Ramus 51 (2) p.203–223 © The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.
doi:10.1017/rmu.2022.12

LIES, DECEITS, MANIPULATIONS, AND OTHER FORMS OF AESTHETIC EXPRESSION IN HORACE, *SATIRES* 2.5

Andrew J. Horne

Finagling an inheritance is one time-tested way of resolving a money shortage: just flatter your way into the good graces of the aged and rich. In *Satires* 2.5 Horace parodies the Roman version of this vice, known as *captatio* or 'legacy-hunting'; with baroque imagination, he presents Odysseus, the mythological hero, consulting the prophet Tiresias in the Underworld and learning how to increase his fortune by amassing inheritances. Odysseus asks: *tu protinus, unde | diuitias aerisque ruam, dic, augur, aceruos* ('tell me forthwith, prophet, where I can dig up riches and heaps of money', 21f.). Tiresias responds: *captes astutus ubique | testamenta senum* ('cleverly snatch on all sides the testaments of old men', 23f.). Social critique naturally looms large in this poem about venal dishonesty. In major studies, Niall Rudd and Klaus Sallmann have examined the poem's criticism of contemporary Roman society, and later scholars have taken a similar line, often reading the poem as a send-up of flattery.[1] All true, but there is more to say. Even as it treats of wills, money, and flattery, the satire also shows a quiet concern with aesthetic issues, especially the state of contemporary poetry.

Satires 2.5 was likely published in 30 BC, shortly before the most famous decade in Latin literature, that of the *Georgics* (c. 29 BC), *Odes* (late 20s BC), and *Aeneid* (19 BC). There is reason to think that the satire offers a wry commentary on the ambitions of Horace and Vergil as they look ahead to their mature works. This paper argues three points. First, that the satire is an anticipatory parody of Vergil's *Georgics*, probably published the following year. Tiresias teaches the art of legacy-hunting by deploying the Hesiodic didactic devices that Vergil will also use to teach farming. Second, that the satire contains meta-literary terms that correlate legacy-hunting and poetry, and so likens Vergil and

Thanks to Emily Gowers, Michèle Lowrie, Peter White, and my anonymous reviewers for their comments on the paper. A version was delivered at the Society for Classical Studies meeting in 2015. Text of Horace is Klingner (1950); of Hesiod, West (1978); of Cicero, Kumaniecki (1995); of Ovid, Kenney (1994); translations are mine.

1. Rudd (1966), ch.8, reads the poem as 'social satire' (235) and provides good historical context (more in Fedeli [1994], 672f.); Sallmann (1970) thinks the Homeric setting adds satirical distancing, to help Romans see their deficiencies afresh. Focusing on flattery are Labate (1984), ch.4; Kemp (2010), 70–2; Yona (2018a), 201–32; (2018b). Damon (1997), 118–21, reads Odysseus as a variation on the stock parasite. Other scholarship: Roberts (1984) points out ways in which the poem is unusual for Horace; Oliensis (1997) and (1998), 51–63, esp. 57, connects the down-and-out Odysseus with other figures of *Satires* 2; Knorr (2004), 200–7, develops parallels with other Horatian satires; Klein (2012) argues for a theatrical component; Freudenburg (2013), 316f.; (2021), 199f., probes connections to Menippean satire.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Horace to money-grubbing flatterers. Third, and looking ahead, that Ovid's reception of the satire in the *Ars amatoria* responds to its specifically aesthetic concerns. Presaging with puckish humor a decade for the ages, *Satires* 2.5 makes no attempt to be a serious manifesto. What it is is a gaudy, self-deprecating send-up of the burgeoning ambitions of the soon-to-be Augustan poets.

I. Another Works and Days

Horace writes a good deal of mock didactic poetry, joking and teaching in the same breath.[2] Not all didactic is the same, however, and in *Satires* 2.5 we find a specific version of it—the Hesiodic version.[3] The satire parodies the *hypothêkai* genre of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, the original, proto-didactic poem in Greco-Roman literature. In doing so, it anticipates Vergil's forthcoming *Georgics*. The Hesiodic parody narrowly beats the great Hesiodic poem of Rome.[4]

The first indication of Hesiodic allegiance is formal. *Satires* 2.5 is a consummate example of a *hypothêkai* poem—a poem of 'instructional commands'. Thus Tiresias spouts a characteristically immoral instruction:

> *sicui* praeterea ualidus male filius in re
> praeclara sublatus aletur, ne manifestum
> caelibis obsequium nudet te, leniter in spem
> *adrepe* officiosus, ut et scribare secundus
> heres et, siquis casus puerum egerit Orco,
> in uacuom uenias: *perraro haec alea fallit*.
>
> (2.5.45–50)

> Besides, say that someone has a sickly son,
> accepted and raised to a glittering property: lest you be exposed by open
> flattery, the sort you would use for an unmarried man, slip softly,
> with dutiful services, into the hope of being inscribed
> as second heir—and if any misfortune send the boy to Orcus,
> of coming into the gap. Not often does this gamble fail.

2. On didactic in Horace's corpus, Hardie (2014). On the didactic inclinations of both Old Comedy and Roman satire, Ferriss-Hill (2015), 63–72. Because this paper takes the Roman perspective, I have not scrupled to use the term 'didactic' even for the archaic material.

3. Contra Lejay (1911), 483f., who thinks *Satires* 2.5 engages in non-specific parody of didactic, 'la couleur générale'. Sallmann (1970), 179f., thinks the poem parodies *Hellenistic* didactic, given that its hunting theme suggests the Hellenistic genres of the *Cynegetica* and *Halieutica.* But the hunting theme is better seen as belonging to the poem's many anachronisms; see n.39.

4. A few scholars have connected Hesiod and Horace. Rand (1911) suggests that Hesiod's gently critical tone resembles that of Horatian satire. Sinclair (1932), xiii–xvi, argues that the *Works and Days* has generic resemblances to Horace's *Epistles*. Hunter (2014), 50 n.26, suggests comparing *Satires* 2.2, which involves farming, with the *Works and Days*. Hunt (1981) and Nisbet (2004), 158f., point to aspects of the *Works and Days* that resemble Roman satire generally.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This could almost be by Hesiod. The lines are a *hypothêkê*, an instructional command, according to the archaic pattern. The passage is in hexameters. It instructs through an imperative, the main verb being *adrepe*, 'slip'. Surrounding the imperative is an apparatus of further information: a situation in which to perform the command ('say someone has a sickly son'), and a concluding explanation or defense of the command ('not often does this gamble fail'), which fills the paroimiac verse. The only thing missing from this *hypothêkê* is an apostrophe, but Hesiod often omits the apostrophe as well.[5]

Passages like these—instructional commands with surrounding apparatus—are the dominant form of much of Hesiod's *Works and Days*. Hesiod stacks his imperatival instructions one upon the other. The pattern also appears on a smaller scale in certain Homeric wisdom speakers (Mentes, Nestor, etc.), whose resemblance to Hesiod has often been recognized.[6] By adopting the *hypothêkai* form for *Satires* 2.5, Horace is probably making a literary-historical gesture—he is doing didactic in the archaic, preeminently Hesiodic style. Though other didactic poets will scatter a command here, a command there, Hesiodic didactic is built almost entirely out of commands, and so is Horace's satire. There are ten discrete *hypothêkai* in the satire, amounting to nearly the whole of Tiresias' instructional speech; they are interrupted only by an oracle (2.5.59–69) and Odysseus' naïve interjections.[7]

The reader may wonder, of course, whether Horace is only engaging in vague archaic pastiche,[8] not specific didactic parody. But consider the previous poem in the book, *Satires* 2.4. This satire is also mock didactic—2.4 proffers cooking advice—but formally very different. Its instructions are couched not as commands but as declarative, indicative statements.[9] Do you want to know where to find good cabbage? *cole suburbano qui siccis creuit in agris | dulcior* ('cabbage grown in dry fields is tastier than cabbage from around Rome', 15f.). The advice is declaratory, not imperatival. Again, *Picenis cedunt pomis Tiburtia suco* ('fruit from the Tibur region is inferior in its juice to fruit from Picenum', 70). There are exceptions,[10]

5. On the *hypothêkê*, Horne (2018b), with discussion of the basic form (34f.), situation (48–51), explanation (46–8), paroimiac verse (45), apostrophe (42f.), and full bibliography (esp. 32–4). Faraone (2021) has since argued that the 'situation' may have roots in hexameter oracles.

6. On the association between *hypothêkai* and Hesiod, Horne (2018b), 38–41; between *hypothêkai* and Homer, 34–8. On the similarity of Homeric wisdom speakers and Hesiod's *Works and Days*, 33 n.6.

7. Discrete *hypothêkai* blocks include 2.5.9f., 10–17, 23–6, 27–44, 45–50, 51–7, 70–83, 84–98, 99–106, 106–9. Comparable outlines can be found in Roberts (1984), 426f.; Fedeli (1994), 671f.; and esp. Sallmann (1970), 182f. Klein (2012), 107, categorizes the poem's imperativals. Lejay (1911), 489f.; Kiessling and Heinze (1968), 281; and Muecke (1993), 179f., remark on the lack of clear organization in Tiresias' speech—but that is the *hypothêkai* style: Sallmann (1970), 196, speaks of 'die Kette der Empfehlungen' in Tiresias' speech, and Friedländer (1913), 570, and Munding (1959), 71, use similar terms for Hesiod; cf. Hunter (2008), 156.

8. In *Odyssey* 11, Tiresias does use *hypothêkai* forms (119–25, 126–37), but not as many as in Horace's satire.

9. The contrast is noted by Lejay (1911), 488f.

10. Catius does offer one *hypothêkê* (2.4.12–14), a jussive (35), and an imperatival future (68), but all other instructions are indicative. The Horace figure in 2.4 uses commands (10, 89, 91), but he is not the didactic teacher.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but the speakers are basically consistent. If Tireisas in 2.5 teaches through commands, Catius in 2.4 teaches through declarative statements. One way to understand the formal contrast is through literary history.[11] If *hypothêkai*, or imperatival instructions, are characteristic of Hesiod, indicative didactic is characteristic of Aratus.[12] In the *Phaenomena* Aratus generally uses imperativals only to move on to a new subject (e.g. 75, 96), not for substantive instructions; for those he prefers declarative statements. Comparably few commands pop up in Nicander's *Alexipharmaca* and Lucretius' *De rerum natura*;[13] although Nicander's *Theriaca* exults in commands, the poem (10–12) also acknowledges a special debt to Hesiod.[14] It seems likely, then, that *Satires* 2.4 and 2.5 form a diptych, juxtaposing a Hesiodic didactic poem (2.5) with an Aratean or more broadly Alexandrian one (2.4).[15] The fact that 2.5 takes place in the Homeric Underworld and features mythological characters while 2.4 is set in contemporary Rome, with Horace and his friend Catius as speakers, reinforces the distinction: one poem is contemporary, the other old or mythical. Kirk Freudenburg has already associated the stylistic preciosity of 2.4 with Alexandrian aesthetics.[16]

Apart from the formal contrast, there are other differences between *Satires* 2.4 and 2.5 that reinforce the idea of a didactic diptych, Aratus facing Hesiod. A major contrast is authority—what gives the teachers the right to teach? In 2.4, didactic authority is indirect. The speaker Catius offers no instructions in his own name; he merely reports advice he heard at a lecture.[17] Catius is the *interpres*, the 'go-between' (91); he intends to 'write down' (*ponere signa*, 2) the teachings he heard but not contribute any of his own.[18] Indeed, the satire makes rather elaborate hay of not revealing who the cooking teacher is (10f., 88–95), thus drawing attention to the hidden source of authority.[19] This hands-off approach has specific connotations—Alexandrian ones. So we hear in one of Cicero's dialogues:

---

11. Gibson (1997) and (2003), 9–11, offers a more detailed categorization of didactic subgenres according to form of instruction.

12. Both Parmenides (no. 28 DK, frr. B2.1f., B4, B7.2–6, B8.49–51) and Empedocles (no. 31 DK, e.g. frr. B1, B3.9–13, B4, B6, B23.9–11) give *hypothêkai*, but mostly to encourage their listeners to listen, not for substantive instruction. Theognis is excluded from discussion because his *hypothêkai* are elegiac, not hexametrical.

13. Gibson (1997), 91, tabulates imperativals in Lucretius and other Latin authors.

14. Gutzwiller (2007), 105.

15. Horne (forthcoming) adduces other reasons to see *Satires* 2.4 and 2.5 as a diptych. The pairing overlaps with the 2.3 and 2.4 pairing proposed by Freudenburg (1996).

16. Freudenburg (1996). To his observations I would add the baroque politeness of 2.4.4–7, 10, 88–95 and the learned designation of Socrates as *Anyti…reum* ('the man prosecuted by Anytus', 2.4.3).

17. Fraenkel (1957), 136f.; Anderson (1963), 33f.; Classen (1978), 334; and Gowers (1993), 138–40, see imitation of Plato in the indirect reportage. Lejay (1911), 448f., collects imperial Roman instances of the trope.

18. On writing as a distinctive mark of Hellenistic didactic, Toohey (1996), ch.3.

19. Classen (1978) thinks the source is Epicurus, with Catius being a comically second-rate Epicurean; Berg (1996), 148–50, thinks the source is Nasidienus; Lejay (1911), 449f., rejects the idea that it could be Maecenas and finds in the not naming names 'une simple plaisanterie' (449, cf. *ad* 2.4.11).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> etenim si constat inter doctos, hominem ignarum astrologiae ornatissimis atque optimis uersibus Aratum de caelo stellisque dixisse; si de rebus rusticis hominem ab agro remotissimum Nicandrum Colophonium poetica quadam facultate, non rustica scripsisse praeclare: quid est cur non orator de rebus iis eloquentissime dicat, quas ad certam causam tempusque cognorit?
>
> (*De or*. 1.69)

> For if learned persons agree that a man with no knowledge of astronomy, Aratus, spoke about the sky and stars in wonderfully elaborate verses, and that a man who lived nowhere near a farm, Nicander of Colophon, wrote superbly on farming topics, using his poetic rather than agricultural skill—then why should an orator not speak with high eloquence on topics he has prepared for one time and one case?[20]

Learned opinion is clear: Aratus' didactic poem on the stars was written from a position of astronomical ignorance. Same with Nicander on farming: both poets relied on technical sources rather than conduct original research. It is this tradition that Catius of 2.4 follows.[21]

No such remove is found in *Satires* 2.5. Teacher Tiresias spouts instruction upon instruction in his own voice; authorized by the gods to speak, he does not rely on any other expert authority.[22] When he declares *accipe qua ratione queas ditescere* ('listen to how to get rich', 10), he cites no sources. A *uates* ('prophet', 6) and *augur* ('seer', 22), Tiresias has divine warrant to speak. He is consulted as an oracle (*responde*, 'tell me', 2), and goes into full-dress oracular mode halfway through the speech (62–9). If Catius' ventriloquy associates him with Aratus, Tiresias' confidence puts him in line with the *hypothêkai* genre. Instructions in the *Works and Days* come from Hesiod, not an extraneous expert.[23] So too, *hypothêkai* speakers in Homer speak on their own authority,[24] sometimes reinforcing that authority with an assertive first-person ὑποθήσομαι

20. Similar points are made at *Rep*. 1.22 and Hipparchus *Commentary* 1.1.8. See Kidd (1997), 4f.; Toohey (1996), 50, 76; Gutzwiller (2007), 99.

21. Watson (2007), 351f., reads the trope as illustrating Catius' incompetence rather than his Alexandrian credentials.

22. The contrast is noticed by Knorr (2004), 200f. Freudenburg (1996), 199, points to a similar contrast between 2.3 and 2.4.

23. On Hesiod's teaching persona, Griffith (1983), 55–62; Clay (1993).

24. The following speeches in Homer are labeled *hypothêkai* by the scholia: Andromache gives instructions to Hector (*Il*. 6.429–39), Zeus to the Olympian gods (8.5–27), Nestor to Agamemnon (9.96–113), Peleus to Achilles (9.254–8), Nestor to the guards (10.192f.), Poseidon to Aeneas (20.332–9), Nestor to Antilochus (23.306–48), Athena/Mentes to Telemachus (*Od*. 1.279–305), Ino to Odysseus (5.339–50), Nausicaa to Odysseus (6.303–15); full citations in Horne (2018b), 36 n.15. Though not labeled, Odysseus' advice to Achilles (*Il*. 19.155–83) is one of the strongest *hypothêkai* speeches in Homer.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

('I will instruct').[25] Although divine inspiration is not a major part of the *hypothêkai* genre—Hesiod is a farmer, not a prophet—there is a passage in the middle of the *Works and Days* that rather suddenly claims divine inspiration:[26]

> ἀλλὰ καὶ ὧς ἐρέω Ζηνὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο·
> Μοῦσαι γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξαν ἀθέσφατον ὕμνον ἀείδειν.
>
> (*WD* 661f.)
>
> Even so will I speak the mind of Zeus who bears the aegis,
> for the Muses taught me to sing an inexpressible song.

This statement has formal similarities with a claim made by Tiresias in *Satires* 2.5, also occurring unexpectedly in the middle of his speech:

> O Laertiade, quidquid dicam aut erit aut non;
> diuinare etenim magnus mihi donat Apollo.
>
> (2.5.59f.)
>
> Son of Laertes, whatever I will say, either it will be or it will not;
> for great Apollo gives me to prophesy.

Both claims are couplets, with close correspondences between the second lines.[27] Infinitives switch places with gods, verse-end ἀείδειν becoming verse-initial *diuinare*, verse-initial Μοῦσαι becoming verse-end *Apollo*.[28] The pronoun-verb combination μ' ἐδίδαξαν leaps to the other side of the caesura as *mihi donat*. But the γάρ stays in place as *etenim*, and ἀθέσφατον ('inexpressible, prodigious') probably corresponds to *magnus*, also at the start of the paroimiac verse. Two stable elements allow for a mirroring effect among the rest. Corresponding to the formal reversal is parody in the sense: Tiresias declares tautologically that his prophecies will always be true ('either it will be or it will not'), and turns Hesiod's 'mind of Zeus' into a louche *quidquid dicam*. If *Satires* 2.4 offers a cartoonish parody of Aratean didactic authority, 2.5 does the same for Hesiodic.

In addition to form and authority, there is also a difference in content. *Satires* 2.4 teaches cooking, 2.5 legacy-hunting—by no means commensurable domains

25. Thus Poseidon and Athena give advice to Achilles (*Il*. 21.293), Athena/Mentes to Telemachus (*Od*. 1.279), Eurymachus to Telemachus (2.194), Calypso to Odysseus (5.143). On ὑποθήσομαι, Horne (2018b), 36 n.19.

26. Clay (2003), 72–80, explores the reduced role of the Muses in the *Works and Days*, and detects humor in the belated turn to them (72).

27. Other comparable hexameter verses—Homer *Il*. 1.72, *Od*. 8.488, 15.252f.; *H. in Musas* 2f.; Hesiod *Theog*. 94f.—are not as close.

28. Here Horace may be beating the epos tradition at its own game. Hexameter Apollo often comes at the end of the verse (Hom. *Il*. 1.72, 5.449, 454, 7.81, 11.353, 15.441, 16.725, *Od*. 8.488, 21.338, 22.7; Hesiod fr. 33a29 M-W) and often gives things (Hom. *Il*. 1.72, 2.827, 7.81, 11.353, 15.441, 16.725, *Od*. 21.338, 22.7; Hesiod fr. 33a29 M-W).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in terms of moral importance. Modern readers acknowledge a difference between the subject matter of Hellenistic didactic which is technical, scientific, sometimes abstruse (think astronomy and snake bites), and the moral and political focus of Hesiod.[29] Horace dramatizes a similar distinction in 2.4 and 2.5.[30] For 2.4 flaunts an ethics of triviality. It purports to talk about the happy life, *uitae praecepta beatae* ('precepts of the happy life', 95)[31]—but as Emily Gowers has suggested, it is hard to see that the happy life would consist in choosing eggs that are prolate spheroid instead of spherical (12–14).[32] In contrast, 2.5 is anything but trivial. However perversely, the satire touches on issues of justice, economics, and society. Poverty is not trivial (9); neither is sharing one's wife with another man (75–83), nor (possibly) bumping off someone's son (49). Moral terms recur (5, 20f., 33, 102). The mock high seriousness of 2.5 is another point of connection with the *Works and Days*—and indeed specific parallels are striking. Both poems discuss the lawcourts; in both the courts are broached in verse twenty-seven. And the advice corresponds, albeit in reverse: if Hesiod advises steering clear of the courts as they eat up money and time (*WD* 27–46), Tiresias recommends the opposite: think of the lawcourts as the place to strike it rich (2.5.27–44). If Hesiod is angry at his brother for getting caught up with the 'grandees' (βασιλεῖς) around the courts (*WD* 37–42), Tiresias advocates pursuing them: Odysseus must attach to himself rich old men. If Hesiod thinks this fast lifestyle unsustainable—ὤρη γάρ τ᾽ ὀλίγη πέλεται νεικέων τ᾽ ἀγορέων τε ('short is the season of cases and courts', *WD* 30)—there is no time limit placed on Odysseus; legacy-hunting is a lifelong business and he will haunt the courts in search of victims throughout his career (2.5.24–6, 106–9).[33] In addition to legal justice, the satire also shares with Hesiod an interest in moral behavior: Hesiod is concerned with being just (esp. *WD* 174–292), Tiresias with how to lie, manipulate, control. Both poems discuss economics, that is, how to increase your livelihood.[34] The poems pursue serious subjects and do so in comparable ways.

Recognizing that *Satires* 2.5 is a parody of Hesiodic *hypothêkai* offers a new entrée into what the poem is about. It was not a casual thing to do in 30 BC, adopting a Hesiodic model, when Vergil's own Hesiodic poem, the *Georgics*,

29. Bulloch (1985), 599 ('scientific' versus 'wisdom'); Toohey (1996), 9f., 33; Gutzwiller (2007), 97–106 passim.

30. For Romans recognizing a difference between trivial and important subject matter, e.g. Vergil *Ecl*. 4.1, 6.3–8, *G*. 3.46–8, *Aen*. 7.45, with Thomas (1985).

31. Catius speaks of hospitality (2.4.17–20), rightness (72), justice (86), order (76f.), cleanliness (78–80), and moderation (81–7), though food is his main topic. Comparably, Aratus' *Phaenomena* has a theological frame (1–18), and Nicander's *Theriaca* arguably has an ethical one (1–7).

32. Gowers (1993), 137f.

33. The point is made by Rudd (1966), 234.

34. Esp. Hesiod *WD* 298–319. Mazon (1914) takes justice and work as the fundamental Hesiodic themes; Fontenrose (1974) and Heath (1985), 245–51, are similar. For more on justice in Hesiod, Wilamowitz (1962), 142f.; Sinclair (1932), xxvi–xxxvi; Adkins (1960), 70–3; Verdenius (1962), esp. 111–14, 160–2, 166f.; Gagarin (1973); Nelson (1998), ch.5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was on the immediate horizon (probably published in 29 BC).[35] And the satire indeed looks forward even as it looks back. Formally it anticipates Vergil's use of *hypothêkai*. Though the *Georgics* is not stylistically uniform, *hypothêkai* dominate the first panel of instructions (1.43–117) after its proemium, a clear initial acknowledgment of Hesiod. Horace's satire also anticipates the *Georgics*' assumption of direct authority. Not holding back like Catius in *Satires* 2.4, Vergil often appeals to his own experience to justify his instructions[36] and has no hesitation in speaking to Octavian: the *Georgics* is the first piece of Latin poetry to address Octavian directly (1.24–42).[37] The situations overlap too: if *Satires* 2.5 presents Tiresias, a *uates*, speaking to a king and general, Odysseus, Vergil in the *Georgics* addresses a king and general, Octavian. Thematically, the *Georgics* displays a major interest in justice—not only like Hesiod but also like Horace.[38] One of the more famous episodes of the *Georgics*, the epyllion of Orpheus and Eurydice (4.453–527), is set in the Homeric Underworld, as is this satire. It seems that *Satires* 2.5 is looking forward, through parody, to Vergil's essay in Hesiodic didactic.

A forward-looking orientation would help to explain the copious anachronisms. Though *Satires* 2.5 is set in the Homeric world, it makes no bones about mentioning fishponds (44), legal wills (48–55, 66–9), the Lares (14), the forum (27), the Roman names Quintus and Publius (32), an oracle about a contemporary legal squabble (55–69)—for Horace, these are the sounds of modern Rome.[39] Yet the anachronisms coexist with continual reminders of Hesiod and Homer.

> difficilem et morosum offendet garrulus: ultra
> 'non' 'etiam' sileas; Dauus sis comicus atque
> stes capite obstipo, multum similis metuenti.
> obsequio grassare; mone, si increbruit aura,
> cautus uti uelet carum caput; extrahe turba
> oppositis umeris; aurem substringe loquaci.
>
> (2.5.90–5)

35. Vergil claims Hesiodic precedent at *G.* 2.176, and Propertius interprets the *Georgics* similarly (2.34.77). Thomas (1986), 172–4, 190; (1988), 1.3–6; and Farrell (1991), 28–33, 63f., downplay Hesiod's influence on the *Georgics*, given the relative dearth of allusion, on which see Wender (1979). But the organizing thematic concern of the two poems, justice, may be the same: Horne (2018a).

36. Vergil appeals to common experience (*uides*, 1.56; *uidemus*, 2.32, 'you/we see') or his own experience (*uidi*, 1.193, 197; *ego…uidi*, 1.316–18, 'I have seen'); on Vergil's epistemology, Schiesaro (1997). In reality, Vergil does rely on written sources and plays interesting games with them: Thomas (1986), (1987).

37. On the motif of king and advisor, Rawson (1989); on king and advisor in the *Georgics*, Horne (2018a), 113–22.

38. Horne (2018a); Lowrie and Vinken (2022), ch.2.

39. Also anachronistic is the hunting language (*captes*, 23; *captator*, 57) and fishing language (*hamo*, 25), discussed in Rudd (1966), 232f., and Roberts (1984), 428–31. As Sallmann (1970), 180, notices, the language suggests Hellenistic didactic (n.3 above). Another list of anachronisms is in Fedeli (1994), 673.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> A big talker will annoy him, morose and peevish as he is. Apart
> from ‘no’ and ‘yes’, be silent. Be a comic Davus and
> stand with your head at a tilt, as if greatly afraid.
> Walk deferentially; tell him, if the breeze has grown strong,
> to take caution and cover his dear head; drag him out of a crowd
> with your shoulders set against it; listen attentively to his bloviating.

The anachronism here is the *Dauus comicus*, the slave of Roman Comedy: Roman Comedy did not exist in Homeric times. Yet the modern element is offset by a strong pastiche of Hesiod. At the end of the *Works and Days*, the commands come fast and furious (695–821); so here, towards the end of 2.5, we find an increasing tempo and pile-up of commands—*grassare*, *mone*, *extrahe*, *substringe*, all in three lines. The advice to wear a hat comes from Hesiod (*WD* 545f.). Odysseus' aggressive shoulders (*oppositis umeris*) are worthy of a Homeric hero.[40] With no embarrassment, Horace sets the Roman elements next to the Hesiodic-Homeric, as if *hypothêkai* poetry belonged in his contemporary world.

A final indication that the satire may be pointing ahead is its position in the book. There are eight poems in *Satires* 2. That means that 2.5 introduces the second half and takes the *proemio nel mezzo* position—it looks forward, while 2.4, the conclusion of the first half, looks back. It is piquant that the Hesiodic, that is archaizing poem would look forward structurally, while the modernist, Aratean poem looks back; as the Augustans will prove, what is new is old; what is old is new.[41] The joke may go further. As Emily Gowers suggests, the first-time reader of *Satires* 2 expects ten poems, on the model of *Satires* 1 and the *Eclogues*; it is a surprise when the book stops at eight.[42] In this light, the fifth poem becomes, on a first reading, the valediction of the first half, and only on the second reading the introduction to the second half. This poem that looks old may really be the presage of something new.

II. Restoration and Metapoetics

Restoration was in the air in 30 BC. Language of return and renewal was common in the Triumviral and Augustan periods—peace was back, orderly government back.[43] The *Laudatio Turiae* speaks of the ‘republic restored’ (*res*[*titut*]*a*

40. On shoulders as a distinguishing characteristic of the hero, *Il*. 3.194, 210, 227, 328, 334, 5.7, 16.360, 791, 23.380, *Od*. 6.225, 18.68, 22.488, as well as Vergil *Aen*. 1.589, 5.376, 9.725, 11.679.

41. Knorr (2004), 201, reads *Serm*. 2.5 as a *proemio nel mezzo* because of its forward-looking themes: rebirth (Odysseus returning from the Underworld), restoration (of wealth). Compare Gowers's (2009) treatment of *Satires* 1.5, the last poem of the first half of *Satires* 1: it knows it is the end.

42. Gowers (1993), 178.

43. The major discussion of *res publica restituta* is Millar (1973), 61–7, with exhaustive texts. The trope seems to originate with Cicero, who says his ‘voice and authority’ have been ‘restored’ (*meam uocem et auctoritatem…restitutam*) by Caesar (*Marc*. 2) and sketches a return to normality (*Marc*. 23). In *Res gestae* 20, Augustus speaks of ‘restoring’ (*refeci*) the built environment of Rome, but according

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

re publica, 2.25);[44] Velleius Paterculus later describes the Augustan settlement with multiple terms of restoration (*reuocata*, *restituta*, *redactum*, 2.89.3f.).[45] As early as the *Eclogues*, Vergil speaks of the 'return of justice' (*redit et Virgo*) and the 'return of the golden age' (*redeunt Saturnia regna*, 4.6); in the *Georgics* he again evokes 'justice returned' (*redditaque Eurydice*, 4.486).[46] In later work, Horace picks up on both tropes, speaking of the 'return' (*redire*) of the virtues and of the golden age.[47] In the *Aeneid* we often hear of Troy being born again.[48] Even if the Romans do not say so explicitly, one aspect of the broader movement to restore was literary restoration. In the 20s BC Horace and Vergil revived models of verse partially discarded by their Alexandrian predecessors, with Vergil attempting a large-scale heroic epic, a brave thing to do after Callimachus, and both authors returning to relatively direct political engagement in their art.[49]

Doing its part in this program, *Satires* 2.5 enacts the restoration of Hesiodic *hypothêkai* in conscious contrast to Alexandrian didactic.[50] As it does so, the satire reinforces the theme of restoration through a repertory of metapoetic terms.[51] In the opening nine lines, a concatenation of potentially metapoetic words suggests a correlation between legacy-hunting and literary restoration. Just as Odysseus 'restores' (*reparare*, 2) his wealth through legacy-hunting, so Vergil and Horace restore the languishing state of poetry.[52]

---

to Millar he never declared the restoration of republican government, either in 27 BC or at any other time.

44. Text in e.g. Osgood (2014), 155–69. Variations on the phrase *res publica restituta* appear in Cicero *Dom*. 146; Livy 3.20.1; Velleius Paterculus 2.16.4; [Sallust] *Epist. ad Caes*. 2.13.6.

45. Velleius Paterculus here declares that peace, law, traditional government, and *antiqua rei publicae forma* ('the traditional form of the state') have been restored.

46. The observation comes from Lowrie and Vinken (2022), ch.2.

47. Virtues: *Carm. saec.* 57–9. Golden age: *Carm*. 4.2.39f.: *quamuis redeant in aurum | tempora priscum* ('though the times return to their former gold')—Horace actually one-ups the golden age by saying that Augustus' age is better.

48. e.g. *Aen*. 1.206: *regna resurgere Troiae* ('for the kingdom of Troy to rise again'); 10.27: *nascentis Troiae* ('Troy coming to birth'); 10.58: *recidiua…Pergama* ('Pergamum returned'); 10.74f.: *Troiam…nascentem* ('Troy coming to birth').

49. For acknowledgement of archaic models, Horace *Carm*. 1.1.29–36, *Epist*. 1.19.23–34; Propertius 2.34.65f., 77. On Vergil's evolution towards grander public poetry, Thomas (1985); on Horace's, Feeney (1993); Lowrie (1997), chs.6, 9; Barchiesi (2000). Zetzel (1983) argues that the switch from Alexandrian to archaic models was central to the Augustan poetry of the 20s BC.

50. Regarding the *Georgics*, Farrell (1991), 314–17, argues that there was no precedent for a substantial Hesiodic poem. The Horatian-Vergilian turn to Hesiod really was an archaic restoration.

51. Horace's metapoetic interests have been much studied. On *Serm*. 2.1, see Freudenburg (1990); on 2.3 and 2.4, Freudenburg (1996); on 2.4 and 2.8, Gowers (1993), 126–79; on 2.6, Freudenburg (2006). On metapoetics in *Satires* 1, Freudenburg (1993), 185–98; in the *Odes*, Davis (1991), esp. chs.1f.; Lowrie (1997).

52. Freudenburg (2013), 317, thinks Odysseus may be a stand-in for Horace, after his eastern military adventures. A reviewer points out to me that the material success of both Horace and Vergil also connects them to Odysseus' money-making project. Cf. Freudenburg (2021), 9, 202.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> *Od. hoc quoque*, Tiresia, *praeter narrata* petenti
> responde, quibus *amissas reparare* queam *res*
> *artibus atque modis*. quid rides?
> *Tir.* iamne doloso
> non satis est Ithacam reuehi patriosque penatis
> adspicere?
> *Od.* o nulli quicquam mentite, uides ut
> *nudus inopsque* domum redeam te *uate*, neque illic
> aut *apotheca* procis *intacta* est aut pecus: atqui
> *et genus et uirtus*, nisi cum *re*, uilior alga est.
> *Tir.* quando pauperiem missis *ambagibus* horres
> …
>
> (2.5.1–9)

> *Od.* This too, Tiresias (I want more than what's been told)—
> tell me how I can restore my lost wealth, by
> what arts and means. Why are you laughing?
> *Tir.* Is the tricky man now
> not satisfied with reaching Ithaca again and seeing
> his ancestors' house?
> *Od.* O you who never lied to anyone, you see
> how bare and poor I'm coming home (so you declare), and how
> neither storeroom there nor flock the suitors leave untouched.
> Yet birth and strength, where there's no wealth, are not worth seaweed.
> *Tir.* Since, not to beat about the bush, you are afraid of poverty
> …

Odysseus asks the prophet for advice on 'restoring his lost wealth', *amissas reparare…res*; after years of ravaging by Penelope's suitors his net worth could use a boost. Wealth may not be the only sort of restoration in play, however. The term *res* can also mean poetic topics; this was the meaning in *Satires* 2.4, the most recent occurrence of the term: *res tenuis, tenui sermone peractas* ('delicate matter, conveyed in delicate words', 9).[53] And the literary meaning is likely to be active here too. For this is a metaliterary context, *Satires* 2.5 being a fan-fiction addition to the Homeric text, a belated insertion into the Underworld scene of *Odyssey* 11 (90–151). The opening phrase, *hoc quoque, Tiresia* ('this too, Tiresias'), acknowledges as much. It is no innocent conversation the satire reports, but a self-conscious continuation of Homer.

Besides, the word *res* is hardly alone. 'Tell me', says Odysseus, 'how I can restore my lost *res*, by what *artes* and *modi*' (1–3). Taken together the three terms are suggestive. *artes* may also refer to technical expertise like rhetoric;

53. Gowers (1993), 143, cf. 147–9, argues that the phrase is a statement of Callimachean poetics.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Horace himself will write the *Ars poetica*.[54] *modi* is a common term in Horace for poetic meter.[55] And *res* are topics. The polyvalence of the terms raises the possibility that Odysseus' quest to restore his wealth (*res*) may be read as a project of poetic restoration as well: 'tell me how to restore lost subjects (*res*) to verse, by what techniques (*artes*) and meters (*modi*)'—in other words, how to do exactly what *Satires* 2.5 is doing, with its return to Hesiod's moralizing, 'serious' didactic.

Then there are the economic terms. Greeks and Romans made fairly wide use of economic metaphors for rhetoric, and the quoted passage contains money words that could also be literary. When Odysseus complains of being *nudus* and *inops*—*uides ut* | *nudus inopsque domum redeam* ('you see | how bare and poor I'm coming home', 5f.)—the terms have a foot in both material and rhetorical domains. Cicero uses *inops* to describe oratory that lacks fullness and adornment; the term has both Stoic and Atticist connotations.[56] *nudus* too is rhetorical, as in Cicero's famous description of Caesar's style as like a nude statue.[57] In later work Horace complains of *uersus inopes rerum* ('verses impoverished of matter', *Ars P.* 322). Next, Odysseus reiterates his poverty by complaining that *neque illic* | *aut apotheca procis intacta est aut pecus* ('not storeroom there nor flock the suitors leave untouched', 6f.). What kind of storeroom is this? *apotheca* is not itself a critical term, but its synonyms are: *thesaurus* for the place (primarily)[58] and *copia* for the contents.[59] And the term *intactus* is often used by Latin poets wanting to make a claim of originality: elsewhere Horace speaks of *Graecis intacti carminis* ('a song untouched by the Greeks', *Serm.* 1.10.66), and Vergil calls his poetic subjects *saltus…intactos* ('untouched groves', *G.* 3.40f.).[60] The depletion of the storeroom, its ransacking by the suitors, may suggest poetic depletion.[61] Finally, Odysseus turns to loaded terms when he complains: *et genus et uirtus, nisi cum re, uilior alga est* ('birth and strength, where there's no wealth, are not worth seaweed', 8). It is not a

54. e.g. Cicero *De or.* 1.108–10, 2.30 (technical body of knowledge), 187 (the disciplines).

55. Horace *Serm.* 1.4.58, *Carm.* 2.1.40, 2.9.9, 2.12.4, 3.3.72, 3.9.10, 3.11.7, 3.30.14, 4.6.43, 4.11.34, *Epist.* 1.19.27, 2.2.144 (metaphorical), *Ars P.* 211, 405.

56. *inops* or related: *Brut.* 118 (Stoic connotations), 202, 221, 238, 246, 263, 285 (Atticist connotations).

57. Cicero *Brut.* 262; more at *De or.* 1.218, 2.341, with further citations in Leeman et al. (1985) *ad loc*.

58. Julius Pollux considers ἀποθῆκαι and θησαυροί synonyms (1.80). For θησαυρός or *thesaurus* referring to literature, Pindar *Pyth.* 6.7f.; Xenophon *Mem.* 1.6.14; *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 3.28; cf. Quintilian 10.1.2.

59. Cicero uses *copia* as a synonym of (rhetorical) *ubertas* ('richness') and antonym of *exilitas* ('thinness', *De or.* 1.50). He speaks of *copia rerum* (*De or.* 1.250, cf. 1.85, 3.125) and *exemplorum copia* ('wealth of examples', 1.90), and compares rhetorical *copia* to a literal storehouse (*De or.* 1.162). On rhetorical *copia*, Leeman et al. (1985) *ad De or.* 2.6; Freudenburg (1993), 189; Reinhardt (2003) *ad Top.* 3; Mankin (2011) *ad De or.* 3.31.

60. More at Propertius 3.1.18 and in Lejay (1911) *ad Serm.* 1.10.66. I am grateful to Peter White for suggesting these readings of both *intacta* and *apotheca*.

61. Vergil also complains of hackneyed subjects in *G.* 3.3–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lack of *genus* that haunts him, a word that means both family and genre: Cicero speaks of *dicendi genus*, *orationis genus*, *genus scriptionis*, *genus litterarum*, and just plain *genus*.[62] Nor is Odysseus bothered by a lack of *uirtus*, be that military prowess or poetic quality.[63] What haunts him in *Satires* 2.5 is the lack of *res*—something to write about. In a passage keyed in to the literary, Odysseus implies that generic and technical mastery will get him only so far when he has nothing worth saying.

Last, there is Tireisas. If Odysseus occupies the place of a struggling new poet—someone with talent but no subject, and with high ambitions to restore—where else to turn but to the great poet-prophet of antiquity? The interaction between the figures can be read as a gesture to poetic education. Odysseus consults the *uates* (6), a term that means both prophet and poet.[64] The language of his request is double-edged: Odysseus asks for *praeter narrata petenti* ('more than what you have already told me', 1). *narrare* implies a story; elsewhere Horace uses the term to describe epic or the plot of drama,[65] and the participle *narrata* would make a plausible calque on the Greek ἔπεα, narrative poems. As Odysseus consults the *uates*, he asks for new stories. Tiresias himself seems to acknowledge the figuration of these lines when he says: *quando pauperiem missis ambagibus horres* ('since, not to beat about the bush, you are afraid of poverty', 9). *ambages* means roundabout or periphrastic ways of speaking, and plausibly alludes to the figured language of these opening lines.[66] Tiresias' concluding wink sets off the passage as distinctly metaliterary.

hoc quoque, *praeter narrata*, *amissae res*, *artes*, *modi*, *uates*, *nudus*, *inops*, *apotheca*, *intactus*, *genus*, *uirtus*, *res* again—the opening lines are filled with potentially literary terms. Though detailed allegory would be out of place, what matters is the tongue-in-cheek correlation between restoring wealth and restoring poetry. The correlation that these terms suggest is surely a comment on that moment of expectation that was 30 BC, when all was being restored, and Vergil and Horace were anticipating their most ambitious works. In fact, the phrase *amissas reparare…res* (2) has a further resonance linking it to the political situation. In the preceding decades, Cicero twice used the collocation *res publica amissa* ('the Republic lost', *Att*. 1.18.6, cf. *QFr*. 1.2.15) to refer to the political chaos of the time.[67] In combining

62. *dicendi genus*: Cicero *Brut*. 29, 93, 112, 123, 165, 198, 199, 202, 247, 271, 276, 283, 302, 306, 324, 327; *orationis genus*: *Brut*. 95, 114, 119, 133, 202, 291, 321, 325; *genus scriptionis*: *Brut*. 228; *genus litterarum*: *Brut*. 13. For literary *genus* without a further qualifier, Cicero *Opt. Gen*. 6; Horace *Serm*. 1.4.24.

63. Cf. *uirtutes dicendi*: Cicero *Brut*. 232, 235; *oratoriae uirtutes*: 65; *uirtutes oratoris*: 185; *uirtus oratoris*: 250; *uirtus*: 91, 279; Horace *Epist*. 2.1.48; *Ars P*. 308, 370 with Brink (1971), 337f., 359f. The two terms, *genus* and *uirtus*, are likewise paired at *Brut*. 129.

64. Newman (1967), 44, mentions the satire only briefly in his treatment of the Augustan *uates*.

65. Epic: *Epist*. 1.2.6. Plot of drama: *Ars P*. 91. Messenger speeches: *Ars P*. 184. Speeches in his own *Satires*: *Serm*. 2.2.116, 2.7.5.

66. Gowers (2016), 144, explores *ambages* in Vergil.

67. Cicero was picking up on another political phrase, by Naevius: *cedo qui uestram rem publicam tantam amisistis tam cito?* ('come, how have you lost this great state of yours so quickly?', quoted in Cic. *Sen*. 20).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

res and *amitto*, the satire affiliates Odysseus' project of legacy-hunting with the contemporary restoration of the Roman state.[68] Great things were in the offing in 30 BC; Horace must make fun of them; and the slimy ambitions of Odysseus are one way to speak about that moment of expectation.

III. Horace and the *Ars amatoria*

At least one figure in antiquity recognized the aesthetic dimension of *Satires* 2.5. A few years after Horace's death in 8 BC, Ovid produced the *Ars amatoria* (c. 2 BC–AD 2), his own work of mock didactic, followed shortly by a palinode, the *Remedia amoris*. These poems are aware of multiple didactic predecessors, from Hesiod to Lucretius to Vergil, but not least among the models is Horace *Satires* 2.5.[69] Both Horace and Ovid take as their subject the art of deceiving people into liking you, whether rich old men or lovers. It is true that the poems operate in a common tradition: there were Greek handbooks on how to attract people, and C.M.C. Green speculates that the handbooks were parodied in Greek.[70] (When Ovid talks about how crowded the road is, he may be gesturing to literary predecessors.[71]) But Ovid's *Ars* is clearly conscious of a connection to Horace. Verbal and tropological parallels abound, and there is even a point at which Ovid seems to footnote his predecessor: *in tabulas multis haec uia fecit iter* ('this method has, for many, led straight to testamentary bequests', *Ars am.* 2.332). Hunting lovers is rather like hunting legacies.[72]

---

68. Since Vergil uses plural *res* to refer to Rome (*res Romanae*, *G.* 2.498), there can be no objection to a political plural in Horace.

69. On Ovidian didactic, Kennedy (2000); on Ovidian mock didactic, Kenney (1958); Steudel (1992); Watson (2007).

70. Dillon (1994); Green (1996), 225f.

71. *Ars am.* 2.5, cf. *Rem. am.* 466. On path imagery used for poetry: Ford (1992), esp. 41–4; Nünlist (1998), chs.11–14; Schiesaro (2014), 86.

72. Here are my parallels, many of which overlap with Lejay (1911), 482f., and Wildberger (1998), 415 (though collected independently). Whether at funerals or will-readings, Tiresias and Ovid both think of death as an opportunity for picking people up (*Serm.* 2.5.106–9, *Ars am.* 3.431). Odysseus should tell the old man to wear a hat in the wind, should protect him in 'a crowd', *turba* (*Serm.* 2.5.93–5); Ovid bids his student hold an umbrella over the girlfriend's head and find space for her in 'a crowd', *turba* (*Ars am.* 2.209f.). Both poems recommend gift-giving of the vegetable and animal varieties, including thrushes (*Serm.* 2.5.10–14, *Ars am.* 2.261–72). Both poems emphasize the value of persistence: *persta atque obdura* (*Serm.* 2.5.39), *perfer et obdura* (*Ars am.* 2.178, cf. 2.524, 2.702, *Rem. am.* 642), in imitation of Catullus 8.11: Wildberger (1998), 218. Hunting people requires exercising virtue (*Serm.* 2.5.20f.; *Ars am.* 2.107, 2.233–50, 2.537f.). Tiresias recommends praising the old man's wretched poetry (*Serm.* 2.5.74f.); the Ovidian lover must praise his girlfriend's clothes, dancing, and singing, however unfortunate (*Ars am.* 2.295–310). Flattery works on both old man (*Serm.* 2.5.96–8) and female love interest (*Ars am.* 1.619–30). Ovid's cynical statements about women—they only pretend to be uninterested (1.271–4); even Penelope can be conquered (1.477)—connect to Tiresias' cynicism about Penelope (*Serm.* 2.5.74–83). Making friends with the victim's attendants is a good idea (*Serm.* 2.5.70–2), not to mention with the loved one's husband (*Ars am.* 1.579–89) and enslaved persons (2.251–60). It is good not to let your real emotions show on your face (*Serm.* 2.5.103f., *Ars am.* 2.311–14, cf. *Rem. am.* 489–522).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although connections have long been noticed between the poems, close readings are in short supply.[73] Here I want to examine a scene in the *Ars* that engages with Odysseus, and through him with *Satires* 2.5. It is a scene that responds above all to the satire's aesthetic or metapoetic dimension.[74]

> non formosus erat, sed erat facundus Ulixes,
>   et tamen aequoreas torsit amore deas.
> a quotiens illum doluit properare Calypso,
>   remigioque aptas esse negauit aquas!
> haec Troiae casus iterumque iterumque rogabat;
>   ille referre aliter saepe solebat idem.
> litore constiterant; illic quoque pulchra Calypso
>   exigit Odrysii fata cruenta ducis.
> ille leui uirga (uirgam nam forte tenebat),
>   quod rogat, in spisso litore pingit opus.
> 'haec' inquit 'Troia est' (muros in litore fecit),
>   'hic tibi sit Simois; haec mea castra puta.
> campus erat' (campumque facit), 'quem caede Dolonis
>   sparsimus, Haemonios dum uigil optat equos.
> illic Sithonii fuerant tentoria Rhesi:
>   hac ego sum captis nocte reuectus equis—'

Tiresias' advice 'to be obsequious' (*obsequio grassare*, *Serm*. 2.5.93) morphs into a six-verse fantasy on the word *obsequium* (*Ars am.* 2.179–84). Ovid claims to sing for the poor (*Ars am.* 2.165) as Tiresias sang for the penurious Odysseus (*Serm*. 2.5.1–9). Tiresias is a *uates* (*Serm*. 2.5.6), Ovid is a *uates* (*Ars am.* 2.11, 165, 173, *Rem. am*. 3); Tiresias offers a formal prophecy (*Serm*. 2.5.62–9), Ovid offers a formal prophecy (*Ars am.* 1.213–18)—not something he got from the *Georgics*. (On Ovid's claim to be a *uates*, Ahern [1990]; Volk [2002], 161f.). If Tiresias uses language of hunting and fishing prey (n.39), so does Ovid: he speaks of hunting (*Ars am.* 1.45f., 89f., 253, 263, 265, 269f., 351, 358f., 392, 2.2, 12), fishing (1.47f., 393, 763f.), and even fowling (*Ars am.* 1.47, 391, *Rem. am*. 502); discussion in Leach (1964), 144–6; Green (1996). The merism 'in heat or in cold' occurs at both *Serm*. 2.5.39–41 and *Ars am.* 2.231f., and the eternal quality of the task carries through both works (*Serm*. 2.5.106–9; *Ars am.* 2.11f.). In addition to these intertexts with *Satires* 2.5, the *Ars* and *Remedia amoris* also contain intertexts with other Horatian poems, reinforcing the importance of Horace as model. Thus Ovid's *propositumque tene* (*Ars am.* 1.470) alludes to the famous *Carm*. 3.3.1, while his *carpe uiam* (*Ars am.* 2.230, cf. *Ars am.* 2.44, *Rem. am*. 214) recalls *Serm*. 2.6.93. Ovid's retelling of the Ariadne story (*Ars am.* 1.525–64) seems to follow the pattern of Horace's Europa ode (compare esp. *Carm*. 3.27.73 and *Ars am.* 1.556); Ovid and Horace are similarly paradoxical about Agamemnon's love for conquered concubines (*Carm*. 2.4.7f., *Rem*. 469). The prominent place Ovid gives to sex in his history of civilization (*Ars am.* 2.473–80) suggests *Serm*. 1.3.107–10. The idea of using nice names for faults (*Ars am.* 2.657–62, cf. *Rem. am*. 291–330) resembles *Serm*. 1.3.44–53; discussion in Labate (1984), 190–4. The triple *arte* of *Ars am.* 1.3f. may suggest *Carm*. 3.3.9–15; *Ars am.* 1.156 may recall *Serm*. 1.2.101–3; Ovid's motto on discontent (*Ars am.* 1.717) is similar to *Serm*. 1.2.105–8. Ovid's hymn to modern times (*Ars am.* 3.121–8) may recall Horace's preference for the moderns over the ancients in *Epistles* 2.1; the dislike of houses built on the sea (*Ars am.* 3.126) is Horatian (*Carm*. 3.1.33–7); drinking greedily from a substantial stream (*Rem. am*. 534–6) also occurs in *Serm*. 1.1.54–60.

73. Labate (1984), ch.4, does make several references to the satire in his reading of the *Ars amatoria*; he argues that the Ovidian lover is more like a responsible citizen than a bohemian.

74. A similar vignette about Odysseus occurs at *Rem. am.* 263–88.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pluraque pingebat, subitus cum Pergama fluctus
abstulit et Rhesi cum duce castra suo.

(*Ars am.* 2.123–40)

No handsome man, Odysseus, but a clever one,
he still tormented the sea goddesses with love.
How often, ah, Calypso grieved his hastening,
and claimed the seas unsuitable for oars.
She'd ask to hear Troy's fall again, again;
he'd tell the selfsame tale in different ways.
They stood on shore; lovely Calypso here again
demands the Odrysian chieftain's bloody fate.
He with light stick (a stick by chance he held),
draws in dense sand the picture she requests.
'This', he said, 'is Troy' (drawing walls in sand),
'let this be Simois, imagine this my camp.
A field there was' (the field he makes) 'with Dolon's blood
we smeared it, as he stayed awake for Thessaly's horses.
There was the tent of Rhesus, come from Thrace;
back was I brought this night on captured horse.'
And he was drawing more, when a sudden wave
carried Troy off and Rhesus' camps, leader and all.

There are *prima facie* reasons to expect Horace in the background. Horace is the last important author to treat Odysseus at length (the *Aeneid* mentions Odysseus multiple times but without making him a prominent actor; Ovid engages with him *in absentia* in *Heroides* 1). And the character is reprised in a poem that already has generic connections to *Satires* 2.5 (mock didactic about manipulating people).

Ovid does not disappoint. Specific points of connection abound, and they tend to be aesthetic. First there is the didactic nature of both scenes. In Horace, Odysseus is the pupil; here he carries a 'stick', *uirga*, like a schoolmaster.[75] As he explains his Trojan War heroism to Calypso, he uses, as Jula Wildberger notes, a simplified, repetitive style, as if conscious of a didactic role.[76] Next, both episodes give us an Odysseus interested in poetry.[77] In Ovid, he is a storyteller (*referre*, 'tell', 2.128), his subject the Trojan War. The illustrations he draws in the sand are an *opus* (2.132), an important Ovidian term for poetry.[78] The

75. I owe this point to one of the readers. Cf. *Epist*. 2.1.70f., where Horace complains about a teacher overzealous with the rod.

76. Wildberger (1998), 198. Ovid elsewhere imagines that dispensing knowledge is a good romantic trick: *Ars am.* 1.227f.

77. Blodgett (1973), 322f., and Volk (2010), 70, take the Odysseus story as metapoetic, a representation of Ovid's self-consciously rhetorical voice. Wildberger (1998), 197, dismisses the metapoetic interpretation of *Ars am.* 2.128, with bibliography.

78. e.g. Ovid *Am.* 1.1.14, 24, 27, 3.9.5, 3.15.20, *Met.* 15.871, and very frequently.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

combination of the visual and poetic in Ovid's storytelling may even gesture at Horace's motto, *ut pictura poesis* ('a poem is like a picture', *Ars P.* 361). If the Odysseus of *Satires* 2.5 wants to learn about poetry from Tiresias, in Ovid it seems he has succeeded—now he is a poet himself, and one who, like his teacher Tiresias, thrives on didacticism.

Yet even as Ovid takes over the notion of Odysseus the poet, he associates him with aesthetic principles that seem anti-Horatian by design. If there is one great characteristic of Horace's Odysseus, it is his resolve; if there is one great characteristic of Ovid's, it is his lack of serious purpose—and the difference is as much aesthetic as moral. Thus declares Odysseus in *Satires* 2.5: *fortem hoc animum tolerare iubebo* ('I will bid my heart be strong, and endure this', 20). Tiresias exhorts him: *persta atque obdura: seu rubra Canicula findet | infantis statuas, seu…Furius hibernas cana niue conspuet Alpis* ('persist and endure, whether ruddy Canicula splits the gaping statues, or…Furius sprinkles the winter Alps with white snow', 39–41); *neu, si uafer unus et alter | insidiatorem praeroso fugerit hamo, | aut spem deponas aut artem inlusus omittas* ('if one or two clever fellows bite off the hook and escape the fisherman, do not lose hope, do not leave off your art because you've been deluded', 24–6). Odysseus' life as a legacy-hunter will be one of 'long servitude and care' (*seruitio longo curaque*, 99), continuing without end (106–9). This is an Odysseus of perversely high seriousness. So is the aesthetic he stands for. The Hesiodic tradition into which *Satires* 2.5 inserts itself is moral, political, 'serious'. The Augustan aesthetic that the satire announces has similar aspirations. Indeed, the patient, laborious process of legacy-hunting resembles Horace's own view of poetry.[79] His Odysseus, whether legacy-hunter or poet, is dogged and ambitious.

Nothing could be further from Ovid's take on the hero. Gone is the high seriousness: Odysseus has become a sort of improvisation artist, telling his stories differently every time (*Ars am.* 2.128); drawing because he 'happens' (*forte*, 2.131) to be holding a stick, not from any set program; drawing on the shore, even though the waves will wash everything away (2.139f.). Whereas Horace's Odysseus has a single goal to which he devotes his life—to restore his property (or poetry)—Ovid's Odysseus is focused on the moment. When Calypso asks to hear about the 'fall of Troy' (*Troiae casus*, 2.127), Odysseus chooses the night raid from *Iliad* 10, an episode that famously does nothing to advance the plot.[80] He narrates an extra-teleological story, not really the fall of Troy. If the story suppresses Iliadic teleology, it also suppresses Odyssean: apparently forgetful of Penelope, Odysseus is showing off for Calypso. He chooses the night raid

79. Horace compares the *Odes* to bronze or stone (*Carm.* 3.30.1–5)—definitely not sand. He advocates extensive revision (*Serm.* 1.10.50f., 67–71, *Ars P.* 445–52, cf. *Serm.* 1.4.9–18) and even recommends putting a poem away for nine years (*Ars P.* 386–90).

80. So much so that the scholiast considered the episode extraneous to the *Iliad*: Schol. T in *Il.* 10.0b Erbse (thanks to a reader for the reference). On Ovid's many allusions to Homer in this episode, Sharrock (1987).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

because it puts him in a good light; he reinforces his successful actions with the self-centered language of *mea castra* ('my camp', 2.134), *sparsimus* ('we bespattered', 2.136), and *ego* (emphatic 'I', 2.138). After all, as we know from the outset, Odysseus attracts people through his intellectual skills (2.107–22).[81] But why does Odysseus want to attract Calypso? His goal in the *Ars* (2.125f.), not to mention the *Odyssey*, is to get home to Ithaca.[82] Whereas Horace gives us a focused, committed Odysseus, an Odysseus with a life plan and the goal of restoring property (or poetry), Ovid gives us an Odysseus living for the moment, embracing the non-teleological aspects of life. If *Satires* 2.5 is a reflection on Augustan ambitions—a wry one, to be sure—Ovid's Odysseus seems to have no ambition other than attracting a very temporary partner.[83]

These points of contact between Ovid's Odysseus and Horace's are specific enough to take seriously: both stories have a metapoetic dimension, they occur in generically similar works, and the two Odysseuses represent almost diametrically opposite approaches to life, and probably aesthetics. Ovid is often said to trade in a post-classical aesthetic, brilliant and facile, that differs from that of Vergil and Horace.[84] Certainly, Ovid is at one with Horace in his goofy take on Homeric mythology, in his parodic approach to didactic. But he carefully evacuates his Homeric episode of the ambition, the purpose, and the drive encoded in Horace's Odysseus. There is more to be said about these poems and their relationship, but it is enough for now that Ovid was a good reader of Horace *Satires* 2.5, and a further witness of its aesthetic interests.

Providence College
ahorne3@providence.edu

Bibliography

Adkins, A.W.H. (1960), *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values* (Oxford).
Ahern, C.F., Jr. (1990), 'Ovid as *Vates* in the Proem to the *Ars Amatoria*', *CPh* 85, 44–8.
Anderson, W.S. (1963), 'The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satires', in J.P. Sullivan (ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire* (London), 1–37.

81. On Odysseus' egotism, see Myerowitz (1985), 172; Wildberger (1998), 196f.

82. The contradiction is discussed in Frécaut (1983), 288f.; Sharrock (1994), 80f.; Wildberger (1998), 195f. Frécaut (1983), 292f., compares the vignette to the Helenus and Andromache scene in *Aeneid* 3, another foil to a teleological plot.

83. In the corresponding episode in the *Remedia* (263–88), Ovid also depicts an extra-teleological episode, Odysseus' sojourn with Circe, and uses terms reminiscent of *Aeneid* 4, the extra-teleological delay with Dido: *sedit* (*Rem. am.* 268, cf. *Aen.* 4.15), *amor* (*Rem. am.* 268, *Aen.* 4.17, 38, etc.), *fuga* (*Rem. am.* 266, 281, *Aen.* 4.281, 328, 338, 400, 430, 543, 575), plus references to marriage (*Rem. am.* 274, *Aen.* 4.48, 172, 324, 338f.). Circe asks: *quae tibi causa fugae? non hic noua Troia resurgit* ('why are you running away? There is no second Troy arising here', *Rem. am.* 281). Exactly.

84. e.g. Fyler (1971), esp. 196; Conte (1994), 342, 401; Volk (2010), 2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Barchiesi, A. (2000), 'Rituals in Ink: Horace on the Greek Lyric Tradition', in M. Depew and D. Obbink, *Matrices of Genre* (Cambridge, MA/London), 167–82.
Berg, D. (1996), 'The Mystery Gourmet of Horace's *Satires* 2', *CJ* 91, 141–51.
Blodgett, E.D. (1973), 'The Well Wrought Void: Reflections on the *Ars Amatoria*', *CJ* 68, 322–33.
Brink, C.O. (1971), *Horace on Poetry: The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge).
Bulloch, A.W. (1985), 'Hellenistic Poetry', in P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox, *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge), 541–621.
Classen, C.J. (1978), 'Horace—A Cook?', *CQ* 28, 333–48.
Clay, J.S. (1993), 'The Education of Perses: From "Mega Nepios" to "Dion Genos" and Back', *MD* 31, 23–33.
——— (2003), *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge).
Conte, G.B. (1994), *Latin Literature: A History*, tr. J.B. Solodow (Baltimore/London).
Damon, C. (1997), *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage* (Ann Arbor).
Davis, G. (1991), *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (Berkeley/Los Angeles).
Dillon, J. (1994), 'A Platonist *Ars Amatoria*', *CQ* 44, 387–92.
Faraone, C.A. (2021), 'Oracular Commands and Avuncular Advice in the Hesiodic Calendars for Farming and Sailing (*Works and Days* 383–694)', *TAPhA* 151, 247–63.
Farrell, J. (1991), *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History* (New York/Oxford).
Fedeli, P. (1994), *Q. Orazio Flacco, Le Opere: Tomo Secondo, Le Satire* (Rome).
Feeney, D. (1993), 'Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets', in N. Rudd (ed.), *Horace 2000: A Celebration* (Ann Arbor), 41–63.
Ferriss-Hill, J.L. (2015), *Roman Satire and the Old Comic Tradition* (New York).
Fontenrose, J. (1974), 'Work, Justice, and Hesiod's Five Ages', *CPh* 69, 1–16.
Ford, A. (1992), *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca, NY).
Fraenkel, E. (1957), *Horace* (Oxford).
Frécaut, J-M. (1983), 'Une scène Ovidienne en marge de l'*Odyssée*: Ulysse et Calypso (*Art d'aimer* II, 123–142)', in *Hommages à Robert Schilling* (Paris), 287–95.
Freudenburg, K. (1990), 'Horace's Satiric Program and the Language of Contemporary Theory in *Satires* 2.1', *AJPh* 111, 187–203.
——— (1993), *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton).
——— (1996), 'Verse-Technique and Moral Extremism in Two Satires of Horace (*Sermones* 2.3 and 2.4)', *CQ* 46, 196–206.
——— (2006), 'Playing at Lyric's Boundaries: Dreaming Forward in Book Two of Horace's *Sermones*', *Dictynna* 3, 135–72.
——— (2013), 'The Afterlife of Varro in Horace's *Sermones*: Generic Issues in Roman Satire', in T.D. Papanghelis et al., *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations* (Berlin/Boston), 297–336.
——— (2021), *Horace: Satires Book II* (Cambridge).
Friedländer, P. (1913), 'ΥΠΟΘΗΚΑΙ', *Hermes* 48, 558–616.
Fyler, J.M. (1971), '*Omnia Vincit Amor*: Incongruity and the Limitations of Structure in Ovid's Elegiac Poetry', *CJ* 66, 196–203.
Gagarin, M. (1973), '*Dikē* in the *Works and Days*', *CPh* 68, 81–94.
Gibson, R.K. (1997), 'Didactic poetry as "popular" form: a study of imperatival expressions in Latin didactic verse and prose', in C. Atherton (ed.), *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry* (Bari), 67–98.
——— (2003), *Ovid: Ars Amatoria, Book 3* (Cambridge).
Gowers, E. (1993), *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature* (Oxford/New York).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

——— (2009), 'The Ends of the Beginning: Horace, *Satires* 1', in L.B.T. Houghton and M. Wyke (eds), *Perceptions of Horace* (Cambridge/New York), 39–60.
——— (2016), 'Under the Influence: Maecenas and Bacchus in *Georgics* 2', in P. Hardie (ed.), *Augustan Poetry and the Irrational* (Oxford), 134–52.
Green, C.M.C. (1996), 'Terms of Venery: *Ars Amatoria* I', *TAPhA* 126, 221–63.
Griffith, M. (1983), 'Personality in Hesiod', *ClAnt* 2, 37–65.
Gutzwiller, K. (2007), *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature* (Malden, MA).
Habinek, T., and A. Schiesaro (eds) (1997), *The Roman Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge).
Hardie, P. (2014), 'The *Ars poetica* and the Poetics of Didactic', *MD* 72, 43–54.
Heath, M. (1985), 'Hesiod's Didactic Poetry', *CQ* 35, 245–63.
Horne, A.J. (2018a), 'Georgic Justice', *Vergilius* 64, 103–29.
——— (2018b), '*Hypothêkai*: On Wisdom Sayings and Wisdom Poems', *ClAnt* 37, 31–62.
——— (forthcoming), 'Ethical Architecture in Horace, *Satires* 2', *Hermes*.
Hunt, R. (1981), 'Satiric Elements in Hesiod's *Works and Days*', *Helios* 8, 29–40.
Hunter, R.L. (2008), *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception* (2 vols: Berlin/New York).
——— (2014), *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days* (Cambridge).
Kemp, J. (2010), 'Flattery and Frankness in Horace and Philodemus', *G&R* 57, 65–76.
Kennedy, D.F. (2000), 'Bluff Your Way in Didactic: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*', *Arethusa* 33, 159–76.
Kenney, E.J. (1958). 'Nequitiae Poeta', in N.I. Herescu (ed.), *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide* (Paris), 201–9.
——— (1994), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris,* second edition (Oxford).
Kidd, D. (1997), *Aratus: Phaenomena* (Cambridge).
Kiessling, A., and R. Heinze (1968), *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Satiren* (Dublin/Zurich).
Klein, V.S. (2012), 'Performing the Patron-Client Relationship: Dramaturgical Cues in Horace's *Sermones* 2.5', *ICS* 37, 97–119.
Klingner, F. (1950), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Leipzig).
Knorr, O. (2004), *Verborgene Kunst: Argumentationsstruktur und Buchaufbau in den Satiren des Horaz* (Hildesheim).
Kumaniecki, K.F. (1995), *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Oratore* (Stuttgart/Leipzig).
Labate, M. (1984), *L'arte di farsi amare: Modelli culturali e progetto didascalico nell'elegia ovidiana* (Pisa).
Leach, E.W. (1964), 'Georgic Imagery in the *Ars amatoria*', *TAPhA* 95, 142–54.
Leeman, A.D., H. Pinskter, and H.L.W. Nelson (1985), *M. Tullius Cicero: De Oratore Libri III, vol.2* (Heidelberg).
Lejay, P. (1911), *Oevres d'Horace* (Paris).
Lowrie, M. (1997), *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford/New York).
Lowrie, M., and B. Vinken (2022), *Civil War and the Collapse of the Social Bond: The Roman Tradition at the Heart of the Modern* (Cambridge).
Mankin, D. (2011), *Cicero: De Oratore Book III* (Cambridge/New York).
Mazon, P. (1914), *Les travaux et les jours* (Paris).
Millar, F. (1973), 'Triumvirate and Principate', *JRS* 63, 50–67.
Muecke, F. (1993), *Horace: Satires II* (Warminster).
Munding, H. (1959), *Hesiods Erga in ihrem Verhältnis zur Ilias* (Frankfurt am Main).
Myerowitz, M. (1985), *Ovid's Games of Love* (Detroit).
Nelson, S.A. (1998), *God and the Land* (New York/Oxford).
Newman, J.K. (1967), *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry* (Brussels).
Nisbet, G. (2004), 'Hesiod, *Works and Days*: A Didaxis of Deconstruction?', *G&R* 51, 147–63.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nünlist, R. (1998), *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart/Leipzig).
Oliensis, E. (1997), '*Ut arte emendaturus fortunam*: Horace, Nasidienus, and the Art of Satire', in Habinek and Schiesaro (1997), 90–104.
——— (1998), *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (Cambridge).
Osgood, J. (2014), *Turia: A Roman Woman's Civil War* (Oxford).
Rand, E.K. (1911), 'Horatian Urbanity in Hesiod's *Works and Days*', *AJPh* 32, 131–65.
Rawson, E. (1989), 'Roman Rulers and the Philosophic Adviser', in M. Griffin and J. Barnes (eds), *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society* (Oxford), 233–57.
Reinhardt, T. (2003), *Cicero's Topica* (Oxford/New York).
Roberts, M. (1984), 'Horace *Satires* 2.5: Restrained Indignation', *AJPh* 105, 426–33.
Rudd, N. (1966), *The Satires of Horace* (London).
Sallmann, K. (1970), 'Satirische Technik in Horaz' Erbschleichersatire', *Hermes* 98, 178–203.
Schiesaro, A. (1997), 'The Boundaries of Knowledge in Virgil's *Georgics*', in Habinek and Schiesaro (1997), 63–89.
——— (2014), '*Materiam superabat opus*: Lucretius Metamorphosed', *JRS* 104, 73–104.
Sharrock, A.R. (1987), '*Ars Amatoria* 2.123–42: Another Homeric Scene in Ovid', *Mnemosyne* 40, 406–12.
——— (1994), *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria 2* (Oxford).
Sinclair, T.A. (1932), *Hesiod: Works and Days* (London).
Steudel, M. (1992), *Die Literaturparodie in Ovids Ars Amatoria* (Hildesheim).
Thomas, R.F. (1985), 'From *Recusatio* to Commitment: The Evolution of the Vergilian Programme', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5, 61–73.
——— (1986), 'Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference', *HSPh* 90, 171–98.
——— (1987), 'Prose into Poetry: Tradition and Meaning in Virgil's *Georgics*', *HSPh* 91, 229–60.
——— (1988), *Virgil: Georgics* (2 vols: Cambridge).
Toohey, P. (1996), *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry* (London/New York).
Verdenius, W.J. (1962), 'Aufbau und Absicht der Erga', in K. von Fritz et al. (eds), *Hésiode et son influence* (Geneva), 109–70.
Volk, K. (2002), *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius* (Oxford/New York).
——— (2010), *Ovid* (Chichester).
Watson, L.C. (2007), 'The Bogus Teacher and his Relevance for Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*', *RhM* 150, 337–74.
Wender, D. (1979), 'From Hesiod to Homer by Way of Rome', *Ramus* 8, 59–64.
West, M.L. (1978), *Hesiod: Works & Days* (Oxford).
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. (1962), *Hesiods Erga*, second edition (Berlin) [orig. publ. 1928].
Wildberger, J. (1998), *Ovids Schule der ‚elegischen' Liebe: Erotodidaxe und Psychagogie in der Ars amatoria* (Frankfurt am Main).
Yona, S. (2018a), *Epicurean Ethics in Horace: The Psychology of Satire* (Oxford).
——— (2018b), 'A Manual for Flatterers, a Proof of Candor: Philodemus' *On Flattery* and Horace's *Satires* 2.5', *AJPh* 139, 605–40.
Zetzel, J.E.G. (1983), 'Re-creating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past', *Critical Inquiry* 10, 83–105.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rmu.2022.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press