pattern of corruption. Indeed the sources of Rome's vitality are threatened. Juvenal pictures the Roman family as decadent and complacent, and he attacks the once respected virtues of parsimony and hard work as self-interest that opposes public spirit, as manifestations of *auaritia*. He sees the old order failing and bankruptcy impending.

In a plea to halt this decline toward selfishness, in which the next generation will outstrip his own, Juvenal next imagines that he is addressing the parents (210–55). He prophesies with apocalyptic vision what chaos their abdication of responsibility will bring. Of the virtues that may perhaps remain, honesty and religion will go when the young man, barely mature but already venal, perjures himself before the gods for a small reward (216–19). Marital trust and love will be worthless when the bride is not only married, but also murdered, for her dowry (220–22). Ultimately not even the bond of blood will afford protection because the murderous son will be a menace to his father (244–55). Such crimes, Juvenal insists, spring from Rome's present failure: "mentis causa malae tamen est et origo penes te" (226). *Auaritia*, by now the symbol of parental indifference and public corruption, has been encouraged, while the impulses to friendship and familial solidarity have been disparaged and discredited (222–43). The outcome must be anarchy.

Mindful of the fearsome prospects, Juvenal, in the concluding passage of his poem (256–31), appraises the existing situation and finds it hopeless. Rome's malady seems incurable. No force or place can contain it. *Auaritia* transforms life into a giant, unending spectacle stripped of all meaning. Even the traditional games had more of reality. The familiar and in itself useless act of tight-rope-walking might earn a man his food and shelter. By contrast, the enterprise of the seafaring *mercator* does not relate to any need and is entirely frivolous (265–302). His untiring efforts symbolize the full range of irrelevance and destruction that *auaritia* imposes on one's life. To import raisin wine from Crete in jars of local pottery, to travel far, to risk one's life and one's property, all with the hope of gain, is the height of folly. His *spes lucri* (278) will ultimately leave the *mercator* destitute in a shipwreck or lead to paranoia if he becomes wealthy.

Escape from this dilemma, it is proposed, may lie in sensible simplicity. A *mensura census* (316–17) might provide it. But Juvenal, a few lines before in the metaphorical anecdote about Alexander the Great and Diogenes (308–14), has already doubted that Rome is willing to accept such a restriction. Like Alexander, Rome is inexorably driven to continue her material expansion although she can perceive its futility. A life whose terms are dictated by basic needs, or philosophy, or sound Roman tradition (316–21), is alien to her. Even a moderate measure of wealth, as a concession (322–26), will not please. And so after a feeble plea for moderation and reason, Juvenal closes the poem, seemingly resigned to Rome's failure. The boundless riches of Croesus, of Persia, even the enormous wealth of the villainous Narcissus are all inadequate to sate this generation's aspirations. Before the many and varied forces marshaled by *auaritia* Rome goes down to defeat.

The fourteenth Satire then is a complete and coherent statement about the condition of Rome. The commonplace topics of satire are unified and vitalized under the headings of parental indulgence and *auaritia* and in this array afford a broad target for attack and reason for Juvenal's despondency.

J. PETER STEIN

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

CAEPIO, TACITUS, AND LUCAN'S SACRED GROVE

In "Lucan's Grove" (*CP*, LXIII (1968), 296–300), Professor O. C. Phillips gives a learned and interesting discussion of the literary background and possible intent of the incident of the cutting of the Gallic sacred grove in Book 3 of the *Bellum civile* (394–452).[1]

1. I wish to thank Professors J. David Konstan and Archibald Allen of the Wesleyan Classics Department for useful comments.

He presents a cogent and convincing argument for the possible mythological and historical parallels that could have suggested both the use and significance of this episode. However, there are two other events, one a contemporary cutting of a grove and the other an act of sacrilege committed by a Roman general in Gaul two generations before Caesar, that might have attracted the attention of the poet and stimulated his imagination.

Tacitus, in his account of the campaign of Suetonius Paullinus in Wales (*Ann.* 14. 30), gives the following description of the assault on the island of Mona:

Stabat pro litore diversa acies, densa armis virisque, intercursantibus feminis; in modum Furiarum veste ferali, crinibus deiectis faces praeferebant; Druidaeque circum, preces diras sublatis ad caelum manibus fundentes, novitate aspectus perculere militem, ut quasi haerentibus membris immobile corpus vulneribus praeberent. dein cohortationibus ducis et se ipsi stimulantes, ne muliebre et fanaticum agmen pavescerent, inferunt signa sternuntque obvios et igni suo involvunt. praesidium posthac inpositum victis excisique luci saevis superstitionibus sacri: nam cruore captivo adolere aras et hominum fibris consulere deos fas habebant. haec agenti Suetonio repentina defectio provinciae nuntiatur.

These events took place in A.D. 60 and, followed as they were by the rebellion of Boudicca, attracted great attention at the court of Nero where Lucan at this time must have been beginning the *Bellum civile*.[2] Lucan was in an especially good position to receive information on Britain, for he was the nephew of Seneca who, if one tradition is to be believed, had substantial investments in Britain. The withdrawal of these investments was said to be one of the causes of the outbreak of the rebellion.[3] Eyewitness accounts of the affair circulated in Rome within a relatively short time. Tacitus presumably received the substance of his account from his father-in-law Agricola who had been a *tribunus militum* in Britain under Suetonius Paullinus during those years (*Agr.* 5).

Thus, whatever the mythological and symbolic significance of the Gallic grove incident in Lucan's poem, he could well have had fresh in his mind a very recent cutting of a sacred grove that had been connected with calamitous events. Furthermore, in the over-all structure of the narration of the two episodes in Lucan and Tacitus, there is a parallelism which suggests literary influence as well as historical connection.[4]

The account of Lucan can be divided into four main themes: the description of the eerie qualities of the scene at the grove, the hesitation of the soldiers to assault the grove, the urging and assumption of responsibility by the commander, and the suggestion of expected retribution. Each of these has a general parallel in the Tacitean account. In the first part, Lucan concentrates on the physical features of the grove itself and the suggestion of supernatural fear they create (399–425), while Tacitus describes the human specters that stand before the sacred grove of Mona. Both have the same effect; the soldiers stand immobile. Lucan describes them as "implicitas magno . . . torpore cohortes" (vs. 432); Tacitus (*Ann.* 14. 30. 1–2) as "novitate aspectus perculere militem, ut quasi haerentibus membris immobile corpus vulneribus praeberent." Caesar acts dramatically, seizing the axe and applying it to the grove with the words, "iam nequis vestrum dubitet subvertere silvam / credite me fecisse nefas" (436–37). The participation of Suetonius Paullinus is less dramatic, but his responsibility is made clear by phrases like *cohortationibus ducis* and *haec agenti Suetonio*.

As Phillips points out, the expectation of retribution for the act of Caesar is strong among the Massiliotes, but not necessarily

2. The general background of the campaign of Suetonius Paullinus is discussed in S. Frere, *Britannia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 87–88; D. Dudley and G. Webster, *The Rebellion of Boudicca* (New York, 1962), pp. 41–60.

3. The source is Dio 62. 2. 1–2. The veracity of the statement has been disputed. See R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), pp. 762–63; G. Walser, *Rom, das Reich und d. fremden Völker* . . . (Basle, 1951), p. 133.

4. The Editor has pointed out to me the several scenes employing sacred groves in the plays of Seneca (*Thyestes* 651 ff.; *Herc. Oet.* 1618 ff.; *Oed.* 530 ff.). While it is tempting to relate this to Seneca's familiarity with events in Britain (where some knowledge of the sactuary of Mona must have been available before the campaign of Suetonius Paullinus), still this means establishing a firm chronology for the dramas of Seneca which does not seem possible on the present evidence.

fulfilled (p. 300). Tacitus does not specifically raise this issue. However, his account closes with the ominous words "haec agenti Suetonio repentina defectio provinciae nuntiatur."

It is highly probable that Lucan and Tacitus both knew of the events on Mona from first-hand sources. To a certain degree, the relation of the structures of the two accounts may reflect this. However, more direct influence possibly existed.[5] It may be observed that Lucan ends his account with an epigram that might well have caught the eye of Tacitus:[6] "... servat multos fortuna nocentes, / et tantum miseris irasci numina possunt" (448–49)

The second example of sacrilege that could have interested Lucan had taken place sixty years before Caesar besieged Massilia and was considered one of the classic scandals of the Roman Republic. In 106 B.C. Q. Servilius Caepio attacked the tribe of the Volci Tectosages in the Toulouse area. In the course of this attack, he looted the tribal sanctuary which was particularly rich in dedications in valuable metals. Divine retribution was not long in following. Caepio was one of the Roman commanders at the disastrous battle of 105 B.C. at Orange, and was condemned in 104 or 103 B.C.[7]

The whole affair became a *cause célèbre* and received ample mention in the various classical authors. Cicero refers to it twice (*Nat. deor.* 3. 30. 74; *De. or.* 2. 28. 124). Justin in his epitome of Pompeius Trogus makes the connection between the sacrilege and military disaster clear with the statement "Quod sacrilegium causa excidii Caepioni exercituique eius postea fuit. Romanos quoque Cimbrici belli tumultus, velut ultor sacrae pecuniae, insecutus est" (32. 3. 9–11). The account in Strabo is the most interesting. His information was drawn from Timagenes with some corrections from Posidonius. After discussing the possibility that some of the treasure at Toulouse was loot taken from Delphi, he goes on to say, "and it was on account of having laid hands on them that Caepio ended his life in misfortune, for he was cast out by his native land as a temple robber and he left behind as his heirs female children only, who, as it turned out, became prostitutes, as Timagenes has said, and therefore perished in disgrace . . ." (4. 1. 13). Whatever may be thought of the lurid details in the Strabo-Timagenes account, it is possible to see that the author was conceiving the Caepio story in terms of the archetypal sacrilege which Phillips sees as relevant to the episode in the *Bellum civile*.

Lucan may well have become familiar with the Toulouse sacrilege in the course of his reading in the history of the late Republic. Both the sacrilege at Toulouse and the events surrounding the siege of Massilia took place in Gaul and were intimately bound up with the history of the area. It is not impossible that Lucan was acquainted with the works of Timagenes, especially since the latter had written on the activities of Pompey.[8] Indeed, it is tempting to think of the combination of the past action of a Roman general in Gaul narrated in the pattern of Timagenes and the current deeds of another general in Britain stimulating Lucan's thought on the relation of historical action and mythological process.

STEPHEN L. DYSON
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

5. L. Robbert, *De Tacito Lucani imitatore* (Göttingen, 1917); R. Syme, *op. cit.*, pp. 142–43; E. Paratore, *Tacito*[2] (Rome, 1962), pp. 255–58.

6. For a comparable Tacitean example, see *Hist.* 1. 3. 2: "non esse curae deis securitatem nostram, esse ultionem."

7. For his career, see Münzer, "Q. Servilius Caepio" (49) in *RE*, 2e R., IIA (1923), 1783 ff.

8. For the place of Timagenes in the Roman culture of Augustus, see G. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 123–26.

HOMER *ODYSSEY* 21. 406–9

ὡς ὅτ' ἀνὴρ φόρμιγγος ἐπιστάμενος καὶ ἀοιδῆς
ῥηϊδίως ἐτάνυσσε νέῳ περὶ κόλλοπι χορδήν,
ἄψας ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐϋστρεφὲς ἔντερον οἰός,
ὡς ἄρ' ἄτερ σπουδῆς τάνυσεν μέγα τόξον Ὀδυσσεύς.

Merry, in claiming that "the insertion of a fresh peg and the fixing of a new string in the φόρμιγξ is the most ordinary piece of routine with a musician,"[1] is only half right. It is

1. W. W. Merry, *Homer: "Odyssey," Books XIII–XXIV* (Oxford, 1878), *ad loc.*