

THE ROLE OF *EVOCATIO* IN MACROBIUS' *SATURNALIA*

by

ELIZABETH A. GEPHARDT

(Under the Direction of Erika T. Hermanowicz)

ABSTRACT

In the third book of Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, the *evocatio* and *devotio* of Carthage stands in sharp contrast to the surrounding text and to other quotations in the dialogue. Why would the author incorporate such a lengthy text into his dialogue, and how does the *evocatio* relate to *Saturnalia* 3 as a whole? In the past, scholars have treated the *Saturnalia* as a sourcebook, but more recent scholarship has centered on the didactic nature of the dialogue and its role in Vergilian criticism. How does the *evocatio* contribute to Macrobius' educational dialogue? To answer these questions, I will examine how the *evocatio* fits within Praetexataus' speech, how the *evocatio* relates to other quotations within *Sat.* 3, and how Macrobius' treatment of the *evocatio* differs from his contemporary, Servius.

INDEX WORDS: *evocatio*, Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, Vergilian Criticism

THE ROLE OF *EVOCATIO* IN MACROBIUS' *SATURNALIA*

by

ELIZABETH A. GEPHARDT

BA, The Catholic University of America, 1996

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

© 2009

Elizabeth A. Gephardt

All Rights Reserved

THE ROLE OF *EVOCATIO* IN MACROBIUS' *SATURNALIA*

by

ELIZABETH A. GEPHARDT

Major Professor: Erika T. Hermanowicz

Committee: Keith Dix
Sara Spence

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2009

DEDICATION

For Ryan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am most grateful to my family for providing me with an incredible amount of support and inspiration for this project. Special thanks are due to my siblings Benjamin and Miriam Gephardt and to my husband Ryan Howell.

In the classics department, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Hermanowicz, for her insight and patience, and the members of my committee, Dr. Dix and Dr. Spence for their thoughtful comments. I would also like to recognize Dr. Norman for encouraging me to pursue the *evocatio* and Sandra Phillips for helping me navigate the paperwork and policies of the University of Georgia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
1 <i>DILIGENTIA</i> IN THE <i>EVOCATIO</i>	6
Introduction.....	6
Vergil Becomes <i>Pontifex Maximus</i>	8
<i>Proprietas</i> in Macrobius and Other Authors	13
The Driving Force of <i>Proprietas</i> in <i>Sat.</i> 3.1-8.....	19
How <i>Proprietas</i> Operates within the <i>Evocatio</i>	34
Conclusion	41
2 <i>SCIPIO AEMILIANUS</i> AND <i>VERECUNDIA</i>	45
Introduction.....	45
The Role of Speakers in the <i>Saturnalia</i>	46
The Organization of Speakers in <i>Sat.</i> 3	52
Literary Voices in Praetextatus' Speech.....	61
The Voice of Scipio Aemilianus in <i>Sat.</i> 3	65
Conclusion	72
3 <i>DOCTRINA</i> IN THE <i>EVOCATIO</i> 'S INTRODUCTION	76
Introduction.....	76

Secondary Sources in Praetextatus' Speech	77
Sammonicus Serenus.....	82
The Secret Protector of Rome	86
The Two-Part Form of the <i>Evocatio</i>	93
Conclusion	101
CONCLUSIONS.....	106
BIBLIOGRAPHY	110

INTRODUCTION

Over five hundred and fifty years after the Punic Wars, Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius wrote the third book his dialogue, the *Saturnalia*, which includes a fragment containing the curse on the city Carthage. Set during the eponymous festival, *Sat.* 3 reports conversation from the second evening of the feast, exploring topics such as Roman religion, lavish banqueting practices during the Republic, the morality of dancing, and concludes with a catalogue of dessert foods. As the evening's second speaker, Vettius Agorius Praetextatus lectures on Vergil's knowledge of Roman religious practices, using the curse text to close his speech.¹ First, the curse calls the protective god or goddess out of the city of Carthage (*evocatio*), luring him or her with the promise of temples and worship. Next, the curse asks the spirits of the underworld to help destroy Carthage, its army, and surrounding territory, while keeping the Roman forces safe (*devotio*).² When taken together, the two parts of the curse comprise the longest quotation in *Sat.* 3, situated in the very heart of the dialogue. Why would Macrobius use such a lengthy text like the *evocatio* in the *Saturnalia*? Finding an answer to this question by reading modern scholarship on the *Saturnalia* or the ritual of *evocatio* is a difficult if not impossible task. Some scholars consider the *Saturnalia* an encyclopedia rather than a dialogue because it includes diverse topics and a multitude of textual fragments in its corpus. The *Saturnalia* has preserved unique fragments within in its text, which encourages literary mining. As a result, removing fragments from the dialogue's context has become an accepted practice, considering the *Saturnalia* as an historical sourcebook rather than a work of literature in its own

¹ For clarity in this paper, I refer to Praetextatus' words as his own. However, I am fully aware that the author Macrobius is the mind behind the creation of Praetextatus' fictionalized personage in the *Saturnalia*.

² For brevity's sake, hereafter I will refer to the combined curse text, *evocatio* and *devotio* as the *evocatio*.

right. Unfortunately, this practice also has demoted passages like the *evocatio* to historical curiosities, without considering their relationship to the larger work. The sheer quantity of fragments included in the *Saturnalia* creates another problem: so much of the text is either quotation or allusion that some scholars see the dialogue as a literary pastiche, lacking originality. This attitude encourages piecemeal readings of the dialogue and robs and denies the *Saturnalia*'s contributions to Vergilian criticism.

These problems are not unique to the *Saturnalia*. In *Beowulf and the Critics*, J.R.R. Tolkien argues that *Beowulf* has also been summarized, taken out of context, and otherwise ill-used by historians.³ His essay argues for studying *Beowulf* as the poem that it is, and chastises the greats who have overlooked the literary value of *Beowulf* (particularly G.K. Chesterton who called the poem "small beer"). For scholars who have analyzed the poem after only a cursory reading, Tolkien warns "The intensive student has some reward denied to the traveling giant of mighty range."⁴ Tolkien's attitude towards *Beowulf* echoes Macrobius' virtue of *diligentia*—that one achieves the best analysis by reading text closely, weighing each word—rather than sweeping over an entire work of literature. Robert Kaster notes that for Macrobius, "*diligentia* involves a willingness to extend oneself, to behave with energetic scrupulousness in performing one's duty."⁵ This confluence of ideas is my inspiration: as an "intensive student" like Tolkien, I hope to value the *Saturnalia* as first and foremost a work of literature and then study the *evocatio* with Macrobian *diligentia*. However, it is difficult to maintain a narrow focus with an author like Macrobius who pulls ideas together from many different sources. In times of doubt, I have always returned to the text of the *Saturnalia* for a closer reading, and of course to the Vergilian

³ J.R.R. Tolkien, *Beowulf and the Critics*, Ed. Michael D.C. Drout, (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 31.

⁵ Robert Kaster, "Macrobius and Servius: Verecundia and the Grammarian's Function," *HSPH* 84, (1980): 234.

corpus for guidance. To be completely clear, I am not using the *evocatio* to describe the historical figures of the *saeculum Praetextati*, to make arguments about pagan religious practice in the Late Empire, or even to determine the *evocatio*'s historical authenticity, which I admit is tempting. Instead, I intend to follow scholars like Catherine Chin, who characterizes the *Saturnalia* as “an educational treatise with grammatical concerns at its core.”⁶ My goal is to make a literary analysis of the *evocatio* within the context of *Sat.* 3, focusing on this question: why would Macrobius import such a lengthy text like the *evocatio* into his work, allowing it to take a position of prominence at the end of Praetextatus' speech?

Whether literary analysis can discern an author's intent is a debate best held outside of the confines of this study, but in the *Saturnalia*, Macrobius makes his intentions clear from the very beginning: he wishes to complete the education of his son (*Eustachi fili*, *Sat.* 1.*praef.*1). Macrobius asserts that *natura* charges all parents with the task of educating their children: *eamque nostram in his educandis atque erudiendis curam esse voluit* (and she wants our concern to be their upbringing and education, *Sat.* 1.*praef.*1). His son's education is also personally important: *hinc est quod mihi quoque institutione tua nihil antiquius aestimatur* (This is why nothing is more valuable to me than your education, *Sat.* 1.*praef.*2). With his goal firmly established, Macrobius envisions a compendium that will take Eustachius from schoolboy to aristocratic scholar, following in the tradition of Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* (*Sat.* 1.*praef.*2-5).⁷ Considering Macrobius' educational goal, what could the *evocatio* possibly teach Eustachius? Surely Macrobius is not instructing his son to destroy cities by performing secret rites. Since the *Saturnalia* is first and foremost a literary dialogue, the question of Eustachius' education is best framed by the intellectual virtues it espouses. In addition to “energetic

⁶ Catherine Chin, *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007): 54.

⁷ Macrobius incorporates much of Gellius' preface into his own, *NA praef.* 2-3.

scrupulousness,” Kaster describes academic *diligentia* as “the care and maintenance required for keeping in touch with one’s culture.”⁸ He also argues that *verecundia* and *doctrina* are equally vital to the educational *ethos* of the *Saturnalia*. *Verecundia* is a complex concept that can mean respect for self and others in a social setting, but as an intellectual virtue its charge is somewhat different: one must respect the literary past and participate in Rome’s cultural legacy by discussing and preserving literature for the future.⁹ According to Kaster, when *verecundia* and *diligentia* combine, they produce a third virtue, *doctrina*, which he defines as “*prudencia, scientia, peritia*” (wisdom, knowledge, and experience).¹⁰ Adding to Kaster’s definition, Catherin Chin describes *doctrina* as a wide spectrum of knowledge and skills, “the imagination of a very broad field of knowledge,” which is an apt synopsis of the topics addressed in the *Saturnalia*.¹¹ It is under the lens of the virtues of *diligentia*, *verecundia* and *doctrina* that I will examine the educational role of the *evocatio* in Macrobius’ *Saturnalia*.

In the first chapter I will observe how the *evocatio* demonstrates *diligentia*. Praetextatus begins his lesson in *diligentia* under the premise that Vergil is a learned religious scholar, worthy of the title *pontifex maximus*. His mandate is to uncover evidence that Vergil alludes to appropriate religious customs (*proprietas moris*) and terminology (*proprietas verborum*) in his poetry. I argue that Praetextatus first guides the reader in becoming a *diligens lector* of the Vergilian corpus so that the *evocatio* represents the culmination of this philological study, a final exam for students of *proprietas moris* and *proprietas verborum*. In the second chapter, the virtue of *verecundia* describes the relationship between the *evocatio* and two of the speakers in *Sat.* 3, Praetextatus and Rufius Albinus. Praetextatus utters the *evocatio* in a direct quotation, but Scipio

⁸ Robert Kaster, “Macrobius and Servius: Verecundia and the Grammarian’s Function,” *HSPH* 84 (1980), 234.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 231.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 234.

¹¹ Catherine Chin, 57.

Aemilianus, the understood voice behind Carthage's *evocatio*, surfaces as a literary interlocutor. Scipio Aemilianus' voice returns in *Sat.* 3 during Rufius Albinus' discussion of the propriety of dancing. The examples of proper behavior and cultural respect between Scipio Aemilianus, Praetextatus and Rufius Albinus represent a literary example of *verecundia* spanning many generations. In the third chapter, Macrobius' ultimate educational goal, *doctrina*, measures the literary tradition and scholarly debate presented in Praetextatus' introduction to the *evocatio*. After examining the way Praetextatus uses secondary sources in his argumentation, I will address a scholarly dispute that he alludes to in the *evocatio*'s introduction: the secret name of Rome's protective god. In a further display of *verecundia* and *doctrina*, Macrobius engages Sammonicus Serenus as the source of many learned discussions in *Sat.* 3, including the *evocatio*. Ultimately, I will compare *Sat.* 3.9.6 and *Serv. A.* 1.277 to demonstrate that Praetextatus respects and engages other scholars, creating true erudition in the *Saturnalia*. This study attempts to examine the *evocatio* through the eyes of a reader like Eustachius, with an understanding of his father's intentions for the work. Measuring the *evocatio* against Macrobian virtues reveals that it is a philological, moral, and scholarly teaching tool.

CHAPTER 1

DILIGENTIA IN THE EVOCATIO OF MACROBIUS' SAT. 3

Introduction

Praetextatus dominates the discussion in *Sat.* 1 by giving a history of the Saturnalia festival (*Sat.* 1.7-10), describing other important festivals on the Roman calendar (1.12-16), and describing a *numen multiplex* by linking different gods from the Greco-Roman pantheon to the worship of the sun (1.17-23). At the end of his speech, the other guests praise his powers of recollection (*memoriam*) his learning (*doctrinam*) and the way he ties everything together (*religionem*, *Sat.* 1.24.1). Interrupting this praise, Evangelus, who has already established himself as a rude guest, criticizes Vergil's use of the phrase *Liber et Alma Ceres* which Praetextatus mentioned in his speech. Evangelus describes Vergil as ignorant (*ignorans*) on many topics, asserting that those who would construe Vergil's poetry as philosophy are no better than self-aggrandizing Greeks (1.24.4). The renowned senator Quintus Aurelius Symmachus responds to Evangelus first by musing whether Vergil has a place beyond classroom instruction and then by addressing him directly: *videris enim mihi ita adhuc Vergilianos habere versus qualiter eos pueri magistris praelegentibus canebaramus* (To me, you seem to comprehend Vergilian poetry just like we did as boys—singing verses back at the schoolmasters who read them first, *Sat.* 1.25.5). Accused of having only an elementary education, Evangelus retorts that as a schoolboy he was not permitted to find fault with Vergil's text even though Vergil ordered the manuscript burned because he considered the *Aeneid* imperfect (1.24.6). Symmachus affirms Vergil's respect for the *Aeneid*, and then identifies the real problem: grammarians. With the exception of the grammarian

Servius, who is an esteemed member of the dialogue, Symmachus accuses other grammarians of only being interested in explicating text (*nihil ultra verborum explanationem*) and of setting up educational blockades (*certos scientiae fines*) and sacred boundaries (*pomeria*) of Vergilian interpretation (*Sat.* 1.24.12). Continuing with a religious metaphor, Symmachus claims that with the erudition of the present company, they will bypass the hedge established by grammarians and reveal the secret workings of the poet:

sed nos, quos crassa Minerva non dedecet non patiamur abstrusa esse adyta sacri poematis, sed arcanorum sensuum investigato aditu doctorum cultu celebranda praebeamus inclusa penetralia.

But we who are graced with Minerva's wisdom, will not allow the entrances of sacred poetry to be barred, although the entrance to hidden meaning has not been crossed, let us reveal the inner sanctum that must now be filled with the worship of the learned. (*Sat.* 1.24. 13)

Although their methods may be new (*investigato aditu*), Symmachus implies that a collective study (*doctorum cultu*) will reveal the most information about Vergil's text. Setting an example for the other guests, Symmachus suggests that he and Eusebius will illustrate Vergil's superb use of oratory. Then he encourages the other guests to take on different areas of study to show Vergil's wide range of knowledge (*doctrina*). All eyes are on Praetextatus when he volunteers to demonstrate Vergil's learning in the area of pontifical law (*ius pontificium*). He contends that in his speech he will show so many examples of pontifical law in Vergil's work that all will agree that Vergil should be a *pontifex maximus*, the head of the college of priests (*Sat.* 1.24.16).

Since the debate between Evangelus and Symmachus was the catalyst for discussing Vergil, Praetextatus' speech in *Sat.* 3 responds to both speakers. While applying Vergil's text outside of the classroom will surely aggravate Evangelus, Praetextatus must bypass grammarians and elucidate Vergil's text with more authoritative sources in order to please Symmachus. In this chapter, I will begin by exploring what the term *pontifex maximus* means to Praetextatus'

character in the dialogue and how the term might resonate with readers like Eustachius. Next, I will trace the way Praetextatus uses language to qualify the poet as a *pontifex maximus*.

Praetextatus believes that Vergil chose his words with *diligentia* and that a learned reader must exercise equal care when reading Vergil's text. For this reason, Praetextatus uses the phrase *proprietas moris* to indicate that Vergil has correctly referred to a religious custom and phrase *proprietas verborum* to designate words that conform to pontifical definitions. In order to understand this unique method of literary analysis, I will trace the term *proprietas verborum* in Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, Cicero's *De Oratore* and Varro's *De Lingua Latina*, and demonstrate Praetextatus' application of these terms in *Sat.* 3.1-8. Next, I will show how Praetextatus' methods operate within *Sat.* 3.9 and provide purpose for the *evocatio*'s placement and length. Finally, I hope to determine to what extent Praetextatus succeeds in using the method of *proprietas* in conjunction with the *evocatio* to prove that Vergil is indeed worthy of the title *pontifex maximus*.

Vergil Becomes Pontifex Maximus

Macrobius fictionalized historical persons from the ranks of the senatorial elite and intelligentsia including Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, the speaker who quotes the curse text. A natural choice for speaking on Roman religion, Praetextatus was a prominent politician and pagan in the 4th century responsible for restoring many temples in Rome under his urban prefecture. Alan Cameron dates the fictional setting of the dialogue to December, 384 C.E., only weeks before Praetextatus' death, following the literary tradition of setting a dialogue shortly before the death of its central speaker.¹² Praetextatus' speeches dominate the first and third books of the *Saturnalia*. Due to a lacuna, the third book of the *Saturnalia* begins with Praetextatus'

¹² Alan Cameron, "The Date and Identity of Macrobius," *JRS* (1966): 29.

speech already in progress and ends shortly after Carthage's curse (3.1.1-3.9.16). The speech parallels his earlier treatment of the *numen multiplex* in length, use of quotations, and the reaction from the other speakers. Both speeches are seven to nine chapters long, and uninterrupted. In addition, Praetextatus employs sections from Orphic Hymns that produce an effect similar to that of the *evocatio*, drawing on an arcane text to impress his listeners and prove his points by literary example. Each speech also ends with the respect of the listeners: *omnes in eum adfixis vultibus admirationem stupore prodebant* (Everyone offered admiration in silence with their faces fixed on him, 1.24.1) and *omnes concordi testimonio doctrinam et poetae et enarrantis aequarent* (Everyone in agreement said the erudition of both the poet and commentator were equal, 3.10.1). Evangelus is an obvious exception to these praises, asking questions in a hostile tone that insults his own intelligence more than anything else. In *Sat.* 1, Symmachus fields these questions, while Praetextatus answers them himself in *Sat.* 3 (1.24.2-15; 3.10-12). In addition to establishing the pattern and structure of his speeches, *Sat.* 1 also provides valuable insight because Praetextatus states that he will prove Vergil to be *pontifex maximus* by examining the poet's works for places where *ius pontificium* (pontifical law) has been preserved:

equidem inter omnia quibus eminet laus Maronis hoc adsiduus lector et admiror, quia doctissime ius pontificium tamquam hoc professus in multa et varia operi sui parte servavit, et si tantae dissertationi sermo non cesserit, promitto fore ut Vergilius noster pontifex maximus adseratur.

Even among everything for which the praise of Vergil shines, I continuously read and admire this: that in a most learned manner he has preserved pontifical law in many different places of his own work. If my speech holds up to such an argument, I assert that our Vergil will be proved a *pontifex maximus*. (1.24.16)

Appointing Vergil to a religious office differs significantly from his treatment in other books of the *Saturnalia*. In the fourth book, the statesman Symmachus argues that Vergil is a rhetorician to rival Cicero, while books five and six present the Vergilian corpus as the keystone of classical

literature encompassing the poetry of Homer as well as earlier Roman poets like Ennius, and Lucretius. In his first speech, Praetextatus's used a variety of literary sources to reveal his own knowledge of Roman religion. Now established as an expert witness in his own right, Praetextatus limits himself to connecting Vergil's words to Roman religious text.

Naming Vergil *pontifex maximus* has political as well as literary and religious ramifications. The office of *pontifex maximus* began during Rome's monarchy with Numa Pompilius heading the *collegium pontificium*. As an office held for life, this tradition continued through the Republic with Julius Caesar serving as *pontifex maximus* from 63 B.C.E. until his assassination when Lepidus assumed the title. Upon Lepidus' death in 13 B.C.E., Augustus was made *pontifex maximus*, consolidating his religious and political power. The title was passed down to each emperor in succession from Augustus until Gratian refused it in 381 C.E.¹³ This break with imperial precedent shortly before Macrobius' fictional feast highlights the necessity for creating a new *pontifex maximus* for the speakers in the literary world of the *Saturnalia*. Vergil is not stepping into a practical role as *pontifex maximus* any more than Gratian was likely to have fulfilled its religious duties during his reign. Appointing their own man, *Vergilius noster*, to the recently vacant post circumvents imperial authority in a unique way. Instead of seeking support from an emperor, these aristocrats are looking for literary support from a common author. Accessible to any educated Roman, Vergil is elevated from his status as an author for schoolboys, an idea which offends those like Evangelus (1.24.6-7). In *Sat.* 1 and 3 It is important to remember that the knowledge that Praetextatus displays is primarily a literary view of Roman theology and ritual rather than a pragmatic guide to worship and sacrifice.

¹³ Alan Cameron, "Gratian's Repudiation of the Pontifical Robe," *JRS* 58 (1968): 99-100.

The historical figure Vettius Agorius Praetextatus held many religious offices and priesthoods during his distinguished career.¹⁴ As *praefectus urbis*, Praetextatus restored many temples in Rome. Even after Gratian refused the title of *pontifex maximus*, removed the Altar of Victory from the senate house, withdrew state support for the Vestal Virgins, and while revoked their privileges, Praetextatus supported the Vestals in some way, perhaps supplementing their funding out of his own pocket as Kahlos suggests.¹⁵ In gratitude, the chief Vestal dedicated a statue to him with two surviving records of this gift: one from Praetextatus' widow Paulina, and another from Symmachus who followed in Praetextatus' post as *praefectus urbis*. Paulina erected a statue to the chief Vestal, Coelia Concordia, thanking her in kind for the statue and inscription dedicated to her late husband.¹⁶ In a letter to Nichomachus Flavianus, Symmachus expresses his opposition to Praetextatus' statue arguing that no *pontifex maximus* in Rome's history had been allotted such an honor.¹⁷ Kahlos uses Paulina's inscription and Symmachus' letter to describe a debate surrounding the Vestals' memorial to Praetextatus.¹⁸ She also notes the connection between the term *pontifex maximus* and the Saturnalia: "Macrobius and other fifth-century antiquarian pagan-minded writers may have regarded Vergil as well as Praetextatus as their symbolic *pontifex maximus*."¹⁹ Beyond implying that Praetextatus was functioning *de facto* as a *pontifex maximus* during his lifetime, Symmachus' letter is also a likely source of inspiration for Praetextatus' speech in *Sat. 3*. Macrobius based many components of the *Saturnalia* on the published correspondence of Symmachus including the name and character description of

¹⁴ *CIL* VI 1778.

¹⁵ Majestina Kahlos, *Vettius Agorius Praetextatus: A Senatorial Life in Between* (Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 2002): 60.

¹⁶ *CIL* VI 2145.

¹⁷ *Symm. Epist.* 2.36

¹⁸ Kahlos, 155-6.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 204.

Evangelus, Dysarius, Horus, and other minor characters.²⁰ Moreover, he also connects the setting of each night of the Saturnalia feast to the content of Symmachus' published correspondence: the first book of *relationes* contains many letters addressed to Praetextatus who hosts the *Saturnalia* on the first evening, while letters in the second book, including 2.36, are all addressed to Nichomachus Flavianus, who hosts the second evening of Macrobius' dialogue.²¹ Considering that this very book of correspondence inspired setting of *Sat.* 3, it follows that this letter could have provided the inspiration for the fictional Praetextatus' connection to the pontificate.

The term *pontifex maximus* sits at the intersection of the historical and the fictional Praetextatus, yet signifies something different for each personage. In the *Saturnalia*, Macrobius confines his characters to strictly academic topics, avoiding even a hint of political debate. The idea of a literary pontiff seems safe and far removed from the real political turmoil of Praetextatus' day. In fact, one could imagine that the historical Praetextatus would have much to say about office of *pontifex maximus* and who should hold it - not to mention the opinions of Symmachus and other speakers in the dialogue. Why would Macrobius have the fictionalized Praetextatus nominate a poet, albeit Vergil, to Rome's highest priesthood? Fortunately, the character Praetextatus reveals his plan for the new *pontifex maximus* toward the beginning of his speech. He is commenting on a line taken from the encounter between the shipwrecked Aeneas and his mother, Venus, disguised as a huntress, *et vacat annales tantorum audire laborum* (even if there is time to listen to the annals of such great labors, *Sat.* 3.2.17; *A.* 1.373).²² After listening to the goddess' summary of Carthaginian history, Aeneas addresses her, still unaware that he is speaking to his mother. As the verb *vacat* suggests Aeneas does not waste time chronicling

²⁰ Charles Guittard, "Macrobe et Symmaque : l'encyclopédiste et l'épistolier," *Epistulae antiquae* 2 (2002): 291.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² J.B. Greenough reads *et vacet annalis nostrorum audire laborum*, *A* 1.373.

(*annales*) his adventures (*laborum*) in the woods outside of Carthage. Even though Aeneas refuses to tell his story at this point, just the mention of *annales* is enough for Praetextatus to confirm that Aeneas is a *pontifex*. Praetextatus states that one of the great responsibilities of a *pontifex* is writing annals, or logs of religious activity:

pontificem Aenean vel ex nomine referendorum laborum eius ostendit. pontificibus enim permissa est potestas memoriam rerum gestarum in tabulas conferendi, et hos annales appellant et quidem maximos quasi a pontificibus maximis factos.

[Vergil] shows that Aeneas is a *pontifex* rather from the term that he used for recording Aeneas' labors. For pontiffs are permitted the power of writing the record of their activities onto tablets, and they call these records *Annales* or even the *Annales Maximi* if they were done by the *pontifices maximi* (3.2.17)

In this passage, Praetextatus states that the power (*potestas*) of keeping religious records is entrusted to the pontiffs, so who better to write down the religious record than Rome's greatest poet? Making Vergil a *pontifex maximus* also turns Vergil's writings, especially the *Aeneid* into *Annales Maximi*: records of religious activity. This also has consequences for those who analyze Vergil's text. Although the power of the written word is entrusted to Vergil to hand religion down to future generations, in some ways, the role of pontiff transfers to the man who can unlock Vergil's secrets and explain Vergil's allusions to pagan rituals. If indeed the fictional Praetextatus takes part in this "literary pontificate," his impending death in 384 C.E. brings into question who will take up his literary and cultural legacy.

Proprietas in Macrobius and Other Authors

Praetextatus makes the argument that Vergil is a worthy *pontifex maximus* because his poetry demonstrates fitting use (*proprietas*) of Roman religious practices (*mores*) and terminology (*verba*). Before making a detailed account of the phrases *proprietas moris* and *proprietas verborum* in *Sat. 3*, it is helpful to examine the use of the term *proprietas* in other

books of the *Saturnalia* and as well as its precedence in other authors. Overall, the word *proprietas* occurs nineteen times in the *Saturnalia*, and is used primarily by two speakers: Eustathius and Praetextatus. In *Sat.* 7, the Greek philosopher Eustathius follows Pliny the Elder's scientific uses of the word. In his speech, the phrase *proprietas lunae* refers to the different characteristics of the moon so that the word *proprietas* occurs six times in the span of a paragraph (7.16. 21-32). Praetextatus repeats the word *proprietas* ten times over the course of his second speech, and uses the adjectival form *proprius* and adverbial form *proprie* as well. While the coinage of *proprietas moris* appears only in *Sat.* 3, the phrase *proprietas verborum* appears in Aulus Gellius, Servius, and Quintilian. To a greater extent, Praetextatus' principle of *proprietas verborum* draws on Quintilian's coinage, meaning: "correct usage" or "verbal precision."

Quintilian's idea of *proprietas verborum* was that a learned orator would use a word with a full understanding of its etymological origins and weight. In his introduction to the entire *Institutio Oratoria* Quintilian notes: *Nam verborum proprietas ac differentia omnibus qui sermonem curae habent debet esse communis.* (For the proper choice of words and their specialized meanings should be shared by all who take care in their speech, *Inst.* 1. *proem.* 16). In Book eight of *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian argues that using words with their correct and intended meaning aids the orator in one of his greatest challenges: speaking with clarity (*perspicuitas*) as opposed to the cardinal sin of oratory, unclear speech (*obscuritas*). To help his students achieve clarity, Quintilian outlines several types of *proprietas verborum*. First, using a term clearly – with attention to meaning: *Quare proprietas non ad nomen sed ad vim significandi refertur, nec auditu sed intellectu perpendenda est.* (Therefore, the appropriate usage of a word is attributed not to the word itself but the force of its meaning, one must prove *proprietas* by understanding rather than by listening, 8.2.6). Secondly, *proprietas* has an application when discussing word

derivation: transferred meaning. When one word applies to many things, the original word from which the others derive is the more proper (*proprius*) term. For example, sole (*solea*) is flat fish appropriately derived from the flat sole of a shoe (8.2.6-7). Next, *proprietas* can refer to a term which has a special meaning in a particular context. In this case, a Corinthian slave means “a slave from Corinth”, but Corinthian bronze has a more particular meaning: the adjective “Corinthian” when applied to the noun “bronze” refers to a special amalgamation of metals that came about during the sacking of Corinth, and not ordinary bronze that comes from the same city (8.2.8). Finally, Quintilian examines what happens when authors maximize the significance of words using both literal and applied meaning, using words with the utmost significance. *At illud iam non mediocriter probandum, quod hoc etiam laudari modo solet ut proprie dictum, id est, quo nihil inveniri possit significantius* (But one usage that people praise as *proprietas verborum* is especially worthy: that is the usage that reveals the greatest meaning of all, 8.2.10). Quintilian introduces his reader to this type of *proprietas* with the epithets *Hannibalem dirum* and *Caesarem sobrium* and later the cognomen *Fabius Cunctator*.²³ For Quintilian, these nicknames describe not only the character of the person, but also refer to greater military and political situations. Continuing with this final type of *proprietas verborum*, Quintilian provides two more examples of epithets, this time using adjectives that allude to poetic genres. In the first example, Vergil calls his poem fine and slender (*deductum carmen*), words which also indicate his choice for bucolic poetry over epic.²⁴ In addition, Horace’s shrill flute (*acrem tibiam*) certainly can mean just that—a high-pitched flute. When taken in the context with the rest of the poem, Horace shows his preference for his *acri tibiae* of lyric poetry over the *heroa lyra* of epic

²³ Hor. *Odes* 3.6.36; Suet. *Caes.* 53.

²⁴ *Ecl.* 6.5.

poetry.²⁵ Both of these examples from Vergil and Horace allude to poetic genres, so that Quintilian chooses examples that have a dual purpose: literal meaning and a specialized or transferred meaning. This is the principle that Praetextatus adapts for his speech: that Vergil's words function on a literal level, but also are part of a religious subtext in the *Aeneid* and Vergil's other works.

Precedent for Quintilians' ideas about *proprietas* can be found in Cicero's dialogue *De Oratore* 3 and to a lesser extent in Varro's *De Lingua Latina*, although these authors use only the adjectival form of the word (*proprius*). In Cicero's dialogue, the speaker Crassus compares and contrasts the styles of different orators:

Ecce praesentes duo prope aequales Sulpicius et Cotta. Quid iam inter se dissimile? Quid tam in suo genere praestans? Limatus alter et subtilis, rem explicans propriis aptisque verbis; haeret in causa semper et quid iudici probandum sit cum acutissime vidit, omissis ceteris argumentis in eo mentem orationemque defigit; Sulpicius autem fortissimo quodam animi impetu, plenissima et maxima voce, summa contentione corporis et dignitate motus, verborum quoque ea gravitate et copia est, ut unus ad dicendum instructissimus a natura esse videatur

Look at these two equals standing right here, Sulpicius and Cotta. Now what is the difference between them? What is so outstanding in each type of orator? Cotta is restrained and refined, explaining a case with fitting and well-chosen words; he sticks to his argument and when he keenly sees what he must prove to the judge, to the exclusion of all other arguments, he fixes both his attention and his speech on that one fact. Sulpicius has a distinctive and very bold personality, a very full and resonant voice, and he moves his body with the utmost dignity during a debate; he has a large vocabulary as well as seriousness in tone. In the end, one man seems extremely well-taught and the other a natural to the art of speaking. (*De Orat.* 3.31)

In these descriptions, Cotta is the very personification of *proprietas verborum*. Cicero's pleonasm *propriis aptisque verbis* is very helpful here, using two adjectives to describe well-chosen language. Because Cotta has linguistic restraint, he can shy away from irrelevant words and hone in on the points that will prove the case. Crassus also describes Cotta as *instructissimus*—very well-taught—which was what Quintilian was trying to do in his treatise,

²⁵ Hor. *Odes* 1.12.1.

produce well-trained orators. Instead of formal training, Sulpicius uses his resonant voice (*plenissima voce*) and physicality (*dignitate motus*) to achieve success. Although he is adept with his words, they are by no means carefully chosen, but passionate and inspired: Sulpicius is the very antithesis of *proprietas*. His ample vocabulary (*verborum quoque ea copia*) implies that he uses more words than necessary, being neither careful nor subtle in his speech. The contrast between the two orators illustrates that *proprietas* is thoughtfully chosen language, as opposed to passionate and perhaps more natural usage. Quintilian echoed this definition of *proprietas*: *nec auditu sed intellectu perpendenda est*. Sulpicius may be expressive and persuasive on an emotional level, but Cotta's skill is best appreciated by the mind.

In *De Oratore* 3, Cicero uses the term *verba propria* in another way that bears mentioning here, as an antonym for *translatio* or metaphorical language. In this instance a *verbum proprium* is a natural usage, signifying a thing with the usual word such as the word *pes* signifying a foot. A *translatio*, however is applying a word into a new situation such as the phrase *pes navi* signifying the stern of a ship, although boats literally have no feet (*De Orat.* 3.159). Quintilian parallels this with the term *solea* which has a natural meaning "the sole of a shoe" as well an applied meaning, "a flat fish." The idea that words have an innate or natural meaning occurs frequently in Varro's work *De Lingua Latina*, but Varro is neither concerned with training young orators, nor analyzing oratorical styles, so he uses the phrase *propria verba* in a slightly different way. Varro's primary concern with etymology is the history behind a word, evident as he explores the origins of the verb *pronuntiare*:

*Pronuntiare dictum a pro et nuntiare; pro idem valet quod ante, ut in hoc: proludit. Ideo actores pronuntiare dicuntur, quod in proscaenio enuntiant poetae cogitata, **quod maxime tum dicitur proprie**, novam fabulam cum agunt. Nuntius enim est a novis rebus nominatus, quod a verbo Graeco potest declinatum; ab eo itaque Neapolis illorum Novapolis ab antiquis vocitata nostris.*

The word *pronuntiare* is from *pro-* and *nuntiare*; *pro-* means the same thing that it did before in this example: *proludit*. Therefore, actors are said to pro-nounce because in the pro-scenium they utter the thoughts of the playwright. The word *pronuntiare* is spoken most appropriately when they are performing a new play, for the noun *nuntius* is coined from the idea of “new” (*novus*), which can be demonstrated from a Greek usage: the town is named *Nea-polis* by the Greek word and *Nova-polis* by our ancestors (*LL* 6.7)

According to Varro, certain contexts create a most apt usage of a word (*maxime proprie*) by linking the word to its etymological origin. For example, if players were performing a revival of Sophocles’ *Antigone*, the term *pronuntiare* would apply to the actors’ actions and be appropriate, but at the premier of Plautus’ *Menaechmi*, the term *pronuntiare* would be doubly appropriate since it connects to the physical setting of the proscenium as well as the novelty of a first production of a play.

Tracing *proprietas verborum* through Quintilian, Cicero and Varro illuminates the development of ideas that shape Praetextatus’ speech in *Sat.* 3. The ultimate example of *proprietas verborum* for Quintilian is when a word shows meaning on both natural and applied levels, while for Cicero, *propria verba* denotes artful, educated and subtle speech. Varro also recognizes that certain contexts cause words to resonate more than others, thus revealing a word’s history. In the world of oratory, although the speaker and his audience participate in the experience, the listener is not necessarily burdened with making etymological connections. The burden of *proprietas* or *propria verba* is on the speaker since linguistic connections are intended to achieve persuasive clarity. In contrast, Praetextatus is not advising the young on what words to use in speeches or even in religious rites, so the reader is not responsible for generating *propria verba*. Macrobius reverse engineers the idea of *proprietas*: he finds examples of *proprietas verborum* in the existing Vergilian corpus and uses them for a new purpose, to prove Vergil’s knowledge of Roman religion. In this type of literary analysis Macrobius, like Varro, conveys a deeply seated belief that words convey more meaning in certain contexts, but Macrobius moves

beyond Varro's interest in showcasing this type of speech *per se*. In the course of his speech, Praetextatus uncovers words that, according to his religious understanding, carry the maximum force of their etymology in the way that Vergil uses them. This means that Vergil deliberately chose words to create a religious subtext in the *Aeneid*, but Praetextatus must also wield and expert knowledge of Roman religion to find and interpret the evidence. Because the phrase *proprietas verborum* only applies to accurate etymological usage, Macrobius creates a new term for Praetextatus' speech to denote accurate ritualistic detail, *proprietas moris*. In this type of *proprietas*, the precedent for a word stems from ancient religious practices rather than the written definitions of terminology. Together, *proprietas verborum* and *proprietas moris* shape the literary context and the analytical method of Praetextatus' speech in *Sat. 3*.

The Driving Force of *Proprietas* in *Sat. 3.1-8*

Praetextatus argues that Vergil's language is what makes him a worthy *pontifex maximus*, using Vergil's phrases and individual words to prove his point. The first component of his argument (*proprietas moris*) is that Vergil accurately describes customs and rituals from Roman religious practice. Some of these rites are well-known to the present company, while many like the *evocatio* are well-hidden (*ocultissimus*). The second component of his argument (*proprietas verborum*) is that Vergil uses religious terminology according to accepted definitions. Throughout his speech, Praetextatus uses *proprietas moris* and *proprietas verborum* with equal weight, copiously citing secondary authors, such as Hyginus, Varro, and Festus to support his arguments. In the first chapter of his speech he contrasts different customs used in preparing sacrifices: Ablution to purify sacrifices to the gods above and aspersion for the gods below. Praetextatus expresses his intention of finding each type of cleansing ritual in Vergil's text: *nunc*

quoniam purificationem deorum in Vergliana observatione monstravimus, videamus utrum et circa inferorum deorum cultum proprietatem moris idem poeta servaverit. (Now since I have shown purification of the gods from a Vergilian example, let's see whether the poet has preserved the same correctness of custom concerning the worship of the gods of the underworld, 3.1.5). Praetextatus finds passages that describe these divergent sacrificial customs, noting each time that Vergil uses the correct procedure for the particular gods honored. The accurate action and the mention of the appropriate god(s) are paramount in demonstrating Vergil's *proprietas moris* (appropriate reference to religious custom). This principle grants Vergil's words a special meaning—beyond what a casual reader would infer. Although Praetextatus provides no secondary sources to support his assertions at this point, a modern reader must remember that *Sat.* 3.1 begins with Praetextatus' speech in progress. When considered with subsequent chapters, it is likely that the material now lost included secondary sources that described instances of ablution and aspersion.

In the next chapter, Praetextatus changes his focus from ritual action to religious terminology, so that the word *proprietas* governs correct word usage rather than the correct description of a sacrificial custom. Related to *proprietas moris*, the principle *proprietas verborum* means that words, when used correctly, can convey the full weight of a specific religious meaning. Praetextatus asserts that Vergil uses religious vocabulary so well that it is no great honor to for him to record examples of it: *Verborum autem proprietas tam poetae huic familiaris est ut talis observatio in Vergilio laus esse iam desinat; nullis tamen magis proprie quam sacris aut sacrificialibus verbis* (However, the appropriate use of words is so commonplace in this poet that noticing such an example in Vergil is unpraiseworthy; for no words are more appropriately used than holy or sacrificial language, 3.2.1). Praetextatus' conceit in this passage

also highlights that he intends to reveal the extent of his own learning on the subject of Roman religion. Looking for sacrificial language, Praetextatus contrasts the verbs *proiciam* and *porriciam* in divergent readings of the *Aeneid*, stating that *porriciam* must be the correct reading because it is the appropriate sacrificial word: *extaque salsos/ porriciam in fluctus* (I will offer a sacrifice unto the salty waves, *A.* 5. 237-8). Rather than tossing entrails onto the waves, as *proiciam* suggests, he discerns that Vergil's intent was for Cloanthus to say *porriciam in fluctus*. On the surface, Praetextatus seems to be searching for *proprietas moris* because the reading he rejects, *proiciam*, describes the action of tossing entrails onto the sea. Instead of focusing on the description of the ritual itself, Praetextatus applies *proprietas verborum* by turning to a literary definition to support his reading. Praetextatus asserts that *porriciam* follows an example that Veranius cited from an authoritative source on pontifical law, the first book of Pictor, *exta porricunto, dis danto, in altaria aramve focumve eove quo exta dari debebunt* (Offer the entrails, give gifts to the gods, in an altar or altar or hearth or in a place where entrails ought to be given, 3.2.3). Praetextatus contends the sea qualifies as a substitute location for this sacrifice so that indeed the correct reading should be *porriciam*, the *proprium verbum* from a sacrificial standpoint (3.2.4).

Sometimes Praetextatus alternates the noun *proprietas* with its adjectival (*proprius*) and adverbial (*proprie*) forms. By linking these forms to words that relate to speech like *verbum*, *vox*, *dicitur*, and *vocando*, recalling Cicero's earlier usage *propriis aptisque verbis* and Varro's *dicitur proprie*. When showing approval once again of Cloanthus' words, this time with the expression *voti reus* (bound to a vow, 5.237), Praetextatus remarks that the priest uses a *vox propria sacrorum* (a voice suitable for sacred rites, 3.2.6). Continuing with the sound of the human voice, Praetextatus finds words in Vergil *quae ad proprietatem sacrorum noverat pertinere* (that he had

known to retain for the fitting description of sacred rites) this time even *mutato verbi sono* (when the sound of the word had changed, 3.2.10). He contends that Vergil's phrase *laetumque choro paena canentes* (and singing a joyful hymn in chorus, *A.* 6.657) follows Titus' definition of the verb *vitulari est voce laetari* (to exult is to rejoice with the voice). In his syllogistic reasoning, Praetextatus notes that Varro equates the verb *vitulari* with the Greek *παιανίζειν* (to chant a song of triumph). It then follows that Vergil shows his understanding of the custom *vitulari* by choosing the word *paena*.

Praetextatus continues to discuss the religious terminology in a general sense, citing definitions that are removed from practical use:

Et quia inter decreta pontificum hoc maxime quaeritur quid sacrum, quid profanum, quid sanctum, quid religiosum, quaerendum utrum his secundum definitionem suam Vergilius usus sit et singulis vocabuli sui proprietatem suo more servavit

And because among pontifical decrees this is greatly discussed: what is sacred, what profane, what holy, what ritualistic, one must ask whether, according to their own definitions, Vergil used these words and whether he has preserved the appropriate use of a single (each) word along with its own custom. (3.3.1)

Praetextatus follows with definitions of each term from Trebatius' first book on religion, citing examples in Vergil that follow each definition. The word *proprietas* also appears in Trebatius' definition of the word *profanum*, although here, *proprietas* refers to possession or ownership rather than appropriate word choice or reference to a custom: *profanum id proprie dici ait quod ex religioso vel sacro in hominum usum proprietatemque conversum est* (Trebatius says something is properly called profane that is changed from religious or sacred use into the use and ownership of people, 3.3.4). Working with Trebatius' definition, Praetextatus follows up with an example from the *Aeneid* in which the Trojans destroyed a sacred tree (12.70). Following this definition, Praetextatus comments that Vergil *ostendit proprie profanatum* (fittingly shows it has been profaned, 3.3.4). Next, turning to the word *religiosus*, Praetextatus discusses how Vergil

accurately describes sacred groves by emphasizing their remoteness: *et adiecit quo proprietatem religionis exprimeret* (and he added to express the appropriateness of the word “religion,” 3.3.9).

In essence, the holiness of a grove means that it has an area of sacred space around it.

Proprietas verborum is the foundation of Praetextatus’ analysis as the discussion of sacred space moves from remote groves (*lucus, nemus*) in *Sat.* 3.3 to shrines (*delubra*) in the next chapter: *Nomina etiam sacrorum locorum sub congrua proprietate proferre pontificalis observatio est. ergo delubrum quid pontifices proprie vocent et qualiter hoc nomine Vergilius usus sit requiramus* (It is also the priestly practice to utter names of sacred places under the appropriate terminology. Let’s find out what pontiffs properly define as a *delubrum*, or shrine, and how Vergil has used this word, 3.4.1). Praetextatus infers that he will start with quotations from actual priests (*delubrum quid pontifices proprie vocent*) and then check whether Vergil accurately describes *delubra* according to these priestly definitions (*qualiter hoc nomine Vergilius usus sit requiramus*). From Praetextatus’ summary of Varro’s definition that follows, it is clear that Varro was corralling two different schools of thought, perhaps two groups of *pontifices*, regarding the word *delubrum*:

Varro libro octavo Rerum divinarum delubrum ait alios aestimare in quo praeter aedem sit area adsumpta deum causa, ut est in Circo Flaminio Iovis Statoris, alios in quo loco dei simulacrum dedicatum sit, et adiecit, sicut locum in quo fingerent candelam candelabrum appellatum, ita in quo deum ponerent nominatum delubrum.

In book eight of *Divine Matters*, Varro says that some think a shrine, is the *area* next to a temple that is reserved for the sake of the gods, as exists in the *Circus Flaminius* with the shrine of *Iuppiter Stator*; [he says that] others think that a shrine is where the cult image of the god is dedicated, and he adds that just as the place that they put a candle is called a *candelabrum*, so too the place that they put the god is called a *delubrum*. (3.4.2-3)

In this passage, the repetition of *alios...alios* separates two completely different sets of criteria for *delubra*: The first group of *pontifices* thinks that a *delubrum* is an outdoor affair, the sacred

space that adjoins a temple and includes a cult image, like the example of *Iuppiter Stator* in the *Circus Flaminius*; the second group defines a *delubrum* as the actual place where the cult statue is located, implying that this could also be inside a temple, perhaps even referring to the *cella*.

It is easy to be distracted by Varro's charming yet erroneous analogy, *candela:candelabrum::deus:delubrum* which suggests that a *delubrum* is some sort of godly container. Sabine MacCormack suffers this distraction when she examines contrasting this analogy from *Sat.* 3 and Augustine's ideas about language. Noting that Varro's etymologies typically arise from examining only the shape and sound of words with little regard for connections in meaning, MacCormack concludes that Macrobius models Varronian linguistic principles while Augustine is primarily concerned with effective communication.²⁶ The main problem with her characterization of Macrobius is that Varro is only a small piece of Macrobius' linguistic battery. His method of *proprietas verborum* reaches for a deeper contextual meaning rather than stopping at superficial similarities between words. In addition to relying upon Quintilian and Cicero's ideas of *proprietas*, Macrobius also incorporates a multitude of secondary sources during Praetextatus' speech so that Varro is one voice among many authors. Moreover, MacCormack takes Varro's analogy *candela:candelabrum::deus delubrum* as the only definition for *delubrum* in *Sat.* 3.4 misrepresenting Praetextatus' actual argument that Vergil uses two completely different definitions of the term. Praetextatus emphasizes that he will show examples of both sets of criteria: that a *delubrum* is either a sacred, outdoor space adjacent to a temple or the location of the cult statue of a god. *Vergilius tamen utramque rationem diligenter est exsecutus. ut enim a postrema incipiamus, observavit delubrum nominaturus aut propria deorum nomina aut ea quae dis accommodarentur inserere* (Nevertheless, Vergil has followed

²⁶ Sabine MacCormack, *The Shadows of Poetry: Vergil in the Mind of Augustine*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998): 75, 77

each definition. To begin with the last definition, he has observed the word *delubrum* because he will identify the appropriate names of the gods or those things that are attributed to the gods, 3.4.4). What follows is confusing to the reader because Praetextatus cites examples that suit Varro's second "container" definition before he backtracks, discussing the importance of the *area*. Ultimately Praetextatus must show that Vergil is a *pontifex maximus* who understands both definitions (*utramque rationem*) of the word *delubrum* because *proprietas verborum* entails using a word according to its full potential. In support of Varro's second definition, Praetextatus quotes Aeneas' narrative of the fall of Troy. Vergil follows the path of the sea serpents, who have already strangled Laocoon and his sons: *at gemini lapsu **delubra** ad summa dracones/effugiunt* (but by slithering the twin serpents retreat to the highest shrines, 2.225-6). In these lines *ad summa delubra* is the important phrase to notice. Praetextatus notes that Vergil subsequently alludes to the cult image of Pallas, *et mox simulacrum nominaret, subtextuit* (and next he wrote this to signify the cult image). Here the cult image, or *simulacrum* parallels the *candela* in Varro's analogy. Vergil describes the statue, but from the point of view of the serpents: *saeveque petunt Tritonidis arcem/sub pedibus deae clipeique sub orbe teguntur* (fiercely they infiltrate the citadel of Pallas and weave themselves underneath the feet of the goddess and the wheel of her shield, 2.226-7). In this example, the specific details of the cult statue support Praetextatus' argument that a *delubrum* contains the cult image of a specific god or goddess. Concluding this line of his argument, Praetextatus quotes Aeneas' lament *item: 'nos delubra deum miseri quibus ultimus esset/ille dies'* (moreover: 'the shrines of the gods...we pathetic beings for whom that day was the very last, 2.248-9). Praetextatus omitted the second half of Vergil's line, so reader must supply the rest to make sense of the sentence: *ille dies festa velamus fronde per urbem* (throughout the city we covered the shrines of the gods with festive

palms, 2.249). MacCormack does not comment directly on these examples from the *Aeneid* that actually follow Varro's "container" analogy. Instead, she misappropriates the second group of examples that describe a *delubrum* as a sacred space adjacent to a temple.

Next, Praetextatus cites examples that conform to Varro's first definition of the term *delubrum*: *illam vero opinionem de area, Quam Varro praedixerat non omisit* (He also doesn't miss what Varro said before, the opinion about an *area*, 3.4.4-5). Praetextatus is trying to show in his last example that *delubra* are situated in the open air, in the space reserved for a statue next to the temple: '*principio delubra adeunt, pacemque per aras/ exquirunt...*' *et mox*: '*aut ante ora deum pingues spatiat ad aras*' ('at first they approach the shrines, seeking pacification through the altars...' and next: 'or in front of the images of the gods she walks around to the fatted altars.'). While Praetextatus chooses this example to show that one must preserve the sacred space of a *delubrum* by walking around it, Mac Cormack misses this analysis and focuses on the countenances of the gods (*ante ora deum*):

Praetextatus thus illustrated the organic linkage between *deus* and *delubrum* from Vergil, who described how Dido and the Carthaginians had approached the temples, *delubra*, and then, under the very eyes of the gods, *deum*, that is, facing their statues, had offered sacrifice.²⁷

Using the same lines from Vergil, Praetextatus concludes something altogether different: *quid enim est spatiat quam spatio lati itineris obambulat? quod adiciendo ante aras ostendit aream adsumptam deorum causa. ita suo more velut aliud agendo implet arcana* (What is *spatiat* other than a space that someone must walk around with a wide berth? By adding *spatiat* before the word the *aras* he illustrates that the *area* is reserved for the sake of the gods. Just as Vergil has done elsewhere, he fulfills hidden meaning, 3.4.5). According to MacCormack, the phrase *ante ora deum* is evidence of Varro's "organic linkeage" between *deus* and *delubrum*, but

²⁷ *Ibid.*

according to Praetextatus' interpretation Varro's "container" definition does not apply to a second Vergilian example. Praetextatus has already showed Varro's "organic linkage" in his first example by referencing the cult statue of Minerva's *delubrum* by name (*Tritonidis*) and by accoutrement (*clipeus*). For this reason, Praetextatus bypasses the phrase *ante ora deum* because it lacks the specificity needed to show *proprietas verborum* –no named gods or symbols for gods appear in the second example. Using Varro's first definition of *delubrum*, Praetextatus zeroes in on the verb *spatiatur*, which denotes walking around something (*obambulabat*). Because the verb *spatiatur* comes before the phrase *ad aras* Praetextatus contends that Vergil is describing a journey: Dido and her entourage first see the *area* that contained cult states (*ante ora deum*), are forced to walk around the sacred ground (*spatiatur*), and finally reach the altars (*ad aras*) located outside of the temple. In the process of making Vergil a *pontifex maximus*, Praetextatus also reveals his philological strengths. Rather than only following Varro's etymologies as MacCormack suggests, Praetextatus achieves more sophisticated results by his method of *proprietas verborum*.

After showing examples of *delubra* in Vergil, Praetextatus argues that Vergil also knows about the origin and nature of the Penates: *De dis quoque Romanorum propriis* (Also concerning the very own gods of the Romans, 3.4.6). Similar to Trebatius in *Sat.* 3.3.1, this usage of the adjective *propriis* suggests ownership rather than correctness and relates neither to word choice nor religious tradition, but the discussion of the *Penates*' origin does yield yet another example of *proprietas verborum*:

Varro Humanarum secundo Dardanum refert deos Penates ex Samothrace in Phrygiam, et Aeneam ex Phrygia in Italiam detulisse. Qui sint autem di Penates, in libro quidem memorato Varro non exprimit: sed qui diligentius eruunt veritatem Penates esse dixerunt per quos penitus spiramus, per quos habemus corpus, per quos rationem animi possidemus: esse autem medium aethera Iovem, Iunonem vero imum aera cum terra, et Minervam summum aetheris cacumen: et argumento utuntur quod Tarquinius, Demarati

Corinthii filius Samothracicis religionibus mystice imbutus, uno templo ac sub eodem tecto numina memorata coniunxit.

In his second book called *Human History*, Varro reports that Dardanus brought gods called *Penates* from Samothrace to Phrygia and that from Phrygia, Aeneas had brought them to Italy. However, Varro does not articulate in that book exactly who the *Penates* are. But those who root out the truth more carefully have said that the *Penates* are the gods through whom we breathe in, through whom we have a body, and through whom we possess our mind's reason. Jupiter is the middle ether, Juno the lowest ether and from the earth, and Minerva the head ether and the highest. And they use the argument that Tarquinius, son of Demaratus Corinthius, schooled in mystery and religion of Samothrace, joined the deities recorded here under one temple and even the same roof.

Praetextatus begins with Varro's definition (*Dardanum...detulisse*), and then specifically says that Varro doesn't actually record the names of the gods themselves (*qui...exprimit*). He gives an enigmatic description of another opinion regarding the *Penates* (*qui diligentius eruunt veritatem*). It is these truth-seekers who assert that the word *Penates* is derived from *penitus* and that the three gods represent breath, mind, and body. MacCormack's incorrectly states that Varro is the source for this information:

Macrobius thus quoted from Varro the statement that, through the *Penates*, "we breathe from within, *penitus*, and through them we have a body and possess reason in our souls." The breath that enlivened the body, Macrobius thought, was derived from Jupiter, his consort Juno stood for the body, and the goddess Minerva, for reason.

A careful reading of the *Saturnalia*'s text shows that Praetextatus does not cite Varro as the source for the connection between the words *Penates* and *penitus*. MacCormack also comes to the erroneous conclusion that Varro's etymologies are the operative force in this portion of the *Saturnalia*:

Here also, etymology helped to show both how words form clusters that in turn shed light on their meaning and how that meaning was sustained in the verses of a great poet, just as Varro had believed ought to be the case.

This conclusion overlooks the fact that Praetextatus uses a source other than Varro to illustrate the role of these gods in Vergil's work. *Cassius vero Hemina dicit Samothracas deos eosdemque Romanorum Penates, proprie dici* θεοὺς μεγάλους, θεοὺς χρηστούς, θεοὺς δυνατούς (Cassius Hemina says that the gods of the Romans Penates are the same gods of Samothrace, correctly calling them great gods, good gods, and mighty gods 3.4.9). MacCormack adequately summarizes the way that Praetextatus uses Cassius Hemina's work. Here *proprie* indicates that the cultural and etymological origins of these gods can be revealed by epithets assigned to the gods who comprise the *Penates*. Praetextatus uses the examples *Cum sociis natoque, Penatibus et magnis dis, Iunonis magnae, bona Iuno, dominamque potentem* to show that Vergil expressed a full understanding of the roles of the *Penates*. MacCormack does note that Varro also refers to the *Penates* as θεοὺς δυνατούς (powerful gods, *LL* 5.10) which references the *Libri Augurum*. Varro's account stops short of providing Cassius' more complete set of epithets. Perhaps Cassius Hemina was writing from the same source, his account is more complete, providing Praetextatus with the fodder for the epithets great, good and powerful that appear in Vergil. Although Varro is an important source to Praetextatus in his speech, incorporates additional authors like Cassius Hemina, but ultimately relies on *proprietas verborum* for his final conclusions.

A similar phrase, *proprie dicitur*, approves Vergil's use of *persolvo* when the boxer Entellus pays honor to Eryx with a bull instead of killing the Trojan, Dares: *ait 'persolvo' quod de voto proprie dicitur, utque ostenderet persolutum dis, signavit dicens...* (he said, *persolvo*, because it is rightly said concerning an offering, and to show that the offering was made to the gods, [Vergil] showed this when saying... 3.5.3). Again, this shows the correct usage of terminology. In *Sat.* 3.6, Praetextatus turns to Vergil's appropriate use of epithets for the gods in the next chapter, first asserting that *pater* in Vergil alludes to *Apollo Genitor*: *at vero cum*

taurum mox immolat Apollini et Neptuno, apud aliam utique aram factam intellegemus, et bene supra tantum modo patrem quod ibi proprium est, et infra quod commune est, Apollinem nominat (but indeed when he then burns up a bull for Apollo and Neptune, we understand that it is done at another altar, because in the former passage only *pater* is appropriate there, and in the latter passage he names Apollo, which is the common name, 3.6.4). He further explains how Vergil has preserved this religious history in the epithets of these gods: *ut servavit Apollinis Gentoris proprietatem patrem vocando, idem curavit Herculem vocando victorem* (As he has preserved the correct use of *Apollo Genitor* by calling him “*pater*,” he takes care of the same thing by calling Hercules, “Victor,” 3.6.9). Praetextatus asserts that the Vergil’s phrases *da pater augurium* (3.89) and *victor Alcides* (3.362) also reveal Vergil’s detailed knowledge of these gods.

After these examples of *proprietas verborum*, he comments on the word *sedili* pointing out an unusual dining custom: *nam propria observatio est in Herculis sacris epulari sedentes* (for in the festival of Hercules, dining seated is the proper practice, 3.6.16). The phrase *propria observatio* conforms to the concept of *proprietas moris* established in *Sat.* 3.1 when Praetextatus praised Vergil’s use of the term *abluero*. When a word accurately describes a detail or action from a ritual, like *sedili* in this instance, it shows that Vergil understands the practice of Roman religion. Praetextatus then comments on the lines in which the fates select Halaesus who has been hiding in the forest until his father’s death: *iniecere manum Parcae telisque sacrarunt/Evandri* (the fates have laid their hand and have sacrificed him with the weapons of Evander, 10.419) Here, Praetextatus is taking the literal meaning *sacrarunt*, to consecrate something, i.e. sacrifice a victim. In a transferred meaning for humans, the word can mean doomed or slated for execution. Taking full ownership or *mancipium* is a parallel idea in Roman

law, since Praetextatus views sacrifice as the gods taking possession of the victim. In this case, Praetextatus' interpretation is that Vergil is accurately describing Halaesus as a sacrificial victim rather than a warrior on the battlefield:

ita ergo opportune sacratum Halaesum facit quia erat appetiturus. et hic proprietatem et humani et divini iuris secutus est. nam ex manus iniiectione paene mancipium designavit, et sacrationis vocabulo observantiam divini iuris implevit.

So therefore [Vergil] conveniently makes Halaesus a sacrificial victim because he is about to die. The poet has followed the right use of human and divine law. For from the words *iniectione manus* he has almost described *mancipium*, legally taking possession, and he has fulfilled the practice of divine law with a word of sacrifice. (3.4.6)

As Praetextatus' commentary points out, the *Parcae* act on two levels, the human and the divine, as they take possession of Halaesus' life; they take ownership of the youth by the laying on of hands and they make him a sacrificial victim by the sword of Evander. Here, *observantiam* recalls the phrase *propria observatio* from *Sat.* 3.6.16. Both examples describe an act or ritual so in effect the terms *observatio* and *observantia* function as synonyms for *mos*. The method behind Praetextatus' analysis of the seated sacrificial banquets of Hercules and the death of Halaesus is the same: rather than arguing that Vergil uses the full etymological meaning behind a word in the context of his poetry, Praetextatus shows that a single word alludes to an actual ritual or religious custom. The pattern is consistent in *Sat.* 3.1-3.7: each segment of his argument examines Vergil's *proprietas verborum* or *moris*. Praetextatus uses a short quotation from Vergil and then supports the presence of *proprietas* with secondary sources, often a summary or quotation of from less accessible sources on Roman religion.

One of the confusing things about tracing *proprietas* in Praetextatus' speech is that the noun *proprietas* disappears after *Sat.* 3.7 along with its adjectival and adverbial forms.²⁸ Instead

²⁸ There is one exception: in *Sat.* 3.8.4 Praetextatus does refer to Hyginus' work entitled *de proprietatibus deorum* (on the essential nature of the gods), but this is a scientific usage of the word that does not contribute to the overall argument of the speech.

of pursuing more examples, Praetextatus introduces material relevant to the discussion of *evocatio*: gods manifesting two genders, and the definition of the term *mos*. He begins by showing how manuscript traditions have obscured Vergil's knowledge, specifically that the phrase *ducente dea* should actually read *ducente deo* (With the goddess leading, 2.32). Preferring the *lectio difficilior*, Praetextatus provides examples of masculine depictions of the goddess Venus. Among these, he quotes Laevinus who says incorporates the formula *sive femina sive mas est* into a prayer addressed to the goddess. Following this, Praetextatus makes a detailed examination of the term *mores*. Praetextatus describes the tradition (*mos*) of having young attendants at sacrifices and discusses the different genders (*camillos/camillas*) represented in literature and in descriptions of rituals from sources on religion (3.8.5-7). He first demonstrates how Vergil uses the term and then defines it in Varro and Festus (3.8.9-14). By choosing to define *mos* toward the end of his speech rather than at the beginning, Praetextatus seems to deconstruct the phrase *proprietas moris* which has been a guiding force in the speech. In the example from the *Aeneid*, Vergil is referring to opening the gates of Janus to initiate warfare: *mos erat Hesperio in Latio quem protinus urbes/Albae coluere sacrum nunc maxima rerum/Roma colit* (in Hesperian Latium there was a sacred custom which the Alban cities continuously practiced and now Rome, the greatest empire of all practices it, 7.601-3). In his commentary on this quotation, Praetextatus does not mention to which tradition Vergil refers. If one looks back into the passage from the *Aeneid*, Vergil describes King Latinus' reluctance to open the gates of the temple of Janus and unleash Mars on his people. Juno, the Saturnian one, performs this task in the end. Praetextatus assumes that his audience has the educational background in Vergil to make this connection. Instead, using Varro's definition of *mos*, *institutum patrum pertinens ad religiones caerimonias maiorum* (the institution of our fathers

relating to religious observances and ceremonies of our ancestors, 3.8.9), Praetextatus proceeds to show that Vergil uses the word with the full force of Varro's definition. Rather than the tradition itself, Praetextatus focuses on the way Vergil shows that it is handed down from antiquity:

servavit enim regnorum sucessionem, quippe primi regnaverunt Latini, inde Albini et inde Romani. ideo, 'mos erat' primum dixit, 'Hesperio in Latio'; et postea, 'quem protinus urbes Albanae coluere sacrum', deinde subiecit, 'nunc maxima rerum Romam colit'.

Here [Vergil] has preserved the succession of kingdoms, since the Latins first ruled, then the Albans, and then the Romans. So first he said, "There was a custom in Hesperian Latium; and after that, "which sacred [custom] the Alban cities continuously practiced", and finally he added, "and now Rome the greatest empire of all practices it" (3.8.14)

Surprisingly, his example illustrates *proprietas verborum*, since Vergil has used the full etymological meaning of the word *mos* according to Varro's definition. Although Praetextatus does not use the phrase itself in his analysis, he follows his template from *Sat.* 3.3, which established Vergil's *proprietas verborum* from Trebatius' definitions of *sacer*, *religiosus*, and *profanus*. For Praetextatus, Vergil pointed out the deep-rooted tradition of Varro's *maiores* in Latium and Alba Longa, and then the continuation of this tradition in Rome under Varro's *institutum patrum*. In addition, the perfect form of *coluere* contrasts nicely with the present force of *colit*, with both verbs underscoring the time span of this tradition. Praetextatus' method is consistent in his speech. He typically introduces a topic by quoting line from the Vergilian corpus, and then backs up the poet. For the most part, Vergil is said to have shown *proprietas verborum* when he uses a religious term accurately and according to its cited definition. *Proprietas moris* occurs when an action or custom that Vergil alludes to follows even the most obscure Roman traditions.

How *Proprietas* Operates within the *Evocatio*

After carefully proving that Vergil's use of the term *mos* conform to Varro's definition of the term, Praetextatus moves on to study one of the most ancient Roman *mores*. Following his established practice from 3.1-3.8, he uses a quotation from the *Aeneid* as his starting point. In Dido's court, Aeneas recounts words that he uttered to his men during the sack of Troy: *excessere omnes adytis arisque relictis/ di quibus imperium hoc steterat*. (All of the gods, by whom this kingdom had stood, have left the sanctuaries and altars abandoned, 2.351). Initially, Praetextatus describes Aeneas' words as *de vetustissimo Romanorum more et de occultissimis sacris vox ista prolata est* (such a voice has revealed something about a most ancient Roman custom and the most hidden rites, 3.9.1), later emphasizing their obscurity with *moremque Romanorum arcanum* (the archaic tradition of the Romans, 3.9.2). As a speaker and a commentator, Praetextatus explains the implications of a city losing its protective gods. He asserts that all cities have protective gods that had to be evoked, or called out of a surrounded city before the Romans would lay siege to it. By first evoking a city's gods, the Romans prevented a sacrilege: gods becoming captives in their own destroyed city (3.9.2). Next, he summarizes rumors about the name of Rome's protective god, which, according to him, has been kept a secret since antiquity. Rejecting suggestions that Jove, Luna, or Angerona fulfill this role, Praetextatus personally favors the idea that *Ops Consivia* is the secret protector of Rome (3.9.3-4). Even though he reveals one "state secret" the name of Rome's protector, he does not venture even a guess about Rome's secret name, a name which he says enemies could use to bring down the entire city (3.9.5). At this point, Praetextatus is still analyzing *proprietas morum*: providing details about *evocatio* that prove Vergil has properly alluded to the ancient custom. Correcting the misconception that the *evocatio* is contained in *uno carmine* (in one prayer), Praetextatus

quotes a two-part prayer (*utrumque carmen*) that neutralizes the power of these protective gods (3.9.6). The *carmen* itself he found in a copy of Sammonicus Serenus' *Res Reconditae* which Sereneus allegedly discovered in an old volume of Furius. First the *evocatio* calls out the protective gods from a besieged city and then the *devotio* hands the city over to the infernal gods for utter destruction. The *evocatio* first addresses the protective god or goddess of Carthage *si deus, si dea est* (if there is a god, if there is a goddess, 3.9.7) and then proceeds with the initial request: *peto ut vos populum civiatemque Carthaginensem deseratis, loca templa sacra urbemque reliquatis*. (I pray that you desert the people and the Carthaginian state, that you leave the sacred places, temples, and city). If the deity does transfer allegiance *Romam ad me meosque* (to Rome, me and my people) there is a promise of *templa ludosque* (temples and games). Although Praetextatus fails to name the speaker of the *evocatio* or first half of the *carmen*, the unnamed voice emphasizes that the gods will be placed before *mihi que populoque Romano militibusque meis* (me, the Roman people, and my soldiers). Not mentioned by name, Scipio Aemilianus was the general responsible for the destruction of Carthage at the end of the Third Punic War. Praetextatus introduces the *devotio*, indicating that only a general performs the second half of the *carmen*. This reinforces the fact the Scipio Aemilianus is the intended voice for the curse. He addresses the gods below: *Dis pater Veiovis Manes, sive vos quo alio nomine fas est nominare* (Infernal father Jove and the spirits of the underworld, or if it is right to call you by any other name, 3.9.10). The requests are simple and destructive: *fuga formidine terrore compleatis* (that you fill the Carthaginians with fear and flight), *eum exercitum eos hostes eosque homines urbes agrosque eorum et qui in his locis regionibusque agris urbibusque habitant abducatis* (that you remove their army, the enemy troops, and their men and the cities and plowed earth and those who live in these places, lands and cities), *lumine supero privetis*

(deprive them of divine light), *uti vos eas urbes ... devotas consecratas habeatis* (that you consider the cities devoted and consecrated), and *qui in his rebus gerundi sunt bene salvos siritis esse* (that you grant that those who do the deed remain safe). Scipio then swears to *Tellus mater teque Iuppiter* (Mother Earth and you too, Jove) promising *ovibus atris tribus* (three black sheep). This curse concludes by describing the actions of the speaker in third person: *cum Tellurem dicit, manibus terram tangit: cum Iovem dicit, manus ad caelum tollit: cum votum recipere dicit manibus pectus tangit*. (When he says Mother Earth, he touches the earth with his hands: when he says Jove, he reaches his hands to the sky: when he says receive the offering, he touches his chest with his hands).²⁹ Praetextatus then provides a list of other devoted towns, and then returns to Vergil by concluding, *Hinc est ergo quod propter huius modi evocationem numinum discessionemque ait Vergilius...* (From here is therefore why, on account of an *evocatio* of this type and departure of the gods Vergil says...). At this point, he repeats the quote from the *Aeneid* 2.351 and then includes the words of the Trojan priest Panthus to Aeneas, *ferus omnia Iuppiter Argos/transtulit* (cruel Jove has transferred everything to the Argives, 2.326-7). Praetextatus often begins his analysis with Vergilian text, but only occasionally repeats the text after his analysis. In *Sat.* 3.9, he not only repeats the words of Aeneas, but also jumps back to Panthus' words in the previous scene. This would cause a learned reader to recall both Panthus and Aeneas' complete speeches strengthening the connection between the destruction of Carthage in the *evocatio* and the destruction of Troy in the *Aeneid*. More importantly, the

²⁹ In his edition, Willis does not italicize 3.9.12 as part of the quotation from Sammonicus Serenus' *Res Reconditae*, though shifting from first person to third person does not necessarily indicate that Praetextatus is now summarizing this source. Earlier in the third book, Praetextatus frequently summarizes the work of authors using indirect statement and indirect question. Here, the present tense and indicative mood of *tangit*, *dicit*, and *tollit* suggest an outside witness to the curse and a continued quotation from Serenus.

example of Panthus' word *transtulit* underscores Aeneas' words, *excessere* and *relictis* all of which denote the transfer of divine power from one people to another.

Typically, Praetextatus quotes a Vergilian passage, and then supports Vergil's word choice with secondary texts about sacred law. In *Sat.* 3.1-3.8, Praetextatus tends to edit and summarize non-Vergilian sources effectively using a combination of short quotations, and *oratio obliqua*. Constituting over two-thirds of the text in chapter nine the curse provides the longest albeit interrupted quotation in *Sat.* 3. Other than the *evocatio* and *devotio* which total twenty-nine lines in Willis' text, the second-longest quotation in Praetextatus' speech totals eight lines. In addition to the sheer length of the curse, the repetitive ritualistic language from this *carmen* is intact. Showcasing the formulaic nature of the curse is a deliberate choice which works well with the pontifical topic of Praetextatus' speech. This curse text stands out from Vergil's text as well as the secondary treatises that Praetextatus quotes because of its repetitive language. For example, the phrase *loca templa sacra* (temples and sacred places) appears twice. In the context of a curse the redundancy makes sense, ensuring that the god or goddess abandoned not only temples but also any other shrines or sacred spaces. The repeated phrase clarifies that the god or goddess comes to *nostra loca templa sacra* (our temples and sacred places) with parallel structure emphasizing the transfer of the gods' allegiance from Carthage to Rome. Avoiding pronouns makes the request clear within the curse: the phrase *populus civitasque Carthaginiensis* (the people and the Carthaginian State) appears again in the accusative case, *populum civitatemque Carthaginiensem*. Likewise in the *devotio*, the general uses a particular pattern when referring to his own troops that appears twice in nominative case, *legiones exercitumque nostrum* (our legions and army) and later in dative case, *exercitibus legionibusque nostris* (for our army and legions). Because of its ritualistic language, the curse not only fits well into the

topic of pontifical law but also stands out stylistically from the Vergilian text and secondary references occurring earlier in the speech. Language like *ubiubi faxit* reinforces that the curse text is an actual prayer rather than a poeticized prayer from the *Aeneid* or secondary sources that academically discuss religious practice and vocabulary.

Although the *evocatio* is a religious rather than academic text, it does have a unique relationship with the vocabulary in Vergil's lines from the *Aeneid*. Chin aptly summarizes the impact of the *evocatio* and its dual connection to Vergil's text:

Vergil's observation of the "most ancient custom of the Romans" (*vetustissimum Romanorum morem*) refers, first to his knowledge of earlier religious practice and, second, to the incorporation of knowledge, and its vocabulary, into his literary work, of which Macrobius' readers are the consumers.³⁰

What Chin refers to "knowledge of earlier religious practice" can also be characterized as Praetextatus' method of *proprietas moris*. Vergil's allusion to the ancient rite of *evocatio* is in itself an excellent example of *proprietas moris* because the ritualistic language and archaisms like *ubiubi faxit* highlight an actual Roman practice. In addition, Chin's "incorporation of knowledge and its vocabulary" is none other than Praetextatus' method of *proprietas verborum*. The curse illustrates *proprietas verborum* through its relationship with the text from the *Aeneid*, actually glosses Vergil's words in a way that Praetextatus mentions in his brief conclusion:

*hinc est ergo quod propter huius modi evocationem numinum discessionemque ait
Vergilius,
 excessere omnes adytis arisque relictis
 di, ...
et tutelares designaret, adiecit:
 quibus imperium hoc steterat
utque praeter evocationem etiam vim devotionis ostenderet, in qua praecipue Iuppiter ut
diximus invocatur, ait:
 ...ferus omnia Iuppiter Argos
 transtulit.*

³⁰ Catherine Chin, *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007): 58.

videturne vobis probatum sine divini et humani iuris scientia non posse profunditatem Maronis intellegi?

Because of the calling out and going out of the gods of the type described here, this is why Vergil says:

All of the gods have left the sanctuaries and altars abandoned
and to specify the protective gods, he added:

by whom this kingdom had stood

Besides the *evocatio*, he said this to show the force of *devotio* as well, in which, as we have said, Jupiter is invoked in particular:

Infernal Jove has transferred everything to Argos

Does it now seem proved to you that without knowledge of divine and human law the depth of Vergil cannot be understood? (3.9.14-16)

According to Praetextatus, Vergil alludes to these elements of the curse text: the departure of the gods (*discessio numinum*), the protective nature of these gods (*tutelares designaret*), the violence of the *devotio* (*vis devotionis*), and Jupiter's role in the *devotio* (*praecipue Iuppiter... invocatur*). Unfortunately, Praetextatus does not go back in detail and point out examples for each of these ideas in this case. Perhaps Macrobius considers these examples self-evident and a more dramatic way to end Praetextatus' speech than detailed analysis. Whatever the reason, the reader is left to draw his or her own conclusions from Praetextatus' generalized remarks. As Praetextatus mentions, Vergil uses the words *excessere* and *relictis* to describe the *discessio numinum*, or departure of the gods. Upon examination, the *evocatio* employs the subjunctive verb *relinquatis* to implore the gods to leave, since Vergil uses the same verb the ablative absolute *aris relictis*. In addition, *deseratis* and *absque his abeat* intensify the request to leave the city in question. The parallel structure of these subjunctive verbs spells out to the gods, or to anyone with even a limited Latin vocabulary what is being requested: a departure. This example shows what is so attractive about this passage in regard to *proprietas verborum*: the verbs in the curse provide cultural and etymological precedent for Vergil's use of the words *excessere* and *relictis*. In addition, Vergil's phrase *adytis arisque* echoes the phrase *loca templa sacra urbemque* from the

curse, again showing the textual precedent for Vergil's word choice. Since this exact phrase appears twice in the curse text, the reader has two opportunities to connect it to Vergil's text. Praetextatus also notes that Vergil makes the gods protective, *tutelares designaret*, with these words: *omnes di...quibus hoc imperium steterat*. The *evocatio* uses the gender neutral formula *si deus si dea*, to ambivalently call upon the gods in question, while the Vergilian passage uses an inclusive *omnes di*, qualifying it with the relative clause *quibus hoc imperium steterat*. The curse directly uses the phrases *est in tutela*, and *tutelam recepisti* to show that these gods are protective, a word choice reflected in Praetextatus' analysis, *tutelares designaret*. In spite of these similarities, the actual locations of Vergil's *imperium* and the *civitas* in the *evocatio* are altogether different. In the passage from the *Aeneid*, Aeneas uses the phrase *hoc imperium* in reference to Troy during its fall. The general in the *evocatio*, Scipio Aemilianus, is very specific about the region under the gods' protection using these phrases: *hoc populus civitasque Carthaginensis, urbis huius populi, populum civitatemque Carthaginensem*. In regard to the *devotio*, Praetextatus notes the Vergil alludes to its force (*vim*) and to the way that that Jupiter is evoked (*Jupiter invocatur*). Initially the request is to fill the enemy with fear (*fuga formidine terrore compleatis*), then to lead them away from their homes (*abducatis*), and finally to deprive them of divine light/life (*lumine supero privetis*). Praetextatus makes a special point to go back into the scene at the fall of Troy and pull out Panthus' speech. As mentioned before, this brings in the verb *transtulit* that highlights the movement of divine power, but Praetextatus is more interested in Panthus' phrase *ferus Iuppiter*. In the *devotio*, Aemilianus calls upon Jupiter by two different names: infernal Jove under the title "father of the spirits of the dead" *Dis pater Veiovis* along with the *Manes*, or spirits of the dead, while at the end of the curse he calls upon both *Tellus Mater* and the father of the gods, *Iuppiter*.³¹

³¹ Both of these gods connect to patron deities of Carthage with *Tellus Mater* referencing the Punic goddess Tanit

Conclusion

Superficially, it seems that the speech was an unqualified success and that Praetextatus achieved his goal of making Vergil *pontifex maximus* as he set out to do in *Sat. 1: promitto fore ut Vergilius noster pontifex maximus adseratur* (I assert that our Vergil will be proved a *pontifex maximus*, 1.24.16). However, upon closer examination, Praetextatus' final conclusion has significant differences from his original goal: *videtur vobis probatum sine divini et humani iuris scientia non posse profunditatem Maronis intellegi?* (Does it now seem proved to you that one cannot understand the depth of Vergil without knowledge of divine and human law, 3.9.16). Praetextatus' goal has changed: the onus of being a dutiful *pontifex maximus* is no longer on Vergil, nor must Praetextatus alone prove the poet worthy. Now the reader needs to have an understanding of Roman religion to appreciate the poet. Why is there a change at the conclusion of Praetextatus' speech? Why not keep to the original plan and state that Vergil is clearly a *pontifex maximus* beyond reproach? This question is compounded by the reaction of the other guests: *omnes concordi testimonio doctrinam et poetae et enarrantis aequarent* (Everyone in agreement said the erudition of both the poet and commentator were equal, 3.10.1). The *Saturnalia's* narrative voice describes how the other speakers value Vergil's poetry as well as Praetextatus' commentary. Judging from the reaction of this majority, Vergil's assumed role as *pontifex maximus* has transferred onto Praetextatus, revealing the erudition of both poet and commentator. The obvious exception to this reaction is Evangelus who questions Vergil and Praetextatus' grasp of Roman religion.³² The narrative voice describes Evangelus as he is about to erupt with questions and criticism: *exclamat Evangelus diu se succubuisse patientiae, nec*

and *Iuppiter* connecting to Baal Hammon.

³² It is important to note that Evangelus does not ask questions regarding the *evocatio* in *Sat. 3.10-12*, although he is cut off by another lacuna, so it is impossible to say whether he questioned Praetextatus' interpretation of *A.351-2* or not. *Sat.3.13.1* begins with Caecina's discussion of sumptuary law already in progress.

ultra dissimulandum quin in medium detegat inscientiae Vergiliana vulnere (Evangelus shouts that he has resigned himself to patience for too long and cannot pretend to be patient any more, and that he must reveal the flaws of Vergil's ignorance to the group, 3.10.1). As a foil to Praetextatus, Evangelus places the blame back on the poet Vergil. When Praetextatus aptly counters his arguments, it reinforces that the reader is responsible for not only having a command of Vergil, but also a detailed understanding of Roman religion.

In part, the shift to a reader's responsibility can be attributed to Macrobius' didactic goal for the *Saturnalia* as a whole. For Macrobius and his contemporaries, Vergil is the ultimate source of knowledge, the textbook for Roman education and therefore the best starting point for learned discussion. Referring to Vergil by name over 200 times, Macrobius also frequently quotes the *Aeneid*, *Georgics*, and *Eclogues* without citing authorship. Vergil's prominence in the dialogue can be partially explained by the author's dedication in the preface: *Eustachi fili*, my son Eustachius (1.Praef.1). Macrobius goes on to outline ways that the *Saturnalia* will complete his son's education:

hinc est quod mihi quoque institutione tua nihil antiquius aestimatur; ad cuius perfectionem compendia longis anfractibus anteposenda ducens, moraeque omnis impatiens, non opperor ut per haec solo promoveas quibus ediscendis naviter ipse invigilas, sed ago ut quoque tibi legerim

This is why I value nothing more precious than your education; for the purpose of its completion creating a summary that is preferable to long readings, not permitting any delay. I didn't want you to go ahead on your own through these works since in their study you yourself would have to be especially vigilant. I am doing this so you too can read what I have already read.

Frequent references to Vergil provide readers like Eustachius entry into a sophisticated literary world via a familiar classroom text.³³ Throughout their discourse, speakers like Praetextatus and Symmachus connect cultural topics and literary quotations to relevant Vergilian texts. Since the

³³ MacCormack, 83-5.

dialogue requires a sufficient command of the works of Vergil to follow the conversation of the speakers, the opportunities for both explicit and implicit textual comparisons are numerous. In addition, Eustachius can also model the expert literary analysis of the well-educated speakers, and shun the superficial criticisms and disjointed analysis of the inexperienced and ignorant, such as Evangelus. At the end of his speech in *Sat.* 3, Praetextatus is convincing the reader of a need to have an understanding of Roman religion in order to discuss Vergil like an educated aristocrat. Praetextatus provides the reader with a particular method, *proprietas verborum* and *proprietas moris*, for discussing Vergil which after all is the main activity of the *Saturnalia* (1.24.16-22).

Considering Macrobius' didactic goal provides a fresh approach to the *evocatio* and *devotio*, keeping in mind that the intended readership included his son, Eustachius, and others like him who were finishing their education. *Sat.* 3 does not address the technicalities of performing sacrifices and curses any more than Vergil's *Georgics* can be considered a manual for farming. Praetextatus credits Vergil with a generalized knowledge *doctrina* which is an amalgamation of many cults and practices in Roman religion.³⁴ Both works are didactic, yet what each actually teaches the reader does not necessarily equal the work's subject matter. Chin notes, "The linguistic subject is construed as religious, and the religious subject as literary."³⁵ Examining the principle of *proprietas* in Praetextatus' speech allows one to uncover the real lesson of the *Saturnalia*: an aristocratic method for discussing and analyzing Vergil. The method of *proprietas* may be peculiar to Praetextatus' speech in *Sat.* 3, but the intellectual value behind it is pervasive Macrobius' work. Kaster observes:

³⁴ Catherine Chin, *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007): 57.

³⁵ *ibid.*

But the *diligentia* of the poet is not sufficient by itself. It must strike a responsive chord in the reader: as the poet “reveals his own *diligentia*” in his work, so the reader is called to be *diligens* in his turn—in essence, to prove himself worthy of the poet.³⁶

Kaster considers *diligentia* a moral absolute for the speakers in the *Saturnalia*, so that each speaker must prove his own worth by showing a detailed knowledge of Vergil as well as related field such as Praetextatus’ expertise on pontifical law. This nexus, the relationship between poet, narrator, and reader is especially prevalent in the *evocatio* because Praetextatus provides only a small amount of literary guidance to connect the *evocatio* to Vergil’s text. In a way, he has trained the reader in the methods of *proprietas verborum* and *proprietas moris* during *Sat.* 3.1-3.8. Now it is the reader’s turn to make connections between the two texts.

³⁶ Robert Kaster, “Macrobius and Servius: Verecundia and the Grammarian’s Function,” *HSPH* 84, (1980): 235.

CHAPTER 2

SCIPIO AEMILIANUS AND *VERECUNDIA*

Introduction

Studying *proprietas* within Praetextatus' speech is a good starting point for understanding the curse on Carthage, but any examination of the *evocatio* would be remiss if it did not address how the curse functions as part of the dialogue. While examining the speaker of a text is a perfunctory part of any literary analysis, it is particularly important in dialogue because speakers provide the divergent points-of-view that define the genre. Moreover, the same phrase, when uttered by different speakers, conveys different meanings to the reader. Though the nine chapters of Praetextatus' speech that encompass the *evocatio* may seem like a monologue, it is important to remember that the *Saturnalia* is first and foremost a dialogue. In these circumstances, examining Praetextatus' speech in isolation is not enough because an ensemble of voices contributes to the ideas and discussion in *Sat.* 3. Of particular interest to the study of the *evocatio*, is the fact that the general who utters the curse on Carthage, Scipio Aemilianus, makes another appearance later on in the evening's discussion. Rufius Albinus quotes a passage in which Scipio Aemilianus describes scandalous behavior going on at dancing schools (3.14.7). Although Aemilianus does not physically attend the banquet, his words concur with speakers who prefer exchanging jokes to watching dancing girls (2.1.5). When taken together, the *evocatio* and the speech against dancing schools create a portrait of Scipio Aemilianus from two different points of his career, fleshing him out as a character in the dialogue.

In this chapter I will begin by analyzing the significance Macrobius assigns to his speakers in the preface of the *Saturnalia* using text from Seneca Minor and Aulus Gellius. Next,

I will examine how the *evocatio* fits into the structure of the dialogue. This study includes tracing the *ordo* and relationships between speakers in *Sat.* 3, as well as paying close attention to the placement Aemilianus' two speeches within the dialogue's temporal framework. Since Praetextatus himself refers to Cloanthus and Aeneas as *voces*, I will also explore ways that characters from the *Aeneid* participate in Praetextatus' speech as literary characters. My final analysis will focus on the distribution of first-person verbs in *Sat.* 3 and how these verbs bring Scipio Aemilianus' voice to the forefront, on par with the *Saturnalia*'s speakers. Together, these examples of behavior and speech explore the principle of *verecundia*: what it means to behave in aristocratic society and how ancient literary sources are relevant to a reader like Eustachius.

The Role of Speakers in the *Saturnalia*

As a genre, dialogue is defined by speakers and their unique voices, but Macrobius uses a substantial portion of the *praefatio* to describe the role of voices in the *Saturnalia*, highlighting their significance. In a manner that is typically Macrobian, he splices together quotations from Seneca the Younger's *Epistulae Morales* and Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* to describe the goals for his *opus*.³⁷ Looking at the way Macrobius uses Seneca and Gellius in this context reveals Macrobius' intentions for the speakers in his own dialogue. Macrobius also draws attention to voices from the past, from eras preceding the *saeculum Praetextati*:

vides quam multorum vocibus chorus constet: una tamen ex omnibus redditur. aliqua est illic acuta, aliqua gravis, aliqua media; accedunt viris feminae, interponitur fistula: ita singulorum illic latent voces, omnium apparent et fit concentus ex dissonis. tale hoc praesens opus volo: multae in illo artes, multa praecepta sint, multarum aetatum exempla, sed in unum conspirata: in quibus si neque ea quae iam tibi sunt cognita asperneris, ne quae ignota sunt vites, invenies plurima quae sit aut voluptati legere aut cultui legisse aut usui meminisse.

³⁷ Willis cites the *praefatio Noctes Atticae* and Seneca's *Epistulae Morales* 84 in the notes for his text, Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, vol.1 ed. J. Willis (Leipzig: Teubner, 1963): 2-3.

You see how a chorus is made up of many voices: nevertheless from many voices one resounds. One voice is high, another low, still another in the middle; women soar above the men, a flute is added. In the end individual voices fade away; they blend together and harmony is created from dissonance. I want such a thing for my current work: there are many disciplines [represented] in it, many principles, and examples taken from many time periods, but they are blended together into one. If you don't look down on the things that you already know, or deny gaps in your learning—things you don't know, you will find many things which are either pleasant to read, educational to have read or useful to remember. (1.praef.9)

Macrobius' initially wishes the different voices in the *Saturnalia* to unify (*in unum conspirata*).³⁸ This simile is particularly fitting since one can imagine assigning a shrill voice to Evangelus (*acuta*), a heavy serious tone to Praetextatus (*gravis*), and perhaps a more mellow sound to a speaker like Rufius Albinus (*media*). Individually, these voices may be strident or wobbly, but together they create a pleasant sound (*fit concentus ex dissonis*). Contrasting voices like those of Praetextatus and Evangelus do more than add interest; they create positive and negative role models for Eustachius. In effect, a reader like Eustachius can imitate the expert literary analysis of a well-educated speaker, and shun the superficial criticisms and disjointed analysis of the inexperienced and ignorant. Macrobius' changes to Seneca's text create a transition showing how the speakers in the *Saturnalia* bring both diversity and unity to the work (tale hoc praesens opus volo: multae in illo artes, multa praecepta sit, multarum aetatum exempla, sed in unum conspirata). Sat. 3 includes different disciplines (multae in illo artes) such as philosophy and astronomy, augury, pontifical law, and sumptuary law. Rather than the entire group sharing in the discussion, Macrobius selects one or two speakers to specialize in a topic; for example, Praetextatus presents religious matters, and the Albini describe Republican dining. Kaster has written on important principles that surface within the work (multa praecepta sit) including *verecundia* as well as *diligentia* and *vetustas*, with the latter two playing prominent

³⁸ For choral imagery in *Sat.* 7 with additional references to this common image in other ancient sources, see Robert Kaster, "Macrobius and Servius: *Verecundia* and the Grammarian's Function," *HSPH* 84, (1980): 233-4.

roles in the speeches of Sat. 3. Speakers like Praetextatus, Rufius Albinus, and Servius embrace these principles while Evangelus seems to oppose them at every turn. Beyond the Vergilian corpus, literary examples in Sat. 3 cover the spectrum of Roman literature from Naevius and Plautus to Sammonicus Serenus (*multarum aetatum exempla*). Praetextatus and the Albini take particular pride in showing their love of *vetustas* by incorporating ancient and obscure examples into their speeches (3.14.1-2). The way Macrobius manipulates Seneca's text reveals the significance of these phrases, so it is helpful to examine the passage in its original context. In *Epistulae Morales* 84, Seneca desires the unanimity of a well-balanced choir for his own mind:

Non vides quam multorum vocibus chorus constet? unus tamen ex omnibus redditur. Aliqua illic acuta est, aliqua gravis, aliqua media; accedunt viris feminae, interponuntur tibiae: singulorum illic latent voces, omnium apparent. De choro dico quem veteres philosophi noverant: in commissionibus nostris plus cantorum est quam in theatris olim spectatorum fuit. Cum omnes vias ordo canentium implevit et cavea aeneatoribus cincta est et ex pulpito omne tibiarum genus organorumque consonuit, fit concentus ex dissonis. Talem animum esse nostrum volo: multae in illo artes, multa praecepta sint, multarum aetatum exempla, sed in unum conspirata.

You see how a chorus is made up of many voices: nevertheless from many one [voice] resounds. One [voice] is high, another low, still another in the middle; women soar above the men, a flute is added: in the end individual voices fade away, they blend together. The type of chorus I am talking about is one that ancient philosophers had known: In contemporary productions there are more singers than there once were spectators in entire theaters. When chorus lines filled all the aisles and the seating area was surrounded by trumpets and every type of flute and organ resounded from the stage, harmony arose from discord. I want my mind to be like that: many skills in it, many principles, examples of many ages, but blended together as one. (Seneca *Epist. Morales* 84, 9-10)

Macrobius quotes verbatim the portion in boldface, editing out Seneca's comparison of contemporary choruses to those of classical Greece. More importantly, Macrobius modified Seneca's phrase *talem animum esse nostrum volo* (I want my mind to be like that) to his own *tale hoc praesens opus volo* (I want such a thing for my present work). This shows that Macrobius adapted Seneca's original text to suit a specific meaning for the *Saturnalia's praefatio*. In

essence, Seneca is wishing for his mind to work in concert like a well-balanced choir, while Macrobius wants all of the elements of the *Saturnalia* to work together for his desired effect. Looking at these subtle differences is important because other scholars often treat Macrobius as a repository for other texts—someone who copies and preserves with a limited understanding of what he is doing. In this case Macrobius’ choices are deliberate: He edits and truncates Seneca’s text, changing the terms of comparison from *animus* to *opus*.

It is not surprising that Macrobius quotes Aulus Gellius in the *Saturnalia*’s preface, since Macrobius dedicated both the *Saturnalia* and *In Somnium Scipionis* to his son, Eustachius, and Gellius also dedicated *Noctes Atticae* to his children (*liberis quoque meis*, *NA* praef.1). Although such inscriptions are by no means unusual, both Gellius and Macrobius take great pains to articulate educational goals in their respective *praefationes*. Throughout the *Saturnalia*, Macrobius incorporates many passages from Gellius, frequently without citing authorship. The *praefatio* in particular contains both verbatim and paraphrased text from the preface of *Noctes Atticae* that originally expressed Gellius’ wishes to broaden his children’s knowledge and literary horizons. In many ways the *Saturnalia*’s preface is an homage to Gellius, whose nocturnal scribblings (*lucubrationunculas*, *NA* praef.14) perhaps inspired Macrobius to generate a legacy for Eustachius almost three hundred years later. Although the *Saturnalia* is a dialogue and *Noctes Atticae* is not, the two works do have a similar scope and focus: both encompass many disciplines using a variety of literary sources and both provide commentary intended to educate the reader. The ways that each author provides commentary and organizes text are strikingly different. As a commentator, Gellius explains passages using his own voice throughout the work, sometimes using the first-person point of view, while Macrobius relies on the speakers of his

dialogue to comment on literature.³⁹ Although Gellius describes his own work as commentary rather than dialogue (*annotationibus pristinis*, *NA* praef. 3), *Noctes Atticae* is not organized according to primary texts. Because so many different topics are involved, Gellius groups texts under chapter headings rather than preserving the integrity of the primary text. Macrobius also groups texts in the *Saturnalia* according to topic, but rather than chapter headings, he employs the dialogue's speakers to change topics. Both works contain copious amounts of quoted and summarized text, which explains why Macrobius relies on Gellius to help him describe the types of text included in the *Saturnalia*. In the preface of *Noctes Atticae*, Gellius supplies the criteria that he used to select passages from longer works:

*Sed ne consilium quidem in excerpendis notandisque rebus idem mihi, quod plerisque illis, fuit. Namque illi omnes et eorum maxime Graeci, multa et varia lectitantes, in quas res cumque inciderant, "alba," ut dicitur, "linea" sine cura discriminis solam copiam sectati converrebant, quibus in legendis ante animus senio ac taedio languebit quam unum alterumve reppererit quod **sit aut voluptati legere aut cultui legisse aut usui meminisse.***

But I didn't have the same strategy at all that many previous authors used for writing down the excerpts and topics. For all of them (mostly Greek authors who write about so many different subjects) while pursuing a single narrative, swept together whatever they had found "with a white line" as they say: without concern for differentiation [between topics]. When reading their work, one's mind suffers with senility and boredom until it comes across one thing or another that is either pleasant to read, educational to have read or useful to have remembered (*NA* praef. 11)

The portion that Macrobius quoted directly appears in boldface. For Gellius, these are the criteria for selecting passages from Greek works that were on the whole, tedious to read: passages must be pleasurable, educational, or useful. In *Noctes Atticae*, Gellius' mind discovered these passages (*animus...reppererit*), but Macrobius wishes that his reader will discover them in the text of the *Saturnalia* (*invenies*). By shifting to second person, Macrobius turns Gellius' criteria for selecting excerpts into outcomes for his reader, Eustachius. The deliberate way that Macrobius

³⁹ On a much smaller scale, Gellius does use dialogue as teaching tool: *NA*, 17.8.

alters this passage suggests that these are important goals for his work: the *Saturnalia* should be fun, educational, and useful to read. In the same sentence, Macrobius paraphrases Gellius when he asks his Eustachius to set aside intellectual snobbery and keep an open mind: *quibus si neque ea quae iam tibi sunt cognita asperneris, ne quae ignota sunt vites* (If you don't look down on the material in it that you already know, or deny that there are some things, holes in your learning, that you still don't know). In this passage, Macrobius combines two different sentences from the preface of *Noctes Atticae*, creating opposition between the known (*cognita*) and the unknown (*ignota*).⁴⁰ For readers like Eustachius, Vergil is the known (*cognita*) author and classroom text, while sources like Sammonicus Serenus that provide the text for the *evocatio* are likely to be *ignota*, or unfamiliar to a schoolboy.

Juxtaposing these quotations from Seneca and Gellius creates new meaning for Macrobius as he steps out of writing commentary like *In Somnium Scipionis* and embarks on writing in a new genre, dialogue. Macrobius takes time to describe his vision for the *Saturnalia* to the reader and combines ideas from different authors to arrive at a statement that is uniquely his own. Although his speakers have varying levels of competency, Macrobius wishes to create a unified message, sometimes using different voice types as foils, in the case of Praetextatus and Evangelus. Moreover, the *Saturnalia*'s speakers offer different areas of expertise, presenting skills, values and examples to complement the reader's education. Advising his reader to keep an open mind, Macrobius bridges the gap between topics studied in school and more arcane and

⁴⁰ *Ab his igitur, si cui forte nonnumquam tempus voluptasque erit lucubratiunculas istas cognoscere, petium impetratumque volumus, ut in legendo quae pridem scierint non aspernentur quasi nota invulgataque.* (If anyone by chance has the time and pleasure to be acquainted with such obscurities, I have a request and a favor to ask them: that while reading they not discount information they already know as common and everyday, *NA* praef.14).

Quae porro nova sibi ignotaque offenderint aequum esse puto ut sine vano obtrectatu considerent (Furthermore, I think that it is fair [for readers] to assess new and unknown things that they have encountered without [resorting to] empty and malicious criticism, *NA* praef.16).

sophisticated topics suitable for aristocratic discussion such as religious rites, exotic foods, and dancing. Finally, he hopes that the *Saturnalia*'s reader will find its passages either fun to read, educational, or useful.

The Organization of Speakers in *Sat. 3*

After the *Saturnalia*'s *praefatio*, Macrobius masks his own voice with the fictionalized speakers in the dialogue, allowing his creations to take center stage. The speakers who participate in *Sat. 3* include: Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, Evangelus, Caecina and Rufius Albinus, Quintus Aurelius Symmachus, and Servius. Splitting the voice of the author into six or seven characters creates dynamic contrast within the dialogue. Dominant speakers like Praetextatus and Symmachus can demonstrate comprehensive analysis of Vergil in relation to other texts, show good manners and take turns when speaking, and give expert opinions on textual details. In their speeches, Caecina and Rufius show a great love of *vetustas* by tracing precedent from Republican and Augustan eras, while the fictionalized Servius also has his place at the end of *Sat. 3* as he lists dessert foods. In contrast, Evangelus strident tone shows only a superficial understanding of Vergil, and interrupts the hierarchical order of speaking.⁴¹ What these individuals say is only part of the message of *Saturnalia*. For each speaker it is important to consider where they stand within hierarchy of the group and how they react to the others around them.

In his commentary to *Somnium Scipionis*, part of the sixth book of Cicero's *De Re Publica*, Macrobius uses his own voice as a constant and dependable guide. Macrobius goes beyond simple explanation of Cicero's text and expands upon the cosmology presented in the

⁴¹ Robert Kaster, "Macrobius and Servius: Verecundia and the Grammarian's Function," *HSPH* 84, (1980): 227-9.

dialogue, but in his own voice. Since the narrator in the *Saturnalia* makes few observations and comments, Macrobius leaves room for the reader to discern credible witness from fraud. The *Saturnalia* is also a marked departure from the *In Somnium Scipionis* because its primary focus is literature rather than cosmology. Both works are didactic, but in different ways: *In Somnium Scipionis* is a commentary to a dialogue, while the *Saturnalia* is dialogue that often functions as commentary. While a true commentary like *In Somnium Scipionis* follows Cicero's dialogue, expounding and explaining the primary text, Praetextatus seeks to explain and justify Vergil's word choice—making many of his observations suitable for the genre of commentary. Prominent aristocrats and experienced speakers like Praetextatus and Symmachus are allowed to dominate the conversation over others. Praetextatus' speeches provide the foundation for the first two evenings of the *Saturnalia* while Symmachus, an equally respected senator, begins the final day of the feast with a speech on Vergil's display of oratorical skill. The length and prominent placement of these speeches suggest that Macrobius considers both the men and their words particularly important, granting additional weight to the topics they address. One note of caution: Even though Praetextatus is the most revered speaker in the dialogue, it is a mistake to equate his opinions and words with Macrobius the author. There is too much evidence to suggest that Praetextatus is a fictionalized and idealized version of the historical personage.⁴² In the same way, one cannot assume that Evangelus' opinions are always contrary to Macrobius' own. In dialogue, all of this can happen without compromising the integrity of Macrobius, the author since he conveys a variety of opinions. It is in this climate, among a plurality of voices, that the reader must weigh the significance of Carthage's curse.

⁴² Charles Guittard, "Macrobe et Symmaque : l'encyclopédiste et l'épistolier," *Epistulae antiquae* 2 (2002): 289-98; Maijastina Kahlos, *Vettius Agorius Praetextatus: A Senatorial Life in Between* (Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 2002).

When examining the speakers in the *Saturnalia*, it is important to consider the way Macrobius arranged the order of their speeches. Kaster has carefully traced the hierarchy that Macrobius established in *Sat.* 2.2 and 7.4, noting that the speakers follow a strict *ordo* according to their scholarship and place in society. He observes that Servius, who has a low social status, expresses respect for his betters (*verecundia*) by waiting his turn to speak, while the renegade Evangelus frequently interrupts his superior, Praetextatus, well before it is his turn.⁴³ At first inspection, *Sat.* 3 partially conforms to the patterns Kaster set out for 2.2 and 7.4 because Praetextatus' speech comes first, and later the Albini with Rufius following Caecina. Moreover, Evangelus disrupts the *ordo* by challenging Praetextatus (3.10.2), while Servius preserves his *verecundia* by speaking at the end of the evening and then only upon Symmachus' invitation. In the extant text of *Sat.* 3 the *ordo* is: Praetextatus, Evangelus/Praetextatus, Caecina Albinus, Rufius Albinus, (Symmachus), Servius, (Praetextatus).⁴⁴ However, modern readers do not have all of *Sat.* 3 at their disposal since there are *lacunae* both before Praetextatus' speech and after Praetextatus' exchanges with Evangelus. Based on references within the *Saturnalia*, Davies reconstructs *Sat.* 3 so that Macrobius' intended *ordo* should read: Eustathius, Nichomachus Flavianus, Praetextatus, Evangelus/Praetextatus, Horus, Caecina Albinus, Rufius Albinus, (Symmachus), Servius, (Praetextatus).⁴⁵ It seems that the revered Praetextatus has been upstaged not only by the respected Nichomachus Flavianus but also by a Greek, the philosopher Eustathius. Why is the hierarchy that Kaster observes in other places so different in *Sat.* 3? First of all, it is important to note that Kaster comments on passages in *Sat.* 2 and 7 which are both

⁴³ Robert Kaster, "Macrobius and Servius: Verecundia and the Grammarian's Function," *HSPH* 84, (1980): 228.

⁴⁴ Symmachus and Praetextatus appear in parentheses because at the end of *Sat.* 3, rather than making long speeches, they only serve to prompt the change of speaker and to close the dialogue for the evening.

⁴⁵ Percival Vaughn Davies, trans. with intro. and notes, *The Saturnalia* (New York: Columbia University Press 1969):15, Davies notes that Eustathius speech is mentioned in 1.24.24; Nichomachus Flavianus says that he will speak on augural law in 1.24.17-18; Caecina refers to Horus' comments in 3.13.16.

after-dinner conversations, part of a symposium. The passages he analyzed are based on Greek models where turn-taking is more noticeable because the exchanges between characters are brief. In contrast, the lengthy speeches in *Sat.* 3 indicate that Macrobius was using Ciceronian dialogue as a model. This does not mean, however, that *Sat.* 3 lacks a defined *ordo* or that its speakers suddenly rebel against *verecundia*. Instead, the close links between speaker, topic, and food cause the banquet itself to be a driving force behind the *ordo* in *Sat.* 3.

The best place to observe the connection between speaker, topic, and food is the transition that occurs before Servius speaks at the close of the day's discourse. When the dessert course comes in, Symmachus, inspired by the food on the table, calls upon Servius to lecture on the names of different types of produce:

Adhuc dicente Furio secundae mensae inlata bellaria novo sermoni principium dederunt. Symmachus enim attrectans manu nuces , 'vellem', inquit 'ex te audire, Servi, tanta nucibus nomina quae causa vel origo variaverit aut unde , tot mala cum hac una appellatione vocitentur, fiunt tamen seorsum diversa tam vocabulo quam sapore. ac prius de nucibus absolas volo quae tibi memoria crebrae lectionis occurrunt.'

While Rufius was still speaking, the dessert that was brought in for the second course started a new topic of conversation. For Symmachus, grabbing a handful of nuts, said, 'I want to hear from you, Servius, why nuts have so many names, why their origin varies, or why, though so many "apples" are so-called under this one name, yet, [these fruits] have evolved separately, as diverse in nomenclature as in flavor. But first, on the topic of nuts, I want you to unleash what you remember from your intense reading.' (3.18.1)⁴⁶

While Servius catalogs dessert foods, the reader also experiences a literary *secunda mensa* of both obtainable and exotic fruits. Incorporating the works of Vergil, Naevius, Plautus, and Cicero among other lesser known authors, Servius continues uninterrupted until Praetextatus calls the evening to its close, bidding the company reassemble at Symmachus' house the following evening (3.19.8). The connection between the dessert table and Servius' speech is

⁴⁶ Although there are problems in the manuscript, Rufius and Furius are the same speaker, see Alan Cameron "Macrobius, Avianus and Avienus." *CQ* 17 no.2 (November 1967): 292 note.

well-defined, but unfortunately the *lacunae* that surround Praetextatus' speech make it difficult to discern if any other transitions like this existed in *Sat.* 3. Evidence of these transitions does arise, however, in the patterns established by *Sat.* 1, 2, and 7 as well as in the content of Rufius and Caecina's speeches.

Because of *lacunae* at the end of *Sat.* 2 and the beginning of *Sat.* 3, the modern reader does not know whether the conversation on the second day begins in the morning or later in the day.⁴⁷ Regardless of the hour, the speeches of Eustathius, Flavianus, and Praetextatus follow the pattern established by *Sat.* 1 of presenting educational lectures before the meal is served. Since he is the banquet's host on the second day of the feast, it is not surprising that Nicomachus Flavianus speaks before Praetextatus. Likewise, Praetextatus and Symmachus each speak first when they host the party of the first and third days of *Saturnalia*. The fact that Eustathius precedes Flavianus is an interesting question that can be mediated by considering that Flavianus spoke on the topic of augural law. A modern reader can imagine Flavianus making a natural connection between Eustathius' topic of astronomy and Praetextatus' speech on pontifical law because augury involves both observations of the sky and Roman religion. By placing the text of the *evocatio* at the end of Praetextatus' speech Macrobius sets the course within the series of pre-dinner lectures that revolve around Vergil. Moving from the Greek philosopher Eustathius to Nicomachus Flavianus and then culminating with Praetextatus, Macrobius created a crescendo that is the reverse of the *ordo* that Kaster observed in 2.2 and 7.4: moving from a lower-ranked member of society to a respected senator, to finally the most respected senator whose words are weighted by his pending death. Scipio Aemilianus' words are spoken not only by the most respected speaker in the dialogue but also placed at the climax of scholarly discussion in *Sat.* 3.

⁴⁷ The dialogue begins on the evening before the Saturnalia feast during this first conversation; the speakers decide to reconvene the next morning at Praetextatus' house, rather than waiting until dinnertime (1.6.1).

While reading Praetextatus' speech, it is easy to forget that the *Saturnalia* is a dialogue because he speaks continuously for nine chapters (3.1.1-3.9.16). Evangelus, after listening to such a long lecture, explodes at Praetextatus before beginning his own misguided criticism of Vergil (3.10.2). He questions Vergil's descriptions of sacrificing a bull to Jove (3.10.2-4), making libations of wine to Ceres (3.11.1-3), and decorating the altar of Hercules with poplar branches (3.12.1-2). When he starts to examine Dido's sacrifice for her wedding rites (3.12.10), it becomes clear that he is criticizing the accuracy with which Vergil describes Roman rituals, a concept that Praetextatus calls *proprietas morum*. In his previous speech, Praetextatus argues that Vergil is worthy of the title *pontifex maximus* partly because he accurately describes obscure details from Roman religious traditions. Although Evangelus' outburst is incredibly rude, it does provide a marked transition from Praetextatus' monologue. Unfortunately, the exchange between the two ends prematurely because of a lacuna in the text. Evangelus' questions do not follow the order of Praetextatus' speech since Praetextatus addresses sacrificing a bull in *Sat.* 3.4.6, the Altar of Hercules in *Sat.* 3.6.9-17, and Dido's wedding in *Sat.* 3.5.5. Moreover, his question about libations to Ceres refers to a chapter that is now engulfed by the lacuna at the beginning of *Sat.* 3, since Praetextatus' speech in its current form covers no such topic. Based on the number of questions that Evangelus asks in *Sat.* 1 and the length of Praetextatus' speech in *Sat.* 3, it is likely that Evangelus had several additional matters to debate with Praetextatus. Perhaps the *evocatio* was one of these since its falls under the *aegis* of *proprietas verborum*. Whether its omission was conscious choice on Macrobius' part or an error in transcription, Evangelus does not critique the *evocatio* in *Sat.* 3.

On the second day of *Saturnalia*, the conversation ends in concert with the *secunda mensa* but the *minisculis poculis* that appeared on the first day are never brought forth (3.18.1;

2.1.1). In the introduction to his translation, Davies notes that chapters thirteen through twenty encompass the after-dinner conversation on the second day of *Saturnalia*.⁴⁸ This seems to be a reasonable assumption because at the end of *Sat.* 1, there is a very clear break for dinner (1.24.22-4), and *Sat.* 2 begins with the after-dinner conversation from the first day of the feast. Also in *Sat.* 7, Praetextatus suggests that the company begin speaking on philosophy with different, even smaller cups (*variantibus poculis minutioribus*, 7.1.1) after enduring a meal in silence. Several things contraindicate Davies' assumption: the *nuces* that prompted Servius' speech, Horus' comments about contemporary dining, the vivid picture of Republican banqueting that the Albini present, and most of all the fact that Vergil is no longer the center of discussion. Since the *secunda mensa* is brought forth at the beginning of chapter eighteen, dinner can hardly be said to be over in chapter thirteen. In addition, the *nuces* that Symmachus picks up indicate that, at least in *Sat.* 3, it is permissible to converse while food is on the table. Caecina's response to Horus' earlier criticism of contemporary dining (although Horus' actual words are missing due to a lacuna) suggests that the Egyptian philosopher and boxer reacted to a modest *prima mensa* laid before the company by describing fancier affairs that he attended in Rome. Some consider the pointed show of restraint in the *Saturnalia* such as *minisculis poculis* (2.1.1) and *minutioribus poculis* (7.1.1) to be a literary reaction to the way Ammianus Marcellinus depicted 4th century senatorial dining.⁴⁹ Horus' comments may have agreed with Ammianus because Caecina responds by describing of lavish banquets from bygone days, concluding that extravagance was practiced more in the Republican era than in the present day (3.13.16). Ultimately Caecina's examples of Republican decadence do contrast with a modest meal that the

⁴⁸ Percival Vaughn Davies, trans. with intro. and notes, *The Saturnalia* (New York: Columbia University Press 1969):14-15.

⁴⁹ Alan Cameron, "The Date and Identity of Macrobius," *JRS* (1966): 38.

participants in the dialogue would likely consume, especially considering the diminutive size of their cups.

Rufius Albinus picks up the topic and continues after a brief exchange of pleasantries with Caecina (3.14.1). Postponing the discussion of the types of exotic fish that have appeared on the tables of famous Romans, Rufius temporarily digresses to discuss dancing (3.14.3). Initially, he relates divergent Republican attitudes toward its practice, focusing on aristocratic participation in dancing. In this environment, Rufius quotes a speech against Tiberius Gracchus' judiciary law in which Scipio Aemilianus the *censor* is speaking out against the evils of dancing schools that have sprung up around Rome (3.14.6-7). This is a variation on a theme from *Sat.* 2 when Avienus suggests that instead of enjoying the company of dancing girls that the gentlemen at the *Saturnalia* entertain themselves by telling jokes (2.1.5). Although Aemilianus does not expressly concur with the speakers like Avienus who avoided having dancing girls in, his rebuke of fathers from the aristocracy who would have their free-born children trained in dancing is severe. The portrait of Aemilianus that Rufius presents in his speech is quite different from Praetextatus' *imperator*, full of religious language during the *evocatio*. Rufius is using Aemilianus' reaction to show that dancing was considered proper at certain times in Roman history, particularly during and shortly after the Punic Wars (3.14.4). In addition to dancing, Rufius also embraces the other types of performance, referring to Sulla's singing (3.14.10) as well as Cicero's defense of Roscius (3.14.11-13). In the next chapter, the stories Rufius relates about different types of fish perhaps was meant to emphasize the fish, or perhaps the lack of exotic fish at Nichomachus Flavianus' table. He includes stories about lamprey eels (*murenas*, 3.15.4) sturgeon (*acipenser*, 3.16.1), mullet (*mullum*, 3.16.9), and fish from the river Tiber caught at a very specific location (*inter duos pontes*, 3.16.14). Like Servius' catalogue of dessert

foods, Rufius echoes the banquet setting by telling stories about the ways that Romans obtained these exotic fish. This too contrasts the *luxuria* of the Republic and early Empire with the restraint of the present company. In the final chapter of his speech, Rufius details laws that restricted expenditures at banquets and consumption of exotic foods that were enacted during the Republic. His chronology includes: the *Lex Orchia* (3.17.2), *Lex Fannia* (3.17.3), *Lex Didia* (3.17.6-7), *Lex Licinia* (3.17.7-10), and the *Lex Cornelia* (3.17.11). Initially his motives are unclear for citing such a long list of rather ineffective attempts to keep the excesses of the aristocracy in check, but towards the end of his litany, Rufius articulates his greater purpose: *vetus verbum est, leges inquit bonae ex malis moribus procreantur* (There is an old saying that goes, ‘good laws are born from bad morals,’ 3.17.10). Rufius explains that by chronicling the government’s many attempts to limit *luxuria* that he proves it was a recurring problem in the Republic. Concluding his speech, Rufius recounts Anthony and Cleopatra’s extravagance at their own banquets after enacting laws that ordered rationing. In the end Rufius Albinus characterizes the Republic and its decline as a climate of excess and hypocrisy. In this environment, Aemilianus becomes a reactionary who opposes the moral decline around him. Servius’ ‘discourse on dessert’ that follows Rufius’ speech provides a lighter conclusion to the evening’s conversation.

There is an internal rhythm in *Sat. 3* driven by the courses of the banquet that the speakers experience. The first group of speakers discusses the Vergilian corpus in the light of disciplines such as astronomy, augury and religion before the meal ever begins, while the second group addresses topics that complement the dinner as it is served. The reader partakes in a cultural feast designed by Macrobius, the literary sommelier: serious topics arise before dinner, lighter topics are served with the meal, and the lightest topics are reserved for the dessert course.

Aemilianus appears twice in different environments: His *evocatio* of the city Carthage is part of the more intellectual pre-dinner conversation, while Aemilianus' speech against dancing schools is part of the lighter dinner conversation, directly preceding stories of exotic fish. These two quotations provide contrast and bring Aemilianus to the forefront of the dialogue as a participant who would have fit right in with the present company had he lived another five hundred years.

Literary Voices in Praetextatus' Speech

Speakers in the *Saturnalia* teach different skills (*multae in illo artes*) and principles (*multa praecepta*) using examples that span the history of Latin literature (*multarum aetatum exempla*, 1.praef.9). In *Sat.* 3, Praetextatus lectures on the discipline of pontifical law and illustrates the literary principle of *proprietas* in Vergil. In the first chapter, I demonstrated how Praetextatus interacts with Vergilian text as a commentator, using secondary authors like Varro, Trebatius and Sammonicus Serenus to prove that Vergil would make a worthy *pontifex maximus*. On closer examination, the relationship between commentator and Vergilian text is more intimate. Quotations from the *Aeneid* have the potential to become more than literary *exempla* because characters like Aeneas often use first-person verbs when performing a sacrifice or ritual. Rather than static *exempla*, the voices of Aeneas, Cloanthus, Turnus, Latinus, Dido, and Entellus rise out of Praetextatus' speech in prayer. For instance, Praetextatus quotes Aeneas in the first-person in reference to purification, performing sacred rites to all of the gods in Thrace, and leaving Troy's citadel under the goddess' protection.⁵⁰ These examples illustrate that Aeneas knows how to perform required rites and work in concert with the gods' wishes. In chapter two Praetextatus includes first-person verbs from the prayers of Cloanthus and King Latinus:

⁵⁰ *abluero* (*Sat.* 3.1.1, 3.1.6 ~ *A* 2.720); *ferebam* (*Sat.* 3.3.2~*A* 3.19); *discedo, expedior* (*Sat.* 3.8.1~ *A* 2.632-3 *descendo*).

Cloanthus first establishes an altar for fulfilling his vow and then promises that he will offer both animal and liquid sacrifice to the sea, while Latinus' prayers are heard in part because the king was holding onto the altar while praying.⁵¹ Following strict guidelines in these examples seems to be an important part of having one's prayers heard and wishes granted. In chapter three Dido prepares the rites of infernal Jove, while Turnus prays to Faunus and recounts his worship of Mother Earth.⁵² Although these characters do not have their wishes fulfilled in the end, their participation in more exotic cults is appealing to a student of *arcana* like Macrobius. Entellus also fulfills a vow to Eryx using a first-person verb in chapter five.⁵³ Praetextatus makes special note that Entellus uses the verb *persolvo* correctly as he substitutes a bull for Dares. Altogether, chapters one, two, three, five, and eight each contain verbs in the first-person quoted from characters of the *Aeneid*. These sixteen first-person verbs first and foremost highlight religious language, but they also relieve Praetextatus from being the sole voice in his speech.

Praetextatus himself uses first-person verbs in every chapter of his speech, seventeen times in all. Although the *Saturnalia* was meant to be read and not recited, one should not limit the interplay between text and commentator to the written word. Contemporaries reading the *Saturnalia* would have had an experiential intimacy with the *Aeneid*'s text inaccessible to modern readers. Although Praetextatus "speaks" Vergil's words in the dialogue, the auditory memory of a contemporary reader might have substituted the voice of a family member, teacher, or another student reciting those lines. Perhaps the physical memory of reciting Vergil as a schoolboy would have caused the reader to mouth the text on the page and continue with the next few lines of the poem. Continuing in this way, the contemporary reader experienced a dialogue

⁵¹ Cloanthus: *porriciam, fundam* (Sat. 3.2.2~A 5.238- *proiciam*); *constituam* (Sat. 3.2.6~A 5.237). Latinus: *tango, testor* (Sat. 3.2.9~A 12.201).

⁵² Dido: *parabam* (Sat. 3.3.2~ A 4.638 - *paraui*). Turnus: *precor, colui* (Sat. 3.3.4~A 12.777-8); *descendam* (Sat. 3.2.6~ A 12.649).

⁵³ Entellus: *persolvo* (Sat. 3.5.3~ A 5.484).

between the new words (*ignota*) of Praetextatus and well-known (*cognita*) words spoken by the familiar characters of the *Aeneid* (*Sat.* 1.*praef.*9).

One way to find literary voices from the *Aeneid* is to trace the repetition of first-person verbs in *Sat.* 3, but another way is to look at the language Praetextatus uses to describe the characters of the *Aeneid*. Macrobius already used the term *vox* in the *praefatio*, comparing the *Saturnalia* to a well-blended choir (1.*praef.*9), but when Praetextatus uses the same word in *Sat.* 3, it is not in reference to other speakers in the dialogue, but to the literary voices of Cloanthus and Aeneas. He quotes the priest Cloanthus' words *constituam ante aras voti reus* (bound to a vow, I will establish an offering before the altars, *A.* 5.235) and then comments on the passage by saying *haec vox propria sacrorum est* (this is a voice suitable for sacred rites, *Sat.* 3.2.6). In the Vergilian text, *constituam* in the first-person calls special attention to the voice of Cloanthus since the subject “*ego*” does not refer to Praetextatus. Praetextatus' words *haec vox* call attention to Cloanthus' voice from the quotation rather than his own. Describing Cloanthus' voice as *propria sacrorum* also has important ramifications in *Sat.* 3, essentially transferring the principle of *proprietas* from the author Vergil to the character Cloanthus. In this way, Cloanthus himself shows *proprietas verborum* when he utters the words *voti reus* because he has used the appropriate terminology to describe religious customs—precisely the right word. If *proprietas verborum* is the correct usage or precision of words, then a *vox propria sacrorum* is a voice that uses religious language properly. In addition to showing that Vergil can write characters who use the appropriate tone of voice for sacred rites, Praetextatus also describes the religious tone that characters from the *Aeneid* have when performing rites or sacrifices, and who could be more *pious* than Aeneas himself?

When introducing the *evocatio* at the beginning of chapter nine, Praetextus uses similar language to describe Aeneas' words: *de vetustissimo Romanorum more et de occultissimis sacris vox ista prolata est* (such a voice has revealed something about a most ancient Roman custom and the most hidden rites, 3.9.1) In this passage the phrase "*ista vox*" is really a variation of *haec vox* from Praetextatus' comments on Cloanthus' speech (3.2.2). Although it is important to note that according to Praetextatus, a voice (*vox*) has the power to reveal (*prolata est*) ancient secrets about Roman religion. Praetextatus is describing to the concept of *proprietas moris*, a principle which means "accurately alluding to a Roman religious tradition." The difference is subtle: Praetextatus attributes *proprietas verborum* to Cloanthus and *proprietas moris* to Aeneas with the phrases *vox propria sacrorum* and *de vetustissimo Romanorum more et de occultissimis sacris vox ista prolata est*. Since Aeneas' voice does not address the gods or participate in a religious contract like Cloanthus, it is not a true *vox propria sacrorum*. The phrases *vox propria sacrorum* and *vox ista* both highlight the fact that a conversation is taking place between commentator and text in the *Saturnalia*. Unlike the words of Cloanthus, Aeneas' quotation in chapter nine does not contain first-person verbs: *excessere omnes adytis arisque relictis/ di quibus imperium hoc steterat*. (All of the gods, by whom this kingdom had stood, have left the sanctuaries and altars abandoned, 2.351). However, in subsequent lines Aeneas does use memorable first-person verbs as he encourages his men: *moriamus et in media arma ruamus* (Let us die and rush into the midst of battle, A.2.353).

The evidence that characters from the *Aeneid* function as speakers within Praetextatus' speech is twofold. First, there are many instances of first-person verbs within the quotations that Praetextatus selects for his speech. Since the overall topic is pontifical law, it is not surprising that the characters in these texts are usually addressing the gods in prayer or performing sacred

rites. Secondly, these characters come forward in *Sat.* 3 through the language that Praetextatus uses to describe them. Instead of depersonalizing these characters by using terms like *exemplum*, or *verba*, Praetextatus uses the word *vox*. This word carries additional weight in the *Saturnalia* because in the choral simile that occurs in the preface, Macrobius compares his entire work to a chorus of many voices. For Macrobius, this word is closely connected to the speakers in his dialogue. Together, this shows that the voices of characters from the *Aeneid* influence not only Praetextatus' argument but also the dynamic of his speech. The ongoing conversation between Praetextatus and Vergilian characters is oblique, but it is there. Praetextatus provides explanation and instruction, often using first-person verbs, while voices from the *Aeneid* utter prayers that the reader can recall from previous study. In this way, Macrobius bridges the gap between the well-known text of Vergil and more obscure secondary texts designed to educate the reader.

The Voice of Scipio Aemilianus in *Sat.* 3

In chapter nine, Praetextatus' observes that Aeneas alludes to a custom—*evocatio* and *devoti*—rather than personally participating in its sacred rites. In this capacity Aeneas also functions as a *pontifex maximus* by recording the annals of rites and sacrifices. In order to prove that Aeneas' *vox ista* accurately describes Roman rituals (*proprietas moris*), Praetextatus also must demonstrate that Aemilianus uses religious language properly and effectively in the *evocatio*, thus presenting a *vox propria sacrorum*. Rather than detracting from the impact of Praetextatus' speech, Aemilianus' *vox propria sacrorum* supports Praetextatus' argument with text that predates Vergil's *Aeneid*. Because the first-person verbs in the *evocatio* occur in the present tense, they also bring the reader back to the destruction of Carthage and the presence of the general Scipio Aemilianus. After the initial invocation of the protective god or goddess,

Aemilianus begins by making his main request: *precor venerorque veniamque a vobis peto ut vos populum civitatemque Carthaginiensem deseratis*. (I pray and I beseech and I ask this favor from you: that you abandon the people and the state of Carthage, 3.9.8). The synonyms *precor venerorque* and *peto* do two things. First, they create a *tricolon crescens* beginning with the idea of reverential worship (*precor venerorque*) and ending with the actual request (*peto*) of the deity. Second, the redundancy allows the first-person form to repeat three times, emphasizing the “ego” of the three verbs. Personal pronouns also have the effect of drawing attention to Aemilianus, especially the alliterative way that they occur in the *evocatio*: *proditique Romam ad me meosque veniatis* (And once you have surrendered, that you come to Rome, to me and my people). In this phrase, *ad me meosque* underscores the first-person point of view, but as a substantive adjective, *meosque* also implies Aemilianus’ control over an understood *populos* or perhaps *milites*.

Looking carefully at pronouns, the instances that *noster* and *nos* occur in this curse are interesting to note: *nostraque vobis loca templa sacra urbs acceptior probatior sit* (that our temples and sacred spaces are more fitting and acceptable to you). At first, it seems that these words are completely interchangeable with their singular counterparts, *ego* and *meus*.

Throughout the curse, Aemilianus applies the term *nostra* to temples as well as expressions that include the Roman Army, but there is one exception: *mihique populoque Romano militibusque meis praepositi sitis ut sciamus intellegamusque* (that you protect me, the Roman people, and my soldiers so that we may know and understand it). *Sciamus* and *intellegamus* are also meant to include the army and the witnesses into the process. Here, *militibus meis* differs from *exercitum nostrum* and *exercitibus legionibus nostri* which occur later in the prayer. As Aemilianus continues his language delineates a contract between the gods of Carthage and himself: *si ita feceritis, voveo vobis templa ludosque facturum*. (if you do these things, I vow to establish

temples and games for you). Within the curse text, these verbs create a contract between the “*ego*” (Scipio Aemilianus) and the “*vos*” (protective deities of Carthage). Juxtaposing *feceritis*, *voveo* and *vobis* highlights the conditions of the contractual side of this curse- that upon transferring their allegiance, Scipio will reward the gods with temples and worship.

When introducing the *devotio*, Praetextatus calls attention to the speakers of curse texts: *sed dictatores imperatores soli possunt devovere his verbis*: (but commanders and generals alone are able to utter a curse with these words, 3.9.9) The power of destroying a city with a *devotio* is reserved for generals rather than *sacerdotes or pontifices*, although the offices are not mutually exclusive. This statement singles out Scipio Aemilianus as the speaker of the curse text as well as assigning a great deal of power to these words (*his verbis*). With words alone, Scipio can mark the actual army and territory that the gods of the dead will help the Romans destroy: *exercitum quem ego me sentio dicere...agrosque eorum quos me sentio dicere* (the army which I intend to designate...and their fields which I intend to designate, 3.9.10). In his introduction to the *evocatio*, Praetextatus mentions that Rome has a secret name as well as a secret deity to protect the city. Although Praetextatus readily gives the name of Rome’s protector, Ops Consivia, he coyly keeps Rome’s secret name to himself, claiming that even the most learned scholars don’t know what it is (3.9.4-5) Based on this idea, the phrase *me sentio dicere* seems a likely place where one would insert the “secret name” of the territory of army to be destroyed.

The main portion of the *devotio* is riddled with references to the first-person point of view. The initial purpose of these is contractual, since Scipio is bargaining for his soldiers and the Roman people. First-person verbs and pronouns appear in boldface:

eosque ego vicarios pro me fide magistratuque meo pro populo Romano exercitibusque legionibusque nostris do devoveo ut me meamque fidem imperiumque legiones exercitumque nostrum qui in his rebus gerundis sunt bene salvos siritis esse. si haec ita faxitis ut ego sciam sentiam intellegamque.

I offer and devote the enemy as a substitute for me, my good faith and command, for the Roman people and our army and legions, so that you will make me, my faith and command, and our army and legions and those who are involved in these deeds, safe and sound. If you will do these things so that I know perceive and understand them (3.9.11)

Phrases like *pro me fide magistratuque meo, exercitibusque legionibusque nostris, exercitumque nostrum* provide support to the strong construction of the first-person verbs. In the curse text, verbs are stacked next to each other intensifying the action while these verbs individually repeat first-person endings. The double force of *do devoveo*, highlighted by its asyndeton, provides solemn religious and even legal tone to the curse, while the synonyms *ego sciam sentiam intellegamque* layers three first-person verbs in a *tricolon crescens*. The last words of the curse, *Tellus mater teque Iuppiter obtestor* (Mother Tellus and you too Jove, I pray, 3.9.12) leave the impression of swearing a solemn oath, which Aemilianus follows with symbolic gestures. Praetextatus speedily returns as the first-person speaker after this description: *in antiquitatibus autem haec oppida **inveni** devota* (I have discovered the following devoted towns in ancient sources).

Up to this point in the speech, Praetextatus is the subject of seventeen first-person verbs and Vergilian characters are the subjects of sixteen. Since the *evocatio* and *devotio* also contain seventeen first-person verbs, Scipio Aemilianus' voice is an equally strong presence in Praetextatus' speech. Like *voces* from the *Aeneid* that illustrate *proprietas*, Aemilianus uses verbs in the first-person to make requests and promises to the gods. However, quotations from the *Aeneid* are brief, while Aemilianus' sustained voice in the *evocatio* and *devotio* shows the repetition, grandeur, and power of religious language. Instead of summarizing the text, Macrobius preserves the first-person point of view in the *evocatio*. This brings Aemilianus to the forefront of the dialogue and heightens the impact of his religious language as a true *vox propria*

sacrorum. Part of what Praetextatus is trying to trace his observance of *vox propria sacrorum* is the contract between humans and gods. Since he already discussed the gods themselves in *Sat.* 1, this time he focuses on the human aspect of the contract. It is also important to consider that this is the only non-Vergilian text that contains first-person verbs in Praetextatus' speech.

Praetextatus favors short quotations and summaries from sources like Varro and Trebatius, so the lengthy *evocatio* and *devotio* stand apart. Moreover, other non-Vergilian texts are summarized and rarely include first-person verbs, the *evocatio* and *devotio* conform more closely to the first-person voices from the *Aeneid* like Aeneas and Cloanthus. Within Praetextatus' speech, there is an even distribution of first-person verbs between the following subjects: characters in the *Aeneid*, Praetextatus, and Scipio Aemilianus.⁵⁴ The overall effect is a dialogue between characters from the *Aeneid*, Praetextatus and Scipio representing *multa aetatum* the Republic, Augustan Age, and Late Empire. As the dialogue continues into the evening, Aemilianus' voice resurfaces in a first-person narrative, keeping up with the other speakers in the dialogue. As the first-person subject of twenty-one verbs, Aemilianus is bested only by Rufius Albinus and Praetextatus who are the subjects of twenty-five first person verbs apiece.⁵⁵ Aemilianus' two lengthy speeches substantiate his presence in the dialogue over the course of the evening revealing different aspects of his character.

Aemilianus appears for the second time in *Sat.* 3 during Rufius Albinus' speech on *luxuria* and sumptuary law. Before talking about delicacies from the sea, Rufius considers attitudes toward dancing during the Republic, particularly whether or not it is appropriate for aristocrats to dance. He cites a speech against Tiberius Grachus' *Lex Iudicaria* in which Scipio Aemilianus bears witness to quite a scandal: schools that were teaching children to dance

⁵⁴ Praetextatus: 17, Scipio: 17, Vergilian Verbs: 16

⁵⁵ Caecina: 7, Servius: 4, Evangelus: 3, Symmachus: 2

suggestively (3.14.6).⁵⁶ The figure of Scipio Aemilianus comes to life in this passage as he describes the scene using first-person point of view in a detailed account that is an entertaining read (*voluptati legere*, 1.praef.9). To demonstrate the strong force of this first-person narrative, I have placed both first-person verbs and personal pronouns in boldface:

*eunt, **inquam**, in ludum saltatorium inter cinaedos virgines puerique ingenui. haec cum **mihi** quisquam narrabat, non **poteram** animum inducere ea liberos suos homines nobiles docere: sed cum **ductus sum** in ludum saltatorium, plus medius fidius in eo ludo **vidi** pueris virginibusque quinquaginta, in his unum – quod **me** rei publicae maxime miseritum est – puerum bullatum, petitoris filium non minorem annis duodecim, cum crotalis saltare quam saltationem impudicus servulus honeste saltare non posset.*

They are going into dancing schools, I say, virgins and innocent boys among queers. When someone told me this, I could not imagine that noble men are teaching these things to their own children, but when I was taken into a dancing school I saw more than fifty boys and girls in the school, in only one of these schools—a fact which causes me to lament for the Republic—[I saw] a boy wearing his *bullā*, a candidate's son around twelve years old, dancing a routine with castanets that a vulgar little slave could not rightly dance (3.14.7)

Certainly Aemilianus is a *testis* (3.14.6), but also an expert storyteller who maintains suspense, providing vivid details and appeals to the audience's emotions. Initially, *inquam* pulls the reader into the story while *non poteram animum inducere* takes us into Aemilianus's frame of mind as a censor unwilling to believe such tales. The passive form of *ductus sum* implies that he was reluctant to step into a dancing school in the first place and builds suspense as the reader waits for the lurid details. The verb *vidi* heralds his description of the candidate's son wearing a *bullā* and using castanets at the same time. It is also important to note that Rufius and Aemilianus are each offended by different aspects of the dancing school. In his introductory comments, Rufius is most shocked that young ladies are students in the school: *nobilium vero filios et, quod dictu*

⁵⁶ The *Lex Iudicaria* sought to increase the number of senators by several hundred men also making men currently in the equestrian order eligible to preside over trials as judges. Aemilianus seems to be arguing that men who send their children to dancing schools are not fit to join the ranks of the senate, see Nadia Berti, "Scipione Emiliano, Caio Gracco e l'evocatio di 'Giunone' da Cartagine." *Aevum* 64 (1990): 69-75.

nefas est, filias quoque virgines inter studiosa numerasse saltandi (indeed sons of the nobility and what is wrong even to say, unmarried daughters were documented at the dancing school, 3.14.6). In contrast, Aemilianus can barely bring himself to say that a twelve year-old boy still wearing his *bullā* is taught to dance suggestively, delaying his description to lament the fate of the Republic (*quod me rei publicae maxime miseritum est*). Aemilianus seems to sneer at the very idea of dancing when he repeats the phrases *in ludum saltatorium*, *saltare*, and *saltationem*. The biggest insults of all, a *proprietas verborum* of another sort, are the words *non honeste*, *impudicus*, and of course *cinaedos*. It is difficult to capture the full sense of these words in modern usage because contemporary ideas about sexuality differ from those of ancient Rome. Although *cinaedus* originally referred to a male professional dancer, Aemilianus' use of the word is closer to *pathicus*, a male who seeks to be penetrated by other men. When he uses the words *non honeste* and *impudicus* afterwards, he implies that the candidate's son is in effect, studying to be a *pathicus*, an unacceptable role for a male of the senatorial class. This paints a portrait of Scipio Aemilianus the censor, trying to keep riff-raff out of the senate by appealing to his audiences' sense of shame.⁵⁷ Moreover, the use of first-person point of view accompanied by vivid descriptions in this passage take the reader outside of the power of Rufius, the speaker in the dialogue. Although Rufius initially validates Aemilianus by citing Cato's opposition to dancing, he provides more examples of Romans who dance, sing, or support actors. This groups Aemilianus with the most conservative of Romans from the Republic and serves as a reminder that the guests on the first night of Saturnalia preferred to tell jokes rather than bring in dancing girls.

As a general who is on the brink of completing his conquest, Aemilianus uses the words in the *evocatio* to transfer divine power from Carthage to Rome. The language of the *evocatio* is

⁵⁷ Aemilianus did serve as censor during the time the *Lex Iudicaria* was enacted.

terse, formal, and redundant to communicate effectively with the gods above, the gods below, and any Carthaginians who might be listening. The first-person verbs in the curse also mirror examples of religious language from the *Aeneid* that Praetextatus uses throughout his speech. In stark contrast, Aemilianus rails against fathers who would send their free-born children to dancing schools using language like *quod me rei publicae maxime miseritum est* to appeal to his audience's emotions and loaded words like *cinaedos* and *impudicus* to shock them into taking his side. And yet, the lewd language of *cinaedos* and *impudicus* seem to be better suited for the comic stage than for the halls of the senate, and the overall image that Aemilianus presents seems more caricature than crime scene. It is important to remember that the speech against dancing schools fits also into the type of sexual humor in *Sat. 2* which ranges from jokes about Augustus' daughter Julia (2.5.9) to Socrates' description of intercourse as some sort of epileptic fit (2.8.16). In this way, Rufius is a good participant in the dialogue because he chooses subject matter that conforms to an established pattern: lighter conversation as the dinner-course is being served. Removed from the turmoil of the war with Carthage and power struggle of the Gracchi, a reader like Eustachius sees Aemilianus as a man who has complete control over the contractual intricacies of religious *formulae* as well as a man who can use language to insult and persuade and knows when each is appropriate.

Conclusion

Macrobius created a symbiotic relationship between Scipio Aemilianus' voice and Praetextatus' and Rufius Albinus' speeches that conforms to the principle of *verecundia*. The fact that Aemilianus' voice resounds through such respected speakers adds authority to the *evocatio* and the "dancing schools" speech. In turn, Aemilianus supports and augments the ideas

that Praetextatus and Rufius explore in their speeches. The *evocatio* illustrates *proprietas verborum* and *moris* in lines from Vergil's *Aeneid*, but Aemilianus' voice also provides a paradigm for contractual religious language (*vox propria sacrorum*) by using first-person verbs. In contrast, Aemilianus' strong opposition to provocative dancing supports Rufius Albinus' illustration of a degenerate Roman Republic. Rufius calls upon Aemilianus as a witness to the scandalous goings-on at dancing schools with first-person verbs, characterizing the speech as an eye-witness account and not hearsay. Together, both of these speeches take Aemilianus beyond *pontifex* and *testis* and push him into the foreground of the dialogue because he is the subject of so many first-person verbs in the text.

Having established Aemilianus as a full-fledged speaker in *Sat.* 3, how does his voice support the educational goals that Macrobius established in the preface of the *Saturnalia*?

tale hoc praesens opus volo: multae in illo artes, multa praecepta sint, multarum aetatium exempla, sed in unum conspirata.

I want such a thing for my current work: there are many disciplines [represented] in it, many principles, and examples taken from many time periods, but they are blended, together into one. (1.praef.9)

In the *evocatio*, Aemilianus does not teach how to plunder or curse; neither does his description of the dancing school teach the reader how to gyrate with castanets. The skill (*multae in illo artes*) that Aemilianus teaches Eustachius can best be described as *potestas verborum*—the power of language. The precise wording of the *evocatio* brings the power of Carthage's gods to Rome and the *devotio* levels the city with the destructive force of the dead. In Rufius' speech, Aemilianus trades the precision of religious language for the ability to tell a convincing story and persuade by appealing to his audience's emotions. While Aemilianus' words support Praetextatus' and Rufius' arguments, his speeches on their own merit demonstrate typically

Roman virtues (*multa praecepta sint*). Even though the actual words *pietas* and *gravitas* do not appear in Macrobius' text, Aemilianus embodies their abstract concepts. *Pietas* entails fulfilling one's duty to the gods, so the examples that Praetextatus uses from the *Aeneid* show using first-person verbs that these characters are doing the prescribed rite. Likewise, Aemilianus speaks a complicated curse that negotiates with the gods. In his contract, he makes promises of games, temples, and sacrifices to convince the gods to come over to the Roman side. Being able to negotiate and complete these actions is *pietas*. In contrast, the way that Aemilianus shows *gravitas* is antithetical. Rufius highlights the term *luxuria* many times when describing exotic fish and grand expenditures at banquets.⁵⁸ However, Aemilianus and the following chronicle of sumptuary laws present a reaction to that trend, in effect, an *anti-luxuria* policy. These reactions conform to the idea of *gravitas* because Aemilianus encourages the aristocracy to refrain from eastern behaviors like dancing, while sumptuary laws limit the amount of food consumed at banquets and avoid exotic imports. Part of the beauty of this dialogue is that the conversation spans hundreds of years (*multarum aetatum exempla*) and exemplifies the Macrobian virtue of *verecundia*. Aemilianus' words from the Republic, Vergil's words from the Augustan age, and Praetextatus' and Rufius' from the Late Empire create a chorus that incorporates many perspectives. As an agent of *verecundia*, Vergil facilitates cultural connections between the *evocatio* and the reader. Voices from the *Aeneid* are powerful intermediaries between the *evocatio* text and Eustachius because they frame aspects of Roman religion in terms that someone with a standard education can understand. Aemilianus' voice also contributes to the multi-generational debate about the morality of dancing, but it is difficult to reconcile his two appearances in *Sat.* 3. Although the *evocatio* and dancing speech are polar opposites, it is

⁵⁸ Rufius Albinus uses the word *luxuria* in the following passages: 3.16.9; 3.17.1; 3.17.4; 3.17.13; 3.17.15; 3.15.9 and *luxuriosus* in 3.17.12

important to remember that the *Saturnalia* comprises a complicated web of topics, ideas and text from many different periods of Greek and Latin literature. Teasing out any real unity from these two speeches seems either futile or overly simplistic, but the unity that Macrobius alludes to in his preface (*sed in unum conspirata*) does not apply to modern ideas of theme or leitmotif.⁵⁹ By unity, Macrobius means “*telos*” or “goal,” so that all of the disjointed members of the dialogue strive in their own way to educate Eustachius. More than a simple morality play, the two portrayals of Aemilianus explore questions that are central to the entire *Saturnalia*: What does it mean to be a Roman aristocrat? What knowledge and methodology does a young man need to converse with the senatorial class as an equal? What types of behavior are acceptable and unacceptable in society? The *Saturnalia*’s speakers answer these questions through the study of different topics (*multae in illo artes*), as well as through examples of good and bad behavior. The end result is a confederation of topics and ideas that have educational value for Eustachius, but Macrobius allows his son to make the final judgement on the analysis and behavior presented in the dialogue.

⁵⁹ Robert Kaster, “Macrobius and Servius: Verecundia and the Grammarian’s Function,” *HSPH* 84, (1980): 233.

CHAPTER 3

DOCTRINA IN THE *EVOCATIO*'S INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Praetextatus supports his argument for the evidence of *proprietas verborum* and *proprietas verborum* in Vergil by consistently citing and quoting secondary sources on Roman religion. Although interplay between Carthage's curse and Vergilian hexameters is indeed a study full of *diligentia*, how Praetextatus introduces the *evocatio* has an equally important impact on the validity of his argument. Starting after Vergil's lines in *Sat.* 3.9.1, this substantial introduction defines the term *evocatio* and outlines two distinct controversies. First, Praetextatus summarizes the scholarly debate concerning the secret identity of the god who protects Rome. While some scholars believe that Jupiter, Luna, or Angerona protect the city, Praetextatus believes that tutelary divinity is Ops Consivia (3.9.5). Then he addresses the second controversy: whether the curse is really one prayer—an *evocatio/devotio*, or two separate prayers—an *evocatio* and *devotio* (3.9.6). Foregoing any citation up to this point, Praetextatus makes a special effort to establish the *evocatio*'s provenance, citing book, author and volume number: *Nam repperi in libro quinto Rerum reconditarum Sammonici Sereni utrumque carmen, quod ille se in cuiusdam Furii vetustissimo libro repperisse professus est.* (For in the fifth book of Sammonicus Serenus' *Arcane Subjects* I discovered each prayer which he in turn said that he had discovered himself in a very old book of a certain Furius, 3.9.6). In addition to citing Serenus' *Res Reconditae*, Praetextatus notes that the *evocatio* is actually an embedded quotation, first appearing in *cuiusdam Furii vetustissimo libro*. This detailed citation of Serenus' *evocatio* stands in sharp contrast to Praetextatus' earlier summary of secondary sources. Why is his

citation so inconsistent in the *evocatio*'s introduction? This simple question is difficult to answer from a modern perspective because ancient attitudes toward citation and plagiarism are very different. In Macrobius' world quotations and summary that are not cited can still be respectful and erudite as in his homage to Seneca and Gellius in the *praefatio* of the *Saturnalia*.

In this chapter I will evaluate Praetextatus' introduction to the *evocatio* in accordance with Macrobius' own intellectual ideals: *diligentia*, *verecundia*, and *doctrina*. Robert Kaster initially describes *doctrina* as the sum of *verecundia* and *diligentia*, but he concludes that true *doctrina* is a communal effort, arrived at through dialogue between learned gentlemen.⁶⁰ In the introduction to the *evocatio* there is ample evidence for literary tradition and debate that creates this *doctrina*, Macrobius' ultimate educational goal. First, I will establish that Praetextatus is indeed a meticulous scholar who shows *diligentia* and *doctrina* in the way he introduces secondary sources in his speech (*Sat.* 3.2-3.12). Second, I will show how Sammonicus Serenus continues Rome's cultural legacy as a secondary source in *Sat.* 3, displaying *verecundia* and earning the title *vir saeculo suo doctus* (an erudite man in his own time, *Sat.* 3.16.6). Next, I will investigate the debate over the name of Rome's tutelary deity by tracing sources that Praetextatus summarizes in *Sat.* 3.9.5. I will also explain the significance of Praetextatus' suggestion that Ops Consivia is indeed the protector of Rome using Praetextatus' own remarks. Finally, Praetextatus argues that the *evocatio* has a two-part form, and I will prove that this is a response to Servius' commentary on *A.* 1.277 and an essential part of his analysis of *A.* 2.351-2.

Secondary Sources in Praetextatus' Speech

When examining the introduction to the *evocatio* in Praetextatus' speech, the reference to the fifth book of Sammonicus Serenus' *Res Reconditae* seems erudite and learned, but

⁶⁰ Robert Kaster, "Macrobius and Servius," 238.

Praetextatus introduces many of his secondary sources in exactly the same way, so that referencing author and text appears to be the force of habit. In order to prove that Vergil's text contains traces of pontifical law, he must cite authoritative secondary sources on that very subject. Non-Vergilian authors appear by name fifty times in his speech, and are accompanied by book title and volume number for those authors twenty-six times. Of these references, there are twenty direct quotations and thirty instances of indirect statement or indirect question so that each chapter from *Sat.* 3.2-3.8 contain between two and twelve non-Vergilian references.⁶¹

While most other works appear only once in the course of his speech, two that appear frequently are Varro's *Rerum Divinarum* and Trebatius' *Quaestiones Religionum*. The impression that this gives the reader is that Praetextatus has all of these arcane resources in some sort of amazing mental rolodex, the very essence of *doctrina*. Praetextatus is in command of his sources and can compare and contrast differing points of view regarding religious topics.

Because Praetextatus discusses so many interesting secondary sources, it is tempting to equate his voice with Macrobius, the author. As the central speaker in the *Saturnalia*, Praetextatus' intellectual habits are no small matter, but Praetextatus is more paradigm than mouthpiece. His erudition and detailed references are important aspects of his character: the idealized religious scholar. There is no doubt that Macrobius designed Praetextatus' intellectual personality and orchestrated a network of secondary sources within his speech, but ultimately Praetextatus is a merely a character who embodies intellectual virtue. A more effective way to evaluate Praetextatus' scholarly habits is to compare him with other speakers in the *Saturnalia*. In *Sat.* 3, Praetextatus, Rufius and Servius all differ in the way they use source material because they each address a different topic. While Praetextatus cites many obscure secondary sources

⁶¹ No citations of secondary sources appear in 3.1, because of the lacuna at the beginning of the book. Praetextatus starts with the end of an argument containing quotations from Vergil that conform to secondary sources now lost to the lacuna.

with the author's name, title of the work and volume, he is not alone in this practice. Both Servius and Rufius Albinus make frequent references to Varro's *De Agricultura* for descriptions of exotic edibles, but together, they reference fewer than eight works with detailed book numbers or descriptions of contents. Rufius Albinus, who also attributes some of his text to Sammonicus Serenus, cites the *Lex Didia*, *Lex Orchia*, and other sumptuary laws in his speech about Roman dining. Servius also refers to authors such as Gavius Bassus, Cloatius Verus, Opius, Favorinus, and Cicero, concerning varieties of produce, but does not provide many titles and volume numbers for his references. While all of the speakers in *Sat.* 3 cite other works, Praetextatus stands out because of the number of his references, their frequency in his speech, and their specificity.

The number and type of references in the *Saturnalia* is closely related to what Macrobius expected his reader to know. For example, Praetextatus often quotes Vergil with no introduction at all, and only mentions book numbers twice in his speech for Vergilian texts.⁶² Typically, Praetextatus quotes the *Aeneid* directly without providing book numbers or context from the story. From this pattern one can deduce that Macrobius intended his readers to have an intimate knowledge of the Vergilian corpus. Looking outside of *Sat.* 3, Symmachus analyzes Vergil's rhetorical style by quoting Cicero, Demosthenes, and Homer. He cites fewer authors and quotes non-Vergilian text less frequently than Praetextatus. As part of his analysis, Symmachus typically refers to a generalized *Graeci* or *rhetores* when providing examples of Greek words or rhetorical devices. This is a significant difference—it is not necessary for Symmachus to refer to specific texts on rhetoric because Greek vocabulary and rhetorical terminology are considered general knowledge for the reader. It is fair to say that Praetextatus' *diligentia* arises out of necessity: the rites and practices that he refers to are no longer general knowledge, so he must

⁶² *Georgicorum libro primo*, 3.5.7; *duodecimo libro*, 3.8.12.

provide the reader with a complete citation. Moreover, Praetextatus' citations must be detailed enough to provide a reading list for Eustachius.

To compare the use of secondary religious texts with lines from Vergil, one can turn to a speaker held in low intellectual esteem, the hostile Evangelus. After Praetextatus' speech, Evangelus responds by asking questions intended to show Vergil's lack of erudition and poor understanding of Roman religious customs (3.10-12). A modern reader will notice that part of the debate between Evangelus and Praetextatus is missing due to a *lacuna*. Nevertheless, just one of the complete exchanges between the two speakers can be very instructive. In *Sat.* 3.12 there is a sharp contrast between the scholarly methods of the two speakers. Not only does Evangelus have a tough time discussing Vergil, but he only cites one secondary source to prove his argument. He boasts that he has found two errors (*gemino errore*, 3.12.1) in one Vergilian example: *tum Salii ad cantus incensa altaria circum/ populeis adsunt evincti tempora ramis* (Then the Salii, around the blazing altars, are in attendance for the chant, their temples encircled with poplar branches, *A.* 8.285). According to Evangelus Vergil incorrectly called the priests of Hercules by the name *Salii* and mentioned the wrong tree when describing their crowns. To support his assertions, Evangelus begins by stating the ancients assigned the *Salii* to Mars rather than to Hercules (*nam et Salios Herculi dedit, quos tantum Marti dicavit antiquitas*, 3.12.1), and adds that the urban prefect wears a laurel crown when he performs the rites of Hercules (*Videmus et in capite praetoris urbani lauream coronam, cum rem divinam Herculi facit*, 3.12.1-2). While these generalizations contain no references to secondary sources, Evangelus does cite one of Varro's Mennipean satires entitled *The Thunderbolt*. Evangelus summarizes a scene from the satire, a feast dedicated to Hercules, after which the participants return home wearing laurel crowns (3.12.2). On the surface, Evangelus seems to have succeeded in showing Vergil's *error*

geminus, especially since he supported his argument with Varro, a well-used source by many speakers in the *Saturnalia*.

In response to Evangelus, Praetextatus cites no less than five sources, referring to author and title. Evangelus may cite Varro once, but Praetextatus bests him with two different citations from Varro, beginning with *Res Humanae* book two: after Rome was founded the Romans used laurel branches from the trees that sprouted on the Aventine for religious rites (3.12.4-5). Next, Praetextatus notes that Hercules is equated with Mars in Varro's satire, *The Other Hercules*. From Octavius Hersennius' aptly titled treatise *De Sacris Saliaribus Tiburtium*, Praetextatus reports that the *Salii* were established for Hercules and that they perform rites under the auspices on certain days. Then, Praetextatus describes a work by Antonius Gniphio *in eo volumine quo disputat quid sit festra, quod est ostium minusculum in sacrario, quo verbo etiam Ennius usus est* (in which volume he defines the term *festra* which is a tiny opening in a sacred container, even Ennius uses the same term, 3.12.8). In this instance, he gives the surrounding context in lieu of a title, as if to guide the reader to the appropriate document and passage. Praetextatus also makes one generalization without naming a particular author or book as a source, saying that the Chaldeans call the planet Mars "Hercules." Praetextatus concludes that his argument has strength because of the sources that he quotes: *Idoneis, ut credo, auctoribus certisque rationibus error qui putabatur uterque defensus est* (as I believe, each item that was considered a "mistake" has been disproven by concrete examples from suitable authors, 3.12.9) In effect, multiple examples from different time periods effectively defeat Evangelus' argument. In the *Saturnalia*'s preface, Macrobius demonstrated how much he values literature from different time periods: *hoc praesens opus volo...multarum aetatum exempla* (I want such a thing for my current work...examples from many ages, 1.praef.9). According to Macrobius, to produce a successful

literary argument one must have *multarum aetatum exempla*, concrete examples (*diligentia*) from a variety of sources (*doctrina*). While Evangelus makes an attempt at *diligentia* by citing Varro once, he is remiss in the *doctrina* required to prove his argument. In contrast, Praetextatus uses five different sources, *multarum aetatum exempla*, showcasing the range of his erudition (*doctrina*) and, uses specific examples with detailed citation (*diligentia*). Their debate answers the question why Praetextatus' detailed citations are so necessary: *multarum aetatum exempla* are not only vital for producing a successful literary argument, but an important part of being a learned aristocrat.

Sammonicus Serenus

Sammonicus Serenus and Macrobius both chose to include the *evocatio* in their respective works, but their common interest transcends the destruction of Carthage. From Praetextatus' words, one can observe that both authors wanted to portray the discovery of the curse text: *Nam repperi in libro quinto Rerum reconditarum Sammonici Sereni utrumque carmen, quod ille se in cuiusdam Furii vetustissimo libro repperisse professus est.* (For in the fifth book of Sammonicus Serenus' *Arcane Subjects* I discovered each prayer which he in turn said that he had discovered himself in a very old book of a certain Furius, 3.9.6). Perhaps because the *evocatio* is such an unusual text, Praetextatus and Serenus each say that they "discovered" it (*repperi/reperisse*). By repeating the verb *repperi...reperisse* Macrobius depicts both Serenus and Praetextatus as literary archeologists uncovering unique and valuable texts. When he quotes the *evocatio*, Praetextatus takes on Serenus' role as a custodian of Roman culture, and even the title *Res Reconditae* resonates with Praetextus' own arcane references in

Sat. 3.1-12. This small reference to Furius' *vetustissimo libro* is yet another example of the Macrobian virtue of *verecundia*: the importance of preserving ancient texts for the future.

Looking at the *evocatio* in isolation, one might think that Sammonicus Serenus was experienced in only religious matters, but his name appears five more times in *Sat.* 3 in a culinary rather than religious context (3.16-17). Rufius Albinus describes Sammonicus Serenus as a *vir saeculo suo doctus* (a learned man in his own time, 3.16.6) and the fragments from Serenus that follow show his diverse interests. In a letter to Septimius Severus, Serenus states that the sturgeon, a fish neglected in Pliny's age, has now come back into fashion at the dining table. Serenus then requests to attend an upcoming banquet because he expects to see the reenactment of an ancient dining practice in which *hunc pisces a coronatis ministris cum tibicine introferri* (the sturgeon is brought in into a feast by attendants wearing garlands and accompanied by a flute player, 3.16.7).⁶³ Serenus concludes his letter by writing about the sturgeon in a scholarly way, noting that Pliny and Nigidinus Figulus both observed its retrograde scales (3.16.7). Commenting on this passage, Rufius infers that Serenus was trying to embarrass the emperor into dining more simply (*haec Sammonicus, qui tupiditatem convivii principis sui laudando notat*) and characterizes the "sturgeon parade" as a religious procession rather than a dinner service (*non deliciarum sed numinis pompa*, 3.16.8). Rufius subsequently paraphrases Serenus, reporting that Asinius Celer once bought a mullet for seven thousand sesterces (3.16.9). Even though Serenus may have originally described Severan banquets as part of his comparison, the examples contained in *Sat.* 3 revolve around the past: the *antiqui* who so elaborately served the sturgeon, and Asinius Celer, consul in 38 C.E., who spent so much for a single fish.

Next, Serenus comments that the *Lex Fannia* was a reaction to a state thrown into crisis by banqueting and partying (3.17.4-5). Serenus uses strong language to describe boys who traded

⁶³ S.E. Stout, "The Coalescence of the Two Plinys," *TAPA* 86 (1955), 250.

their sexual purity and freedom so they could dine well (*ut gula inlecti pleri ingenui pueri pudicitiam et libertatem suam venditarent*, 3.17.4). In this passage, Serenus' description of decadent behavior is reminiscent of Scipio Aemilianus' earlier speech regarding dancing schools. Scipio Aemilianus warns the senate that Roman free-born children are attending dancing schools taught by teachers of questionable moral character (*in ludum saltatorium inter cinaedos virgines puerique ingenui*, 3.14.7). Aemilianus' concern is that they would learn *cum crotalis saltare quam saltationem impudicus servulus honeste saltare non potest* (to dance a routine that a vulgar little slave could not rightly dance). Both Serenus and Aemilianus create a strong contrast between the free-born boys (*ingenui pueri*) and their sexual opportunism. In the first example Serenus uses the verb *venditarent* to indicate that the boys have been prostituting themselves for lavish dinners. In the second example, Aemilianus uses words like *impudicus servulus* and variations of the verb *saltare* to convey that the children are being trained as exotic dancers. This entertaining opposition between future citizens of the Republic and provocative behavior suggests that Serenus may be the source of both passages. In fact, many scholars assume that Serenus may be the source for all of *Sat.* 3.13-3.20.⁶⁴ Because Aemilianus' speech responds to the vice of *luxuria* in this particular way, it fits within the scope of Serenus' fragments contained in *Sat.* 3. Taken together, Serenus' stories about expensive fish and the promiscuity of Roman youngsters paint a picture that is a familiar trope in Roman literature: extravagance and moral decline in Rome.

Praetextatus and Rufius Albinus both respect Sammonicus Serenus as an excavator of ancient literature and a *vir saeculo suo doctus*, but for a modern reader, this reverence is undercut by the off-beat and risqué content of his entertaining fragments. Reacting to Serenus' stories in

⁶⁴ Edward Champlin, "Serenus Sammonicus" *HSPH*, 85 (1981), 192; Pierre Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources* (1969) 23-4.

Sat. 3.16-17, Champlin concludes that Serenus is “exceptionally silly.” From a modern perspective it is difficult to reconcile the Serenus of the *evocatio* with the Serenus of the “sturgeon parade.” Champlin uses the *Saturnalia*, the *Historia Augusta*, and letters to explore the identity of Sammonicus Serenus, creating a biography of “septimius serenus sammonicus,” a tutor and member of the African, Severan court.⁶⁵ In his article, Champlin tries to connect Sammonicus Serenus to the poet Septimius Serenus and to the unknown Latin translator of a notorious Greek forgery, the *Dictys Cretensis*.⁶⁶ While he does not prove Serenus’ authorship of these works convincingly, many of his arguments are formed Sammonicus Serenus’ fragments from the *Saturnalia*. A modern reader must be mindful that in the *Res Reconditae* these fragments conformed to Serenus’ ideas about antiquity, while the same fragments appear in the *Saturnalia* to illustrate Macrobius’ own set of intellectual virtues. Concerning the transmission of the poems of Lucilius, Conte made remarks that are also applicable to Serenus’ fragments in the *Saturnalia*: “It is also necessary to recall that the fragments are the result of a selection that has been made for its own purposes.”⁶⁷ The reader of the *evocatio* must keep in mind Serenus’ original focus, as well as regard Macrobius’ selection and placement of the fragments within the *Saturnalia*. Serenus certainly shows *verecundia* by citing Furius as the *evocatio*’s original source, but he also presents a dialogue between Pliny the Elder, the *antiqui* who love sturgeon, and the Severan court. Although Serenus’ range of topics may make him less credible to a modern reader, to Macrobius’ speakers this represented *doctrina*, knowledge on many fronts. The same author who seems “exceptionally silly” to a modern reader becomes a paragon of *verecundia* and *doctrina* in Macrobius’ dialogue.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 209.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 204-207.

⁶⁷ Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press (1999), 631.

The Secret Protector of Rome

In contrast to these examples of detailed citation, Praetextatus summarizes much of the ancient scholarship on the *evocatio* in his substantial introduction in *Sat.* 3.9.2-6. He contends that an *evocatio* actually is a very ancient Roman custom, that all cities are under the protection of some god or other, and that when the Romans were ready to pillage a city they would “evoke” the gods first to avoid a sacrilege (3.9.2). Next, he connects the rite of *evocatio* to Rome’s protective deity, stating that Romans keep the god’s name secret preclude an *evocatio* performed by the enemy :

nam propterea ipsi Romani et deum in cuius tutela urbs Romana est Latinum nomen ignotum esse voluerunt. sed dei quidem nomen non nullis antiquorum, licet inter se dissidentium, libris insitum et ideo vetusta persequentibus quicquid de hoc putatur innotuit.

Furthermore, the Romans themselves wanted the god under whose protection the Roman city exists and the Latin name of the city itself to remain unknown. But indeed the name of the god is located in many old writers’ books, although there is disagreement among them, and so whatever is known about it has informed those researching ancient matters.
3.9.4

Praetextatus a scholarly debate (*dissidentium*) that is buried in books (*libris insitum*). The phrase *libris insitum* conveys the type of nested quotation that Praetextatus relies on for some of his sources, including the *evocatio*. For example, the *evocatio* is nested in Furius’ ancient volume that is in turn quoted in Sammonicus Serenus’ *Res Reconditae*. Macrobius also takes part in nesting other fragments in the *Saturnalia*, preserving them for posterity. In sum, the term *libris insitum* is an example of *verecundia* by describing the valuable text that authors find and transmit.

Identifying Rome’s secret protector is a clear digression from Praetextatus’ search for *proprietas* in Vergil, but the *evocatio* and secret god are closely linked in other authors as well. Although Praetextatus notes the disagreement (*dissidentium*) about the god’s identity,

Gustaffsson concisely summarizes the facts shared by many authors “...in the texts of Pliny, Servius, and Macrobius, it is said that the reason why the name and identity of Rome’s tutelary gods are or were kept secret is the fear of an *evocatio* against Rome. Macrobius also says that the true name of the city itself is secret, and this is also stated elsewhere by Pliny (N.H. 3.65) and Servius (1.277).”⁶⁸ Gustaffsson also thinks that Rome’s secret protector was an idea that only came about in the Augustan age, but what Gustaffsson does not observe is that Pliny and Servius each cite other authors in their text (*libris insitum*) including Verrius Flaccus and Varro. In exploring this labyrinth of sources, my goal is not to prove that Macrobius was specifically referring to these authors, but rather to show evidence for literary discussion (*dissidentium*) concerning the god who protected Rome and the secret name of Rome itself. Praetextatus and Pliny the Elder make many similar assertions regarding the *evocatio*, with both authors connecting the *evocatio* and the need for Rome’s protector to remain secret. Pliny describes a literary tradition concerning both topics:

Verrius Flaccus auctores ponit, quibus credat in obpugnationibus ante omnia solitum a Romanis sacerdotibus evocari deum, cuius in tutela id oppidum esset, promittique illi eundem aut ampliorem apud Romanos cultum. Et durat in pontificum disciplina id sacrum, constatque ideo occultatum, in cuius dei tutela Roma esset, ne qui hostium simili modo agerent.

Verrius Flaccus quotes forth trustworthy authors that during a siege, before all else, that the god who protected the town used to be evoked by Roman priests, and they promised the god the same or greater worship among the Romans. This rite has continued in the practice of priests, and everyone knows that the god who protects Rome is well hidden lest any enemy do a similar thing. *Nat.* 28.17-18

In this passage Pliny is not just referring to Verrius Flaccus, but the *auctores quibus credat* – the trustworthy sources that Flaccus quotes. This is an example of Praetextatus’ term *libris insitum*.

⁶⁸ Gabriela Gustafsson, *Evocatio Deorum*, Uppsala: Uppsala University (2000) 132.

Moreover, Pliny mentions that *evocatio* survives in priestly practice, which suggests that Praetextus may also allude to references on pontifical law.⁶⁹

In the next part of the introduction, Praetextatus muses about the name of Rome's tutelary god, admitting that some scholars think that Angerona, Luna, or Jupiter fulfill this role. He resorts to the expression *alii...alii* without naming any authors or books, and ultimately asserts that Ops Consivia is Rome's true protector:

alii enim Iovem crediderunt, alii Lunam, sunt qui Angeronam, quae digito ad os admoto silentium denuntiat, alii autem quorum fides mihi videtur firmior, Opem Consiviam esse dixerunt.

For some believe that Jupiter is the god, others Luna, and there are those who think it is Angerona because she calls for silence with a finger drawn to her mouth, there are others whose case seems stronger to me- those who say the god is Ops Consivia. 3.9.4

Of the three gods, Praetextatus provides the most information about Angerona, *quae digito ad os admoto silentium denuntiat*. Her description in *Sat.* 3 parallels another passage from *Naturalis Historia* that begins with the story of Valerius Soranus. Pliny reports that he revealed the secret name of Rome and had to pay the price (*enuntiavit Valerius Soranus luitque mox poenas, Nat.* 3.65). This story is rather mysterious because Pliny does not say to whom Soranus pronounced (*enuntiavit*) the secret name of the city, nor does he specify what the actual penalty (*poenas*) was. After the story of Valerius Soranus' punishment, Pliny awkwardly changes the subject:

non alienum videtur inserere hoc loco exemplum religionis antiquae ob hoc maxime silentium institutae. namque diva angerona, cui sacrificatur a. d. xii Kal. Ian., ore obligato obsignatoque simulacrum habet.

It doesn't seem out of place to include here an example of an old religious practice that was mainly set up on account of this silence. For the goddess Angerona, to whom one sacrifices on December 21st, has a cult image bound and gagged at the mouth. *Nat.* 3.65

Although Praetextatus' Angerona calls for silence with her finger at her lips (*quae digito ad os admoto silentium denuntiat*, 3.9.5) and Pliny's goddess is bound and gagged (*ore obligato*

⁶⁹ *nam primo pontificii iuris libro apud Pictorem verbum hoc positum est vitulari, Sat.* 3.2.13.

obsignatoque simulacrum, 3.65), both authors associate Angerona with one of Rome's secrets. It is not clear whether Angerona simply guards the secret name or if Pliny avoids declaring that she is Rome's secret god in an attempt to avoid Valerius Soranus' fate. In the *Saturnalia*, Praetextatus places Angerona's festival on the Roman calendar, naming Verrius Flaccus as his source (1.10.7). Even though Pliny does not provide a source for his description of Angerona, Praetextatus' citation in *Sat.* 1.10.7 implies that Verrius Flaccus had written about the goddess in his work.

In addition to Pliny the Elder, Servius also mentions Valerius Soranus, citing Varro's version of the story: *denique tribunus plebei quidam Valerius Soranus, ut ait Varro et multi alii, hoc nomen ausus enuntiare, ut quidam dicunt raptus a senatu et in crucem levatus est* (In the end a tribune of the plebs, a certain Valerius Soranus, as Varro and many others say, having dared to utter this name, as they say he was grabbed by the senate and lifted onto a cross, *Serv. A.* 1.277). Next, Servius admits that there is another version of Soranus' fate: *ut alii, metu supplicii fugit et in Sicilia comprehensus a praetore praecepto senatus occisus est* (As others say, he fled for fear of punishment, was apprehended in Sicily and executed by a praetor on the senate's command). Even though Servius makes no mention of Angerona, he adds that even Hyginus didn't reveal Rome's secret name (*hoc autem urbis nomen ne Hyginus quidem cum de situ urbis loqueretur expressit*). There is evidence of a much broader *dissidentium* in Servius' account because he tells two different versions of Soranus' story. Although he only names Varro in conjunction with Soranus, the fact that Hyginus would not reveal Rome's name infers that he at least broached the subject.

It seems that Varro had much to say about Valerius Soranus because he quotes and discusses lines of Soranus' Poetry in a fragment preserved in Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*. By

using this example, I am not attempting including Augustine in Praetextatus' scholarly *dissidentium*. Rather, I am focusing on Soranus' lines and Varro's analysis. Although Augustine criticizes Varro at the end of book 7, in this passage he introduces Varro reluctantly, as part of a larger discussion about the gods Janus and Jupiter:

In hanc sententiam etiam quosdam uersus Valerii Sorani exponit idem Varro in eo libro, quem seorsum ab istis de cultu deorum scripsit; qui uersus hi sunt:

*Iuppiter omnipotens regum rerumque deumque
Progenitor genetrixque deum, deus unus et omnes*

Regarding this opinion, Varro quotes certain verses of Valerius Soranus in that book that he wrote apart from those other ones about the worship of the gods. Here are the verses:

All-powerful Jupiter, king of gods and things
Begetter and birth-mother of the gods, the one and every god. (*C.D.* 7.9)

Augustine follows with Varro's opinion that Jupiter represents both the male sower of reproductive seed and its female vessel *eum omnia semina ex se emittere et in se recipere* (that he produces every seed and receives every seed into himself). Varro also asserts that Jupiter encompasses the entire world *mundus enim unus, et in eo uno omnia sunt* (the world is one and everything in it is unified) and that is why he manifests both genders. There are other points to consider in this quotation besides Varro's transmission of Valerius Soranus' verse. First, Praetextatus says that some believe Jupiter is the protective god of Rome, so it seems possible that *alii* could include Varro and Soranus (*Alii Iovem crediderunt*, 3.9.5). In support of this connection, Jaime Alvar notes that Servius includes a prayer to Jupiter in a note about *evocatio*: *Iuppiter optime maxime, sive quo alio nomine te appellari volueris* (Jupiter Optimus Maximus, or if you wish to be called by any other name, *Serv. A.* 2.351).⁷⁰ However, Servius is unclear in this example whether he is suggesting that Jupiter is Rome's secret protector or merely giving

⁷⁰ Jaime Alvar, "Matériaux pour l'étude de la formule *sive deus sive dea*," *Numen* 32 no.2 (December 1985), 259-261.

examples of ambiguous invocations: *et iure pontificum cautum est, ne suis nominibus dii Romani appellarentur, ne exaugurari possint* (It is advised in pontifical law that the Roman gods not be called by their own names, so they won't be desecrated). In conclusion, Alvar points out that above all, Varro is the common source for Servius and Augustine, "Il est logique de penser que les vers de Valerius Soranus sont en relation avec la révélation du nom secret de Rome et en conséquence, avec le problème de l'évocatio (It is sensible to think that Valerius Soranus' verses are connected with the revelation of the secret name of Rome and ultimately, with the problem of *evocatio*)."⁷¹

Although Praetextatus thinks that Ops Consivia is Rome's protector, he provides no support for his assertion (*alii autem quorum fides mihi videtur firmior, Opem Consiviam esse dixerunt*, 3.9.5). It is especially significant that Praetextatus designates Ops Consivia because she is an amalgamation of the Ops, the goddess of abundance and Consus, a god of harvest, combining both male and female attributes.⁷² Although Jupiter is both *progenitor* and *genetrix* in Valerius Soranus' verse, Praetextatus argues that Venus also manifests two genders in *Sat.* 3.8. He begins by exploring Vergil's term *ducente deo* (*A.* 2.632 ~ *Sat.* 3.8.2). Praetextatus supports his reading of the text by showing that the goddess Venus indeed has both male and female attributes, mentioning a Cyprian statue of a bearded Venus in female dress, and Laevinius' address to the same goddess, *sive femina sive mas est* (whether she is male or female, 3.8.2-3). Praetextatus' description of a male and female Venus in *Sat.* 3.8.2-3 anticipates his designation of goddess Ops Consivia in *Sat.* 3.9.5 and the phrase *Si deus, si dea est* from the *evocatio* in *Sat.* 3.9.7.⁷³

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 260.

⁷² Gustaffssohn, 132

⁷³ Praetextatus also mentions Ops' festival during May, naming her as the daughter of Faunus and connecting her to the secret rites of Bona Dea, *Sat.* 1.12.21-2.

It seems counterintuitive that Praetextatus would first reveal the name of the god that protects his own city and then articulate an example of the formula used for destroying cities. Why not just hint at the name of the god, like Pliny? In answering this question, there are three distinct avenues that merit consideration: the characterization of Praetextatus, the historical background of Macrobius' day, and the principles of *verecundia* and *doctrina*. One can consider that naming Ops Consivia was less of a statement of fact by Macrobius and more of an expression of Praetextatus' characterization. After all, Ops had a *sacrarium* in the *regia* of the *forum* that only the chief Vestal and *pontifex maximus* could access.⁷⁴ Considering Praetextatus' connection to the *pontificate* in Symmachus' *relatio* 2.36, perhaps Macrobius is using the name Ops Consivia to suggest the Praetextatus was acting as *pontifex maximus* during his career. As *pontifex maximus*, Praetextatus can provide the reader with a private tour of the *regia* by mentioning the name of the goddess. For Praetextatus, Ops Consivia represents the unified goddess discussed in *Sat.* 1 as well as the goddess with two genders in *Sat.* 3.8. For this reason, suggestion of Ops Consivia can be understood as a complex piece of his characterization, a "patron goddess" of Praetextatus the *pontifex maximus*.

If Macrobius did agree with Praetextatus that Ops Consivia was the protector of Rome, the speculative mood that precedes the *evocatio* takes on a darker tone. Gustaffssohn suggests that "the mythical and theological perspective of Macrobius should be viewed against the background of the disaster of 410," but she does not elaborate on what perspective the siege and plunder of Rome actually provides.⁷⁵ Perhaps Praetextatus foreshadows Alaric's attack by saying the name Ops Consivia in 384 C.E, or perhaps Macrobius is secretly lamenting that Ops' *sacrarium* was one of the sacred objects melted down to pay Alaric's ransom, but applying

⁷⁴ Samuel Platner, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, London: Oxford University Press, 1929.

⁷⁵ Gustaffssohn, 140

Macrobius' concerns about Rome's situation in 410 C.E. to a fictional conversation at a Saturnalia in 384 C.E. seems to muddy the waters rather than produce new insight. Gustaffsson also asserts that the idea of a secret deity protecting Rome is probably a later invention from the early principate, but I have shown, using sources like Servius, Pliny, and Augustine, that the debate more likely extends back into the Republic.⁷⁶ Both Servius and Augustine cite Varro, and Pliny notes that Verrius Flaccus has credible sources as well. Embedded in *De Civitate Dei*, Varro's quotation of Valerius Soranus also suggests that the debate over Rome's secret god began even earlier. Praetextatus states that these nested quotations (*libris insitum*) are an important source for antiquarians (*vetusta persequentibus*). More importantly, mentioning Rome's secret god and hidden name connects an obsolete tradition, *evocatio*, to Rome's safety which is a more pressing concern for Eustachius. By "the background of the disaster of 410," perhaps Gustaffsson intended to place the debate over Rome's secret god in the context of a general concern for Rome's safety. In the *Saturnalia*, this juxtaposition is an act of *verecundia* because Macrobius hands down ancient sources, making an ancient ritual relevant to contemporary readers.

The Two-Part Form of the Evocatio

The debate does not end when Praetextatus concludes that Ops Consivia is Rome's protector. Since Servius' *In Vergilium Comentarius* was in circulation well before the *Saturnalia* was composed, Servian commentary is relevant comparison for Praetextatus' treatment of the *evocatio*. For the most part, Servius and Praetextatus are remarkably similar concerning the basic facts of *evocatio* because they both used sources like Varro, Pliny, and Verrius Flaccus. However, when Servius conflates the rites of *evocatio* and *devotio* and uses Serenus' text for

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

evidence, his interpretation of Vergil is affected. For this reason, Servius' analysis of *A.* 1.277 becomes the catalyst for Praetextatus arguing that the *evocatio* indeed has two distinct parts.⁷⁷ To prove this, I will first establish precedent by examining commentary on *A.* 5.237-8 according to Servius (*Serv. A.* 5.237-8) and Praetextatus (*Sat.* 3.2.5). Based on linguistic similarities, I argue that Praetextatus's insistence on a two-part *evocatio* performs the same function (3.9.5). Praetextatus uses two different quotations from the *Aeneid* to show that Vergil also recognized the distinct features of *evocatio* and *devotio*. Praetextatus' response creates a dynamic relationship between Servian commentary used in classrooms and the type of scholarly discourse that generates true *doctrina*.

Both Praetextatus and Servius recognize divergent readings of *A.* 2.238 in Vergilian manuscripts: Praetextatus argues that *porriciam* is the correct reading, while Servius prefers to read *proiciam* as the main verb. For Praetextatus *extaque salsos/porriciam in fluctus* (I will offer entrails unto the salty sea, *A.* 5.237-8) conveys a giving or offering to the sea, while for Servius *extaque salsos/proiciam fluctus* (I will cast out entrails into the salty sea) describes the tossing of entrails onto the waves. In his discussion, Servius acknowledges three different interpretations in the debate between *porriciam* and *proiciam*:

exta 'proiciuntur' in fluctus, aris 'porriciuntur', hoc est porriguntur: nisi forte dicamus etiam fluctibus offerri. quod si est, 'porriciam' legendum est, id est porro iaciam.

Entrails are 'tossed out' onto the waves; they are 'offered up' at altars. The latter is from the verb *porriguntur*: unless by chance we should say that [the entrails] are given to waves. But if one must read the verb '*porriciam*,' it is actually 'yonder, will I toss' from *porro* and *iaciam*. (*Serv. A.* 5.238).

Servius argues that the reading *porriciam* would only be valid if an altar were involved. He concedes that constructing a compound from the adverb *porro* (beyond/yonder) and *iaciam* (I

⁷⁷ It is also important to consider that Macrobius is responding on two levels, to Servius' interpretation and to the source(s) that Servius summarized in his commentary. These would be sources known to both Servius and Macrobius, such as Donatus' commentary, which is unavailable to modern readers.

will toss) would yield the form *porriciam*, which also denotes a tossing action.⁷⁸ In the end, Servius adopts *proiaciam* as his reading of Vergil's text, but provides no citation to back up his assertion. Conversely, Praetextatus reads *porriciam* in Vergil's text:

Veranius ex primo libro Pictoris ita dissertationem huius verbi exsecutus est: exta porriciunto, dis danto, in altaria aramve focumve eove quo exta dari debebunt

Quoting from the first book of Fabius Pictor, Veranius followed up on the discussion of this word: Offer the entrails, give them to the gods on an altar or shrine or a hearth or anywhere else entrails should be given (3.2.4).

In this example, Praetextatus uses a substantive participle to distinguish those who read *proiciam* in *A.* 5.237-8 and preference: *non ut quidam 'proiciam', aestimantes dixisse Vergilium proicienda exta, quia adiecit 'in fluctus.' sed ita non est* (it is not '*proiciam*' as some read, thinking Vergil said that the entrails must be tossed out because he added the words '*in fluctus*,' 3.2.2). Comparing *Sat.* 3.2.5 and *Serv. A.* 5.238 illuminates a hidden dialogue between Praetextatus and other Vergilian critics. In this subtext Praetextatus politely disagrees with Servius and the tradition of criticism that Servius has summarized.

Praetextatus also uses a substantive participle when he disputes that the *evocatio* and *devotio* are one continuous prayer: *sed videndum quod non nulli male aestimaverunt nos quoque confundat, opinantes uno carmine et evocari ex urbe aliqua deos et ipsam devotam fieri civitatem* (one must be careful not to confuse an issue that some people have evaluated poorly, **those thinking** that with one prayer the gods are evoked from a city and the city itself becomes devoted, 3.9.6). Although Praetextatus does not name these misguided scholars, instead of the pronouns *alii...alii...* he uses the substantive participle *opinantes*. Using these participles is more polite than Evangelus' offensive phrase *gemino errore*, implying that Vergil has committed some

⁷⁸ The suggestion of a compound from *porro* and *iaciam* also appears in the Festus' definition of *porriciam*. Festus' work epitomized Verrius Flaccus' *De Significatu Verborum*. Although Macrobius and Festus are using the same author (Verrius Flaccus), they each arrive at a different conclusion.

sort of literary crime. Praetextatus shows that his discussion is among men of reason because *opinantes* and *aestimantes* infer that the unnamed scholars formed their interpretations thoughtfully. While Praetextatus uses substantive participles (*opinantes/aestimantes*) to represent opposing viewpoints, he cites very specific sources to support his own position. In *Sat.* 3.2.5, Praetextatus cites Veranius as well as the source Veranius that quoted, Fabius Pictor, an example of *libris insitum*. Moreover, Praetextatus cites the source material for the *evocatio* in the same way, summoning Sammonicus Serenus and Furius to support his argument rather than merely alluding to “other sources” (*alii autem quorum fides mihi videtur firmior*, 3.9.5). Although Praetextatus may be polite by using participles like *opinantes* and *aestimantes*, he is set on correcting Vergilian analysis using a long tradition of scholarship to support his assertions.

There is an important difference between the debate over *porriciam* and the discussion of the *evocatio*: in *Sat.* 3.2.5 Praetextatus disputes Servius’ interpretation of lines he is discussing (5.237-8) while in *Sat.* 3.9.5: Praetextatus comments on lines *A.* 2.351-2 and *A.* 2.226-7 but is actually responding to Servius’ commentary on *A.* 2.244. The generic differences between commentary and dialogue have created this situation. Because Macrobius has composed a lengthy speech for his character, Praetextatus can take time to provide background information and analysis of the *evocatio*. Moreover, Praetextatus discusses Vergil’s lines according to the structure of the curse so that *A.* 351-2 precedes *A.* 2.326-7 in his discussion. In contrast, Servius’ commentary must conform to Vergil’s text so that his notes on the *evocatio* are spread out over several books. Since I have already discussed *A.* 1.277 in connection with Valerius Soranus, I will address Servius’ remaining notes on *evocatio* in the following order: *A.* 12.841, *A.* 3.351, *A.* 2.244. Servius uses the idea of *evocatio* to explain Juno’s mollification at the end of the *Aeneid*: *sed constat bello Punico secundo exoratam Iunonem, tertio vero bello a Scipione sacris*

quibusdam etiam Romam esse translata. (but everyone knows that Juno was beseeched at the end of the Second Punic War, and at the end the Third Punic War she was transferred to Rome by certain sacred rites, *A.* 12.841). The term *exorata* hints at a lesser *evocatio* at the end of the Second Punic War, while *translata* implies that a formal *evocatio* took place along with Juno's transport to Rome.⁷⁹ Servius also says that Juno is the patron of Carthage and that Scipio Aemilianus was the agent of *evocatio*. Servius considers these common knowledge (*constat*) which explains why Praetextatus only alludes to Juno and Scipio in his commentary. Praetextatus assumes that his audience is well acquainted with Rome's wars with Carthage, while Servius writes these facts to educate a reader inexperienced in Roman History.

Servius and Praetextatus both comment on the same passage from the *Aeneid*: *excessere omnes adytis arisque relictis/ di quibus imperium hoc steterat*. (All of the gods, by whom this kingdom had stood, have left the sanctuaries and altars abandoned, *A.* 2.351-2). Praetextatus formally discusses these lines in all of *Sat.* 3.9.1-16, and these lines also inspired Servius' most lengthy note on the *evocatio*:

EXCESSERE quia ante expugnationem evocabantur ab hostibus numina propter vitanda sacrilegia. Inde est, quod Romani celatum esse voluerunt, in cuius dei tutela urbs Roma sit. et iure pontificum cautum est, ne suis nominibus dii Romani appellarentur, ne exaugurari possint.

EXCESSERE To avoid a sacrilege, the divinities were called away from the enemy before the city was plundered. This is the reason why the Romans wanted to conceal the god under whose protection Rome continued to exist. And there was a warning in pontifical law that the Roman gods should not be called by their own names so they could not be desecrated in this manner. (*Serv. A.* 2.351)

The beginning of Servius' commentary provides information that is, for the most part, shared by Praetextatus' introduction (3.9.2-4) and Pliny's summary of Verrius Flaccus (*Nat.* 28.17-18).

However, there are two phrases that are only used by Servius and Pliny. Servius uses *ante*

⁷⁹ Eduard Frankel. *Horace*. 237-8.

expugnationem while Pliny uses *ante omnia* to denote that the *evocatio* occurs before the final part of the siege. Pliny states that according to pontifical law (*in pontificium disciplina*) only Rome's protector remained a secret, while Servius notes that pontifical law (*iure pontificium*) forbade the gods to be called by their real names. Servius provides examples not of suggestions for Rome's protector, but of methods of addressing gods in general:

Et in Capitolio fuit clipeus consecratus, cui inscriptum erat 'genio urbis Romae, sive mas sive femina'. Et pontifices ita precabantur 'Iuppiter optime maxime, sive quo alio nomine te appellari volueris': nam ipse ait "sequimur te, sancte deorum, quisquis es."

Also, there was a consecrated shield on the Capitolium whose inscription reads, "to the genius of the city Rome, whether you are male or female." even the priest prayed thus, "Jupiter Optimus Maximus, or whether you wish to be called by any other name." For [Vergil] himself said, "We follow you, holy one of the gods, whoever you are." (Serv. *A.* 2.351)

Because Servius begins his examples with the *Genius Urbis Romae* it is easy to confuse his list of gods with Praetextatus' suggestions in *Sat.* 3.9.5. However, these typical formulae for Roman prayer, *sive mas sive femina, sive quo alio nomine te appellari volueris* and *sancte deorum, quisquis es*, all echo the construction of *Si deus, si dea est* from Serenus' *evocatio*. Since Servius actually quotes a portion of the *evocatio* in *A.* 1.277, it is likely that he also consulted it while writing commentary on *A.* 2.351.

Servius may discuss the *evocatio* at length in *A.* 2.351, but he does not recognize any allusion to *devotio* in these lines: *Ferus omnia Iuppiter/Argos transtulit A.* 2.326-7. Instead, he focuses on Panthus' anger, describing the adjective *ferus* as an insult (*invidiose dictum, Serv. A.* 2.326). Moreover, he opposes *ferus* with a more typical epithet for Jupiter, "just" (*aequus*) so that *ferus Iuppiter* implies a cruel or unjust god. Using the same phrase, Praetextatus argues that, *Ferus Iuppiter* denotes Infernal Jove, the destructive god of *devotio* (*Sat.* 3.9.15). In *A.* 2.327 Servius is still focused on Panthus, but this time he clarifies the priest's meaning rather than

pointing out his emotional outburst. For Servius, the verb *transtulit* describes Jupiter as a traitor, and the situation at Troy past redemption, *quasi dicat, qui defendas quod Iuppiter transtulit?* (As if to say, who should still fight since Jupiter has crossed to the other side? 2.327) In both of these examples, Servius is explaining the meaning of certain words by providing antonyms (*ferus/aequus*) and rephrasing Vergil's text (*quasi dicat*). By reallocating lines 2.326-7 to his description of *evocatio*, Praetextatus is pointing out an oversight on Servius' part, but does not correct the existing commentary on these lines.

In *A.* 2.244, the Trojans have just managed to squeeze the horse through the gates, and Aeneas describes what could have motivated them to stand gaping at the instrument of their destruction. Servius elaborates on Vergil's phrase *immemores caeci furore*:

sane si peritiam Vergilii diligenter intendas, secundum disciplinam carminis Romani, quo ex urbibus hostium deos ante evocare solebant, hoc dixit; erant enim inter cetera carminis verba haec "eique populo civitatieque metum, formidinem, oblivionem iniciatis"; unde bene intulit 'inmemores caecique furore', tamquam quos dei perdiderant.

Indeed, if you are looking carefully for Vergil's experience, this is what he says following the structure of a Roman **prayer** that they used to evoke the gods from enemy cities. These are the words, among others, in the **prayer**: "**may you fill the people and the state with terror, fear, and forgetfulness.**" From this he aptly coined the phrase "forgetful and blind with fear." as if the gods had destroyed them. (Serv. *A.* 2.244)

In this passage, Servius quotes a portion of Serenus' *evocatio* (*eique populo civitatieque metum, formidinem, oblivionem iniciatis Sat.* 3.9.8). Although Praetextatus doesn't comment on *A.*

2.224, he does provide the complete text of the *evocatio* and *devotio* in *Sat.* 3.9.7-12.

Praetextatus argues that some scholars (*non nulli*) have conflated the *evocatio*'s two formulas (*confundat*) These scholars think that the *evocatio* is one long prayer (*uno carmine*) that extracts the gods from the city (*evocari ex urbe aliqua deos*) and then dedicates the city for destruction (*ipsam devotam fieri civitatem*). Servius' analysis fits this description in two important ways.

First, he uses the singular form of *carmen* in his analysis: *secundum disciplinam carminis*

Romani, and *inter cetera carminis verba haec*. By themselves, these singular forms do not create a problem for Praetextatus because Servius initially refers to only *evocatio* portion of the prayer. However, in Servius' final analysis of the line he uses says *tamquam quos dei perdiderant* (as if the gods had destroyed them). In the context of the noun *dei*, the verb *perdiderant* means to utterly destroy or damn which signifies a *devotio* to Praetextatus.⁸⁰ Because of this Praetextatus uses the phrase *utrumque carmen* when he introduces Serenus' text in *Sat.* 3.9.6. Moreover, he provides a second introduction for the *devotio* that physically separates two portions of the curse (*Sat.* 3.9.9).

When Servius addresses the *evocatio* in *A.* 1.277, he indicates to the reader that he will use similar methods to Praetextatus: *sane si peritiam Vergilii diligenter intendas* (Indeed, if you are looking carefully for Vergil's experience). Reading this phrase from Praetextatus' perspective, *peritiam* parallels the concept of *proprietas* and the adverb *diligenter* anticipates the type of meticulous philological analysis found in Praetextatus' speech. However, Servius is limited in his analysis by the very genre in which he writes. Because Serenus' *evocatio* and *devotio* are so lengthy, Servius includes only a small portion in *A.* 1.277. As commentary, Servius' entire work hangs on the order and structure of Vergil's text, so his writings on *evocatio* are spread out over several books. Servian works also cater to different clientele, which is evident in the way Servius defines words and provides historical facts. Because the *Saturnalia* is a dialogue, Praetextatus can utter the entire curse without interruption, quote Vergil's lines in the order that works for his arguments, and develop a coherent discussion of the *evocatio*'s text. In a pointed contrast to Servius, Macrobius showcases Praetextatus' *diligentia* by a detailed citation for the *evocatio*, which Servius omits in *A.* 1.277. In short, Praetextatus can afford to treat the

⁸⁰ Gustafssohn also observes that Servius is describing a destructive catastrophe, 44-5.

evocatio expansively in dialogue, whereas Servius' treatment is shorter and confined to the *ordo* of Vergil's text.

On the surface, this *dissidentium* between Praetextatus and Servius seems to be a digression from analyzing *proprietas moris* and *proprietas verborum* in Vergil, but the two-part *evocatio* is closely connected to the idea of *proprietas moris*: Praetextatus discusses two separate texts from the Aeneid to prove that Vergil knew the curse consisted of an *evocatio* (*A.* 2.351-2~*Sat.* 3.9.1) and a separate *devotio* (*A.* 2.326-7~*Sat.* 3.9.15). This may seem like a superficial issue in the face of the many linguistic connections (*proprietas verborum*) between the *evocatio* and Vergil's text, but Praetextatus actually uses the two-part form of the *evocatio* to frame his argument. Praetextatus is correcting an interpretation from Servius' commentary (*Ser. A.* 1.277) that conflates the two parts of the curse. This hidden dialogue with Servius, author of his own Vergilian commentary, is certainly genial and polite. In part, the *evocatio* is generating a learned, scholarly response to Servius' commentary. Admittedly, Servius' work had slightly different goals than the *Saturnalia* which is obvious from the way that Servius explicates grammatical usage and rhetorical devices in his notes. Praetextatus on the other hand is teaching an advanced course in comparative literature for those who have outgrown many of the comments in Servius' text. Nevertheless, Praetextatus seems eager to correct the record of Vergilian criticism on this point, producing true *doctrina* through a new interpretation.

Conclusion

Macrobius presents the *evocatio* in *Sat.* 3.9 through the persona of Praetextatus, who participates in the dialogue on many different levels. As a character, he addresses distinguished men of letters, and responds to Evangelus' attack in a learned and direct way. Praetextatus also

engages in an implicit dialogue with *maiores* such as Varro, Pliny the Elder, Verrius Flaccus, and Sammonicus Serenus. On both of these levels, Macrobius characterizes Praetextatus as an idealized scholar, juxtaposing his opinions with both speakers and secondary sources to manufacture erudition. Although the *evocatio* is ostensibly a religious rite, Praetextatus is not attempting a reenactment in *Sat.* 3.9. Rather, he centers a literary debate around the curse text, summoning *maiores* like Pliny and Serenus to engage in the *Saturnalia*'s ultimate religious activity: unlocking Vergil's secrets. As an important component to this literary *doctrina*, *verecundia* requires respect for ancient texts as well as moral behavior during a discussion. Evangelus' behavior is abhorrent because he lacks respect for Vergil and Praetextatus during their debate. In contrast, Praetextatus respects even those who disagree with him and considers them thoughtful human beings (*opinantes*). Genteel behavior does not mean that Praetextatus suffers foolish Vergilian analysis, but in order to correct an existing interpretation, he seeks clear support from literary *maiores*, using quotation and detailed citation.

This could include multiple authors, as Praetextatus demonstrated in his debate with Evangelus, or one premier *exemplum* like the *evocatio* with a pedigree that spans hundreds of years. As an example of *libris insitum*, the *evocatio* spans *multarum aetatum* because Furius wrote down the *evocatio* in the late Republic and Sammonicus Serenus quoted Furius' book in the Severan age. Sammonicus Serenus becomes an important agent of the *evocatio*'s cultural legacy, a status that Praetextatus retains using the verb *reperisse/repperi* (3.9.6). Like Serenus, while Macrobius incorporates the entire *evocatio* and *devotio* in *Sat.* 3.7-12, he also injects some of Serenus' eclectic taste into the dialogue by including his writings about fish, partying, and dancing in *Sat.* 3.14-17. As a result, Serenus' *Res Reconditae* provides a different interpretation of *doctrina* because as a *vir saeculo suo doctus*, Serenus displays learning in a variety of areas,

rather than specializing in religious matters like Praetextatus. In this way, Serenus and his *Res Reconditae* is a synopsis of the entire *Saturnalia*. Both Macrobius and Serenus value knowledge spanning a wide range of topics (*doctrina*) as well as encapsulating entire texts like the *evocatio* in their writing. By example, Macrobius models *verecundia* and *doctrina* for his son by pursuing precedent in literary arguments (*vetusta persequentibus* 3.9.5), discovering ancient texts (*repperi/repperisse* 3.9.6), and sowing quotations with their provenance into his work (*libris insitum*). Although Macrobius and Serenus both display *verecundia* and *doctrina*, Macrobius tries to inspire the same qualities in his reader. This not only widens his son Eustachius' field of knowledge but also empowers him to look up secondary sources and create new interpretations. This is the measure of gentlemanly *doctrina*: valuing the *dissidentium* of literary *maiores* and using the dialogue to generate new interpretations.

In exploring the identity of Rome's secret protector, Praetextatus explicitly states that nested quotations *libris insitum* like the *evocatio* play a crucial role in researching antiquity (*vetusta persequentibus*). The summary that Praetextatus provides alludes to the works of Verrius Flaccus and Valerius Soranus that are also cited in Varro, Pliny and Servius. Macrobius is following in this antiquarian tradition, but it is not enough for him to study these texts in isolation. Like Pliny and Servius, who link the rite of *evocatio* to the identity of Rome's secret protector, Praetextatus also links his suggestion of Ops Consivia to the actual formula of *evocatio*. In Praetextatus' implicit comparison, Venus in *Sat.* 3.8.2 and Ops Consivia in *Sat.* 3.9.5 anticipate the *evocatio*'s ambiguous formula *Si deus si dea est*. Modern scholars analyzing the *evocatio* in isolation have come to various conclusions regarding the protective gods of Carthage. Alvar asserts that perhaps the *evocatio* begins with *Si deus, si dea est* to include the

gods Jupiter and Juno, known to the Carthaginians as Baal-Hammon and Tanit.⁸¹ Based on Scipio Aemilianus' construction of temples in the *Forum Boarium*, Berti introduces the god Hercules/Melquart into the mix of protective deities at Carthage.⁸² These suggestions are made from religious and historical perspectives, without regard to arguments that Praetextatus actually presents in his own speech. Implicitly, Praetextatus provides examples of a male and female Venus and then suggests that Rome's protector is also comprised of a goddess and her consort. On the surface, this seems to support Alvar's interpretation that both Jupiter and Juno protected Carthage. However, Praetextatus explicitly asserts that the *evocatio* is a two-part formula. That is why he uses two examples from Vergil. In Praetextatus' opinion, Juno Caelestis would still protect Carthage, represented by *Tellus mater* at the end of the *evocatio* and *devotio* (*Sat.* 3.9.12). Jupiter, responsible for the city's destruction, appears only in the *devotio*. From the text of the *devotio*, *Dis pater Veiovis* and *Iuppiter* explicitly compare with *ferus Iuppiter* from Vergil's lines. Although Praetextatus' analysis may not be a convincing religious or historical argument, it provides an important literary perspective from his speech in the *Saturnalia*.

Although his approach is very different, the grammarian Servius is involved in the same religious task of demystifying Vergil. Servius certainly has respect for the poet, but he does not employ the method of *proprietas verborum* to the extent that Praetextatus does in *Sat.* 3.9. Servius has other matters to explain to his readers, such as Vergil's idioms, facts from Roman history, and narrative details. As a result, Servius' notes on *evocatio* are shorter and more generalized than Praetextatus' commentary. As Vergilian scholars, the difference between the character Praetextatus and the author Servius is their treatment of secondary sources like the *evocatio*. Since the two-part form of the *evocatio* impacts his interpretation of Vergil,

⁸¹ Alvar, 253.

⁸² Nadia Berti, "Scipione Emiliano, Caio Gracco e l'evocatio di « Giunone » da Cartagine," *Aevum* 64 (1990): 73-4.

Praetextatus provides the complete text of the *evocatio* while Servius provides only a brief excerpt. When he is not defending Vergil, Praetextatus can afford to speculate and be vague about scholarship concerning Rome's secret god. It seems that *diligentia* is only important with regard to the poet. Like many other grammarians, Servius is holding all of the cards when he discusses the *evocatio*.⁸³ The reader is only able to see a snippet of the curse text. Without the *devotio*, a reader like Eustachius is railroaded into making the same erroneous assumption as Servius, that the *evocatio* and *devotio* are indeed one formula. Moreover, Eustachius cannot look up the entire text of the *evocatio* because Servius provides no citation in his commentary. As a participant in the collective *doctrina* of the *Saturnalia*, Praetextatus provides the entire text of the *evocatio*, trusting Eustachius to create some of his own analysis. He also provides a detailed citation for the *evocatio* because of its profound impact on Vergilian interpretation.

⁸³ Kaster, "Macrobius and Servius," 253-4.

CONCLUSIONS

By reading *Sat.* 3.9, Macrobius's son Eustachius encounters unnamed divinities and secret formulae that have the power to preserve and destroy. But to what extent is Praetextatus' lesson practical and to what extent is it fantasy? Many scholars have asked a similar question about the *evocatio* – is it authentic or a fake? When addressing these questions it is important to remember that Praetextatus' lesson and its content are above all, literary. In order to teach successfully, he must first master the content of the lesson. Praetextatus dominates the content of *evocatio* because he sits at the center of an intricate web spun from Vergilian lines and secondary sources on Roman religion. By placing the *evocatio* at the end of Praetextatus' speech, Macrobius also creates a dynamic ending to the pre-dinner lecture on the second night of the dialogue. Organizing Praetextatus' speech by topic also expands the significance of the curse text, connecting it with Vergil's lines and theories about Rome's secret god in a way that is both coherent and entertaining.

As a teacher of literature, Praetextatus models important skills and acceptable behaviors that are closely related to *verecundia* and *diligentia*. In the introduction to the *evocatio*, Praetextatus defines and demonstrates an important skill for academics: locating and citing sources. First, he implies that an important part of research is studying fragments nested in larger works (*libris insitum*, 3.9.4). Second, he uses the verb *repperi/repperisse* to describe Serenus' discovery of the *evocatio* in Furius' text, and in turn, his discovery of the same text in Serenus' *Res Reconditae* (3.9.6). While many classicists still use this method of research today, for Macrobius its practice had moral and religious significance. In the exercise of *verecundia* one

must respect ancient authors and strive to continue the literary tradition. The *evocatio*'s survival in the *Res Reconditae* and the *Saturnalia* exemplifies this reciprocity, but Macrobius is not content with mere preservation, he must provide Praetextatus' example and methods to make the *evocatio* useful and relevant for Eustachius' generation. Since Macrobius envisions Rome's religious tradition in a literary way, Praetextatus must rely on the written word to quote and discuss the *evocatio*. Since rituals once practiced on a large scale are no longer supported by the Roman state, Macrobius must then look to the written word to continue his culture, writing Praetextatus' speech as a personalized edition of the *Annales Maximi* for his son to read. This is not to say that members of Eustachius' generation do not continue private rituals, only that one could no longer become educated in Roman religion by experiencing state rituals like *evocatio*.

Considering the Vergilian focus of *Saturnalia*, it is not surprising that effective literary analysis is the most important skill for Macrobius' son to develop. Macrobius adapts the phrase *proprietas verborum* from Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* for Praetextatus' speech (*Sat.* 3.1-3.9). Quintilian advocates the practice of choosing words carefully to produce clear speech, but for Macrobius, *proprietas* represents a literary principle and analytical method. As a principle, *proprietas* represents a belief that words have hidden layers of meaning and that Vergil's text contains secret knowledge that only analysis can unlock. As a method, *proprietas* is essentially comparative analysis, looking for similar words and ideas in two distinct sources. Praetextatus uses comparison in his analysis to establish precedent for Vergil's allusion to rituals (*moris*) and his use of terminology (*verborum*). One cannot overestimate the value of *proprietas* in Praetextatus' speech. He demonstrates the principle and method of *proprietas* so that by *Sat.* 3.9, Eustachius becomes a *diligens lector*, by weighing each word and reading the secondary sources that Praetextatus references so meticulously. *Diligentia* becomes the measure of the discussion in

Sat. 3: instead of generating *proprietas* in their own language, speakers and secondary sources must observe *proprietas* in Vergil to be valued in the dialogue.

In the *Saturnalia*, speakers manufacture *doctrina* in a dialogue between past and present. Voices from Rome's past can include secondary sources, like Varro, or the historical figure Scipio Aemilianus whose speech and curse text come to the forefront of the dialogue. Sammonicus Serenus in particular represents a *vir saeculo suo doctus* according to Macrobian standards because his writing spans a wide range of topics and preserves images Rome's history. Whereas Serenus dabbles in *doctrina*, Vergil is the true expert in all matters, including the *evocatio*. At the end of Praetextatus' speech, the narrator observes: *omnes concordi testimonio doctrinam et poetae et enarrantis aequarent* (Everyone in agreement said the erudition of both the poet and commentator were equal, 3.10.1). Like a chorus made up of many voices (*multorum vocibus chorus constet*, 1.praef.9), everyone has a role to play to achieve balance and harmony in the world of knowledge. This sentiment represents Macrobius' *telos* for Eustachius: to be equipped with the knowledge and skills necessary to participate in the communal rite of *doctrina*. Robert Kaster describes *doctrina* as the sum of *verecundia* and *diligentia*, for Eustachius, *doctrina* becomes the goal or *telos* of the lesson.

Although I have carefully examined *evocatio* and its role in *Sat. 3* from a literary perspective, my efforts have by no means exhausted the subject. At the completion of this study, I observe that there are three topics that warrant further investigation: looking in Symmachus' correspondence as a source for *personae* in the *Saturnalia*, comparing Praetextatus' speeches in *Sat. 1* and *Sat. 3*, and scrutinizing the analytical techniques employed by characters in the *Saturnalia* and Servius' commentary. In chapter one, I noted that Charles Guittard has linked Symmachus' published correspondence to the overall structure of the *Saturnalia* and to the

characterization of Evangelus, and observed that Symmachus implied that Praetextatus was the acting *pontifex maximus* in *epistula* 2.36. This correlates with Praetextatus' efforts to prove Vergil is a literary *pontifex maximus* as well as his characterization as a religious scholar. Although little research has been done in this area, the prospect of comparing Symmachus' letters and Macrobius' *Saturnalia* is indeed promising. In the third chapter, I mentioned that Praetextatus describes the goddesses Angerona and Ops in *Sat.* 1 as well as *Sat.* 3. This is one small example of the work that can be done comparing the content, method and style of Praetextatus' two speeches. To a great extent, Robert Kaster has investigated the Vergilian criticism of Macrobius and Servius, but much of his analysis does not treat *Sat.* 3. In the third chapter I broached this topic by examining Praetextatus' and Servius' application of the *evocatio* to Vergilian texts, but many more opportunities like this are waiting to be explored in *Sat.* 3.

Although the *evocatio* is ostensibly a prayer, Macrobius uses its ritualistic language to make literary arguments. While pleonasm and repetitive language prove Vergil's *diligentia* in his word choice, its contractual language highlights a literary dialogue with Scipio Aemilianus. Ultimately, Macrobius structures a learned response to Servius' commentary around the two parts of the curse: *evocatio* and *devotio*. In this way, the linguistic features of the *evocatio* that designate it as a religious text are at the core of Praetextatus' literary lesson for Eustachius.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANCIENT SOURCES

- Augustine. *De civitate Dei*. Ed. B. Dombert and A. Kalb. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928.
- Cicero. *De Oratore*. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1928. Reprint, London: Heinemann Ltd, 1943.
- Gellius, Aulus. *Noctes Atticae*. Oxford Classical Library. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Macrobius, Ambrosius Aurelius Theodosius. *Saturnalia and Commentarii on Somnium Scipionis*. ed. J. Willis. Leipzig: Teubner, 1963.
- Pliny. *Naturalis Historia*. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1975.
- Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1920-1922.
- Symmachus, Quintus Aurelius. *Quae supersunt*. ed. Otto Seeck. Berlin: Weidmann, 1863.
- Servius. *Aeneidos librorum I-XII commentarii*. Vol. 1-3, ed. Georg Thilo. Leipzig: Teubner, 1902.
- Varro. *De Lingua Latina*. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Vergil. *Opera*. Oxford Classical Library. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

MODERN SOURCES

- Alvar, Jaime. "Matériaux pour l'étude de la formule *sive deus sive dea*." *Numen* 32 no.2 (December, 1985): 236-273.
- Berti, Nadia. "Scipione Emiliano, Caio Gracco e l'evocatio di « Giunone » da Cartagine." *Aevum* 64 (1990): 69-75.
- Cameron, Alan. "The Date and Identity of Macrobius." *JRS* 56 (1966): 25-38.
- _____. "Gratian's Repudiation of the Pontifical Robe." *JRS* 58 (1968): 96-102.

- _____. "Macrobius, Avianus and Avienus." *CQ* 17 no.2 (November, 1967): 385-399.
- Champlin, Edward. "Serenus Sammonicus." *HSPH* 85 (1981): 189-212.
- Chin, Catherine M. *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Conte, John Biagio *et. al.*, *Latin Literature: A History*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Davies, Percival Vaughn, trans. with intro. and notes. *The Saturnalia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. *Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Gustafsson, Gabriela. *Evocatio Deorum: Historical and Mythical Interpretations of Ritualized Conquests in the Expansion of Ancient Rome*. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2000.
- Guittard, Charles. "Macrobe et Symmaque : l'encyclopédiste et l'épistolier." *Epistulae antiquae* 2 (2002): 289-98.
- Jones, A.H.M. *The Later Roman Empire 284-602: A Social, Economic and Political Survey*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
- Kahlos, Majestina. *Vettius Agorius Praetextatus: A Senatorial Life in Between*. Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 2002.
- Kaster, Robert A. "The Grammarian's Authority." *CPh* 75 (1980): 216-41.
- _____. *Guardians of the Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- _____. "Macrobius and Servius: Verecundia and the Grammarian's Function" *HSPH* 84 (1980): 219-62.
- MacCormack, Sabine. *The Shadows of Poetry: Vergil in the Mind of Augustine*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Marina Sáez, Rosa Marina and Juan Francisco Mesa Sanz. *Concordantia Macrobianana : A Concordance to the Saturnalia of Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius*. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 1997.
- Starr Raymond J. "Explaining Dido to your son: Tiberius Claudius Donatus on Vergil's Dido." *CJ* 87 no. 1 (October-November, 1991): 25-34.