Performing the Patron-Client Relationship
Dramaturgical Cues in Horace's *Sermones* 2.5

V. Sophie Klein

This article interprets Horace's *Sermones* 2.5 as a short play intended for spoken performance. It identifies and examines the dramaturgical cues encoded within the satire, in particular the stage directions, metrical prompts, and *ethopoeia* of supporting characters. These elements inform an actor's reading of the poem and spotlight the theatricality inherent in the patron-client relationship, the satire's central subject. I argue that Horace intentionally activates the language of the stage in order to characterize the client as an actor and to underline the scripted nature of his words and gestures toward his patron.

In *Sermones* 2.5, Horace stages a conversation between Tiresias and Ulysses on the shady subject of inheritance-hunting (*captatio*).[1] This satire is highly theatrical: it stars two veterans of the stage, is written in dialogue format, includes specific stage directions, alludes to a motley crew of comedic stock characters, and frequently echoes the diction of playwrights such as Plautus and Terence. The *sermo* also recalls the elusive dramatic genres of mime, Menippean satire, and the *fabula Rhinthonica* in its selective use of lowbrow language, lowlife subjects, elements of fantasy, and epic parody all in the service of ridiculing human folly (and, of course, entertainment). The poem comprises so many salient theatrical features that scholars regularly describe it as "dramatic," in a figurative sense. I suggest that *Sermones* 2.5 is not only figuratively dramatic, but also literally so.

On the basis of the poem's internal cues, as well as contemporary literary and social practices, I wish to propose two complementary hypotheses: (1) Horace designed the satire to be read aloud and accompanied by interpretive gestures, either by the poet himself or by professional actors, and (2) Horace intentionally cultivated a dramatic context in order to call attention to—and satirically comment upon—the theatrical nature of the patron-client relationship, the underlying subject of this satire. I aim to support these hypotheses by analyzing a sample of the theatrical components, the ones that most directly

1. All Latin quotations come from the OCT edition of Horace's *Opera* by Wickham and Garrod (1901). The translations are my own. I wish to thank Patricia Johnson, Ann Vasaly, and James Uden, as well as the editor and the anonymous referees, for their invaluable comments and suggestions.

inform a dramatic reading of the poem, namely the stage directions, metrical prompts, and *ethopoeia* of supporting characters. I posit that Horace incorporated these devices not only to guide an actor's dramatic performance, but also to satirize the client's "social performance."

The idea of social performance at Rome has been widely interpreted.[2] My own interpretation closely aligns with the work of Susanna Braund, Catherine Keane, and Ellen Oliensis. All three scholars recognize that theatricality was a regular part of Roman social, as well as political, interaction. Braund says of the Romans in general: "It seems that the Romans thought of life, perhaps more than we do, in terms of roles performed and the variety of *personae* adopted in differing circumstances."[3] Keane says of the Roman satirists more specifically: "The Roman satirists construct a world where actions and utterances, including their own, are viewed as performances or responses to performances."[4] Oliensis says of Horace in particular: "Like the rest of us, Horace will have presented different faces to different people in different situations. He wore one face, we may presume, in the presence of Augustus, and a quite different face when he was giving orders to his slaves."[5] For my purposes, I am broadly defining social performance as "strategic self-presentation": an individual deliberately plays a part, adapting the external signs of his character he presents to others in order to conform to a particular social role.[6]

In *Sermones* 2.5, Horace concentrates specifically on the role of a *captator*, an inheritance hunter, and by extension, an aspiring client.[7] He presents a comedy of manners in which Tiresias describes how one might enact a cynical and self-serving version of the "ideal client." Tiresias advises Ulysses to project the outward appearance of a loyal client, while at the same time inwardly plotting to exploit his gullible patron. The poem depicts an ironic portrait of both patron and client, in which neither individual is motivated by the *fides* on which the relationship was traditionally meant to rest.[8]

2. Cf. Bartsch (1994), Lyne (1995), Braund (1996), Oliensis (1998), Gamel (1998), Krostenko (2001), McNeill (2001), Freudenburg (2001), Habinek (2005) and Keane (2006), among others.

3. Braund (1996) 2.

4. Keane (2006) 17.

5. Oliensis (1998) 1.

6. Cf. Goffman (1959), especially 15–16.

7. The *captator* and the client provide similar services to their benefactors. According to Champlin (1991) 90, the *captator* ministers gifts, praise, and deeds. The captator's deeds (*officia*), in particular, parallel those of the client: "mainly physical attendance on the prey, morning salutation, presence at recitations, accompaniment in the street, support in court, presence at dinner."

8. A form of *amicitia*, the patron-client relationship was often described using the language of friendship. Saller (1982) 12 observes that participants often favored the designation *amici* over *patroni* or *clientes*. Konstan (1995) 329 explores the meaning of the word *amicus* and argues that

My reading, then, identifies social performance as the primary subject of *Sermones* 2.5. It suggests that Tiresias is encouraging Ulysses, above all else, to hone his acting skills in order to cultivate an artificial bond between himself and his potential benefactor. I argue that Horace uses the language of the stage to spotlight the histrionics of social performance and to condemn this type of behavior as licentious, artificial and insincere. In this way, Horace closely links the nefarious reputation of the stage and its actors with the patron-client relationship and its players.[9] A dramatic reading of the *sermo*, either by the poet (a client himself) or by professional actors, would vividly illustrate this point.

Overview of *Sermones* 2.5

Before we turn to the dramaturgical cues, let us start with a brief overview of the satire. The poem begins *in medias res*, as if it were a continuation of the two characters' conversation in *Odyssey* 11. This highly satirical episode pretends to be a deleted scene from Homer's epic, irreverently restored by Horace. Ulysses asks Tiresias for advice on how he can most effectively replenish his riches. The hero is confident that he will return to Ithaca, defeat his enemies, and reinstate his rule. However, he also knows that the suitors have depleted his resources in his absence and is acutely aware that his natural virtues, namely "nobility and manliness," are effectively worthless without material wealth (2.5.8). Ever the pragmatist, Ulysses wants to plan for life after the *Odyssey*.

Tiresias offers Ulysses candid counsel: he suggests that he find himself a benefactor and manipulate his way into this man's good graces and will. These rather surprising words of advice signal to the audience that the traditional world of Homer's epic is behind us and that we have entered into the realm of parody.[10] In this new playful context, Horace is (relatively) free to discuss and satirize contemporary issues relevant to his own culture.[11]

---

it is not simply synonymous with "patron" or "client," but that it retains some of the connotations of "friend." On the close connections between friendship and patronage, see Saller (1982), Wallace-Hadrill (1989), Konstan (1995) and (1997), White (2007), and Bowditch (2010).

9. On the *infamia* of actors, cf. Liv. 7.2 and Cic. *Rep*. 4.10. See Green (1933), Reynolds (1943) 38n5, and Edwards (1993), esp. 99.

10. Mythological parody was a common subject of many dramatic genres, including mime, Menippean satire, Greek and Roman comedy, and the obscure *fabula Rhinthonica*. Rudd (1966) 235–39 offers a thorough overview of this *sermo*'s parodic predecessors, and concludes that "no one had ever written anything quite like *Sat*. 2.5, [and] neither had Horace himself." The mock *katabasis* and *nekyia*, in particular, were recurring themes in Menippean satire; see Relihan (1993), esp. 103–18. For a survey of mythological parodies in mime, see Panayotakis (2010) 11n20. For a description of the *fabula Rhinthonica* and its points of contact with *Sermones* 2.5, see Lejay (1911) xlii.

11. For a summary of the everyday Roman elements couched in the epic Greek context, see Rudd (1966) 232.

Tiresias delivers a lengthy monologue,[12] offering his materialistic mentee step-by-step instructions on how to "play" people. He tells Ulysses to cruise the forum for the ideal target: a wealthy, foolish and (most importantly) childless hothead (2.5.28–31). Once he has located his audience, he should commence his performance. He must address this man by his first name, flatter him, pretend to have his best interests in mind. If Ulysses can persist and endure the fool's company, in time, he will develop a reputation as a selfless and devoted companion and attract the attention of other simple-minded benefactors.

Ulysses is appalled by the prophet's fortune-telling, but Tiresias remains unapologetic and forthright. Momentarily recalling their epic and tragic characterizations, he refers to Ulysses by his patronymic and reminds the son of Laertes (and us) about his own traditionally solemn persona and Apollonian accreditation: "O son of Laertes, whatever I say will either happen or not; for great Apollo gives me the gift of divination" (*'o Laertiade, quidquid dicam aut erit aut non: / diuinare etenim magnus mihi donat Apollo'*, 2.5.59–60). Tiresias abruptly explodes this brief glimpse of *grauitas* and escalates his outrageous advice.[13] He catalogues a litany of both verbal and physical gestures for Ulysses to perform in front of other attendants as well as the head of the household. He tells the hero to keep up the charade, even after his benefactor has died. He encourages him to perpetuate the public spectacle, sparing no expense on the tomb or funeral (2.5.105–6). In this way Ulysses can advertise his carefully crafted reputation in order to ensnare new patrons. As if the death of this hypothetical benefactor were his cue, Tiresias announces that he himself must return to Hades, and the curtain falls on this entertaining and provocative mini-drama.

Literary and Social Contexts for Poetic Performance

While the satire was certainly circulated as a written text, the performative features built into it suggest that Horace intended for the poem to be read aloud and accompanied by interpretative gestures.[14] We may never know for sure if he

12. This long, sermonizing monologue is Terentian in style. Cf. Delignon (2004) 160: "Ce dernier [Terence] met en effet volontiers dans la bouche de ses personnages de longs développements moraux, conférant à ses comédies le rythme tempéré qui leur vaut le nom de *statariae.*"

13. This kind of linguistic burlesque is typical of Menippean satire. Cf. Relihan (1993) 26: "Vocabulary and grammar are allowed to be as fantastic as the action that they describe, and are suffered to alternate in the wildest swings from grand to low style, from fustian to textbook simplicity, from the recherché to the banal."

14. Similar studies have focused on the performative features in the poetry of Catullus, Ovid, Varro, and Juvenal. Veyne (1983), Wiseman (1985), and Skinner (1993) and (2001), among others, speculate that Catullus may have performed his own poetry, based on internal rhetorical cues. Cunningham (1949) 100 posits that Ovid's *Heroides* were "originally written as lyric-dramatic

personally performed this piece—or whether it was performed by professional readers—but the possibilities align with contemporary literary and social practices. Elaine Fantham observes that "the author at Rome was in many genres and most periods both composer and performer. He designed his work and controlled its realization, whether as the director of a mime troupe or, more formally, as an orator in court, Senate house, or public assembly; as a poet or grammarian too he would present his work, or discuss the work of others, in oral performance."[15]

There is compelling evidence in the *Satires* and *Epistles*, and even an anecdote from Ovid's *Tristia* (4.10.49–50), to support the idea that Horace did occasionally perform his poetry. The poet admits to reciting his own work in *Sermones* 1.4, even though he denounces recitations in general: "I do not recite my poetry to anyone except friends, and then only when compelled to do so, and not just anywhere or in front of anyone" (*nec recito cuiquam nisi amicis, idque coactus, / non ubiuis coramue quibuslibet, S.* 1.4.73–74).[16] At the same time as he rejects various modes of performance, Horace reveals valuable information about how poetry was performed in his day. In *Sermones* 1.4, he distinguishes himself from other authors who recite their work in the middle of the forum or at the baths (*S.* 1.4.74–78). In *Sermones* 1.10 he shuns poetic competitions in the temple and repeat performances in the theaters (*S.* 1.10.37–39). He reinforces this last point in *Epistles* 1.19, when he claims to be ashamed to recite his unworthy lines in the packed theaters and to give undue weight to his trifles (*Ep.* 1.19.41–42). Instead, Horace favors intimate gatherings of learned friends and distinguished colleagues (*S.* 1.4.73–74).[17] He names Maecenas, Vergil, and Pollio,[18] among other literati, as his ideal audience (*S.* 1.10.81–88). Horace thus attests to at

---

monologues to be presented on the stage with music and dancing" based on structural elements. Wiseman (2009), esp. 138, demonstrates that Varro's Menippean satires were written for the stage, based on references in the fragments to the audience, applause, the stage, and costumes. Braund (1988), esp. 170–77, conceives of Juvenal's ninth satire as a dramatic text, based on its dialogue structure, use of comedic stock characters, and situations and language reminiscent of mime and Atellan farce.

15. Fantham (1996) 2. On the correlation between literary production, reception, and performance, see also Williams (1978) 303–6, Quinn (1982), Wiseman (1985) 124–29, Gamel (1998), and Lowrie (2009).

16. Lowrie (2009) 63 rightly cautions that "it is uncertain whether we can take Horace's satiric statements seriously and whether they pertain to lyric, but the likelihood of recitation is based on current cultural realities rather than anything Horace says."

17. Cf. Plin. *Ep.* 8.21.4: "I write first for my friends and then for myself" (*primum amicis tum mihi scriberem*).

18. The Elder Seneca (*Con.* 4 *pr.* 2) credits Asinius Pollio with being the first to organize formal *recitationes* in Rome. For a discussion of this dubious attribution, see Dalzell (1955).

least five different contemporary contexts for poetic performances including: public readings in the forum, public readings at the baths, competitions in the temple, staged readings in the theater, and private readings for small groups of friends. His *Carmen Saeculare* is evidence of a sixth context, namely religious festival (17 B.C.E.). In this special case, the poem was not performed by the author himself, but by a chorus of young men and women.[19]

While it is tempting to take Horace at his word when he says that he only recites poetry to his friends (and then only under duress), we must interpret his autobiographical assertions as part of his carefully constructed poetic *persona*.[20] It is extremely unlikely that he only recited his poetry under ideal circumstances.[21] In fact, in *Epistles* 2.2.91–101, Horace actually depicts himself participating in the very sort of poetic competition that he claims to avoid in *Sermones* 1.10.37–39:[22]

> carmina compono, hic elegos. 'mirabile uisu
> caelatumque nouem Musis opus!' aspice primum,
> quanto cum fastu, quanto molimine circum-
> spectemus uacuam Romanis uatibus aedem!
> mox etiam, si forte uacas, sequere et procul audi,
> quid ferat et quare sibi nectat uterque coronam.
> caedimur et totidem plagis consumimus hostem
> lento Samnites ad lumina prima duello.
> discedo Alcaeus puncto illius; ille meo quis?
> quis nisi Callimachus? si plus adposcere uisus,
> fit Mimnermus et optiuo cognomine crescit. (*Ep.* 2.2.91–101)

> I compose odes, this man composes elegies, "wonderful to behold and a heavenly work by the nine muses." See first with how much haughtiness, with how much self-importance we gaze upon the temple open to Roman

19. Lowrie (2009) 63 observes that the "*Carmen saeculare* is the only extant Latin poem of the Augustan period where external evidence establishes that it was composed for performance and actually performed."

20. Lyne (1995), McNeill (2001), and Freudenburg (2001), among many others, discuss the many social and political pressures that contribute to Horace's defensive self-presentation. The poet conscientiously attempts to come across as humble and self-deprecating, the kind of person who belongs in Maecenas' circle by virtue of his merit and lack of ambition. This is, of course, a form of social performance in and of itself. As Freudenburg (2001) 69 remarks, "[Horace's] every claim to be happy with 'who he is' and ambition-free totters under the weight of its own irony."

21. Quinn (1982) 152 agrees that "there is an element of unreality, in the context of the Augustan Age, about Horace's claim to be interested only in writing for a few friends—the members of the group around Maecenas, the addressees of the various odes and epistles—and of course posterity. It is all something of a pose."

22. Quinn (1982) 148.

> poets. At some point soon, if you happen to be free, attend and listen from a distance to what each man has to offer and by what means he weaves a crown for himself. We are both thrashed by the same number of blows and we wear out our opponent, like the Samnites, in a drawn-out battle lasting up to the first lights. I come away as Alcaeus by that man's vote, but who is that man to me? Who but Callimachus? If he appears to demand more, he becomes Mimnermus and flourishes in his chosen name.

This contradiction opens up the possibility that Horace did, in fact, participate in public performances, beyond the private recitations that he would have us believe. It is conceivable, then, that *Sermones* 2.5, a conspicuously dramatic dialogue, might well have been presented in any one of the performance spaces available to authors in Horace's day.

Horace uses the word *recitare* to refer to both private performances for his friends (*S.* 1.4.73–74) and public performances in the theater (*Ep.* 1.19.41–42). This further complicates our ability to delineate between *recitationes* proper and related performative genres.[23] One form of *recitatio* seems to have been a kind of workshop, an opportunity for the poet to present his compositions to a sympathetic (but nonetheless critical) audience and receive constructive feedback before formally publishing a text.[24] It was an aristocratic institution that relied upon and reinforced the bonds of *amicitia*. Pliny the Younger tells us that these were unembellished performances, which lay all the emphasis on the words themselves. According to Pliny, the poet would remain seated with the text open in front of him and give a straightforward reading, restricting his hand gestures and facial expressions.[25] He quickly adds that it is little wonder the listener becomes bored given the absence of any external stimuli (Plin. *Ep.* 2.19). It is difficult to say whether Pliny is representing an accurate depiction of a *recitatio* and whether we can universally apply his description to all *recitationes* of this kind. In fact, in *Ep.* 5.17, Pliny destabilizes the notion of a static reading when he praises Calpurnius Piso for his moving delivery of a poem about the constellations. Indeed, it would be surprising if a poet were to divest deliberately

23. Scholars are still not quite sure how to interpret *recitare*, how to capture all its nuances, and how to distinguish it from similar verbs, most notably *cantare*. Allen (1972) 13 explores the specific meaning of *cantare* and concludes that it can refer to both a "private recital aloud" and "a formal presentation in a theater, as in the case of Vergil's *Eclogues*." Quinn (1982) 154 posits that *recitare* was used of the poet reading his own work, while *cantare* was used of a reading by a professional performer. Markus (2000) 141 asserts that that the terms *recitare* and *cantare* express the distinction between the serious and the popular recitation of poetry.

24. Cf. Cic. *Off.* 1.147; Plin. *Ep.* 5.12, 7.17, and 8.21. See also Starr (1987), Dupont (1997), Valette-Cagnac (1997), Markus (2000), and Parker (2009).

25. Cf. Pers. 1.15–18, a satirical portrait of the seated poet-performer.

his performance of any gesture or expression, especially if the work happens to call for them, as in the case of *Sermones* 2.5. Additionally, the grammarians Dionysius Thrax (*Ars gramm.* 2) and Varro (fr. 236 Funaioli, *GRF* 266f) remark that delivery is part of the criteria taken into account in poetic criticism.[26] It is likely, therefore, that *some* body language accompanied these readings.

Poetry was also performed as entertainment at social gatherings, such as dinner parties.[27] In this convivial context, the recitations must have been lively. Holt Parker is careful to distinguish between this type of recitation and the "workshop" sort. The main distinction, according to Parker, is that the poet would never have performed his own poetry at a banquet. Rather, professional performers, including slaves and freedmen, would be hired for the occasion. He notes that "nowhere in Catullus, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus or Ovid do we find a single suggestion that the poets ever 'performed' at their own or anyone else's *conuiuia*."[28] This would have associated them with the *infamia* of actors or *scurrae*.[29] But what if that were the very point of the poem being performed? *Sermones* 2.5 satirizes the client for behaving like an actor. Whether the poet or professional actors were to recite the *sermo*, the very act of performing it would reinforce its underlying satirical message. A convivial gathering, attended by patrons and clients alike, would arguably be the most appropriate setting for a performance of this poem. It would accomplish one of satire's primary functions, namely to hold a mirror up to its audience and encourage self-reflection.

While a private *conuiuium* would offer a poignant setting for this satire, the poem also lends itself to public performance in a theater. Horace's contemporaries, Vergil (Serv. *ad Ecl.* 6.11) and Ovid (*Tr.* 2.519–20 and 5.7.25–26) had their work performed on the stage by professional actors. These performances ranged from dramatic readings to lavish spectacles, complete with music and dancing. Based on the structure and content of *Sermones* 2.5, I am inclined to think that this poem was designed for a non-musical performance by two actors. We may never know the exact circumstances of its performance—whether it was presented in a public or private space, whether Horace personally read it (either by himself or with an interlocutor), or whether it was performed by one or two professional actors—but

26. Wiseman (1985) 124n105.

27. Cf. Johnson (2000) 620: "Several ancient sources enumerate *lectores* among the possibilities for after-dinner diversion, alongside dramatic players, storytellers, musicians, and the like (Pliny, *Ep.* 1.15.2, 9.17.3, cf. 9.36.4; Suet. *Aug.* 78.2; Hist. Aug. *Hadr.* 26.4)."

28. Parker (2009) 206.

29. The main Roman rhetorical treatises all advise public speakers to differentiate themselves from actors, in order to avoid debasing themselves and undermining the persuasiveness of their performances; cf. *Rhet. Her.* 3.24 and 3.26; Cic. *de Orat.* 3.213–27. See also Graf (1991) 39.

the poem's pervasive dramatic and dramaturgical qualities strongly suggest that it was designed to be read aloud and physically enacted. Let us take a closer look at some of its more striking performative features.

1. Dialogue/Stage Directions

Like so many of his other *Sermones*, especially in the second book, this satire is designed as a dialogue. Horace utilizes this theatrical mode in two ways. First, he constructs the overall architecture of the poem as a conversation between two actors. Secondly, he has Tiresias voice and act out a number of auxiliary characters in a series of vignettes performed for Ulysses. By establishing this dual dramatic framework, Horace plays up the theatrical nature of the poem's form and its subject matter. By setting his study of social performance *within* a dramatic performance, he combines the medium and the message.

Horace builds upon the theatrical structure of the satire by incorporating specific stage directions, both on the larger level of the Ulysses/Tiresias dialogue and also on the smaller scale of Tiresias' play-within-a-play. An example of the former occurs at the opening of poem:

> Hoc quoque, Teresia, praeter narrata petenti
> responde, quibus amissas reparare queam res
> artibus atque modis. quid rides? (*S.* 2.5.1–3)

> UL. Answer me this as well, Tiresias, beyond what you've already said. By what arts and measures can I recover my lost riches? Why are you laughing?

Horace is encoding a dramatic cue here; he is indicating that Tiresias should laugh at that moment, notably at the line's principal *caesura.* This seemingly minor detail is actually quite significant. In conjunction with the dialogue format, these stage directions effectively turn the satire into a script. They introduce a sound effect and an action, namely laughter, and contribute to bringing an otherwise static conversation to life.[30] It is telling that *laughter* is the very first gesture that Horace chooses to describe. With these two simple words, *quid rides*, he establishes a comedic tone for the poem, right from the start.

There is an additional stage direction at the very end of the satire. When Tiresias prepares to make his exit, he announces: "But imperious Proserpina is dragging me away. Live long and farewell" (*sed me / imperiosa trahit Proserpina; uiue ualeque*, 109–10). Wolter identifies this particular moment as a prime example of a dramatic *exodus*.[31] The reference to Proserpina is very likely just a

30. Wolter (1970) 211 points to corresponding evidence of stage directions elsewhere in Horace's *Satires*, for example the movements of the witches in *S.* 1.8.

31. Wolter (1970) 210.

figure of speech, but in the spirit of comedy, it might also signal a kind of parodic *deus ex machina* finale.[32] These words are charged with comic potential. The impression they make is similar to that of an oversized hook reaching out from the wings and dragging a vaudeville performer off the stage. A silent reader of this poem might imagine a humorous pantomime to this effect. An oral reader might perform it. The diction of line 110 supports a burlesque interpretation. There is a striking disparity between the epic/tragic language (*imperiosa Proserpina*) and the comic/casual (*uiue ualeque*).[33] This sharp juxtaposition reinforces the playful tone of this particular moment and the satire as a whole.

On a smaller scale, the prophet describes (and likely simulates)[34] for Ulysses the behavior of an "ideal" client, which constitutes a kind of play-within-a-play. The success of the hero's *captatio* depends on his ability to play his part convincingly.[35] Tiresias coaches him on the specific body language that he will have to master, choreographing step-by-step movements that Ulysses must execute when presented with his benefactor's will:

> qui testamentum tradet tibi cumque legendum,
> abnuere et tabulas a te remouere memento,
> sic tamen ut limis rapias quid prima secundo
> cera uelit uersu; (*S.* 2.5.51–54)
>
> If someone hands over a will for you to read, remember to refuse and to move the tablets away from you, but in such a way that you can still snatch a sidelong glance at what the first page 'wills' on the second line.

Horace neatly alludes to the con itself in these stage directions. The *tmesis* in line 51 (*qui . . . cumque*) cleverly illustrates the *captator*'s trap. The intricately

32. Cf. Anderson (1956) 150. Anderson points out that *S.* 1.9, a similarly dramatic satire, ends with a *deus ex machina* resolution, only this time it is Apollo who spirits the protagonist away.

33. Muecke (1993) 193 describes *uiue ualeque* as an "everyday expression, cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 1340, Catull. 11.17, Hor. *Epist.* 1.6.67, Suet. *Aug.* 99.1 (dying words). Anchises' ghost is more formal (Verg. *Aen.* 5.738f.)."

34. Panayotakis (2005) 182–83 asserts that in Roman comedies it is appropriate to expect gestures when the author has one character describe the movements of another. Wolter (1970) 213 entertains the possibility that Tiresias's advice here might have been accompanied by particular gestures. He says that Tiresias could very well have mimed the comic Davus with "his head tilted to the side, resembling one who is much afraid" (*capite obstipo multum similis metuenti*) in the same way as he could have acted out other directions like "assault him with obedience" (*obsequio grassare*) and "creep up courteously" (*adrepe officiosus*).

35. Quinn (1982) 145 makes an analogous observation regarding the "stage directions" in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*: "When Ovid talks of writing poems in praise of one's mistress, he takes it for granted that the poems will be read to her by the lover and that their success as a stratagem of conquest will depend on the skill of the performer (Ovid *Ars* 2.283–84)."

woven syntax visually encloses both the will (*testamentum*) and Ulysses (*tibi*) within the word *quicumque*. In this way, Horace poetically draws the tablets in toward the hero (*qui testamentum tradet tibi cumque*), at the same time as Tiresias tells Ulysses to push them away.

Throughout the satire, Tiresias communicates his stage directions with an impressive number of imperatives, as well as prohibitive and jussive subjunctives. He employs five prohibitive subjunctives (16–17, 24–26, 89), ten jussive subjunctives (11, 14, 23, 53, 72, 91, 92, 106), and twenty-six (possibly twenty-seven)[36] imperative verbs in these 110 lines (10, 29, 31, 32, 38, 39, 48, 52, 55, 75, 76, 88, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 103, 105, 108, 110). He also uses the indicative *iubeo* to issue a command in line 70 and the gentle, periphrastic exhortation *adiuuat hoc quoque* ("this too helps") in line 73. In this way, he is able to set out specific and compelling instructions for Ulysses. He frequently groups imperative verbs together in order to enhance their individual and collective force. Lines 38 and 39, for example, contain four imperatives in close proximity: "Bid him to look after his little hide. Become his advocate; Persist and endure. . . ." (*pelliculam curare iube; fi cognitor ipse, / persta atque obdura. . . .*).[37] This rhetorical strategy enables Tiresias to build momentum and raise the dramatic stakes with each subsequent command.[38] His directions begin to sound more and more urgent and essential to the success of their scheme. They also become more and more outrageous, contributing to the sarcastic tone of the satire.

At line 84, however, Tiresias checks himself and warns Ulysses not to *over*-act. He begins with a cautionary tale about an old woman who arranged for her corpse to be well oiled so that, in death, she might finally be able to slip from the overeager clutches of her greedy heir. To convey the importance of this message, Horace pulls out all the stops and activates imperative, prohibitive subjunctive, and jussive subjunctive constructions in quick succession. In simple imperative and declarative statements, Tiresias gives Ulysses clear instructions to temper his performance:

36. Regarding the grammatically ambiguous *illacrimare* (103), Muecke (1993) 193 observes: "Interpretation of the text is uncertain. Many editors take *illacrimare* as the infinitive after *potes*. According to Shackleton Bailey's interpretation, it is the imperative of the deponent. This form is not well supported, the only certain instance being in the Digest. (It is a variant at Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.82.) On the other hand, the sequence of thought is better with the two imperatives coordinated by *et*, followed by an independent explanation."

37. The phrase *persta atque obdura* might well be meant to recall Catullus 8, itself a lively dramatic monologue.

38. Lejay (1911) 489–90 remarks that Tiresias's sermon could have quickly become monotonous with its succession of commands and cold condescension. Horace avoided this by seeking variety and interweaving strategies of attack and defense.

cautus adito:
neu desis operae neue immoderatus abundes.
difficilem et morosum offendet garrulus; ultra
non etiam sileas. Dauus sis comicus atque
stes capite obstipo, multum similis metuenti.[39] (*S.* 2.5.88–92)

Approach cautiously; neither neglect your service nor excessively overdo it. A chatterbox will offend someone who is morose and difficult to please; beyond 'no' and 'yes', be silent. Be Davus in the comedy and stand with your head tilted to the side, resembling one who is much afraid.

Horace reinforces the theatrical nature of these lines by employing Tiresias in a variety of dramaturgical roles. As director, Tiresias blocks out and explains the motivation behind Ulysses' behavior. As playwright, Tiresias scripts the hero's words, "no" and "yes." As actor, he actually performs the part for Ulysses (and us).

Tiresias is expressly advocating strategic social performance at this moment. He prescribes both verbal and physical gestures for Ulysses to emulate in order to optimize his public perception and his personal gain. The most striking evidence of Horace's correlation between dramatic and social performance appears in line 91, where he connects the social role of a client with the dramatic role of a slave. In the same verse, Tiresias summarizes "ideal" client conduct and also makes an overt theatrical reference to the clever slave of comedy, Davus.

Horace populates this satire with a number of familiar faces from the Greek and Roman stage, including the Flatterer (*parasitus*),[40] the Braggart Soldier (*miles gloriosus*), the Pimp (*leno*), and even the Prostitute (*meretrix*). Davus, however, is his most explicit reference to a comedic stock character. The name Davus refers to a recurring role (Daos or Davus) in the comedies of Menander and Terence.[41] Horace briefly mentions him in *Sermones* 1.10, 2.5, and the *Ars Poetica*. He also casts him as one of two main interlocutors in *Sermones* 2.7.[42] In each instance, Davus stands in for the archetypal *seruus callidus*.[43]

39. Lejay (1911) 486 observes that these are typical servile gestures for *feigning* modesty, according to Persius (3.80) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 11. 3.83).

40. Rudd (1966) 303n17: "Horace's *captator* has many points of contact with the flatterer and the parasite as portrayed in Theophrastus and Greco-Roman comedy. A large amount of comparative material on the flatterer will be found in O. Ribbeck, 'Kolax,' . . . 1883. See also R. G. Ussher's commentary on the *Characters* of Theophrastus (London, 1960), pp. 43–50. Within Horace's work references may be made to *Sat.* I. 9 and to those rather uncomfortable epistles I.17 and I.18." See also Damon (1997).

41. Cf. Legrand (1910). For a general survey of Davus's many appearances in Greco-Roman comedy, see Lejay (1911) 485–86.

42. Bo (1965) 112.

43. Muecke (1993) 214: "Davus's name is important for his characterization: he is a *seruus cal-*

In this satire, Horace not only names the allusive Davus, but he also describes him as *comicus.* With this significant adjective, Horace further underscores the slave's theatrical identity. The epithet *comicus* reminds us that Davus is, in fact, performing in a play. At first glance, Tiresias appears to describe an *atypical* version of Davus. He seems to contradict the stereotype of the garrulous slave, when he tells Ulysses to act like the comic Davus and remain *silent*. Traditionally, the *seruus callidus* is notoriously outspoken; Horace will later emphasize this aspect of his stock characterization in *Sermones* 2.7.[44] I would argue, however, that reticence is also consistent with Davus's traditional persona. The *seruus callidus* is perfectly capable of self-restraint, especially when a ruse requires it.[45] He is only too happy to play a part in order to dupe a comic villain and ensure a happy ending.[46] Horace is likely referring to this kind of strategic silence here in *Sermones* 2.5. He depicts Davus consciously performing within his own plays.[47]

---

lidus, the typical slave of comedy, cf. Menander (in eight plays), Plaut. *Amph.* 365, Ter. *An.* 194, Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.40, 2.5.91, *Ars P.* 237." MacCary (1969) and especially (1970) offers a nuanced study of this figure. He recognizes that Menander presents variations of Daos in his different plays, but determines that the playwright generally characterizes him as πανοῦργος ("rogue").

44. In *Sermones* 2.7, Davus takes advantage of the Saturnalian setting to go off on a lengthy diatribe about his master's flaws. He dominates the dialogue, co-opting 110 of the poem's 118 lines. Along the way, he (proudly) reveals himself to be a typical comedic slave, conforming to all of the stereotypes described by Stace (1968) 72: "talkative, conceited, insolent, and lazy . . . gluttonous, lying, sordid, and selfish."

45. Davus demonstrates restraint at the very beginning of *Sermones* 2.7.1–2. He humbly opens the poem: "For a long time now, I've been listening and wanting to say a few things, but being a slave, I shrink back in fear (*iamdudum ausculto et cupiens tibi dicere seruus / pauca reformido*). Once Horace gives him permission to speak freely, Davus quickly casts this restraint aside and launches into his tirade. MacCary (1969) 282–83 praises Daos in the *Aspis* for his self-restraint, calling him "Menander's most attractive slave." He goes on to note that "what is most striking about Daos, besides the nobility of his mission and the cleverness with which he carries off the deception of Smikrines, is his reticence; he never boasts of his sacrifice or ingenuity nor does he abuse Smikrines. His three scenes with the old miser (Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer* XXVI [Geneva 1969] 1–96, 164–249, 391–468) are models of disapproving deference, the finest 'put on' in ancient comedy."

46. Slater (1985) 162 identifies several Plautine *serui callidi* who role-play in order to attain their goals, including "Sagaristio in the *Persa* (543ff.) playing a 'Persian' anxious to unload a slave on the unsuspecting slave-dealer [and] Leonida in the *Asinaria* (407ff.) playing the steward Saurea in order to bilk the ass-dealer." He adds that other comic tricksters such as the parasite Curculio in the play of the same name (391ff.) and Phronesium in the *Truculentus* (449ff.) also use role-playing as a means to an end.

47. Slater (1985) 16 observes that this kind of metatheatricality occurs quite frequently in the comedies of Plautus. Many of his characters, especially the *serui callidi* and others like them, "demonstrate a self-awareness of the play as a play and through this awareness demonstrate their own ability to control other characters in the play."

When Tiresias tells Ulysses to become (*sis*, 91) this comic figure, he is specifically instructing the man of many wiles to *act*. He reinforces this point, once again, by blocking out specific stage directions to help Ulysses craft his performance. Manipulating several layers of theatricality, Horace depicts Tiresias playing Ulysses playing Davus. Issuing a striking six imperatives in six lines (93–98), Tiresias both prescribes and performs the role of a slave for Ulysses:

> obsequio grassare; mone, si increbruit aura,
> cautus uti uelet carum caput; extrahe turba
> oppositis umeris; aurem substringe loquaci.
> importunus amat laudari: donec ohe! iam
> ad caelum manibus sublatis dixerit, urge,
> crescentem tumidis infla sermonibus utrem. (*S.* 2.5.93–98)

> Assault him with obedience; warn him, if a breeze grows strong, to be careful and cover up his dear head. If there is a crowd, use your shoulders to make way for him. If he is chatty, bind your ear to him. If he is relentless in his love of praise, press on, continue to inflate his ego until he throws his hands up into the air and says "enough already!"

By describing these loudly obsequious and insincere gestures, Horace calls attention to and criticizes the hypocrisy of social performance. He does so within the immediate context of an explicitly theatrical metaphor, introduced by *Dauus sis comicus* (91), and within the larger context of this highly dramatic satire.

2. Metrical Prompts

Horace also communicates dramaturgical cues through the hexameter. He uses metrical prompts to signal sense and assignment of speech, in much the same way as a modern playwright might employ commas, quotes, or italics to suggest pause, tone or change of voice. There are twelve points in the dialogue where the speaker shifts from one character to another. The majority of speaker-changes occur at regular line breaks, that is, a new speaker picks up at the beginning of a new line (8, 17, 22, 58, 60, 61, 78). Three fall at *diaereses* (3, 5, 19) and two occur at *caesurae* (20, 76). In three striking cases, one speaker abruptly interrupts or overlaps with the other. The meter here not only informs a reader's recitation of these lines, but it also enhances the meaning and rhetorical effect of the characters' words. The first example of overlapping dialogue occurs in the fifth line:

> 'iamne doloso
> non satis est Ithacam reuehi patriosque penatis
> aspicere?' 'o nulli quicquam mentite, uides ut
> nudus inopsque domum redeam te uate. . . .?' (*S.* 2.5.3–6)

> TIR. Is it no longer enough for the crafty one to return to his homeland and to gaze upon his household gods? UL. O you who have spoken falsely to no one, do you see how I am returning home stripped bare and resourceless, according to your prophecy. . . .?

Ulysses has just asked Tiresias for advice on how to recover his fortune. The prophet laughs and asks the wily hero if it is not enough just to get home and to look upon (*aspicere*, 5) the household gods. Perhaps sensing the sarcasm in these words, Ulysses is quick to defend himself. He jumps right in, overlapping with Tiresias by way of an elision: *āspĭcĕr[e] Ō nūl lī quīc quām mēntītĕ, uĭdēs ŭt*. The elision does away with the natural pause between speakers. It reinforces the alacrity of Ulysses' response and reflects the speed and agility of his legendary craftiness (*doloso*, 3) at work. With melodramatic flair (underscored by a series of three spondaic feet) he simultaneously flatters Tiresias and attempts to account for his disgraceful request.

The blind prophet sees past his puffery. He encourages him, by example, to drop the act and just be frank: "All beating about the bush aside, since you shudder at poverty, learn by what calculation you can become rich" (*quando pauperiem missis ambagibus horres, / accipe qua ratione queas ditescere*, 9–10). The second example of overlapping dialogue occurs just a few lines later. Tiresias candidly instructs Ulysses to prioritize his patron over his own household god and to worship him accordingly no matter how base an individual he may be (*qui quamuis periurus erit, sine gente, cruentus / sanguine fraterno, fugitiuus, ne tamen illi / tu comes exterior, si postulet, ire recuses*, 15–18). Ulysses, still clinging to his heroic persona, responds with appropriate outrage at the suggestion. One key line later, he changes his tune:

> utne tegam spurco Damae latus? haud ita Troiae
> me gessi certans semper melioribus. 'ergo
> pauper eris.' fortem hoc animum tolerare iubebo;
> et quondam maiora tuli. . . . (*S.* 2.5.18–21)

> UL. Am I to defend the flank of filthy Dama? Not thus did I conduct myself at Troy, fighting with better men. TIR. Then you will be poor. UL. I shall order my stout soul to endure this; at one time I bore greater hardships. . . .

Horace makes use of short, almost stichomythic banter in line 20 when Tiresias delivers his concise prognosis *ergo pauper eris* and Ulysses immediately volleys back with *fort(em) hoc animum tolerare iubebo* (20–21). Horace skillfully manipulates the meter to illustrate the lightning speed of Ulysses' change of heart. Line 20 (*paūpĕr ĕrīs fŏrt[em] hōc ănĭmūm tŏlĕrārĕ iŭbēbō*) is markedly dactylic and brisk. The *caesura* in the second foot marks the shift in the speaker. Ulysses

processes and articulates his response *literally* without a missing a beat; his reply immediately picks up and completes the rhythm introduced by Tiresias. The elision between *fortem* and *hoc* might further suggest the haste of his speech. It is as if Ulysses cannot get the words out of his mouth fast enough and he ends up slurring them together. The comic timing conveyed by the meter complements the comic sense of his words; Ulysses uses this powerful, traditionally heroic statement to express his completely antiheroic willingness to compromise the attitude he just articulated.

He seems to catch himself and regain some composure in the next line (*et quondam maiora tuli*). This mock epic expression recalls his words in *Od.* 20.18: τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη· καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης ("Endure now heart, as you once endured more terrible things at another time").[48] The initial sequence of long solemn syllables (*ēt quōndām māiōră tŭlī*) contrasts with the ignoble haste of the previous line. In this way, the metrical juxtaposition further illustrates the hero's comedic degradation.

The last (and arguably funniest) example of overlapping dialogue occurs at line 76. At this moment in the satire, Tiresias instructs Ulysses to give his patron whatever he wants, including praise for bad poetry and also . . . his beloved wife. This shocking suggestion is all the more comical for its (mis)casting of Penelope, legendary for her loyalty, in the role of *meretrix*:

> '. . . scortator[49] erit: cave te roget; ultro
> Penelopam facilis potiori trade.' putasne,
> perduci poterit tam frugi tamque pudica,
> quam nequiere proci recto depellere cursu? (*S.* 2.5.75–78)
>
> TIR. "If he's a Casanova, don't let him have to ask you. Hand Penelope over voluntarily to the more capable man." UL: "Do you think she can be persuaded, one so upright and so pure, whom the suitors have not been able to drive off the right course?"

With unabashed candor, Tiresias states *Penelopam facilis potiori trade* and Ulysses completes the hexameter with *putasne*. So the whole line then reads: *Pēnĕlŏpām făcĭlīs pŏtĭōrī trādĕ pŭtāsnĕ.* The meter opens up a number of interesting dramatic interpretations of this line. Ulysses' sudden interruption might reflect his incredulity, his disgust, or possibly even his enthusiasm for the idea, especially since Tiresias goes on to assure him that Penelope, like her other-half, will quickly abandon her values once she experiences even the smallest benefit

48. Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.199.

49. Muecke (1993) 190: "The only instance of *scortator* in Horace, cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 287. It is a very blunt term, which is incongruous in Tiresias's mouth."

from doing so. He takes this travesty to an even further extreme, presenting the incongruous image of noble Penelope fastened to the old benefactor like a dog to a greasy hide: "Thus is your Penelope upright, but once she has tasted a little profit from an old man, having shared it with you, then she will never be kept away, like a dog from a greasy hide" (*sic tibi Penelope frugi est, quae si semel uno / de sene gustarit tecum partita lucellum, / ut canis a corio numquam absterrebitur uncto*, 81–83).[50] However a reader chooses to interpret Ulysses' words, the meter reinforces the fact that he has a strong reaction to Tiresias' sensational suggestion. By manipulating the meter in this way, Horace opens up a variety of interpretative opportunities for the reader and underscores the poem's dramatic potential.[51]

3. *Ethopoeia*

The third dramaturgical cue that Horace weaves into the *sermo* is *ethopoeia*. Over the course of *Sermones* 2.5, Tiresias performs a series of dramatic vignettes for Ulysses, the satire's internal audience. These brief comic sketches resemble mimes with respect to both content and characters. They correspond to the basic paradigm outlined by Elaine Fantham: "scenarios based on confidence tricks, disguise, and cheating lovers, in which the leading role might vary between the trickster and his elderly miserly or foolish dupe."[52] Tiresias functions as a sort of archimimus here, narrating and enacting each episode for Ulysses (and us). Tiresias "does voices," as it were, playing multiple parts in this poem. His most substantial role is none other than (a satiric version of) Ulysses himself. Tiresias illustrates his advice for the hero by acting it out for him. He plays the part of Ulysses the Client, demonstrating not only how the hero should behave, but also

50. Delignon (2004) 159 relates this image to the bawdy body humor found in certain Old Comedies, Middle Comedies, and mimes, in particular the phallic costumes worn by the actors: "Il lui arrive certes de proposer de équivalents poétiques aux jeux de scène, aux masques ou aux postiches comiques. La personnification du sexe de l'adultère Villius ou le morceau de cuir trempé dans l'huile auquel Pénélope, prostituée à un vieux barbon, prend goût, évoquent ainsi le phallos dont étaient affublés les acteurs de la comédie ancienne, de certaines comédies moyennes et du mime latin."

51. Gamel (1998) 84–85: "Performance requires the performer to *decide* among the many possibilities offered by a written text at each particular moment. How fast? how loud? what gestures? what tone of voice? and always, to what purpose, and with what effect? To a knowledgeable performer, the state of empirical suspense created by a complex text offers opportunity rather than *aporia*."

52. Cf. Fantham (1989) 155. Horace frequently incorporates elements from the elusive genre of mime in his satires. Fantham (1989) 159 points to *S.* 1.8 and 1.9, for example, in which Horace employs the mimic motif of "last-minute escape." On the mimic elements in these two satires, see also Lejay (1911) xxxix. Brown (1993) 113, among others, has noted the conspicuous allusion to the "adultery mime" in *S.* 1.2.127–34. Juvenal develops this mimic motif (e.g., 6.41–44 and 8.196–97).

what he should say in rather delicate social situations. Tiresias directly speaks for Ulysses three times in the satire—at lines 32, 91 and 101 respectively—and indirectly suggests what he should say approximately eleven times.[53]

The first time that Tiresias speaks directly for Ulysses, he advises him on how to approach a potential patron. The prophet scripts the hero's lines, explains his motivation, and ultimately performs the scene himself:

> "Quinte," puta, aut "Publi," (gaudent praenomine molles
> auriculae) "tibi me uirtus tua fecit amicum;
> ius anceps noui, causas defendere possum;
> eripiet quiuis oculos citius mihi quam te
> contemptum cassa nuce pauperet; haec mea cura est
> ne quid tu perdas neu sis iocus." (*S.* 2.5.32–37)

> "Quintus," say, or "Publius" (delicate little ears delight in a first name) "your virtue has made me your friend. I understand the ambiguous law, I know how to defend cases. I'd sooner let someone rip out my eyes than let him despise you or defraud you of as much as an empty nutshell. This is my concern, that you neither lose anything nor become a joke."

This speech is loaded with comic nuance. Horace alludes to the Roman comedians several times in these lines; Frances Muecke, among others, has noted that colloquialisms such as *cassa nuce*[54] (35–36) and *iocus*[55] (37) are typical of Plautus and Terence.[56] The casual, disarming vocatives establish a playful, colloquial voice. The condescending adjective "delicate" (*molles*, 32) and the diminutive term "little ears" (*auriculae*, 33) set a tongue-in-cheek tone. The use of *uirtus* (33), to characterize the patron after his earlier unflattering depiction, underscores the hypocrisy of Tiresias' words. There is also inherent comedy in the famously *blind* prophet wagering his eyes (35), even if he is playing another character. In this way, Tiresias puts expressly comedic words in Ulysses' mouth.

Besides Ulysses the Client, Tiresias also gives voice to three other characters in this satire. At line 42, he plays a nameless witness, who comments upon the hero's

53. These are most easily seen when Tiresias uses a specific verb to denote speech or the absence thereof (i.e. *iubēre*, 37–38; *laudāre*, 72 and 74–75; *silēre*, 90–91; *monēre* 93–94; *dicere* and *addicere*, 106–9). I also include in this list the verbs *abnuere* (51–54) and *tradere* (75–76), which could imply speech along with gesture, and Tiresias' periphrastic use of *urgēre* and *inflāre* (96–98).

54. Muecke (1993) 184: e.g., Plaut. *Mil.* 316, *Ps.* 371.

55. Muecke (1993) 184: e.g., Ter. *Eu.* 300.

56. Fairclough (1913) 189–90: "The comic writer's influence in moulding the admirable style of Horace's *sermo cotidianus* has often been commented upon, and a comparative study of Horace and Terence will show that the later poet owes not a little of his success to his intimate familiarity with the plays of Terence."

exceptional patience and loyalty: "'Don't you see', someone tapping a bystander with his elbow will say, 'how long-suffering, how attached to his friends, how passionate he is?'" ("*nonne uides,*" *aliquis cubito stantem prope tangens/ inquiet,* "*ut patiens, ut amicis aptus, ut acer?*" 42–43). This nameless witness represents the larger target audience of Ulysses' social performance, beyond his current patron. Tiresias encourages Ulysses to play to the crowd of gullible spectators, as well as to his benefactor, in order to promote his reputation and set up future patronage opportunities. The prophet assures the hero that "more tunny-fish will swim up and the ponds will grow" (*plures adnabunt thynni et cetaria crescent*, 44).

At line 96, Tiresias also performs the role of the hypothetical patron himself. Horace allows this buffoonish figure one brief exclamation in the entire poem. All the patron ever says is "Hey now!" or "Enough already!" (96) when Ulysses the Client is presented as continuously and aggressively flattering him. It is entirely fitting that these are the patron's only and final words. This is the first we hear from the patron directly, and the last we hear of him at all before his death just a few lines later at line 99. The poem also concludes not long thereafter at line 110. Kirk Freudenburg observes that at least two other Horatian satires, specifically *S.* 1.1 and 2.8, abruptly cease with this statement ("enough already!") in one form or another.[57] When the patron *finally* gets a word in edgewise, it is with great comic effect that he calls for an end to Ulysses' performance, while at the same time signaling his own end and that of the satire.

One additional part that Tiresias performs for Ulysses is as reader of the will:

> cum te seruitio longo curaque leuarit,
> et certum uigilans QVARTAE SIT PARTIS VLIXES,
> audieris, HERES: "ergo nunc Dama sodalis
> nusquam est? unde mihi tam fortem tamque fidelem?"
> sparge subinde et, si paulum potes illacrimare: est
> gaudia prodentem uultum celare. (*S.* 2.5.99–104)
>
> When he has relieved you from long servitude and care and (certain that you're awake) you hear "Of a fourth part let Ulysses be heir," say: "Therefore my companion Dama is no more? Where will I ever find another friend so courageous and so faithful?"; and, if you are able to cry a little, you can conceal your expression betraying gladness.

The prophet tells the hero to react appropriately when he hears someone say: "Of a fourth part, let Ulysses be . . . heir" (100–101). Here the poet uses enjambment

57. Freudenburg (1993) 235: "The hasty retreat of the dinner guests [*S.* 2.8] alludes to the last lines of *Satires* 1.1, where the satirist, the "full dinner guest" (*conuiua satur*) of line 119 says simply, 'Enough now', [*iam satis est*] and within two lines he brings the piece to an abrupt close."

for dramatic effect: he withholds the word "heir" (*heres,* 101) until the next line, leaving us to wonder what exactly Ulysses has coming to him. When the reader of the will finally pronounces the word *heres,* he confirms that Ulysses' scheme has been successful. It also cues the hero's grand finale, his last chance to make an impression on his larger target audience, any prospective patrons who might be watching.

Jumping back into the role of Ulysses the Client, Tiresias speaks directly for the hero one final time (101–2). The sarcasm of these lines is palpable. On the one hand, Tiresias (speaking as Ulysses) identifies Dama as his bosom buddy (*sodalis*, 101). On the other hand, the "real" Ulysses has called this same Dama *spurcus* ("filthy") back in line 18.[58] This conspicuous contradiction once again confirms the duplicity at the core of Tiresias' advice.

At this point, Tiresias instructs Ulysses to perform a mime, imitating the mien of someone coping with tragic news. He tells him that if he is able to cry a little, the hero should shed crocodile tears and conceal his expression betraying his gladness (103–4). Line 104 reveals the deception motivating Tiresias' directions. The words *gaudia prodentem uultum celare* confirm that the prophet is instructing the hero to suppress his "real" emotions behind a mask. Once again, Horace employs dramaturgical diction to highlight the histrionic nature of Tiresias' advice.

As we have seen, Horace uses the language of the stage to satirize two closely related social phenomena, namely inheritance-hunting and, by extension, the patron-client relationship. Tiresias prescribes and performs the role of the "ideal client" for Ulysses, the satire's internal audience. At the same time, Horace presents his external audience with an exaggerated caricature of a client, a role that he himself actually played in the extrapoetic world. In this way, Horace uses theater to confront the stereotypes associated with this figure and include himself in the joke. He is able to address and diffuse the criticism that he likely received based on his close relationship with Maecenas. Horace is particularly concerned with defending this relationship and his reputation as a worthy client, friend, and poet throughout his corpus, and especially in his *Satires*. To that end, he is constantly "performing" both in and by means of his poetry. My reading of *Sermones* 2.5 takes this idea one step further. It suggests that Horace is satirizing social performance itself, by describing it in theatrical terms and demonstrating it through *actual* performance.

In addition to uncovering new layers in Horace's multifaceted depiction of the patron-client relationship, this study has broader implications for our understand-

58. On *spurcus*, see Muecke (1993) 182: "(the sole instance in Horace) is emphatic. The man is not only a slave, as his name shows (*Sat.* 2.7.54N), but also of unsavory character. Cf. Lucil. 173 W (of a gladiator)."

ing of how Horace's poetry was performed, as well as his larger poetic program. It brings to light the medley of genres that constitute satire and illustrates how the poet calls upon aspects of kindred genres (in particular, drama and epic) in order to enrich the form and meaning of his *sermo*. Using the tools and techniques of a playwright, he designs a vivid theatrical world and creates the most appropriate context in which to satirize the histrionics of social performance.

Boston University sophiek@bu.edu

Works Cited

Anderson, W. S. 1956. "Horace, the Unwilling Warrior: *Satire* I,9." *AJPh* 77.2: 148–66.

Allen, W. 1972. "Ovid's *cantare* and Cicero's *Cantores Euphorionis*." *TAPhA* 103: 1–14.

Bartsch, S. 1994. *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bo, D. 1965. *Lexicon Horatianum A-K.* Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Bowditch, P. L. 2001. *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2010. "Horace and Imperial Patronage." In G. Davis, ed., *A Companion to Horace*, 53–74. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Braund, S. M. 1988. *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1996. *The Roman Satirists and their Masks.* London: Bristol Classical Press.

Brown, P. M., trans. 1993. *Horace: Satires I.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Champlin, E. 1991. *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cunningham, M. P. 1949. "The Novelty of Ovid's *Heroides*." *CPh* 44.2: 100–106.

Damon, C. 1997. *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Dalzell, A. 1955. "C. Asinius Pollio and the Early History of Public Recitation at Rome." *Hermathena* 86: 20–28.

Delignon, B. 2004. "Les *Satires* d'Horace et la comédie gréco-latine: Le genre du mélange et le mélange des genres." *BAGB* 1: 158–87.

Dupont, F. 1997. "*Recitatio* and the Reorganization of the Space of Public Discourse." In T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro, eds., *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, 44–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, H. R. 1913. "Horace's View of the Relations between Satire and Comedy." *AJPh* 34.2: 183–93.

Fantham, E. 1989. "Mime: The Missing Link in Roman Literary History." *CW* 82.3: 153–63.

———. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture: From Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Freudenburg, K. 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
———. 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gamel, M. K. 1998. "Reading as a Man: Performance and Gender in Roman Elegy." *Helios* 25: 79–95.
Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
Graf, F. 1991. "Gestures and Conventions: The Gestures of Roman Actors and Orators." In J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg, eds., *A Cultural History of Gesture from Antiquity to the Present Day*, 36–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Green, W. M. 1933. "The Status of Actors at Rome." *CPh* 28: 301–4.
Habinek, T. 2005. "Satire as Aristocratic Play." In K. Freudenburg, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, 177–91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hunter, R. L. 1985. "Horace on Friendship and Free Speech." *Hermes* 113: 480–90.
Johnson, W. 2000. "Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity." *AJPh* 121.4: 593–637.
Keane, C. 2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Konstan, D. 1995. "Patrons and Friends." *CPh* 90: 328–42.
———. 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Krostenko, B. A. 2001. *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Legrand, P. E. 1910. *Daos: Tableau de la comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle-Κωμῳδία Νέα*. Paris: A. Fontemoing.
Lejay, P. and Plessis, F., eds. 1911. *Oeuvres d'Horace.* Paris: Librairie Hachette.
Lowrie, M. 2009. *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1995. *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
MacCary, W. T. 1969. "Menander's Slaves: Their Names, Roles, and Masks." *TAPhA* 100: 277–94.
———. 1970. "Menander's Characters: Their Names, Roles and Masks." *TAPhA* 101: 277–90.
Markus, D. 2000. "Performing the Book: The Recital of Epic in First-Century C.E. Rome." *ClAnt* 19.1: 138–79.
McNeill, R. L. B. 2001. *Horace: Image, Identity, and Audience*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Muecke, F., trans. 1993. *Horace: Satires II.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Panayotakis, C. 2005. "Nonverbal Behaviour on the Roman Comic Stage." In D. Cairns, ed., *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, 175–93. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

———. ed. 2010. *Decimus Laberius: The Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, H. N. 2009. "Books and Reading Latin Poetry." In W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker, eds., *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, 186–225. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Porter, D. H. 2002. "Playing the Game: Horace, 'Epistles' I." *CW* 96.1: 21–60.

Quinn, K. 1982. "The Poet and His Audience in the Augustan Age." *ANRW* II.30.1: 75–180.

Reynolds, R. W. 1943. "Criticism of Individuals in Roman Popular Comedy." *CQ* 37: 37–45.

Relihan, J. C. 1993. *Ancient Menippean Satire*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rudd, N. 1966. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saller, R. 1982. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skinner, M. B. 1993. "Catullus in Performance." *CJ* 89.1: 61–68.

———. 2001. "Among those Present: Catullus 44 and 10." *Helios* 28.1: 57–73.

Slater, N. W. 1985. *Plautus in Performance: The Theater of the Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stace, C. 1968. "The Slaves of Plautus." *G&R* 15: 64–77.

Starr, R. J. 1987. "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World." *CQ* 37.1: 213–23.

Valette-Cagnac, E. 1997. *La lecture à Rome: Rites et pratiques*. Paris: Belin.

Veyne, P. 1983. *L'élégie érotique romaine: L'amour, la poésie et l'Occident*. Paris: du Seuil.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1989. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London: Routledge.

White, P. 2007. "Friendship, Patronage, and Horatian Sociopoetics." In S. Harrison, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 195–206. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wickham, E. C. and Garrod, H. W., eds. 1901. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Williams, G. W. 1978. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wiseman, T. P. 1985. *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2009. *Remembering the Roman Republic: Essays on Late-Republican Politics and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wolter, E. 1970. "Théâtre et satire chez Horace." *Caesarodunum* 5: 203–21.