the education of an orator, emancipation from the cares of the forum is also recommended: *subducta foro det pagina cursum* (5.17). The criticism of the state of the arts and sciences with which Eumolpus precedes the *Troiae Halosis* is more concerned with greed, but water imagery crops up again when he asks: *quis si philosophiae fontem attigisset?* (88.7). Eumolpus' point here is that artistic decline is due to an inundation of vice (*nos uino scortisque demersi*, 88.6), as opposed to the proper inundation of learning—a point also made by Agamemnon (*nec perditis addictus obruat uino / mentis calorem*, 5.6–7). The target of Eumolpus' criticism in section 118, then, is the would-be poet; but also, strengthened by reference to other critical epousals in the *Satyricon*, it is the society which breeds the would-be poet.

Towards the end of 118 the target of the criticism shifts slightly, or rather it focuses. Having chosen for his example the genre of historical epic, Eumolpus takes to task the poet who would emphasize the historical aspect over the epic:

*non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe  
melius historici faciunt, sed per ambages deorumque ministeria et  
fabulosum sententiarum tormentum praecipitandus est liber spiri-  
tus, ut potius furentis animi vaticinatio appareat quam religiosae  
orationis sub testibus fides.* (118.6)

For many commentators this sharpens the focus of the criticism to a point: Eumolpus seems to be talking about Lucan. Lucan's *Pharsalia* is the only other extant hexameter poem on the Civil War, so, at least for the modern reader, it is difficult not to see parallels. But the reference to the importance of a divine machinery (*deorumque ministeria*) makes the connection all the stronger, since perhaps the most distinguishing feature of Lucan's poem is its radical rejection of the gods in favour of a more naturalistic explanation of the conflict. Proponents of the theory that Eumolpus is specifically criticizing Lucan see a subtle zooming-in effect which runs

throughout section 118: Eumolpus begins by criticizing the young,<sup>45</sup> then anyone who merely makes words fit a metre, then lawyers-turned-poets,<sup>46</sup> then those who would turn away from traditional epic and innovate in the genre, and finally those who would treat bare historical facts in verse.<sup>47</sup> Each of these describes Lucan with an increasing level of detail, until, with a pointed *ecce*<sup>48</sup> and the words *belli ciuilis* (118.6), the target of the critique comes fully into focus. That target is still unnamed, but such was the practice among contemporaries,<sup>49</sup> and at the mention of the Civil War it seems there can be no other poet in mind.

It is reasonable enough to accept that the author of the *Satyricon* was that contemporary of Nero's, the Petronius described by Tacitus.<sup>50</sup> It is therefore also reasonable to suppose that Petronius had at least some knowledge of Lucan and his famous poem. Rose presents the most comprehensive study on the subject, concluding:

However much doubt may be cast on several of the supposed parallels, it remains clear that Petronius had read Lucan's first three books and expected his audience to have done the same. ... It is not possible to prove that Petronius had not, or had, read all the books of the *Pharsalia*. Very possibly he had; but if so, because of his greater familiarity with the published books, he used them far more than the others.<sup>51</sup>

But in an article aimed at defusing the immense scholarly debate around the relationship of the *Bellum Ciuile* to the *Pharsalia* (one critic even argues that Petronius influenced Lucan and not vice versa),<sup>52</sup> George debunks many of the supposed correspondences between the type of poet that Eumolpus criticizes in section 118 and Lucan. Firstly, the weight of the manuscript tradition seems to come down on the

45. Sullivan (1968) 168–9.

46. cf. *[Lucanus] magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90.

47. *sunt quidam, qui [Lucanum] dicant non esse poetam*, Martial 14.194; *in numero poetarum [Lucanum] esse non meruit quia uidetur historiam composuisse non poema*, Serv. A. 1.382.

48. “Which marks a transition and suggests something which is before the eyes, i.e. contemporary”, Courtney (2001) 182.

49. Rose (1971) 68.

50. *Annals* 16.18–19; the identification is now widely accepted; see Rose (1971) 38 ff.

51. Rose (1971) 93–4.

52. Grimal (1977).

side of *iuuenes* (118.1) being vocative and not accusative, so that it refers not to young poets such as Lucan but to Eumolpus' young companions.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, *belli ciuilis* (118.6), does not necessarily single out Lucan: there was a general enthusiasm for historical epic during this period—the *Pharsalia* could well not have been the only one on the Civil War.<sup>54</sup> Similarly the reference to innovations in the genre: that the only poet to have eschewed Vergilian gods and survived to the present day is Lucan does not mean there were not others. There is both a history of questioning Vergil's techniques of divine machination, as well as a discussion dating as far back as Aristotle of the correctness of the formulation whereby poetry=fiction and history=fact.<sup>55</sup>

George goes on to address correspondences between the poems themselves, but here he has shown that the preface to the *Bellum Ciuile* does not necessarily criticize Lucan specifically. The target of Eumolpus' criticism is the mere versifier of facts (*non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt*, 118.6), and the modern re-appreciation of Lucan has gone a long way towards proving that the *Pharsalia* is much more than such a versification. The reference to strict and dry testimony (*religiosae orationis sub testibus fides*, 118.6) is not so much a reference to Lucan's style, nor to his background in declamation; rather it is an echo of the *controuersiam* and *forensibus ministeriis* of the hack lawyer-poet already described (118.2). Again, compare the criticisms in the Agamemnon episode and in section 88: it is the state of society which Eumolpus is lamenting, a society which cultivates literary ignorance. In fact, this may be just Petronius' point: Eumolpus is not saying anything new; here he is again, denouncing the decline of the arts, just like he did when Encolpius first encountered him, just like Agamemnon did at the beginning of the extant *Satyricon*, and indeed, probably just like many of Petronius' contemporaries were in the habit of doing. It may not be that Petronius is parodying Lucan in his poem on the Civil War so much as he parodies the likes of Lucan's detractors in the preceding effusion of clichéd criticism. Ultimately, the real "target" of Eumolpus' criticism ends up being Eumolpus himself.

53. George (1974) 121; *o iuuenes* appears in both O and L manuscripts, cf. Sullivan (1968) 166 and Rose (1971) 68.

54. George (1974) 121-2.

55. George (1974) 122.

**Eumolpus' literary models**, at least the ones he cites, are Homer, the lyric poets, Vergil, and Horace (118.5). Other poets either did not see the path *qua iretur ad carmen*, or else were afraid to tread it. It is usually assumed that “Petronius is obviously thinking of epic (*carmen*, not *nugae* or *lusus*), because he insists that lofty, non-vulgar language is the appropriate style.”<sup>56</sup> But only two of the models whom Eumolpus cites actually wrote epic: *lyrici* points to a specific genre which is *not* epic, and Horace famously wrote several *recusationes* avoiding the loftier genre.<sup>57</sup>

The mention of Horace, the quotation of him (*odi profanum uulgus et arceo*, 118.4=*Carmina* 3.1.1), and the reference to a *uiam qua iretur ad carmen* all recall another poet: Callimachus. The history of the *recusatio* goes back to Callimachus, who turns away from epic poetry in the prologue to the *Aetia*. Indeed, the Horace quote is in turn a quotation of Callimachus: σικχαινῶ πάντα τὰ δημοσῖα (*Epigr.* 28.4 Pf.). In the same epigram, Callimachus also despises “the well-trod path” (οὐδε κελυθῶι χαίρω τις πολλοὺς ὠδε καὶ ὠδε φέρει, *Epig.* 28.1–2 Pf.). This is an image again employed in the prologue to the *Aetia*, where Apollo warns Callimachus away from the path on which the wagons travel. This triple-allusion elucidates the somewhat strange choice of the verb *calcare* (118.5): “the Latin *calcare* is the regular translation for πατεῶ, the verb Callimachus uses to describe the wagons which travel on the path a good poet should avoid.”<sup>58</sup>

But all this cross-reference makes Eumolpus' point obscure. The overall point of the passage is to honour the traditions of poetry. It is a conservative message, and one which advises against innovation. But the advice of Callimachus is to “find one's own way”: advice which Eumolpus must support, since it is the source of the line from Horace which he quotes so approvingly.<sup>59</sup> Furthermore, Eumolpus' choice of the word *calcare* indicates that, unlike Callimachus, he advocates taking the common road, the path of traditional epic which Homer, Vergil, and countless others trod. It becomes even more difficult to ascertain Eumolpus' view when *calcare* turns up in the poem itself: *haec ubi calcauit Caesar iuga* (v. 152). On the one

56. Sullivan (1968) 167.

57. Horace, *Odes* 1.6, 2.12, 4.2, 4.15, and arguably others.

58. Connors (1998) 133.

59. Of course it is possible that Eumolpus is unaware of the connection with Callimachus, and that he quotes Horace only with reference to the need for refined diction in poetry; but this likewise would contribute to the characterization of his ignorance in literary matters.

hand, the path through the alps is narrow, unmarked, and treacherous. On the other hand, Caesar is following in the footsteps of great men, namely Hercules and Hannibal, just as Eumolpus advocates following in the steps of literary greats. It should also be noted that the imagery of Eumolpus' insistence that the poet be inundated by a great flood of literature (*ingenti flumine litterarum inundata*, 118.3) clashes somewhat with another Callimachean image: the preference for the narrow stream or light mist rather than the wide flood. Connors suggests that a contemporary enthusiasm for neo-Callimacheanism is being attacked here,<sup>60</sup> but Eumolpus is not consistently anti-Callimachean; rather he both approves and disapproves of the Callimachean ideal. Eumolpus at least seems to be muddling his allusions.

Petronius has done this before to characters who present themselves as critical authorities, including Agamemnon, Trimalchio, even Encolpius. Trimalchio is by far the worst offender: blatantly and unknowingly confused in his knowledge of wines, mythology, and literature, he makes a series of gaffes to the amusement of the reader and chagrin of his fellow diners.<sup>61</sup> Agamemnon and Encolpius are not so obviously caricatured, but they are both portrayed as hypocrites. Encolpius declaims against declaiming (1-2), while Agamemnon acknowledges the problems with the education system, yet continues to pander to it (3-5). Such paradoxical incongruities are a staple of Petronius' humour. The case with Eumolpus, though, is more subtle. He can perhaps be forgiven for faulty art criticism in the *pinacotheca* (88), since art is not his game; but Eumolpus is a self-professed poet (*ego ... poeta sum*, 83.8): he ought really to be in his element when it comes to literary criticism. That he makes a blunder of his literary allusion may be yet another—indeed, this the most refined—testament to Petronius' genius for characterization.

On the other hand, it may be that in his jumbled reference to other poets Eumolpus is not so much betraying his inadequacy as deliberately misleading the reader. To return to the point of genre, it has already been noted that less than half of the authors whom Eumolpus cites (*lyrici* is plural) actually wrote epic poetry. References to Homer, Vergil, and their *ambages deorumque ministeria*, have all led scholars to assume that Eumolpus is principally concerned with that genre. But the genre which Eumolpus elects for his *exemplum* is not *mythical* epic, in the line of the *Odyssey*, the *Iliad*, or the *Aeneid*; the genre of the *Bellum Ciuile* is *historical*

60. Connors (1998) 132-4.

61. Section 48 is particularly replete with Trimalchio's blunders of this sort.

epic. This has a slightly different tradition in that the events which it describes have occurred in the recorded and sometimes even living memory of the audience; the mythical variety takes place, by contrast, in the mythical past. This difference is perhaps what led Lucan to eschew the Vergilian and Homeric gods: an audience familiar with the historical motives for, and events of, the Civil War would perhaps find a supernatural account of such factors less compelling than the naturalistic account provided in the *Pharsalia*. Historical epic was popular in the principate; Eumolpus seems also to be working in that genre, and yet the models he cites are not his contemporaries. Moreover, the poets whom he does claim as his inspiration did not touch historical epic. If Eumolpus' intent really were to provide a "fair copy" version of the Civil War, true to the tradition of the epic genre, why does he not cite Ennius or Naevius, the fathers of Roman epic and both authors of revered historical works? Are they to be understood as among the *ceteri* (118.5) who either did not see or feared to tread the path to true poetry? It seems there is some dissonance between the type of poetry Eumolpus claims to admire in his discourse on *ars poetica* and that which he claims to have produced in the *Bellum Ciuile*.

In this connection it is also of interest to note the different genres in which an author such as Horace, admired by Eumolpus, actually did write. Sullivan assumes that *carmen*=epic;<sup>62</sup> but of course Horace's *Carmina*=odes.<sup>63</sup> Eumolpus does not seem to be drawing attention to these of Horace's poems, though, for he has already adduced the *lyrici*;<sup>64</sup> so what else did Horace write? The *Ars Poetica* is naturally relevant to Eumolpus' present purpose. On the proper subject matter for verse, though, compare what Eumolpus has to say:

*non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe  
melius historici faciunt* (118.6)

with what Horace says:

*res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella  
quo scribi possent numero monstravit Homerus* (Ars P. 74-5)

62. Sullivan (1968) 167.

63. Catullus too wrote *carmina* which were not epic.

64. Although it is probably the Greek lyric poets that are meant.

That the phrase *tristia bella* occurs near the very beginning of the *Bellum Ciuile* (v. 6) confirms the confusion Eumolpus is in. Horace agrees that Homer was right to cast *res gestae* into hexameters, and Eumolpus cites both of these authors approvingly, only to in the same breath deny that *res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt*, and then go on to treat an historical event in verse. Moreover, the poet who privileges frenzied inspiration (*furentis animi*) over measured restraint (*religiosae orationis*, 118.6) seems to encourage the unbalanced behaviour of the *poeta uesanus* who appears at the end of Horace's work:

*ut mala quem scabies aut morbus regius urget  
aut fanaticus error et iracunda Diana,  
uesanum tetigisse timent fugiuntque poetam  
qui sapiunt, agitant pueri incautique sequuntur.  
hic, dum sublimis versus ructatur et errat,  
si ueluti merulis intentus decidit auceps  
in puteum foueamue, licet 'succurrite' longum  
clamet, 'io cives', non sit qui tollere curet.* (Ars P. 453–60)

Elsewhere Eumolpus is said to be afflicted by an illness (*quid tibi uis cum isto morbo*, asks Encolpius, 90.3) which means he cannot keep from spouting verse at any opportune moment: he promises Encolpius he will desist (90.6), only to break his promise twice almost immediately (91.3/92.6, 93.3). After the shipwreck, too, he is described in terms similar to Horace's poet: trapped like a wild animal and uttering annoying pleas (*murmur insolitum ... quasi cupientis exire beluae gemitum*, 115.1), he is a "mooring poet" (*poetam mugientem*, 115.5). Wise people avoid Eumolpus: he is ejected from the picture gallery (90.1), the theatre (90.5), and the baths (92.6). His multiple similarities with Horace's *poeta uesanus* again undercut the poetic programme in section 118: the "inspired" behaviour of the raving poet (*liber spiritus, ...furentis animi uaticinatio*, 118.6) is completely at odds with the *Horatii curiosa felicitas* (118.5).

Finally, it should be noted that Horace also wrote satires. Though the *Bellum Ciuile* claims to be historical epic, many have noted a satirical tendency in the work. Slater points out that without the benefit of the clue in the preface (*ecce belli ciuilis ingens opus quisquis attigerit...*, 118.6), the reader of the *Bellum Ciuile*

would struggle to place the subject matter of the work, and its genre:

Without this context, the beginning of Eumolpus' poem is almost unreadable. Though the metre is hexameter, the genre could as easily be satire as epic. The subject of the next forty-two lines is the moral decay of Rome, couched in terms so general that we still have no firm signal from the poetry itself that the time is that of the civil war. ... Even allowing for the rhetorical style of epic in the Silver Age, we still have no incontrovertible genre markers.<sup>65</sup>

Though "almost unreadable" is an exaggeration, it is certainly true that Eumolpus avoids making it clear from the beginning that he is embarking on an historical epic on the Civil War. The lack of a proemium or invocation of the muses contributes to this, but the content of the first sixty lines especially reads like a contemporary criticism of Roman society and its declining moral values. Nor are such subjects confined to the poem's opening: they are the principal concern in the conversation of Dis and Fortuna, Caesar himself decries the *mercedibus emptae / ac uiles operae quorum est mea Roma nouerca* (vv. 165–6), and the panicked flight from Rome can well be read from a satirical point of view. Slater's mention of the hexameter reminds one that this was the metre not only of epic but of didactic and satirical verse as well. Horace's use of hexameters was restricted to only these last two genres—indeed the first book of Horace's *Satires* begins with a poem on greed and avarice.

Besides muddling his literary allusions, Eumolpus also muddles his literary models. The poem he offers his companions on the road to Croton pretends to be an historical epic, but only two of the poets Eumolpus cites in his theory of *ars poetica* actually wrote epic, and neither of them the historical variety. On the contrary, one of those models, Horace, refused to write epic and did write satires; so it is perhaps not surprising that the poem which Eumolpus presents has a strongly satirical flavour. Of course, the theory set out in section 118 is concerned with poetry in general, so really Eumolpus was free to choose whichever role models he liked. But when he then turns to historical epic specifically he undercuts the expectations he

65. Slater (1990) 196.

has set up by discussing the merits of such poets as Homer, the lyric poets, Vergil, and Horace.

Having identified *whom* Eumolpus admires and whom he does not, it now remains to identify *what* he admires, and to evaluate the *Bellum Ciuile* against those values. There are five main guidelines for a good poem set out in section 118; they are:

- The poet's mind ought to be steeped in the literary tradition (*ingenti flumine litterarum inundata*, 118.3; *plenus litteris*, 118.6), so that his poetry can be allusive (*per ambages*, 118.6),
- The diction of poetry ought to be refined (*refugiendum est ab omni verborum, ut ita dicam, vilitate et sumendae voces a plebe summotae*, 118.4),
- The ostentatious *sententia* is the preserve of declaimers (*controuersiam sententiolis uibrantibus pictam*, 118.2); in poetry *sententiae* ought to be worked into the fabric of the whole (*ne sententiae emineant extra corpus orationis expressae*, 118.5),
- Poetry ought to make use of divine machinery (*deorumque ministeria*, 118.6),
- Inspiration ought to trump faithfulness to fact in historical poetry (*potius furentis animi uaticinatio appareat quam religiosae orationis sub testibus fides*, 118.6).

In his use of **allusion** Eumolpus does prove himself to be at least somewhat *plenus litteris*. The *Bellum Ciuile* is allusive in general and in detail. When it comes to general inspiration, it has already been noted that Eumolpus' greatest debt is probably to Lucan. George calls into question the relevance of the intense debate on Petronius' relationship with Lucan and convincingly disproves many of the supposed parallels between the two, but even he must allow that "it remains possible that Petronius was aware in a general way of some of the characteristics of Lucan's

work”, even if, “at most, it would explain the choice of subject, and Petronius’ penchant for theology.”<sup>66</sup> That is to say, it is not necessary to think of Lucan specifically in order to attribute the inspiration for the *Bellum Ciuile* to a contemporary trend in literature. This in itself seems to go against Eumolpus’ conservative literary programme, but presumably *plenus litteris* means as much “keeping up with the state of the art” as it does absorbing the traditional masterpieces. Indeed, Eumolpus’ attempt on the whole seems to be to unite traditional technique with contemporary themes.

As for specific textual parallels, Rose assembles a list of those with Lucan;<sup>67</sup> to which Grimal adds Vergil, Seneca, Ennius, and Ovid;<sup>68</sup> and Baldwin Horace, Catullus, and Lucretius.<sup>69</sup> Zeitlin makes a convincing case that of these influences it is not Lucan’s but Vergil’s that is the most prominent, and the most important clue to understanding the *Bellum Ciuile*.<sup>70</sup> Particularly striking are the similarities between: the description of the Phlegraean fields (vv. 67–75) and Aeneas’ adventures in the underworld (A. 6.237–242); the divine conference for war of Dis and Fortuna (vv. 76–121) and that of Juno and Allecto (A. 7.286–340); the appearance of *Fama* (v. 211) and that of the same creature (A. 4.173–88), as well as Allecto (A. 7.511–18); the flight from Rome (vv. 215–237) and that from Troy (A. 7.511–18); *Furor*’s bursting forth (vv. 258–60) and her imprisonment (A. 1.294–6); the description of Discordia (vv. 271 ff.) and that of the same goddess (A. 6.280, 8.702). Besides Vergil, Eumolpus makes striking use of Livy: his description of Caesar’s descent from the Alps (v. 185–208) draws heavily on Livy’s description of Hannibal’s descent (Liv. 21.35–6). In the same passage, the particular detail of the breaking of (molecular?) bonds as troops and horses trample the ice (*turmae nimbos fregere ligatos / et pauidus quadrupes undarum uincula rupit*, vv. 187–8) seems almost Lucretian. The implications of all this allusion will be discussed in the third part of the present work; it is enough to note here that, in keeping with his poetic precepts, Eumolpus does indeed demonstrate an ability to draw on a wealth of literary references.

66. George (1974) 132

67. Rose (1971) 87–94.

68. Grimal (1977) 261–292.

69. Baldwin (1911) 22–5.

70. Zietlin (1971a) 76–9.

On the question of refined **diction** Eumolpus seems to fare less well. Baldwin argues that, albeit by necessity, “Petronius has simply transferred to the poem his prose vocabulary, shorn of its exuberances, and augmented by a few new terms.”<sup>71</sup> But this is not to say that the diction of the poem is unrefined; merely that it is not significantly different from that of the surrounding prose (which can itself be quite high-register):

This double use of his vocabulary is made possible, not only by the comparatively prosaic tone of the verse, but also by the tendency of the characters in his romance to indulge in melodramatic rant and describe their sordid doings in language filched from epic, tragedy, and oratory.<sup>72</sup>

Sullivan declares, that “Petronius’ vocabulary, although Vergilian, is jejune and imitative.”<sup>73</sup> In fact this actually confirms Eumolpus’ conservative precept: he does not say that a poet’s vocabulary should be innovative; only that it should not be that of everyday speech. Baldwin’s point is that the “everyday speech” of the characters in the *Satyricon* is already quite elevated, so that the *Bellum Civile* does little to distinguish itself from the rest of the work in its diction. This does not mean that Eumolpus has failed to meet his guideline.

Baldwin does adduce a few examples of colloquialisms, namely forms of *accersere* (vv. 117, 158; also common in Lucan) and the “plebeian circumlocution” of *esse nocens coepi* (v. 164), as well as the following examples of legal language, which the argument of section 118.2 would also seem to forbid:<sup>74</sup>

- *sine uindica praeda*, (v. 50)
- *nullum sine pignore corpus*, (v. 53)
- *causam dicite*, and (v. 169)
- *causa peracta est*. (v. 175)

71. Baldwin (1911) 47.

72. Baldwin (1911) 49.

73. Sullivan (1968) 182.

74. Baldwin (1911) 43.

Offsetting these “failures” are many poetic usages, of which Baldwin gives eleven examples,<sup>75</sup> while several others have already been discussed in the first chapter of the present study. On balance, then, though it may not differentiate itself from the diction of the rest of the *Satyricon*, the language of the *Bellum Ciuile* is nevertheless quite fitting for poetry. Of course, it may not be the diction of *epic* poetry, but given that the first sixty lines of the poem seem to have more in common with the genre of satire than that of epic (as discussed above), this is perhaps not surprising.

Eumolpus claims that *sententiae* ought not to stand out of a poem as ornaments, as in a declamation, but rather that they should be worked into the fabric of the whole. Some commentators charge the poet with hypocrisy on this point:

Eumolpus on occasions even stands convicted of his own charges—and quite obviously so. For example, he roundly condemns obtrusive and irrelevant *sententiae* (118.5). And yet, surely, a prime instance of that very fault may be found at 89.27...<sup>76</sup>

It seems strange that Beck should quote a verse from the *Troiae Halosis* in support of an argument concerning the remarks which precede the *Bellum Ciuile*. Indeed, there are several examples of *sententiae* in the latter poem, though they are few enough to list here:

- *ingeniosa gula est.* (v. 33)
- *inops audacia tuta est.* (v. 57)
- *hos gloria reddit honores.* (v. 66)
- *Fors, cui nulla placet nimium secreta potestas,  
quae noua semper amas et mox possessa relinquis...* (vv. 80–1)

It must be remembered that Eumolpus’ injunction is not against *sententiae per se* but against their standing out (*ne ... emineant*, 118.5). Several of the most memorable sections of the *Bellum Ciuile* are those attended by *sententiae*. Martial, for example, quotes *ingeniosa gula est* (v. 33 = Mart. 13.62.2). It must be assumed that

75. Baldwin (1911) 43–4.

76. Beck (1979) 253, n. 52.

Eumolpus considered his *sententiae* sufficiently unobtrusive and appropriate,<sup>77</sup> and it is against this principle that his success ought to be evaluated.

None but the last of the examples cited takes up as much as a whole line, so that, at least in one respect, Eumolpus' *sententiae* are not readily removed without damaging the lines around them. The last example is part of an address to Fortuna, so likewise difficult to remove. The full address is:

*“rerum humanarum diuinarumque potestas,  
Fors, cui nulla placet nimium secura potestas,  
quae noua semper amas et mox possessa relinquis...”* (vv. 79–81)

The sentential thought (that fortune is fickle) is neatly woven into that standard extended description of a divine addressee which often also alludes to the capacity in which the god or goddess is being addressed.<sup>78</sup> It is specifically to Fortuna's distaste for power too long seated that Dis is appealing. None of these examples, then, could be removed from the text without either damaging a line or confounding the purpose of an address. In this sense they are integral to the text, and so “woven” into it (*intexto vestibus colore niteant*, 118.5).

Furthermore, each of the examples of *sententiae* is bound closely with the subject matter of its context, and not an arbitrary or out of place abstraction. So *ingeniosa gula est* and *inops audacia tuta est* are reflections on Rome's gluttonous immobility, “appended as tags to the lines which suggest them”;<sup>79</sup> *hos gloria reddit honores* is linked to what precedes it by the demonstrative pronoun; and the commonplace description of Fortuna as changeable is apropos Dis' exhortation for change. Not only are the *sententiae* of the *Bellum Ciuile* woven into the text on the level of the texture of the verse, but also on the level of content. Moreover, the instances of sentential thought, though incorporated into the theme of their context, still shine out (*niteant*) in respect of their universal relevance, for which Martial's appreciation of one of them is evidence. Though at first he seems to violate his own rule, on closer reading of both the formulation of that rule, and of the text, Eumolpus proves true to his guidelines on the inclusion of *sententiae*.

77. Sullivan (1968) 169.

78. cf. *o pater, o hominum rerumque aeterna potestas / namque aliud quid sit quod iam implorare queamus?* Virgil A. 10.18–19.

79. Baldwin (1911) 43.

It is in his inclusion of **divine machinery** that Eumolpus most emphatically fulfills his programme. Most of the actors in his poem are deities—Caesar, the main exception, would himself eventually be deified. Eumolpus crafts a plot which is neatly divided between the mortal and the divine realms, emphasizing that the acts of men mirror the will of the gods. Indeed, if the omens before and after Caesar's speech count as the acts of gods, the number of verses devoted to divine actions comes nearly equal to that of those devoted to human actions.<sup>80</sup> The transitions between these two theatres of action run thus: the *Bellum Ciuile* opens in the world of men, with a description of all-too-human decadence and luxury at Rome (vv. 1-60); the cause of this state of affairs is then reflected upon by Dis and Fortuna, who decide upon war (vv. 61-125); this divine compact is immediately followed by a catalogue of omens (vv. 126-141); Caesar is then introduced, and he makes his speech on the Alps (vv. 142-176); the speech is attended by omens favourable for war (vv. 177-182); Caesar and his army descend from the Alps to march on Rome (vv. 183-208); in a brief switch to divine action, Fama spreads the news of Caesar's approach (vv. 209-214); at Rome there is general panic and flight (vv. 215-244); the remainder of the action takes place in the realm of the gods, as several supernatural creatures also flee Rome, others arrive there, the Olympians choose sides in the conflict, and Discordia takes up the position from which she will oversee the proceedings of the war proper (vv. 245-295).

It will be noticed that where the narrative begins in one sphere it finishes in the other. Further, the transitions between the two spheres are managed and smooth. The first transition, from a description of Rome to the conference of Dis and Fortuna, is mediated by six verses where divine and mortal actors mingle (*tres tulerat Fortuna duces...*, vv. 61-6). The transition back to the realm of men and the acts of Caesar takes place through an intermediary account of the præternatural. Further omens break up the central Caesar episode, and the introduction of Fama provides a transition between Caesar's action and that at Rome. Finally, the scene at Rome is, like the opening scene, mirrored in the actions of the gods.<sup>81</sup> It is apparent that Eumolpus has put some care and thought into working his *deorum ministeria* into the flow of the narrative.

80. Roughly, 151 verses of episodes in the mortal sphere, 122 of episodes in the divine sphere, and 22 verses devoted to omens.

81. Compare *pectora perque duas scinduntur territa causas*, v. 217, and *omnis regia caeli / in partes diducta ruit*, vv. 265-6.

But Eumolpus' is not a Vergilian divine machinery. Through his citation of Homer and Vergil as models for good poetry (118.5), together with his insistence on the inclusion of the gods in historical epic (118.6), Eumolpus implies that those two authors between them provide the best model for interactions between human characters and divine. Vergil and Homer both made use of a raft of lesser deities, but in their works it is the Olympians who are the prime movers. Eumolpus reverses this, making prominent use of allegorical deities while shifting the Olympian gods into the background. Jupiter is referred to obliquely at v. 125, and at vv. 264-270 several of the Olympians choose sides in the war; but none of these divine characters is described either in action or in speech: compare Dis and Fortuna, who converse, and Discordia, who overlooks the battlefield and urges on the fight. Furthermore, though in Vergil and Homer gods do touch the earth,<sup>82</sup> the real decision- and fate-making actions take place during divine councils set in heaven or on Olympus; in the *Bellum Ciuile*, all the action, mortal and divine, takes place on earth (the "divine council" of Dis and Fortuna takes place in the Phlegraean fields). Eumolpus does not retain the most cosmos-defining aspects of the Homeric/Vergilian divine machinery.

In this respect it is important to note the main difference between Eumolpus' attempt at epic and the epic works of his literary models. Homer and Vergil could perhaps get away with elaborate divine machinery, for their subjects were shrouded in the mythical past; Eumolpus enjoyed a distance of only some one hundred years from his subject matter. It is easy to suspect that part of Eumolpus' reason for restricting his divine cast of characters to a more minor set (and part of Lucan's reason for excluding the gods altogether) was the proximity of the events of the Civil War to the time of the poem's composition. A contemporary reader, so the reasoning goes, would be less inclined to suspend their belief and entertain the possibility that the gods took part in the events of recent history. But this is not borne out by the epic tradition on the whole: most Roman epic poetry was historical epic,<sup>83</sup> and, though there is little evidence to go on, it seems likely "that divine participation in Roman historical epic ... was the norm rather than the exception."<sup>84</sup> Indeed, the two earliest examples of the Roman version of the genre treated events which

82. cf. *sentit terra deos*, v. 264.

83. Feeney (1991) 107-8.

84. Feeney (1991) 269.

had happened within the lifetimes of their authors: Naevius fought in the very war which was the subject of his *Bellum Punica*, the first epic poem in Latin; Ennius covered history from the Trojan War down to and including his own time in his *Annales*, the first Roman epic to be written in hexameters. And yet the proximity of the events which were the subject matter of these two poems to their authors did not stop either from employing divine machinery in their works.

If one compares the *Bellum Ciuile* against the norm of historical epic, rather than taking Eumolpus' bait and compare his poem to Vergil and Homer, it becomes clear that it is possible to include the gods even in the telling of events only recently past. It may also be the case that the set of gods appropriate to such an epic was slightly different to that employed by Vergil. It is true that Naevius and Ennius make use of Olympian deities, but it is not impossible that in the historical tradition more space and influence was given to lesser gods such as those in Eumolpus' poem: Ennius, for example, also gives a vivid description of Discordia (*Ann.* fr. 258-9). The generally attested innovation of Vergil in respect of divine machinery only strengthens this possibility. Vergil's gods are chiefly the most supreme and most fate-determining of the pantheon precisely because Vergil is very concerned with outlining the cosmic fate of Rome. While there is a precedent for this long view of Roman destiny in Naevius, the *Aeneid* is exceptional in its ambitious scope. It seems likely that historical epic was less concerned with the cosmic significance of the events it described and more interested in the events themselves. If this were the case then it would not be surprising to see a greater predominance of the allegorical deities, since they are tied more closely to the aspects and events of the physical world. Nor would it be surprising if, for the same reason, less of the divine machinery of historical epic took place in heaven and more on earth, as in the *Bellum Ciuile*. If at first Eumolpus seems to have produced a less than traditional divine machinery it is because he misdirects the reader by mentioning Homer and Vergil in his preface. In reality Eumolpus' gods may in fact be quite close to those of historical epic.

Although the allegorical deities are more prominently active, the Olympians are not completely absent from the *Bellum Ciuile*. Several of them (namely, Venus, Mars, Apollo, Diana, and Mercury) appear in the scene where the gods split into factions (*omnis regia caeli in partes diducta ruit*, vv. 265 ff.), and after Dis and Fortuna come to their agreement there is a sign from the most powerful of their

number:

*uixdum finierat cum fulgure rupta corusco  
intremuit nubes elisosque abscidit ignes.  
subsedit pater umbrarum, gremioque reducto,  
telluris pauitans fraternos palluit ictus.* (vv. 122–5)

The *fraternos ictus* are of course the bolts of Jupiter. In keeping with the poet's general avoidance such gods it is a passing and indirect reference, but a reference nonetheless. The adjective *fraternos* foreshadows the impending fraternal strife of civil war, but what is the significance of Jupiter's thunder? Dis and Fortuna have concluded their discussion and are resolved on war: the fact that the thunder comes immediately upon the making of this pact (*uixdum finierat*) could indicate that it is a sign of approval. The Civil War was after all part of the divine plan for Rome in Anchises' account according to Vergil, however regrettable,<sup>85</sup> and so by implication, it is the will of Jupiter. But Dis' rapid and frightened retreat could equally indicate his brother's displeasure at the agreement reached with Fortuna. The story of the Civil War is the opposite of that of the *Aeneid*: it tells not of Rome's rise but of its fall.<sup>86</sup> The ambiguity with which Eumolpus laces Jupiter's reaction to the plan for war is in fact similar to Lucan's ambiguous attitude to the need for war. Lucan refers to both randomness and divine providence as causes of the war, but he does not answer definitively which he thinks really was the cause, nor does he describe what he thinks the nature of any divine providence might have been.<sup>87</sup> Eumolpus by contrast does describe the providence of the gods, but the motives of Dis and Fortuna are petty (Dis—or rather Tisiphone—craves more souls; and Fortuna is disgruntled with the Romans' lack of appreciation for the benefits she has granted them): when it comes to the ultimate authority (Jupiter) Eumolpus too casts doubt on whether war was sanctioned by the highest of powers.

The ultimate authority in the *Bellum Ciuile* is not so much Jupiter as it is Dis. Of the three main deities in the poem,<sup>88</sup> he is the one who signals the need for war; Fortuna simply agrees to it, and Discordia oversees it as it is acted out in the world.

85. *Aen.* 828–31.

86. Zeitlin (1971a) 76.

87. Feeney (1991) 277–283.

88. That is, of the three deities who are given speeches; on this see below.

The god of the underworld, though by definition not an Olympian, was not of any little account: Dis was a powerful god and included by some reckonings among the δωδεκάθεον. Indeed, his position in the *Bellum Ciuile* as the judge of Rome's fate threatens the traditional role of Jupiter. The *fraternos ictus* which attend the end of Fortuna's speech recall the uneasy agreement whereby the world was divided between the realms of Jupiter, Neptune, and Dis, and act as a warning not to overstep the boundaries appropriate to the god of the underworld. This idea of Dis outstripping his prerogative is reinforced by the setting of his conference with Fortuna. The lonely swamps of lake Avernus are a half-way point between each of the spheres of the divine interlocutors. Fortuna acts in the world of men, Dis in the underworld: the gloomy Phlegraean Fields are both intermediary between and estranged from these two worlds. The birdless, otherworldly nature of the *locus* makes it a fearful and ominous place for mortals to tread, but Dis also shows his discomfort: in an awkward gesture at the end of his speech, he fails to embrace Fortuna and instead causes a great chasm in the earth to open between them (100-101). Yet this uncomfortable setting is as close as the *Bellum Ciuile* gets to a physical separation of the divine plane from the mortal. Its remove from scenes both at Rome and with Caesar on the Alps set it apart, like the divine council at Olympus, but it is nevertheless still on earth. Moreover, instead of being set in heaven and presided over by Jupiter, this divine council takes place on the doorstep of the underworld and is presided over by Dis. By choosing to represent divine providence through the gods of darkness rather than the gods of light, Eumolpus emphasizes the sinister nature of civil war. The inversion of divine influence mirrors the inversion of the implications: Jupiter oversaw Rome's rise in the *Aeneid*; in the *Bellum Ciuile* Dis oversees its fall.

Dis is presented as the prime motivator of the war, but it is Fortuna's influence which pervades the work. The goddess of chance first appears briefly in her usual abstract guise:

tres tulerat Fortuna duces quos obruit omnes  
armorum strue diuersa feralis Enyo.

Crassum Parthus habet, Libyco iacet aequore Magnus,  
Iulius ingratham perfudit sanguine Romam,

et quasi non posset tot tellus ferre sepulcra,  
 diuisit cineres. hos gloria reddit honores. (vv. 61-6)

At this point 'Fortuna' could as well be rendered 'fortuna', for here she represents the various turns by which Caesar, Crassus, and Pompey came to power, and is in that respect no different to Lucan's concept of fortune or chance. Enyo is more personified, for she receives the adjective *feralis*, but *Fortuna* as the subject of *tulerat* is a personification as much as *tellus*, the subject of *ferre*, or *gloria*, the subject of *reddidit*. She is not presented as a goddess until she meets with Dis in the Phlegraeian fields, and it is only through the course of their discussion that the reader comes to realize that it was perhaps by Fortuna's own conscious efforts that Caesar, Crassus, and Pompey rose to power. The ironic *sententia*, *hos gloria reddit honores* (v. 66) then reveals its extra force, and the five and one half lines preceding it become a summary of the whole poem, complete with the divine machinery. The Fortuna/Enyo partnership prefigures the Fortuna/Dis partnership: just as Fortuna raised the three generals to power only for Enyo to claim their lives, so Fortuna raised Rome to power only for Dis to submit her to Civil War.

Fortuna's portrayal as a character who participates personally in the events of the poem carries through even after her speech. Eumolpus perverts the comment Caesar reportedly made on crossing the Rubicon:<sup>89</sup> where Suetonius records *iacta alea est* (*Jul.* 32), and Plutarch ἀνεπιφθω κύβος (*Pomp.* 60.2.9), the author of the *Bellum Ciuile* has Caesar say *iudice Fortuna cadat alea* (v. 174). And in the end it is indeed Fortuna who witnesses Pompey's defeat (*pro pudor! ... ut Fortuna leuis Magni quoque terga uideret*, vv. 243-4). Eumolpus makes the goddess responsible for both the act which began the war and that which ended it. She governs the fates of the war's two main characters, and, caught between, that of the ordinary Roman (*hic dat uela fugae Fortunaque omnia credit*, v. 237). Set against Lucan's *fortuna*, a pervading but abstract force, Eumolpus' *Fortuna* is a pervading and personal force. According to the poet's literary precepts, it is the inclusion of the gods *as characters* which makes poems such as the *Bellum Ciuile* poetry and not history.

Feeney points out the difference between the ancient and modern notions of history, which allows for the participation of the gods in the former but not in the

89. The fact that Eumolpus has Caesar utter this comment as he crosses the Alps and not the Rubicon is dealt with below.

latter:

We must remember that, by the grammarians' categories at least, the historicity of an event (whether it happened or not) was not at issue: "the difference between *fabula* and *historia*," according to Servius, "is that *fabula* is the *narration* of something against nature, *whether it happened or not* (e.g. Pasiphae), while *historia* is whatever is *narrated* in accordance with nature, *whether it happened or not* (e.g. Phaedra)" (*historia est quicquid secundum naturam dicitur, siue factum siue non factum, Aen. 1.235*).<sup>90</sup>

It is in this sense that Lucan is accused of being an historian (or an orator) rather than a poet.<sup>91</sup> His work, though it may include human perceptions of divine or oracular events, delivers only what is "narrated in accordance with nature": it is all *historia* and no *fabula*. If *fabulosum* is the correct reading for the corrupt *fabulosum sententiarum †tormentum†* (118.6), then it is this distinction especially to which Eumolpus draws attention. The reference to the testimony of witnesses (*religiosae orationis sub testibus fides*, 118.6) recalls Cicero, who also belittles those *qui ... non ut a poeta sed ut a teste ueritatem exigant* (*Leg. 1.4*). It is this poetic truth, this *ueritas ut a poeta* which Eumolpus hopes to impart by weaving *fabulae* into his account of the Civil War. In the ancient world historians and poets alike could report divine interventions, but only the poet could describe such an intervention from the deity's point of view:

An ancient historian will describe a report of a deity appearing in a battle, for example, but he will not narrate the decision of the deity to appear, or transcribe the conversation before he sets off for the battle-site. The more identity one sees between historical epic and history proper, the more clearly it emerges that the characterful narration of divine action is the irreducible line of demarcation between epic and history.<sup>92</sup>

90. Feeney (1991) 255, his emphasis.

91. Serv. A. 1.382; Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90; Mart. 14.194.

92. Feeney (1991) 261.

The difference between Eumolpus' treatment of the Civil War and Lucan's, then, is not that one includes the gods and the other does not, but that in one the gods speak and act and in the other they are silent. It has been seen that this is especially so in the case of Fortuna: Eumolpus emphasizes the point of difference by taking Lucan's favourite abstract force and converting her into a fully-fledged character.<sup>93</sup>

Indeed, if the speech and action of gods is the most defining aspect of epic poetry, then there is only one more deity in the *Bellum Ciuile* who merits significant attention: Discordia. The other supernatural figures either herald the coming of war (Fama, vv. 211-214), flee Rome at its arrival (Pax, Fides, Iustitia, and Concordia, vv. 249-253), attend its arrival (Erinys, Bellona, Megaera, Letum, Insidia, Mors, and Furor, vv. 254-263), or take sides in it (Venus, Pallas, and Mars on Caesar's side; Apollo, Diana, Mercury, and Hercules on Pompey's, vv. 264-270), all in an evocative but straightforward description of panic in the divine sphere, mirroring that in the mortal sphere (vv. 215-244). But it is Discordia who receives the final speech, Discordia who gives the signal for the fighting to begin (*sumite nunc ... arma*, v. 283). Indeed, it is the goddess of discord who provides the final link in the formulation of Eumolpus' divine machinery.

Although Dis and Fortuna were responsible for conceiving the plan for war, it was not made clear at the conclusion of their meeting how this plan was to be enacted. Dis bade Fortuna set her face for war and beset the Romans (*quare age, Fors, muta pacatum in proelia uultum / Romanosque cie ac nostris da funera regnis*, vv. 94-5). In response Fortuna prophesied the carnage to come (*cerno equidem gemina iam stratos morte Philippos...*, vv. 111 ff.) and bade Dis open up his realm to receive the dead (*pande, age, terrarum sitientia regna tuarum / atque animas accerse nouas*, vv. 116-117). But Fortuna does not participate in the fighting herself; she operates on a more cosmic scale. True, she presides over the casting of Caesar's *alea* (v. 174), and she is present when Pompey is defeated (v. 244), but she does not have any direct contact with the physical world. Fortuna cannot be the link between divine providence and human action.

It could be that the omens which occur in the transition between the divine sphere and Caesar's actions atop the Alps are intended to be understood as the glue

93. Connors (1989) 92.

between the will of the gods and the results as played out in the realm of men. After all, as soon as the portents appear, Caesar puts off any further delay and begins his march on Rome (vv. 141 ff.). But if the omens really were the means by which Caesar was moved to war, which god employed them? It seems that it cannot be Dis, since he went to Fortuna rather than instigate war himself. Nor can it be Fortuna: she has *rerum humanarum diuinarumque potestas* (v. 79), not power over nature. It is possible that the omens are a continuation of Jupiter's thunder (vv. 122-3), but it has already been noted that Eumolpus is ambiguous about Jupiter's attitude to the war. Indeed, the omens seem to be a strictly elemental reaction, to both the concordance of Dis and Fortuna, and to the incipient action of Caesar. The vague reference to a god at the conclusion of the catalogue (*haec ostenta breui soluit deus*, v. 141) confirms this, suggesting the Stoic concept of divinity as a unified force in nature (in which Fortuna was also an important figure). Moreover, though Caesar's resolve is attended by portents, there is nothing to say that those portents resolved him. Rather, Caesar is depicted as having already been contemplating war: *moras* (v. 142) imply that there is something to be put off. In the end, Caesar was free to interpret the omens as he saw fit, for all Eumolpus' pains to precede them with a scene of divine machinations.

But when Discordia appears, so too does a point of connection between the divine and human spheres. For Discordia scales the Appennine, and in doing so presents herself in a physical locality overlooking the site of war. She is at hand, not in a location removed from the unfolding events, such as the Phlegraean fields where Dis and Fortuna met. Moreover, Discordia does not confer with other gods but communicates directly with the combatants. It is Discordia who bids Caesar throw off his final delay and attack the city, and Discordia who goads his foe Pompey for not fighting back:

*quid porro tu, diue, tuis cunctaris in armis,  
non frangis portas, non muris oppida soluis  
thesaurosque rapis? nescis tu, Magne, tueri  
Romanas arces? Epidamni moenia quaere  
Thessalicosque sinus humano sanguine tingue.* (vv. 290-4)

The climax of the poem as Eumolpus presents it is this moment of contact between the divine and human desires for Civil War. The disjunction which persisted between the concordance of Dis and Fortuna and Caesar's decision to march is resolved by Discordia's call to arms. She is the final and the crucial link in Eumolpus' divine machinery. She presides over the height of dramatic tension in the poem, in both the divine sphere and the mortal, and when in her both the decree of the gods and the will of Caesar meet, Civil War breaks out. This confluence of effect is testament to what can be achieved by including divine machinery in historical epic. Of all the guidelines for good poetry he sets out in section 118, the exhortation to make use of the gods is the one to which Eumolpus devotes the most energy: consequently, it is also the one by which his *Bellum Ciuile* most benefits.

In any creative work purporting to describe historical events there is a tension between **fact and fiction**. Eumolpus clearly prefers faithfulness to the latter: the plot of the *Bellum Ciuile* displays several inconsistencies with the known facts of the Civil War. The merit in occasionally bending the truth lies in the effect which it produces. Eumolpus' success in applying his literary theory, then, depends on the poetic effects he has achieved in lieu of being faithful to the facts.

The first inconsistency is more a fault of omission: Eumolpus has nothing to say about the political motives for the war. Instead he blames Rome herself. The first fifth of what Eumolpus recites describes the corruption, luxury, and greed of Rome, culminating in an image of the city drunk and complacent, asleep. From this sleep only war can wake her:

*hoc mersam caeno Romam somnoque iacentem  
quae poterant artes sana ratione mouere  
ni furor et bellum ferroque excita libido?* (vv. 58–60)

It should be noted that this image depicts the city as a victim. There are two senses to the word *Roma*: on the one hand it represents the physical city, its people, and the extent of its dominion; on the other it represents the allegorical deity associated with that concept. The personification in the verses just quoted suggests that here *Romam* is used in the latter sense. But Roma the goddess is not depicted as the perpetrator of her own undoing: it is the *uictor Romanus* (v. 1) who has conquered the world, and the citizens, people, and senators of Rome who are corrupt (*emptique*

*Quirites*, v. 39; *uenalis populus, uenalis curia patrum*, v. 41). In the description of those who have caused the corruption, words such as *Romanus, Quirites, populus*, and *curia patrum* are associated with *Roma* in its first sense. It is the people of Rome who are greedy, and the goddess *Roma* suffers their excess.

The connection between the state of affairs at Rome and the outbreak of war is not clear. The causes usually given for the Civil War include the death of Crassus, the subsequent dissolution of the Triumvirate, and the politicking between Caesar and Pompey/the senate. But Eumolpus gives scant account of these factors: instead, Caesar is portrayed as having been considering war for some time; halfway through the *Bellum Ciuile* he simply “puts off any further delay” (*exiit omnes quippe moras Caesar*, v. 141-2) and the course of war is begun. Before this moment, the only mention of the war’s principal actors is brief, and concerned mainly (and anachronistically) with their deaths:

*tres tulerat Fortuna duces quos obruit omnes  
 armorum strue diuersa feralis Enyo.  
 Crassum Parthus habet, Libyco iacet aequore Magnus,  
 Iulius ingrata perfudit sanguine Romam,  
 et quasi non posset tot tellus ferre sepulcra,  
 diuisit cineres—hos gloria reddit honores.* (vv. 61-6)

The main events of the Civil War can be read into this epitaphic summary, but it can hardly be said to be a comprehensive account of the political factors. More to the point is the mention of *Fortuna* and *Enyo*, for this passage marks a transition: of the action, from the mortal to the divine realm; but also of the responsibility for the war, from men to gods. It was *Fortuna* who led forth the men who would fight the war, and *Enyo* who claimed their lives. *Fortuna* is accountable, for it was by her grace that each of the members of the First Triumvirate succeeded in securing great power; *Enyo* first took Crassus, which dissolved the alliance, and caused the war which would allow her to claim the lives of the other two. In its transfer from the sickness at Rome to the role of the gods, accountability for the Civil War lands only briefly, and lightly, on the shoulders of the men who were actually responsible.

The conference of *Dis* and *Fortuna* focuses again on the folly of Rome’s greatness. *Dis* approaches *Fortuna* in her capacity as both the means by which Rome

rose to such greatness, and the means by which she may be robbed of it. This is the point of his opening appeal:

*“rerum humanarum diuinarumque potestas,  
Fors, cui nulla placet nimium secura potestas,  
quae noua semper amas et mox possessa relinquis...”* (vv. 79–81)

Incidentally, the mention of Fortuna’s power over both men and gods refers again to the double sense of *Roma*: she is responsible for the rise and success of both individual Romans and Roma herself; but also for the corrupted state of both. The blame for the state of affairs which Eumolpus implies was the cause of civil war is shifted onto Fortuna. *ecquid Romano sentis te pondere uictam?* asks Dis, *nec posse ulterius perituram extollere molem?* (vv. 82–3). The god of the underworld is motivated by Tisiphone’s lust for blood (v. 97) and offence at the Romans’ encroachment into his realm (*en etiam mea regna petunt*, v. 90), but the approach he takes with Fortuna is to accuse her of not being true to her nature. He appeals to her desire never to see power too long seated in one place: she has let things get to the stage where civil war is inevitable. Fortuna for her part does not deny she is at fault, and vows: *omnia quae tribui Romanis arcibus odi / muneribusque meis irascor* (vv. 107–8). She accepts the blame and in the following passage Caesar makes his decision.

But, true to the poet’s desire to incorporate divine machinery into his work, Fortuna’s responsibility and the Romans’ are really only two sides of the same coin: both have resulted in the rot at Rome, and it is this which is blamed for the Civil War. Eumolpus pointedly refuses to treat the political causes of the conflict. The purpose of this could be to elevate the work beyond the mere personal differences of two men. In this case the implication would be that, however great Caesar and Pompey were, the result of the Civil War brought about changes so drastic and pervasive that they can only have been the result of divine interference or other cosmic forces. True, Eumolpus undercuts his argument somewhat by making his cause of war a satirical portrait of Roman luxury; but the introduction of Dis and Fortuna does lend the theory an air of inevitability, that it was the fate of Rome that fortune could no longer support an unbroken prosperity. The purpose of ignoring the political causes for war is to ask the reader to understand the Civil War in cosmic terms.

The second liberty which Eumolpus takes has to do with his account of the portents attending Caesar's decision to march on Rome (vv. 126-140). A catalogue of such omens was a standard feature of historical epic; Eumolpus adopts it here, and in keeping with his fidelity only to poetic truth, his account differs from those of historians. He records an eclipse of both sun and moon, avalanches, rivers running slow, the sounds of war on the air, the eruption of Mt Aetna, the walking dead, a comet, and rain of blood. Eumolpus ignores the three main portents which historians record, namely a fire at Rome, a foaling mule, and temples struck by lightning. Connors points out that, instead of noting these, Eumolpus, like Lucan, chooses to describe the omens usually attributed to the time of Caesar's death, including especially the solar eclipse, the eruption of Mt Aetna, and the comet, all of which are described by Livy, Vergil, Ovid, and Tibullus as having followed the murder of Caesar.<sup>94</sup> Here it appears that Eumolpus is following Lucan, and not innovating. Nevertheless, the effect of relating portents usually associated with the death of Caesar at the point of his marching on Rome is to recast their import in an anti-Caesarian light. If this is only mimicking Lucan, Eumolpus does at least add a darker tinge to several of the omens: where Vergil's sun is bright (*nitidum*, *G.* 1.467), Eumolpus' is *ore cruento / deformis* (vv. 127-8); Eumolpus' description of the Jupiter-ward eruption of Mt Aetna may hint at the Gigantomachy, foreshadowing civil war; and the comet, a symbol appropriated by Augustus as a sign of Caesar's deification (the *Iulium sidus*), marks the end of the republic.<sup>95</sup> The point of these darker and misplaced omens is to emphasize that it is Caesar's arrival, and not his demise, which spells disaster for Rome.

The other misplaced event which Eumolpus recounts is that of Caesar's irrevocable transgression. It was of course at the Rubicon that Caesar crossed from Gaul into Rome, from compliance into Civil War,<sup>96</sup> and at Ravenna that he made the speech to his men.<sup>97</sup> But Eumolpus pushes the site of both of these actions back to the Alps. Like Caesar himself, in his commentary on the war, Eumolpus surely has a reason for omitting reference to the Rubicon, though the two reasons are probably different. It has already been seen that this poet has no interest in the political machinations which preceded the war, and the chief import of the Rubicon was as a

94. Connors (1989) 100.

95. Connors (1989) 101-7.

96. Suet. *Jul.* 32; Plut. *Caes.* 32; App. *BC* 2.35.

97. Caes. *Civ.* 1.5 ff.

political boundary. Its crossing is only meaningful if one is aware of the symbolism associated with it, and Eumolpus has refused to describe the situation which gave rise to that symbolism. The Alps, on the other hand, are an elevated position, raising Caesar to a god-like status and emphasizing the cosmic influence his decision will have. Moreover, the place is associated with two great figures of myth and legend: Hercules and Hannibal. The implications of such a setting are not those of politics but of poetry and story-telling. The pay-off for Eumolpus' factual infidelity is the association of Caesar with heaven, with the strength of a demigod, and with Rome's greatest threat.

Caesar is compared to Hercules both before and after his speech. In the description of the setting Eumolpus refers to the Greek divinity (*Graio numine*, v. 144) who first crossed the alps. Furthermore, the exact point at which Caesar chose to cross is *Herculeis aris sacer* (v. 146), probably because it marked Hercules' actual route. Eumolpus has Caesar tread literally in the footsteps of Hercules. There is also a hint that Caesar himself may have desired this association: *optauitque locum* (v. 153) cannot mean "made the selection of a camping-ground", as Baldwin suggests,<sup>98</sup> for after the speech the army continues to march; rather, Caesar has chosen this particular place to make his speech, perhaps in order to confer an extra sense of authority and divine inevitability by associating himself with a demigod. Moreover: Caesar is not only following in the footsteps of Hercules; he is *like* Hercules, in that he bears the weight of the world on his shoulders. Verse 151, *totum ferre potest umeris minitantibus orbem*, describes the mountain, but it is clearly an allusion to Hercules and the Atlas myth. The arrangement of the words in the line, with the word for shoulders in the middle, and those for the whole world at either end, draw attention to the centre, the summit. At the summit of the alps is Caesar (*summo de uertice montis ... prospexit*, vv. 153-4), and so the supporter of the world becomes not the mountains but Caesar, in the image of Hercules.

After his speech Caesar is again compared to Hercules, this time explicitly: he is *qualis Caucasea decurrens arduus arce / Amphitryoniades* (vv. 205-6). For the Romans below, the approach of a Caesar-as-Hercules is a boon, for when Hercules entered Italy he ended up strangling Cacus and thus making way for the *Forum Boarium* of future Rome; when Caesar enters Italy he will make way for the future

98. Baldwin (1911) *ad loc.*

Roman Empire. This comparison is strengthened by the following one to Jupiter:

*aut toruo Iuppiter ore  
cum se uerticibus magni demisit Olympi  
et periturorum deiecit tela Gigantum* (vv. 206–8)

Here the reference is to the Gigantomachy, and so has overtones of civil strife. But Caesar is presented as Jupiter, the victor in that affair, who ultimately secured an enduring order. The result of Caesar's civil strife would be an enduring Empire. The fact that Caesar has already been compared to Hercules, who helped the Olympians to defeat the Giants, reinforces the comparison of Caesar to a god. Indeed, both Caesar and Hercules were eventually deified, and both were incorporated into the founding myth of Rome.

Set against this positive view is an association with Hannibal. The description of Caesar's descent from the Alps (vv. 177–208) recalls Livy's description of Hannibal's (Liv. 21.35–6). Moreover, Caesar's choice of location for a speech to his men looks out across Italy (*Hesperiae campos late prospexit*, v. 154), just as Hannibal's does (Liv. 21.35.8). This association casts Caesar as an attacker against Rome. In contrast with the associations with Jupiter and Hercules, the advance of a Caesar-as-Hannibal is a terror to the Romans below. This aspect of Caesar's characterization is emphasized by the description of the panicked flight from Rome which is the direct result of his approach. By centring the drama of Caesar's decision to march on Rome at the Alps, then, Eumolpus has drawn two conflicting comparisons.

In Connor's opinion, "Eumolpus manipulates historical traditions in order to argue that Caesar's actions at the outbreak of the war are the result of a long-term plan for Civil War."<sup>99</sup> But surely the poetic benefits are what is most important to Eumolpus. After all, he is the *poeta phreneticus*, who recites in public in spite of receiving both verbal and physical abuse for it, and who cannot be dragged away from his work, even after shipwreck. Eumolpus cannot resist the opportunity for combining Caesar's momentous decision, the high rhetoric of his speech, and the ominous associations of the setting of the Alps into a single compelling plot point.

99. Connors (1989) 116–7.

More than the exigencies of a confined space of less than three hundred verses, it is the poet's artistic temperament which demands the treatment he gives, and the historical details are passed over. Eumolpus certainly is true to his ideal as set out in section 118.6, and it may be argued that the result is worth it. What rises out of the displacement, from the Rubicon to the Alps, of the decision to march on Rome is a far richer and ambiguous characterization of Caesar thanks to the available comparisons to both Hercules and Hannibal.

On the whole, then, Eumolpus does adhere to the guidelines which he sets out before reciting the *Bellum Ciuile*. In respect of his allusion, diction, and use of *sententiae* the value and effectiveness may be arguable, but in his decision to retain the gods and twist the facts for poetic effect Eumolpus is both true to himself and produces a striking account of the lead-up to the Civil War.

### THREE: IMPLICATIONS

Having arrived at a better appreciation of the *Bellum Ciuile*, both on its own merits and as it relates to the remarks which preface it; having, in other words, discovered just *what* the poem is, it now remains to ask *why* it is. The usual explanations of the poem's purpose within the narrative are often based on the assumption that Eumolpus' verse is at best mediocre. In the course of the previous two chapters, though, it has proved to be more than this. A better understanding of the poem's merits complicates its place in the narrative. Some of the arguments usually adduced to explain the *Bellum Ciuile* require only slight moderation in light of the foregoing analysis; others are more seriously problematic and need to be replaced by better theories. The remainder of the present study addresses the implications of a more charitable appreciation of the *Bellum Ciuile*: for the place of the poem in its surrounding text, for the genre and wider purpose of the *Satyricon*, and for the characterization of the poet Eumolpus.

The **length and occasion** of the poem tell much about its purpose. On the road to Croton, just before he begins to recite the *Bellum Ciuile*, Eumolpus calls his offering an *impetus*, which has not yet received its *ultimam manum* (118.6). On the surface, his poem is intended to serve as an example, corroborating the poetic precepts which he set out in section 118. It has been shown that on the whole he is faithful to these precepts; but on another level the poem serves a separate purpose, which is to provide the conventional distraction to lighten a long journey.<sup>100</sup> It seems natural that the compulsive poet Eumolpus could not help but fill such a gap in the narrative with some of his own verses, so that his remarks in section 118 are really only a pretext, an excuse to indulge his habit of versifying, with a captive audience into the bargain.

100. Walsh (1970) 48.

At first glance, the sentence with which Eumolpus introduces his poetic offering seems like a fairly simple apology for the poem's incompleteness:

*tanquam si placet hic impetus, etiam si nondum recepit ultimam  
manum...* (118.6)

But the exact nature of that incompleteness will give a clue to the poem's place in the narrative. If Eumolpus is only admitting that his poem lacks a final polish, then *impetus* = "attempt" and *ultima manus* = "finishing touches". He concedes incompleteness on point of quality: the treatment is not perfect, but it will serve as an example. Under this reading, it is the more stylistic precepts of section 118 which are the focus: details such as the diction and use of *sententiae*. But the *Bellum Ciuile* is lacking much more than "finishing touches" if it is to be considered a model poem on the Civil War: there is no proem or invocation of a muse, and, most importantly, the whole action of the war receives almost no treatment. The verses which Eumolpus delivers deal mainly with the cause of the war; the actual fighting is summed up only in the final verse:

*factum est in terris quicquid Discordia iussit.* (v. 295)

Details such as a proem are of course of little significance to the story itself, and would naturally be added once the composition of the poem was complete. The *Bellum Ciuile* as Eumolpus presents it, though, is so light on the actual Civil War that it can hardly be said to grapple with the *belli ciuilis ingens opus* (118.6). This is perhaps the point of the foreshortened effort which Eumolpus offers: he concedes that the topic is so difficult (*ingens*) that he has only managed a beginning; nevertheless, it will serve as an example of how one might approach a poem on the Civil War. Under this reading, *hic impetus* = "this beginning", *ultima manus* = "the rest of the story", and the focus is on the more structural precepts of section 118, namely the inclusion of a divine machinery and the attitude towards factual accuracy. Because these latter concerns are obviously of greater importance to Eumolpus' poetic programme than mere stylistic details, it seems that the second way of reading the comment with which the poet introduces the *Bellum Ciuile* is the correct one.

In fact, it is quite possible that Eumolpus does have an entire poem at his disposal but only recites enough to make his point about how a divine machinery might be retained in the telling of an historical epic. While the poem's almost off-hand ending could be a place marker signalling where the rest of the unfinished story is to be taken up, it certainly does have the air of an "...and you get the point"-type comment. But Eumolpus does not seem the type to break off from reciting poetry just because he has proved his principles. It usually takes violence to shut him up (90.5): he cannot keep a simple promise to desist from versifying even for a short time (90.6; cf. 93). Rather than making a voluntary end to the *Bellum Ciuile*, it is perhaps more likely that Eumolpus is cut off by the arrival at Croton. It was, after all, with great relish that he planned the mimic deceit of the *captatores* to take place upon arrival in the city (*utinam quidem sufficeret largior scaena*, 117.2): it is completely plausible that Eumolpus should leave off abruptly as soon as that future site of his grand ruse comes into view. At first it seems that the pluperfect *effudisset* can be read against this theory, as an implication that Eumolpus had already finished reciting by the time he and his companions arrived at Croton, but what Encolpius means by *haec ... ingenti uolubilitate uerborum effudisset* (124.2) is something more like: "he had already gotten this far, when at last we arrived at Croton". It seems that it is a lack of time available for reciting rather than a lack of verses to recite which brings the *Bellum Ciuile* to a close.

Indeed, the description of Eumolpus just previous to the journey to Croton strengthens the case that he had in fact finished composing the poem. After the shipwreck, Encolpius and Giton find Eumolpus still furiously at work:

*inuenimus Eumolpum sedentem membranaeque ingenti versus  
ingerentem. mirati ergo, quod illi vacaret in vicinia mortis poema  
facere, extrahimus clamantem iubemusque bonam habere mentem.  
at ille interpellatus excanduit et "sinite me" inquit "sententiam  
explere; laborat carmen in fine."* (115.2-4)

It seems likely that the poem he is working on is in fact the *Bellum Ciuile*. The word *ingenti* and the apparent difficulty Eumolpus is having (*laborat carmen*) are picked up by the phrase *belli ciuilis ingens opus* (118.6) when it comes time for a poem to be recited on the road to Croton. But the reference to a *membrana ingens*

implies that “Eumolpus had already composed the poem on tablets and is here transposing the complete poem to parchment, which is the last stage before its final form for publication.”<sup>101</sup> This seems to argue against the incompleteness of the poem, since there would be no point in copying an unfinished composition onto parchment. It seems that if the poem Eumolpus is working on aboard Lichas’ ship is indeed the *Bellum Ciuile*, then the lack of an *ultima manus* can only refer to the interruption of the act of transcription. It is possible that the phrase *sententiam explere* refers to the composition of a thought, but it could just as easily represent Eumolpus’ stubborn desire to be allowed to finish copying out his current sentence. Likewise, the phrase *laborat carmen in fine* could mean that Eumolpus is struggling with the actual composition of the poem’s ending, or, just as easily, that he is in the final stages of painstakingly copying out a completed poem. If Eumolpus was copying out a poem he had already composed, then the incompleteness of what he recites on the road to Croton can only be explained by the fact that he was cut off. Even if he had reached the end of what he had copied onto parchment, he could presumably still have read to the end of his poem by referring to his tablets. Indeed, the relative merit of what Eumolpus recites (described in the first chapter of the present study) supports the notion of an already-completed *Bellum Ciuile*.

The meaning of *hic impetus ... nondum recepit ultimam manum* (118.6), is deceptive, then, for it seems to refer to the fact that the *Bellum Ciuile* breaks off before any of the actual Civil War is described, when really it probably only refers to the fact that Eumolpus had not yet finished copying the poem out onto parchment when Encolpius and Giton rescued him from the shipwreck. The real point of ending the *Bellum Ciuile* where it ends lies in the fact that while Eumolpus could not choose when his poem would break off, Petronius could. By modulating the length of the journey to Croton, and so the length of the *Bellum Ciuile*, Petronius achieves a great deal of humour at Eumolpus’ expense. It has been shown that Eumolpus makes a reasonable attempt at fulfilling his poetic programme, but this is deflated somewhat if his poem on the Civil War is deprived of the Civil War itself. Moreover, while Eumolpus sets up the expectation of a grand epic, Petronius devastates that expectation by cutting him off before the description of any battles, thus throwing emphasis onto the stated cause of the war (moral decay at Rome), so that

101. Schmeling (2011) *ad loc.*

the poem comes across in a tone more satirical than epic. If Eumolpus' purpose in delivering the *Bellum Ciuile* is to validate his poetic precepts, then it is Petronius' purpose to invalidate them.

Besides the occasion for the poem and its artificial foreshortening, another telling feature is the reaction of **Eumolpus' audience** to what he recites. Encolpius seems relieved at the rather matter-of-fact ending Eumolpus makes to the poem. He hints at the suffering he has endured when he straightaway says: *cum haec Eumolpos ingenti uolubilitate uerborum effudisset, tandem Crotona intrauimus* (124.2). The comment betrays boredom, but for this poet such an accusation is nothing: he is used to much harsher treatments (90.5), such as being pelted with rocks at the *pinacotheca* (90.1) or being expelled from the baths (92.6). Eumolpus presumably would not even register Encolpius' indifferent reaction to his poem: part of his characterization is that he versifies compulsively, and in spite of the lack of respect it earns him. In fact, in light of the first chapter of the present work, which found significant merit in the *Bellum Ciuile*, Encolpius' comment says more about him than it does about the poem's author.

What Encolpius' says when Eumolpus stops reciting reflects the fact that the journey to Croton and the poem recited on that journey are really one and the same: when one ends so does the other, and, in the narrator's opinion, one is as tedious as the other. Encolpius has nothing to say about the actual content of the poem, nor about its quality or the literary manifesto which preceded it. His reaction has as much to do with the tedium of the journey as it has with that of the poetry: if the way had only been shorter, he implies, then Eumolpus would not have been able to go on versifying so long. It seems strange that Encolpius has nothing to say about the fact that the diversion Eumolpus supplies is a poem on the Civil War. It is true that this is in keeping with the reaction to Eumolpus' poetry elsewhere: nobody in the *Satyricon* cares what it is about, they just want it to stop. But the *Bellum Ciuile* appears on a much grander scale than any other poem in the *Satyricon*, and its historical-political content is likewise unique. It seems that if any poem's content should merit at least some comment, it is this one. But of all the reactions to the poetry which Eumolpus spouts, the reaction to the *Bellum Ciuile* is by far the tamest. Is this out of recognition of its relative merits? or does it simply indicate that Encolpius does not care about the poetry of Eumolpus?

The narrator's attitude towards the poet-character is not at all straightforward. He certainly seems to have more tolerance for Eumolpus than the general public does. His first impression of the old man is that he "promises something of greatness" (*uideretur nescio quid magnum promittere*), and even before he speaks he easily identifies him as the sort of literary man whom rich men "love to hate" (*facile appareret eum ex hac nota litteratum esse quos odisse divites solent*, 83.7). Encolpius displays an automatic interest in the poet partly because Eumolpus is older and wiser than him, and partly because it is his wont to expect great things of new acquaintances. In general, Encolpius seems happy to "go with the flow": there is indeed a "lack or holding back of explicit comment and outright judgement on the narrator's part";<sup>102</sup> he is often a very passive observer. He seems to identify with Eumolpus because he is a man of letters. Encolpius, too, is literate: in the opening scene he shows himself to be a clever student (*quoniam sermonem habes non publici saporis et, quod rarissimum est, amas bonam mentem*, Agamemnon tells him, 3.1); in the final episode he makes a sly literary gesture by taking the name Polyaeus, an epithet of Odysseus, for his pseudonym in Croton; and his sotadean verse at 132.8 is an hilarious Vergilian pastiche. As the narrator of the *Satyricon* he is also a poet: the poet *of* the narrative as opposed to Eumolpus, the poet *in* the narrative.<sup>103</sup> In this sense he is somewhat threatened by his poetic rival; indeed, at one point he may admit as much, though fragmentation makes the context unclear:

*me nihil magis pungebat quam ne Eumolpus sensisset quicquid  
illud fuerat et homo dicacissimus carminibus vindicaret.* (113.12)

But other than here Encolpius never expresses more than a mild discomfort or embarrassment at Eumolpus' versifying. After he sees the results of the recitation of the *Troiae Halosis*, he threatens to also throw rocks at the poet (90.4), but this is only out of concern for the old man, whose behaviour he recognizes as a disease (*quid tibi vis cum isto morbo?* 90.3). Encolpius only chastises his new companion out of fear that he himself will also be thought a poet and so share in his abuse (*timui ego ne me poetam vocaret*, 90.2; cf. 93.3). If there is anyone who does not appreciate Eumolpus' poetry, then, it is not Encolpius but the general public.

102. Beck (1979) 241.

103. Edmunds (2009) 96.

Indeed, it is perhaps a damning comment on the latter that they react to poetry so violently, for it is not specifically Eumolpus' poetry that they hate; all it takes to attract the ire of the mob is the mere whiff of a poet: *nam si aliquis ex is qui in eodem synoecio potant nomen poetae olfecerit, totam concitabit viciniam et nos omnes sub eadem causa obruet* (93.3). With the absurd exception of Bargates, who hails him, *o poetarum ... disertissime!* (96.6), none of the characters in the *Satyricon* openly admires Eumolpus. Most abuse him; Encolpius barely tolerates him. It is possible that the lukewarm reception of the *Bellum Ciuile* is intended to confirm the merits of that poem, by contrast with the violent reaction Eumolpus' poetry usually provokes; more likely, though, is that it is a reflection of the fact that his essentially captive audience is the best he can hope for.

As for the other members of that audience, Giton and Corax, they have nothing to say about Eumolpus' effort whatever. The light-hearted scene, reminiscent of Old Comedy,<sup>104</sup> where they trade fart for fart (117.12) provides a neat contrast to the seriousness with which Eumolpus sets out his literary principles and recites the poem. Giton is one of the only characters who is prominent in the narrative but does not speak in verse.<sup>105</sup> Even if he is actually a slave, his blissful ignorance of literary matters puts him far ahead of the ex-slave Trimalchio, who is eager to show off his learning but embarrasses himself by his obvious lack of any. Just as Eumolpus is about to solemnly begin his *Bellum Ciuile*, to which Encolpius will listen half-seriously, and which a careful reader may actually appreciate, Petronius reminds one through the innocence of Giton and Corax that all it takes is two steps back to see literary pursuits as quite ridiculous.

For the characters in the narrative, then, to hear Eumolpus turn the Civil War to verse is nothing out of the ordinary: it is impossible to keep him from versifying, so on the road to Croton they must simply suffer his compulsion. But what is the reader to make of the *Bellum Ciuile*? How does it fit into the rest of the *Satyricon*? Is it really a **dead rat inside a python**, as Connors suggests? In the past there had been a tendency to see the poem as somewhat removable from the surrounding text. Indeed, there is evidence that it actually was removed: Sochatoff documents a tradition for the independent circulation of the poem, and notes one translation of

104. Schmeling (2011) *ad loc.*

105. Edmunds (2009) 78.

the *Satyricon* (Tailhade's) which omits it.<sup>106</sup> But even when the poem is not physically isolated from its context there is still an inclination to isolate it critically, an inclination due to its exceptional length, subject matter, and presentation.

Most of the poems in the *Satyricon* are between four and seventeen verses, or about eight verses on average.<sup>107</sup> At nearly three hundred verses, the *Bellum Ciuile* is by far the longest poem in the work as it survives. The only other poem of significant length, the *Troiae Halosis* (89), is only sixty-five verses. It is true that much of the *Satyricon* is lost and that there may have been other long poems, but the trend in the surviving fragments makes this seem unlikely. Another poem of hundreds of verses would presumably require another character such as Eumolpus (that is, a poet) to recite it, and another occasion for a poem of some length. While it is completely likely, given the tendency of the main characters to wander, that there would be other long journeys to be whiled away, it is not clear that Eumolpus would continue to accompany Encolpius, that if he did he would then have other *magna opera* up his sleeve, or that if he faded out of the story in the same way as Ascyrtos whether another poem-reciter would take his place. The length of the *Bellum Ciuile* is anomalous, at least in the extant state of the *Satyricon*.

Another way in which the poem is unique is in respect of its subject matter. In general, "a poem follows from the immediately preceding action, and has a purpose."<sup>108</sup> The *Bellum Ciuile* is preceded by shipwreck and followed by the arrival at Croton; its purpose is to while away the long journey in between. But there is nothing to say that a poem on the Civil War is what was required here. Petronius could have opted to omit recounting the journey at all, and simply "cut to" the Croton episode. It is difficult to tell from the fragmented text whether Petronius may have used this technique elsewhere: a sudden "cut" would not be at all surprising in the text as it survives, but the original narrative may have been quite contiguous. One need not look far for an example of the difficulty—section 115 breaks off with:

*et Licham quidem rogas inimicis collatus manibus adolebat.  
Eumolpus autem dum epigramma mortuo facit, oculos ad  
arcessendos sensus longius mittit...* (115.20)

106. Sochatoff (1962) 451-3.

107. Edmunds (2009) 77.

108. Edmunds (2009) 82.

Section 116 resumes with a brief *hoc peracto libenter officio...*, and proceeds with the narrative. It may be that what has fallen out of the lacuna was the epigram itself, but that is not certain.<sup>109</sup> Petronius could easily have glossed over the content of the poetry and moved on. In any case, even if the journey to Croton really did need to be whiled away somehow, why by a poem? Elsewhere Eumolpus has demonstrated an ability to deliver charming prose tales, one of which would be just as appropriate here as a poem (and perhaps better received).<sup>110</sup> And if a poem really was required here, why a poem on the Civil War? Nowhere else in the *Satyricon*, in verse or in prose, are events of such a political and historical nature addressed. The only possible contender is the other long poem, the *Troiae Halosis*. But while this poem describes an important episode for Augustan Rome, its subject matter is nevertheless mythical, and not historical-political in the same way as the Civil War. More importantly, the subject matter of the *Troiae Halosis* is relevant to the rest of the narrative: though it is probably only one of Eumolpus' set-pieces, opportunistically deployed in his efforts to impress Encolpius, the poem does after all describe the same event depicted in one of the paintings at the *pinacotheca*. Eumolpus claims to have noticed Encolpius' interest in a painting of the sack of Troy (*sed uideo te totum in illa haerere tabula quae Troiae halosin ostendit*, 89.1), and while the offering of the poem is more humorous if Encolpius was not in fact dwelling on this particular painting, the subject matter of the poem is nonetheless thereby accounted for. In the case of the *Bellum Ciuile*, the subject matter of the poem, at least on the face of it, has nothing to do with the situation the characters are in whatever. Why a shipwrecked Eumolpus chose to recite this particular poem during his journey to carry out a confidence trick on the inhabitants of Croton can only be conjectured.

This has not kept scholars from conjecturing about just that, of course. A completely out-of-place poem on the Civil War is not ideal in any explanation of the wider structure of the *Satyricon*. Petronius has chosen a form which is prosimetric: both verse and prose are necessary elements, and the effectiveness of the work relies on their combination. Edmunds notes that while prose comes first by weight and in carrying the plot ("one could delete the poems and there would still be a

109. "Gagliardi suggests that fr. 46 M = AL 692 R be inserted" here; Schmeling (2011) *ad loc.*

110. Eumolpus tells stories in prose at 85-87, 92.6-11, and 111-112; Beck (1979), esp. 245 ff. argues Eumolpus is a better story-teller than poet.

narrative”), the poetry must convey something extra, since “verse can replace prose but not vice versa”; in fact, one is as important as the other: “poems and prose stand in a ‘dialogic’ relation.”<sup>111</sup> In an effort to make the *Bellum Ciuile* of a whole with the rest of the *Satyricon*, several scholars have found ways of relating the subject matter of the poem to elements of its wider context.

In the episodes previous to the poem being recited, Zeitlin notes two foreshadowings of the point in the *Bellum Ciuile* where the gods choose sides at the outbreak of Civil War (*omnis regia caeli in partes diducta ruit*, vv. 265–6): one during the fight on board ship (*Tryphaena ... nauigii turbam diducit in partes*, 108.7) and one in the farm bailiff’s description of Croton (*quoscumque homines in hac urbe uideritis scitote in duas partes esse divisos*, 116.6).<sup>112</sup> Zeitlin also sees many echoes of Vergil in the lead-up to the occasion for the poem: “the shipwreck, the arrival upon an unknown shore, the identification of the place through converse with a stranger, the view of a city from a high escarpment, and the subsequent journey to the city follow closely the pattern of the arrival of Aeneas in Carthage in *Aeneid* 1.”<sup>113</sup> Although it is true that such a sequence is just at home in the romantic novel as it is in epic, Zeitlin relates it to other Vergilian features of Eumolpus’ poem (some of which have been discussed in the second chapter of the present work), drawing up a neat comparison between Carthage, Croton, and Rome: the wealthy new city of Carthage in the *Aeneid* is contrasted with the dead and wasted city of Croton in the *Satyricon*, and the opening description of Rome in the *Bellum Ciuile* illustrates how the transition is made from one to the other.<sup>114</sup>

Connors expands on Zeitlin’s point regarding the fight on board ship, noting the similarity in phrasing between Tryphaena’s exclamation, *quis furor ... pacem conuertit in arma?* (108.14) and Lucan’s *quis furor, o ciues, quae tantia licentia ferri?* (Luc. 1.8). To this she adds that “scenes on board Lichas’ ship exploit conventional figures of the ship of state and the ship of poetry.”<sup>115</sup> That is, just as Lichas’ ship goes down, so Eumolpus’ poem flounders and is unfinished, and so Rome’s ship of state meets with peril during the Civil War. Rimmel also builds on these themes, emphasizing the importance of water imagery: the atmosphere of shipwreck

111. Edmunds (2009) 73.

112. Zeitlin (1971a) 67–69.

113. Zeitlin (1971a) 68.

114. Zeitlin (1971a) 68–71.

115. Connors (1998) 141–2.

prefigures such phrases in Eumolpus' literary programme as *portum feliciorum* (118.2), *ingenti flumine litterarum inundata* (118.3), and *nisi plenus litteris, sub onere labetur* (118.6).<sup>116</sup>

As for the relation of the poem to the episodes which follow it, the emphases on death, the underworld, and civil strife are again for Zeitlin Vergilian themes, this time from *Aeneid* 6, and together with the theme of luxury and wealth they presage the obsession with death and money in Croton.<sup>117</sup> For Rimell, the fact that the *Bellum Ciuile* breaks off just before the actual fighting begins casts the arrival at Croton as the beginning of civil war, especially since Encolpius and Giton have sworn oaths like gladiators (117.5–6).<sup>118</sup> Indeed, the rampant practice of legacy-hunting at Croton is very similar to civil war: the inhabitants are divided into two factions (*aut captantur aut captant*, 116.6); and just as in war brother fights brother, so the ultimate culmination of Eumolpus' deceit is the contemplation of man eating man (141).<sup>119</sup> Such comparisons can even extend beyond the poem's immediate context. Rimell sees the *Bellum Ciuile* "as a climactic moment in an all-pervasive strategy of incorporation":<sup>120</sup>

Indeed, the *Satyricon* as a whole tells the story of a bitter and often aggressive conflict between "brothers", *fratres*, which is how Encolpius, Ascyltos and Giton refer to each other. All the central characters in this fiction are (sexually) related and divided. At 80 Encolpius and Giton split into rival factions and plan also to split Giton's body in half (*partem meam necesse est uel hoc gladio contemptus abscindam*, 80.1).<sup>121</sup>

The *Bellum Ciuile* thus becomes for Rimell the centre round which the whole *Satyricon* turns.

But while these sometimes ingenious explanations do identify themes which cut across both the poem and its context, perhaps thereby explaining Eumolpus' choice of subject matter, they do not address the *Bellum Ciuile*'s most truly unique

116. Rimell (2002) 81–83.

117. Zeitlin (1971a) 70–71.

118. Rimell (2002) 88.

119. Arrowsmith (1966) 316, Zeitlin (1971a) 69–70, Rimell (2002) 86–88.

120. Rimell (2002) 78.

121. Rimell (2002) 88 n. 24.

characteristic: the fact that it is presented, like nowhere else, as a literary artifact in its own right. Even though it was probably composed beforehand, the *Troiae Halosis* at least pretends to be delivered *e tempore*. Similarly, other characters' poetic utterances, such as Trimalchio's, are presented as having just been composed, even if the reader suspects they had already been. Even those poems composed by Encolpius-the-narrator (presumably after the fact, at the time of narrating) read as if they were composed on the spot, inspired by the episode described in the preceding prose.<sup>122</sup> The *Bellum Ciuile*, though, is too long to be an extemporization, and, besides, Eumolpus introduces it as something he has been working on (*tamquam si placet hic impetus, etiam si nondum recepit ultimam manum*, 118.6), perhaps while on board Lichas' ship (115.2-4). Even if the poem he was working on at sea was not the *Bellum Ciuile*, just the fact that he is depicted as a poet at work immediately before the journey to Croton is enough to strengthen the sense that what Eumolpus offers on that journey is intended as a real literary specimen. In this sense the *Bellum Ciuile* is like no other poem in the *Satyricon*: it is presented as an attempt at actually producing literature, as opposed to simply an attempt to impress by appearing literate. Everywhere else, the transition to verse is presented as a lapse: Petronius inverts the classical order of discourses by putting conversational language above the poetic; slipping into verse represents a sentimental character flaw.<sup>123</sup> But the *Bellum Ciuile* is no such "slip": it is a conscious effort at composition. It is perhaps this quality that allows the poem to take the seemingly incongruous subject of the Civil War. Really, the poem employed to pass the time on the road to Croton could have taken any subject. So far, Eumolpus has been forced to restrict his versifying to what was appropriate to the occasion: hence the *Troiae Halosis*, the musings on hair (109.9-10), and the epitaph of Lichas (115.20). On the road to Croton, though, the poet is free to indulge his creative spirit and is not bound by the context of his surroundings. A poem on the Civil War, then, is Eumolpus' choice, and it can therefore tell the reader much about his values as a poet.

The narrative-mechanism which gives Eumolpus free reign in his choice of subject matter is interesting in itself. Perhaps it can be explained in terms of the general principles which guided Petronius' composition. Perhaps, in a word, it is the

122. Edmunds (2009) 91-4.

123. Jensson (2004) 54-5.

**genre** of the *Satyricon* that can account for the appearance of such a poem as the *Bellum Ciuile*. Petronius' chiefest guiding principle cannot be anything else but humour, that much is sure. But humorous intent is common to many types of literature: it is the location of the *Satyricon* within a specific generic framework that has proved notoriously difficult. It is commonly held that it belongs not to any one genre but to a combination of them. Admitting the possibility of such a *mélange* seems to weaken the point of attributing a genre in the first place, but the theory is that Petronius is a kind of literary opportunist, drawing on or parodying many different types of literature according to his taste, his humour, and the demands of the narrative at any given point. Abbot gives six possible lines of descent for a work like the *Satyricon*: the mime, the prologues of comedy, the Milesian tales, epic, the romance, and Menippean satire.<sup>124</sup> In the course of his study he evaluates the contribution of each of these types to the overall structure of the work: here they are only considered in as much as they might explain the inclusion of the *Bellum Ciuile*.

The genres of mime and comedy may be excluded at the start. It is true that both exert an important influence on the *Satyricon*: for instance the confidence trick at Croton, the planning and execution of which flank the *Bellum Ciuile*, owes much to mime. But it is difficult to see how either of these types of literature can account for the occurrence of a poem on the Civil War.

The *Satyricon*'s debt to epic may prove a more fruitful point of comparison, considering that is the genre of the poem itself. It is true that there are many references to Homer and many Homeric themes in Petronius, including such episodes as Giton's hiding underneath the bed in the manner of Odysseus escaping the Cyclops (97.4, cf. *Od.* 9.431 ff.), such details as Encolpius' taking the Odyssean epithet Polyaeus for a pseudonym during the episodes at Croton, and such themes as that of an angered deity pursuing the main character. But Petronius makes these allusions for comic effect: where Odysseus was ruthlessly pursued by a wrathful Neptune, Encolpius is comically beset by an offended Priapus; where the journey of Odysseus is a noble return home after war, the wanderings of Encolpius are dictated by the rumblings of his stomach. Moreover, it has already been seen that the genre of the *Bellum Ciuile* is different from that of Homer's *Odyssey* on an important point: it is of the historical rather than the mythical variety of epic. There may

124. Abbot (1911).

be a link between reciting a poem to while away a journey and the conventional telling of stories in the banquet scenes of epic, but Eumolpus' poem on the Civil War is certainly not the ecphrasis that his earlier *Troiae Halosis* is. It is difficult to see how a piece of literature modeled on Homeric epic would yield such an inset as the *Bellum Ciuile*.

Related to the genre of epic is that of the romance. The episodic and character-focused plots of both Petronius' work and the Greek romance novels have a common source in the tales of the wandering Odysseus. But just as Petronius subverts the serious tone of Homer, so too he undercuts many of the stock elements of the romance:

We could speak of a parody of the romance, with a substitution of homosexual for heterosexual love, a triangle for a couple, realism for idealism, a character like Eumolpus for the wise old man such as Heliodorus' Calasiris, a hero running away from rather than trying to discover his destiny, and so on.<sup>125</sup>

Several other features remain in common, such as shipwreck and attempted suicide. Relatively recent discoveries of papyri suggest that the Greek novelistic tradition may in fact pre-date the *Satyricon*, thus making a Petronian parody/development of that genre possible. As for whether an adventure-narrative frame can account for the *Bellum Ciuile*, the same discoveries also admit a precedent for the prosimetric romance, but there is no evidence of any extended poetic extract in any of the novels. Moreover, the environment of the romance is a sealed-off, idealised world: the *Bellum Ciuile* both alludes to contemporary poetic practice and covers an important event of recent history. These aspects of Eumolpus' poem cannot be explained by the Greek romance novel.

The usual connection made with the *Satyricon* on point of prosimetry is to the genre known as Menippean satire. Whether such a literary division existed in the minds of the ancients is not clear: the generic term itself did not come into use until the 16th century.<sup>126</sup> The only complete extant work usually called a Menippean satire is the *Apocolocyntosis* of Seneca, but the similarities of the *Satyricon* to that

125. Relihan (1993) 94.

126. Relihan (1993) 12.

work are only superficial. Petronius does not have the same single parodic focus as Seneca does in the apotheosis of Claudius. That both works are *prosimetra* is of little significance if that form can be sourced elsewhere. It has already been mentioned that prosimetric romances have been posited; when to this are added the possibilities of prosimetric mime and Milesian fiction, the relevance of the *prosimetrum* of Menippean satire all but vanishes.<sup>127</sup>

As for the possibility of a connection between the themes of the *Satyricon* and whatever was the satirical aspect of Menippean satire, Petronius' choice of title is perhaps deceptive. The manuscript tradition is in favour of the proper title for the work consisting in the greek genitive *satyricon*, with *libri* supplied or understood. The word, σατυρικος in the Greek, means "pertaining to satyrs": considering the mischievous and sexual themes of much of the *Satyricon*'s content, this would make it quite an appropriate title. It is often suspected, though, that there is a pun intended, an additional overtone of the word *satira* or *satura*. The spelling variations which proliferate in the manuscripts strengthen the case that such an overtone was perceived, but they are all late and so probably etymological misunderstandings.<sup>128</sup> It is true that many satirical situations arise in the *Satyricon*, but it is not clear that they are accompanied by that morally corrective component which was the mark of Roman verse satire. The tired debate over whether Petronius was a moralist asks whether there is an implied disapproval in his many descriptions of moral degeneracy. The case against such disapproval relies on Encolpius' dispassionate style of narrating and on the conviction that Petronius' ultimate aim was not to correct but to entertain:

Since the story part of the *Satyricon* has every appearance of being written primarily to amuse, we may conclude that it is not a satire, expanded and incidentally taking on the form of a romance, but rather romance which has been somewhat influenced by satire.<sup>129</sup>

127. Astbury (1998) 84.

128. Perry (1925) 33.

129. Perry (1925) 36.

A more nuanced approach sees Petronius' moral statement as the reflection not of the descriptions of vice in the *Satyricon* but of the anarchic manner in which they are presented.<sup>130</sup> But, "this approach is based on the unproven conviction that every work must have a message, however diffusely or perversely expressed":<sup>131</sup> is it not more likely that Petronius is presenting the adventures of a band of rogues in a morally degenerate society simply for the purposes of humour? Satirical situations are encountered by the characters of the *Satyricon*, but no comment is offered about right or wrong actions. If there is any satirical dimension to the work it is the deflation of satire: the story is delivered but the moral withheld. For Walsh the possible pun in the title of the work refers to just this fact, that satire is not what the *Satyricon* is ("satyr-like" is the primary meaning); rather it is what the *Satyricon* makes fun of. He offers a diagram demonstrating that each encounter which the triangle of Encolpius, Giton, and Ascyltos/Eumolpus faces involves a type from verse satire. He lists them:

- Agamemnon: hypocritical *rhetor*
- Quartilla: *mulier libidinosa*
- Trimalchio: boorish host
- Eumolpus: manic poet
- Lichas/Tryphaena: *superstitiosi*
- Croton: *captatores* (Circe)<sup>132</sup>

Each of these characters/situations is given moral censure by the likes of Lucilius, Horace, and Juvenal; but in the Petronian treatment they are accorded neither approval nor disapproval. The adventures simply flow one into the other, and Encolpius offers no further insight. This can be seen in the case of the *Bellum Ciuile*, which is an instance of an encounter with the "manic poet" character: Eumolpus offers a specimen of his verse which fails to capture the interest of its audience. Moreover, the poet deviates sharply from traditional accounts of the cause of the Civil War, substituting a cause which is usually the topic of satire: the decline in morals at Rome. But even this striking adaptation does not provoke

130. Pioneered by Zeitlin (1971b).

131. Anderson (1982) 95.

132. Walsh (1974) 189.

comment from the poem's audience. Encolpius has nothing to say about whether Eumolpus is right about the Civil War and its cause: he notes only that the poem went on far too long. If there is satire in the *Satyricon*, it has a character very different to that of either Menippean or Roman verse satire.

Finally, perhaps the *Satyricon* and the *Bellum Ciuile* can be explained by a Milesian model. The Milesian tales of Aristides were salacious short stories, probably with a fondness for the twist-ending. Obvious parallels in the *Satyricon* are the two amusing prose tales delivered by Eumolpus: that of the Pergamene Boy (85-7) and that of the Widow of Ephesus (111-12). Both of these involve a degree of titillation, and both have unexpected endings. Furthermore, both are especially associated with a geographical location, just as the Milesian tales were associated with the debauched lifestyle at Miletus.<sup>133</sup> It is possible that the *Satyricon* was conceived as a stringing-together of such tales: this at least seems to be the model for the only other extant sample of Roman first-person novelistic fiction, the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius:

*at ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram. (Met. 1.1)*

In fact, from this and other evidence, it seems that the original form of the *Milesiaca* of Aristides may itself have involved a narrative which strung the stories together. After all, *Milesio* agrees with *sermone*, not *varias fabulas*: the implication is that Apuleius is stringing different stories together in that "Milesian manner", not stringing various Milesian tales together to form his own unique narrative. The prevailing view has been that the genre of the Milesian tales may provide material for certain episodes within the *Satyricon* but not its overall organizing principle. This view depends on the assumption that the Milesian tales were conventionally presented as a collection of short, unrelated stories, united only by the persistent narrator;<sup>134</sup> but Jensson makes the case that the original *Milesiaca*:

was not a collection of short stories, but a first-person novel, more specifically a travelogue told from memory by a narrator who every now and then would relate how he encountered other

133. Harrison (1998) 67-68.

134. So Perry (1967) 94-95.

characters who told him stories which he could then incorporate into the main tale through narrative impersonation. The result is a complicated narrative fabric carried by the main narrator with numerous subordinate tales carried by subordinate narrative voices.<sup>135</sup>

Jensson's case is persuasive, and his formulation of the nature of the Milesian tales obviously provides a precedent for the novels of both Apuleius and Petronius.<sup>136</sup> The *Metamorphoses*, like the *Milesiaca*, consists in the recollections of a narrator who travelled to a foreign place, in this case Thessaly, where he heard or otherwise witnessed a series of intriguing tales. Likewise, the *Satyricon* can be seen as "The Recollections of Encolpius":<sup>137</sup> an account of the stories the narrator heard and witnessed during his travels.

Of course, to find a Greek source for Petronius is not to rob him of his inventiveness altogether: while the Milesian tales are concerned with only one *locus* of lasciviousness, namely Miletus; Encolpius in his wanderings visits several such places, including Naples and Croton in the surviving text, with reference also to previous episodes in Massilia, Ostia, and Puteoli, and possible further adventures in northern Africa.<sup>138</sup> This may be the point of the title of the work. The word *satyricon* is in the genitive case; the appropriate nominative would be *Satyrica*.<sup>139</sup> compare the titles of the Greek novels, *Ephesiaca*, *Babyloniaca*, *Phoinicica*, and *Aethiopica*—indeed that of the *Milesiaca* itself. Petronius could not give his work a title in exactly the same way, since the setting of the *Satyricon* changes; instead he gave it a title which reflects the common nature of the places visited by Encolpius and the events he experienced in each, their lascivious, "satyr-like" nature.

The organizing principle of the sensational travelogue is elastic, allowing the inclusion of a wide range of reported stories as well as the narrator's recollections of his own adventures. The Milesian tales may even provide a source for the

135. Jensson (2004) 262.

136. In seeking such a precedent, both Jensson and Harrison (1998) (independently, at first) revitalize the theory of the German scholar K. Bürger; cf. Perry (1925), his earlier opinion.

137. The title of Jensson (2004).

138. Jensson (2004) 171.

139. A form of the title considered more correct by modern commentators; so in the title of, eg. Schmeling (2011).

*Satyricon*'s prosimetry.<sup>140</sup> But the nature of the *Bellum Ciuile* is still anomolous. The poem does not contribute to one of the many self-contained episodes which make up the *Satyricon*; rather it *is* one such episode. And yet nothing about the *Bellum Ciuile* has any of that Milesian character which colours the other episodes in the work. While the Milesian tales, at least when understood as including a cohesive framing narrative, may provide perhaps the best model for the *Satyricon* as a whole, it is still no closer to explaining the appearance of the *Bellum Ciuile*.

To understand how a poem with such political-historical interests can fit into such a non-serious and often lascivious framework, the *Bellum Ciuile* must ultimately be understood in terms of its **characterization** of the poet who utters it. Care has been taken in the foregoing to refer to the poem as first and foremost the work of Eumolpus. Earlier commentators were content to see the *Bellum Ciuile* as the honest effort of Petronius, and the literary criticism in section 118 as representative of the author's own views.<sup>141</sup> Under such an understanding, discussions of Petronius' purpose in including the poem on the Civil War centred around the question of whether it was intended as a serious criticism of Lucan and a demonstration of how better to write such a poem, or whether it was intended as a parody or travesty of the *Pharsalia*. The foregoing appreciation of the *Bellum Ciuile*, which suggests that the merits of the poem outweigh its failings, if only slightly, perhaps indicates that the former is the more likely scenario. Indeed, the parallels with Lucan are not strong enough to make him the target of a very focused parody. Rather, the fact that, as shown in the second part of the present study, Eumolpus adheres rather strictly to the precepts he gives in section 118, precepts which seem to criticize Lucan, or poets like him, is an indication that the poem may well have been intended as a "fair copy" or a correction of the perceived failings of the *Pharsalia*. Such an explanation furthermore explains the incomplete state of the poem, and its abrupt ending: "of course [Eumolpus] does not rewrite the whole poem; a specimen to indicate his own way of handling the material was enough."<sup>142</sup>

This formulation does indeed depend upon the reckoning of the *Bellum Ciuile* as Petronius' own effort—for what interest could a fictional character such as Eumolpus have in criticizing and correcting a real contemporary of Petronius?

140. Jenson (2004) 297.

141. Sullivan (1968) 165 ff.; Baldwin in her commentary on the poem constantly refers to Petronius as its author.

142. Luck (1972) 133.

Furthermore, arguments such as Luck's depend on the identification of the criticism in section 118 with Petronius' own views. But Petronius cannot seriously be suspected of having the same literary views as Eumolpus: if he did have such conservative ideals, he could hardly have created the ingenious and probably innovative low-brow entertainment that is the *Satyricon*. Rather, Petronius delights in irony, and is not one to wear his heart on his sleeve. Eumolpus, like every other Petronian character, is characterized by the incongruity of his thoughts with his habits, and the purpose of such an ironic characterization is simply to amuse. That is not to say that Petronius does not have a hand in what Eumolpus says; rather that the reference to Lucan, or poets like him, ought to be understood as a comment made in good humour rather than with the intent to criticize. It is true that by omitting reference to Lucan by name Petronius may simply be extending a customary courtesy to a contemporary, but the anonymity of the attack on would-be historian/lawyer-poets serves another, dual purpose. On the one hand, Eumolpus gets to utter more of his commonplace literary criticism, characterizing him further as a shameless poet, without the problem of referring to literary practice outside of the narrative of the *Satyricon*. On the other hand, Petronius makes it clear enough the type of poet Eumolpus is talking about, and thereby gets a laugh, possibly at the expense of either Lucan or poets like him, but probably more likely at the expense of contemporary detractors of such poets who, like Eumolpus, only deliver clichéd literary conservatism.

If the question is what is the purpose of the *Bellum Ciuile*, and it is accepted that the work ought to be seen as the effort of the poet character rather than the honest effort of Petronius, the question then becomes: what is the purpose of the poem as envisioned by its author, Eumolpus? Ostensibly it is to serve as an example after the literary criticism in section 118. In the second part of the present work it was shown that, though he may undercut his purpose in places, Eumolpus largely succeeds in being faithful to his literary principles. But how valid is Eumolpus' literary theory? In the time of the principate, if not at every period, traditionalist views on poetry were commonplace. Lucan's experimentation and innovation in the epic genre seem mainly to have earned himself criticism for breaking away from tradition—even the honour of being called a poet was stripped from him.<sup>143</sup>

143. *magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus*, Serv. A. 1.382

Eumolpus, on the other hand, is greatly concerned to be recognized as a poet: the first thing he says to Encolpius is, *ego ... poeta sum* (83.8). He therefore picks up on the same criticism which was made of Lucan:

*ecce belli ciuilis ingens opus quisquis attigerit nisi plenus litteris,  
sub onere labetur. non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae  
sunt, quod longe melius historici faciunt, sed per ambages deo-  
rumque ministeria et fabulosum sententiarum tormentum praecipiti-  
tandus est liber spiritus, ut potius furentis animi uaticinatio  
appareat quam religiosae orationis sub testibus fides.* (118.5–6)<sup>144</sup>

In doing so Eumolpus backs up his credentials as a real poet. Just as the correctness of his hexameters sets him apart from other versifiers such as Trimalchio (as discussed in considering the metre of the poem, above), so his opinions on literary matters, however wearied, nevertheless set him apart from other versifiers such as Lucan, as a true “poet’s poet”.<sup>145</sup> This concern to “do what poets do” carries through into Eumolpus’ choice of genre and subject matter for his poems. Historical epic enjoyed much enthusiasm in this period;<sup>146</sup> moreover:

The *Halosis Troiae* was perhaps the most hackneyed of many hackneyed themes in Roman tragedy. First-century Rome is full of versifiers jostling with each other to declaim their tragic lays. ... When Petronius takes up his hackneyed theme which Vergil’s treatment had made popular, this in itself is indicative of his purpose.<sup>147</sup>

Eumolpus does not care whether his subjects are so very “hackneyed”; he cares only that they identify him as truly a poet. Ironically, considering the reception he gets, Eumolpus is only trying to give the people what they want. This may be what lies

144. cf. *in numero poetarum esse non meruit quia uidetur historiam composuisse non poema*, Serv. A. 1.382.

145. Or, a “super-poet”; cf. Edmunds (2009) 89–90.

146. George (1974) 121–2.

147. Walsh (1968) 209.

behind the perceived difference between the style and content of his poems:

In the *Troiae Halosis*, Petronius of course gives us a contemporary Silver handling of the subject-matter of the *Aeneid* (as from Seneca); [in the *Bellum Ciuile*] we have a Vergilian version of contemporary Silver subject-matter.<sup>148</sup>

Eumolpus is torn between the traditional themes of poetry and its more modern incarnation. Desperate to prove himself a poet, he makes two attempts at a hybrid, of which the *Bellum Ciuile* is one. While differentiating itself from Lucan's work in its treatment of the content, Eumolpus' verse nevertheless retains much of that post-Augustan style. This again is a way of bowing to the popular and hoping to be recognized as a poet. While people are still excited in the age of Nero about gods and drama (more so than they are about the sober retelling of facts) they do not want the exciting tales retold in the same old way. Besides satisfying Eumolpus' conservative temperament, the retention of a divine machinery is good for the story. Rather than jettison it as Lucan did, Eumolpus adjusts his divine machinery to the modern style: the promotion of the allegorical deity Fortuna to the status of one of the divine prime movers is perhaps the best example of this type of hybridization. The purpose of the *Bellum Ciuile*, in Eumolpus' view, is to recall the likes of Lucan to the poetic cause. "Give the people what they want," he seems to be saying, "a bit of gods and heroes, and less of those politics and facts." The *exemplum* he provides is intended to validate both his literary credo and his literary credibility.

In the narrative, though, Eumolpus has no literary credibility. The first lengthy poem he delivers is greeted with the throwing of rocks (90.1), he was likewise expelled from the baths for trying to recite there (92.6), and Encolpius' reaction to the *Bellum Ciuile* itself is not exactly encouraging (124.2); indeed, Eumolpus has grown used to such violent reactions to his bad habit (90.5). In the case of the *Bellum Ciuile*, his choice of subject, genre, and treatment panders to what was in vogue in Petronius' time, but the inhabitants of the world of the *Satyricon* reject it. The many ways in which Eumolpus is similar to the *poeta uesanus* of Horace have also been discussed. The poem on the Civil War is the last poem which Eumolpus

148. Anderson (1982) 102.

recites in the extant text, and it seems also to be the final touch to his characterization as a “manic poetaster”.<sup>149</sup> Such a comical character is of course not at all out of place in an essentially humorous work. Indeed, none of Petronius’ characters can be taken seriously: Encolpius, Ascyltos, and Giton are all remorseless rogues whose only real concern is where the next meal is coming from. Each of these picaros has his own failings and his own comic traits; but it is another set of characters to which Eumolpus belongs: that of the would-be critical authority.

In this respect Eumolpus finds company with the hypocritical Agamemnon, but also, outside of the sphere of educated men, with Trimalchio. Even Encolpius, the narrator himself, shows a critical tendency on occasion. The combined scope of these characters’ criticism is all-encompassing: Agamemnon criticizes the education system (as does Encolpius), Trimalchio pretends to be an authority on living well, and Eumolpus deals with both art and literary criticism, the one before reciting the *Troiae Halosis* and the other before the *Bellum Ciuile*. It has already been mentioned how each of these three characters undercuts his own reputation: Agamemnon is a hypocrite, continuing to pander to his students in spite of his opinion that that very behaviour is the reason for the decline in education; Trimalchio makes many obvious blunders in the knowingness he exudes; and Eumolpus, in the first place, is in no position to judge art, and in the second, in that literary sphere in which he ought to be more comfortable, he confuses the allusions in his poetic programme, producing an unclear aim which his *Bellum Ciuile* only too well achieves. It was also noted that the treatment of Eumolpus’ failure to live up to his own ideals is by far the most subtle: almost imperceptible when compared to the broad strokes with which Trimalchio is characterized. Nevertheless, in the case of each of these three mentors to Encolpius, Petronius derives humour from the idea that any one of them can produce a piece of criticism at the drop of a hat, and yet when it comes down to it, none of them can “produce the goods”, as it were.

The effect of these characters’ failings on the narrator is equally humorous, for Encolpius does not pass judgement on them.<sup>150</sup> Encolpius is in agreement with the hypocritical Agamemnon; though he may privately have a low opinion of Trimalchio, he cares about filling his stomach enough to know that to call him out would not be to his advantage; and he tolerates Eumolpus’ company and even his

149. Walsh (1970) 94.

150. For this attitude of Encolpius, especially regarding Trimalchio, see Beck (1975).

versifying, when others throw rocks and jeer at that lowest of low in the world of the *Satyricon*, a poet. In respect of Eumolpus' characterization as a *poeta uesanus*, Encolpius' tolerance is especially damning. Wise men, says Horace, will avoid such a character:

*uesanum tetigisse timent fugiuntque poetam qui sapiunt,  
agitant pueri incautique sequuntur.* (Ars P. 453–60)

As a young man, Encolpius ought to goad Eumolpus (*agitant pueri*); instead he is one of the *incauti* who follow him. By characterizing the poet as compulsive, unbalanced, and not quite skilful enough to produce very good verse, Petronius gets a laugh not only out of that character but also out of those who accept him into their group.

And yet all of these theories are only really compelling if Eumolpus does indeed come off as an utterly bad poet. It is true that he earns little respect within the narrative. His very name (=“sweet-singer”) seems to be just another ironical appellation, of which there are many in the *Satyricon*. But it was shown in the first part of the present study that when considered in its own right the *Bellum Ciuile* has significant merits. It may be that there is a double irony in Eumolpus' name: it sets up the expectation that his verse will be terrible, so that the reader is surprised when it is not completely so. Moreover, contrary to the suggestion that Petronius derives humour from the comical incongruity between Eumolpus' literary theory and practice, it was shown in the second part of the present study that he is rather successful in fulfilling his poetic programme. This gives a different spin to the way in which the poem on the Civil War characterizes its author, and challenges the notion that Petronius is simply subjecting the poet to further ridicule. After all, surely if the aim was to simply discredit Eumolpus as an annoying poetaster, that had been amply achieved by the time he had properly taken up with Encolpius and Giton. It seems that the purpose of the *Bellum Ciuile* ought not to be only a confirmation of this characterization. True, it could be the case that Petronius had an ironical intent to bore the reader by having Eumolpus again spout his turgid verses, this time rendered even more tedious by the fact that they are allowed to go on for some time. But the relative merit of the poem disallows this. Rather than confirm Eumolpus' characterization, that is, the *Bellum Ciuile* complicates it.

The technique whereby a competent piece of literature is delivered by an incompetent character is paralleled in Apuleius. The tale of *Cupid and Psyche* (*Met.* 4-6) is, like the *Bellum Ciuile* in the *Satyricon*, a significant insertion into its framing narrative. This famous story-within-a-story is well-regarded and memorable, and yet it is narrated by a disreputable hag. She is a bent-over crone (*anum quandam curuatam graui senio*), associated with a group of thieves who roundly abuse her (*etiamne tu, busti cadauer extremum et uitae dedecus primum et Orci fastidium solum*), and a drunk (*quae diebus ae noctibus nil quicquam rei quam merum saeuienti uentri tuo soles auuiditer ingurgitare*, *Met.* 4.7). The purpose of her “old-woman’s tale” (*anilibusque fabulis*, *Met.* 4.27) is to calm the victim of a kidnapping. The fact that such a lowly character delivers such a worthwhile piece of literature plays with the expectations of the reader. The situation in the *Satyricon* is not as striking, because Eumolpus is a poet and his reciting poetry, even in the extended instance on the road to Croton, is no surprise. But just as Apuleius complicates the interpretation of *Cupid and Psyche*, so Petronius complicates the character of Eumolpus by contrasting the appreciation Eumolpus’ poetry receives within the narrative of the *Satyricon* and that which it is perhaps due if the *Bellum Ciuile* is given a more objective and charitable reading. Such a paradox is quite in keeping with Petronius’ sense of irony: indeed, he is fond of unreliable narrators—what else is Encolpius?

The result of this more complicated characterization of Eumolpus is to have it both ways: to make fun of both pretentious poets and those who lack an appreciation of literature. On the one hand, Eumolpus’ conservative impulse represents the same clichéd opinions bandied about after Vergil; on the other hand, the intolerance of the general public in the face of Eumolpus’ versifying is perhaps a greater indictment of their failings than those of his verse. Eumolpus recognizes that as a poet he is doomed to suffer poverty and the hatred of his fellow man (*primum propter morum differentiam odium habet; quis enim potest probare diversa?* 84.1). He is essentially a different species, treated by general society as a leper. But he is resigned to this, and it does not keep him from reciting poetry. Encolpius recognizes these traits in the poet even at first sight, and his reflection that Eumolpus is the type of man *quos odisse divites solent* betrays a sympathy which nobody else seems to afford the poet. Indeed, a sympathetic reading of the *Bellum Ciuile* and Eumolpus’ other poetic effusions, rather than condemning the character of him who

utters them, condemns instead the contemporary decline of literature. This is reinforced by the constant equation of technical criticism with moral criticism. So Agamemnon blames the decline of education on the situation whereby tutors must cater to the demands of their students (*nihil nimirum in his exercitationibus doctores peccant, qui necesse habent cum insanientibus furere. nam nisi dixerint quae adulescentuli probent, ut ait Cicero, 'soli in scholis relinquuntur.'* 3.2); Eumolpus blames avarice for the decline of the visual arts (*pecuniae ... cupiditas haec tropica instituit*, 88.2); and though there is no explicit moral component to the literary criticism delivered on the road to Croton, there the criticism is juxtaposed with the beginning of the *Bellum Ciuile*, which is largely concerned with the moral lapses of the Romans even in pre-Augustan times. If the society in which the characters of the *Satyricon* find themselves is so corrupt, then the fact that poetry goes unappreciated is only a symptom of the corruption.

This is not to say that Petronius intends a serious critique of society, any more than he intends a serious critique of Lucan. The point is, as ever, humorous. By allowing space for an appreciative reading of the *Bellum Ciuile*, Petronius pokes fun at those who would claim the worthlessness of poetry. In the *Satyricon*, nobody escapes the author's cruel and ironic ridicule. But in order to achieve this all-points burlesque Petronius has had to tread a narrow path in order to avoid validating the seriousness of either the poem in earnest or the poem as parody. This is purpose of the *Bellum Ciuile*'s pointed "mediocrity", which Beck is correct in saying "is pitched at exactly the right level":

If Petronius had made it really bad or grotesque (like Trimalchio's execrable pieces on morality at 34.10 and 55.3), then the qualified acceptance of Eumolpus as a poet would be quite implausible. If, on the other hand, the poetry had been given real merits, it could have compromised the comic tone of the characterization, making us treat seriously the image of unrecognized genius that Eumolpus at moments entertains about himself and distracting us with the troubling discovery that here alone, amid all the moral and aesthetic posturing of the *Satyricon*'s characters, true worth is to be found.<sup>151</sup>

151. Beck (1979) 241-2.

This argument needs but a little modification in light of the findings of the first chapter of the present work. For there was made that “troubling discovery that here alone ... true worth is to be found.” The comic characterization of Eumolpus is derived not so much from the fact that his verse is neither good nor bad, as from the fact that while his verse may actually have its merits those merits go unrecognized in the morally degenerate world of the *Satyricon*. Petronius could easily have created a character who was indeed a terrible poetaster, an imposter who could not deliver what he pretended to be able to deliver—and the characterization would have been a humorous one. But this is already what has been done in the case of Trimalchio. When it comes to, not an uneducated ex-slave, but a self-professed poet, Petronius is bound, in a work in which literature plays an important role, to take a much more nuanced approach. Eumolpus is not merely another character who can moralize on demand but when it comes to producing something of his own cannot meet the high expectations he has of others. His *Bellum Ciuile*, while not a work of genius, is a work of competence, and it does validate his own ideals. It is the fact that it is dismissed as a tedious outpouring of so many words (*ingenti uolubilitate uerborum*, 124.2) that makes Eumolpus’ character seem ridiculous, with the added benefit that fun is also made of the unappreciative audience.

The real tension in Eumolpus’ characterization, then, is not between the quality of his verse and the expectations he sets up for himself. Rather, it lies in the fact that he is characterized on the one hand as a real poet, and on the other as only a mischievous rogue. Beck makes a convincing case that Eumolpus, though he prides himself on being a poet, is actually a better story-teller in prose than he is in verse.<sup>152</sup> The examples adduced are those of the Pergamene Boy and the Widow of Ephesus, mentioned in the discussion of genre above. Compare the violently negative reception of Eumolpus’ poetry to the general encouragement his prose tales receive:

*erectus his sermonibus consulere prudentiorem coepi aetates tabularum...* (88.1)

152. Beck (1979) 245 ff.

*risu excepere fabulam nautae et erubescere non mediocriter Tryphaena vultumque suum super cervicem Gitonis amabiliter ponente. at non Lichas risit, sed iratum commovens caput “si iustus” inquit “imperator fuisset, debuit patris familiae corpus in monumentum referre, mulierem affigere cruci.”* (113.1)

Even Lichas, who is not amused by the tale, at least is moved to express an opinion: the *Bellum Ciuile* earns no such response. This contrast “has to do directly with the effectiveness of each type of performance and only indirectly with the quality.”<sup>153</sup> That is, it is not that the quality of Eumolpus’ verse is somehow at odds with its aspiration, but that the fact that Eumolpus versifies at all is completely at odds with where his talents truly lie.

“Though a third-rate poet, [Eumolpus] is a first-rate raconteur.”<sup>154</sup> This extends beyond his creative efforts to his very mode of living. In literary matters, Eumolpus is quick to criticize the decay of morals: so in his remarks prefatory to the *Troiae Halosis* (88), and in the content of much of the *Bellum Ciuile*. But in his own habits he is hardly an upstanding member of society. That he takes up with the rascals Encolpius and Giton at all is evidence of his lack of personal decorum. The deceit which he engineers for the *captatores* at Croton is motivated by that very lust for gold to which he attributes the decline of morals—indeed, to which he attributes the cause of the Civil War. Of course, the mime at Croton is as much motivated by the need for survival as it is by want of money, but the fact that Eumolpus must live by his wits and not by his poetry deflates his literary pretensions. Moreover, in joining the triangle of protagonists of the *Satyricon* Eumolpus is clearly motivated by sex. Encolpius is naïve about his approach in the *pinacotheca*, taking oblivious comfort in the story of how Eumolpus seduced another boy (*erectus his sermonibus*). When the poet meets Giton he is clearly smitten:

*“felicem” inquit “matrem tuam quae te talem peperit: macte virtute esto. raram fecit mixturam cum sapientia forma.”* (94.1)

153. Beck (1979) 246.

154. Beck (1979) 245.

These carnal motivations recall the subject matter of the Milesian tales. Eumolpus relates two amusing and salacious stories whose qualities are often recognized as those of the Milesian tale; but, more than this, Eumolpus is himself an incarnation of that genre. The poet confirms the story he told of the Pergamene Boy when he re-enacts it at Croton:

*[Philomela] ergo ad Eumolpum venit et commendare liberos suos  
eius prudentiae bonitatisque credere se et vota sua. illum esse solum  
in toto orbe terrarum qui praeceptis etiam salubribus instruere  
iuvenes quotidie posset.* (140.2)

Just as Eumolpus passed himself off in Pergamum as an upright *praeceptor* only to abuse the confidence of the boy's parents, so here Eumolpus passes himself off as an ailing will-maker with no heirs. His treatment of Philomela's daughter makes it clear that his motives at Croton have not changed. This "real life" Milesian tale betrays Eumolpus' true character, throwing his poetic pretensions into high contrast. This is the tension which is required of Petronian humour. Eumolpus, for all his aspirations, is just as much a rogue as Encolpius or Giton. He is older and so perhaps displays more cunning, but ultimately his motives cannot be said to be honourable. His desires, like those of his companions, are bodily. That he then attempts to pass himself off as a poet concerned about moral and artistic decline is highly comical.

In this sense the *Bellum Ciuile* does indeed play a role in the characterization of Eumolpus, though not exactly the role it is usually assumed to play. The poem is often seen as proof that its author is something of a hack. To a degree this view holds, but here it has been shown that such a view is challenged by the relative merits of the *Bellum Ciuile* and its consistency with its literary precepts. It seems that the poem acts rather to reinforce than to detract from Eumolpus' status as a poet. The comic incongruity then becomes that between his stance on morals in his guise as a poet and that which is evident in his regular behaviour.

## CONCLUSION

In the *Satyricon*, humour is always the result of some tension. The usual argument in the case of Eumolpus' characterization has been that, like Agamemnon, and like Trimalchio, Eumolpus can "talk the talk" but cannot "walk the walk". The first two chapters of the present work challenged this view by providing evidence that the *Bellum Ciuile* actually succeeds to some extent, both as poetry in its own right and as a validation of the literary views which precede it. It cannot simply be the case, then, that the requisite tension is between Eumolpus' views as a poet and his poetic acts. That tension only holds to an extent: for the most part Eumolpus' poetic effusions confirm his poetic views. Rather, it was suggested in the third chapter of the present work that the ironic and comical tension in the characterization of Eumolpus is to be found in the conflict between, on the one hand, his status as a poet concerned about the moral decay of society, and on the other, the amoral roguishness of his actual behaviour. By providing evidence both for the *Bellum Ciuile*'s merits and for its role in validating its author's literary views, the present study has called for a re-appreciation of the poem and a re-evaluation of its author's character. It has been suggested that Eumolpus ought to be given some credit for producing a rather striking poem on the Civil War, and that Petronius deserves admiration for the way in which he uses both the poem and its author to immensely amusing effect.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot, F. F. (1911) "The Origin of the Realistic Romance Among the Romans", *CP* 6: 257-70.
- Anderson, G. (1982) *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play* (Chico).
- (1984) *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World* (Totowa).
- Arrowsmith, W. (1959) *Petronius Arbiter: The Satyricon* (Ann Arbor).
- (1966) "Luxury and Death in the *Satyricon*", *Arion* 5: 304-331.
- Astbury, R. (1999) "Petronius, P. *Oxy.* 3010, and Menippean Satire", in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel* (Oxford).
- Bagnani, G. (1954) *Arbiter of Elegance : A Study of the Life and Works of C. Petronius* (Toronto).
- Baldwin, B. (1971) "Trimalchio's Poetry", *CJ* 66: 254-5.
- Baldwin, F. T. (1911) *The Bellum Civile of Petronius* (New York).
- Beck, R. (1973) "Some Observations on the Narrative Technique of Petronius", *Phoenix* 27: 42-61.
- (1975) "Encolpius at the *Cena*", *Phoenix* 29: 271-83.
- (1979) "Eumolpus *poeta*, Eumolpus *fabulator*: A Study of Characterization in the *Satyricon*", *Phoenix* 33: 239-53.
- Cameron, A. M. (1970) "Myth and Meaning in Petronius: Some Modern Comparisons", *Latomus* 29: 397-425.
- Coffey, M. (1976) *Roman Satire* (London and New York).
- Collignon, A. (1892) *Étude sur Pétrone* (Paris).
- Connors, C. (1989) "Petronius' *Bellum Civile* and the Poetics of Discord", (diss. Michigan).
- (1998) *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon* (Cambridge).
- Conte, G. B. (1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (Ithaca and London).
- (1996) *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon* (Berkeley).

- Courtney, E. (1962) "Parody and Allusion in Menippean Satire", *Philologus* 106: 86-100.
- (1991) *The Poems of Petronius* (Atlanta).
- (2001) *A Companion to Petronius* (Oxford).
- Crump, M. M. (1931) *The Epyllion: From Theocritus to Ovid* (Oxford).
- Duckworth, G. E. (1969) *Vergil and Classical Hexameter Poetry: A Study in Metrical Variety* (Ann Arbor).
- Edmunds, L. (2009) "Rules for Poems in Petronius' *Satyrica*", *Syllecta Classica* 20: 71-104.
- Feeney, D. C. (1991) *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford).
- Ferreira, P. S., Leão, D. F., and Teixeira, C. (2008) *The Satyricon of Petronius: Genre Wandering and Style* (Coimbra).
- Frye, N. (1957) *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton and Oxford).
- George, P. A. (1966) "Style and Character in the *Satyricon*", *Arion* 5: 336-58.
- (1974) "Petronius and Lucan *De Bello Civili*", *CQ* new ser. 24: 119-33.
- Grimal, P. (1977) *La Guerre Civile de Pétrone dans ses rapports avec la Pharsale* (Paris).
- Guido, G. (1976) *Petronio Arbitro. Dal "Satyricon": Il "Bellum Civile"* (Bologna).
- Harrison, S. J. (1998) "The Milesian Tales and the Roman Novel", in H. Hofmann and M. Zimmerman (eds.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* (Groningen).
- Hight, G. (1941) "Petronius the Moralizer", *TAPA* 72: 176-194.
- Hofmann, H. (ed.) (1999) *Latin Fiction: The Latin Novel in Context* (London and New York).
- Jennson, G. (2004) *The Recollections of Encolpius: The Satyricon of Petronius as Milesian Fiction* (Groningen).
- Luck, G. (1972) "On Petronius' *Bellum Civile*", *AJP* 93: 133-41.
- Monella, P. (2008) "The Sleep of Reason in the *Bellum Civile* of Petronius", (talk delivered at UCLA).
- Peck, H. T. (1911) *A History of Classical Philology* (New York).
- Perry, B. E. (1925) "Petronius and the Comic Romance", *CP* 20: 31-49.
- (1967) *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).

- Prag, J. and Repath, I. (eds.) (2009) *Petronius: A Handbook* (Chichester).
- Raith, O. (1963) *Petronius, ein Epikureer* (Nuremberg).
- Rankin, H. D. (1971) *Petronius the Artist: Essays on the Satyricon and its Author* (The Hague).
- Relihan, J. C. (1993) *Ancient Menippean Satire* (Baltimore and London).
- Rimell, V. (2002) *Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction* (Cambridge).
- Rose, K. F. C. (1971) *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Leiden).
- Sandy, G. (1969) "Satire in the *Satyricon*", *JP* 90: 293-303.
- (1970) "Petronius and the Tradition of the Interpolated Narrative", *TAPA* 101: 463-476.
- Sanford, E. M. (1931) "Lucan and His Roman Critics", *CP* 26: 233-257.
- Schmeling, G. (2011) *A Commentary on the Satyricon of Petronius* (Oxford).
- Slater, N. W. (1990) *Reading Petronius* (Baltimore and London).
- (2012) "Eumolpus poeta at Work: Rehearsed Spontaneity in the *Satyricon*", in E. Minchin (ed.), *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World* (Leiden and Boston).
- Smith, W. S. (2009) "Eumolpus the Poet", in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis, and G. Schmeling (eds.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel* (Eelde and Groningen).
- Sochatoff, A. F. (1962) "The Purpose of Petronius' *Bellum Civile*: A Re-Examination", *TAPA* 93: 449-58.
- (1963) "Stephanus and the Text of Petronius' *Bellum Civile*", *TAPA* 94: 281-92.
- (1970) "Imagery in the Poems of the *Satyricon*", *CJ* 65: 340-4.
- Sullivan, J. P. (1968) *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study* (London).
- Walsh, P.G. (1968) "Eumolpus, the *Halosis Troiae*, and the *de Bello Civili*", *CP* 63: 208-12.
- (1974) "Was Petronius a Moralist?", *G&R* 21: 181-90.
- (1995) *The Roman Novel* (2nd edn. London).
- Williams, G. (1978) *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Yeh, W. (2007) *Structures Métriques des Poésies de Pétrone: Pour quel Art Poétique?* (Paris).

- Zeitlin, F. I. (1971a) "Romanus Petronius: A Study of the *Troiae Halosis*, and the *Bellum Civile*", *Latomus* 30: 56-82.
- (1971b) "Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity", *TAPA* 102: 631-84.