

MEMBERS ONLY? THE NON-AGGRESSION OF PHALLUSES IN LUCILIAN SATIRE¹

IAN GOH

Recently, a claim from a British Museum exhibition catalogue caught my eye (Roberts 2013.52): “The Romans saw nothing shocking in this—the protective phallus was everywhere in Roman culture. Intentionally erotic Roman imagery certainly exists, but most ‘sexualized’ or ‘eroticized’ images were seen by Romans as symbols of fertility, amulets of good fortune, or just comic.” In this article, I want to read some fragments of Gaius Lucilius (180–103/2 B.C.E.), the supposed founder of the one truly Roman genre, verse satire (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.93), against the supposed ubiquity of the phallus in Roman life.

Juvenal’s splenetic and cartoonish portrayal of women in his sixth satire, and of Naevolus’s and Virro’s joint exploits in his ninth, plus Horace’s diatribe about sex in *Satires* 1.2, among others, have taught students of satire to be on the lookout for obscenity as a marker of “frank talk,” an announcement that these poems that embody *libertas* will not shy away from the “facts of life,” even as their speakers turn out to be addled and unreliable. The words for genitalia are supposedly standard elements in this genre of aggressive, streetwise poetry.² And the republican inaugurator of the tradition was apparently a raunchy bachelor (Christes 1971.17, 60) who refused to grow up and settle down. Splattering the page with obscenities,

1 With thanks to the organisers of and audience at the Classical Association Annual Conference 2015, especially Tom Geue, and to Amy Coker, who read a version of this paper in my absence; also to the anonymous reviewers and editors of *Arethusa*, and to Anna Chahoud and Emily Gowers. Translations of Lucilius are my own, based on those in Warmington 1938.

2 John Henderson 1989.54–57; I treat a related issue, an instance of euphemism, in Goh 2016–17.

he celebrated his sexual conquests and purveyed a macho image with a tone “savage and jolly at the same time” (Richlin 1992.169). But is it true that the activities we associate with the phallus, urination and ejaculation, typify Lucilius, such that the “single common element in Lucilius’s attitudes is that of staining” (Richlin 1992.170)? Rather, is there not a conservative strain of self-control to satire?³ I will argue that the Lucilian fragments which seem to involve the appearance of penises need to be reinterpreted in a less overtly sexual light. Indeed, we have in Lucilius no parallels for Horace’s three deliberate uses in *Satires* 1 of the term *cunnius*, “vagina,” even if my Cook’s tour below will encompass references to *ψωλόζ*, *caulis*, and *mutto* (all words for penis).⁴

If we approach the question through the lens of genre, we find several possible models for Lucilius’s super-sized poetic mode. Firstly, we can turn to Horace’s infamous and important claim at the opening of *Satires* 1.4 that the Old Comedians served as Lucilius’s inspiration. Eupolis, Aristophanes, and Cratinus are named (*Sat.* 1.4.1), and Lucilius is said to “depend utterly” (“hinc omnis pendet Lucilius,” 1.4.6) on these authors. While Horace cites the Old Comedians primarily because they supposedly savaged their enemies in public (*notabant*, 1.4.5), the phallus featured prominently in costumes for performances of their plays.⁵ While these are usually “wholly within the fictional world” (Ruffell 2011.240) and not referred to self-consciously, the very prominence of the visual element in the theatre puts the phallus front and centre; in contrast, the lack of an acting component in satire and the concomitant reliance on

3 See Chahoud 2011.380–82 on the absence of more than innuendo in satire; cf. Steenblock 2013.35–50. I am gratified to discover the positing of refinements to Richlin by Beard 2014.105–08.

4 Cf. Petronius, who mostly avoids primary obscenities (Schmeling 2011.xxvi). I define these, after Jeffrey Henderson 1991.35, as references to the “sexual organs, excrement or the acts which involve them.” As for Lucilius’s reference to *eugium* (“hymen”) in *Hymnis sine eugio* (“Hymnis without maidenhead”: the fragment’s only discernible words) at 896 Warmington = 940–41 Marx, see Adams 1982.83 for a discussion, although the argument that *eugium* must mean *cunnius* is weakened by the state of the words transmitted immediately preceding *Hymnis (sine podice*, “without an anus,” is Marx’s conjecture for the transmitted *in epodis*, “in the epodes”). The hopelessly corrupt reference seems to involve the *lack* of the obscene object.

5 On the question of the comic body, cf., e.g., von Möllendorff 1995.74–90, Foley 2000, Revermann 2006.145–59, and, recently, Compton-Engle 2015.24–26, 40–43. See Marshall 2006.62–66 for the question of whether the actors of Roman comedies wore phalluses as part of their costume.

the text arguably lessens the (deliberate) outrageousness when a phallus appears.⁶

Moreover, in Old Comedy, comic obscenity is “strongly identified as masculine through the figure of the comic buffoon” (McClure 1999.205). Was Lucilius a buffoon? Invective language and obscenity are typical both of the more overtly public works of Old Comedy and of the iambic poetry of the private symposium, and much has been made of the cross-pollination between these modes, with particular focus on literary rivalry and self-presentation (a treatment pioneered by Rosen 1988). As far as the phallus is concerned, though, there is a difference between stylised banter about masculine prowess and the presentation of comic wretchedness or paradox via actors’ underclothes.⁷ We should also note that the Hellenistic world was also well used to the public presentation of phalluses.⁸

At Rome, by contrast, iambic had a particular impact on the poetry of Catullus, which contains memorable examples of hyper-masculine invective featuring what is essentially penis wagging (such as the famous poem 16, with its immortal opening and closing line, “pedicabo ego uos et irrumabo,” “I’ll bugger you and fill your mouths”). A key concern is the public nature of phallic display, as with Catullus 37, which figures itself as the scrawl of *sopiones*, comic cartoon graffiti, on the walls of a bar-cum-brothel (Ruffell 2003.41–42). And farcical mime surely featured the phallus in public in scenarios such as the well-known adultery mime, famously imitated at (among others) the close of Horace’s *Satires* 1.2. Lucilius was much later classed together with a mime-writer (Pomponius) by the Christian writer Arnobius for having apparently situated his poetry in a brothel: “quia Fornicem Lucilianum et Marsyam Pomponi obsignatum memoria continetis” (“because you have fixed in your memory the Bordello of Lucilius and the Marsyas of Pomponius,” Arnob. *Adv. Gent.* 2.6).⁹

6 For the un-Old Comic nature of Horace’s phallus in the *Satires*, see Ferriss-Hill 2015.53–55, where Lucilius is only mentioned in terms of the city/country divide (see 102 on the possible derivation of *satura* from satyr play; the low-key nature of this relation in extant satire precludes that genre’s phalluses from appearing in this survey).

7 See Hughes 2011.181–83: “While the ritual *phallos* may be erect and fertile, the comic article is invariably flaccid and impotent” (84). Green 2006.146–50 is good on the gradual transition from long, dangling *phalloi* to tied or looped-up examples.

8 See, e.g., Fischer 1999, with Athen. 5.201e. Csapo 2013 treats the Dionysiac procession at Athens.

9 Though the manuscripts transmit *Lucialinum*, which all editors emend to *Lucilianum*, at least one other reading, *Caecilianum*, is possible. See on the adultery mime, McKeown 1979, Fantham 1989, and Freudenburg 1993.46; cf. Newman 1990.143–44 for Arnobius

Yet even in Catullus, such untrammelled, aggressive masculinity coexists with sappy, love-struck attitudes to women.¹⁰ Taking a cue from such resistance to compartmentalisation, we should also consider that Lucilius may have written at least part of his corpus in a proto-elegiac vein.¹¹ His Book 21 (of which we have no fragments) was apparently entitled *Collyra*,¹² in the same familiar way that later books of poems written in elegiac metre would be named for the poet's mistress; *Cynthia* for Propertius's *Monobiblos* is a prominent example.¹³ Lucilius's Books 22–25 perhaps contained elegiac couplets, although our meagre remains do not reveal much.¹⁴ The elegiac poet devoted to his mistress needs to be reconciled with the Don Juan who thinks with his penis and for whom women are only good for a quick lay.¹⁵ This article suggests that the synthesis can be achieved in a way more convincing than the observation that “there are gradations in the attitude expressed in Lucilius's poems” (Richlin 1992.166).

Of course, the fragmentary state of Lucilius's poetry means that his work is a happy hunting ground for proponents of speculation. Every critic brings his or her own expectations to a close reading, and one can

-
- and now the hypothesis of Panayotakis 2010.319 on Laberius 45 Panayotakis, which bears a resemblance (concerning as it does remnants of excrement on testicles) with Lucilius 1182 Warmington = 1186 Marx, discussed below. On mime's mimesis, see Beard 2014.167–72.
- 10 The similarities between Catullus and Lucilius in terms of the writing of personal poetry have been outlined in detail by Hass 2007, especially 19–29. See also Newman 1990.66–69 and now Roman 2014.35–36. Hutchinson 2012.76 n. 49 is not right, I think, to posit that Lucilius's love poetry and satire (whatever this meant to the poet) occupied separate books.
- 11 As compared to Roman comedy, Lucilius's poetry moves beyond that genre's outdoor scenarios into the bedroom and mentions obscenities to a greater extent—if we ignore Plautus's and Terence's references to rape: see Auhagen 2001.13–19.
- 12 Porphyrio tells us, in commenting on Horace's *C.* 1.22.10 (the Lalage ode), that “just so is the 16th Book of Lucilius inscribed as *Collyra*, and it is written about his girlfriend Collyra.” Cichorius 1908.94 suggests the change from XVI to XXI, since Book 16 seems not to contain any fragments suggesting such a focus on a single mistress. Richlin 1992.166 acknowledges these erotic elements in Lucilius's poetry (also at 44–45).
- 13 When Horace's travelling party is joined by Maecenas, he smears *nigra collyria* (“black ointment,” *Sat.* 1.5.30) on his eyes, ostensibly to help with his conjunctivitis: is this a retrospective staining of Lucilius's beloved Collyra?
- 14 Of the lines commonly attached to Book 22, two are single pentameters as transmitted, an elegiac couplet is preserved by Donatus, and one, 628 Warmington = 583 Marx, was assigned to Book 22 by Lachmann (Book 12 is the reference given by Nonius), on the grounds that, as preserved, it fits a pentameter.
- 15 Essentially the dichotomy posed at Hass 2007.116: does Lucilian satire count as proto-elegy or Roman comedy?

only hope that the Lucilius here disinterred is at least plausible, in spite of fact that the text of Lucilius, largely derived from citations in the much later dictionary of Nonius Marcellus, is something of a mess, and notwithstanding the general incoherence and lack of certainty over which persona is speaking—whether in the voice of the author or not. One relevant illustration of the difficulties is a fragment that describes a prize specimen of livestock, which we might colloquially call “the dog’s bollocks” (“A1” in alternative parlance), regarding which A. E. Housman vehemently and memorably castigated Marx for his interpretation of *pellicula* (559–61 Warmington = 534–36 Marx):¹⁶

“ibat forte aries,” inquit, “iam quod genus! quantis
testibus! uix uno filo hosce haerere putares,
pellicula extrema exaptum pendere onus ingens”

“There went by chance a ram,” said he, “and what a breed!
How huge his cods were! You’d think they were stuck
on by scarcely so much as a single thread, that this huge
load hung fastened to the outside of his hide.”

The rustic context, typical of obscene Latin,¹⁷ masks literary implications that result from the approval of the ram’s physical features.¹⁸ The mime writer Laberius would later call a ram *testitrahus* (“testicle dragging,” 154 Ribbeck), in a line (noteworthy for its “acoustic effect”; Panayotakis 2010.429) which could be a reminiscence of Lucilius’s description. I even think we could see here in Lucilius Odysseus clinging to the bottom of Polyphemus’s ram (*Od.* 9.432–34, 444–45), though Lucilius’s Odyssean fragments seem only to come from the next book, 17. However, the picture of a ram carrying a heavy weight on its underside would surely cause one,

16 Housman 1907.66: *pellicula* means *tergore*, “fleece” (lit. “on the back,” as at *Juv.* 1.11). Even Warmington 1938.176 professes surprise: “Marx takes *pellicula* in the sense of fore-skin; how I do not know.”

17 Adams 1982.57, 71 takes the reading of genitalia in these lines at face value in discussing “verbs of hanging” (*pendere*) and the testicles as a “burden” (*onus*).

18 Williams 2010.350 cites this Lucilian passage in support of the argument that Roman males admired well-endowed peers. Schlegel 2005.163 seems tempted to connect the fragment with *Hor. Sat.* 1.9, with its picture of the Pest clinging onto the Horatian persona. Hass 2007.128 interprets the scene, as does Krenkel 1970.79 (though with different emphasis: “he said” or “she said?”), as a bedroom argument. Fiske 1920.167–68 reads a fable here.

on rereading, to think of Odysseus if the satirist had compared himself to Odysseus elsewhere.¹⁹ But certainty is not forthcoming.

Putting aside such guesswork, it is undeniable that the Lucilian fragments whose subject matter is sordid raise important questions of value, readership, and intent. Our subject is nonetheless frequently treated with kid gloves in the scholarly literature, which pruriently expresses displeasure at Lucilian obscenity or, conversely, avers that Lucilius, as the first of all the high-status Roman poets, was out to shock his audience by saying the unsayable.²⁰ If Horace is right to claim (*Sat.* 2.1.71–74) that Lucilius was a friend of the good and great (of the order of Scipio Aemilianus and Laelius), then Lucilius’s output amounts to seedy portrayals of the demi-monde for their eyes only. Given the argument that Ennius likely did not incorporate obscenity into his poetry because he was from a lower social stratum (Petersmann 1999.296), should we assume that Lucilius was given carte blanche for obscenity because he could be considered a bantering mate for the ruling class? With Anna Chahoud (2011.382), we can usefully compare Horace, like Lucilius, a member of the equestrian class.²¹ In *Satires* 1.2, the diatribe satirist is really writing about a form of moderation for excessive behaviour (Gibson 2007.19–24), creatively utilising a mix of commanding genres and voices, including didactic (see, e.g., Jones 2007.118–20). Such repurposing of authoritative literature may have some humorous value, which is only made possible by the relatively high floor of the author’s social status.

Throughout this discussion, we shall see Horace reinterpreting Lucilius (dead and therefore unable to answer back in defence) in ways which could be said to put a suggestive spin on Horace’s character assassination of his predecessor. In some ways, the aim here is to present a somewhat cleaner Lucilius and a somewhat dirtier Horace. Of course, I am not

19 Cf., e.g., Cucchiarelli 2001.30 with bibliography on Hor. *Sat.* 1.5 as the *Odyssey* (which would imply Lucilius Book 3, on which Horace’s poem is also based), in the course of his persuasive argument (15–55) that it is equally a rewrite of Aristophanes’ *Frogs*. See Bain 2007.40–43 on μήδεα vs. μέζεα to mean “testicles” in Hesiod; also Rosen 2007.228 on Naevolus as a Siren at Juv. 9.147–50 (and 240–41 on Virro’s apples at Juv. 5.149–52).

20 Hass 2007.112–34 presents a Lucilius whose obscenities are emblematic of a personal perspective (see 121 on how they typify a “Liebhaber”). Gruen 1992, an influential reading, severely underplays the richness of Lucilius’s apparently lived experience and ignores almost all of the obscene fragments in the service of his identification of the satirist as a “conventional moralist” (309). However, the analysis of Lucilius as not evincing “deep-felt misogyny” (286) chimes with the project of this article.

21 Hooley 1999 assimilates both Lucilius and Horace as close to authority.

advocating that Horace on Lucilius *has* to be read in that particular fashion, merely that the possibility for a wanton or obsessive reader exists. Nor am I claiming that Horace directly alludes to certain Lucilian passages which have conveniently been preserved; I merely posit that Horace on occasion refers back to what his readers might remember of Lucilius.

Indeed, we should not assume that any satirist's audience was naive to start with.²² Lucilius's packaging of obscene terminology for noble consumption may have been the tongue-in-cheek, provocative way of saying of what usually went unspoken. After all, it is well established that references to obscenity, however veiled, had a role to play in the courtroom,²³ which is interesting since at least two of Lucilius's books, the first and second of the mature hexameter collection, featured such law-court scenes. And at a finer grained level, consider the knowing statement of Cicero (*Orat.* 154): "quid, illud non olet unde sit, quod dicitur cum illis, cum autem nobis non dicitur, sed nobiscum? quia si ita diceretur, obscenius concurrerent litterae, ut etiam modo, nisi autem interposuissem, concurrissent," "Is it not perfectly plain why we say *cum illis*, but use *nobiscum* rather than *cum nobis*? If the latter were used, the letters would coalesce and produce an obscene meaning, as they would have done in this sentence unless I had placed *autem* between *cum* and *nobis*" (trans. Hubbell).

Cicero coyly points out that he nearly mentioned the obscenity *cunnus* in the course of his explanation but refrained from so doing.²⁴ The collection of Lucilian penises which now follows in this article shows the satirist, though lacking quite so much subtlety—and possessing a more robust vocabulary—engaging in a similar play with language and holding back from obscenity. His authority is similar to that of Cicero in that social status plays a role and, on occasion, Lucilius is also engaging in instruction or, at least, in a mocking version of didactic practices, as with the spelling rules of his Book 9.²⁵

22 Freudenburg's (2001.275–77) analysis that the audience of Juvenal 5 is wrong-footed by the sub-Lucilian "sideshow routine" he provides does not, I think, take into account that Lucilius's own act may have promised but not delivered the goods. See Rosen 2007.241 n. 41 for a similar comment on "frustration" being what we expect from a satirist.

23 See, e.g., Corbeill 1996.104–06 on Cicero's own practice (106–24 on *Verr.* 2.3 and *Dom.*; 124–27 on the class implications of *os impurum*, "impure speech"—more than just a potty mouth). On the performativity problem, see Ziolkowski 1998.43–46.

24 On the general alertness to such *cacemphata* (i.e., "possibilities of inadvertently obscene speech"), see Ziolkowski 1998.33. Cf. the bilingual pun on the Greek name Konnos at *Fam.* 9.22.3, with Richlin 1992.18–26.

25 Cf. Rosen 2007.222–23 on the "vener of didacticism" in Juvenal 9.

FORTIFICATIONS AND FANS

In tandem with such derring-do, however, the first penis I wish to consider is also Ciceronian and (surprise!) may not be a penis at all. It seems to appear in a metaphor in a letter to Atticus. Having sent his *Second Philippic* to Atticus for criticism, Cicero has presumably been told that he need not shield his friend Sicca, who has something to do with the freedman Fadius, while still attacking Antony (Cic. *Att.* 16.11.1): “itaque perstringam sine ulla contumelia Siccae aut Septimiae, tantum ut sciant παῖδες παίδων sine uallo Luciliano eum ex C. Fadi filia liberos habuisse,” “So I shall touch on it, without any offence to Sicca or Septimia, just enough to make posterity aware with no Lucilian coarseness [?], that he [Antony] had children by C. Fadius’s daughter.”²⁶

The phrase *uallo Luciliano* has also been read as φαλλῶ *Luciliano* (a Lucilian phallus, i.e., obscenity; hence it belongs to this collection of penises), and certainty is lacking. However, both of these options are worthy of comment if we approach the phrase without the assumption that *sine ulla contumelia* and *sine uallo Luciliano* must mean similar things.²⁷ They do not both refer to Sicca and Septimia. If it is a Lucilian penis to which Cicero refers, his meaning is not necessarily that he is making his claim without the iambic speech supposedly practised by Lucilius. Instead, he will make the allusion to untoward behaviour with a freedman’s daughter without the safety of an apotropaic Lucilian emblem, without cloaking it as a private matter, and without carefree festive or ritual banter. Certainly, Cicero is keeping something in reserve, as the sentences before and after that reproduced above show; the former (though corrupt, see Shackleton Bailey 1967 ad loc.) ends: “I scarcely held myself back” (*aegre me tenui*), while the letter continues by bemoaning the lack of licence to speak: “atque utinam eum diem uideam cum ista oratio ita libere uagetur <ut> etiam in Siccae domum introeat! sed illo tempore opus est quod fuit illis III uiris. moriar nisi facete!” “I only wish I may live to see the day when that speech

26 420 Shackleton Bailey. See Ramsey 2003.164–65 for comment on the final version at *Phil.* 2.3. Corbeill 1996.215–16 notes how the immediately following joke serves as an ironic and macabre premonition of Cicero’s death.

27 An anonymous reader suggests that the *sine* here could mean “allow,” which would indicate that Cicero actually is employing Lucilius to say “please forgive me the use of a Lucilian screen or euphemism,” referring to the Greek words or the formal phrase *liberos habuisse*, both of which are opaque ways of skating over Antony’s relationship with Fadia.

[sc. the *Second Philippic*] circulates freely enough even to enter Sicca's house. What we need is to get back to the days of the Domestic Committee of Three! Pretty good that!"

The problem is that the "joke" itself (as Shackleton Bailey 1967 ad loc. explains) seems to be a reference to Fulvia's promiscuity with three husbands (Clodius, Curio, and Antony), implies naughtily that Clodius was cuckolded by Curio and Antony even when Fulvia was married to him, and casts the triumvirate as husband material. This subtle but still sexual joke gives the lie to Cicero's profession of being without a "Lucilian phallus," even if we take the phrase (and the phallus) conventionally as a symbol of lascivious wit.

As for *uallum*, we should recall that it was used in a military metaphor by Horace to describe the obstacle to seducing a matron: her clothing (*Sat.* 1.2.96–99, with Gigante 1993.84–85). Even if *uallo* is accepted in the letter to Atticus, some think what is referred to is the short and sharp-pointed stake (*uallus*) used to build a stockade (*uallum*)—and thus is an indication that Cicero wants to write without Lucilian invective.²⁸ But *uallum* could also denote the entire defensive palisade. Instead of—or as well as—alluding to Lucilius's diatribes, Cicero might be referring to his own gift for euphemism. The advantage of this reading is that the phrase *sine uallo Luciliano* would indicate that posterity will receive the entire truth about Antony from Cicero's *Philippics* 2. If, as is quite possible, Cicero (our only source) made up this indiscretion concerning Antony's youthful marriage to the daughter of a freedman,²⁹ this truth is actually not one at all. The equivocation of hedging is the result of a sense of awkwardness or shame about the wrong things one has done; Cicero will not waver but make his claim explicitly in the speech. Therefore, Lucilius's poetry, in contrast, was not so much aggressively phallic as pre-emptively self-protecting.

Interestingly, if Cicero's root word is *uallus* rather than *uallum*, this could mean a "winnowing-fan" (*OLD* 2). Now Lucilius did mention this rustic utensil, a Bacchic tool perhaps especially appropriate to describe

28 Marx 1904–05.2 ad loc. thinks that *vallum* as "stake" (just like *hasta*, "spear," or *cuspis*, "spear point") is meant to stand for a phallic object. Shackleton Bailey (1967.299) cautiously approves but also cites the conjecture *felle*, "with bile," for *vallo*. Svarlien (1989.124–25) argues for the stake but notes its inapplicability in a case like this.

29 Babcock 1965.13 claims the marriage was not formalised; Huzar 1986–87.97 disagrees.

a woman,³⁰ in erotic contexts, though only through alluding to its alternative spelling *uannus* in his choice of a verb, *uanno*. This occurs twice, once in the apples-and-oranges choice proposed between boys and women as sexual objects: “hunc molere, illam autem ut frumentum uannere lumbis,” “[I can make] this boy grind, but as for her, she’ll be winnowing corn with her thighs” (302 Warmington = 278 Marx), and again: “crisabit ut si frumentum clunibus uannat,” “She’ll bounce as though she were winnowing corn with her buttocks” (361 Warmington = 330 Marx).³¹ The winnowing-fan is a sexual metaphor for a woman’s movement during intercourse, and it is perhaps odd or deliberate that the two major possibilities for the word which Cicero wrote are, essentially, the sexual parts of either men or women respectively.³² Still, again, the claim not to be mentioning a Lucilian image is belied by Cicero’s fixation on the sexual dangers of Antony (and Fulvia); he knows Atticus, who has read the speech, is aware that the maintenance of decorum is merely a fiction.³³ I ended the last section with Lucilius Book 9, filled with grammatical and syntactical rule-giving, and the *crisabit* fragment just discussed comes from that book: is it possible that Cicero is exploiting a Lucilian explication of a facetious etymological story in a definition of *vannus* or *vanno*?

FAILURE

That easy use of Greek in Cicero’s private correspondence can be compared with its frequent Lucilian appearances (as Horace would memorably chastise in *Satire* 1.10.20–30).³⁴ Less demurely perhaps, a seduction scene

30 Cf. Verg. *G.* 1.166: *mystica uannus Iacchi*, “mystic fan of Bacchus,” and the Bacchana-lian affair as described by Liv. 39.8–19. I think Richlin 1992.166 is wrong to assign the action here to a man. See Classen 1996.18 on such “country matters” (Shakespeare *Hamlet* 3.ii.116) as typically risqué for Lucilius.

31 So *criso* “indicated the motions of the female in intercourse” (Adams 1982.136); cf. ps.-Acro on Hor. *S.* 2.7.50 and Juvenal 6.322. This is a generally accepted conjecture, since the Nonian manuscripts have *curisait*, “ran to and fro”—the sexual context is certainly likelier, if not explicit.

32 Perhaps a similar equivocation can be seen in 167 Warmington = 174–76 Marx: “quod si nulla potest mulier tam corpore duro | esse, tamen tenero manet, qui sucus lacerto, | et manus uberibus lactanti in sumine sidat” (“But if no woman can be so hard in body [as a man is], she who still has sap oozing within a tender sinew, whose hand may sink on milky teat and dugs . . .”); the equivalence of man and woman is complicated by the pun of *sucus*/σῦκον, “fig,” slang for a woman’s genitals. The reading here (Warmington’s) is not certain.

33 For other kinds of fiction in *Philippics* 2, see, e.g., Dugan 2005.337–38.

34 See, e.g., Hutchinson 2013.153–56 with copious bibliography.

that goes wrong may indicate that Greek was the language of pillow talk (331–32 Warmington = 303–04 Marx):

cum poclo bibo eodem, amplector, labra labellis
fictricis conpono, hoc est cum psolocopumai,

When I drink from the same cup, when I embrace, when
I place my lips to the little lips of the deceiver, that is
when “I’m racked with tension.” (trans. Rudd 1986.166)

He drinks, he embraces, he kisses—but what does *psolocopumai*, a transliteration of the Greek ψωλοκοποῦμαι (“to be affected with priapism,” as the LSJ supplement decorously has it) entail? Clearly the code switching encloses something obscene (despite Hass 2007.94). The compound verb is only elsewhere extant, in the active, in the margin to *P.Lond.* 604 B col. 7 (first identified by Crönert 1910.470–71, see Adams 2003.361), with τὸν ἀναγιγνώσκοντα (“the reader”) as the object. Even there, it is unclear whether the implication is that the reader is merely “affected with priapism” or ejaculation occurs.

Horace’s *Satires* 1.2, seen as a parallel by Wilfried Stroh (2000.25), gives a possible imitation, describing an erection and perhaps its payoff (*Sat.* 1.2.116–18):

tument tibi cum inguina, num si
ancilla aut uerna est praesto puer, impetus in quem
continuo fiat, malis tentigine rumpi?

When your loins are swollen, if a maidservant or a household slave-boy is on the spot and you can attack them straightaway, do you prefer to be broken by your hard-on?

Here Horace “Latinizes the technical Grecism” (Gowers 2012.114) of Lucilius’s *psolocopumai*—and to describe a lack of sexual success because the addressee is putatively too picky.³⁵ So does that mean that Lucilius’s usage also featured an unhappy ending? While I am trying to avoid circularity, if Horace’s verb [*rumpi*] is passive, is ψωλοκοποῦμαι

35 One anonymous reader notes that “*rumpere* cannot mean orgasm as the situation makes abundantly clear,” but I am not so sure that the passive verb precludes the release of the sexual tension.

also passive? In Attic Comedy, female speakers use the passive voice when they refer to themselves and males use the active (Bain 1991.55). Would this apply here? Even if the verb is in the middle voice, it could perhaps be derived from a Greek verb such as κόπτειν (“to hit”),³⁶ a verb which could be used as a synonym for *futuere*.³⁷ Assuming a simultaneous occurrence with the other actions, if Lucilius’s *hoc est cum* is temporal, then it could describe premature ejaculation, with the planned sexual encounter curtailed when the protagonist comes too soon.³⁸ If the Greek “also had a distancing effect” (Adams 2003.362), then this may be a case of the speaker’s unconscious revulsion at his own inadequacy. Compare, though, Archilochus’s Cologne Epode (frag. 196a West), where the delicately described encounter with the younger daughter of Lycambes takes place among the flowers (v. 28), mention of which mirrors the earlier language of cornice, gates, and grass (v. 14, 16) and Neobule’s over-ripened flower (vv. 17–18). In that case, the (likely but much debated) comic premature ejaculation introduces a completely unexpected and alien component with its “white force I sent out” (λευκὸν ἀφῆκα μένος, v. 35); yet the impact is graphic.

However, anyone who read the word ψωλός in conjunction with a verb that means “to cut” would not necessarily understand the noun to imply “with foreskin pushed back,” meaning an erection.³⁹ It could also mean “circumcised, with the foreskin cut away” (ἀπεψωλημένος).⁴⁰ Since κόπτειν can also mean “to cut,” the pun is enforced by repetition: the smooth seduction culminates in a painful operation.⁴¹ The Lucilian fragment with *psolocopumai* could be related to Horace’s mentions of Jews near the ends of poems (three times in *Satires* 1).⁴² The last is an especially Lucil-

36 Another possibility is κόπτειν/κυπτάζειν, which itself has a confused meaning: in comedy, it implies bending forward for penetration from behind, but in other poetry, it denotes fellatio; cf. Sophr. 39, 41. See also Jeffrey Henderson 1991.179–80, 183. A middle or passive here could easily be interpreted as denoting a male being penetrated; we should not assume that Lucilius was clear, rather than coy, about what actually happened.

37 See Adams 1982.145–49 for Latin verbs meaning “Strike’ and the like” (his title at 145) as synonyms for sexual acts.

38 If *hoc est = id est* (“i.e.”), *psolocopumai* still constitutes seductive foreplay: the protagonist is “raring to go.”

39 Cf. Ar. *Eq.* 965–66, *Av.* 507, and *Av.* 560 (there feminine ψωλή); see Dunbar 1995.347.

40 Cf. Ar. *Ach.* 161, *Ach.* 591–92, and *Pl.* 267, the last modifying αὐτόν (“an old man”).

41 Note that Persius’s estimation that Lucilius *secuit . . . urbem* (“cut up the city,” 1.114) can be interpreted as a surgical manoeuvre (cf. Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli 2005.210 on “the satirist’s role as healer” in Lucilius).

42 Namely, *Sat.* 1.4.142–43, *Sat.* 1.5.100, and *Sat.* 1.9.69–70; see Gowers 2012.152 and ad locc.

ian context (Horace is saved from the Pest by Apollo, in an adaptation of his predecessor's quotation of Homer),⁴³ and there the circumcision joke, already an explicit example of low humour with its addition of the bodily function of "farting in the faces of the curtailed Jews," is enhanced when Aristius, Horace's friend, refuses to save him *sub cultro*, "from under the knife" (*Sat.* 1.9.74).⁴⁴ So if Lucilius's *psolocopumai* concerns circumcision and implicates Jews, the fragment could, as in the Horatian example, be a closural motif from near the end of a Lucilian poem. Whether or not circumcision, as mentioned by the later satirists (Döpp 2008), already had a Jewish cast in Lucilius, it is possible that the operation was seen as an insult to manliness via a conflation of circumcision and castration (cf. Sen. *Q. Nat.* 7.31.3).

One Lucilian character is driven to the last resort of castration in what is advertised as the taking of revenge, elaborate or maybe even ritualistic, although the idea of harming oneself to harm others seems strange or unlikely (303–05 Warmington = 279–81 Marx):

hanc ubi uult male habere, ulcisci pro scelere eius,
testam sumit homo Samiam sibi, "anu noceo" inquit,
praecidit caulem testisque una amputat ambo.

When the man wants to spite this woman and take vengeance for her crime, he takes to himself a Samian potsherd, saying, "I am hurting the old woman," and cuts off the stalk and lops off both balls at once.

Slippery meanings here include the obvious pun on *testis* ("testicle") with *testa* (Mras 1928.83) and the term *caulis*: the earliest extant

43 It has been recognised since Porphyrio that Horace, with "sic me seruauit Apollo" ("In this way, Apollo rescued me," *Sat.* 1.9.78), offers a sly riposte to a Lucilian version, "<nil> ut discrepet ac τὸν δ' ἐξήραξεν Απόλλων | fiat," "So that it may be all the same and become a case of 'and Apollo rescued him'" (267 Warmington = 231 Marx) with its Homeric quotation (*Il.* 20.443). The double invocation serves as "poetic protection": John Henderson 1998.171. Note how *eriperet* (*Sat.* 1.9.65), which could have translated the Homeric verb (cf. John Henderson 1993.85), has perhaps sinister connotations of ravishment and rape. For the Pest as Lucilius, see Ferriss-Hill 2011.

44 The superstitious Jew Apella (*α-pellis*, another circumcision joke already recorded by Ps.-Acro) in *Sat.* 1.5.100 has a suggestively similar name to Apollo, for which see Feldman 1996.511 n. 111. See also on Jewish circumcision, Gruen 2002.51–52 and Isaac 2004.472–74.

attestation of such vegetable imagery as a euphemism for the phallus (Adams 1982.26–28). That is interesting,⁴⁵ given the emphasis elsewhere in Lucilius—not to mention other satire—on the moral efficacy of members of the brassica family and other home-style vegetables, sorrel for instance (and cabbage, *holus* in that case, in Horace’s portrait of Lucilius in *Satire* 2.1).⁴⁶ So, too, the all-or-nothing response (chopping off penis *and* testicles) seems to defy the castration anxiety we might expect.⁴⁷

A similar example, which the commentators print as following soon afterwards, seems to present two unpalatable choices for the speaker: either to castrate himself or kill his wife (the oversexed matron familiar from mime, farce, and comedy: think a seedier version of Nausistrata from Terence’s *Phormio*) who is presumably cuckolding him (306–07 Warmington = 282–83 Marx):

dixi. ad principium uenio. uetulam atque uirosam
uxorem caedam potius quam castrem egomet me.

I’ve said my speech. To come to the point: I would
“strike” my petulant and man-obsessed wife rather than
castrate myself.

The self-possessed tone here, whether the speaker is being mocked or not, dramatizes the attempt to deliberate seriously over the best way out of the speaker’s dilemma and abjection. Owing to the several meanings of *caedere* (“to kill,” “to fall,” “to ‘bang’”), though, the speaker can be interpreted as not hitting or killing his wife but, even if he forces himself upon her, going meekly back not just to her but to his regular sexual routine.⁴⁸ Although *caedere* has the whiff of punishment about it (Adams 1982.145–46), the refusal to let rage overwhelm lest the speaker do

45 For *caulis* as a brassica, cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.116, 2.2.62, and 2.3.125; *colis* at Varr. *R.R.* 157.2 and Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.15. See also Gowers 1993.252–53 on the *coliculus* of Mart. 5.78.7.

46 See, e.g., 205 Warmington = 1235–40 Marx, which is the long passage in praise of sorrel (in Laelius’s mouth), preserved in Cic. *Fin.* 2.24. I discuss both the sorrel and *holus* in forthcoming book chapters.

47 Cf. the “wishful thinking” (Nikoloutsos 2007.73) of Priapus at Tib. 1.4.70, suggesting that the profit-obsessed boy who rejects a lover-poet will castrate himself in devotion to Cybele.

48 Cf. *OLD* 2, Cat. 56.7, and Laber. 15 Panayotakis. See also “ita uti quisque nostrum e bulga est matris in lucem editus,” “Just as when each of us was produced into the light from our mother’s sack” (704 Warmington = 623 Marx): business as usual resumes. Cf. Hass 2007.125–26 on “Treueproblematik.”

something stupid (*dixi* seems to indicate a measure of control) is important, especially if Lucilius or the poem's *ego* (or the stand-ins whose affairs Lucilius describes) could be interpreted as philandering like his wife (Charpin 1978.281). But *caedere* also means "to cut" (*OLD* 8): the statement therefore puns on the idea of "screwing/slicing" the wife rather than oneself. So there is a possibility of triumph after all—but it is still a hollow victory if it is only better than self-harming.

Indeed, there is possibly one Horatian nod to Lucilius which can be read as a veiled reference to these instances: the satiric successor claims that the older poet, if transported to the present day, "would often in making his verse scratch his head" ("in uersu faciendo | saepe caput scaberet," *Sat.* 1.10.70–71). While the context features attempts by the displaced Lucilius to fit into the new poetic aesthetic by self-censoring and editing down his work, the image which Horace employs is doubly slippery: not only does the word *caput* commonly denote the glans of the penis (Adams 1982.72),⁴⁹ but scratching one's head was a celebrated sign of the pathic. The gesture could be seen as effeminate if you used one finger, as in the celebrated invective of Calvus against Pompey, where the implication is either that the perpetrator's hairstyle is not to be disturbed or that the scratcher is displaying womanly nervousness (18 Courtney = 39 Hollis):⁵⁰

Magnus, quem metuunt omnes, digito caput uno
scalpit; quid dicas hunc sibi uelle? uirum!

What would you say he wants for himself? A man!

49 There is cutting, too, in the immediate context: Horace has just said that a modern-day Lucilius "recideret omne quod ultra | perfectum traheretur" ("would cut down everything dragged beyond complete," *Sat.* 1.10.69–70). For scratching (e.g., *scalpo*) in an obscene sense (implying *paedicatio*, the "practice of unnatural sexual vice"), see Adams 1982.149–50. If the suggestion seems far-fetched, consider that Horace immediately afterwards talks about making poetry worth reading ("quae legi digna sint," 1.10.72): the author (who has written a poem in this book in the voice of Priapus!) is trying to close off the possibility of these salacious interpretations of satire. Priapus refers to his "head" stained with excrement—of crows (delayed till the next line): "merdis caput inquirer albis | coruorum" ("May my head be defiled by the white shit of crows," 1.8.37–38), cf. Gowers 2012.276–77 and also 266 on the decapitation and obscenity of *truncus* and *ficulus* ("trunk," "fig-tree," 1.8.1).

50 Cf. Cicero saying the same of Caesar (Plut. *Caes.* 4.9); for "foppishness," see Kraus 2005.104–12 and Juv. 9.130–33. For not wanting to disturb one's coiffure, see Courtney 1993.210 and Williams 2010.244. Jocelyn 1996 and Hollis 2007.84 favour the interpretation of more general anxiety.

So in this subversive reading, what Horace denigratingly says Lucilius would do in Horace's own time (scratching his head—which could be metonymy for the genitals via the meaning “head of the penis”), Lucilius was already talking about doing in *his* own time (scratching—or doing worse—to the genitals); Horace makes Lucilius effeminate in a way which dramatises Lucilius's own perhaps self-mocking record of failure.

FILTH

Another scenario in Lucilius which has been interpreted by all as decidedly more erotic is actually entirely metaphorical: “permixi lectum, imposui pede pellibus labes,” “I wet the bed, I made a mess by putting my foot on the skins” (1183 Warmington = 1248 Marx). That there is a penis here at all depends on the possibility that *pes* means “penis” rather than “foot” as I have translated it.⁵¹ Some scholars think this describes a wet dream like Horace's in *Satires* 1.5.82–85:⁵²

hic ego mendacem stultissimus usque puellam
ad mediam noctem exspecto: somnus tamen aufert
intentum Veneri; tum immundo somnia uisu
nocturnam uestem maculant uentremque supinum.

Here I stupidly wait right up to midnight for a lying girl:
sleep, however, took me, though I was intent on lovemaking;
my dreams with their obscene fantasies stained my
pyjamas and my stomach as I lay on my back.

Ejaculation is still the figure for satire in its staining sense,⁵³ but Horace's graphic depiction of his sexual exploits has a sorry (and soggy) conclusion, a deliberate self-effacement. Now Lucilius's possible urination can be a “crude metaphor” for ejaculation.⁵⁴ Yet it is easy to be seduced

51 For *pes* = *mentula*, “phallus,” see Schol. Eur. *Med.* 679.

52 Fiske 1920.310–11; see also Hass 2007.100–01 and 157 (after Cichorius 1908.255), and Terzaghi 1934.298.

53 Richlin 1992.206–07 and Plaza 2006.152–53. Cf. Hor. *Ars* 470–71, *Pers.* 1.113–14, and *Juv.* 1.129–31.

54 Adams 1982.142; cf. *Cat.* 67.30, *Hor. Sat.* 2.7.52, and *Pers.* 6.73. Holzberg 2002.81 interprets *Cat.* 39's portrait of Egnatius who brushes his teeth with urine as an indication that he is a pervert given to fellatio.

by the prospect of ever more Lucilian obscenity to form a contrast with Horace's—if not exactly squeaky clean—fall guy image. A mud metaphor, for instance, is equally plausible, with Lucilius coming in from outdoors and getting dirt on the furnishings as a result. Such an interpretation would deepen Horace's judgement of Lucilius as *lutulentus*, “muddy” (*Sat.* 1.4.11, 1.10.50), implicitly a literary-critical opinion but a literal one too. That said, the famous Horatian take on Lucilius that immediately follows is complicated by “foot” as “penis”: “uersus dictabat stans pede in uno,” “He dictated his verses standing on one foot” (*Sat.* 1.4.10). Of course, this would not be actually standing, but “depending on” (*OLD* 21, cf. *OLD* 5, “becoming erect”) a single meter, namely dactylic hexameter: the resulting image is still surreal and ends up emphasising the simultaneity of the actions, with Lucilius narrating the act in the course of performing the act. Not only is Horace taking a cheap shot at his predecessor, he may be revealing a truth about his poetry: Lucilius's dedication to making a record of events is such that he must multitask.

But if regular urination is really the referent in Lucilius, we may compare a different Horatian context. Horace, or at least the diatribe speaker of *Satire* 1.3, is discussing whether a friend has urinated on a couch when drunk or has thrown on the floor “a plate rubbed by the hands of Evander” (“catillum | Euandri manibus tritum,” 1.3.90–91). Once more, there may be Lucilian parallels. Two major Lucilian commentators claim that the urination of the friend recalls Lucilius's line above,⁵⁵ and several have identified the “errant friend” of this satire with Horace himself.⁵⁶

We may agree with them in part, if we believe that Horace in the *Satires* is doing damage to Lucilius's reputation. The friend, who could be Horace in a “boorish self-portrait” (Gowers 2012.137) destroys not just any old antique but a Roman antique, as Evander is familiar as the mythical king of Pallanteum on the site of the future Rome (Verg. *Aen.* 8.97–100 and Liv. 1.7). So, too, Horace is destroying his predecessor, the *echt*-Roman satirist. A hint in this direction may be that Horace's *catillum*

55 Marx 1904–05.2.396 and Krenkel 1970.2.667 (who also offers the *Sat.* 1.5 interpretation). For the similarly drunk dinner guest (parasite?) of *Sat.* 1.4.86–90 as a representation of Lucilius, see, e.g., Anderson 1982.16–17. Those lines immediately precede a direct quotation of *Sat.* 1.2.25–27 at 1.4.91–93, on which see Feeney 2009.20–21.

56 Sharland 2010.152–53, cf. 144–46 on *Sat.* 1.3.29–37; Sharland follows Freudenburg 1993.29–33, who adapts Armstrong 1989.37–41 to take in the comic tradition of buffoonery. See Gowers 2012.136.

reflects, in the same *sedes* at the end of the line, a word used by Lucilius, *catillo*. The relevant fragment, preserved by Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.16), refers to a bottom-feeding fish, “a plate-licker of the Tiber caught between the two bridges” (“pontes Tiberinus duo inter captus catillo,” 603 Warmington = 1176 Marx).⁵⁷ Now Macrobius specifies that *catillo* was technically the term for those who came last to an offering to Hercules and were forced to lick the plates (“proprie autem catillones dicebantur qui ad polluctum Herculis ultimi cum uenirent catillos ligurribant”). If this is so, it may be significant that Horace has chosen Evander, who famously hosted and would later venerate Hercules (*Aen.* 8.184–305 and *Liv.* 1.7.3–15), as his representative of hoary antiquity and, perhaps, as his stand-in for Lucilius.⁵⁸

In any case, river-bottom mud might be no less filthy: Lucilius’s *catillo* literally “eats shit” because the major sewer of Rome emptied into the Tiber in its feeding-ground between the two bridges. Let us adduce the satirist’s nastiest line, the matter-of-fact “haec inbubinat at contra te inbulbitat,” “This woman be-bloods, but the other be-shits you” (1182 Warmington = 1186 Marx). This last example has been interpreted by the commentators as a condemnation of greedy prostitutes who seek custom despite their menstruation or diarrhoea.⁵⁹ The *in-* prefix complicates matters because it is the addressee who is doing the penetrating, while the verbs indicate that he, the self-same penetrator, is spattered by the receivers’ bodily fluids:⁶⁰ the joke is on the addressee, and he is the greedy one who loses out.

Bottoms are indeed a big deal in Lucilius: witness the line, “si natibus natricem inpressit crassam et capitatam,” “If he has pushed a thick-headed snake in his buttocks” (62 Warmington = 72 Marx). This fragment is certainly playful, with the prefix *nat-* repeated (and perhaps

57 I discuss this fragment elsewhere in forthcoming work.

58 Freudenburg 2013.333 assimilates Evander, though admittedly not in this particular context, to Ennius: “For both the Romans and the one genre they claimed was theirs, founders and foundation myths proliferate, such that for every city-founding Romulus (Lucilius) can be found an Etruscan Tarquin or ‘Lydian’ Corythus (Livy’s *ludiones*), a native Italian Latinus or Turnus (*fabula Atellana* or the *agricolae prisci* of *Hor. Epist.* 2.1.139), a Hercules (Aristophanes), or an Evander (Ennius).”

59 Despite Fest. [Paul.] 23L, “est puerili stercore inquinare” (“It means to soil with a child’s dung”), which seems to suggest that the second, anally penetrated partner, is a boy rather than a girl. Rudd 1986.166 n. 17, in this case perhaps fairly, accuses Lucilius of a dire lack of taste.

60 Johnson and Ryan 2005.159: the *in-* prefix emphasises “just how messy the process can be.”

a pun on *crassam* and *Crassus*, the son-in-law of Scaevola from the trial in Book 2, to which the fragment is assigned by Nonius).⁶¹ Yet since this is as obscene as Amy Richlin (1992.168) deems, how could it have been spoken in an official setting, as the law-court scene of Book 2 seems to have been? Further exuberant wordplay on the same theme is found in the statement, cited by Porphyrio on Horace *Odes* 1.27.1, that “podicis, Hortensi, est ad eam rem nata palaestra,” “The wrestling-school, Hortensius, is born for the purpose of the rump” (1180 Warmington = 1267 Marx). To be sure, the allusion refers to the gymnasium’s reputation as a hive of paedophilic vice; at the same time, the word *natis* (“buttock”) is hinted at by *nata* (Hass 2007.133–34), making this line more about witty word games, and holding greater (perhaps sympotic) nuance than straight invective. And one more reference to posteriors in “non peperit, uerum postica parte profudit” (“[She] did not so much give birth as pour forth from her back passage,” 111 Warmington = 119 Marx) may describe not only a fart, defecation, or episode of childbirth but, more specifically, the aetiological formation of an island such as Procida in the Bay of Naples (Gowers 2011.181–82). Again we have a mock didactic scenario.

FINAL FANTASY

It should be clear that, despite the difficulties of interpretation, we have in these fragments an odd blend of hyper-realism and fantasy. An interesting example is the line which might follow the seduction scene above because it seems to describe the aftermath of the action indicated by *psolocopumai*: “at laeua lacrimas muttoni absterget amica,” “But the girl wiped off the tears from my cock with her left hand” (335 Warmington = 307 Marx). This phallus, as a possible precursor of Horace’s talking *mutto* (“penis,” *Sat.* 2.68–72) and Persius’s “ejaculating eye” (*Sat.* 1.18), is driven to tears (Freudenburg 2001.164–65). I wonder about the specification of the “left hand.” Elsewhere in Lucilius, a woman who “et pedibus laeua Sicyonia demit honesta,” “Also, with her left hand, took the lovely Sicyonian shoes off her feet” (1157 Warmington = 1161 Marx),⁶² is using her

61 Cf. Adams 1982.31 on the possibility that this is a whip, though see Williams 2010.315–16; I agree with that analysis, that it is not the phallus which is out of order here, but the receiving of it.

62 Cf. Lucr. 4.1125, in which the Sicyonian shoes laugh mockingly at their owners in love; see Plaza 2000.17.

left hand entirely decently.⁶³ Alternatively, in this latter fragment, *honesta* could agree with *laeua*, which presents a possible contradiction between “unlucky” and “lovely,” although *laevus* in the language of augurs does mean “favourable” (*TLL* 7.2.892.15–39). But the “aftermath” fragment suggests cleaning and a re-establishment of decorum rather than indiscriminate sexual swagger. Crying is, after all, not an optimal response to a sexual tryst. So aggression is not necessarily the watchword. Rather, in the examples I have adduced, the eroticism and obscenity are, in the end, fairly nuanced.

Picking up the element of fantasy in the Lucilian descriptions of sexual activity, we might recall the choice of the word *fictrix* (“deceiver”) as a description of the female participant in the tryst with the premature ejaculation (331–32 Warmington = 303–04 Marx, p. XX above). We should ask ourselves how different the stereotypical sneaky “Woman the Deceiver” (among many others, the label at Dixon 2001.137 for Lesbia) is from the poet, himself a maker of *facta* in an important and potentially programmatic passage (791–92 Warmington = 688–89 Marx):

rem populi salute⁶⁴ et fictis uersibus Lucilius,
quibus potest, inperitit, totumque hoc studiose et sedulo.

Lucilius addresses the common weal with good cheer and made-up verses, such as he is able to write, and all this earnestly and eagerly.

While the other reference to *factores* in the Lucilian corpus is disputed (Lactantius gives *pictorum* at 529 Warmington = 489 Marx), it also involves things which are *facta*: “sic isti somnia ficta / vera putant,” “in this way they think false dreams are true” (527–28 Warmington = 487–88 Marx). The subject of that fragment (which I intend to discuss elsewhere) is divine sculptures,⁶⁵ a fact that has implications for the meaning of *fictrix* in the *psolocopumai* fragment because it could signify “modeller” as well

63 But see Williams 2010.25 (with note at 312) for *pullaria* (“right hand”) in Plautus, recorded in Festus as so called because that was what was used for masturbation of the *pullus* (“penis,” perhaps that of a partner).

64 The first three words are disputed: *item populi salute* is transmitted (with *salutem* in some manuscripts); *rem populi* is Lachmann’s conjecture, supported by Housman 1907.59, who criticises Marx’s reading *te, Popli*.

65 For the text and interpretation, see, e.g., O’Hara 1987 and Feeney 1998.93–94.

as “dissembler.” If *fictrix* means “sculptress,”⁶⁶ then we can consider the reference to marble in another fragment from Book 29 as more than just an indication of colour (923–24 Warmington = 859–60 Marx):

hic corpus solidum inuenies, hic stare papillas
pectore marmoreo.

Here you will find a firm body, here breasts standing out
on a marble-white chest.

One could imagine the speaker as a prostitute advertising her wares, willingly participating in masculine objectification,⁶⁷ but *solidum* also seems to promise certainty, terra firma.⁶⁸ But if, as is very much the case for Horace’s conception of Lucilius, the poetic corpus is mirrored by the satirist’s actual *corpus* (Farrell 2007.186–88), the second-person direct address could certainly be read as an invitation to the reader to discover what is inside Lucilius’s oeuvre as much as one to an internal addressee—an enticing window display.⁶⁹

A favourite swashbuckling rationale for the workings of satire as Lucilius’s inheritors practised it is the freewheeling ethos of the Bakhtinian carnivalesque. This theoretical elucidation has been used to read the grotesque body as a symbol of the punishing sterility of Roman satire.⁷⁰ Such

66 So Richlin 1992.166 translates it; cf. Cic. *N.D.* 3.92.

67 See, e.g., Fiske 1920.263–64 with reference to Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.83–85. Hooley 1999 reads this fragment as being about “the least troublesome and most economical opportunities for sexual gratification,” although his formulation (“seems to comment explicitly”) leaves room for disappointment. The body could be a boy’s—*papilla* is used of men at Mart. 8.64.10 and Suet. *Otho* 11.2—but this is not necessarily Williams’ (2010.24) “interchangeability of boys and women as erotic objects.” Rather, fluidity of gender may be emphasised in that one would expect a phallus to *stare*, “stand erect,” instead.

68 On the parallel at Ter. *Eun.* 318, where Pamphila is described by her besotted lover Chae-rea as possessing “color uerus, corpus solidum et suci plenum” (“real colour, a firm body and full of sap”), Vincent 2013.77 has an erotic reading incorporating the bilingual pun on *sucus* as discussed above, though Barsby 1999.146 interprets the Lucilian phrase chastely as referring only to the “strength in a woman’s arm.”

69 Cf. the *candida puella* of Cat. 13.4, 35.8, and compromised *candida* at 86.1: Gowers 1993.233–34. Lucilius linked whiteness with love’s universality, as in 957–58 Warmington = 830–31 Marx: “et amabat omnes. nam ut discrimen non facit | neque signat linea alba” (“And s/he loved everybody; for as a white line makes no distinction nor any mark . . .”).

70 See, e.g., Miller 1998 for the theory’s relevance to the genre. Cf. for Persius’s brand of satire, D’Alessandro Behr 2005; for Catullus’s personal mode as fissuring into dialogic, Batstone 2002.

a reading might be prompted by the Saturnalian aspects of Horace's second book (with both *Satires* 2.3 and 2.7 taking that festival as their setting).⁷¹ The Saturnalia was a famously topsy-turvy affair, where restrictions on free speech were relaxed—but would this mean that staining obscenity was authorised? I have held back from mentioning Bakhtin till now because I am not certain that it is especially useful to read all of extant Lucilius through that theoretical prism. In particular, it would be remiss of me to make further claims about the dialogic or polyphonic nature of Lucilian satire when so much is uncertain about the fragments.⁷² However, in Lucilius's Book 6, at least, a slaves' festival is explicitly cited whose name does not fit in the metre (252–53 Warmington = 228–29 Marx):

seruorum est festus dies hic,
quem plane hexametro uersu non dicere possis.

This is that slaves' holiday which you simply could not express in a hexameter line.

This festival, as Ulrike Auhagen (2001.19–20) notes, could have been the Saturnalia. If even the name of the festival is not mentionable, this is not encouraging for the prospect of free speech elsewhere in Lucilius's oeuvre. Now the possibility left open by the lack of a definitive name is that it could have been, not the Saturnalia, but the Compitalia, a festival supposed to have been instituted by Servius Tullius to commemorate his conception after his mother saw a phallus rise out of the hearth.⁷³ Giant penises are not lacking from the myth of satiric origins, given the possibility that Fescennine verses consisting of ritual abuse had something to do with some early version of the genre.⁷⁴ *Fescennini* may derive from a word

71 Oliensis 1998.52–53. On a broader Saturnalian aesthetic in Horace's satire (mostly extending the conventional view to Book 1), see Freudenburg 1993.211–23 and the close readings of Sharland 2010.

72 On difficulties with Bakhtin and the nature of the Saturnalia, see now Beard 2014.62–65.

73 Marx 1904–05.2.ad loc.and Cichorius 1908.286–87; cf. Plin. *N.H.* 36.204. A mystifying passage claims a link to Lucilius: “tum sancta efferuentia numina uim uomuisse Lucilii ac regem Seruium natum esse Romanum,” “Then the holy deities, boiling over, vomited the spirit of Lucilius and the Roman king Servius [Tullius] was born” (Arnob. *Adv. Gent.* 5.18.352–53 Warmington = 1339 Marx).

74 Brink 1982.179–86, Braund 2004.414–18, and Graf 2005.201–02 discuss Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.139–55, which seems to provide a Latin inheritance in tension with the derivation from Greek Old Comedy. Fescennine verses were in republican times confined largely to weddings; cf. Cat. 61.119–48 for a literary example and see Hersch 2010.151–56.

for “penis,” *fascinum*,⁷⁵ with apotropaic associations, and Varro reminds us that Roman children wore amulets, some of which depicted phallic symbols (*L.L.* 7.97). Indeed, Horace’s wet dream in *Satire* 1.5 (see, above, p. XX) was perhaps an apotropaic attempt to guarantee the success of the upcoming peace negotiations between Octavian and Antony (Reckford 1999.544–45); the pun in *immundus* there emphasised the triviality of the sexual congress compared to the real-world political congress.⁷⁶ But the phallus did not deter at least one Lucilian character in Book 2, perhaps in the same trial context as the above “thick-headed snake” (62 Warmington = 72 Marx), from gaming the system; rather, it encouraged him by preventing others from questioning him with disapproval (67–69 Warmington = 78–80 Marx, following the text at Krenkel 1970.1.128 which splits the difference between Warmington and Marx):

nam quid moestino subrectoque huic opus signo?
ut lurcaretur lardum et carnaria fartim
conficeret?

For what need was there for this erect phallic emblem?
So that he might stuff himself by guzzling up bacon fat
and stripping meat hooks?

The link between the phallus and gluttony is that the addressee, probably Scaevola whose name means exactly that, a phallic emblem (Marx 1904–05.2.37), stuffs himself like an engorged phallus with a variety of foods (Cichorius 1908.240), with the upshot that the resulting food coma would leave the perpetrator weak and impotent. Moreover, the phallus seems to have been apotropaic, used as a badge to indicate membership in a select club for the benefit of role playing: to downplay and avert a food fight rather than to advertise aggression.⁷⁷

Ironically, another Lucilian reference to marriage: “nupturum te nupta negas, quod uiuere Ulixen | speras,” “Being married, you deny that you will get married, because you hope Ulysses is alive,” 565–66 Warmington = 538–39 Marx describes a famous Greek couple with, apparently, a masculine future participle standing in for a feminine: Gell. 1.7.1–15.

75 Cf. Fest. [Paul.] 76L, Plin. *N.H.* 28.39: see Maltby 1991.230, and Hersch 2010.153.

76 As with *psolocopumai*, *intantum Veneri* is passive. Grammar is part of the joke: *intantum* could be the supine stem of *intendere*, which matches the fact that Horace is himself supine.

77 Plin. *N.H.* 28.39 notes that generals and children were protected by the emblem. Steenblock 2013.40–41 also reads the fragment as weakening the potency of the phallic symbol. For the difficulties of the too-easy description “apotropaic,” see Beard 2014.58, 146, and 234.

While I do not suggest that it is definitely Lucilius who assumes this persona—or any other discussed in this article—my conclusion is that the penises described in his poetry, which seem at some level to characterise it, need not have obscene, derogatory, or even aggressive meanings to do the work of satire. In other words, not all of this is Richlin’s “staining”: even if the poet clearly knew his way around the inside of a brothel, we should at least admit that there is more to this work than belligerent “being on top” and invective combativeness. Layers of irony are possible, even in the midst of sexual situations: in Lucilian situations which do not need to be read sexually and in Horatian situations where tendentious readings bring out extra, between-the-lines discredit to his predecessor.⁷⁸ Often these analyses have rested on just one word, but the forthrightness of the language employed and the ubiquity of references to the phallus should not dull us to the author’s desire to provoke, knowingly but generally harmlessly. Although mutuality seems to be too much to ask for, and we have seen a fair amount of braggadocio in the style which Catullus will adopt with his *nouem continuas fututiones* (“nine consecutive fuckings,” 32.8), we should not be so invested in the sexually aggressive Lucilius often read into the fragments. In fact, we might go so far as to say that it is worth considering the Lucilian phallus to be consistently on the back foot.

University of Exeter

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.
 ———. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.
 Armstrong, D. 1989. *Horace*. New Haven.
 Auhagen, U. 2001. “Lucilius und die Komödie,” in G. Manuwald, ed., *Der Satiriker Lucilius und seine Zeit*. Munich. 9–23.
 Babcock, C. L. 1965. “The Early Career of Fulvia,” *AJP* 86.1–32.
 Bain, D. M. 1991. “Six Greek Verbs of Sexual Congress,” *CQ* 41.51–77.
 ———. 2007. “Low Words in High Places: Sex, Bodily Functions, and Body Parts in Homeric Epic and Other Higher Genres,” in P. J. Finglass, C. Collard, and N. J. Richardson, eds., *Hesperos: Studies*

78 Hence even Rosen, an enthusiastic proponent of satire’s acerbity, can entertain the existence of an otherwise oxymoronic “genteel Lucilian approach” (2007.227).

in *Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*. Oxford. 40–57.

- Barchiesi, A., and A. Cucchiarelli. 2005. "Satire and the Poet: The Body as Self-Referential Symbol," in K. Freudenburg, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge. 207–23.
- Barsby, J. 1999. *Terence: Eunuchus*. Cambridge.
- Batstone, W. W. 2002. "Catullus and Bakhtin: The Problems of a Dialogic Lyric," in R. Bracht Branham, ed., *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Evanston. 99–136.
- Beard, M. 2014. *Laughter in Ancient Rome: On Joking, Tickling, and Cracking Up*. Berkeley.
- Braund, S. M. 2004. "Libertas or Licentia? Freedom and Criticism in Roman Satire," in I. Sluiter and R. M. Rosen, eds., *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden. 409–28.
- Brink, C. O. 1982. *Horace on Poetry, vol. 3: Epistles Book II*. Cambridge.
- Chahoud, A. 2011. "The Language of Latin Verse Satire," in J. Clackson, ed., *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Malden, Mass. 367–83.
- Charpin, F. 1978. *Lucilius: Satires*, vol. 1. Paris.
- Christes, J. 1971. *Der frühe Lucilius: Rekonstruktion und Interpretation des XXVI. Buches sowie von Teilen des XXX. Buches*. Heidelberg.
- Cichorius, C. 1908. *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius*. Berlin.
- Classen, C. J. 1996. "Grundlagen und Absicht der Kritik des Lucilius," in C. Klodt, ed., *Satura Lanx: Festschrift für Werner A. Krenkel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Hildesheim. 11–28.
- Compton-Engle, G. 2015. *Costume in the Comedies of Aristophanes*. New York.
- Corbeill, A. 1996. *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*. Princeton.
- Courtney, E. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Crönert, W. 1910. "Variae lectiones," *RhM* 65.461–71.
- Csapo, E. 2013. "Comedy and the Pompe: Dionysian Genre-Crossing," in E. Bakola, L. Prauscello, and M. Telò, eds., *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres*. Cambridge. 40–80.
- Cucchiarelli, A. 2001. *La satira e il poeta: Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones*. Pisa.
- D'Alessandro Behr, F. 2005. "Open Bodies and Closed Minds? Persius's *Saturae* in the Light of Bakhtin and Voloshinov," in R. Bracht Branham, ed., *The Bakhtin Circle and Ancient Narrative*. Groningen. 260–96.

- Dixon, S. M. 2001. *Reading Roman Women: Sources, "Genres," and Real Life*. London.
- Döpp, S. 2008. "'Credat Iudaeus Apella, non ego': Die Satiriker Horaz, Persius, und Juvenal über eine Minderheit," in T. Haye and F. Schnoor, eds., *Epochen der Satire: Traditionslinien einer literarischen Gattung in Antike, Mittelalter, und Renaissance*. Hildesheim. 15–33.
- Dugan, J. 2005. *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford.
- Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes: Birds*. Oxford.
- Fantham, E. 1989. "Mime: The Missing Link in Roman Literary History," *CW* 82.153–63.
- Farrell, J. 2007. "Horace's Body, Horace's Books," in S. J. Heyworth, ed., *Classical Constructions: Papers in Memory of Don Fowler, Classicist and Epicurean*. Oxford. 174–93.
- Feeney, D. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome*. Cambridge.
- . 2009. "Becoming an Authority: Horace on his own Reception," in L. B. T. Houghton and M. Wyke, eds., *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and his Readers*. Cambridge. 16–38.
- Feldman, L. H. 1996. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton.
- Ferriss-Hill, J. L. 2011. "A Stroll with Lucilius: Horace, *Satires* 1.9 Reconsidered," *AJP* 132.429–55.
- . 2015. *Roman Satire and the Old Comic Tradition*. New York.
- Fischer, J. 1999. "Der Zwerg, der Phallos, und Harpokrates: Groteskfiguren aus dem ptolemäischen Ägypten," in H. Felber and S. Pfisterer-Haas, eds., *Kanobos: Forschungen zum griechisch-römischen Ägypten*, 1. Leipzig. 27–45.
- Fiske, G. C. 1920. *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation*. Madison.
- Foley, H. P. 2000. "The Comic Body in Greek Art and Drama," in B. Cohen, ed., *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*. Leiden. 275–311.
- Freudenburg, K. 1990. "Horace's Satiric Program and the Language of Contemporary Theory in *Satires* 2.1," *AJP* 111.187–293.
- . 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton.
- . 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge.
- . 2013. "The Afterlife of Varro in Horace's *Sermones*," in T. D. Papanghelis, S. J. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis, eds., *Generic*

Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions, and Transformations. Berlin. 297–336.

- Gibson, R. 2007. *Excess and Restraint: Propertius, Horace, and Ovid's Ars Amatoria.* London.
- Gigante, M. 1993. *Orazio: una misura per l'amore: lettura della satira seconda del primo libro.* Venosa.
- Goh, I. 2016–17. "A Note on a Euphemism in Lucilius," *HSCP* 109 (forthcoming).
- Gowers, E. 1993. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature.* Oxford.
- . 2011. "The Road to Sicily: Lucilius to Seneca," *Ramus* 40.168–97.
- . 2012. *Horace: Satires Book I.* Cambridge.
- Graf, F. 2005. "Satire in a Ritual Context," in K. Freudenburg, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire.* Cambridge. 192–206.
- Green, J. R. 2006. "The Persistent Phallos: Regional Variability in the Performance Style of Comedy," in J. Davidson, F. Muecke, and P. Wilson, eds., *Greek Drama III: Essays in Honour of Kevin Lee.* London. 141–62.
- Gruen, E. S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome.* Ithaca.
- . 2002. *Diaspora: Jews Amidst Greeks and Romans.* Cambridge, Mass.
- Hass, K. 2007. *Lucilius und der Beginn der Persönlichkeitsdichtung in Rom.* Stuttgart.
- Henderson, Jeffrey. 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy.* Oxford.
- Henderson, John. 1989. "Satire Writes 'Woman': Gendersong," *PCPS* 35.50–80.
- . 1993. "Be Alert (Your Country Needs Lerts): Horace *Satires* 1.9," *PCPS* 39.67–93.
- . 1998. "Virgil *Eclogue* 9: Valleydiction," *PVS* 23.149–76.
- Hersch, K. K. 2010. *The Roman Wedding: Ritual and Meaning in Antiquity.* Cambridge.
- Hollis, A. 2007. *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 B.C.–A.D. 20.* Oxford.
- Holzberg, N. 2002. *Catull: Der Dichter und sein erotisches Werk.* Munich.
- Hooley, D. 1999. "Horace's Rud(e)-imentary Muse: *Sat.* 1.2," *Electronic Antiquity* 5.2, at <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/ElAnt/V5N2/hooley.html>.
- Housman, A. E. 1907. "Luciliana," *CQ* 1.53–74, 148–59.
- Hughes, A. 2011. *Performing Greek Comedy.* Cambridge.

- Hutchinson, G. O. 2012. "Booking Lovers: Desire and Design in Catullus," in I. M. le M. du Quesnay and A. J. Woodman, eds., *Catullus: Poems, Books, Readers*. Oxford. 48–78.
- . 2013. *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality*. Oxford.
- Huzar, E. G. 1986–87. "Mark Antony: Marriages vs. Careers," *CJ* 81.97–111.
- Isaac, B. H. 2004. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton.
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1996. "C. Licinius Macer Calvus, fr. 18 Büchner," *Eikasmos* 7.243–54.
- Johnson, M., and T. Ryan. 2005. *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Society and Literature: A Sourcebook*. New York.
- Jones, F. 2007. *Juvenal and the Satiric Genre*. London.
- Kraus, C. S. 2005. "Hair, Hegemony, and Historiography: Caesar's Style and its Earliest Critics," in J. N. Adams, M. Lapidge, and T. Reinhardt, eds., *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*. Oxford. 97–115.
- Krenkel, W. 1970. *Lucilius: Satiren*, 2 vols. Leiden.
- Maltby, R. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds.
- Marshall, C. W. 2006. *The Stagecraft and Performance of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge.
- Marx, F. 1904–05. *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquae*, 2 vols. Leipzig.
- McClure, L. 1999. *Spoken like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama*. Princeton.
- McKeown, J. 1979. "Augustan Elegy and Mime," *PCPS* 25.71–84.
- Miller, P. A. 1998. "The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility," *Arethusa* 31.257–83.
- Mras, K. 1928. "Randbemerkungen zu Lucilius' Satiren," *WS* 46.78–85.
- Newman, J. K. 1990. *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility*. Hildesheim.
- Nikoloutsos, K. P. 2007. "Beyond Sex: The Poetics and Politics of Pederasty in Tibullus 1.4," *Phoenix* 61.55–82.
- O'Hara, J. J. 1987. "Somnia Ficta in Lucretius and Lucilius," *CQ* 81.517–19.
- Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge.
- Parker, H. N. 1998. "Loyal Slaves and Loyal Wives: The Crisis of the Outsider-Within and Roman *Exemplum* Literature," in S. Joshel and S. Murnaghan, eds., *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*. London. 152–73.
- Panayotakis, C. 2010. *Decimus Laberius: The Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Plaza, M. 2000. *Laughter and Derision in Petronius's Satyrice*. Stockholm.

- . 2006. *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying*. Oxford.
- Ramsey, J. T. 2003. *Cicero: Philippics I–II*. Cambridge.
- Reckford, K. J. 1999. “Only a Wet Dream? Hope and Skepticism in Horace, Satire 1.5,” *AJP* 120.525–54.
- Revermann, M. 2006. *Comic Business: Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy*. Oxford.
- Richlin, A. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. New York.
- Roberts, P. 2013. *Life and Death in Pompeii and Herculaneum*. London.
- Roman, L. 2014. *Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome*. Oxford.
- Rosen, R. 1988. *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*. Atlanta.
- . 2007. *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford.
- Rudd, N. 1986. *Themes in Roman Satire*. London.
- Ruffell, I. A. 2003. “Beyond Satire: Horace, Popular Invective, and the Segregation of Literature,” *JRS* 93.35–65.
- . 2011. *Politics and Anti-Realism in Athenian Old Comedy: The Art of the Impossible*. Oxford.
- Schlegel, C. 2005. *Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace’s Satires, Book I*. Madison.
- Schmeling, G. 2011. *A Commentary on the Satyrica of Petronius* [with the collaboration of A. Setaioli]. Oxford.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1967. *Cicero’s Letters to Atticus, vol. 6: 44 B.C.* Cambridge.
- Sharland, S. 2010. *Horace in Dialogue: Bakhtinian Readings in the Satires*. Bern.
- Steenblock, M. 2013. *Sexualmoral und politische Stabilität: Zum Vorstellungszusammenhang in der römischen Literatur von Lucilius bis Ovid*. Berlin.
- Stroh, W. 2000. “Sexualität und Obszönität in römischer ‘Lyrik,’” in T. Stemmler and S. Horlacher, eds., *Sexualität im Gedicht*. Mannheim. 11–49.
- Svarlien, J. 1989. *A Study of the Ancient Testimonia on Lucilius*. Ph.D Diss. University of Texas, Austin.
- Terzaghi, N. 1934. *Lucilio*. Turin.
- Vincent, H. 2013. “*Fabula Stataria*: Language and Humor in Terence,” in A. Augoustakis and A. Traill, eds., *A Companion to Terence*. Malden, Mass. 69–88.

- von Möllendorff, P. 1995. *Grundlagen einer Ästhetik der Alten Komödie: Untersuchungen zu Aristophanes und Michail Bachtin*. Tübingen.
- Warmington, E. H. 1938. *Remains of Old Latin, vol. 3: Lucilius and The Twelve Tables*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Williams, C. A. 2010. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Ziolkowski, J. M. 1998. "Obscenity in the Latin Grammatical and Rhetorical Tradition," in J. M. Ziolkowski, ed., *Obscenity: Social Control and Artistic Creation in the European Middle Ages*. Leiden. 41–59.