

MASK OR MIRROR?
A STUDY OF JUVENAL'S *SATIRES*
AS A REFLECTION OF
AUTHORIAL PERSONALITY AND PERSPECTIVE

BY

PETER MICHAEL WELLESLEY TENNANT

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Human Sciences, University of Natal, Durban.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to present Juvenal's *Satires* as a whole as the fundamentally coherent and plausible product of the author's own personality, convictions and circumstances - where the latter may be reasonably inferred. It therefore questions the view that the dichotomy which the *persona* theory creates between the author and his notional 'speaker' provides the basis for a better insight into Juvenal's *Satires*.

There is no compelling reason to reject the impression that in his earlier Books Juvenal was genuinely writing from the standpoint of a disaffected client; and an examination of the *Epigrams* of Juvenal's contemporary, Martial, suggests that complaints of *paupertas* should not be dismissed as a merely conventional literary facade. Juvenal's own resentment as a neglected dependant and his contempt for the corrupt Roman elite give the first three Books their basic coherence. However, while *Satires* 7, 8 and 9 are not characterised to the same extent by the strident invective which is the hallmark of the earlier poems, the notion that the image of the 'indignant' satirist is deliberately abandoned, albeit tentatively, after Book 2 is less convincing, if one gives due weight to the types of themes treated in the third Book and to the nature of the satirical vehicle used in each instance. Juvenal's empathy with the plight of the neglected intellectuals in *Satire* 7 and his condemnation of the effete and corrupt elite in *Satires* 8 and 9 are clear and forthright: the shift in satirical technique away from aggressive invective towards a more analytical treatment of the themes in *Satires* 7 and 8, as indeed befits the subject matter, and towards wryly ironic humour in the sordid dialogue with Naevolus in *Satire* 9 are not to be interpreted as the manifestation of a refashioned authorial *persona*.

The importance of theme as a major determinant of the satirical method or technique employed is equally evident in the fourth Book. Here, the themes lend themselves, in general, to a more consistently didactic approach, reminiscent of Horace's *Sermones*.

From the outset of Book 1, Juvenal focuses persistently on *avaritia*, in all its manifestations, as a root cause of the malaise in Roman society; and this vice

continues to play a dominant role in Book 3 (particularly in *Satires* 7 and 9). Not only does *avaritia* come under further attack in *Satires* 11, 12 and 13, but the prominence given to it in *Satire* 14 provides cogent evidence of the extent to which the satirist is preoccupied with this most pernicious of social evils. These poems also illustrate the fact that, even when Juvenal adopts a more didactic or reflective approach, his urge towards acerbic satire is far from suppressed; and, as in the cases of *Satires* 7 and 8, he shows his predilection for using ostensibly positive themes as platforms for attacks on vice and depravity. Similarly, when other themes congenial to his prejudices and convictions present themselves - such as an appalling act of barbarism perpetrated by the Egyptians - that urge can readily find expression through the poet's innate propensity towards *ira* and *indignatio*. Furthermore, Books 4 and 5 provide ample evidence of the very qualities which characterize the so-called 'angry' satirist of the first two Books: vigorous and persistent denunciation of contemporary greed and other vices, strong moral convictions, brooding pessimism and cynicism and, not least, an acerbic wit and a genius for crafting powerfully evocative images.

The evidence is tenuous, but sufficient to suggest that the shifts in tone and focus in Books 4 and 5 could also be attributed, in part, to Juvenal's circumstances and state of mind at that time. In *Satires* 10-14 Juvenal shows a particular interest in the Epicurean virtue of *tranquillitas*. This is perhaps to be attributed to a realization that angry protests could effect no real changes for the better and that some solace could be derived from a more detached perspective, and to the comforting conviction that ultimately wickedness finds its *nemesis* in the torture of a guilty conscience. For one steadfastly convinced that he lived in an age of unsurpassed and incorrigible vice, in which the gods were apparently ineffectual, it was probably both satisfying and logical to cultivate such a perspective. One should also not lose sight of the fact that the poet's age could well have contributed to shifts of both attitude and interest.

Satire 15 provides strong corroboration of the view that Juvenal's personality and attitudes remain basically consistent and that theme is a major determinant of the satirical manner adopted. The merciless attack on the Egyptians is not to be seen as a consciously contrived return to the 'old style' or, more fancifully, as an exercise in self-

mockery. Rather, it is clear proof that Juvenal has *not* forsaken his inherently aggressive xenophobia, which was so prominent in Books 1 and 2. Similarly, what remains of *Satire* 16 suggests the same character traits which are so powerfully conveyed in the first *Satire*. That one can still feel the presence of the bitter and acerbic pessimist of that first *Satire* is not the effect of calculated mask-changing, but a further indication that the *Satires* as a whole should be seen as a reflection of the author's own personality and perspective.

-ooOoo-

PREFACE

The fact that Juvenal's bitter denunciations of Roman society were written in an era which the historian Gibbon described as both happy and prosperous might be seen as an anomaly which encourages scepticism about the genuineness of his complaints. Yet, as Ferguson aptly points out, 'gracious and generous living on the part of the upper classes is not incompatible with social injustice, often voiced not by those who are suffering most, but by those who are near enough to the privileged to feel excluded.'¹ However close a society might come to achieving utopian egalitarianism, there will always be those who feel discriminated against and marginalized. Such, indeed, is the case in South Africa at present, where the realignment of the political and economic orders has given rise to resentment and insecurity on the part of many who look back wistfully on the advantages under the old dispensation.

My inclination to look beyond the hyperbole and distortions of Juvenal's emotive portrayal of Roman society and to try to appreciate the basic validity of many of his grievances is probably reinforced by an awareness of some remarkably similar forces at work in the society in which I live. If Juvenal were a satirical columnist in South Africa at this time, there would be a number of themes which would find an ideal vehicle in his brand of satirical invective. I think, for example, of the xenophobic resentment against foreign entrepreneurs, who, like Umbricius' *Graeculus esuriens*, are adept at exploiting commercial opportunities and thus accused of depriving the locals of jobs; of the disillusionment of the erstwhile elite, who now feel alienated from the land of their birth and hanker after the greener and safer pastures of their own *Cumae*; of the shrill complaints and apocalyptic predictions in our newspaper columns, fuelled by perceptions (not always unfounded) of declining moral standards, ubiquitous corruption, exploitation of the helpless and rampant self-enrichment (*quid enim salvis infamia nummis?*); of gross disparities in wealth; of the drying-up of traditional sources of 'patronage'; of accelerated urban decay, accompanied by the 'desecration' of sites of aesthetic and sentimental significance; of the incursion of 'squatters' and the

¹ Ferguson 1979:XXV.

overcrowding of city streets; of a dramatic increase in the crime-rate; and of acts of savagery almost on a par with that of the Ombites in *Satire* 15. He might even become the champion of classicists and other unfashionable intellectuals in their vain quest for some latter-day 'Maecenas' (some, like the poets in *Satire* 7, have been forced to try their hand at 'demeaning' occupations in the commercial sphere!).

Such random examples serve as topical illustrations of the kinds of issues which are readily exploited - with fierce conviction - by those who perceive themselves to be the undeserving victims of an increasingly decadent and dysfunctional society, even at the dawn of a new era of political stability and amid hopeful signs of increased prosperity for the bulk of the population. It is the immediacy of such attitudes and tensions in my own society which persuade me that one should perhaps be more prepared to take Juvenal at face value and not to garnish the unpalatable by propounding the notion that he was deliberately creating a 'speaker' so extreme in his prejudices that he was intended to be an object of satire himself. This is a subjective observation and perhaps out of place amid the stainless steel scalpels and probes of clinical scholarship; yet, I cannot help feeling that there is certain aptness in the concluding lines of W.B. Yeats' satirical portrait of the 'old, learned, respectable bald heads' who edit and annotate the passionate verse of Catullus: 'Lord, what would they say / Did their Catullus walk that way?'

I should like to express my gratitude to my supervisor and colleague, Professor William Dominik, for his friendly guidance and support during the writing of this dissertation. In him I found an *amicus*, whose enthusiasm and constant encouragement ensured that I would never have reason to echo Juvenal's complaint: *nos tamen hoc agimus tenuique in pulvere sulcos / ducimus et litus sterili versamus aratro* (7.48-9)! Needless to say, Bill's generous *beneficia* (ranging from meticulous responses to e-mail *salutationes* to the loan of books and articles) does not imply responsibility for the views expressed here.

I am also grateful to the Department of Classics on the Durban campus of the University of Natal for the opportunity to air my views at several *colloquia* for post-graduate students, and to my colleagues in the Department of Classics on the Pietermaritzburg campus for their forbearance when I took sabbatical leave to do the groundwork for this dissertation: it was a period of *otium* (*cum pecunia!*) that Juvenal could only have dreamed of.

Finally, I must extend the olive branch (yet again!) to my wife Mary-Lynne and to our *Lares* for the long period of neglect while I was engaged in this research.

The Latin text used is the revised edition of W.V. Clausen's *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae* (Oxford 1992).

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT		i
PREFACE		iv
CHAPTER 1	Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2	Poets and Poverty: The Case of Martial	23
CHAPTER 3	Parsimonious Patrons and Perverts: Juvenal on the Upper Classes in Books 1 and 2	42
CHAPTER 4	Tongue in Cheek for 243 Lines? Juvenal on the Patronage of Intellectuals in the Seventh <i>Satire</i>	100
CHAPTER 5	<i>Virtus</i> or <i>Vitia</i> ? Juvenal and the Nobility in the Eighth <i>Satire</i>	150
CHAPTER 6	Queering the Patron's Pitch: The Real Satirical Target of Juvenal's Ninth <i>Satire</i>	193
CHAPTER 7	<i>Satires</i> 10-14: <i>Quando Maior Avaritiae Patuit Sinus?</i>	217
CHAPTER 8	Blowing on the Embers: Juvenal and the Egyptians in <i>Satire</i> 15	271
CHAPTER 9	Conclusion	302
BIBLIOGRAPHY		315

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

'The same industrial movement takes over poet after poet; they survive only to wither in the serpentine manacles of theorists' (Peter Levi)¹

The application of the *persona* theory² to the *Satires* of Juvenal and scepticism about the role of authorial intention have effectively distanced the poet from his audience or reader. It is currently unfashionable to believe that the author's own character, viewpoints, idiosyncrasies and personal circumstances have a direct bearing on his or her writing: in the words of W.S. Anderson,

... the reader should start as the Roman audience nineteen hundred years ago, with a clear realization that the poet is a rhetorical artist and that what he allows to be said in his poems, whether in the first or third person, does not correspond exactly to his own psychological state: the poet dons a mask or creates an objective character.³

In similar vein, Freudenburg, in his more recent study of Horace, insists on the fundamental importance of the *persona* concept as a critical tool:

¹ Levi 1997:2-3.

² For the development and application of the concept of the literary *persona* to English literature in particular, see, for example, Mack (1951) and Kernan (1959 and 1965); Elliott (1982:3-18) provides a useful survey of the *persona* debate. For the *persona* theory as applied to Roman satire, see Winkler 1983:1-22.

³ Anderson 1982:313.

[The *persona* theory] troubles us, for it leads to the ironic realization that all personal poetry, such as satire, elegy, and lyric, is essentially impersonal, or at least personal only in a restricted sense, for the poet chooses to create and project a specific image of himself as speaker just as he would create any other character to create any other character to play a role in his fictional poetic world. This remarkable irony is central to a proper understanding of Horatian and all Roman satire: the speaker who delivers his criticisms in the first person is not the poet himself but the poet in disguise.⁴

Furthermore, the link between the author and his notional 'speaker' can be made even more tenuous - if not broken completely - if one can find grounds for believing that the latter is portrayed as someone 'torn by serious tensions that tend to disqualify the satirist's reliability as a social observer' and possessed of 'moral ideas that we could not possibly share, not so long as we have our wits about us.'⁵ Thus the dichotomy between the author and his *persona* becomes the sword to sever, or at least fray, the Gordian knot: if the speaker is outrageously bigoted and prone to hyperbole and even contradiction, there is no longer any need to see these as manifestations of a real personality with all its idiosyncrasies; rather, each 'deviation' may be seen as the artificial product of the author's imagination; and, once the author has been relegated to behind the puppeteer's curtain, he can even be made to pull the strings of a satirical character who is designed to become the object of satire himself.⁶

⁴ Freudenburg 1993:3.

⁵ Anderson 1982:314. A more recent example of the application of this line of thought is Corn's (1992:309) assessment of the satirist's role in *Satire* 14: 'Juvenal takes on the role of a pseudo-moralist whose opinions and arguments are suspect from beginning to end. In this way Juvenal exposes the moral bankruptcy of the Roman moral tradition.'

⁶ 'The main device of critics so inclined is to show that the narrator or speaker of a story is not only distinct from the author but an object of the author's contempt. The critic assumes that the author deliberately chose, for greater artfulness, not to reveal his attitude openly. So the explicit meaning of the work is treated a priori as only apparently explicit. What the author seems to praise, he blames; where he seems sympathetic, he is really contemptuous' (Ehrenpreis 1974:31).

No one would seriously argue that writers *never* create characters and situations which are remote from their own or that their works are necessarily imbued with a strong autobiographical flavour; playwrights, for example, are most likely to create a host of characters and situations which are wholly unlike their own.⁷ On the other hand, who would be so crass as to insist that a book of poems dealing with a person known to the poet (such as Ted Hughes' recently published volume about his relationship with Sylvia Plath) should perforce be regarded as a cold and calculated artefact, peopled by artificially contrived *personae*?⁸ That is not to say that such a work is wholly free of distortion or untruths. Indeed, one could go so far as to say that misrepresentation of a facet of the author's character *does* constitute a degree of *persona*-creation; and the more rhetorical and impassioned an author's style is, the more likely it is that certain traits (such as Juvenal's *ira* and *indignatio*, for example) are projected with a heightened intensity. Yet, such distortions and misrepresentations do not automatically preclude an insight into the *real* personality and attitudes of the author.⁹ It is really a question of balance and common sense: some works of literature lend themselves to the creation of fictionalized *personae* more than others, and one must take into account a variety of factors which might have some bearing on the extent to which one can legitimately detect the authorial voice in any piece of writing.

⁷ Kennedy (1989:495) draws attention to Aristotle's injunction that the tragic poet should speak as little as possible in his own voice (*Poetics* 24.1460a7).

⁸ Similarly, it would probably be true to say that advocates of the *persona* concept would feel on more secure ground when dealing with Shakespeare's plays than with his *Sonnets*; see the discussion by Abrams 1953:244-9.

⁹ Rudd's (1976:170) cautionary remarks are apposite: '... it is more useful to concentrate on the other type of error mentioned above, i.e. that of applying the doctrine of the *persona* in a dogmatic way where it is not required. First, in traditional and supra-personal genres the idea of the mask can be discarded altogether; nor is it of much service in the study of narrative or straightforward exposition. In drama ... it does have a function, but we are not justified in using it to argue that the outlook of a playwright must always be unknowable ... Actors' personalities, too, are not invariably out of reach ... There must be some relation, however obscure, between an actor's technical range and his personality.' Hutchinson (1993:34), although more guarded, is also wary of imposing a firm distinction between the poet himself entirely from the personality which he projects: 'We are discouraged from simply assuming that the utterance of 'Juvenal' shows us the historical Juvenal in his actual beliefs. At the same time, it would be wrong to divorce Juvenal's speaker from a formal and notional sense of the poet, and to turn him into a third-person figure, himself the main object of exposure.' See also Rudd 1964:216-31.

In Juvenal's case, the dearth of reliable biographical information¹⁰ has made his poems a particularly fertile field for the application of the *persona* theory. However, while it is true that Juvenal provides far fewer 'hard' facts about his background and upbringing than, for example, Horace does, this does not mean that such reticence extends to the revelation of his own personality and attitudes. If Horace, like Juvenal, had *not* provided us with as much biographical detail as he did, that would not prevent us from gaining a reasonably clear impression of his personality and outlook on life.¹¹ His satirical *modus operandi* (*ridentem dicere verum*, *Serm.* 1.1.24) clearly accords with the genial and positive personality which emerges from the *Sermones* and, indeed, from his poetry in general. Juvenal, on the other hand, strikes one as a fundamentally cynical and negative personality, whose sour and embittered outlook on life and rhetorical manner are quite consistent with a certain distance and aloofness. Horace engages and captivates his audience; Juvenal assails and overawes it. Now, of course, it may be argued that both of these 'personalities' are elaborate and sustained literary poses, which provide no reliable insight into the authors' real characters and outlooks. Such an argument is easier to maintain when a writer appears to present different *personae* to his audience. However, as Peter Green points out,

though a creative writer . . . may indeed project a variety of fictionalised mouthpieces for his or her own purposes, a recognisable personality still

¹⁰ See, for example, the following discussions: Ferguson 1979:XV-XIX; Courtney 1980:1-11; Gérard 1976:6-13; Braund 1996:15-6; Green 1998:XII-XXV.

¹¹ 'It must be admitted that Horace is as elusive as he is allusive, but in the end, part of what he says about himself must be as true of the real person as of his carefully constructed poetic self-presentation . . . What little we know about Horace from sources other than himself seems to suggest that his elaborate self-portrait is not all fiction by any means' (Armstrong 1989:4); see also Levi 1997:1: 'What we are told of the story of his life is a feeble but at least a genuine guide through the maze of his poems. The poetry shows his development only when it is carefully sorted through as biography.' Lyne (1995:vii) believes that the concept of the 'mask' does not preclude knowledge of the real person: 'I think that of all ancient poets Horace is the one who most invites us to look through his poem to his 'life'. . . Horace dons mask after mask, changing, for example, as he changes genre; we can never be sure that we have penetrated to the man behind the mask. But to accept the invitation to find even a masked figure is surely reasonable, and it is certainly fascinating. And sometimes I think we can penetrate to the man in all his reality, and appreciate the reality of his difficulties.'

tends to pervade them all: in a very real sense the writer *is* all his characters.¹²

While Juvenal might have used a degree of artistic licence in his self-projection, I find it hard to believe that he assiduously fabricated an authorial *persona* quite remote from his own; in other words, it is more likely that the source of his satire is to be found in his own peculiar circumstances and nature. After my initial acquaintance with Juvenal's *Satires*, it was somewhat disconcerting to discover that the sardonic and cantankerous conservative who emerged so powerfully from the *Satires* had, in the light of modern critical theory, as much substance as a celluloid image. That was disappointing enough, but it went further than that: not only was the 'speaker' or fictionalized mouthpiece wholly remote from Juvenal himself, but he was indeed so contrived as to arouse the disbelief and mockery of his audience.

This study will endeavour to show that a fundamentally consistent authorial personality does indeed pervade the entire *corpus* of Juvenal's *Satires*; and that this, together with repeated attacks on vices which have the most pernicious effect on Roman society, gives all five Books of *Satires* a greater coherence than is generally allowed. It will also be argued that, despite the inherent dangers of the biographical method, there is sufficient circumstantial evidence to suggest that the alterations in Juvenal's satirical focus and methods in Books 3, 4 and 5 are *not* to be explained merely as literary conventions.¹³ Indeed, the quest to accentuate such differences through the rigorous

¹² Green 1989:247; cf. Wright 1960:158 on the poetry of Eliot, Yeats and Pound: 'yet the ultimate hero of such modern poems is, in a way, still the poet himself, who is felt, through all the poetic elements including the persona, as the definitive force within the poem'; and Ehrenpreis 1974:57: 'Through his masterpieces a man defines - not hides - himself. By reading them, we are put in touch with him, not with a series of intermediaries. The nature of his communication may be subtle; his manner devious. Ultimately, however, he is telling us the truth.'

¹³ See Lindo (1974:17-27), who discusses the 'problem' of Juvenal's later *Satires* on the basis of the following assumptions: '(1) that poets composing over a long period of time find their careers affected by several factors; and (2) that they allude to these factors in their work, explicitly or otherwise, depending on the personality of the poet and the extent to which his chosen poetic genre admits personal references. Thus we may expect to find many personal references in elegy, lyric, and satire, but few in tragedy and epic.'

application of a particular interpretative method (e.g. the *persona* theory or the search for omnipresent irony) can shift attention away from the remarkable cohesiveness and consistency of the *Satires* as a whole in terms of the convictions, prejudices, satirical incisiveness and personality which the author projects.

Particular attention will be devoted to *Satires* 7, 8 and 9, which have of late been regarded as indicative of a deliberately contrived and progressive shift away from the angry and indignant *persona* of Books 1 and 2. It will be argued that the *ira* and *indignatio*, which are so prominent in the early poems, are fundamental and genuine traits of this writer's personality; that the external factors which shaped the satirical themes of the first two Books continue to do so in Book 3; and that the apparent moderation of these emotions in the latter is to be attributed to factors other than the deliberate and artificial contrivance of a new authorial *persona*. Juvenal's satire, it will be argued, is at its most scathing when it offers particular scope for the voicing of his own resentments and prejudices: in this regard, *Satire* 15 provides striking corroboration of that trait. Any lessening of his characteristic anger is determined largely by the nature of the theme in question: his *ira* and *indignatio* remain integral elements of his personality and, like any capacity for emotional outburst, can remain latent - or at least restrained - in contexts where invective would be less appropriate.

Interpretations of Juvenal's poems based on over-imaginative and speculative biographical reconstruction must obviously be resisted; but this should not be done at the expense of denying any correspondence of the personality which emerges from the *Satires* to that of the real Juvenal. There are good grounds for believing that Juvenal himself was in fact an embittered and impoverished client, a conservative and xenophobic reactionary and a contemptuous critic of a decadent and delinquent Roman elite. The little that can be gleaned about Juvenal himself actually *does* make his projected character and outlook appear quite consistent and believable; and, if we accept that we are being given an insight into the mind of the poet himself rather than that of a spurious *persona*, the apparent contradictions and inconsistencies observable in the course of the five Books can be adequately explained not only within the framework of the writer's immediate satirical purpose but also in terms of the normal

vagaries of human character and behaviour. It is probable that the composition of the *Satires* was spread over a period of some twenty years¹⁴, and it would be surprising *not* to find variations in both the content, form and even tone of the poems during that time; yet, despite such variations, it is possible to detect throughout the *Satires* the persistent presence of the same authorial personality and attitudes.

The validity of reinterpreting ancient genres in accordance with the constructs of twentieth century literary theory has prompted some vigorous reaction. It is not surprising that Gilbert Highet - the focus of particular criticism for his biographical approach to Juvenal's *Satires* - should have responded with a spirited reaffirmation of his position, emphasising *inter alia* the important points that, first, distinctions should be made between genres of literature in which the authors themselves (especially satirists) 'explicitly or implicitly claim that their personalities are somehow involved and revealed' and others in which the author 'may remain wholly unknown or be no more than a name on the title-page'; second, that we should remember that works like Juvenal's *Satires* 'were first read to, and by, a public many of whom knew their writers personally and would have detected and derided gross misrepresentations'; and third, that it is far from clear why the tensions, or inconsistencies, observable in the *Satires* should not be 'inherent in the poet Juvenal himself, rather than created by him for a fictional "satirist"' - and here he draws attention to a comment from Marchand's preface to his edition of Byron: 'The fact may be that perfect consistency is . . . the greatest pose of all.'¹⁵ Kevin McCabe attacks the wish of many critics to exert a retroactive influence over the literature of the past:

¹⁴ At 1.49-50 there is a reference to the trial of Marius Priscus, which took place in 100, while the reference to a comet at 6.407 is probably to be connected with the sighting of the year 115. Ferguson 1979:XVI-XVII and Courtney 1980:1-2 suggest that Book 1 was published c. 110 or c. 112 respectively. However, Syme 1984:1135-57 is of the opinion that Juvenal did not publish or even write anything before 115 or even 117. There is no doubt that *Satire* 15 postdates 127 (line 27 refers to L. Aemilius Luncus, who was consul from 1 October of that year, according to the *Fasti Ostienses*).

¹⁵ Highet 1974:325; 329-30; 336.

the desire to impose contemporary critical standards on the writers of the past or to write as if former authors wrote with contemporary theories in mind is widespread in current criticism of all literary periods.¹⁶

Like Highet, McCabe opposes the belief that inconsistencies on the part of the author betray the deliberate manipulation of a *persona* and, in response to Anderson's application to Juvenal's *Satires* of the Jacobean dramatists' concept of a satiric character designed to be rejected by the audience as a moral extremist, he remarks: 'That the Jacobean writers were writing nearly fifteen hundred years after Juvenal, and in a different genre, and had no better crystal ball than we have, has not discouraged these conjectures.'¹⁷ Similarly, Peter Green has responded vigorously to the application of modern critical theories to Juvenal:

In those innocent days [referring to his youthful acquaintance with Juvenal's *Satires*] no one had yet come forward to inform us, with peremptory assurance, that authorial intention was irrelevant, that the work was, literally, in the eye of the beholder, that critical reader-response and *Rezeptionsgeschichte* were what mattered, that judging the literary value of a poem or play in any abiding sense was a self-deluding mirage, that a menu or a seed catalogue could be deconstructed in just the same way as the *Iliad*, that the true creative artist was the translator, and that in any case the apparent 'character' of author or narrator must always be viewed as a mere literary mask, a *persona*, an artificial manipulation of traditional formalised *topoi*, i.e. rhetorical clichés . . . The effect on Juvenal, in the last twenty years or so, has been to turn the *Satires* into a series of contrived, semi-dramatic performances, structurally exotic and wholly remote from real life, performed by a literary quick-change artist with a bundle of formal masks behind which to hide, and a bagful of moral

¹⁶ McCabe 1986:79. See also the pertinent remarks of Ehrenpreis (1974:49-60) on the application of the *persona* concept to the English Augustan poets.

¹⁷ McCabe 1986:78-9; 81.

bromides and stock rhetorical tropes or literary allusions to suit every occasion.¹⁸

In a less combative manner, the authors of the epilogue to *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*¹⁹ point out that

it is sometimes difficult to determine how a text should be read at all except by considering its social and historical background as evidence for the author's standpoint . . . It is doubtless wrong to claim that the whole meaning of a literary work can or should be reduced to an account of the psychological state of the author at the time of writing, but it is equally mistaken to exclude consideration of authors' intentions entirely, and those who do so are (in the words of Anne Sheppard) "ignoring an essential fact about art".

Of all ancient literary genres, satire is the one that can lay strongest claim to being rooted in real life; it is indeed this distinctive characteristic which Juvenal, in particular, stresses when he justifies his choice of *genre*, by ridiculing the hackneyed and unreal mythological themes which dominate contemporary poetry:

*semper ego auditor tantum? numquamne reponam
vexatus totiens rauci Theseide Cordi?
inpune ergo mihi recitaverit ille togatas,
hic elegos? inpune diem consumpserit ingens
Telephus aut summi plena iam margine libri
scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus Orestes?
nota magis nulli domus est sua quam mihi lucus
Martis et Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum
Vulcani; quid agant venti, quas torqueat umbras*

¹⁸ Green 1989:245; 246.

¹⁹ Woodman and Powell 1992:209.

*Aeacus, unde alius furtivae devehat aurum
pelliculae, quantas iaculetur Morychus ornos,
Frontonis platani convolsaque marmora clamant
semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae.
expectes eadem a summo minimoque poeta. (1.1-14)²⁰*

*haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna?
haec ego non agitem? sed quid magis? Heracleas
aut Diomedearum aut mugitum labyrinthi
et mare percussum puero fabrumque volentem . . . (1.51-4)*

Not surprisingly, this was an attitude echoed by his fellow poet, Martial, whose *Epigrams* were based on the mundane realities of his own circumstances as a client and citizen of Rome:

*non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpiasque
invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit. (10.4.9-10)²¹*

One of satire's strongest claims for recognition, then, is its *foundation* in reality and topicality: whatever distortions and exaggerations such writers (like modern cartoonists) may indulge in to articulate their satirical responses, this characteristic element persists. More so than any other genre, satire serves as a vehicle for critical and personal observation of society and its *mores* and, as such, readily lends itself to the expression of the author's own personality and viewpoints. The distinctive characters which emerge

²⁰ Woodman (1983:81-4) interprets the first five lines of this passage as a detailed play on words, phrases and ideas borrowed from Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.90-105 and argues that 'it . . . seems that Juvenal has used the two Horatian passages to draw attention to the differences between himself and his predecessor.' The argument, ingenious as it is, is not altogether convincing: apart from the fact that Horace was talking about lyric and not satire, Juvenal makes a complimentary reference to Horace as a satirical role-model later in the poem: *haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna?* (51).

²¹ Cf. 8.3 (*adgnoscat mores vita legatque suos*); 4.49; 9.50.

from the satirical writings of Horace, Persius and Juvenal are readily discernible; and it is significant that, in *Sermones* 2.1.30-34, Horace himself alludes to the autobiographical quality of Lucilius' writing, in that his chosen model used to entrust his 'secrets' to his books, as if to 'loyal companions'.²² The notion of this genre of writing as a vehicle for a peculiarly individual and candid response to the everyday world is underscored by Horace's comment that Lucilius would turn to his books 'whether things went well or badly'. Juvenal was certainly conscious of the forthright character of his predecessors: he chose to 'gallop across the same plain' as Lucilius did²³ and saw the value in Horace's propensity to show things up for what they were²⁴; and when he mockingly asked whether he should rather write about the *fabrum volantem* (sc. Daedalus) and other mythological claptrap - while, for example, Roman husbands were actually playing pimp to their own wives²⁵ - the obvious inference is that Juvenal preferred to write about topical issues from a very personal viewpoint.²⁶ The fact that his *ira* and *indignatio* could lead to distortion and hyperbole is really beside the point. The ultimate source of his satire was the potent mix of his own cynical pessimism, moral outrage, xenophobia and especially his bitter resentment at his perceived financial deprivation (and here it is

²² *ille velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim
credebat libris; neque si male cesserat, usquam
decurrens alio, neque si bene; quo fit, ut omnis
votiva pateat veluti descripta tabella
vita senis. (Serm. 2.1.30-4).*

Lucilius himself claimed to write *ex praecordiis* (W.670-1), while Ennius drew his verses from 'the marrow of his bones' (*medullitus*, Sat. W.6-7).

²³ *cur tamen hoc potius libeat decurrere campo,
per quem magnus equos Auruncae flexit alumnus . . . (1.20-1)*

On Juvenal's indebtedness to Lucilius, see Beaton 1984.

²⁴ *haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna? (1.51)*

²⁵ *sed quid magis? Heracleas
Diomedas aut mugitum labyrinthi
et mare percussum puero fabrumque volantem,
cum leno accipiat moeci bona, si capiendi
ius nullum uxori, doctus spectare lacunar,
doctus et ad calicem vigilanti stertere naso (1.52-7)*

The pimping husband also plays a role in Ovid *Amores* 2.19; but here he is he contempt because his complacency and connivance rob the affair of its excitement.

²⁶ See Marache 1989:592-631.

important to stress that such feelings of resentment are not the preserve of the *really* poverty-stricken: envy of one's 'unjustly' prosperous social inferiors and the perception that, as a recipient of traditional *beneficia*, one is being 'short-changed' by parsimonious patrons are catalysts enough). I imagine, too, that Juvenal - like Martial - could have relied on a receptive audience for his satirical attacks on Jews, Egyptians and other foreign elements in Roman society: a society which could watch countless foreigners being eviscerated in the arena for public entertainment is hardly likely to have been scandalized by satirical jibes at their expense. Richlin's observation on the nature of satire is pertinent:

Satire is a genre intrinsically concerned with power; the satirist writes against those who oppress him or those whom he feels he ought to be able to oppress, depicting himself worsted by plutocrat, general, or noble, or sneering at out-groups (foreigners, "pathic" homosexuals, women, freedmen, and so on). By expressing his hostility, the satirist asserts his own power, and makes himself and his like-minded audience feel better.²⁷

Racist rhetoric seldom falls on uniformly deaf ears; nor is it invariably nullified by sober and dispassionate analysis (after all, Hitler ranted like a madman, but no one would doubt that he had a genuine and deep-seated hatred of the Jews; and certainly many responded enthusiastically to his fulminations). Despite the distortions and exaggerations typical of the genre, it is hard to believe that Juvenal's satirical attacks on immigrant Greeks, Jews and Egyptians would not have elicited a favourable response from at least a section of his Roman audience.

The assumption that Juvenal was deliberately creating a speaker whose perceived exaggeration and irrationality (the by-products of *ira* and *indignatio*) would arouse mixed feelings in his audience has increasingly widened the theoretical dichotomy between the poet and his 'speaker'. The notion of the satirist as an object of satire is espoused by Anderson:

²⁷ Richlin 1984:67.

The point is not to pick holes in the false assertions of the satirist; but to see his insistent claim of truth and his almost simultaneous distortions of that truth, whether by exaggeration or by suppression of redeeming details, as a vital part of his character. Rhetorically, this sort of emotional appeal is to be expected; morally, especially when the satirist calls attention to it, it is bound to alienate readers from the satirist and make him what he is, a dramatic character subject to criticism.²⁸

Yet, I wonder to what extent a Roman audience - especially one which might have shared something of Juvenal's disillusionment - would really have allowed its enjoyment of his vigorous satire to be tempered by a sober and rational evaluation. Are we honestly to believe that the average Roman male would have tut-tutted in a paroxysm of fastidious political correctness at the following passage from the sixth *Satire*:

At last she arrives, red in the face,
thirsty enough to tackle the jar which stands beside her
bulging with three full gallons; she lowers a couple of pints
before her dinner to arouse a raging hunger, for shortly
up it comes and slaps the floor with her stomach's contents.
Streams run over the marble pavement; the gilded basin
reeks of Falernian. For like the gigantic serpent which toppled
into a vat, she drinks and vomits. No wonder her husband
is sickened and only controls his bile by shutting his eyes.²⁹

If this sort of passage was *really* designed by Juvenal to make fun of the satirical 'speaker', what conclusions should we draw about the speaker of the following words?

²⁸ Anderson 1982:304. One can't help reflecting that, if modern audiences in general were that perceptive and critical, many evangelical preachers would be out of business.

²⁹ *Sat.* 6.425-33 (translated by Niall Rudd). Apart from the comical grotesqueness of this female, her behaviour is all the more scandalous because she is intruding on an essentially masculine domain.

With that maw, those flanks, that heavyweight gladiator's physique of yours, you had swilled down so much wine at Hippias' wedding that you had to sick it all up under the eyes of the Roman people the next day. What a disgusting performance, even to hear about, never mind to see! If this had happened to you in the middle of a feast as you gulped down great draughts of wine, wouldn't anyone think it disgusting? But in a gathering of the Roman people, doing public business as Master of the Horse, where a belch would be disgusting, [he] here threw up, and filled his own lap, and the whole dais with gobbets of food reeking with wine.³⁰

This, of course, is part of Cicero's virulent attack on Antony (and there is more of the same). No wonder that Juvenal refers to this particular speech as *divina Philippica*.³¹ If none other than Cicero felt free to indulge in vitriolic satire at the expense of a powerful contemporary who could literally 'give it to him in the neck', we should at least be wary of assuming that this sort of lurid caricature would have elicited a negative reaction from a Roman audience. The modern scholar obviously cannot be caught up in the excitement of the occasion, and so it is all too easy to let passages such as we have read become 'sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought'. In this regard, Ahl makes a very pertinent observation:

Ancient rhetoricians . . . begin with a very different presumption about the speaker or writer and his audience than that which has been common since the Romantic era. They suppose in the audience a desire to believe; we suppose a tendency to disbelieve. The ancient rhetorician would probably have been amused by our concern for the intellectual skeptic who must be induced to suspend belief.³²

³⁰ Cic. *Philippics* 2.63 (translated by W. K. Lacey).

³¹ *Sat.* 10.125.

³² Ahl 1984:197; he goes on to quote Aristotle's remark (*Rhetoric* 1395B) that audiences 'love it when someone happens to proclaim the universal validity of ideas which they

Satire, perhaps more than any other ancient genre, has the *potential* to establish a particularly close rapport between author and audience and to provide the latter with a revealing insight into the character and opinions of the speaker (it is important to focus especially on the dynamics of the *recitatio*, rather than the more 'passive' encounter with the author through reading). The ability of the satirist himself to establish a rapport with his listeners, both through the element of humour and by engaging their attention with topics of mutual interest and relevance, is a salient characteristic of the genre. In Juvenal's case, the striving after unusual and often striking detail reinforces the perception that the writer is eager to project a sense of his own individuality as an observer and commentator. In such a context, the concept of an artificial literary *persona* might well be construed as somewhat paradoxical. There are good grounds, then, for arguing that the interpretation of Juvenal's *Satires* should proceed, in the first instance, from the belief that his rapport with his listeners depended in large measure on the latter's quite reasonable assumption that both the topicality of the *genre* and the powerful convictions of the poet addressing them were not mere dramatic fictions (despite the element of satirical licence).

For the modern reader, it is easy to allow Juvenal's highly rhetorical style to impute an artificiality to his subject matter as well; such an inference would seem even more logical, given the contrived nature of many of the *suasoriae* and *controversiae* which formed the basis of Roman rhetorical education.³³ It would, however, be wrong to assume that a declamatory style necessarily raises doubts about the genuineness or sincerity of a speaker's or writer's sentiments; to a large extent, the manner of expression conforms to the vogue of its particular period.³⁴ In Kennedy's opinion,

themselves hold in individual instances' and suggests that 'we are, perhaps, too sensitive to the possible presence of intelligentsia in an audience.' See also Watts 1976:83-4; 90.

³³ Freudenburg (1993:4), for example, assumes that the use of the first-person mask in rhetoric and in drama must have had a pervasive influence on the writers of poetry.

³⁴ The oratory of Winston Churchill or Adolf Hitler may be instructive: both adopted declamatory styles which are no longer in vogue, yet few would venture to question the genuineness of their convictions; the same might be said of many contemporary preachers.

there is no need to draw a sharp line between sincerity of emotion and artificiality of expression, or between poetry and rhetoric in his work. Juvenal has found what is for himself and his contemporaries a natural form of expression for his indignation within the tradition of the Roman invective as we know it from speeches like Cicero's *In Pisonem* or the discussion in Quintilian.³⁵

In similar vein, Ogilvie remarks: 'To be a satirist Juvenal had to use the literary tools of his day, but to be a true satirist he had to be able to satirize them as well.'³⁶ The pervasive influence of rhetorical education during the post-classical era is sardonically attested by Juvenal himself on several occasions:

*et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus, et nos
consilium dedimus Sullae, privatus ut altum
dormiret . . . (1.15-7)*

*declamare doces? o ferrea pectora Vetti,
cum perimit saevos classis numerosa tyrannos.
nam quaecumque sedens modo legerat, haec eadem stans*

Edwards (1993:141) makes some apt observations: 'But to label the themes and topoi of invective 'rhetorical' or 'conventional' is no justification for dismissing them as unworthy of further consideration . . . Rhetoric was a fundamental part of the education of the Roman elite; the 'rhetorical' language educated men used formed their habits of thought.' Similarly, Knoche (1975:153) points out that 'it must be kept in mind that from about the time of Ovid there was really no form of education and verbal art other than the rhetorical.'

³⁵ Kennedy 1972:549. Also apposite are the remarks of Wiesen (1963:451): 'There can be little doubt that the reaction against Juvenal begun by Nisard and continuing today was a perverse outgrowth of the nineteenth century romantic search for originality in literature, a development of the romantic notion that novelty rather than adherence to the tradition of a literary genre is the hallmark of the true and sincere artist. But the ancients would have judged literature by no such canons. Juvenal's modern critics have usually failed to take to heart the words of Quintilian: *Neque enim dubitari potest quin artis pars magna contineatur imitatione*. The essence of ancient satire had always been the combination of original social portraiture with popular moralistic reflections of a timeless character.'

³⁶ Ogilvie 1980:250.

*perferet atque eadem cantabit versibus isdem.
occidit miseros crambe repetita magistros. (7.150-4)*

*... i, demens [sc. Hannibal], et saevas curre per Alpes
ut pueris placeas et declamatio fias. (10.166-7)*

However, the above extracts make it clear that Juvenal's quarrel with the rhetorical tradition revolves around questions of *theme* and *content* rather than of style: hence the emphasis which he places on the relevance and topicality of *his* subject matter in contrast to the hackneyed mythological themes of his fellow poets. Nowhere does he suggest that his own 'grand' style is anomalous in the context of satire; indeed, it can even be proclaimed as the appropriate vehicle:

*fingimus haec altum satura sumente coturnum
scilicet, et finem egressi legemque priorum
grande Sophocleo carmen bacchamur hiatu
montibus ignotum Rutulis caeloque Latino.
nos utinam vani. sed clamat Pontia 'feci,
confiteor, puerisque meis aconita paravi,
quae deprensa patent; facinus tamen ipsa peregi.' (6.634-40)*

The reader (or, rather, listener) who might be carried away by his grandiloquence into the fantasy-world of high tragedy, is brought down to earth with a bump by the ugly truth (*utinam vani!*) of a *real* woman who admitted to poisoning her own children. The contrast which Juvenal wishes to drive home is accentuated by the fact that Pontia was sufficiently notorious to be mentioned no fewer than three times by Martial.³⁷ For Juvenal, the rhetorical style was a means of driving home the fundamental truth of his assertions, *not* of transporting his audience into the world of literary make-believe.³⁸

³⁷ Mart. *Ep.* 2.34.6; 4.43.5; 6.75.3.

³⁸ Gowers (1993:189) relates the above extract to a remark in *Satire* 15, where cannibalism is described as *cunctis graviora coturnis* (15.29): 'In other words, the satirist means

Recent interpretations of the *Satires* have sought to explain changes in tone and focus in terms of artificially constructed *personae*, based on Anderson's analysis: in Books 1 and 2, the satirist (or his *persona*) is characterised by *indignatio*; in Book 3, which constitutes a 'transitional' phase, a 'rational, hopeful satirist . . . provides the dominant mood' (more recently, Braund has characterised him as an 'ironic spokesperson');³⁹ and in Books 4 and 5 the satirist adopts a 'laughing' or 'Democritean' pose (despite the problematical reversion to *indignatio* in *Satire* 15). However, a more convincing interpretation of Juvenal's poems can be achieved by rejecting such an artificially schematic model and by seeing Juvenal's own personality, his own predicament and his own reaction to the perceived iniquities of the society around him as the creative sources of his satirical writing. That is to say, one needs to recognize the strong probability that the *substance* of his satire was rooted in his own experience, even though the *expression* of it was influenced by contemporary stylistic fashions and, indeed, by the form and content of individual poems. It may be argued, for example, that the angry, declamatory style of the first, second, and sixth *Satires*, in particular, finds an ideal vehicle in the rapid torrent of vices and *exempla* with which Juvenal assails his listeners, whereas his anger and contempt are less stridently expressed in poems where the theme is less diffuse and lends itself to a more focused and analytical approach (e.g. *Satires* 4, 7 and 8); or where direct invective gives way to alternative techniques such as the exploitation of visual contrast (e.g. *Satire* 5); or where the target of the satire is attacked in a more indirect manner (e.g. *Satire* 9).⁴⁰

to expose excess in a style which aspires to that excess: as Quintilian says, hyperbole or exaggeration is justified when the subject-matter is something that has exceeded all limits.'

³⁹ Romano (1979:201), on the other hand, after an exhaustive analysis, concludes that 'it is clear that Juvenal uses irony consistently throughout his satires. To talk of a "new ironic personality" [sc. Fredericks 1971:226] in *Satire* XIII or in any earlier one does not make sense. A wiser approach is to talk of a new less-ironic Juvenal in *Satire* XV, since only 17% of the lines are not meant to be taken literally.'

⁴⁰ Romano (1979:XI) makes the following observations: 'As far as language and style are concerned, there are some detectable changes. Early irony seems to be accompanied by more spectacular rhetorical devices . . . It could be suggested that the impression of a more moderate and detached Juvenal is the consequence of a more restrained linguistic expression. It is possible that Juvenal may have changed his *persona* from *Satire* I to *Satire* XVI, but the same satirist uses irony in the same way.'

Attention, therefore, must be given to the nature of the subject matter when assessing the writer's *modus operandi*: Anderson himself concedes that in the seventh *Satire* 'the satirist chooses a topic which does not admit of indignation to the same extent as the subject matter of *Satires* 1 to 6.'⁴¹ The same may be said of the themes of all the subsequent *Satires*, with the notable exception of the fifteenth. The 'return to invective' in this poem presents an awkward stumbling block in the way of tidy theories about Juvenal's new 'Democritean' *persona*. As Highet rather quaintly puts it, 'as we reach his last body of work, Book V, we are surprised to hear the old lion roaring away with a new access of vigour.'⁴² If one attaches sufficient importance to theme as a determinant of style and to the writer's own personality, the explanation of the resurgence of *indignatio* in the fifteenth *Satire* is not problematical: here was a topic close to the heart of one who displayed such vitriolic hatred of Eastern foreigners, in particular, in the earlier *Satires*; here we have the snarling, scathing satirist warming to one of the themes most congenial to his temperament.

Despite the paucity of biographical detail to be gleaned from the *Satires* themselves and from the *Lives*, it is possible to construct a credible portrait of Juvenal himself from his poems - provided that one is not resistant to the notion that real human beings can at times be inconsistent, fallible and self-contradictory. The importance of this principle lies at the heart of much of the debate about Juvenal as a writer, and the denial of its validity has provided the basis for the following type of critical standpoint:

What sort of *persona* has J[uvenal] created in his opening poem? Is this fiercely indignant character really a coward in the face of danger, in short a hypocrite? A close examination suggests that J[uvenal]'s creation is a hypocrite in several other respects . . . These gaps between the speaker's claims and his practice combine with his final self-betrayal in the closing lines [of *Satire* 1] to hint that he is no paragon of virtue (though he clearly casts himself in this role) but a spineless and petty bigot. This

⁴¹ Anderson 1982:285

⁴² Highet 1954:138

interpretation of J[juvenal] rescues it from the biographical fallacy prevalent in earlier readerships and scholarship.⁴³

More importantly, if it can be shown that there are certain fundamental traits of character and consistent viewpoints evident throughout his writings,⁴⁴ this will constitute a sound basis for believing that Juvenal was not indulging in a form of literary 'puppeteering', but was more likely to have been revealing his own character and convictions. After all, if Juvenal had consistently hidden behind a series of literary 'masks' when engaging with his audiences, he might well have stood accused of indulging in the very artificiality and remoteness from reality which he attacks so vigorously in the introduction to his first *Satire*.

Slight as the evidence may be, it does seem that in his later life Juvenal was in less straitened financial circumstances and it is quite logical to attribute his tendency at times towards a more contemplative and detached manner to such ameliorating factors and, indeed, to the whims and moods of the moment.⁴⁵ This, however, does not imply a fundamental change in his entire outlook and an abandoning of all his deep-seated prejudices and grievances; *Satire* 15 is a salutary reminder of that. Juvenal's hostility towards the upper classes, resentment at the poverty of the client-class (of which he was apparently a bitterly disillusioned member) and his jingoistic conservatism (including racial prejudice, hatred of passive homosexuals and misogyny) constitute the backbone of his satire in the first two Books. When one considers the intensity and, indeed, thoroughness with which Juvenal gives vent to these convictions in the first two Books, it is fair to ask whether he had in fact left any worthwhile satirical stone unturned. However, Book 3 is testimony both to his inventiveness and to his determination to

⁴³ Braund 1996:119-20. To impute cowardice to the satirist is to ignore the very real dangers which outspokenness might incur (see Ch. 3, pp 44-5).

⁴⁴ According to Romano (1979:202), consistency also characterises one element of his satirical technique: 'the use of irony in Juvenal contradicts the commonly held theory that the late Juvenal is different from the early one. The results of the analysis undertaken show that the poet's devices, techniques and approach to his own creation are astonishingly constant.'

⁴⁵ See Lindo 1974:24-5.

pursue his relentless persecution of the nobility; for *Satires* 7, 8 and 9 constitute not an expression of new found positivism or an exercise in irony, but a further expose of the decadence of the nobility and expression of his disillusionment at his maltreatment as a dependant and his feelings of estrangement from his own society.

Was Juvenal's antagonism towards the upper classes merely a convenient literary pose, which he sustained for so long without any real personal *animus* to goad him, or did the impulse to write satire arise, in the first instance, from his own bitter experience and observations? Is it too naïve to believe that his ferocious eloquence is not a sham literary pose, but a *genuine* response to the unpleasant realities of the patron-client relationship in his time? Juvenal's hatred of the *dives avarus*, whose greed and miserliness so exacerbated the hardships of his struggling dependants, and his expressed feelings of alienation from a society which he believes has betrayed his class should be seen, not as mere literary posturing, but as the real catalysts behind his bitter invective. Martial's portrayal of his friend as a weary client paying grudging obeisance to his domineering patrons is, therefore, a detail of particular significance.⁴⁶ If one takes this description at face value - and there seems to be no convincing reason to believe that Martial concocted a wholly spurious portrait of his friend - it lends considerable authenticity to the attitude of hostility and contempt which Juvenal displays with such obsessive fervour towards the wealthy upper classes in the first three Books of his *Satires*. Yet, in the opinion of Anderson,

It is quite true that the satirist seems unnaturally preoccupied with the poverty of himself and his friends and, on the other hand, the lavish style of life possible for the renegade nobility and the upstart freedmen. However, this propensity in the satirist tells nothing about Juvenal's

⁴⁶ *dum tu forsitan inquietus erras
clamosa, Iuvenalis, in Subura
aut collem dominae teris Dianae
dum per limina te potentiorum
sudatrix toga ventilat vagumque
maior Caelius et minor fatigant . . .* (Ep. 12.18.1-6)

character or biography; instead it shows once more the complexity of the satirist, his inner tensions which constantly oblige readers to dissociate themselves from his jaundiced assertions and to discover reality for themselves.⁴⁷

This theoretical standpoint - that Juvenal's character, convictions and personal circumstances must remain elusive to the reader and that they have no relevance to his choice of theme and satirical technique - is precisely what this study seeks to challenge. There is sufficient evidence available to enable the reader to view Juvenal's *Satires* as a fundamentally coherent work and one with a more plausible biographical basis than is generally allowed. The first three Books in particular show a preoccupation with the financial plight of dependants and are characterized by envious hostility towards the *divites avari*; and there is persuasive corroborative evidence from the poems of his contemporary, Martial, to suggest that this potent factor in Juvenal's writing was far more than a convenient literary affectation on his part.

⁴⁷ Anderson 1982:310. Explicit evidence relating to Juvenal's background is negligible (if one discounts the fourth century biography - see discussions of Ferguson 1979:XV-XVI and Courtney 1980:5-9). However, a likely family connection with Aquinum (see 3.318-21) and his references to his education in grammar and rhetoric (e.g. 1.15-6) suggest at least a modestly comfortable provincial upbringing. If such assumptions are correct, Sherwin-White's (1967:86) remarks about men like Pliny may provide an instructive parallel: 'Precisely because they were conscious of their own lack of noble birth, men like Pliny were all the more hostile to any who had risen from yet lower down the social scale. So once again it is in the environment of a very narrow society which felt itself threatened by alien elements that xenophobia makes itself felt.'

CHAPTER 2

Poets and Poverty:

The Case of Martial

In his seventh *Satire* Juvenal speaks as an embittered poet who has struggled in vain to achieve the financial security, and hence *otium*, essential for real creativity; and elsewhere (particularly in the first and third *Satires*) he displays considerable empathy with the cash-strapped dependants of ungenerous *amici*. This image of an impoverished and down-trodden client is apparently corroborated by Martial's portrayal of his friend, who is still obliged to trudge to the thresholds of the powerful in his 'sweaty toga', while he himself revels in the tranquillity of his Spanish farm, making up for thirty years of insomnia (*Ep.* 12.18) .

Yet how credible are Juvenal's complaints about poverty and the hardships of the dependant's existence? One factor in particular has provided grounds for scepticism about the validity of poets' references to their financial predicament: most of the known poets, from the time of Cicero onwards, belonged to the equestrian or senatorial class and were therefore in possession of the equestrian census (i.e. HS 400,000) at the very least.¹ According to Peter White, 'a capital of this amount invested according to the usual practice in land and loans would have yielded just enough income for a man to live in modest comfort with no further exertion'; and, on the assumption that even the poorest Roman knights should therefore be recognized as 'men of property who could subsist on rents and interest', he concludes that 'for such men the problem was not how

¹ Tibullus has been cited as a good example of a well-off Roman poet of equestrian status who nonetheless complains about financial hardship in his first programmatic poem (1.1.5); see Cairns 1979:20 and Cloud 1989: 206. On Republican and Augustan writers of equestrian rank, see Taylor 1968:469-86.

to secure their basic income but how to enhance it.² In an earlier study,³ White argued that land to the value of 400,000 sesterces could provide the owner a 6% annual return in rents, or 24,000 sesterces. This figure, it would appear from several sources,⁴ represented the sum which would enable a person to live in Rome 'with minimum comfort' for one year. It is clear, therefore, that such modest 'affluence' (in the absence of any additional sources of income) must have been dependent upon realizing the full investment potential of that capital.

While it might be true that the proper investment of the basic equestrian *census* would have ensured a lifestyle of 'modest comfort',⁵ an individual's perception of his or her financial status is a notoriously subjective matter and one in which self-pitying envy of the affluence of others is easily excited.⁶ Furthermore, it is obviously much easier for 'sufficiency' to be equated with 'poverty' in a society characterised by enormous disparities in wealth⁷ - and Rome of the first century A.D. was such a society. If *paupertas* denoted 'small means' or 'moderate circumstances', as opposed to

² See White 1982:52.

³ White 1978:88-9.

⁴ White (1978:89) cites Juv. *Sat.* 14. 322-4 (where the equestrian census is suggested as the next best thing for those who would not be content to live as frugally as Socrates or Epicurus); Juv. *Sat.* 9. 140-1 (where Naevolus yearns for an annual income of 20, 000 sesterces to avert a life of beggary); Mart. *Ep.* 3.10 (where 2,000 a month - or 24, 000 a year - is mentioned as adequate for a young man's needs). He also points out that the *semestris tribunatus* (a sinecure sought after by literary men of equestrian rank) provided a salary of 25,000 sesterces.

⁵ Is it feasible that everyone in possession of the minimum HS 400,000 was in a position to benefit from the full investment potential of such a sum? It is possible, for example, that all or part of that amount might have been spent on a residence rather than on leasable property, thus reducing the profit from interest. Furthermore, if an investor in agricultural land were wholly or partly dependant on profits from agricultural produce, that was by no means a dependable source of income, as Pliny points out: *reditus propter condicionem agellorum nescio minor an incertior* (*Ep.* 2.4).

⁶ As the chorus in Seneca's *Troades* (line 1023) remarks, *est miser nemo nisi comparatus*.

⁷ A modern case in point is provided by members of the academic profession, whose relative financial security has never altered the perception that they are undeservedly underpaid (cf. Saller 1983:249).

abundantia, luxuria at one extreme and to *egestas, inopia* and *penuria* at the other,⁸ it is understandable that a capital of HS 400,000 could well be regarded as *paupertas* when compared to the staggering wealth possessed by others. The gulf between the poor and the rich became even more accentuated in the early Imperial era. It has been estimated by Bastomsky that

in Cicero's time a moderately wealthy man had an income 714 times that of one who was poor, while the extraordinarily rich were 10,476 times better off than the poor. For early Imperial times the gulf between free labourers and the reasonably wealthy remained precisely the same, but now the super-rich were 17,142 times wealthier than the poor.⁹

Pliny the Younger was noted for his generous patronage (e.g. his gift of HS 300,000 to Romatius Firmus to enable him to attain equestrian status)¹⁰, yet his fortune - estimated at 20 million sesterces - was small in comparison with those of others in the early Empire.¹¹ It must have been particularly galling for the likes of Juvenal to compare their financial situations with those of freedmen with the 'Midas touch'. If the arrogant freedman of *Satire* 1, who boasts that his fortune surpasses those of Pallas and Licinus (see note 11) and flaunts his *molles . . . in aure fenestras* (1.102-9) is a caricature, there

⁸ Seneca *Ep.* 87.34: *non video quid aliud sit paupertas quam parvi possessio*; *Ep.* 87.35: *paupertas est non quae pauca possidet, sed quae multa non possidet*. Cf. Martial 11.31 (to someone who makes an exaggerated pretence of poverty): *non est paupertas, Nestor, habere nihil*.

⁹ Bastomsky 1990:40.

¹⁰ *Ep.* 1.19.

¹¹ E.g. Gn. Cornelius Lentulus (died A.D. 25): 400 million; Narcissus (freedman of Claudius): 400 million; imperial freedmen M. Antonius Pallas and C. Iulius Calistus: 300 and 200 million respectively; L. Volusius Saturninus (died A.D. 56): more than 300 million; L. Annaeus Seneca (died A.D. 65): 300 million; C. Iulus Licinus (died after A.D. 14 and mentioned by Juvenal, *Sat.* 1.109): 200-300 million. For a more comprehensive list see Duncan-Jones 1982:343-4.

certainly *were* private freedmen whose wealth would have aroused such envious contempt.¹²

Pliny himself makes some interesting remarks about his own 'moderate' financial status, on the occasion of his donation of an amount of HS 100,000:

*nec est, quod verearis, ne sit mihi onerosa ista donatio. Sunt quidem omnino nobis modicae facultates, dignitas sumptuosa, redditus propter condicionem agellorum nescio minor an incertior; sed, quid cessat ex redditu, frugalitate suppletur, ex qua velut e fonte liberalitas nostra decurrit; quae tamen ista temperanda est, ne nimia profusione inarcescat . . .*¹³

Apart from the description of his wealth as *modicae facultates*, this passage is significant in that it draws a distinction between the possession of capital *per se* and the ready income needed for day to day living: if Pliny, whose annual income has been estimated at HS1,100,000¹⁴, found it necessary to compensate for his 'small or precarious' income by 'simple living', how much more reason would the possessor of the bare equestrian *census* have to feel financially insecure. Even allowing for a degree of false modesty, it is hardly likely that Pliny is grossly misrepresenting his situation.

Cicero's annual income has been estimated at about three-quarters of a million sesterces, yet Plutarch (*Cicero* 7) described his estate as 'small' and Cicero himself referred on several occasions to his debts.¹⁵ It was Cicero, too, who once remarked that a certain man who barely possessed the equestrian *census* had nothing to lose except

¹² According to Pliny *NH* 33.135, C. Caecilius Isidorus (died 8 BCE) had a fortune of HS60 million and bequeathed 4116 slaves.

¹³ *Ep.* 2.4.

¹⁴ Duncan-Jones 1982:21.

¹⁵ He complained that his villas at Tusculum were 'overwhelming' him with debts (*ad Att.* 2.1.11), while his exile had also forced him into debt (*ad Att.* 4.1.7; 4.2.5; 4.3.6).

his life¹⁶ – a clear indication that the basic qualification for equestrian status, as early as 49 BCE, was by no means a guarantee of financial security, let alone of affluence. It is also interesting to note that the equestrian *census* was set at the figure of HS 400,000 as early as 67 BCE by the *Lex Roscia* and that it remained as such throughout the Empire, even though the senatorial *census* amount was increased from HS 800,000 to HS 1,200,00 during the time of Augustus.¹⁷ Even if the rate of inflation during the first century CE was low,¹⁸ it is clear that the attainment of equestrian rank was not likewise made more difficult by even a modest increase in the *census* rating.

The focus of this discussion is not the equestrian who benefited from a salaried position¹⁹ or who had the time (and inclination) to devote to business interests, but the one whose choice of a literary ‘career’ held out no prospect of a substantial and regular source of additional income²⁰ and who was accordingly even *more* dependent on the generosity of his *amici* and, if he was fortunate enough, on imperial patronage. Such an individual, by the very nature of his ‘profession’, would have found it in his interests to cultivate such relationships assiduously in order to secure audiences for his works (in addition to the expected material benefits of such *amicitia*).

¹⁶ *Ad fam.* 9.13.4.

¹⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 41.1; Cassius Dio 55.13.6. Saller (1983:250) makes the pertinent observation: ‘Now if the equestrian census of four hundred thousand sesterces had initially been set in the Republic as the sum required to live without working, it certainly would not have been adequate to meet the rising living costs and living standards of Rome of the emperors’.

¹⁸ Some indication of inflationary pressures during the period in question is provided by the fact that the basic legionary pay was 900 sesterces from the reign of Augustus to that of Domitian, but 1,200 sesterces from Domitian to Septimius Severus (see Duncan-Jones 1982:10).

¹⁹ For the opportunities available to members of the equestrian rank, see Friedländer 1965:137-42.

²⁰ See White 1982:50-2.

As a contemporary of Juvenal, the poet Martial provides a convenient and instructive parallel:²¹ he *did* possess equestrian rank, but nonetheless complained *ad nauseam* about his financial straits. This apparent anomaly has been cited as an example of the 'mendicant facade' typically adopted by poets.²² Yet the evidence of his *Epigrams* suggests that *his* property certainly did not bring in enough money to sustain a comfortable lifestyle, while the very nature of the *beneficia* attested in his poems (see below) militates against any notion of affluence on his part. His little farm at Nomentum was a pleasant enough retreat,²³ but its productivity was such that it had to be supplemented by produce from the local market; and, as Martial jokingly remarked, *nil nostri, nisi me, ferunt agelli*.²⁴ Indeed, the frustrating infertility of his little estate was one of the main factors which made the prospect of a return to Spain so attractive.²⁵ Furthermore, having a large circle of *amici* (as Martial's epigrams would seem to attest) was no guarantee of financial security: when Martial's friend, Sextus, is derided for believing that he can make a living at Rome first as a lawyer and then as a poet, he announces that he will then 'court the halls of great men.' To which Martial gives the sardonic reply:

*vix tres aut quattuor ista
res aluit, pallet cetera turba fame . . .
si bonus es, casu vivere, Sexte, potes.* (3.38.11-2; 14)

²¹ See Colton 1991:45-66.

²² Hardie, A. 1983:51; 54-6; see also Bramble 1974:159.

²³ E.g. *Ep.* 6.27; 6.43; 12.57

²⁴ *Ep.* 7.31; 9.60; 10.58.9; 10.94. Cf. 3.47, where Bassus is pictured carting a variety of farm produce from Rome to his unproductive *villa*. Furthermore, these references to the unproductiveness of his Nomentan property provide little reason to assume, as Hardie (1983:51) does, that Martial would have had a steady income from his vineyards.

²⁵ *illa placet tellus in qua res parva beatum
me facit et tenues luxuriantur opes:
pascitur hic, ibi pascit ager . . .* (10.96.5-7)

Another factor that needs to be taken into account is the possibility that Martial really did not fare well in the competitive environment of those who jostled for *beneficia*. As Wallace-Hadrill remarks,

one of our problems in envisaging how Roman patronage worked is that of seeing how the patron was in a position to (let alone willing to) deliver the goods to large numbers of dependants. Yet the power of the patron may derive not from the ability to secure benefits for all who ask, but from the sheer impossibility of securing them for any but a minority.²⁶

At the time that he wrote Book 1 of his *Epigrams*, Martial was living in quite humble circumstances: in an apartment (*cenacula*, 1.108.3) up three long flights of stairs (*scalis . . . tribus et altis*, 1.117.7), probably situated near the *porticus Vipsania* in the *campus Agrippae* (1.108.3). His cramped living conditions are suggested in another epigram from the same Book: *vicinus meus est manumque tangi / de nostris Novius potest fenestris*. However, his circumstances improved sufficiently to enable him to purchase a town-house on the Quirinal near the temple of Flora (5.22.4; 6.27.1). Although this residence was substantial enough to boast a kitchen (5.50.7-8) and a garden²⁷, the interior of the house was shabbily appointed (*nulla tegit fractos nec inanis culcita lectos, / putris et abrupta fascia recte iacet*, 5.62.5-6) and, unlike most houses in Rome,²⁸ was not connected to the public water supply. It is tempting to believe that the purchase of this property (which, it has been suggested, would have been worth about 150,000

²⁶ Wallace-Hadrill 1989:72-3.

²⁷ *est mihi (sitque precor longum te praeside, Caesar) / rus minimum, parvi sunt et in urbe lares* (9.18.1-2). Martial's request for imperial permission to draw water from the Marcian aqueduct for his *sitientibus hortis* (line 3), suggests that the latter adjoined his Quirinal residence, since the Marcian aqueduct would have supplied that region (see Allen 1970:349). At 8.67.7 Martial refers to the lack of a water supply: *nondum mihi frigida venit*.

²⁸ According to Strabo 5.3, almost every house in Rome had water laid on.

sesterces²⁹) was facilitated by his attainment of equestrian status.³⁰ If this was indeed the case, the 'tying up' of a sizeable proportion of the *census* amount in fixed property (together with the expenses of running his household) would have further reduced his disposable income.

Martial's possession of the *ius trium liberorum* and honorary tribunate, his fame as a literary figure and the fact that he was instrumental in securing imperial grants of citizenship for others have been cited as indicators of his real status in Roman society: 'The measure of the man and the poet is the public approval of the court; his standing with the Emperor was the the most important single element in his existence, and all else derived from it.'³¹ However, while Martial prides himself on the fact that his poems were sometimes read for Domitian's enjoyment³² and basks hopefully in the belief that poets are Domitian's *gloria dulcis*, *cura prior* and *deliciae*,³³ there is no persuasive evidence to suggest that his talent earned him substantial and on-going largesse from the imperial court. In Book 3 he does state that 'both Caesars' (i.e. Titus and Domitian) praised him and bestowed on him certain 'rewards' (*praemia*) in addition to the *ius trium liberorum*.³⁴ It is likely that these 'rewards' refer to favours other than the granting of the honorary tribunate, as he refers specifically to his elevated status a few lines later (*vidit me Roma tribunum*). However, judging by the earnestness of his subsequent hints and flatteries addressed to Domitian, in particular, it would seem that the *praemia* referred to were coupled with specific instances of imperial praise (*laudato tribuit mihi*), rather

²⁹ Sullivan 1991:28. Martial refers specifically to the purchase of gardens at 5.62.8.

³⁰ *vidit me Roma tribunum* (3.95.9). On his tribunate (most probably the honorary post of *tribunus semestris*) see Allen 1970:345-6; Sullivan 1991:4; 32.

³¹ Hardie 1983:51

³² *ipse etiam tanto dominus sub pondere rerum
non dedignatur [has nugas] bis terque revolvere Caesar* (6.64.14-5);
namque solent sacra Caesaris aure frui (7.99.4).

³³ 8.82.5-6

³⁴ *praemia laudato tribuit mihi Caesar uterque
natorumque dedit iura paterna trium* (3.95.5-6)

than indicative of sustained patronage. Such an inference is suggested by the following lines addressed to Domitian:

*quid tamen haec prosunt quamvis venerantia multos?
non prosint sane, me tamen ista iuvant.* (5.15.4-6)

The impression that Martial was far from confident that his verse would reap further rewards from this source is strengthened by another wheedling epigram from his eighth book:

*si quid forte petam timido gracilique libello,
inproba non fuerit si mea charta, dato.
et si non dederis, Caesar, permitte rogari:
offendunt numquam tura precesque lovem* (8.24.1-4).

In yet another epigram (6.10) he refers to a direct petition to the *princeps* for '*pauca . . . milia*', concluding with the hopeful words (presented as imaginary encouragement from Pallas Athene, the 'Thunderer's confidant'): *quae nondum data sunt, stulte, negata putas?*³⁵ Martial gives no subsequent indication whether or not requests such as these were successful,³⁵ but, in the light of two later poems (in which Domitian is contrasted first with Nerva and then with Trajan), it would seem that he had scant reason to feel grateful towards the former:

largiri, praestare, breves extendere census

³⁵ The argument that etiquette would have prevented acknowledgement of imperial gifts (Hardie 1983:46) is unconvincing, when viewed against the sycophantic excesses of Martial's laudatory epigrams. It is hard to believe that someone so eager for recognition by the imperial court would have foregone the opportunity to advertise any financial rewards, in the same way as he drew attention to the granting of his honorary tribunate and the *ius trium liberorum* (3.95); these are almost certainly the gifts acknowledged again at 4.27.5: *non alius poterat quae dare dona mihi*. It should be noted that Statius (*Silv.* 3.1.61f.) did not consider it *infra dig.* to acknowledge an imperial *munus* in the form of permission to tap into the public water supply; the fact that Martial does not refer to the success of a similar request of his own (9.18), should probably be ascribed to disappointment rather than politeness.

*et dare quae faciles vix tribuere dei,
 nunc licet et fas est. sed tu sub principe duro
 temporibusque malis ausus es esse bonus (12.6.9-12);
 omnes cum love nunc sumus beati;
 at nuper (pudet, a pudet fateri)
 omnes cum love pauperes eramus. (12.15.8-10)*

Perhaps Martial's failure to secure monetary handouts from Domitian himself is less surprising when his sycophantic praise of the emperor's underlings³⁶ seems to have yielded no more than the gift of an extravagantly praised toga³⁷ from Parthenius, Domitian's freedman chamberlain or secretary.

If the failure of emperors, Domitian in particular, to provide him with adequate financial rewards is implicit in his poetry, his frustration at the general unprofitability of poetry is more explicit and persistent. In his first book he tries to persuade his friend Gallus to forsake the life of a poet: *quid petis a Phoebos? nummos habet arca Minervae* (1.76.5). Helicon, he says, has nothing beyond a loud but empty 'bravo', and he concludes with a bitter contrast between the impoverished world of literature and the profitable *forum Romanum*:

*quid tibi cum Cirrha? quid cum Permesside nuda?
 Romanum propius divitiusque forum est.
 illic aera sonant: at circum pulpita nostra
 et steriles cathedras basia sola crepant (1.76.11-14)*

³⁶ *at nunc tantus amor cunctis, Auguste, tuorum est
 ut sit cuique suae cura secunda domus.
 tam placidae mentes, tanta est reverentia nostri,
 tam pacata quies, tantus in ore pudor. (9.79.3-6)*

³⁷ 8.28. Perhaps Martial's description of its eventual threadbare condition (9.49) suggests that Parthenius' generosity began and ended with the donation of that *multum cantata* (9.49.1) item of clothing.

This was not merely the complaint of a 'novice' poet struggling to establish himself. because, a decade or so later, Martial was still beset by the problem of securing the support of a latter-day 'Maecenas'. In a poem addressed to Nerva, he prides himself on the fact that his poetry is read throughout the empire;³⁸ yet,

*quid prodest? nescit sacculus ista meus.
at quam victuras poteramus pangere chartas
quantaque Pieria proelia flare tuba,
cum pia reddiderint Augustum numina terris,
et Maecenatem si tibi, Roma, darent! (11.3.6-10)*

There is another factor of considerable importance which, in the cases of Martial and Juvenal certainly, created tension between the desire to be a productive writer and the desire to be financially secure. If, as Peter White has convincingly argued,³⁹ the relationship of poets to their wealthy *amici* was essentially no different from that of other dependants and that they too had to pay court to 'earn their keep', it is not surprising that one of Martial's complaints about the irksomeness of his obligations was the fact that he had to waste time which he would rather devote to his writing. The following poem comments not only on this particular irritation but - most appropriately in the present context - illustrates why the possession of property was not necessarily a safeguard against having to scrounge a supplementary income:

³⁸ Martial's claims that his poetry enjoys a wide audience (e.g. 6.60) must be balanced against his statement that he expects his books to bring him fame only after he has died (5.10) and his expressed preference to entertain *raris . . . auribus* (2.86.12). One wonders, too, whether his frequent attempts to justify his chosen *genre* (e.g. preface to Book 1; 1.35; 1.1; 4.49; 8.3; 9.50; 10.4; 10.33; 11.15) and his eagerness to bring his work to the notice of the emperor (e.g. 1.4; 5.6; 7.99) indicate that his verse - however entertaining - might have been regarded as perhaps too 'slight' and therefore less deserving of patronage than the more 'serious' and traditional *genres*. We know that Domitian's own literary aspirations lay in that direction (see Hardie 1983:45). Also interesting is Pliny's assessment of Martial's status as a poet: *at non erunt aeterna, quae scripsit. non erunt fortasse, ille tamen scripsit, tamquam essent futura* (Ep. 3.21). Perhaps, too, Martial's attempts to justify the licentiousness of some of his verse (e.g. 3.68) point to another obstacle in his pursuit of substantial patronage from Domitian in particular. It is also relevant to note that Martial begged the curator of the Palatine library to allow his works to be housed there (5.5).

³⁹ White 1978:1982.

*Anxuris aequorei placidos, Frontine, recessus
 et propius Baias litoreamque domum,
 et quod inhumanae Cancro fervente cicadae
 non novere nemus, flumineosque lacus
 dum colui, doctas tecum celebrare vacabat
 Pieridas; nunc nos maxima Roma terit.
 hic mihi quando dies meus est? iactamur in alto
 urbis, et in sterili vita labore perit,
 dura suburbani dum iugera pascimus agri
 vicinosque tibi, sancte Quirine, lares.
 sed non solus amat qui nocte dieque frequentat
 limina nec vatem talia damna decent.
 per veneranda mihi Musarum sacra, per omnes
 iuro deos, et non officiosus amo. (10.58)*

This is not an isolated complaint,⁴⁰ and Martial - like Juvenal in his seventh *Satire* - also stresses the necessity of *otium* for creativity and draws attention to Virgil and Horace as *exempla* of the fruits of proper patronage:

*saepe mihi dicis, Luci carissime luli,
 "scribe aliquid magnum: desidiosus homo es."
 otia da nobis, sed qualia fecerat olim
 Maecenas Flacco Vergilioque suo:
 condere victuras temptem per saecula curas
 et nomen flammis eripuisse meum.
 in steriles nolunt campos iuga ferre iuveni:
 pingue solum lassat, sed iuvat ipse labor. (1.107)*

⁴⁰

*Quod mihi vix unus toto liber exeat anno
 desidia tibi sum, docte Potite, reus.
 iustius at quanto mirere quod exeat unus,
 labantur toti cum mihi saepe dies . . . (10.70.1-4)*

In 11.24 Martial complains that dancing attendance on his patron, Labellus, deprives him of time which he could better spend on writing: *sic fit / cum cenare domi poeta non vult* (lines 14-5).

Otium, of course, is merely a euphemism for financial security provided by a generous *amicus*; and Martial – to be echoed by Juvenal again⁴¹ – makes the point more explicitly in a poem addressed to Flaccus (8.56):

*risit Tuscus eques [i.e. Maecenas] paupertatemque malignam
reppulit et celeri iussit abire fuga.*

“*Accipe divitias et vatum maximus esto . . .*” (9-11)

*. . . quid Varios Marsosque loquar ditataque vatum
nomina, magnus erit quos numerare labor?
ergo ego Vergilius, si munera Maecenatis
des mihi? Vergilius non ero, Marsus ero.* (21-4)

Martial’s poems create the strong impression that he had little time or inclination for profitable pursuits, other than paying hopeful but irksome court to his wealthier *amici*, and that he was constantly dogged by the incompatibility of his need for financial security with his hankering after a life of ‘creative leisure’. This dilemma is illustrated by the following poem, which he wrote after his return to Spain:

*matutine cliens, urbis mihi causa relictæ,
atria, si sapias, ambitiosa colas.
non sum ego causidicus nec amaris litibus aptus
sed piger et senior Pieridumque comes;
otia me somnusque iuvant, quæ magna negavit
Roma mihi: redeo, si vigilatur et hic.* (12.68)

It is significant that the sentiments expressed here are quite consistent with those of a much earlier epigram, where Martial, after stating his preference for *delectantia* rather than *seria*, proceeds to explain what *talis amor* costs him:

⁴¹ Juv. Sat. 7.

*nam si falciferi defendere templa Tonantis
 sollicitisve velim vendere verba reis,
 plurimus Hispanas mittet mihi nauta metretas
 et fiet vario sordidus aere sinus.
 at nunc conviva est comissatorque libellus
 et tantum gratis pagina nostra placet.
 sed non et veteres contenti laude fuerunt,
 cum minimum vati munus Alexis erat.
 "Belle" inquis "dixti: iuvat et laudabimus usque."
 dissimulas? facies me, puto, causicum. (5.16.5-14)*

The personality traits which emerge from his epigrams on this theme - particularly his preference for a life of genteel *otium* rather than active money-making - are also reflected in another poem, in which he discusses what constitutes the 'good life':

*vitam quae faciunt beatiorem,
 iucundissime Martialis, haec sunt:
 res non parva labore sed relictis;
 non ingratus ager, focus perennis;
 lis numquam, toga rara, mens quieta;
 vires ingenuae, salubre corpus;
 prudens simplicitas, pares amici,
 convictus facilis, sine arte mensa;
 nox non ebria sed soluta curis,
 non tristis torus et tamen pudicus;
 somnus qui faciat breves tenebras:
 quod sis esse velis nihilque malis;
 summum nec metuas diem nec optes. (10.47)⁴²*

⁴² Cf. 2.90; 6.43; 10.104.

The penultimate line is, of course, wishful thinking and far removed from the unpleasant realities of Martial's life of scrounging and frequent complaints about niggardly patrons. It would seem that even the upkeep of a suburban retreat and his own team of mules could prove irksome to Martial, as suggested by his attitude towards Charinus, who was jealous of his literary fame: *hoc opto: mulas habeat et suburbanum* (8.61.9)

There is frequent mention of *beneficia*, hoped for and received, in his verses. While it is possible that some of the addressees are fictional - particularly those castigated for extraordinary meanness - there appears to be sufficient reliable evidence in his poems to suggest that Martial was in real need of on-going assistance, both in cash and in kind, from his *amici*. Martial refers to apparently unsuccessful requests for loans of HS100,000 (3.40; 6.5; 6.20), to a loan of HS6,000 after he had asked for double that amount (4.76) and to an empty promise of a loan of 200,000 (5.82). Of course, loans are 'gifts' with a sting in the tail, as Martial himself wryly observes: *tu magnus quod das? immo ego, quod recipis* (3.40.4). As for gifts in kind from Martial's benefactors during his stay in Rome,⁴³ they would seem, in the main, to have been the fairly modest 'tokens' of the on-going reciprocity between *amici* (especially those given at the time of the *Saturnalia*).⁴⁴ Gifts given or requested at times other than the *Saturnalia* - and therefore probably more indicative of the normal scale of gift-giving by *amici* - include silver plate (8.71)⁴⁵ a slave boy or girl (requested at 8.73), some mules (11.79; it is possible, however, that these were merely loaned to him by the addressee), a boar (11.27), a basket of food (9.72), a glass bowl (8.51; 8.33), and a *covinnus* (12.24). There is no reason to believe that all of these are deliberately chosen to suggest the

⁴³ On his return to Spain, Marcella presented him with a small property (12.31).

⁴⁴ E.g. those itemised in 7.53: six three-leaved tablets, seven toothpicks, a sponge, a napkin, half a peck of beans, a wicker crate of Picenian olives, a flagon of must, Syrian figs, dried prunes and a jar of figs.

⁴⁵ In this poem Martial jokes about the ever-decreasing amount of silver given him each year, after an initial weight of 4 pounds 10 years previously. Elsewhere (10.57) he mentions 1 pound as a regular gift, while an *amicus* who sends him *libras quattuor aut duas* (12.36) is described as *optimus malorum*.

parsimony of his *amici* (even though Martial is disparaging about the quality of the bowl mentioned in 8.33).

The gifts tend to be both modest and practical, like the roof-tiles given to him by his friend Stella, when his country house was damaged during a winter storm (7.36); but the item which features most frequently in the context of *amicitia* and patronage is the *toga*, a gift which could emanate from a donor as august as the emperor's own secretary.⁴⁶ While Martial's sycophantic praise of the latter was clearly motivated by his eagerness to ingratiate himself with the imperial court, there is little doubt that this type of gift fulfilled a genuine need. This much is implied not only by his gratitude for the receipt of such gifts⁴⁷ but also by his frequent allusions to the threadbare state or inferior quality of his togas and to his need for replacements.⁴⁸ It is significant that this aspect of *amicitia* was obviously both irksome and expensive enough for him to cite it as one of the reasons for his decision to leave Rome and to return permanently to Spain:

*quattuor hic aestate togae pluresve teruntur,
autumnis ibi me quattuor una tegit* (10.96.11-2)

Even if one allows for a degree of poetic licence in this regard,⁴⁹ one can believe that for people like Martial, who were obliged to pay regular court to the affluent and powerful, the wear and tear on the obligatory garb for the *salutatio* must have been a constant source of expenditure: a mundane, but revealing insight into the realities of Martial's financial position. When Martial thanks his friend Stella for the donation of some roof tiles, are we to dismiss the concluding line (*Stella, tegis villam, non tegis agricolam*, 7.36.6) as an entirely contrived joke with no relevance to his personal

⁴⁶ He has lavish praise for a toga given to him by Parthenius (8.28).

⁴⁷ E.g. 10.73

⁴⁸ 2.58; 3.36; 5.79; 6.11; 7.92; 8.28; 9.49; 9.100; 10.14; 10.29; 10.96; 12.36; 12.72.

⁴⁹ So, too, when he contrasts Zoilus' showing off of his eleven togas with his possession of a single garment (5.79).

needs? The frequency with which Martial makes such allusions should lead one not only to question assumptions about his supposed affluence, but also to take seriously his complaints about the regular inconvenience and drudgery of having to attend *salutationes*: the *toga* becomes a ubiquitous symbol not only of his *paupertas* but also of the irksomeness of his dependancy on his wealthier *amici*.⁵⁰

Martial is hardly likely to have assailed his audience with allusions to his *paupertas* so regularly throughout his poems, unless that audience accepted the fundamental validity of such complaints. Martial, after all, had a patently clear motive in advertising his comparatively slender means, and it would hardly have helped his cause to indulge in such an incessant charade. There is sufficient evidence, spread throughout the *corpus* of his writings, to suggest that Martial's temperament was genuinely ill-suited to a life of litigation or any other avenue of employment. It is therefore not difficult to accept that his frequent references to haunting the thresholds of prospective benefactors are *not* to be simply dismissed as elements of an artificial literary *persona*: in reality he had no other option. The self-portrait which emerges from Martial's poems is consistent and credible enough to make one temper, if not abandon, one's scepticism about the validity of his financial grievances.

However, if one continues to doubt the basic veracity of Martial's portrayal of his financial straits on the grounds that poets habitually hide behind a fictitious *persona*, there is an interesting piece of evidence from an independent source. Pliny, in paying tribute to Martial (who had composed a poem in his honour), mentions that he gave the poet a monetary gift, specifically to help him with his travelling expenses on his return to Spain: *prosecutus eram viatico secedentem; dederam hoc amicitiae, dederam etiam versiculis, quos de me composuit* (Ep. 3.210). This immediately begs the question: why should Pliny have donated the money for this purpose, unless he was aware of a real need on Martial's part? We don't know whether or not Martial 'sold up' in Rome prior to his departure; if he did, it would make Pliny's gift all the more surprising. We do know,

⁵⁰ E.g. 3.4; 4.66; 10.47; 10.74; 12.18; 12.72.

however, that a benefactor provided Martial with a small house and farm on his return to Spain.⁵¹ Where, one may wonder, had all that equestrian capital gone?

Martial, as we have already seen, was delighted to have forsaken the frustrations and hardships of trying to make a living in Rome; and this delight could even be coloured by a certain smugness, as seen in the poem which he addressed to his friend Juvenal, whom he left behind in Rome:⁵²

*dum tu forsitan inquietus erras
clamosa, Iuvenalis, in Subura
aut collem dominae teris Dianae;
dum per limina te potentiorum
sudatrix toga ventilat vagumque
maior Caelius et minor fatigant:
me multos repetita post Decembres
accipit mea rusticumque fecit
auro Bilbilis et superba ferro. (12.18.1-9)*

However, what is of more importance than the tone of this epigram is the fact that, for Martial, his friend Juvenal can provide a mirror-image of his former self. It would be absurd to attempt to explain away this portrayal of his fellow poet, with its sharp awareness of the client's subservient drudgery, as a mere poetic charade.⁵³ This is a candid observation on their respective fortunes; and, as such, it is yet another piece of

⁵¹

*post septima lustra reverso
has Marcella domos parvaque regna dedit (12.317-8).*

⁵² The fact that Juvenal put his denunciation of Rome in the mouth of 'Umbricius' seems to me to reflect the reality of Juvenal's own continued domicile in the city; and, while Umbricius may well be a fictitious character, his weariness of the client's impoverished life is something which loomed large in the life of the real Martial (and, no doubt, in the lives of others in his position).

⁵³ It is pertinent to bear in mind Pliny's assessment of Martial, both as a person and as a writer: *erat homo ingeniosus, acutus, acer, et qui plurimum in scribendo et salis haberet et fellis nec candoris minus (Ep. 3.21).*

persuasive evidence to suggest that, even if many poets *were* of equestrian and that this *did* provide a basis for a relatively affluent standard of living for them, there were others, like Martial and Juvenal, whose circumstances and dispositions (including an aversion to the more conventional means of income-generation), might have consigned them to a life of 'shabby-genteel' *paupertas*.

Once again, the credibility of their complaints can be corroborated by reference to a remark by Pliny (who would probably be regarded as a more sober and less suspect authority): *fuit moris antiqui eos, qui vel singulorum laudes vel urbium scripserant, aut honoribus aut pecunia ornare; nostris vero temporibus ut alia speciosa et egregia ita hoc in primum exolevit* (Ep. 3.21). In the light of this contemporary assessment and in the face of the sheer consistency of Martial's portrayal of his struggle to make ends meet in Rome, it would be foolish to assert that Juvenal's picture of the life of a dependent poet in Rome - as it emerges from the evidence of the seventh and third *Satires* in particular - has more to do with a bogus *persona* than with the truth.

CHAPTER 3

Parsimonious Patrons and Perverts:

Juvenal on the Upper Classes in Books 1 and 2

Satire 1 ends with the words: *experiar quid concedatur in illos / quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina* (1.170-1). This is Juvenal's response to an imaginary interlocutor's warning about the perils of offending living individuals.¹ It also makes it clear that the particular targets of his satire are to be the members of the nobility, in particular, and the affluent. To argue that Juvenal means the deceased *in general*² is to ignore the fact that it is the decadence of *these* echelons which have been kept almost constantly in focus in this programmatic *Satire*, as the discussion below will emphasise.³ Furthermore, it is doubtful that Juvenal's audience would have interpreted this reference

¹ 1.150-70

² E.g. Courtney 1980:119.

³ Baldwin (1967:312) interprets line 171 as generic rather than temporal: Juvenal's aim is to attack not just the dead, but members of the Roman aristocracy alive in his day'; he also suggests that the final two lines 'may imply that he feels safe to attack nobles such as the *Lamiae* and officials such as *Gillo* (a *novus homo*?), but has reservations about criticizing low-born favourites, praetorian guards, and the like.' However, against the background of Juvenal's consistent and almost obsessive hostility towards the Roman elite in Books 1 and 2 especially, this seems an over-subtle distinction. Similarly, it would weaken the thrust of *Satire 2* to interpret *praetextatos . . . mores*, in the concluding sentence (line 170) of *Satire 2*, as 'teenage-morals' (thus Rudd 1991:14) rather than as the more pointed and appropriate 'upper-class morals'. Edwards (1993:24) makes the pertinent observation: 'A striking feature of Roman discussions of immoral behaviour (and one not generally remarked on by modern historians) is that they are concerned overwhelmingly with the behaviour of the upper classes . . . The elite had the duty of setting the rest of society an example. It was their behaviour that mattered'.

to the dead in such a general manner, when the likes of Domitian and the actor Paris were buried alongside the *Via Latina* and the *Via Flaminia*.⁴

Nor is Juvenal's heeding of the dire warnings (luridly emphasised by the fate of those rash enough to incur the wrath of powerful and vindictive contemporaries)⁵ likely to be a deliberate anti-climax, designed - perversely - to incur the disappointment of his audience; rather, it is probably intended as a further cynical indictment of an age which has effectively suppressed the *simplicitas scribendi* (152-3) and *animus flagrans* (152) of past eras.⁶ were he alive now, even the mighty Lucilius - one imagines - would be forced to sheath his sword (165), rein in his galloping horses (20) and devote himself to the hackneyed, but safe, unreality of mythological themes, of which Juvenal is so contemptuous in this *Satire*.⁷

⁴ Suet. *Dom.* 17; Mart. 11.13. It is also pertinent to note 1) that of the four surviving *columbaria* found in the vicinity of the *Via Latina* three served as burial-places for connections of the imperial family and for freedmen of members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty (see Toynbee 1971:113); and 2) that 'the appearance of all city cemeteries was, naturally, largely determined by the tombs of the wealthy and reasonably well-to-do who could afford to buy a piece of land on which a personal or family grave-monument or house-tomb could be erected' (Toynbee 1971:74). That Juvenal had the upper echelons of Roman society in mind would seem to be confirmed by his mention of *monumenta Latinae* at 5.55; furthermore, at 8.147, he describes the consul Lateranus careering past *maiorum cineres atque ossa*. Most poor Romans, on the other hand, left no memorials. On the contrast between the burial places of the affluent and those of the urban poor, see Hopkins 1983:205-11.

⁵ *pone Tigillinum, taeda lucebis in illa / qua stantes ardent qui fixo gutture fumant, / et latum media sulcum deducit harena* (1.155-7).

⁶ Cf. Tacitus on the suppression of free speech during the early Principate (*Tiberi Gaique et Claudii ac Neronis res florentibus ipsis ob metum falsae*, *Ann.* 1.5) and on the welcome respite provided by Trajan's reign (*rara temporum felicitate, ubi sentire quae velis et quae sentias dicere licet*, *Hist.* 1.1). On Quintilian and the art of safe criticism, see Ahl 1984:187-208.

⁷ 1.1-14; 52-4; 162-4. Bramble (1974:169-72) argues that the epic imagery used by Juvenal is a misrepresentation of Lucilius' manner: 'Lucilius would have been surprised, given that he reserved grandiosity for parody, having himself professed a plain style, the refined simplicity of which was recognised by later writers. Juvenal has deliberately reinterpreted the already prejudiced satiric portrait of the Lucilian manner' (170). Alternatively, one might explain the imagery simply as Juvenal's characteristically grandiloquent way of emphasizing the forcefulness and confidence of his predecessor's satire; as Bramble himself goes on to observe, Juvenal noted the shortcomings of contemporary mythological epic and substituted new material for old: 'through the exchange, Roman vice became as monstrous and portentous

It might be tempting to explain away Juvenal's apparent retreat from Lucilian aggression and fearlessness as a mere convention in the manner of Horace and Persius,⁸ but it would be a mistake to underestimate the extent of the hostility which outspoken criticism could arouse. Horace, despite his confidence in the protection of his powerful friends and in the exonerating quality of his *bona carmina*, alluded to the dangers of outspokenness when he made an interlocutor say:

*sed tamen ut monitus caveas, ne forte negoti
incutiat tibi quid sanctarum inscitia legum:
si mala condiderit in quem quis carmina, ius est
iudiciumque.* (Serm. 2.80-3)

There is no evidence to suggest that Juvenal enjoyed anything like the 'parliamentary privileges' of his predecessor, or that the political and social circumstances during his lifetime - particularly during the Domitianic period - would have encouraged him to throw caution to the wind: not only does the fate of men like Helvidius Priscus illustrate the point, but Tacitus draws attention to the extreme sensitivity of some individuals to criticism of their deceased ancestors and even to the likelihood of their construing praise of the latter as veiled criticism of themselves.⁹ Martial, too, alludes to the dangers of making personal attacks on members of the upper classes:

as anything in the fictions of epic and tragedy . . . the *materia* offered by life superseded that of myth in its horrific magnitude' (172). Scott (1927:113) sees Juvenal's style as 'a true product of his age, an age when writing and speaking tended towards luxuriance and over-emphasis.'

⁸ See Griffith 1970:59-60.

⁹ Tacitus, *Annals* 4.33: *tum quod antiquis scriptoribus rarus obtrectator, neque refert cuiusquam Punicas Romanasne acies laetius extuleris: at multorum qui Tiberio regnante poenam vel infamiam subiere posteris manent. utque familiae ipsae iam extinctae sint, reperies qui ob similitudinem morum aliena malefacta sibi obiectari putent. etiam gloria ac virtus infensos habet, ut nimis ex propinquo diversa arguens.* Fredricksmeier (1990:796) makes the valid point that 'if Juvenal had openly attacked prominent contemporaries, it would be quite surprising. Juvenal appears, from the almost complete absence of contemporary reference to his name, to have little connection with those powerful enough to provide him with some measure of protection.' See also Knoche 1975:141-2.

*quisquis stolaeve purpuraeve contemptor
quos colere debet laesit impio versu,
erret per urbem pontis exul et clivi* (10.5.1-3).

As J.G. Griffith remarks, 'if it was imprudent at this time to mention families no longer extant or even to accord honour where honour is due, the climate of opinion was indeed abnormal.'¹⁰ It is therefore hardly surprising that Juvenal is reluctant to attack his litigious contemporaries as virulently as he denigrates the deceased. Yet, like Horace, he would surely have the satisfaction of knowing that his *exempla* would touch some raw nerves.

The sheer multiplicity of Juvenal's *exempla* is an integral component of his aggressive satirical style. One may surmise that, since a wider historical perspective offered a much richer range of satirical material, his stated intention not to target his contemporaries directly was also motivated to a degree by artistic expediency; and this *modus operandi* may be compared with that of his contemporary, Martial, whose professed avoidance of offending the living,¹¹ did not diminish the contemporary relevance of his satire:

*at tu Romanos lepido sale tinguere libellos:
adgnoscat mores vita legatque suos.* (Ep. 8.3.19-20)

¹⁰ Griffith 1970:58. Ogilvie (1980:227) points out that not only Juvenal but Pliny and Tacitus were all past middle age when they did feel free to write openly. 'So it was inevitable that their thoughts were concerned not so much with the challenges of the present as with the experiences of the past. There is a perpetual looking backwards about them, a marked fascination with the horrors of their youth.'

¹¹ *spero me secutum in libellis meis tale temperamentum ut de illis queri non possit quisquis de se bene senserit, cum salva infimarum quoque personarum reverentia ludant; quae adeo antiquis auctoribus defuit ut nominibus non tantum veris abusi sint sed et magnis* (Preface to Book 1);

*quintus nostrorum liber est, Auguste, iocorum
et queritur laesus carmine nemo meo,
gaudet honorato sed multus nomine lector,
cui victura meo munere fama datur* (Ep. 5.15.1-3).

*quid te vana iuvant miserae ludibria chartae?
hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'meum est'.
non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque
invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit. (Ep. 10.4.7-10)*

Juvenal promises a theme of *quasi*-epic proportions; but, like Martial, he rejects the fanciful and remote subject matter of conventional epic poetry in favour of the plain and immediate realities of everyday life:

*ex quo Deucalion nimbis tollentibus aequor
navigio montem ascendit sortesque poposcit
paulatimque anima caluerunt mollia saxa
et maribus nudas ostendit Pyrrha puellas,
quidquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas,
gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est. (1.81-6)*

In reality, of course, Juvenal draws on the relatively recent past (Domitian's despised reign in particular) for the majority of his negative *exempla*; and he makes it clear that he is intent upon characterizing the present as a time when evil and corruption have reached their zenith:

et quando uberior vitiorum copia? (1.87)

*nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat
posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores,
omne in praecipiti vitium stetit. (1.147-9)*

Juvenal's first *Satire* is thus infused with an almost apocalyptic character, as it presents the current era as the climactic moment of Rome's and, indeed, of mankind's (*ex quo Deucalion* . . .) long tradition of decadence and vice: an inexorable progression which

is emphasised subsequently on several occasions¹² and reinforced by the frequent references to the lost virtues of the past. Griffith¹³ remarks:

It may fairly be maintained (though it seldom has been) that Juvenal, by drawing his instances from the age of an emperor now dead, has in effect extended the reference of his social comment backwards in time, and has thus fastened on to something more significant than the transient foibles and fashions belonging to the here-and-now, to symptoms deep-seated within society.

It is Juvenal's unwavering conviction throughout Books 1 and 2 that the decay of Rome's moral and social norms is directly attributable to greed¹⁴ and to the degeneracy of its nobility. While the scope of Juvenal's historical perspective provides him with an abundance of *exempla* to sustain his invective, it might be argued that this lack of real topicality, coupled with his policy of not targeting contemporaries by name, suggests a certain artificiality about his *indignatio*. However, while Juvenal's satirical method differs from that of the less circumspect Lucilius, it does not follow that his satirical writing lacks genuine conviction.¹⁵ The retrospective nature of Juvenal's *exempla* certainly gives his satire a broader historical perspective and shows an awareness that the malaise affecting Roman society is not a sudden or recent phenomenon, but his condemnation of the past also serves as a convenient mirror with which to reflect the iniquities of the present;¹⁶ and, before Juvenal reveals at the end of his programmatic *Satire* that his

¹² 6.1-20; 13.28-30.

¹³ Griffith 1970:58.

¹⁴ Cloud and Braund 1982:79: '... the theme which emerges most powerfully from the rest of the gallery is the worship of money, both as something to be acquired and as something which when acquired subverts traditionally respected status and values.'

¹⁵ With Wordsworth's famous definition of the poetic process in mind, one might venture to describe Juvenal's satire as 'emotion recollected in restless indignation' (rather than 'tranquillity!').

¹⁶ 'Derrière les morts, reconnaissons les vivants' (Gérard 1976:448); see also Knoche 1975:142.

exempla are to be drawn from the past, he has already established a sense of immediacy and urgency through his vivid portrayal of the ubiquitous evil and corruption which have compelled him to give vent to his *indignatio*.¹⁷

Juvenal's preoccupation, particularly in the first Book, with the financial hardships of the client-class is almost obsessive. The notion that this seething resentment was *not* a mere poetic fiction and that it was probably the product of his own feelings of privation and neglect by selfish patrons is corroborated (as argued in the previous chapter) by the complaints of his contemporary, Martial.¹⁸ For Juvenal, the blame for the plight of dependants like himself and their feelings of alienation from Roman society lay with those classes whose greed and decadence were directly responsible for the corruption of the patron-client relationship. Cause and effect are vividly portrayed in the first flurry of images with which he assails his audience:

*cum tener uxorem ducat spado, Mevia Tuscum
figat aprum et nuda teneat venabula mamma,
patricios¹⁹ omnis opibus cum provocet unus
quo tondente gravis iuveni mihi barba sonabat,
cum pars Niliacae plebis, cum verna Canopi
Crispinus Tyrias umero revocante lacernas
ventilet aestivum digitis sudantibus aurum
nec sufferre queat maioris pondera gemmae,
difficile est saturam non scribere, nam quis iniquae*

¹⁷ For detailed discussions of the contemporary relevance of Juvenal satirical targets, see Gérard (1976) and Marache (1989); for more sceptical assessments, see, for example, Cloud (1989:205-18) and Bardon (1977:996-1002).

¹⁸ See Colton (1976) for similarities in detail between 1.95-134 and passages in Martial's *Epigrams*: 'The chief social bond between the two poets appears to be the fact both were dependent on wealthy men for their small income, and that both resented the patrons who supported them and the system which degraded them' (35).

¹⁹ On Juvenal's use of *patricii* to signify *nobiles* (cf. *triscuria patriciorum*, 8.190; *artes patricias*, 4.102; *gentis patriciae*, 10.332), see Friedländer 1895:135: 'Der Gebrauch ist wol dadurch entstanden, dass nobiles nicht en den Hexameter passte.'

*tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus, ut teneat se,
causdici nova cum veniat lectica Mathonis
plena ipso, post hunc magni delator amici
et cito rapturus de nobilitate comesa
quod superest, quem Massa timet, quem munere palpat
Carus et a trepido Thymele summissa Latino;
cum te summoveant qui testamenta merentur
noctibus, in caelum quos evehit optima summi
nunc via processus, vetulae vesica beatae? (1.22-39)*

This is a bold and arresting statement of Juvenal's theme, a loud and discordant flourish designed to startle his audience, which has been asked (ironically) to listen calmly and objectively to the author's justification of his choice of genre (*si vacat ac placidi rationem admittitis, edam*, 21). The passage is significant not only for its dramatic quality in its particular context, but also because within the first eleven lines (and the sentence has not yet ended!) it reveals the major satirical impulses which resonate, to a greater or lesser degree, throughout Juvenal's writings: his contempt for the moral decadence of the upper classes; his dismay at the decay of the fabric of the 'traditional' Roman social order; his resentment at the impoverishment of free-born Romans; his revulsion at the greed and excessive affluence of the rich; his xenophobic contempt for foreign upstarts who usurp the 'traditional' rights and roles of Roman citizens and flaunt their wealth; his feelings of alienation from his own city); and his antipathy towards sexual deviancy.

The general notion of a perverted 'natural order' (in both a moral and social sense) is succinctly conveyed by the image of a eunuch taking a wife - the perverseness of the act underscored by the paradox of the female's union with a 'male' partner who is both *tener* and impotent²⁰ - and by the equally shocking image of a woman 'pig-sticker' participating in a *venatio* in the Roman arena. Most importantly, this is no shameless

²⁰ The very word order contributes to the sense of moral and social dysfunction: *tener* is juxtaposed with but does *not* describe, as one would expect, *uxorem*; *spado* is juxtaposed with and is linked - bizarrely - with the verb *ducat*.

'Sheila' from the *Subura*, but a *female* member of the Roman aristocracy²¹ indulging in the ultimate act of shamelessness for a person of her class. Juvenal clearly understood the power of misogyny to engage the attention of a predominantly, if not exclusively, male audience (nicely accomplished, too, by the later reference to an old woman with an itching libido).

While this image provides a striking introduction to his indictment of the upper classes, the sneers at the barber-turned-millionaire (24-5)²² and the repulsive and undeservedly²³ affluent lawyer Matho (32-3) also bring to the fore Juvenal's personal resentment at being upstaged and humiliated by wealthy upstarts;²⁴ even more despicable are lowly-bred eastern immigrants like Crispinus, whose flaunting of Roman regalia is tantamount to an act of desecration. Juvenal's loathing of Crispinus is compounded, of course, by the fact that he had insinuated himself into the imperial court and wielded an influence totally at variance with his despicable origins.²⁵ It is significant that Juvenal's contempt

²¹ See Friedländer 1895:134; Courtney 1980:89; Ferguson 1979:113; Braund 1996:81.

²² Colton (1991:26-7) suggests that this is probably the famous barber Cinnamus, the target of Martial's sarcasm in *Ep.* 7.64; Juvenal, unlike Martial, focuses solely on his great wealth (cf. 10.225, where mention is made of his many villas).

²³ At 11.34 he is described as a *bucca* ('wind-bag'). In Courtney's (1980:92) opinion, the reference to him as a bankrupt *causidicus* at 7.106 'turns out to be poor support for Juvenal's claim that the corrupt are unfairly rewarded'. This, however, does not detract from the fact that he was unjustly enriched in the first place; if anything, it intensifies one's contempt for such a charlatan.

²⁴ The 'injustice' of it obviously rankled sufficiently for Juvenal to repeat the line at 10.226. Martial also mentions a 'Matho' in several of his poems; in 7.10, his extravagance is emphasized in a particularly striking way: *centenis fuit Matho milibus*.

²⁵ Martial had hoped to benefit from Crispinus' intimacy with the *princeps*: *sic placidum videas semper, Crispine, Tonantem / nec te Roma minus quam tua Memphis amet, / carmina Parrhasia si nostra legentur in aula, / (namque solent sacra Caesaris aure frui) / dicere de nobis ut lector candidus aude . . .* (*Ep.* 7.99.1-5). In 8.47 Martial characterises him as a *deliciae* (6), who wears a *Tyriam* . . . *abollam* (1) - a trait which Juvenal was to exploit to the full. Flintoff (1990:126) puts forward the interesting argument that 'far . . . from being a humble slave or ex-slave of 'Egyptian' blood it seems almost certain that Crispinus must have been a Roman of equestrian background . . . who simply happened to have been born in Egypt' and that his enormous wealth could, in fact, have come from the highly lucrative food-importing business. See also White (1974:377-82), who refutes the assumption that Crispinus 'must have had some position of responsibility in order to participate in Domitian's council of state.' It is quite possible that Crispinus is unfairly caricatured; but, given Juvenal's obsessive antipathy towards the

goes beyond the individuals themselves to the upper classes: the fact that the latter can allow their privileges of wealth and status to be 'usurped' is clear evidence of their decadence and their betrayal of their traditional role in Roman society.

A fundamental cause of the malaise is the corruption of the patron-client relationship: *ira* is a wholly appropriate response when one is jostled by hordes of clients dancing attendance on thoroughly despicable characters, who are impervious to feelings of guilt as long as there is profit involved; or when a corrupt and decadent noble (Marius Priscus, proconsul of Africa) can revel in luxurious and lucrative exile.²⁶ Also symptomatic of the destruction of trust between patron and client is the treacherous practice of *delatio*, for which Domitian's reign in particular was notorious. The *amici* or *clientes*, on whose support the power and prestige of the patrons traditionally depended, now wield formidable power over the latter; yet, at the same time, Juvenal cannot conceal his contempt for the nobility, whose decadence he emphasises with a stark metaphor: *de nobilitate comesa / quod superest*.²⁷

Thus, within the first fifty lines of his opening *Satire*, Juvenal has created an indelible impression of a nobility which is in the process of being destroyed by its own greed, moral decay and dereliction of its social duties. Juvenal assails his listeners with a flurry of negative *exempla*, whose profusion and concentration are clearly at variance with

Egyptians - note his sneering reference to the Jewish-born Tiberius Iulius Alexander, Prefect of Egypt in 66-70, as *nescio quis . . . Aegyptius atque Arabaches* (*Sat.* 1.129; see Courtney 1980:110) and his scathing denunciations in *Satire* 15 - the slightest Egyptian connection would have provided him with a suitable platform for attack. On Juvenal's reactionary attitude towards social mobility, see Reekmans 1971:117-61 and Malnati 1988:133-41.

²⁶ *quid referam quanta siccum iecur ardeat ira,
cum populum gregibus comitum premit hic spoliator
pupilli prostantis et hic damnatus inani
iudicio? quid enim salvis infamia nummis?
exul ab octava Marius bibit et fruitur dis
iratis, at tu victrix, provincia, ploras.* (1.45-8)

²⁷ Compare the images of physical decay and dismemberment at *Sat.* 8.4-5.

everyday normality;²⁸ yet, despite this poetic licence, it is significant that none of them, individually, can be dismissed as impossible or excessively exaggerated: eunuchs (*spadones*) were legally entitled to marry;²⁹ women *did* fight in the arena;³⁰ rich *parvenus* (especially of foreign extraction) were a source of resentment for Romans of Juvenal's time;³¹ the lawyer Matho also features in Martial's *Epigrams*;³² informers were rife during Juvenal's life-time, especially during Domitian's reign;³³ Marius Priscus was a latter-day Verres, whose prosecution by Tacitus and the younger Pliny for extortion and *saevitia* would have ensured his notoriety for Juvenal's contemporaries;³⁴ and *captatio*, of course, was a regular - and often unscrupulous - source of enrichment in Roman society. There is also ample evidence for Juvenal's contention that affluence springs from dishonesty: *criminibus debent hortos, praetoria, mensas, / argentum vetus*

²⁸ 'But if we take a step back and ask ourselves on what street in contemporary London or New York you would see such a parade of scandalous and criminal behaviour, all in one day, the answer is clear and illuminating - none. It is evident that our satirist is here using the common satiric technique of distortion - that is, distortion by suppression and omission of the ordinary, everyday and uninteresting aspects of life in the city and by exaggeration of the extraordinary, colourful and fascinating aspects of life in the city' (Braund 1989:25).

²⁹ See Courtney 1980:89.

³⁰ Women performed in the arena during Nero's time (Tac. *Ann.* 15.32); Domitian, significantly, encouraged women to do the same (Suet. *Dom.* 4). See Ferguson 1979:113; Courtney 1980:89.

³¹ Petronius' Trimalchio provides the symbol *par excellence* of this type; while he belonged to the world of fiction, Domitian's favourite, Paris, and the notorious Crispinus did not. Pliny, after discussing the extraordinary wealth of Crassus, makes the point that the early principate saw the rise of even richer ex-slaves: *multos postea cognovimus servitute liberatos opulentiores, pariterque tres Claudii principatu paulo ante Callistum, Pallentem, Narcissum* (N.H. 33.134). Juvenal's indignation at being 'upstaged' by foreign upstarts (cf. Umbricius' tirade in *Satire* 3) is understandable: 'Sociological historians, working on the evidence of surviving epitaphs, are driven to accept Juvenal's general picture of the population of Rome and to believe that by the first century of the Empire only a small portion of the city-residents of Rome were of genuine Italian-Roman stock' (Balsdon 1979:14).

³² Mart. *Ep.* 10.46. The modern reader should be equally familiar with the idea of the 'fat cat' lawyer.

³³ Courtney (1980:92) points out that the characters mentioned by Juvenal - Baebius Massa and Mettius Carus - were notorious informers under Domitian, the former being especially contemptible as an ex-slave who rose to the rank of senator (see Ferguson 1979:114), while Latinus was a well-known mime-artist.

³⁴ Pliny, *Ep.* 2.11.

et stantem extra pocula caprum (75-6). It is, therefore, misleading to speak of the satirist's 'irrational rage'.³⁵

Throughout *Satire* 1, the upper classes remain a regular target of Juvenal's animosity. The Roman equivalent of the wheel-spinning teenager showing off in his father's car (*pervolat axe citato* / *Flaminiam puer Automedon*, 60-1), who feels entitled (*fas esse putet*, 58) to the command of a cohort but who squanders his inheritance on the races, displays precisely the lack of responsibility and the flawed *virtus*, which become the focus of *Satire* 8. His decadence, in Juvenal's reactionary view, is aggravated by the fact that he (like the consul Lateranus in *Satire* 8) is boorish enough to drive the vehicle *himself* (*ipse*, 62), in order to impress his girl-friend; and the latter, to make things even more scandalous, flouts convention as a 'cross-dresser' (*lacernatae . . . amicae*, 62).³⁶

To the modern reader, criticism of such 'trivial' misdemeanours as that of driving the vehicle himself might seem indicative of an insufferably censorious and reactionary mind; but this would be to underestimate the importance (to the conservative Roman) of the quality of *gravitas*. The willful flouting of this aristocratic *sine qua non* could indeed arouse *indignatio*. As Ferguson observes, 'The Romans could forgive Nero his cruelties, but not his stage appearances. They could forgive him for being a tyrant, but not for being a mountebank. They could forgive his offences against *humanitas*, but not his offences against *gravitas*.'³⁷ If the importance of the latter is given due weight, it makes Juvenal's assertion *facit indignatio versum* harder to dismiss as mere rhetorical posturing: the loss of *gravitas* is inherent in almost every indictment of the aristocracy.³⁸

³⁵ Anderson 1982:301.

³⁶ It has been suggested (see Ferguson 1979:116) that there may be a homosexual jibe here, *lacernatae* indicating that the passenger is male and *amicae* being satirical in its gender.

³⁷ Ferguson 1958:176.

³⁸ Perhaps the clearest example of the 'sin' of triviality is provided by the fourth *Satire*, in which Domitian summons his Privy Council to discuss what should be done with a fish.

Every detail in the description of the 'young Automedon' is redolent of Juvenal's contempt. So, too, is the portrayal of the next representative of the moneyed classes: an odious forger of wills, who lolls with Maecenas-like effeteness and obesity in his limousine-litter (*sexta cervice feratur*, 64). Even more shocking in this cavalcade of iniquity is the high-born woman (*matrona potens*, 69), who murders her own husband in the most insidious and cowardly way and who inspires others to do likewise and to be brazen enough to walk 'in mourning' behind their husbands' poison-blackened corpses (*instituitque rudes melior Locusta propinquas / per famam et populum nigros efferre maritos*, 71-2). The despicable crime of poisoning one's relatives is again associated with the rich and powerful at lines 158-9: *qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita, vehatur / pensilibus plumis atque illinc despiciat nos?* The decay of traditional family values is endemic in Roman society: daughters-in-law are seduced for money, brides-to-be are already unfaithful (*turpes*, 78) and schoolboys commit adultery (*praetextatus adulter*, 78). Such a depressing survey makes it hardly likely that Juvenal's contemporaries would have detected any tongue-in-cheek playfulness in his next statement: *si natura negat, facit indignatio versum qualemcumque potest, quales ego vel Cluvienus* (79-80).³⁹ Jenkyns makes an interesting observation on the tone of this remark:

³⁹ Nothing is known of Cluvienus; but it is by no means certain that he was 'no great poet' (Eichholz 1956:61) or 'clearly some poetaster' (Courtney 1980:102), or 'a third rate poet, if poet at all' (Romano 1979:72), or that the concluding phrase is 'a piece of witty bathos' (Ferguson 1979:117) and that it ends a strong passage of invective and protest in a 'limp fashion' (Baldwin 1967:305); see also Cloud and Braund 1982:78. Nor is it necessary to see *Cluvienus* as a metrical cover-name to replace that of a real contemporary poet mentioned in the original recitation of the poem (Highet 1954:289-94). Juvenal could well be referring to a like-minded contemporary, who is also inspired by a sense of outrage; earlier, he draws attention to the satirical vigour of Lucilius (1.20) and the incisiveness of Horace (1.51). Furthermore, Cluvienus' obscurity provides no sound basis for assumptions like those above: Quintilian, in the course of his remarks on Roman satirists, mentions *sunt clari hodieque et qui olim nominabuntur* (*Inst.* 10.1.94; see also Knoche 1975:140-1 on satirists in the time of Domitian). Of course, Quintilian was writing before Juvenal's time; yet, if we have no knowledge of the satirists whom he deemed worthy of mention, it is perhaps rash to view Cluvienus as merely an object of ridicule. On the other hand, if indeed Cluvienus was an untalented writer, Juvenal's point might be that the scope for satire was so wide that *any* writer could make some trenchant observations.

. . . the lines as they stand seem to express not exuberant anger but a self-contemptuous pessimism: the sort of verse that 'indignatio' produces is mean stuff. The writer of *satura* conventionally alludes to the lowness of his muse, but here we have neither Horace's studied modesty nor Persius' gay burlesque of convention; instead there is a sullen chafing at the bit.⁴⁰

Juvenal's reiteration of the human relevance of his satirical themes (*ex quo Deucalion . . . quidquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas, / gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est*, 81-6) is deceptive in both its scope and its blandness; for he immediately focuses, with renewed vehemence, on the issue that is at the root of the evil: *et quando uberior vitiorum copia? quando / maior avaritiae patuit sinus?* (87-9). Not only do these questions emphasise the symbiosis in Juvenal's mind of *vitium* and *avaritia*, but they also show that the poet is concerned with the 'apocalyptic' decadence of his time in particular.⁴¹ If one envisages the speaker as a struggling and resentful member of the client-class himself, it is quite understandable that the first theme which is developed in some detail and which dominates the rest of this programmatic *Satire* would seem to spring directly from his own bitter observation of the widening gulf between patron and client. It is significant that the first vice which Juvenal dwells on as exemplifying the selfish greed of the affluent classes is precisely that which heads the list of indictments of the aristocracy in the eighth *Satire*: reckless gambling. In both instances, Juvenal associates the practice with unmanliness and decadence: *their* mighty battles are fought on the surface of a gambling-table, *their* armourbearers are bankers and croupiers (*proelia quanta illic dispensatore videbis / armigero!*, 91-2); and later, when he pictures the aristocrat Ponticus gambling until sleep overtakes him at dawn - in the very presence of the portrait-busts of his warrior ancestors (*bellatorum*, 8.10) - he underscores the shameful contrast by pointing out that this was the time

⁴⁰ Jenkyns 1982:159.

⁴¹ *Avantia* as a prime cause of the subversion of Rome's traditional moral standards was a familiar and long-established theme (cf. Sallust, *B.C.* 11.5-8; see Earl 1967:18-9), but Juvenal was to denounce this vice with unsurpassed vividness and vigour.

when the generals of old would already be on the march (*quo signa duces et castra movebant*, 8.12).⁴²

Such greed of the affluent, Juvenal implies, is not to be explained away glibly as mere madness but is indicative of inhumane cruelty: *simplexne furor sestertia centum / perdere et horrenti tunicam non reddere servo?* (92-3). This trait is given fuller treatment in the fifth *Satire*, where Virro is portrayed as deriving perverse pleasure from the suffering of his 'inferior' dependant Trebius.⁴³ Selfish greed is illustrated even more clearly in the context of the *cena*, and the contemporary phenomenon of the glutton who refuses to share his meal with his dependants (*quis fercula septem / secreto cenavit avus*, 94-5)⁴⁴ facilitates a neat transition to Juvenal's dominant satirical theme, the plight of the client-class: *nunc sportula primo / limine parva sedet turbae rapienda togatae* (95-6). The degradation of this sector of the citizen-body is starkly conveyed by the notion of a 'toga-clad rabble' and the picture of Roman citizens reduced to being scavengers on the doorsteps of their wealthy *amici* and treated with contempt by the latter's slave-minions. Such is the power of wealth, that it can make a mockery of Rome's traditional social order:

*iubet a praecone vocari
ipsos Troiugenas, nam vexant limen et ipsi
nobiscum. 'da praetori, da deinde tribuno.'*

⁴² Edwards (1993:180) draws attention to the fact that it is the prodigality of the rich upper classes - rather than wealthy freedmen, for example - which is the concern of moralists. 'The prodigal pose a threat to society, in part because, by surrendering to the attractions of a life of pleasure, they call into question the desirability of a life of virtue. But they also disrupt the social order by causing money to flow outside its proper channels . . . For moralists, money should stay within the family, allowing the sons to enjoy the same social position as their fathers, and contributing to the general stability of Roman society.' This type of indulgence of the part of the elite is aggravated by the fact that, far from being condemned, it is viewed as socially beneficial: *alea turpis, / turpe et adulterium mediocribus: haec eadem illi / omnia cum faciunt, hilares nitidique vocantur* (Juv. Sat. 11.176-8).

⁴³ *forsitan inpensae Virronem parcere credas.
hoc agit, ut doleas . . .* (5.156-7)

⁴⁴ On non-participation in communal meals as indicative of social 'deviancy' and *avaritia*, see Braund 1996:37-42. This reprehensible trait is emphasized again at 1.135-41 and 4.22.

*sed libertinus prior est. 'prior' inquit 'ego adsum.
 cur timeam dubitemve locum defendere, quamvis
 natus ad Euphraten, molles quod in aure fenestrae
 arguerint, licet ipse negem? sed quinque tabernae
 quadringenta parant. quid confert purpura maior
 optandum, si Laurenti custodit in agro
 conductas Corvinus ovis, ego possideo plus
 Pallante et Licinis?' expectent ergo tribuni,
 vincant divitiae, sacro ne cedat honori
 nuper in hanc urbem pedibus qui venerat albis . . . (99-111)*

Juvenal's portrayal of the degradation of the client-class is unpalatable, in the same way as he shows how Trebius in *Satire 5* and the indigent poets in *Satire 7* are debased by their circumstances; but he leaves no doubt as to who is responsible for the malaise in Roman society. The corruption of the relationship between patron and client is the direct consequence of the greed for wealth and the consequent collapse of aristocratic values and self-respect. If clients are reduced to exciting pity or to deviousness to eke out a living (e.g. bringing sick or pregnant wives with them, 121-2; claiming on behalf of an absent spouse, 123-6), that is clearly the consequence of their predicament: *quid facient comites quibus hinc toga, calceus hinc est / et panis fumusque domi?* (119-20). Juvenal's account of the *salutatio* suggests considerable familiarity on his part - perhaps the words *nam vexant limen et ipsi / nobiscum* (100-1) should be seen as a suggestive detail - and the description of indigent clients leaving their patron's door empty-handed and desperate is full of empathy, rather than contempt:

*vestibulis abeunt veteres lassique clientes
 votaue deponunt, quamquam longissima cenae
 spes homini; caulis miseris atque ignis emendus. (132-4)*

This empathy is underscored by the sneering contempt evident in the contrasting cameo of the repulsive patron who eats himself to an untimely death in greedy solitude

(like the man mentioned in lines 94-5) and, in so doing, exposes the sham of his friends' professed affection:⁴⁵

*optima silvarum interea pelagi vorabit
rex horum vacuisque toris tantum ipse iacebit.
nam de tot pulchris et latis orbibus et tam
antiquis una comedunt patrimonia mensa.
nullus iam parasitus erit. sed quis ferat istas
luxuriae sordes?*⁴⁶ *quanta est gula quae sibi totos
ponit apros, animal propter convivia natum!
poena tamen praesens, cum tu deponis amictus
turgidus et crudum pavonem in balneum portas.
hinc subitae mortes atque intestata senectus.
it nova nec tristis per cunctas fabula cenas;
ducitur iratis plaudendum funus amicis. (135-46)*

This caricature, dominated by the revolting image of a paunch distended by its undigested contents, provides a brilliantly scathing finale to his indictment of the elite. The shameful contrast with the plight of the wretched clients in the preceding lines is made even more pointed by the poet's direct mockery of this Virro-like figure in lines 142-6;⁴⁷ and the reaction of his *amici* to his sudden death once again emphasises the utter perversion of the values which formerly characterized the patron-client

⁴⁵ Reminiscent of Horace's contention in *Sermones* 1.3 that true friendship cannot exist where money is central to the relationship.

⁴⁶ Cf. Pliny *Ep.* 6.7: *memento nihil magis esse vitandum quam istam luxuriae et sordium novam societatem.*

⁴⁷ Virro himself is the target of an impassioned address by the poet (5.107-12).

relationship.⁴⁸ This passage thus provides a cogent illustration of his pessimistic conviction that he lives in an age on the brink of moral collapse:

*nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat
posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores,
omne in praecipiti vitium stetit . . .* (147-9)

Juvenal's *ira* and *indignatio* are not to be dismissed as wholly contrived trademarks of his style of satire. The elder Seneca, for example, articulated the same concerns (albeit in a less vivid and compelling manner) in a passage that is worth quoting for its resonances with Juvenal's first and second *Satires*:

*id quod unum toto agimus animo, nondum perfecimus ut pessimi
essemus; adhuc in processu vitia sunt. invenit luxuria aliquid novi, in quod
insaniam; invenit impudicitia novam contumeliam sibi; invenit deliciarum
dissolutio et tabes aliquid adhuc tenerius molliusque, quo pereat. non
dum satis robur omne proiecimus; adhuc quicquid est boni moris
extinguimus. levitate et politura corporum muliebres munditias
antecessimus, colores meretricios matronis quidem non induendos viri
sumimus, tenero et molli ingressu suspendimus gradum (non ambulamus
sed incedimus), exornamus anulis digitos, in omni articulo gemma
disponitur. cotidie comminiscimur per quae virilitati fiat iniuria, ut
traducatur, quia non potest exui; alius genitalia excidit, alius in obscenam
ludi partem fugit et, locatus ad mortem, infamae armaturae genus in quo
morbum suum exerceat legit.*⁴⁹

⁴⁸ With reference to line 144, Eden (1985:334-5) maintains that Juvenal envisages two possible outcomes for the extravagantly self-indulgent glutton: either sudden death or survival into an old age which his gluttony has impoverished (cf. line 138: *comedunt patrimonia*). The latter 'punishment' is seen again at 11.44-5: *non praematuri cineres nec funus acerbum / luxuriae sed morte magis metuenda senectus*.

⁴⁹ N.Q. 7.311-3. The *infamae armaturae genus* is that of the *retarius*.

The character traits and attitudes which emerge from the first *Satire* as a whole are clearly consistent with the conservative and reactionary personality which dominates the first fifty lines: in the words of Peter Green, 'a class-conscious, resentful, well-read, xenophobic, envious, slightly down-at-heels provincial poet' and a 'nasty misogynist and nagging moral grumbler'.⁵⁰ It is quite apparent that, in attacking the symptoms of this dysfunctional society, Juvenal sees the decadence of the upper classes as the ultimate cause; and it is also obvious that bitterness stemming from his *own* lot as a struggling dependant and from his sense of estrangement in an increasingly 'foreign' Rome is a powerful catalyst in his satire. Once again, a passage from Seneca (despite its somewhat more balanced perspective) lends credibility to Juvenal's reactionary attitude, this time towards the influx of foreigners in search of the 'Roman dream':

*aspice agedum hanc frequentiam, cui vix urbis immensae tecta sufficiunt; maxima pars istius turbae patria caret. ex municipiis et colonis suis, ex toto denique orbe terrarum confluerunt. alios adduxit ambitio, alios necessitas officii publici, alios imposita legatio, alios luxuria opportunum et opulentum vitiis locum quaerens, alios liberalium studiorum cupiditas, alios spectacula; quosdam traxit amicitia, quosdam industria laxam ostendendae virtuti nancta materiam; quidam venalem eloquentiam - nullum non hominum genus concurrat in urbem et virtutibus et vitiis magna pretia ponentem. iube istos omnes ad nomen citari et "unde domo" quisque sit quaere. videbis maiorem partem esse, quae relictis sedibus suis venerit in maximam quidem et pulcherrimam urbem, non tamen suam.*⁵¹

⁵⁰ Green 1989:252-3.

⁵¹ Sen. *Consol. ad Helv. matr.* 6.2-3.

The theme of Juvenal's second *Satire* provides a vehicle for a far more focused and stinging indictment of Rome's elite.⁵² Secret vice,⁵³ especially sexual depravity, concealed under a veneer of bogus morality offers the satirist rich possibilities: *haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna?* (1.51). Juvenal's aim, however, goes further than the exposure of hypocritical 'paragons' of *virtus* and the condemnation of their passive homosexuality and effeminacy.⁵⁴ His real concern is to show how another fatal flaw in the moral character of the upper classes makes them quite unworthy of their traditional role in Roman society⁵⁵ - a conviction which receives broader treatment in *Satire* 8, under the guise of a discussion of what constitutes true *virtus*. The truism *nemo repente fuit turpissimus* (83) is demonstrated by the inexorable progression from the devious secrecy of those *qui Curios simulant et Bacchanalia vivunt* (3) to the flagrant ostentation of a homosexual marriage ceremony conducted in public (*fient ista palam, cupient et in acta referri*, 136). The implications of such decadence for Rome's reputation are vividly conveyed by the conclusion of the *Satire*: not only are the Romans morally inferior to the 'barbarians' whom they have conquered (*sed quae nunc populi fiunt victoris in urbe / non faciunt illi quos vicimus*, 162-3),⁵⁶ but the contagion of Rome's 'upper class morals' now threatens to 'unman' and corrupt these virile and warlike nations as well.⁵⁷

⁵² On Juvenal's altering, strengthening and improving of material borrowed from Martial's *Epigrams*, see Colton 1965:68-71; cf. Highet 1951:371: 'One of Juvenal's most interesting achievements was to make serious and positive poetry out of Martial's little intimations of immorality.'

⁵³ Taylor, R. 1997:327: 'Rome's literary moralists thought it a terrible thing for a free adult male to be an open pathic, and it was even worse if he hid it.'

⁵⁴ For a detailed discussion of passive homosexuality in *Satire* 2, see Richlin 1993:541-54.

⁵⁵ Konstan (1993:14) makes the observation that 'assuming attributes of the opposite sex is not a sign of 'homosexuality' but a particularly conspicuous and funny violation of the proprieties of power or domination.'

⁵⁶ Juvenal exploits this embarrassing comparison again in *Sat.* 8.116-8.

⁵⁷ To translate *praetextatos* as 'teenage' (e.g. Rudd) runs counter to the whole thrust of the *Satire*, which is an expose of the moral decadence of the ruling classes (including the *princeps* himself). The agent of corruption in this instance is a *tribunus* - hardly a *puer*.

*mittentur braciae, cultelli, frena, flagellum:
sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores.* (169-70)

At no point does Juvenal allow his audience to forget that his target is the upper classes. From the outset we are in the domain of the aristocrats – in their very homes, *plena omnia gypso / Chrysippi* (4-5), where their pretended emulation of their venerable forebears cloaks their licentiousness (*qui Curios simulant et Bacchanalia vivunt*, 3). The paradox of the ‘submissiveness’ of the ‘manly’ ruling elite is luridly portrayed:

*hispida membra quidem et durae per bracchia saetae
promittunt atrocem animum, sed podice levi
caeduntur tumidae medico ridente mariscae.* (11-3)

And the decadence of these *Socratici cinaedi* is underscored by a telling contrast with homosexuals who are ‘born that way’ and who make no attempt to disguise their ‘malady’:

*horum simplicitas miserabilis, his furor ipse
dat veniam; sed peiores, qui talia verbis
Herculis invadunt et de virtute locuti
clunem agitant.* (18-21)

The focus on the nobility is sustained by the senatorial name⁵⁸ of the addressee in the next sentence (*Sexte, verebor?*, 21) and by the scathing indictment of Domitian’s hypocrisy and immorality:

*qualis erat nuper tragico pollutus adulter
concubitu, qui tunc leges revocabat amaras
omnibus atque ipsis Veneri Martique timendas,
cum tot abortivis fecundam Iulia vulvam*

⁵⁸ See Ferguson 1979:128.

solveret et patruo similes effunderet offas. (29-33)

When Laronia⁵⁹ upbraids males for their submissive sexual roles, including *fellatio*, she uses the example of Hispo, who *subit iuvenes et morbo pallet utroque* (50). This name is rare, but the fact that a Ti. Caepio Hispo was proconsul of Asia in 117-8 is a likely indicator of the social class of the offender.⁶⁰ When Juvenal turns to examples of overtly effeminate behaviour, there can be little doubt about the aristocratic character of the names Creticus, Otho and Gracchus;⁶¹ and Juvenal accentuates the degeneracy of this class by contrasting it with the rough simplicity and rectitude of the ordinary citizen. When Creticus is pictured appearing in public in women's chiffon (an overt sign of his *mollitia*),⁶² the contrast is almost laboured:

*en habitum quo te leges ac iura ferentem
vulneribus crudis populus modo victor et illud
montanum positus audiret vulgus aratri* (72-4).

A similarly bizarre and sarcastic contrast is achieved by portraying the pathic Otho fussing over his effeminate toilette on the battlefield:

⁵⁹ Laronia's status is unknown; Green (1998:129) sees her as 'a smart upper-crust adulteress', pointing to the fact that a Q. Laronius was suffect-consul in 33 B.C. However, given the *infamia* attached to prostitutes (see Edwards 1997:81-2), it would make her denunciation all the more ironic and pointed if she belonged to that class. Hallett (1997:265-6) remarks that Juvenal's display of 'witty tolerance' towards female homoeroticism in this passage (in contrast to Martial's scathing indictment of it) is an example of Juvenal's 'literary opportunism'.

⁶⁰ On the name Ti. Caepio Hispo see Syme 1939:14-5.

⁶¹ A Creticus, descended from Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus, who was honoured for his victory in Crete in 62 BCE, is mentioned at 8.38. Courtney (1980:132-3) argues that, if the women mentioned are correctly dated to Juvenal's time, this cannot be the person referred to, since the Caecilii Metelli had long been extinct. Whoever is meant - Martial (7.90.4) mentions a Creticus - it is clear that the name belongs to an echelon exemplified by similar honorifics mentioned by Juvenal: Asturicus (3.212), Ponticus (8.1), Allobrigus (8.13), Gaetulicus (8.26), Bithynicus (15.1).

⁶² On this and other typical characteristics of *mollitia*, see Edwards 1993:68-70; on Juvenal's particular aversion towards 'transgressive' men, see Gold 1998:380-1.

*nimirum summi ducis est occidere Galbam
et curare cutem, summi constantia civis
Bebriaci campis solium adfectare Palati
et pressum in faciem digitis extendere panem* (104-7).

Juvenal makes the homosexual 'marriage'⁶³ of Gracchus even more scandalous by setting it against the backdrop of rituals redolent of ancient ideals of sanctity and *virtus*: Gracchus, believe it or not, was once a member of the Salian brotherhood, *qui sacra ferens nutantia loro / sudavit clipeis ancilibus* (125-6); and, of course, his membership of that ancient *collegia* draws attention to his patrician lineage. Such is the travesty of social rank and sacred traditions that the absence of some sort of divine intervention even calls into question the *virtus* of Romulus and Mars; and, once again, the ideal of hardy peasant simplicity - now in the process of being corrupted - is evoked by the reference to the 'shepherds of Latium':

*o pater urbis,
unde nefas tantum Latiis pastoribus? unde
haec tetigit, Gradive, tuos urtica nepotes?* (126-8)

Gracchus makes a mockery of the traditionally dominant role of the aristocrat by taking on the attributes of female submissiveness, both in his effeminate attire and in playing the female role in his marriage - a point which Juvenal emphasises repeatedly and with increasing disdain (*quadringenta dedit Gracchus sestertia dotem*, 117; *gremio iacuit nova nupta mariti*, 120; *traditur ecce viro clarus genere atque opibus vir*, 129). However, as Konstan points out, 'insofar . . . as sexuality is imagined along the lines of dominance and submission, it is readily analogised to other unequal relationships of power such as class (e.g. aristocrat and slave), ethnicity (native and foreigner), or the relationship

⁶³ Taylor (199:340) points out (in the light of documented instances of homosexual imitation of heterosexual family behaviour in other societies, notably the men of the great European centres of the 18th century who performed same-sex weddings and even mimicked childbirth) that 'Juvenal's vitriolic description of an all-male marriage, although substantially embellished, seems believable.' The 20th century, which has seen homosexual unions accorded legal sanction in several countries, has transformed Juvenal's fantasy into reality.

between conqueror and vanquished...⁶⁴ So, the fact that the aristocrat Gracchus submitted to a lowly foreigner - probably of servile status or background (*cornicini* 118) - makes his degeneracy even more despicable. Yet, even that was not his ultimate disgrace (*vicit et hoc monstrum*, 143); for the betrayal of his social obligations is shown even more emphatically by his appearance in the arena as a net-fighter, which was the lowest order of gladiator in a sport in which the participants were normally drawn from the ranks of slaves and foreigners.⁶⁵ Appropriately, Juvenal depicts Gracchus, an aristocrat of nobler birth (*generosior*, 145) than the Marcelli, Fabii *et al.*, fleeing across the middle of the arena before his social inferior. There could hardly be a more vivid illustration of the flouting of the principles of *gravitas* than this. When Juvenal recounts this incident again in the eighth *Satire*, he aptly captures the mortification of Gracchus' opponent at being party to such a flagrant and public humiliation, not only of the man but of the ideals which he ought to represent in the public eye: *ergo ignominiam graviorem pertulit omni / volnere cum Graccho iussus pugnare secutor* (8.209-10).⁶⁶

The degeneracy of the contemporary aristocracy is again brought into sharp focus by the next vignette, in which Juvenal pictures the reaction of revered figures of the past during a 'Virgilian' encounter in the underworld with the likes of this Gracchus: *cuperent lustrari, si qua darentur / sulphura cum taedis et si foret umida laurus* (157-8). The point, of course, is underscored by the choice of names synonymous with military prowess and true *virtus*: Curio, the Scipiones, Fabricius, Camillus and those who fought at

⁶⁴ Konstan 1993:12-3; cf. Walters (1998:152): ' . . . what is at stake is a concept of manliness which is irreducibly bound up with the holding of power over others, and which is radically incompatible with being the object of power to another. For a respectable Roman to be sexually penetrated, used 'like a woman' by another man, and for him to appear as part of the spectacle in the arena, were both conceptualised as examples, in fact paradigms, of the state of being in the power of another . . . '

⁶⁵ The lowly status of the *retiarius* is given more emphasis in the later account of Gracchus' antics: *et illic / dedecus urbis habes, nec murmillonis in armis / nec clipeo Gracchum pugnantem aut falce supina* (8.199-201); cf. also 6.09-12: . . . *quod nec retia turpi / iunguntur tunicae, nec cella ponit eadem / munimenta umeri pulsatoremque tridentem / qui nudus pugnare solet*.

⁶⁶ For a full discussion of the *infamia* incurred by association with the arena and the theatrical stage, see Edwards 1997:66-95.

Cremera and Cannae. Juvenal starts this scene by debunking the very idea of the underworld (*nec pueri credunt*, 152),⁶⁷ but so bizarre is the mockery which the likes of Gracchus make of aristocratic ideals, that fantasy becomes an appropriate medium.⁶⁸ However, in the conclusion to the *Satire*, Juvenal moves from the world of make-believe to the reality of Rome's power over its conquered nations; but, instead of proudly imposing its traditional *mores* on its subjects, Rome now becomes the exporter of insidious moral corruption:

et tamen unus
Armenius Zalaces cunctis narratur ephebis
mollior ardenti sese indulsisse tribuno.
aspice quid faciant commercia: venerat obses,
hic fiunt homines. nam si mora longior urbem
indulget pueris, non umquam derit amator.
mittentur braciae, cultelli, frena, flagellum:
sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores (163-70).

The fact that it is a Roman official (*tribuno*) who is the agent of corruption is richly ironic and another telling indictment of the elite.⁶⁹ The yawning gulf between ideal and reality and between past and present, particularly at the leadership level, becomes a potent

⁶⁷ Such mocking scepticism is exactly in keeping with his attitude towards other mythological tales in *Satire* 1.

⁶⁸ Winkler's (1983:26-7) interpretation of this passage - which he sees as an example of Juvenal's debunking of 'the good old days' - tends to blur the satirical focus: 'This scene reaches the height of absurdity; we see ethereal spirits with a rather earthly urge for cleanliness frantically scrubbing their "bodies" and using deodorants on themselves and each other. Thus of course they lose all dignity and reverence, making complete idiots out of themselves.' The thought of such perverts being avoided like a plague, even in the underworld, is quite in keeping with the satirist's wish at the beginning of the poem to escape to some remote part of the earth; furthermore, the notion of contagion is consistent with the final image of the *praetextatos* . . . *mores* (170) infecting and 'unmanning' barbarian subjects in the remotest reaches of the empire.

⁶⁹ Clodius' role in the perversion of the *Bona Dea* rites (83-116) also provides striking proof of the insidious corruption resulting from aristocratic degeneracy.

satirical weapon in Juvenal's hands, and one which he uses to even greater effect in *Satire* 8.

In its wide range of themes, *Satire* 3 has much in common with the programmatic first *Satire*; and, even though Juvenal employs a speaker in the person of Umbricius⁷⁰ for most of it, the poem accurately corroborates the impression formed from the first *Satire* of Juvenal's personality and attitudes. That Juvenal intended Umbricius to be his own mouthpiece is evident from his explicit approval of his friend's decision in the opening sentence of the poem⁷¹ and from his own negative observations on the unpleasantness of life in Rome.⁷² The poet himself feels that his own city has become an inhospitable

⁷⁰ The name 'Umbricius' is attested by Pliny (*NH* 10.6.19) and Tacitus (*Hist.* 1.27), so it is perhaps fanciful to attach an allegorical significance to Juvenal's character (e.g. 'shadow man': Motto and Clark 1965:275-6), or to believe that the name suggests either a 'shady' and 'unenlightened' character whose opinions are rather ill-formed and who does not seem to perceive his own ethical faults' or that Umbricius is Juvenal's 'satiric persona's reflection for dramatic purposes' (see Wehrle 1992:65). Given the fact that the name is also attested (*CIL* X 3142) at Puteoli - close to Umbricius' destination in *Satire* 3 - one should perhaps be even less sceptical about the chances that Juvenal's Umbricius was a real person; cf. Friedländer 1895:193: 'Unmöglich ist es nicht, dass diese Inschrift von Juvenals nach dem Puteoli ganz nahen Cumae übergesiedelten Freunde herrührt.' Even if it is impossible to identify Juvenal's character or if the name is only a pseudonym, it would *not* be fanciful to see the actual departure of a disillusioned friend as a factor behind the creation of this *Satire*; the poet's friend, Martial, is a case in point. Why did Juvenal employ a speaker? The obvious answer would be that the poem reflects the *reality* that Juvenal himself, however disgruntled and for whatever reasons, did not leave Rome. Nor should one ignore the dramatic and emotive possibilities afforded by both the interaction of the poet and his friend and the setting for their conversation: the actual departure of Umbricius, described with poignant detail, lends credibility to his complaints. The desire to leave Rome, as a measure of the poet's disgust, is also seen at the beginning of *Satire* 2: *ultra Sauromatas fugere hinc libet et glaciale Oceanum, quotiens . . .* (1-2).

⁷¹ *quamvis digressu veteris confusus amici
laudo tamen, vacuis quod sedem figere Cumis
destinet atque unum civem donare Sibyllae.* (3.1-3)

I see no compelling reason to regard Juvenal's use of another character to deliver the poor client's lament as 'a slight disengagement of sympathy' (Braund and Cloud 1982:83): see above note.

⁷² *ego vel Prochytae praepono Suburae, etc.* (lines 5-20). The wryly humorous inclusion of *Augusto recitantes mense poetas* (9) among the perils of urban life is also very reminiscent of the author's impatience with tedious recitals, which was so forcefully expressed in *Satire* 1.

and alien place: apart from the direct physical threats of fires and collapsing buildings (lines 7-8), there is the more insidious erosion of the 'old Roman ethos' by foreign influences. Juvenal conveys this sense of loss very effectively by making Umbricius deliver his complaint amidst ancient and revered surroundings, whose physical transformation symbolises a 'spiritual' decay: the grove of Numa, with its holy spring and temple, has become a Jewish squatter-camp (12-6); and the desecration of what the Romans ought to hold sacred is also seen in the overlaying of the natural tufa, which used to surround the spring, with imported marble (*ingenuum violarent marmora tofum*, 20).⁷³ The mood which Juvenal creates is so appropriate that the change of speaker, when Umbricius begins his catalogue of complaints, is hardly noticeable.⁷⁴

Umbricius claims that Rome has turned its back on 'respectable skills'⁷⁵ and fails to reward effort and that his financial position is steadily worsening:

artibus . . . honestis

⁷³ Jenkyns (1982:153-4) uses this passage (3.12-20) to illustrate Juvenal's 'genuine sensitivity to the spiritual quality of the landscape.' The demolition of one of the oldest buildings in my home town to make way for a McDonald's emporium has evoked a similar response from citizens with a sentimental attachment to the past. *Quanto praesentius esset numen* - if only the natural shale and timber were not violated by neon and plastic.

⁷⁴ Cf. Fredericks 1973:62: 'In retrospect, however, each of the six themes of his [sc. Umbricius'] attack has already been foreshadowed, and Umbricius merely develops a program already implied in the first twenty lines.' Frøelund Jensen (1986:197), on the other hand, sees Umbricius as an ironic creation by the satirist: 'Sat. 3 is not the autobiographical portrait of a poor client, but the pathetic and humorous portrait of an individual who . . . tries to rationalize his actions in traditional and obsolete terms, in a frantic and, except to himself, unsuccessful attempt to get away with his *dignitas* intact.' Such an interpretation imputes insincerity to the first three lines of the poem, where Juvenal's empathy is unequivocal. It is also worth noting that Juvenal's assertion that the barren isle of Prochyta would be preferable to Rome captures the gloomy attitude of Umbricius, who is not motivated by any positive yearnings for the 'idyllic' country life but rather by frustration and bitterness: 'Für Umbricius ist das Landleben kein Ideal, er verlässt Rom nur gezwungen, weil ein Weiterleben dort nicht möglich ist. Das Land ist dazu die bessere oder genauer: die weniger schlechte Alternative' (Adamietz 1972:8).

⁷⁵ Cicero (*Off.* 1.150) lists some of the professions considered most shameful for a respectable man: *minimeque artes eae probandae, quae ministrae sunt voluptatem - cetarii, lanii, coqui, fartores, piscatores - ut ait Terentius; adde huc si placet, unguentarios, saltatores, totumque ludum talarium*. Edwards (1997:83) makes the pertinent observation that the *infamia* attached to actors, gladiators, and prostitutes could stem from the fact that such professions were associated with pleasures of a very dubious kind.

*nullus in urbe locus, nulla emolumenta laborum,
res hodie minor est here quam fuit atque eadem cras
deteret exiguis aliquid . . . (21-4)*

Poverty is the dominant theme in this *Satire*. The fact that a free-born citizen like Umbricius cannot afford to live in Rome is attributable first and foremost to the debasement of the relationship between patron and client. Umbricius' predicament echoes that of Martial and, probably, of Juvenal: the latter are also dependants whose expectations of adequate patronage for their particular 'respectable skills' (i.e. literary talents) would seem to have been continually frustrated by the increasing reluctance of the wealthy to offer substantial financial support to their dependent *amici*. Both Juvenal and Martial come readily to mind when Umbricius later remarks: *haut facile emergunt quorum virtutibus obstat / res angusta domi, sed Romae durior illis / conatus* (164-6).

To be neglected by selfish patrons is bad enough; even more galling is to see foreign upstarts prospering at one's own expense. Juvenal's sneering and xenophobic remarks to that effect in *Satire* 1⁷⁶ are matched by Umbricius' contempt for *cornicines* from the provinces, who are now wealthy enough to stage gladiatorial shows but will just as readily try their luck at the leasing of latrines (34-8); and, of course, for the Greeks who have the infuriating knack of upstaging native Romans at every turn: these are the types *quales ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum / extollit quotiens voluit Fortuna iocari* (39-40).⁷⁷

⁷⁶ His barber turned tycoon (1.24-5); Crispinus, *pars Niliacae plebis*, flaunting his Tyrian purple (1.26-9); the ex-slave from the Euphrates, now the proprietor of a chain of stores (1.102-9).

⁷⁷ Juvenal's disdain for such menial occupations is also seen in *Satire* 7, where he describes how *celebres notique poetae / balneolum Gabiis, Romae conducere furnos / temptarent, nec foedum alii nec turpe putarent / praecones fieri* (7.3-6). However, Juvenal's attitude towards his fellow indigent poets is fundamentally sympathetic: they are *forced* to resort to such demeaning occupations, whereas the targets of Umbricius' contempt are clearly enthusiastic entrepreneurs: *quis facile est . . .* (31). See discussion of *Satire* 7 below.

It is not only Umbricius' class-bound aversion to such 'base', but profitable, occupations which exacerbates his poverty, but also his 'old fashioned' sense of honesty: *quid Romae faciam? mentiri nescio* (41).⁷⁸ Life in Rome now depends on deceit and duplicity, even to the extent of avoiding a candid opinion about a literary work. The gloomy conviction that success and wealth depend on dishonesty is a prominent theme in Juvenal's first *Satire*:

*aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris et carcere dignum,
si vis esse aliquid; probitas laudatur et alget
criminibus debent hortos praetoria mensas,
argentum vetus et stantem extra pocula caprum.* (73-6)

While this may be a good instance of satiric hyperbole, it is interesting to note that the sober Pliny passed essentially the same judgement, when he referred to Rome as a city *in qua iampridem non minora praemia, immo maiora nequitia et improbitas quam pudor et virtus habent*; and the individual who prompted this observation could well have come from the pages of Juvenal's first *Satire*: *aspice Regulum, qui ex paupere et tenui ad tantas opes per flagitia processit . . .* (Ep. 2.20).

It is clear that the predicament of dependants like Umbricius exposes more than mere selfishness on the part of the upper classes: it is symptomatic of a serious moral degeneracy. Umbricius' wide-ranging indictment of the living conditions in the city, like Juvenal's attack in *Satire* 1, frequently focuses on the failings of the upper classes, whether they are guilty by commission or omission. In *Satire* 1, Juvenal characterises the relationship between patron and client as an exploitative one, based on distrust, greed and deviousness.⁷⁹ In similar vein, Umbricius bemoans the fact that 'gratitude' is

⁷⁸ Cicero (*de Off.* 1.150-1) draws a distinction between those occupations which are *sordidi* (e.g. tax-gathering, usury, manual labour, retailing, and trades which cater for sensual pleasures - such as the selling of foodstuffs and dancing) and those which are *liberales*, requiring *prudencia maior* and bestowing *non mediocris utilitas* (e.g. medicine, architecture, teaching, and especially agriculture).

⁷⁹ . . . *post hunc magni delator amici* (33);

determined by the extent to which one person wields the power of disclosure over another: *quis nunc diligitur nisi conscius et cui fervens / aestuat occultis animus semperque tacendis?* (49-50). This is particularly true in the case of patrons and clients and it is aptly illustrated by the image of the miserable dependant whose ephemeral rewards stem only from the fear which he can inspire in his 'mighty friend' - a state of affairs which Umbricius finds intolerable:

*tanti tibi non sit opaci
omnis harena Tagi quodque in mare volvitur aurum,
ut somno careas ponendaque praemia sumas
tristis et a magno semper timearis amico* (54-7).

When Umbricius begins his satirical *tour de force* against the Greeks, it is clear that he is also attacking the Roman aristocracy (*quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris*, 58; that he is referring to this sector of society, rather than the wealthy in general, is made clear by the connotations of *magnarum domuum* in line 72). For it is this class which has allowed such foreign interlopers to oust ordinary Romans from their rightful claims to its patronage and which thus makes a mockery of the true meaning of *amicus* (it is worth noting that the ironic connotation of the word is accentuated by its prominent placement no fewer than six times between lines 87 and 121).⁸⁰ Juvenal, through Umbricius, puts particular emphasis on how *un-Roman* and contemptible these upstarts are and thereby makes the elite, who actually pander to them, all the more

*..... nunc sportula primo
limina parva sedet turbae rapienda togatae.
ille tamen faciem prius inspicit et trepidat ne
suppositus venias ac falso nomine poscas* (95-8);

*sed cum summus honor finito computet anno,
sportula quid referat, quantum rationibus addat,
quid facient comites quibus hinc toga, calceus hinc est
et panis fumusque domi?* (117-20).

⁸⁰ Placed last in lines 87, 101, 107, 112, 116 and 121.

reprehensible. It is they who have allowed the city of the *Quirites*⁸¹ to become transformed into a *Graecam urbem* (60-1; note juxtaposition) with a new type of despotism (*non est Romano cuiquam locus hic, ubi regnat / Protogenes aliquis vel Diphilus aut Hermarchus*, 119-20).⁸² Worse still, these 'Greeks' actually represent a far more loathsome contamination of the Roman populace and ethos:

*quamvis quota portio faecis Achaei?
iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes
et linguam et mores et cum tibicine chordas
obliquas nec non gentilia tympana secum
vexit et ad circum iussas prostare puellas.
ite, quibus grata est picta lupa barbara mitra.
rusticus ille tuus sumit trechedipna, Quirine,
et ceromatico fert niceteria collo. (61-8)*

⁸¹ This sudden address to the citizens of Rome, when the poet is Umbricius' sole addressee, is an anomaly. However, the most obvious explanation is that the dynamics of the *recitatio* encouraged the poet himself to intrude upon the role of his 'speaker' and to engage directly, as it were, with his audience. This seems to me to be a more plausible explanation than that of Anderson (1982:298-300), who sees this as a deliberately contrived inconsistency on Juvenal's part between Umbricius' naïve honesty and his use of rhetorical tricks - one of the 'tensions' in the satirist which 'render him a dramatic character who is not only quite distinct from the poet, but sufficiently alien to Roman readers, so that it is incorrect to sympathize entirely with his passions and prejudices.' The dramatic licence indulged in here actually serves to emphasize Juvenal's empathy with the views of his character, Umbricius. It is worth noting that, in the course of his homily to Calvinus in *Satire* 13, Juvenal addresses Neptune directly: *perque tuum, pater Aegaei Neptune, tridentem* (81).

⁸² Sherwin-White (1967:98-9) observes that, while Juvenal dislikes the alien ways of the Jews, he does not fear them as competitors in any way. Unlike the *Graeculus esuriens*, 'the Jews were knocking on no Roman doors.' On similar antipathy towards *Graeculi* on the part of both Pliny and Tacitus, see Sherwin-White 1967:76-86; on the Romans' 'love-hate relationship' with the Greeks in general, see Balsdon 1979:30-54.

There can be no mistaking the authorial voice here;⁸³ and, when Umbricius accuses such immigrants of making for the upper class suburbs of Rome with the intention of supplanting their patrons (*viscera magnarum domuum dominique futuri*, 72), his contempt for the effete and submissive aristocracy echoes Juvenal's sneer in *Satire* 1, even in the 'visceral' imagery: *magni delator amici / et cito rapturus de nobilitate comesa / quod superest* (33-5). It is the upper classes who are allowing humbler Roman citizens to be ousted from their traditional functions as dependants, thus diminishing their chances of receiving much-needed patronage:

*me prior ille
signabit fultusque toro meliore recumbet,
advectus Romam quo pruna et cottana vento?
usque adeo nihil est quod nostra infantia caelum
hausit Aventini baca nutrita Sabina?* (81-5)

The patrons succumb to the most blatant and calculating flattery of ambitious Greeks,⁸⁴ while their Roman dependants have no credibility: *haec eadem licet et nobis laudare, sed illis / creditur* (92-3); and the behaviour of such patrons in the company of these fawning Greeks is appropriately indecorous:

*non sumus ergo pares: melior, qui semper et omni
nocte dieque potest aliena sumere vultum
a facie, iactare manus laudare paratus,*

⁸³ Cf. Juvenal's loathing for Crispinus, that *pars Niliacae plebis* and *verna Canopi* (1.26-9) and the upstart freedman from the Euphrates with his *molles . . . in aure fenestras* (1.104), and the effeminate decadence of 'eastern' influences which permeates the description of the *Bona Dea* rites in *Satire* 2 (lines 83-116). The effeminacy of the Greeks is the focus of particular derision in the description of the sexual ambiguity of the Greek actor: *mulier nempe ipsa videtur, / non persona, loqui: vacua et plana omnia dicas / infra ventriculum et tenui distantia rima* (3.95-7). On the penetration of the Syrian language and customs into Rome, see Maebblestone 1985:156-7.

⁸⁴ Edwards (1993:93) observes: 'The qualities attributed to Greeks themselves in Roman texts are often at least implicitly 'feminine'. Lacking physical and moral strength, they are presented as resorting to deceit and flattery to secure their ends.'

*si bene ructavit, si rectum minxit amicus,
si trulla inverso crepitum dedit aurea fundo.* (104-8)⁸⁵

The Roman aristocracy is allowing itself to be violated, and this is emphasised in a graphic manner by the assertion (lines 109-12) that neither the *matrona laris*, nor the patron's *filius pudicus* and *filia virgo*, nor the latter's *sponsus levis* are safe from the sexual predations of these foreigners; even the patron's *avia* is in danger of being 'laid' (*resupinat*)!⁸⁶

The image of the displaced and resentful client, which Juvenal portrayed in the first *Satire*, is summed up succinctly and poignantly at the conclusion of Umbricius' attack on Greek immigrants: *limine summoveor, perierunt tempora longi / servitii; nusquam minor est iactura clientis* (124-5). With the culpability of the patron-class firmly established, Umbricius proceeds to give a vivid account of the numerous hardships and humiliations which make life unbearable for the ordinary Roman dependant. At the same time, every opportunity is taken to tarnish the image of the wealthy elite: the free-born Roman's son must move aside for a rich man's slave (131-2); the latter is wealthy enough to buy the favours of aristocratic 'ladies' (another slur on the *mores* of that class), while the poor citizen can't afford the services of an ordinary prostitute;⁸⁷ and particularly galling is the fact that, in the eyes of the wealthy, poverty deprives a man of his credibility: *quantum quisque sua nummorum servat in arca, / tantum habet et fidei* (143-4). Given the central role accorded to the impoverishment of the citizen-client and the prosperity of the foreign interloper in *Satire* 1, it is hard not to feel that Umbricius'

⁸⁵ Friedländer (1895:204-5) interprets *trulla* as a chamber-pot with a hinged bottom. On the various interpretations of the last line, see Martyn (1985:394-7), who suggests that it means 'if his golden potty lets out a fart under his bent-over bottom.' Less entertaining is the suggestion of Eden (1985:336): '... the emptying of a wine decanter into a drinking vessel with the gurgle which indicates that the helping is a generous one (and perhaps also the last).' I am inclined towards the more obvious interpretation: that the upturned bowl is used as a suitably resonant target for the competing urinators; see Green 1998:136.

⁸⁶ On sexual insatiability and effeminacy as traits of the Greeks, see Edwards 1993:92-7.

⁸⁷ Calvina is probably the *matrona* mentioned by Tacitus (*Ann.* 12.4 and 8), Suetonius (*Vesp.* 23.4) and Seneca (*Apoc.* 8)

portrait of the invidious lot of the poor man is rooted in the satirist's own experience: the sneering reference to the brothel-born progeny of pimps and the sons of auctioneers and gladiators, who can 'legitimately' occupy the seats reserved for knights in the theatre at the expense of poorer citizens, stems from the same sense of injustice that prompted Juvenal's bitter observation in *Satire* 1 that his former barber could now challenge the entire upper class with his millions.⁸⁸ The impression that the author could well be speaking from his own experience as a struggling dependant is strengthened by the poignant and perceptive observation that *nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se / quam quod ridiculos homines facit* (152-3).⁸⁹ Juvenal's friend and fellow-poet Martial, who complained frequently about his threadbare togas and the need for replacements, provides an instructive parallel; indeed, he could have written the following passage, in which Umbricius reflects on the plight of the city-based client *vis a vis* his country-town counterpart:

*pars magna Italiae est, si verum admittimus, in qua
nemo togam sumit nisi mortuus . . .* (171-2)

*hic ultra vires habitus nitor, hic aliquid plus
quam satis est interdum aliena sumitur arca.
commune id vitium est: hic vivimus ambitiosa
paupertate omnes.* (180-3)

Umbricius prefaces his contrast of the urban and country-town lifestyles by reflecting on the unpleasant fact that *haut facile emergunt quorum virtutibus obstat / res angusta domi* (164-5) - precisely what lies at the root of Juvenal's complaint, in *Satire* 7, about the stultifying privations which have to be endured by poets who are at the mercy of the

⁸⁸ 1.24-5.

⁸⁹ Courtney (1980:175) remarks: 'A bitter and not obvious reflection which suggests personal experience.' Mayer (1989:17) points out that there is nothing novel (cf. Cicero, *De Officiis* 2.69-71) in the charge that the rich pay more attention to a dependant's income or status than to his meritorious character and that this causes Juvenal's indictment to 'lose force'; however, it seems odd to suggest that the element of novelty has a necessary bearing on the validity or genuineness of a grievance.

divites avari.⁹⁰ In illustrating the financial and other hardships endured by the poor client, Juvenal consistently portrays the rich patron and the system of patronage in an unfavourable light. Instead of being a source of financial relief to the indigent client, the relationship has been perverted to the extent that the *salutatio* can become an occasion for the *clientes* to distribute largesse: *quid das, ut Cossum aliquando salutes* . . . (184). Not only is the patron cold and aloof towards his clients (*respiciat clauso Veiiiento labello*, 185), but he also makes them suffer the double indignity of celebrating the coming-of-age of his favourite slave-boys⁹¹ - not without cost (*libis venalibus*) - and of having to contribute, in the manner of subject-nations to the financial well-being of his smartly dressed minions:

*ille metit barbam, crinem hic deponit amati;
plena domus libis venalibus. "accipe et istud
fermentum tibi habe." praestare tributa clientes
cogimur et cultis augere peculia servis. (186-9)*

The neglectful attitude of the *divites avari* is shown in a far more reprehensible light, when the plight of the homeless and destitute Cordus is contrasted with that of his rich aristocratic counterpart.⁹² Nobody comes to the rescue of the likes of an indigent poet:⁹³

⁹⁰ *neque enim cantare sub antro
Pierio thyrsusque potest contingere maesta
paupertas atque aeris inops, quo nocte dieque
corpus eget: satur est cum dicit Horatius 'euhoe.'* (7.59-62)

⁹¹ Ferguson (1979:149) interprets *amati* as a reference to the favourite of the first-mentioned slave; but it would be more pointed - and typically Juvenalian - to take this word as descriptive of the catamite-slaves of both patrons (i.e. Cossus and Veientus); cf. Virro's *flos Asiae* (5.56).

⁹² *Persicus* (line 221): an unmistakably aristocratic name, like *Asturici* (line 212). It would seem that Juvenal is referring to the same person here (unless the latter refers to the former owner of the house): it has been suggested that there may have been a Fabius Persicus Asturicus, a relative of Paullus Fabius Persicus (cons. A.D. 34), whose father had been *legatus* in Spain; see Courtney 1980:184.

⁹³ It is interesting that Juvenal puts a fellow-poet at the centre of this 'poor-get-poorer' scenario.

*ultimus autem
aerumnae cumulus, quod nudum et frustra rogantem
nemo cibo, nemo hospitio tectoque iuvabit. (209-11)*

Yet for the latter, the loss of his home becomes not only a cause for extravagant commiseration, but also a source of enrichment:

*si magna Asturici cecidit domus, horrida mater,
pullati procures, differt vadimonia praetor.
tum gemimus casus urbis, tunc odimus ignem.
ardet adhuc, et iam accurrit qui marmora donet,
conferat inpensas; hic nuda et candida signa,
hic aliquid praeclarum Euphranoris et Polycliti,
haec Asianorum vetera ornamenta deorum,
hic libros dabit et forulos mediamque Minervam,
hic modium argenti. (212-20)*

Clearly, the generosity and concern of the *procures* are confined to their own class; and this generosity is tainted not only by their eagerness to profit as *captatores* (*Persicus, orbis lautissimus*, 221), but also by their rapacious and sacrilegious greed in plundering the temples of Asia (*haec Asianorum vetera ornamenta deorum*, 218).⁹⁴

The story of Cordus' plight - ostensibly a graphic illustration of the hazards of *incendia* and *lapsus tectorum* referred to at the beginning of the *Satire* - is thus adapted to serve as yet another attack on the greed and dishonesty of the upper classes.⁹⁵ Likewise, in the concluding account of the variety of physical discomforts and hazards which beset the humbler citizens of Rome, the self-satisfied indifference of the privileged maintains a persistent and galling presence. Only the affluent are able to obtain a good night's

⁹⁴ A 'noble' trait, which reappears in *Satire* 8.100-7.

⁹⁵ Cf. 1.75-6: *criminibus debent hortos, praetoria, mensas, / argentum vetus et stantem extra pocula caprum*.

sleep (*magnis opibus dormitur in urbe*, 235). In the streets, it is the wealthy man (*dives*, 240) who can travel - even snooze - in the curtained luxury of his limousine-litter (*ingenti . . . Liburna*, 240), insulated from the cacophony and congestion; the ordinary citizen, meanwhile, has to endure every imaginable peril of the 'rush hour' traffic, including annihilation by cascading wagon-loads of marble blocks (and here, with a masterly touch, the poor victim of such a fate is depicted languishing on the banks of the Styx without so much as single coin with which to pay the ferryman!). It is the wealthy man, resplendent in his scarlet cloak (*coccina laena*, 283) and accompanied by a *comitum longissimus ordo*, / *multum praeterea flammaram et aenea lampas* (284-5), who is safe from drunken muggers. Not so the likes of the Umbricius, whose poverty is underscored by a contrasting image (*quem luna solet deducere vel breve lumen / candelaee, cuius dispenso et tempero filum*, 286-7). To add insult to injury, Umbricius complains, the thugs do not merely beat you up but take you to court as well! (298-9). This bizarre scenario is concluded by a bitter reflection on the 'rights' of the poor citizen:

*libertas pauperis haec est:
pulsatus rogat et pugnīs concisus adorat
ut liceat paucis cum dentibus inde reverti.* (299-301)

The vulnerability of the poor citizen to criminal violence leads, appropriately, into the pessimistic finale: the rampant criminality which now threatens Rome. The destruction of the old way of life is aptly symbolized (*maximus in vinclis ferri modus, ut timeas ne / vomer deficiat, ne marra et sarcula desint*, 310-1), and reinforced by a reflection on the 'idyllic' existence enjoyed by the earlier inhabitants of the city:

*felices proavorum atavos, felicia dicas
saecula quae quondam sub regibus atque tribunis
viderunt uno contentam carcere Romam* (312-4)

Both the themes and the tenor of Umbricius' reflections on the plight of the marginalized and impoverished citizen leave little doubt that we are being addressed by the authorial voice of the first two *Satires*. This identity is reinforced by the first twenty lines of the

Satire, in which - as pointed out above - the poet makes his reactionary attitudes abundantly clear, and, of course, by the fact that Umbricius' friend is a writer of satires (*saturarum ego, ni pudat illas, / auditor gelidos veniam caligatus in agros*, 321-2). Furthermore, it is more likely than not that Umbricius' mention of Aquinum and the cult of Ceres at the end of the poem identifies his addressee as Juvenal himself, rather than as a fictitious *persona*: although the 'Juvenalis' mentioned in the (now lost) inscription from Aquinum (*CIL* 10 5382) is almost certainly not our satirist, it would seem perverse to dismiss the probability of a family connection with that town,⁹⁶ and it is perhaps significant that the poet's interest in the cult of Ceres (*Helvinamque Cererem*, 320) is attested on no fewer than six other occasions through the *Satires*.⁹⁷ While irrefutable proof is lacking, the circumstantial evidence is sufficiently persuasive to suggest that Juvenal cast himself in the role of Umbricius' companion at the Capenan gate.

While the culpability of the rich elite is a prominent feature of Umbricius' catalogue of complaints, it is the subject of a far more focused and penetrating attack in the fourth *Satire*, where the corruption of the system of patronage and the decadence of the upper classes are shown to pervade the top echelon of Roman society. And how better to demonstrate the truth of these convictions than by focusing, at the outset, on the despicable Crispinus, who wielded influence at the highest level of government? This *pars Niliacae plebis, . . . verna Canopi* (1.26), who had the nerve to wear the apparel of the Roman nobility in ostentatious fashion,⁹⁸ was the reason *par excellence* for Juvenal's initial justification of his choice of genre: *difficile est saturam non scribere* (1.30). What a comment on the *mores* of the upper echelons of Roman society, to think that they stooped so low as to be on intimate terms with this *monstrum nulla virtute*

⁹⁶ See Courtney 1980:3-5; Ferguson 1979:XVI; Green 1989:247.

⁹⁷ 6.50; 9.24; 10.112; 14.219; 14.263; 15.141. If the conjectured [CERE] RI in the Aquinum inscription is indeed correct, this further suggests a family interest in the cult.

⁹⁸ (*cum*) . . . *Tyrias umero revocante lacernas
ventilet aestivum digitis sudantibus aurum* (1.27-8).

redemptum / a vitiis (4.2-3) - a sickly fop, lecher and seducer of Vestal Virgins, whose inordinate wealth enabled him to own huge properties in the most expensive region of the city.⁹⁹ Equally reprehensible was his 'sin' of gross extravagance, when he lavished 6,000 sesterces on a single mullet - *for himself*.¹⁰⁰ It would have been less shocking, says Juvenal, if he had used it to inveigle himself into the list of beneficiaries in an old man's will, or if he had lavished it on a *magnae . . . amicae, / quae vehitur cluso latis specularibus antro* (20-1) - another snide reference, in passing, to the moral decadence of the aristocracy. However odious Crispinus' character and personal habits might be, it is clear that what infuriates Juvenal most is the gulf between the lowly origins of this former papyrus-clad¹⁰¹ fish pedlar and his elevation to the role of Emperor's confidant. Not only does Juvenal emphasise this bizarre travesty of social norms, but he also insinuates that Domitian found a congenial associate in this boorish glutton (an association made all the more shocking by the sarcastic grouping of the solemn archaism *induperator* with the crudely colloquial *glutisse* and *ructarit*):¹⁰²

*qualis tunc epulas ipsum glutisse putamus
induperatorem, cum tot sestertia, partem
exiguam et modicae sumptam de margine cenae,*

⁹⁹ . . . *aegrae solaque libidine fortes
deliciae, viduas tantum aspernatus adulter.
quid refert igitur, quantis iumenta fatiget
porticibus, quanta nemorum vectetur in umbra,
iugera quot vicina foro, quas emerit aedes* (3-7)

¹⁰⁰ This type of extravagance is the target of bitter criticism in the first *Satire* (e.g. 87-5; 135-40).

¹⁰¹ *succinctus patria quondam . . . papyro* (4.24).

¹⁰² Helmbold and O'Neill (1956:68-73) point out the striking similarities between the characters and misdemeanours of Crispinus and Domitian. First, each acquires an enormous fish: while Crispinus foolishly wastes his on a solitary meal (another example of reprehensible anti-social behaviour: cf. 1.94-5; 135-41), Domitian absurdly summons his council for culinary advice. Second, both stand accused of the crime of triviality. The third, most important, parallel is in their characters: Crispinus is 'a tiny reflection of the larger, more savage, and more ridiculous Domitian.' Helmbold and O'Neill also draw attention to the motifs which link the 'Crispinus' section with the rest of the *Satire*: *mullum* (15) / *rhombum* (39); *leviora* (11) / *nugis* (150). See also Clack 1974:77-8 and Jones 1990 [2]:56.

*purpureus magni ructarit scurra Palati,
iam princeps equitum, magna qui voce solebat
vendere municipales fracta de merce siluros?* (28-33)

There could be no better illustration of the types whom Umbricius sneers at in *Satire 3*: *quales ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum / extollit quotiens voluit Fortuna iocari* (3.39-40).¹⁰³

While the utter triviality of the reason for the hasty summoning of the *consilium principis* is clearly intended to make Domitian the object of contemptuous ridicule, the real focus of this *Satire* is - once more - an elite whose decadence and delinquency are a travesty of its traditional role in Roman society.¹⁰⁴ It is not only in the contexts of patronage and their private lives that the members of the nobility are demonstrably corrupt, but even in the highest echelons of government: 'This is another proof of the degeneracy of the Roman aristocracy. We have seen them, through Juvenal's eyes, as greedy, extravagant and perverted. Now he shows that they are also cowards.'¹⁰⁵ Domitian speaks only once in the poem (*quidnam igitur censes? conciditur?*, 130),¹⁰⁶ but his presence is obviously felt throughout the *Satire*. Nonetheless, it is the members of the council who are accorded particular prominence in this *Satire*, and it is their fawning servility and ineffectualness which leave the dominant impression.¹⁰⁷ Twice Juvenal

¹⁰³ On Crispinus' integral role in this *Satire*, see Kilpatrick 1973:230-5 and Flintoff 1990:121-37.

¹⁰⁴ 'We have presented to us here not the arch monster, Domitian, but the courtiers surrounding him . . . It is, in short, a court reflecting the same motley and disorderly congregation found on the streets of Rome (Clack 1974:78).

¹⁰⁵ Highet 1954:82; cf. Jones 1990 [2]:55: 'Domitian's power produces courtiers who devote themselves to physical pleasures, those who willingly indulge in obsequious flattery and murder in order to serve their own interests, and those who are forced, in one way or another, to acquiesce.'

¹⁰⁶ Ferguson (1979:169) suggests that *conciditur* has an ominous reference to a question frequently asked at council meetings; according to Winkler (1995:76), it is intended to foreshadow Domitian's own fate.

¹⁰⁷ Contrast Ferguson (1979:171): 'In this poem the hangers-on of the emperor are an incidental not an essential target, as they have been in the third satire. They are there as the

refers to them sarcastically as *proceres* (73 and 144): these are the leading figures who are *attonitos et festinare coactos* (146), and whose faces bear the *miserae magnaеque . . . pallor amicitiae* (74-5). The hollowness of the latter word is emphasised by the fact that Domitian actually despised them (*quos oderat ille*, 73): even at the pinnacle of the Roman social pyramid, the relationship between *amici* is fraught with fear, distrust and contempt.¹⁰⁸

Juvenal's intention of showing how servile and ineffectual the upper classes have become is made clear by the extent to which he focuses on the behaviour of the councillors. The assembly took place with fawning and panic-stricken haste: '*currite, iam sedit*' (76). It is all the more depressing that even those who were not inherently evil had no influence for the good: Pegasus, *optimus atque / interpres legum sanctissimus* (78-9), was nonetheless ineffectual: *omnia quamquam / temporibus diris tractanda putabat inermi / iustitia* (79-81); Crispus, a man of *mite / ingenium* (82-3) and a potential source of wise counsel,¹⁰⁹ could not bring himself to 'strike out against the current' (89-90), nor was he that type of citizen *qui libera posset / verba animi proferre et vitam inpendere vero* (90-1). The next councillor to come rushing in (*properabat*, 94) was Acilius, but it is the fate of the latter's son which provides Juvenal with an opportunity for yet another attack on the decadence of the nobility in general; and, once again, it is the ignominy of a member of the aristocracy performing in the gladiatorial arena which he uses to good effect:

*profuit ergo nihil misero quod comminus ursos
figebat Numidas Albana nudus harena*

backcloth to the emperor, not the other way round.'

¹⁰⁸ Braund (1996:43) draws attention to the parallel between Juvenal's selfish patron (significantly called *rex*) and the role of Domitian: 'This patron . . . prefigures the emperor Domitian in the fourth *Satire*, who humiliates his cabinet ministers by summoning them to advise him on what to do with an enormous fish . . . and then dismisses the cabinet as soon as they have given their advice, leaving him to consume the fish alone.'

¹⁰⁹ *quis comes utilior, si clade et peste sub illa
saevitiam damnare et honestum adferre liceret
consilium?* (84-6).

*venator. quis enim iam non intellegat artes
patricias?* (99-102).

So much for the members of the council whose positive attributes were reduced to impotence; the rest were characterized by sheer decadence and villainy: Rubrius, guilty of some unmentionable crime (105),¹¹⁰ yet more brazenly impudent (*improbior*) than a *cinaedus* having the cheek to write satire (a typically Juvenalian barb, calling to mind his antipathy towards the hypocritical perverts of *Satire* 2); the gluttonous Montanus, made sluggish by his enormous paunch (107) and steeped in the luxurious extravagance of the Imperial court (136-43);¹¹¹ the revolting Crispinus, reeking of perfume (108-9); the menacing Pompeius, *saevior . . . tenui iugulos aperire susurro* (109-10); Fuscus, whose military prowess was that of an effete 'armchair general' (*marmorea meditatus proelia villa*, 112) and thus earned him an ignominious death (*qui vulturibus servabat viscera Dacis*, 111);¹¹² the sycophantic Veiento (123-8); and, worst of the lot, the deadly Catullus, whom Juvenal caricatures with as much vigour as he does his *bête noire*, Crispinus:

*qui numquam visae flagrabat amore puellae,
grande et conspicuum nostro quoque tempore monstrum,
caecus adulator dirusque, a ponte, satellites,
dignus Aricinos qui mendicaret ad axes
blandaque devexae iactaret basia raedae.
nemo magis rhombum stupuit; nam plurima dixit
in laevum conversus, at illi dextra iacebat
belua* (114-21).

¹¹⁰ According to the scholiast, he seduced Domitia as a child; see Ferguson 1979:167

¹¹¹ Over-indulgence, of course, is a conspicuous trait of a decadent nobility, which has abandoned the ideal of *paupertas Romana*: 1.93-5; 1.135-44; 5 (*passim*); 6.292-300; 6.425-33; 7.182-5; 8.85-6.

¹¹² For Juvenal, the decay of old-fashioned martial vigour is symptomatic of the decline of the Roman nobility: 1.91-2; 2.99-103; 2.124-6; 5.43-5; and especially *Satire* 8 (*passim*).

Juvenal's loathing of Domitian finds an ideal vehicle in the theme of this *Satire*; yet, it is clear from the detailed catalogue of his sycophantic cronies, and especially from the concluding lines of the poem, that the real focus of his contempt is the corrupt and pusillanimous nobility. This is underscored by the fact that he is prepared to twist the historical facts,¹¹³ in order to contrast the latter's feebleness with the implied old-fashioned *virtus* of the ordinary people of Rome (a theme which he was to develop in much greater detail in the eighth *Satire*):

*atque utinam his potius nugis tota illa dedisset
tempora saevitiae, claras quibus abstulit urbi
inlustresque animas inpune et vindice nullo.
sed periit postquam cerdonibus esse timendus
coeperat: hoc nocuit Lamiarum caede madenti. (150-4)*

It is significant that, in order to drive home the contrast, Juvenal holds up the lowliest members of the working-class (*cerdonibus*)¹¹⁴ - whom he ordinarily regarded with disdain¹¹⁵ - as possessing the spirit and initiative necessary to rid Rome of its murderous tyrant.

When Juvenal, in the first *Satire*, describes clients of long standing (*veteres*, 132) trudging away from their patron's door, their hopes dashed (*votaque deponunt*, 133),

¹¹³ Even though the actual assassins were of humble class (Suet. *Dom.* 17; Dio Cass. 67.15), the plotters of the palace-revolution were not; it was believed that the conspirators included Domitia (the emperor's wife) and the *praefecti praetorio*, Norbanus and Petronius Secundus. See Courtney 1980:228; Ferguson 1979:171. On Juvenal's use of ritual allusions in *Satires* 2 and 4 as a means of further exposing Domitian's hypocrisy, see Stewart 1994:309-32. For a balanced appraisal of the hostile literary tradition concerning Domitian's character and reign, see Waters 1964:49-77.

¹¹⁴ Of Greek origin, *cerdo* denotes one who works for money; in the *Digest* it is used as a proper name for slave manual labourers.

¹¹⁵ E.g. Umbricius' complaint: '*quando artibus . . . honestis / nullus in urbe locus . . .*' (3.21-2).

he makes the pathetic observation: *quamquam longissima cenae / spes homini* (133-4). Their plight is made to seem all the crueller by the ensuing portrait of their mean patron regaling himself with a sumptuous and extravagant feast - in solitary splendour. Greed and selfishness have led to the negation of traditional conviviality between patron and client. Soon, Juvenal says, there will be no such thing as a *parasitus* (139) - his use of this contemptuous Greek term showing his aversion to such self-inflicted humiliation by the client - and he asks the rhetorical question: *sed quis ferat ista / luxuriae sordes?* The erosion of the concept of *amicitia* is nowhere more starkly apparent than in the relationship between patron and client in the context of the *cena*,¹¹⁶ and it is this question which foreshadows Juvenal's impassioned and exasperated plea in the fifth *Satire* to the naïve Trebius not to degrade himself by accepting Virro's dinner invitation.¹¹⁷

As a *suasoria* directed at an individual, this poem displays a decidedly contemptuous attitude towards the client's complicity in his own humiliation. However, Juvenal's criticism of Trebius' obtuseness does not negate his sympathy for the down-trodden clients in general.¹¹⁸ This is particularly evident in his bitter observation: *plurima sunt quae / non audent homines pertusa dicere laena* (5.130-1), where there is a poignancy reminiscent of a similar remark in the third *Satire*: *nil habet infelix paupertas durius in*

¹¹⁶ See Cuccioli 1990:140 and Shero 1923:139.

¹¹⁷ Morford (1977:219-20) sees lines 111-3 as providing the keynote of the *Satire*: *solum / poscimus ut cenes civiliter. hoc face et esto, / esto, ut nunc multi, dives tibi, pauper amicis*. 'In these words are the themes of the poem: dinner, social relations between citizens of Rome, wealth and poverty, friendship. From this it is not hard to see that *Satire* 5 must be considered within the context of the first book, for it develops the themes introduced in the program of the first satire and provides a fitting climax to the book.'

¹¹⁸ Such sympathy is evident in the first *Satire*, for example: *caulis miseris atque ignis emendus* (1.134) is a stark (albeit exaggerated) statement of the alternative that awaits the clients who leave their patron's door empty-handed; and, when he earlier talks of the *sportula* . . . *turbae rapienda togatae* (1.95-6), he makes clear its importance to the indigent recipients: *quid facient comites quibus hinc toga, calceus hinc est / et panis fumusque domi?* (1.119-20); and, when he describes some of the ruses which clients resort to in order to get their *centum quadrantes* (1.120-1), this is clearly intended less as criticism of the clients for deviousness than as an indictment of the system which gives rise to such conduct. It is important to bear this distinction in mind - particularly, for example, when Juvenal describes the demeaning occupations which neglected poets are forced to resort to in *Satire* 7.

se / quam quod ridiculos homines facit (3.152-3). Courtney says of the latter: 'A bitter and not obvious reflection which suggests personal experience.'¹¹⁹ Against the background of Juvenal's persistent complaints about the financial hardships of the client-class and his condemnation of their treatment at the hands of the *divites avari*, it is once again hard not to see Juvenal's *indignatio* in the fifth *Satire* stemming, to some extent, from his own frustrations as a struggling dependant: like Trebius, who is pictured as hurrying in anxious haste through the pre-dawn chill (5.19-23), he too is portrayed by his friend Martial as haunting the thresholds of the powerful in his *sudatrix toga* (*Ep.* 12.18.1-9). However, it is Trebius' folly which provides the platform for the main thrust of this *Satire*: an exposé of a patron whose treatment of his dependants represents the antithesis of what *amicitia* customarily entailed. Even the invitation to dinner springs from shrewd calculation rather than from a desire to provide genuine hospitality,¹²⁰ and the reference to the 'host' as *rex* foreshadows not only his contemptuous attitude towards his lowly guests but also his decadent *luxuria*:

*primo fige loco, quod tu discumbere iussus
mercedem solidam veterum capis officiorum.
fructus amicitiae magnae cibus: inputat hunc rex,
et quamvis rarum tamen inputat. ergo duos post
si libuit menses neglectum adhibere clientem,
tertia ne vacuo cessaret culcita lecto,
'una simus' ait. votorum summa.* (12-5)

The hollowness of the invitation '*una simus*' is evident in almost every detail of the ensuing prediction of what awaits Trebius: everything, from the contrasting cuisine¹²¹

¹¹⁹ Courtney 1980:175.

¹²⁰ 'Here food may stand as the symbol of the resources a patron distributes: his power over the client derives not from generous and regular distribution, but from keeping him on tenterhooks with the prospect of access to resources which is never in fact fully granted' (Wallace-Hadrill:73).

¹²¹ The comical exaggeration used by Juvenal should not be allowed to obscure the fact that some clients really were subjected to the indignity of being served inferior food and drink

to the different way in which Trebius and his humbler companions are treated, illustrates how debased the system of patronage has become.¹²² The generosity which the patrons of old showed towards their *modici amici* (108)¹²³ is no longer to be expected: in its place there is an almost sadistic meanness: *cardiaco numquam cyathum missurus amico / cras bibet Albanis aliquid de montibus aut de / Setinis . . .* (32-4).¹²⁴ In former times, the honour of giving was more highly prized than titles and symbols of office; now, it is a vain hope that a client will be treated *civiliter* (112) and not be made to feel utterly inferior, simply because he is poor. Even a *pretence* of equality for the occasion would be welcome: *hoc face et esto, / esto, ut nunc multi, dives tibi, pauper amicis* (112-3).¹²⁵ Virro epitomizes not only *luxuriae sordes* (1.140), but also moral decadence, manifested in the contemptible traits of unmanliness and effete homosexuality. Juvenal sneers at the degenerate luxury of Virro's jewel-encrusted drinking cups (adornments which the heroic and manly Aeneas displayed on his scabbard)¹²⁶ and his beautiful

(cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 2.6; Mart. *Ep.* 1.20; 1.43; 2.43; 3.60; 3.82; 6.11. 9.2).

¹²² 'For Juvenal the *cena* is another example of the corruption of Roman society: the mercenary foundations of the relationship between patron and client are part of the rotten social structure criticised by the satirist' (Morford 1977:224).

¹²³ Konstan (1995:336) uses this passage to illustrate his contention that friendship is distinct from clientship, while allowing that they are not mutually exclusive. There is no doubt that Juvenal's use of *amicus* to refer to the patron is regularly imbued with negative connotations. However, *amicitiam* and *clientem* seem to me to be used here without any clear distinction; if anything, the fact that the client's customary *officia* lead to the derisory *fructus amicitiae* tends narrow any such distinction. When Juvenal a few lines later says that 'his lordship' (*ipse*, 30) would not send even a spoonful of wine to a dyspeptic *amico* (32), the latter *does* seem to emphasize 'friendship' in the conventional sense; however, in the phrase *magni delator amici* (1.33) the notion of 'patron' seems to me to be the dominant one. See also Saller 1989:49-61.

¹²⁴ Cf. the sentiment of 1.92-3: *simplexne furor sestertia centum / perdere et horrenti tunicam non reddere servo?* Juvenal emphasises Virro's delight in humiliating his clients: *ille sapit, qui te sic utitur* (5.170).

¹²⁵ Cf. Pliny *Ep.* 2.6, where he endeavours to make his humbler guests feel more at ease by drinking unpretentious wine himself.

¹²⁶ *nam Virro, ut multi, gemmas ad pocula transfert / a digitis, quas in vaginae fronte solebat / ponere zelotypo iuvenis praelatus larbae* (43-5). Note that Virro is not an isolated phenomenon amongst the upper echelons of Roman society (*ut multi*).

young cup-bearer (*flos Asiae*, 56) - a hint of what is to come in his portrayal of the same patron in *Satire* 9.

Satire 6 is no less effective in demonstrating the moral decadence of the upper classes. While it purports to offer its male addressee cogent reasons for *not* marrying, it becomes in essence a misogynistic tirade, directed especially at the rich and aristocratic echelons of Roman society.¹²⁷ The conviction that vice and depravity have reached 'apocalyptic' proportions in contemporary Rome¹²⁸ is established at the outset, with a vivid contrast between the primitive robustness and chastity of women in the age of Saturn and the decadence and moral laxity of contemporary Roman women:

*Credo Pudicitiam Saturno rege moratam
in terris visamque diu, cum frigida parvas
praeberet spelunca domos ignemque laremque,
et pecus et dominos communi clauderet umbra,
silvestrem montana torum cum sterneret uxor
frondibus et culmo vicinarumque ferarum
pellibus, haut similis tibi, Cynthia, nec tibi, cuius
turbavit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos,
sed potanda ferens infantibus ubera magnis
et saepe horridior glandem ructante marito.* (6.1-10)

¹²⁷ ' . . . it should be remembered that in this poem he has in mind mainly upper-class women . . . ; and also that considerable fire is directed against the husbands' (Courtney 1980:253); 'The humbler women of Rome are thus not exempt from Juvenal's censure; but it is manifest that his attack is directed mainly against the rich and aristocratic' (Courtney 1980:258); cf. Ferguson 1979:185-6: 'J is always attacking the upper classes. He occasionally puts in an aside to say that the lower classes are just as bad, or would be if they could, but that is designed to reinforce his offensive against upper-class women . . .' Braund (1991:71-86) argues that the poem is intended 'not as a general diatribe against women but as a dissuasion from marriage.'

¹²⁸ *nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat
posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores,
omne in praecipiti vitium stetit.* (1.147-9)

There could hardly be a more stark contrast between the rough and simple existence of the *montana uxor* and the pampered sophistication - and immoral lifestyle - of the likes of Cynthia and Clodia, whose bright little eyes could brim with tears at the death of a mere sparrow. Juvenal holds the typically conservative and reactionary view that morality is the product of a simple and austere lifestyle, a conviction that is emphasised particularly in the eighth *Satire*, where moral virtue is also associated with vigorous masculinity.¹²⁹ Courtney rightly observes that, in his introduction to the sixth *Satire*, Juvenal 'wants to insist on the harsh elements in the life of the Golden Age because he is leading up to the explanation of Rome's moral decay in 286 sqq., which links morality with a hard life.'¹³⁰ He also remarks that Juvenal's 'satiric astringency likes to deflate even what he holds up for imitation'. The notion that Juvenal is deliberately debunking the *montana uxor* and her 'acorn belching' husband is expressed more forcefully by Winkler:

The satirist mockingly presents to the reader a repulsive picture of the totally ignoble ancestors themselves . . . It becomes clear that the satirist cannot possibly be serious-minded about the old tradition of the "noble savage" when he describes him as *horridus* . . . This precise satiric vignette of earliest human society with its picture of horribly unattractive, uncouth people shows that the old traditional view of life in the Golden Age no longer carries any value for Rome's modern times, nor does it for the satirist and ultimately for Juvenal himself.¹³¹

¹²⁹ E.g. Juvenal contrasts the effete Fabius with his *squalentis* . . . *avos* (8.17), and emphasises Marius' hardy, peasant lifestyle and tough military training: *Arpinas alius Volscorum in monte solebat / poscere mercedes alieno lassus aratro; / nodosam post haec frangebant vertice vitem, / si lentus pigra muniret castra dolabra* (8.245-8). He even extols such qualities in Rome's barbarian enemies: *horrida vitanda est Hispania* (8.116); cf. also the *vulneribus crudis populus modo victor et illud / montanum positus* . . . *vulgus aratris*, who are subjected to the ludicrous indignity of being addressed by a chiffon-clad fop (2.73-4).

¹³⁰ Courtney 1980:26; cf. Singleton 1972:151-65.

¹³¹ Winkler 1983:29-30.

It cannot be denied that such portrayals of the Golden Age must have contained elements of humorous caricature for Juvenal's sophisticated audience and that they could hardly have been interpreted as a wholly attractive, let alone practical, ideal to be aspired to. However, in emphasising the roughness and crudity of life in the Golden Age, as opposed to the effeteness and immorality of contemporary women, it is clearly Juvenal's purpose to show how very remote the concept of chastity now is and how far woman has 'fallen' from that primeval and innocent state.¹³² His intention could hardly have been to nullify the force of his attack on his primary target by undercutting it with irreverent humour. Juvenal's account has much in common with Lucretius' description of life in those times (*De Rerum Natura*, 5.920ff), where the intention is obviously not satirical; furthermore, Juvenal's explanation *quippe aliter tunc . . . vivebant homines* (11-3) reinforces the idea that he is presenting the 'animality' of life in the Golden Age not as something to be merely ridiculed, but as a way of emphasising his conviction that chastity is incompatible with *luxuria* and *mollitia*; and here he again stresses money as the source of evil and moral corruption: *prima peregrinos obscena pecunia mores / intulit, et turpi fregerunt saecula luxu / divitiae molles . . .* (298-300).¹³³ With this may be compared the approving portrait of Roman women in Republican times:

praestabat castas humilis fortuna Latinas

¹³² On the importance of chastity in idealised portrayals of early Rome, see Edwards 1993:42-7. Juvenal was considerably more cynical and censorious than the annalist L. Calpurnius Piso, who appears to have regarded 154 BCE as the year when 'chastity was overthrown' (Pliny *NH* 17,244 = Piso fr. 38, *HRR*).

¹³³ Singleton (1972:165) offers a far more subtle and complex analysis of Juvenal's purpose: '[the prologue] is an ironical statement by Juvenal of his sphere of interest as a satirist, implying that he speaks for and to civilized men, accepting both the disadvantages and the potential value of the civilized state. This involves the acceptance of the inevitable sinfulness of civilization, but also the fact that civilization is moral *because* it is sinful, for clearly morality cannot exist unless the possibility of its opposite also exists.' I imagine that Juvenal's audience would have settled for a far simpler and more obvious interpretation: as uncouth as they were, those cave-dwelling females of the Golden Age were morally superior to their adulterous descendants; the intention to make rustic simplicity the butt of ridicule is far less obvious here than, for example, in the case of Ovid's description of Romulus' crowd of shaggy-headed yokels ogling the Sabine maidens (*A.A.* 1.107-10. On the other hand, Juvenal find it expedient to exploit his contemporaries' distaste for the uncouthness of their distant forebears at the conclusion of the eighth *Satire*: *maiorum primus, quisquis fuit ille, tuorum / aut pastor fuit aut illud quod dicere nolo* (8.274-5).

*quondam, nec vitiis contingi parva sinebant
 tecta labor somnique breves et vellere Tusco
 vexatae duraeque manus ac proximus urbi
 Hannibal et stantes Collina turre mariti* (6.287-91).

Winkler labels the image of the dutiful wife as 'trite',¹³⁴ but it should be noted that Juvenal actually adds a fresh dimension to this conventional portrait by stressing the *physical* toughness of such women (*vexatae duraeque manus*). To import the essentially twentieth century notion that women 'probably hated' such manual labour and 'must have been exceedingly bored by it' is to lose sight of the very straightforward point that Juvenal is making: it is hard to believe that these hardy and upright women were the ancestors of today's 'monsters': *unde haec monstra tamen vel quo de fonte requiris?* (6.286).

The most striking 'set pieces' in the sixth *Satire* involve upper class women - and their cowed or conniving husbands. The first extended satirical attack is aimed at a representative of the senatorial class, who deserted her husband and eloped with a gladiator:¹³⁵

*nupta senatori comitata est Eppia ludum
 ad Pharon et Nilum famosaque moenia Lagi,
 prodigia et mores urbis damnante Canopo.
 immemor illa domus et coniugis atque sororis
 nil patriae indulsit, plorantisque improba natos
 utque magis stupeas ludos Paridemque reliquit.* (82-7)

¹³⁴ Winkler 1983:32.

¹³⁵ This scandalous episode is prefaced by allusions to women's uncontrollable sexual passion for pantomime actors, musicians and even gladiators; one of these, the wife of Lentulus, is unmistakably aristocratic, and makes her adultery more reprehensible by giving birth to a swordfighter's offspring; this gross flouting of social conventions is vividly conveyed by the description of a 'high class' crib containing an infant with degenerate features: . . . *ut testudineo tibi, Lentule, conopeo / nobilis Euryalum murmillonem exprimat infans* (80-1).

For Juvenal, Eppia's behaviour goes further than the crime of adultery *per se* and is seen almost as a flouting of the ideals of *pietas*, the innocent victims being not only the woman's immediate family and household but even the reputation of her *patria*.¹³⁶ It is, of course, also symptomatic of the aristocracy's abandonment of its traditional duty as a role-model for society: its behaviour now is depraved enough to justify the assertion that Rome's sense of morality pales before that of Egyptian Canopus. Eppia's flouting of convention is seen not only in her adulterous relationship with a member of the lowest order of society - a fact advertised by his *multa in facie deformia* (107) - but also by her eagerness to dine with the crew and to join in hauling on the *duros . . . rudentis* (102).¹³⁷

Eppia was a private individual; even more shocking is the lustful behaviour of women from the highest echelon of the aristocracy (*rivales divorum*, 115), notably that of Claudius' wife, Messalina. There could hardly be a more lurid illustration of the degradation of the aristocratic image than this: an insatiable *meretrix Augusta* in her brothel, nakedly flaunting the womb which gave birth to the *generosus Britannicus* and defiling the Imperial *pulvinar* with the *lupinaris . . . odorem* (116-32). Together, these two women represent a startling enough indictment of the aristocracy. Yet the negative impression is compounded by numerous further *exempla*: the adulterous Caesennia,¹³⁸ whose enormous dowry ensured the conniving silence of her cuckolded husband (136-41); the extravagant Bibula (142-60);¹³⁹ female descendants of the famous Lepidi, Metelli and Fabii, who disport themselves in the arena in full gladiatorial kit, something which even a real gladiator's 'floozy' would not do (246-67); the sex-crazed Saufeia and

¹³⁶ The far-reaching consequences of sexual vice are similarly emphasised at 2. 162-70.

¹³⁷ On the scandal attached to a woman's adulterous relationship with a social inferior, see Edwards 1993:52-3: 'Female sexuality was a potent danger for Roman moralists because it might disrupt status distinctions. Sexual relationships between high status women and low status men were an affront not only to the individual husband but to the social order.' Such was the mind-set which produced *apartheid* South Africa's infamous 'Immorality Act', which outlawed sexual relationships between the dominant White race and other population groups.

¹³⁸ L. Caesennius Paetus was consul in AD 61.

¹³⁹ *Cognomen* of the Calpurnii and Sulpicii.

Medullina, desecrating the Bona Dea rites (314-36);¹⁴⁰ the ostentatious and spendthrift Ogulnia (352-6);¹⁴¹ a descendant of the 'blue-blooded' Claudian family, with an obsession for a stage-musician (385-97);¹⁴² the brash, 'know-all' type who flouts social norms by intruding on the male domain (*coetus . . . virorum*, 399) and by engaging generals in conversation, even 'upstaging' her husband (*praesente marito*, 400);¹⁴³ and, most repulsive of all, the outrageously crude and physical woman who assaults her (male) neighbour on the slightest pretext, indulges in a vigorous weight-lifting session at the public baths, submits to a 'pelvic-massage' by the masseur, and, on her return home, vomits up wine before her dinner guests and her nauseated husband (413-33).¹⁴⁴

While it is their decadence and shockingly abnormal behaviour which give notoriety to these female representatives of the upper classes, it is quite in keeping with Juvenal's attitude to regard *wealthy* woman as especially hard to stomach: *intolerabilius nihil est*

¹⁴⁰ Both are aristocratic names, the point emphasised by *palma inter dominas, virtus natalibus aequa* (323); Medullina was a *cognomen* of the gens *Furia*; see Courtney 1980:299. The lewdness and drunkenness represent a bizarre travesty of a ceremony conducted by chosen *matronae* under the guidance of the Vestals.

¹⁴¹ Q. Ogulnius Gallus was consul in 269.

¹⁴² *quaedam de numero Lamiarum ac nominis Appi / . . . stetit ante aram nec turpe putavit / pro cithara velare caput dictataque verba / pertulit, ut mos est, et aperta palluit agna* (385; 390-2).

¹⁴³ The phrase *recta facie siccisque mamillis* (401) nicely conveys Juvenal's contempt not only for her intolerable brazenness but also for her physical deviation from the 'norms' of femininity. She is the antithesis of the fecund primitive described in lines 5-10: 'Dry breasts, of course, carry the whole weight of invective against a woman who is so little part of her sex that she does not even possess the capability of being a mother' (Gold 1998:374). Juvenal's remark is another indication that his portrait of the latter as *potanda ferens infantibus ubera magnis* (9) is not satirical in purpose.

¹⁴⁴ This woman is not named, but the *marmoribus, aurata . . . pelvis* and *Falernum* (430-1) clearly indicate an upper-class context; so, too, in the case of the vain, vicious, spendthrift and gullibly superstitious types described in lines 474-591. Seneca, it would seem, would not have found Juvenal's description of the vomiting female athlete excessively lurid: [*sc. feminae*] *non minus pervigilant, non minus potant, et oleo* (i.e. wrestling) *et mero viros provocant; aequae invitae ingesta visceribus per os reddunt et vinum omne remetiuntur* (Seneca, *Ep.* 95). Cicero also used nauseating detail to equally good effect in his attack on Antony: *in coetu vero populi Romani negotium publicum gerens, magister equitum, cui ructare turpe esset, is vomens frustis esculentis vnum redolentibus gremium suum et totum tribunal inplevit!* (*Phil.* 2.63).

quam femina dives (460).¹⁴⁵ Underlying this assertion is the familiar symbiosis of vice and ostentatious affluence:

*nil non permittit mulier sibi, turpe putat nihil,
cum viridis gemmas collo circumdedit et cum
auribus extentis magnos commisit elenchos.* (457-9)

Not only do such 'aristocratic' women flout the *mores* of their social class and position, but they even negate the female's fundamental and natural role of child-bearing by regular recourse to abortion.¹⁴⁶ Juvenal pointedly contrasts the selfishness and weakness of aristocratic women with the laudable sense of responsibility and physical vigour of their humbler counterparts:

*hae tamen (sc. plebeiae) et partus subeunt discrimen et omnis
nutricis tolerant fortuna urgente labores,
sed iacet aurato vix ulla puerpera lecto.
tantum artes huius, tantum medicamina possunt,
quae steriles facit atque homines in ventre necandos
conducit.* (592-7)

Yet Juvenal's characteristic cynicism enables him to capitalize on this failing of upper-class females, to the further detriment of their class: the unfortunate husband of such a woman would actually be well advised to administer the potion himself, in order to abort the embarrassing product of his wife's adultery: the *decolor heres* . . . *numquam tibi mane videndus* (600-1), fathered by some Aethiopian;¹⁴⁷ and, in case one should

¹⁴⁵ On problems with this section of text and the likelihood that this line is genuine see Courtney 1980:321-2.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. the unnatural unproductiveness of such females, alluded to earlier in the phrase *recta facie siccisque mamillis* (401).

¹⁴⁷ Such a taunt was apparently used by Antony, who claimed that Octavian's maternal grandfather was an African, who ran a scent shop and then turned his hand to baking (Cic. *Phil.* 3.15f). This is not the only instance where Juvenal exploits colour-prejudice; cf. 2.23: *loripedem*

mistake this for an isolated lapse in fidelity and decorum, Juvenal indulges in an effective piece of *praeteritio*:

*transeo suppositos et gaudia votaue saepe
ad spurcos decepta lacus, saepe inde petitos
pontifices, salios Scaurorum nomina falso
corpore laturos. (602-5)*

Who needs a degenerate Gracchus to desecrate the ancient and holy Salian brotherhood (2.116-26), when the travesty can be ensured at the moment of conception by a member of the equally illustrious *gens Aemilia*? And typically Juvenalian is the bitter conclusion:

*stat Fortuna improba noctu
adridens nudis infantibus: hos fovet omni
involvitque sinu, domibus tunc porrigit altis
secretumque sibi mimum parat; hos amat, his se
ingerit utque suos semper producit alumnos. (605-9)¹⁴⁸*

Juvenal chooses as the climax to his tirade against women a type of crime which he has already presented as especially heinous: the murder of one's kin by means of poison.¹⁴⁹ This time the crime's enormity is on a par with the worst that myth and tragedy can offer: a mother's murder of her own children; and Juvenal cleverly confronts his

*rectus derideat, Aethiopem albus; 5.53-5: nigri manus ossea Mauri / et cui per mediam nolis
occurrere noctem, / clivosae veheris dum per monumenta Latinae; 8.32-3: nanum cuiusdam
Atlanta vocamus, / Aethiopem Cycnum. Popular ridicule of another negroid 'characteristic' is
also seen in his reference to the abnormally large breasts of the women of southern Egypt: in
Meroe crasso maiorem infante mamillam (13.163). On miscegenation as a satirical theme, see
Snowden 1970:194-5.*

¹⁴⁸ A sentiment which has much in common with the observation in *Satire 3: cum sint / quales ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum, extollit quotiens voluit Fortuna iocari* (3.38-40).

¹⁴⁹ 1.69-72 (note that the murderess is a *matrona potens*).

audience with an actual and notorious crime, which effectively nullifies the distinction between the realm of theatrical fiction and the harsh realities¹⁵⁰ of life in Rome:

*fingimus haec altum satura sumente coturnum
scilicet, et finem egressi legemque priorum
grande Sophocleo carmen bacchamur hiatu
montibus ignotum Rutulis caeloque Latino.
nos utinam vani. sed clamat Pontia 'feci,
confiteor, puerisque meis aconita paravi,
quae deprensa patent; facinus tamen ipsa peregi.'
tune duos una, saevissima vipera, cena?
tune duos? 'septem, si septem forte fuissent.' (634-42)*

Not content with the horror of the crime itself, Juvenal contrives to make the deed of the Roman murderess even worse than that of her mythical counterparts: while Procne and Medea were the victims of overwhelming passion and rage,¹⁵¹ real Roman women like Pontia do it 'for the cash' (*propter nummos*, 646). In Juvenal's assertion, *illam ego non tulerim quae conputat et scelus ingens / sana facit* (651-2), the reader is yet again confronted by one of his most insistent themes: the close relationship between *crimen* and *avaritia*.

¹⁵⁰ While the criminal's chilling admission in line 642 is more likely the product of lurid poetic licence than based on fact (but who can say with certainty?), there can be little doubt that the crime itself was well known: Martial mentions Pontia (possibly the daughter of C. Petronius Pontius Nigrinus; see Courtney 1980:346) on three occasions: 2.34.6; 4.43.5; 6.75.

¹⁵¹

*minor admiratio summis
debetur monstis, quotiens facit ira nocentes
hunc sexum et rabie iecur incendente feruntur
praecipites, ut saxa iugis abrupta, quibus mons
subtrahitur clivoque latus pendente recedit. (646-50)*

Juvenal's exoneration of these desperate women is similar to that of the unfortunate victims of siege in *Satire 15* (lines 93-106), who were forced to resort to cannibalism - unlike the Egyptians who were guilty of gratuitous savagery.

Satire 6 is a misogynistic *tour de force*, despite the fact that it 'does not belong to the genre of catalogue or all-embracing misogynistic rant',¹⁵² but, for all its lurid exaggeration and unfairness, the character of the speaker is quite consistent with that which emerges from the earlier *Satires*. This impression is corroborated not so much by misogyny *per se*, which is not a salient feature of *Satires 1* and 2,¹⁵³ but by the presence of traits which are far more explicit in the previous *Satires*: in particular, Juvenal's sneering contempt for a decadent and effete aristocracy, whose members flout the old-fashioned social and sexual norms of Roman society;¹⁵⁴ his conviction that wealth is the source of evil; and his sentimental attachment to the ideal of a lifestyle characterized by austerity and simplicity.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵² Braund 1992:72-3. Juvenal's omission of lesbian practices from the catalogue of female vices can perhaps be seen as corroboration of this view; on the other hand, it could also be seen as indicative of a certain consistency on Juvenal's part, in the light of Laronia's disclaimer at 2.47-9: *non erit ullum / exemplum in nostro tam detestabile sexu. / Tedia non lambit Cluviam nec Flora Catullam*.

¹⁵³ The bare-breasted *bestiana* of *Satire 1* (lines 22-3) features more as an indictment of perverted social norms than as an object of masculine contempt. Of course, there can be little difficulty in attributing misogyny as well to the personality which emerges from Book 1. Courtney's (1980:252-3) observation is pertinent: '... when the development of the argument is considered in conjunction with the vehemence of the denunciation of women it becomes hard to deny that Juvenal is spurred by genuine personal misogyny; and remarks in this direction can be found in his other poems (10.321, 11.186 sqq., 13.191-2), though of course it is hard to judge how far they derive from a settled conviction.' I am inclined to give Juvenal the benefit of the doubt, and therefore remain sceptical of Braund's view (1992:85) that he has created 'a kind of Roman Alf Garnett for the audience's amusement' or that 'this dissuasion [from marriage] is flawed by his personality and his evident failure to convince his addressee' (86). I suspect that Juvenal knew very well what his (predominantly male?) audience liked to hear and that his listeners were unlikely to have been torn between enjoyment of indulging their prejudices and misgivings about the validity of his views on the opposite sex.

¹⁵⁴ Female members of the aristocracy also display a physical weakness, symptomatic of moral decadence: the converse of *mens sana in corpore sano* (10.356)

¹⁵⁵ E.g. *et quis tunc hominum contemptor numinis, aut quis / simpuvium ridere Numae nigrumque catinum / et Vaticano fragiles de monte patellas / ausus erat? sed nunc ad quas non Clodius aras?* (6.342-5). Women are also characterized as subverters of traditional Italian norms in their aping of Greek ways, from speech to sexual positions (6.185-99); on Juvenal's adaptation of Martial 10.68 and 6.23 in this passage, see Colton 1974.

The authorial personality and convictions which emerge from Books 1 and 2 are remarkably consistent;¹⁵⁶ even when the satirist uses Umbricius to deliver the attack in the third *Satire*, there is no clear distinction between this speaker and the authorial voice of the previous *Satires*. Throughout the first six *Satires*, the reader is in the company of a conservative, xenophobic, resentful and irascible personality, whose anger and indignation are directed relentlessly at the upper echelons of society which have failed so shamefully to safeguard the 'traditional' order of Roman society and its *mores*. While the scope of his indictment ranges beyond the limits of the capital itself to parts of the Empire whose remoteness is no safeguard against the corrupting infection of the *mores praetextati*,¹⁵⁷ it is clear that Juvenal's pessimistic pronouncements on Roman society are not the product of disinterested and objective analysis: his anger and resentment stem in the first instance from his plight as a neglected dependant within an increasingly dysfunctional social system.

His obsessive hostility towards the upper classes is therefore better understood as the product of *real* grievances and a *genuinely* reactionary character than as a consciously contrived literary *persona*.¹⁵⁸ Of all the issues which shape Juvenal's satire, none is so persistently juxtaposed or so personally relevant as the tension between *paupertas* and *avaritia*: herein lies the most potent catalyst behind his satirical attack on those he holds responsible for the plight of dependants like himself and for the general malaise affecting Roman society. The paucity of explicit biographical information in the *Satires* themselves must not be allowed to diminish the importance of those few factors in

¹⁵⁶ Even Juvenal's recommendation of a boy lover at 6.30-4, despite showing such abhorrence of the homosexuals in *Satire* 2, is not to be interpreted as inconsistent or hypocritical: the latter are notoriously characterized as *pathici*, and his contempt for such deviants is seen again in his portrait of the despicable Virro in *Satire* 9.

¹⁵⁷ Here used in a broader sense than it is in *Satire* 2.170.

¹⁵⁸ Wilson (1995:8-9) has ventured to suggest that Juvenal's personal experience might have had some bearing on *Satire* 6: 'If we are to assume that Juvenal wrote the Sixth *Satire* with any sort of personal conviction and that it is not a 'rhetorical set-piece', then it is quite possible that Juvenal's universal and relentless harangue stems from . . . a failed relationship or marriage, perhaps with a rich woman, since so many of Juvenal's epigrams are against the well-off women of Rome, in which he has been let down and has let himself down by a 'social myth . . . an expectation of some sort of pervasive *Pudicitia*, which simply does not exist.'

Juvenal's life about which we can be reasonably certain: that he was a dependant and that this dependancy, like that of his friend Martial (and of intellectuals in general), was probably intensified by the quest for *otium*, in order to pursue his literary career. For this reason, *Satire 7* probably brings us closer to Juvenal's personal circumstances and feelings than any other of the *Satires* - even though he there assumes the role of champion of struggling intellectuals in general, making his own predicament clear through sympathetic association with the plight of his fellow poets rather than from an exclusively personal standpoint. However, the fact that he speaks from the standpoint of someone whose profession necessarily brought him into intimate contact with the wealthy elite in their affluent surroundings¹⁵⁹ is likely to have made his feelings of resentment all the more acute.

In the following discussion of *Satires 7, 8 and 9* it will be argued that the motivation for and focus of his satirical attack remain unchanged, and that these poems have a far closer affinity with those of the preceding Books than some recent critics would allow: Book 3 is characterized more by the consistency of its authorial personality and convictions than by a newly contrived poetic *persona* and infusion of pervasive irony.

¹⁵⁹ E.g. Fronto's residence, graced by its marble columns and statues (1.12-3), and the *nobilium magna atria* mentioned at 7.91.

CHAPTER 4

Tongue in Cheek for 243 Lines?

Juvenal on the Patronage of Intellectuals in the Seventh *Satire*

When [Juvenal] wrote Book I, he was derisively unsympathetic towards serious poetry; now he thinks of it as a noble aspiration which deserves encouragement. He said then that it was a useless occupation, and added that the results bored him to death. Now he admires the poet who pawns his overcoat and dishes to keep him alive while finishing his tragedy, and he expresses kindness for the poet laureate Statius who had to write ballet-scenarios in order to pay the grocer's bill.

So wrote Gilbert Highet,¹ who, in the words of David Wiesen,² 'neatly sidesteps the problem by simply assuming a change of heart' on Juvenal's part. How indeed does one reconcile Juvenal's mocking dismissal of the themes of contemporary poetry and his almost vindictive espousal of satire as his chosen medium with his ostensible championing, in *Satire 7*, of poets and other intellectuals who are denied adequate financial and material support? If he was being really serious, he could hardly have endeared himself to the bards of his day with his contemptuous and aggressive attitude towards their poetry:³

Semper ego auditor tantum? numquamne reponam

¹ Highet 1954:107.

² Wiesen 1973:465, n.1.

³ For a discussion of the salient features of this opening passage, see Wehrle 1992:10-2.

*vexatus totiens rauci Theseide Cordi?
 inpune ergo mihi recitaverit ille togatas,
 hic elegos? inpune diem consumpserit ingens
 Telephus aut summi plena iam margine libri
 scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus Orestes?
 nota magis nulli domus est sua quam mihi lucus
 Martis et Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum
 Vulcani; quid agant venti, quas torqueat umbras
 Aeacus, unde alius furtivae devehat aurum
 pelliculae, quantas iaculetur Monychus ornos,
 Frontonis platani convolsaque marmora clamant
 semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae . . . (1.1-13)*

*. . . sed quid magis? Heracleas
 aut Diomedeeas aut mugitum labyrinthi
 et mare percussum puero fabrumque volantem . . . ? (1.52-4)*

The mockery emerges again in *Satire* 3, where Umbricius includes with the hazards of fires collapsing buildings and the countless other perils of life in Rome the danger posed by *Augusto recitantes mense poetas*.⁴ After being thus maligned, the more conventional poets of Juvenal's day might well have approached the seventh *Satire*, particularly the passage in which he describes the sort of frustrations they encounter in trying to organize recitations,⁵ in a decidedly cynical frame of mind: with a friend like that, who needs enemies?

Rejecting the likelihood of a sudden change of attitude on Juvenal's part when he came to compose the seventh *Satire*, Wiesen adopts a less straightforward approach towards explaining the apparent contradiction: he suggests that 'we may discover that Juvenal has not really altered his opinion at all and that beneath the superficial sympathy of

⁴ Sat. 3.9.

⁵ Sat. 7.36-47.

Satire 7 he has concealed a scorn and hostility that contradicts the apparent thesis of the poem'.⁶ In his concluding remarks, Wiesen maintains that 'the charm and wit of the satire lie precisely in the very dissonance of its two leading ideas. This counterpoint of two opposite and conflicting themes, one of which questions the validity of the other, is an essential and little noticed characteristic of Juvenalian satire'.⁷ Likewise, in his study of Juvenal's tone in *Satire 7*, Niall Rudd states that 'if we leave out the wit and the double vision, and talk only in terms of protest and compassion, we are bound to give a sentimental reading of the poem'.⁸

The combination of a new element of sympathy for the plight of the intellectuals with the familiar hostility of earlier *Satires* is seen by Susanna Braund as indicative of a change in *persona* and approach: 'The speaker's attitude is ambivalent. This double-edged and ambivalent treatment of the intellectuals is the first manifestation of Juvenal's new technique of irony with its double point of view'.⁹ Braund uses the opening twelve lines of the seventh *Satire* as an initial illustration of such a technique:

*Et spes et ratio studiorum in Caesare tantum;
solus enim tristes hac tempestate Camenas
respexit, cum iam celebres notique poetae
balneolum Gabiis, Romae conducere furnos
temptarent, nec foedum alii nec turpe putarent
praecones fieri, cum desertis Aganippes
vallibus esuriens migraret in atria Clio.
nam si Pieria quadrans tibi nullus in umbra
ostendatur, ames nomen victumque Machaerae
et vendas potius commissa quod auctio vendit*

⁶ Wiesen 1973:465.

⁷ Wiesen 1973:482.

⁸ Rudd 1976:106.

⁹ Braund 1988:29-30. See also Hardie 1990:158-60.

*stantibus, oenophorum, tripedes, armaria, cistas,
Alcithoen Pacci, Thebas et Terea Fausti.*

Braund maintains¹⁰ that the apparent sympathy for the plight of poets, who have now been reduced to menial positions, is undercut by a 'few dissonant notes': the fact that poets consider it neither *foedum* nor *turpe* to become auctioneers is indicative of a loss of all moral sensibility; the juxtaposition of the 'elevated and aloof world of poetry' in lines 6-7 with the 'harsh and mundane world of reality' incongruously 'reduces the Muse to a beggar, interested only in money'; and the inclusion of lofty sounding tragedies on mythological themes in the auctioneer's junk is an indication of how worthless and trashy such poetry is.¹¹ Braund goes on to assert that the entire poem is pervaded by this double point of view and that many statements, which on the surface are favourable to the intellectuals, are 'invariably intermingled with or followed by words, phrases and ideas which conflict with that sympathy'. This change in style and satiric technique, she maintains,¹² is seen most obviously in the disappearance of the *indignatio* which characterise Books 1 and 2: no longer do we have the angry *persona*, with his indignant rhetorical questions, or the vocabulary associated with anger, such as 'blazing' and 'enduring'.

The argument that Juvenal is being deliberately ambiguous in his treatment of patrons and clients in the seventh *Satire* is unconvincing. For it seems to me that Juvenal's central purpose in this *Satire* is an unequivocal and forthright condemnation of the failure of rich, aristocratic patrons to use their wealth to nurture poetry and other intellectual pursuits; and that, when Juvenal portrays the actual condition of contemporary writers, lawyers and teachers, this is not an exercise in ironic deflation

¹⁰ Braund 1988:30.

¹¹ In this regard, Braund quotes Wiesen (1973:469): 'If Juvenal were sympathising frankly and unambiguously with talented writers forced by grim necessity to auction off their excellent but unsaleable works, these poems would hardly form the climax in a list of second-hand junk'. Compare also Rudd 1976:90-1: 'A particularly dense effect is obtained when lofty tragedies with noble old titles are included in a pile of secondhand junk'.

¹² Braund 1988:25.

and an undercutting of his apparent sympathy for their plight, but rather a bitter indictment of the rich elite, whose selfish greed is directly responsible for the malaise. In other words, this *Satire* represents an extension (albeit in a suitably modulated form) of Juvenal's *ira* and *indignatio* into another area of life, where the nobility is guilty - yet again - of failing in its duty.

Before embarking on an analysis of the *Satire* to support this interpretation, I should like to return briefly to the point raised at the beginning of this discussion: how is one to reconcile Juvenal's ostensibly mocking dismissal of contemporary poetry in the first *Satire* in particular, with his role as champion of poets and other intellectuals in the seventh *Satire*? Friedländer has made a general observation that is pertinent here: he notes that 'it probably hardly ever occurred to Juvenal to try to avoid altogether language that might be inconsistent with that of some other *Satire*; he seems always to have kept steadily before him *just the immediate effect that he sought to produce*' (my italics)¹³. Friedländer cites examples of such inconsistencies, such as Laronia's statement with regard to female athletes at 2.53 (*luctantur paucae, comedunt colyphia paucae*) and the contradictory question at 6.246 (*endromidas Tyrias et femineum ceroma quis nescit?*).¹⁴ Now it may be objected that this and other examples of contradictory attitudes are of less significance than the question of his attitude towards writers and other intellectuals, who occupy such a prominent position at the beginning of the first *Satire* and in the seventh *Satire* as a whole. Nonetheless, it can be argued

¹³ Friedländer 1969:40.

¹⁴ Compare also 3.49, where Umbricius asks: *quis nunc diligitur nisi conscius?*, with 9.96, where Naevolus says: *qui modo secretum commiserat ardet et odit, / tamquam prodiderim, quidquid scio*. Juvenal also exploits religion to good effect: e.g. in *Satire* 6 he extols the simple piety of Numa's time (342ff) in contrast to the foul desecration of the *Bona Dea* rites, described in the preceding lines; yet he adopts a very different manner (humorously of course) when he berates Mars (and Romulus) for not reacting in anger at the shocking perversion of the marriage of a Salian priest to another man (2.126-32). Similarly, he draws on the mythology of the 'Golden Age' in his lament for the decline of chastity (6.1ff), yet he makes no secret of his scepticism about traditions relating to the underworld at the end of *Satire* 2. Furthermore, contradictions may occur within the *same* poem: e.g. in *Satire* 15 he mocks the Egyptians for abstaining from leeks and onions for religious reasons (9-11), but speaks approvingly of Pythagoras who also refused to eat certain vegetables on principle (171-4); on which contradiction see Courtney 1980:34-5; see also 13.181-92 and 13.247-9.

that, in his justification of his choice of *genre* in the first *Satire*, Juvenal deliberately and humorously¹⁵ contrived a vigorous and 'iconoclastic' attack on contemporary poets and their work as a *captatio benevolentiae*, and that his remarks there should not be taken as a reliable indication of his attitude towards the broader and more serious issue of the plight of intellectuals *in general*, which he addresses in the seventh *Satire*. Whereas Horace was quite deferential towards the practitioners of the 'higher' forms of poetry as opposed to his 'humbler' *genre* of satire and even stated that he would not be so presumptuous as to snatch satire's crown from Lucilius' head,¹⁶ Juvenal shows little of this deference and confidently asserts that he has decided to drive his team of horses down the same track as the mighty *Auruncae* . . . *alumnus* (i.e. Lucilius) did.¹⁷ This acknowledgement of Lucilius as his satirical model not only indicates Juvenal's penchant for an aggressive style of criticism, but might also explain why he begins the opening *Satire* with an attack on other *genres* of poetry: for Lucilius himself ridiculed writers of epic and tragedy for their fantastic subject matter and high-flown style.¹⁸ However, Juvenal's aggressive justification of satire's relevance may well have received encouragement from a more immediate source. Both Horace and Persius are careful to distinguish satire from the more conventional literary *genres*: Horace excludes himself from the company of 'serious' poets¹⁹, and Persius in his prologue disclaims any pretensions to being an 'inspired bard'²⁰ However, whereas Horace displays a distinctly respectful attitude towards the 'real' poets: *ingenium cui sit, cui mens divinius atque os*

¹⁵ On Juvenal's tone here see the remarks of Kenney 1962:30.

¹⁶ Hor. *Serm.* 1.4.39-44 and 1.10.40-9.

¹⁷ *Sat.* 1.19-20.

¹⁸ See Rudd 1966:108-10.

¹⁹ *Serm.* 1.10.37-9: *haec ego ludo, / quae neque in aede sonent certantia iudice Tarpa, / nec redeant iterum atque iterum spectanda theatris*.

²⁰ *nec fonte labra prolui caballino
nec in bicipiti somniasse Parnaso
memini, ut repente sic poeta prodirem.* (*Prol.* 1-3)

Wehrle(1992:6-7) maintains that 'it is a mistake to think that P. is being modest or "self-deprecatory" here' and that he 'is deliberately divorcing himself from the traditional class of poets.'

*/magna sonaturum, des nominis huius honorem.*²¹ Persius adopts a more cavalier tone: *Heliconidasque pallidamque Pirenen ? illis remitto, quorum imagines lambunt / hederæ sequaces;*²² and he makes the cynical observations that such poets are ravens and magpies enticed by the glitter of cash: *quod si dolosi spes refulserit nummi, / corvos poetas et poetridas picas / cantare credas Pegaseium nectar.*²³ The sarcastic tone of the prologue is continued in the first *Satire*, in which the artificiality of contemporary poetry is ridiculed. Much of the invective is worthy of Juvenal himself; for example:

*ecce inter pocula quaerunt
Romulidae saturi quid dia poemata narrent.
hic aliquis, cui circum umeros hyacinthina laena est,
rancidulum quiddam balba de nare locutus,
Phyllidas, Hypsipylas, vatum et plorabile siquid
eliquat ac tenero subplantat verba palato.*²⁴;

and:

*summa delumbe saliva
hoc natat in labris et in udo est Maenas et Attis
nec pluteum caedit nec demorsos sapit unguis.*²⁵

Juvenal, therefore, is not being innovative in basing his defence of satire on ridicule of the irrelevance and artificiality of contemporary literature; he is in fact exploiting a conventional theme. In the same way, the problem of the dangers posed by freedom of expression - which Juvenal resolves by a professed avoidance of direct attacks on

²¹ *Serm.* 1.4.43-4. Note also *Serm.* 1.10.40-5.

²² *Prol.* 4-6.

²³ *Prol.* 12-4.

²⁴ *Pers. Sat.* 1.30-5.

²⁵ *Pers. Sat.* 1.104-6.

the living²⁶ - is a problem which both Horace and Persius attempt to deal with, as well.²⁷ Furthermore, Juvenal's aversion to public recitals by long-winded poets is something shared by Horace and Persius alike.²⁸

It can be argued, therefore, that the conventional nature of these elements of Juvenal's *apologia*, together with the fact that Juvenal was clearly intent upon creating a lively and arresting introduction to the first *Satire*, should make one wary of assuming that the ridicule²⁹ there has a necessary bearing on his attitude to the predicament of writers - especially poets - in the seventh *Satire*. In other words, the immediate context and objective were probably decisive in shaping both the tone and content of the satirical attack at the beginning of *Satire* 1,³⁰ and this did not preclude later a sympathetic

²⁶ *dices hic forsitan 'unde
ingenium par materiae? unde illa priorum
scribendi quodcumque animo flagrante liberet
simplicitas?' (Sat. 1.150-3)*

*experiar quid concedatur in illos
quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina (Sat. 1.170-1)*

²⁷ Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.80-7; Pers. *Sat.* 1.

²⁸ Hor. *Serm.* 1.4.74-8; Pers. *Sat.* 1.13ff; 1.79ff.

²⁹ Umbricius' highlighting of 'poets reciting in the month of August', as one of the '*mille pericula saevae urbis*' (*Sat.* 3.8-9) would seem to be directed most obviously at the long-winded and uninspiring exponents of mythological themes whom he ridicules at the beginning of *Satire* 1, rather than at poets in general.

³⁰ Thus, in *Satire* 5, J's exasperated criticism of Trebius' gullibility is a dramatically effective way of throwing the character and behaviour of the despicable patron into sharper relief, and should not be viewed as a contradiction of his sympathy for the clients' miserable lot, as seen for example in *Sat.* 1.132-4: *vestibulis abeunt veteres lassique clientes / votaue deponunt, quamquam longissima cenae / spes homini; caulis miseris atque ignis emendus*. As a *dissuasio*, *Satire* 5 uses criticism of the client/addressee to facilitate the main purpose of the poem (i.e. a scathing indictment of patrons like Virro) and should not be interpreted as part of a broader process of 'disengagement from the client's viewpoint' (Braund 1988:32), which prepares the way for an ironic treatment of this group in the seventh *Satire*. Furthermore, I fail to see how the introduction of a new character, Umbricius, to deliver the poor client's complaint in *Satire* 3 'effects a slight disengagement of sympathy' (Braund 1988:32). If anything, the departure scenes at the beginning and end of the *Satire* give the poem a measure of authenticity (dare one speculate that Juvenal is drawing on actual experience in putting this lament into the mouth of a departing friend?) and the poignant mood created in those two scenes enhances, rather than detracts from, the impression that the satirist himself is at one

treatment of the more serious issue of the plight of writers, whose creativity was being stifled by the lack of adequate patronage. To borrow a comment made by Courtney, in respect of another contradictory attitude evident in *Satire* 15, it was simply a topic which could be turned to whatever use was momentarily convenient.³¹

To what extent, then, can the evidence of the seventh *Satire* itself be used to defend Juvenal against the charge that his attitude towards intellectuals in that poem is ambivalent, and that what appears to be sincere sympathy on his part is undercut by ironic deflation? For the purposes of this discussion, the precise identity of the 'Caesar' mentioned in the opening line is largely irrelevant, although I see no reason to doubt that the reference to his patronage of *studia* is a straightforward acknowledgement of that fact.³² More important are, first, the particular emphasis on the fact that this emperor is the *only* person recently to have shown concern for writers and, second, the brevity of the compliment - in comparison with the space devoted to the miserable plight of the intellectuals. The emphatic juxtaposition of the words *tantum* (1) and *solus* (2) at the end and the beginning of their respective lines almost beg the question: 'Why have *other* wealthy and traditional patrons not given the necessary encouragement and support?' The compliment to the emperor, albeit so tersely expressed as to seem a

with his friend, who is so bitter at the iniquitous lot of the free-born client in Rome. After all, the underlying sentiments in this *Satire* are the same as those found in the first *Satire*. See discussion of this point in Chapter 3.

³¹ Courtney 1980:35. Similarly, Juvenal's contemptuous use of Greek words and practices (e.g. 3.66-8; 6.185-97; 11.138-40) does not preclude him from employing the same associations in a positive manner when the context requires it (e.g. in his evocation of the true glory of Greek culture and art at 8.100-7).

³² The reference is most likely to Hadrian, who reestablished the Athenaeum (see Highet 1954:111-2). For a full discussion of the problem see Rudd 1976:84-9. See also Anderson 1955:255 and A. Hardie 1990:179 and note 143, where there is a brief survey of the main contributions to the debate. Helmbold and O'Neil (1959:107) suggest that the emperor referred to is Domitian, but that this is a veiled attack on Domitian. Bartsch (1994:145), who believes that Juvenal is taking on the *persona* of a court poet for satirical purposes, argues that there is 'no historical addressee per se.' Yet it is hardly likely that, if and when Juvenal recited this poem in public, his audience would have had no idea as to the identity of the emperor; indeed, the very absence of a name suggests the topicality of the reference.

mere statement of fact rather than an expression of gratitude,³³ is immediately overshadowed by a vivid description of the desperate plight of *celebres notique poetae* (3).

It is significant that Juvenal describes the indigent poets as 'distinguished and famous' - a clear indication that he does not have in mind the hack poets whom he ridicules in the introduction to the first *Satire*; and the early reference to the *tristes . . . Camenas* (2) shows that he is addressing a considerably weightier subject than his self-serving mockery of trite poetic themes in his *apologia*. The seriousness of the decline in the fortunes and status of writers is brought home forcefully by the fourth line, in which the *celebres notique poetae* are suddenly depicted trying their hands at lowly and demeaning occupations.³⁴ The use of the word *temptarent* (5) suggests an *effort*³⁵ at least by the poets to make a living and thus indicates a measure of sympathy and understanding on Juvenal's part: if starvation (*esuriens*, 7)³⁶ forces the *Muse herself* to leave the 'vales of Aganippe' and make for the auction-rooms (*atria*, 7), should her *proteges* be derided for turning to a similar occupation in order to survive?³⁷ This

³³ Rudd (1976:88) remarks that '... although complimentary, the references to the emperor are brief and restrained.' Ronnick (1994:91-3) believes that the phrase *ratio studiorum* is borrowed from Cicero's *Pro Archia Poeta* and that Archias' failure to reward Cicero thus imbues Juvenal's use of the phrase with an ironic undertone.

³⁴ Note the effectiveness of the chiasmic arrangement: *balneum* is juxtaposed, and thus contrasted, with *celebres notique poetae*, while the juxtapositioning of *Gabiis* and *Romae* draws attention to the fact that poets are compelled to seek a livelihood in the most inappropriate environments.

³⁵ Wiesen (1973:469), intent upon reading irony into this word, asks in an aside: 'Did they fail at this too?' So, too, Braund (1988:55): '*temptarent* (5) begins to cast doubt on the poets with its hint that they meet with failure even in such a menial role.'

³⁶ Braund (1988:30) says that the *Muse* is reduced to a beggar, '*interested only in money*'. This inference detracts from the element of sympathy and is unwarranted; the point is that the *Muse* is *starving* (*esuriens*), which hardly suggests that cash is her primary objective. Likewise I can see no justification for Wiesen's remark (1973:469): 'Perhaps the *Muse* in her straits had become a *meretrix*.'

³⁷ I therefore disagree with Braund's assertion (1988:30) that 'the fact that the poets think it *nec foedum . . . nec turpe* (5) to become auctioneers suggests that they have lost all moral sensibility'; cf. Wiesen 1973:469. Hardie (1990:169-70) makes the puzzling assertion that 'at 3ff., poets reject fame (*celebres notique*, 3), the traditional aspiration of the aristocratic

interpretation gains force if *cum . . . migraret* (6-7) is translated in a *causal* sense; and it is corroborated by lines 8-10, where the force of the subjunctives *ames* and *vendas* and the device of putting the listener/reader into the shoes, as it were, of those unfortunate writers show that, in Juvenal's view, they had no option but to turn to such occupations - however demeaning they might be.

So far, Juvenal has employed a carefully contrived series of contrasting images and associations to accentuate the degradation of poets and their art: *spes et ratio studiorum / tristes . . . Camenas; celebres notique poetae / balneum . . . furnos . . . praecones; Aganippes vallibus / atria*. This technique³⁸ is pursued in lines 8-12, where the peaceful and leisurely connotations of *Pieria . . . in umbra* are nullified by the competitive clamour of the auction-room (*commissa . . . auctio*), and the names of poets and their works (*Alcithoen Pacci, Thebas et Terea Fausti*) are appended to a list of goods in an auction lot. It has been argued (see above) that if Juvenal were really sympathising with talented writers, he would not make these poems 'form the climax in a list of second-hand junk.'³⁹ A more likely explanation, in the light of what has been said about his attitude towards the distinguished poets and the Muses in the preceding lines, is that Juvenal is intent upon jolting the reader into a sharper awareness of the

Greek poet, for the obscurity, but warmth and profit, of the bath-house keeper or baker.' To attribute any enthusiasm to the poets' enforced involvement in what Juvenal later describes as *indignum . . . laborem* (17) would make nonsense of the obvious intention of this passage - an intention which Hardie alludes to as a possibility: 'Juvenal may intend a contrast between the fame of the poets and the social *infamia* of their adopted activities.'

³⁸ On Juvenal's 'juxtaposition of grand and lowly diction and concepts' see A. Hardie 1990:155-6.

³⁹ Hardie (1990:161) maintains that the goods listed are in fact accessories to his work as a poet, the *oenophorum* being his wine-flagon, the *tripedes* prizes from competitive victories and the works named in line 12 his tragic models. Hardie goes on to assert that he is 'thus characterised as a deep-drinking, competitive, tragic poet, specialising in mythological fantasies.' It is an interesting conjecture - one could probably include *armaria* (as 'book-cases') - but the presence of *cistas* (chests, boxes) does not obviously reinforce the connection; furthermore, it is possible that the *tripedes* are simply 'three-legged tables' (as is commonly assumed), and not prizes. On the inferior quality of *tripedes* see Courtney 1980:351. A striking contrast between the conglomeration of high-sounding proper names in line 12 and the mundane nature of the objects on auction remains the most attractive explanation. Those who wish to see ironic deflation in line 12 will, of course, be tempted to assume that the tragedies are of poor quality and thus deserving of disposal.

scandalous reality that works of literature can be debased to such an extent (in the same way as it is shocking to think of a Muse as a refugee from the 'vales of Aganippe', scrounging a living in the auction-rooms). The next sentence tends to confirm the impression that Juvenal is focusing on the disgraceful fact that a poet can be compelled to lower himself to the status of an auctioneer and his books to the level of 'job lots', rather than indulging in mockery of the quality of the literary works: he points out that at least this occupation (*hoc satius*, 13) is preferable to perjuring oneself in court, as do the *equites Asiani* (14). Juvenal's animosity against eastern immigrants is always close to the surface; however, while this may strike one, in the first instance, as a gratuitous and witty insult, it does make the point that the indigent poet is at least attempting to make an *honest* living.

At line 17 Juvenal reverts to the 'positive' theme of the emperor's patronage:

*nemo tamen studiis indignum ferre laborem
cogetur posthac, nectit quicumque canoris
eloquium vocale modis laurumque momordit.
hoc agite, o iuvenes. circumspicit et stimulat vos
materiamque sibi ducis indulgentia quaerit. (17-21)*

It is quite clear that Juvenal recognises the fact that poets have been *compelled* to resort to demeaning jobs (*nemo . . . cogetur posthac*), and so this acknowledgement of their predicament complements the sympathy inherent in lines 3-11. However, what is one to make of the rather high-flown definition of a poet as one who *nectit . . . canoris / eloquium vocale modis lauris* *que momordit*? For Wiesen the explanation is obvious: 'When Juvenal launches into the grand style, parody should always be suspected. The lofty description of the poet . . . suggests the distance between the poets' exalted self-image and the petty squalor of their lives; it thus mocks their pretensions.'⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Wiesen 1973:470. Similarly Braund 1988:55-6: 'But the magnificent effect is capped by a bathetic and uncomplimentary phrase which makes inspiration sound rather silly - *laurumque momordit*.' One can make the phrase sound silly by translating the verb as 'chomping' - as Braund does in her note (p. 215) - but it is likely that Juvenal intended the phrase

Yet are the poets themselves really being mocked by the use of this consciously poetic language and imagery, or is it even possible that the 'speaker' is deliberately aping the excesses of a court poet 'praising the emperor to offer potential criticism of his effect on creative speech in general'⁴¹? I am inclined to see in these lines yet another stark contrast (of the sort seen several times in lines 3-12), whereby Juvenal draws attention to the yawning gulf between the ideal and the reality. In this instance the elevated diction contrasts the cherished ideals and conventions of poetic creativity with the squalid reality of the *indignum . . . laborem*, which has hitherto blighted the lives of writers.⁴² The same technique can be seen at work in lines 60-2, where *maesta / paupertas atque aeris inops, quo nocte dieque / corpus eget* is thrown into sharper relief by the heightened imagery of *neque enim cantare sub antro / Pierio thyrsusque potest contingere*. An intention to ridicule does not seem obvious in the latter passage, where the very familiarity of the imagery or *topoi* highlights the fact that the nurturing of a cultural tradition which has hitherto been taken for granted is now withering through neglect.

At this point a brief remark on Juvenal's use of *topoi* and borrowings is necessary. In her analysis of lines 1-97, Braund focuses on Juvenal's 'sustained use of poetic *topoi* and allusions connected with patronage and inspiration of poetry' and maintains that this feature 'lends an extra ironic tone to the whole section':

This pastiche of over-familiar commonplaces and "borrowed" thoughts and expressions will have been obvious to the Roman audience, well-versed in the "classics" like Virgil and Horace . . . and well acquainted with the

to complement the previous one in portraying the elevated realm of poetic creativity. Why should the notion of 'chewing laurel leaves' not be taken in a straightforward symbolic sense, without pejorative overtones?

⁴¹ See Bartsch 1994:146.

⁴² Braund 1988:38 remarks that the phrase *canoris / . . . modis* seems to be taken from Virgil, *Aen.* 7.699-701, and also cites Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.76, Hor. *Ars* 322 and Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.3-4. If Juvenal's audience recognised this phrase to be 'full of echoes' (as Braund describes it), this would have given added emphasis to the contrast between the ideal of unhampered poetic creativity and the sordid reality of *indignum . . . laborem*.

court poetry of more recent (and also, presumably, contemporary) times

43

Yet allusiveness and imitation are part of the very fabric of Roman poetry in general,⁴⁴ and the assumption that Juvenal's audience would necessarily have attributed *his* allusions and borrowings to an ironic motive is at least open to question. Indeed, the very familiarity of a *topos* is sometimes exploited to good effect, as has been argued above. Another example is Juvenal's use of the poetic shade (*Pieria . . . in umbra*, 8): with its connotations of peace and tranquillity it provides a fine contrast with the pandemonium of the auction-room (cf. above); and the common motif of a deity leaving the earth in disgust is cleverly adapted when Clio is made to head not for heaven, as might be expected, but for the auction-rooms (lines 6-7).

The more positive tone of lines 17-19 is heightened in the exhortation to younger aspirant poets (*iuvenes*) to get to work and to take advantage of the emperor's *indulgentia*. One suspects, however, that the feelings of euphoric expectation which the poet appears to be arousing in the younger writers is part of a contrived climax before the sharp change of direction and mood in line 22; for this marks the start of the real theme of the *Satire*: a bitter indictment of the nobility for their failure to provide writers (and other intellectuals) with adequate financial support. The phrase *ducis indulgentia* was a commonly used technical term for imperial favour,⁴⁵ and its prominent position at the end of the exhortation to the *iuvenes* stresses once again the point made so forcefully in the opening lines of the *Satire*: that the emperor is the *only* source of patronage available. It was remarked earlier that Juvenal's praise in lines 1-3 is far from

⁴³ Braund 1988:42.

⁴⁴ Quintilian recognises the essential role of imitation in art: *artis pars magna contineatur imitatione* (*Inst.* 10.2.1). Wiesen (1963:451) makes the apposite observation: 'Moreover, Petrarch, whose knowledge of Latin literature was no doubt equal to that of most of Juvenal's critics, assuredly recognized a *locus communis* when he saw one, but he did not exclaim derivate! insincere! every time he came across a *topos* in the satires.' See also Townend 1974:148, Rudd 1976:149-50 and Chapter 1 above.

⁴⁵ See Courtney 1980:353 and Braund 1988:36. Ferguson (1979:219) notes that the phrase occurs no fewer than twenty times in Pliny's letters to Trajan.

fulsome. The reason is that a eulogy of the emperor is of secondary importance to the theme of this *Satire*: the mere fact that patronage can be shown to emanate from a single and clearly defined source provides Juvenal with an ideal platform for his attack on the rich elite. That much is evident both from the content and tone of the rest of the poem and from the fact that not a single further compliment is paid to the emperor concerned; from line 22 onwards Juvenal becomes wholly absorbed in the elite's dereliction of duty in this sphere of patronage.

Such an understanding of the function of Juvenal's compliment to the emperor at the beginning of the poem will no doubt appear as naïvely simplistic in the light of Shadi Bartsch's recent analysis:

. . . if, as I have argued, the poet Maternus of the *Dialogus* stands revealed as a paradigm for the practice of doublespeak and the loss of *libertas* even as he flatters the emperor with words that deny the importance of that loss, so too the speaking poet in *Satire 7* can emerge as an exemplum of the political impotence (and stylistic degeneracy) of court poetry even as he speaks the flattering words that deny to imperial influence any effect but a beneficial one.⁴⁶

Some of Bartsch's arguments will be commented on in the course of this discussion. However, the subversive role ascribed to the poet in the first part of this *Satire* might be easier to accept (for all its subtlety and complexity) *in isolation*: it is less convincing in the overall context of Juvenal's *unambiguous* indictment of so-called patrons for their neglect of intellectuals in general. I stress the word 'unambiguous', for it seems to me that the key to understanding this poem lies in seeing a single and overriding purpose behind it - a further manifestation of his consistent resentment at the greed and selfishness of the rich elite.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Bartsch 1994:126.

⁴⁷ For this reason, I favour the very approach which Bartsch finds inadequate: 'Let us cast Juvenal (*at the cost to be sure, of identifying him with the poem's first-person voice*) in the

The announcement that no other source of patronage exists is sudden and blunt (*si qua aliunde putas . . .*, 22); and the stark truth of this fact is emphasised by the ensuing imagery, dominated by notions of futility and waste. The fullness of expression here, together with the verb *impletur*, serves to emphasise the sheer quantity of work involved and to accentuate the idea of utterly wasted effort, when the poet is advised to consign all that he has produced to the flames or to abandon them to the bookworms.⁴⁸ The sentiment here has much in common with Juvenal's recognition of the enormous efforts demanded of historians (98-102; see below). The tone of bitter cynicism is intensified by the mock-epic periphrasis *Veneris marito*: Vulcan is cast in the role of a grand 'patron' who will promptly reduce the poet's offering to ashes.⁴⁹

In the line *frange miser calamum vigilataque proelia dele* (27), Juvenal's indebtedness to Martial is obvious: *frange leves calamos et scinde, Thalia, libellos*.⁵⁰ These words form the climax to an observation and question (*at me litterulas stulti docuere parentes: / quid cum grammaticis rhetoribusque mihi?*), whose cynical tone is captured and developed by Juvenal. However, whereas the mention of *Thalia* in Martial's poem calls to mind the *genres* of lyric or comedy, Juvenal intensifies the sense of wasted effort by

mold of a man of mixed feelings or limited tact, and all difficulties fade.'

⁴⁸ A similar emphasis on the futility of effort occurs in lines 98-102, where Juvenal addresses the historians:

*vester porro labor fecundior, historiarum
scriptores? perit hic plus temporis atque olei plus.
nullo quippe modo millensima pagina surgit
omnibus et crescit multa damnosa papyro;*

And it is to be noted that, if Juvenal were intent upon ridiculing the efforts of historians, he would not make a point of accounting for the size of their out-put: *sic ingens rerum numerus iubet atque operum lex*.

⁴⁹ Wiesen (1973:472) describes this phrase as a 'ludicrous epic periphrasis' which is 'exactly the sort of clumsy attempt at noble expression that might appear in a hack epic.' However, if this phrase is to be labelled as something worthy of a hack epic, what is one to make of other 'epic' periphrases in Juvenal - such as *per quem magnus equos Auruncae flexit alumnus* (1.20) or *proponimus illuc / ire, fatigatas ubi Daedalus exiit alas* (3.24-5)?

⁵⁰ Mart.9.73.9. It was Martial who first used the word *calami* in the sense of 'pens', as opposed to 'arrows' or 'pipes' - as used respectively by Virgil and Calpurnius; see Rudd 1976:93.

addressing a poet working in the 'weightier' domain of epic poetry (*vigilata proelia*). The word *vigilata* obviously refers to *lucubratio*, and thus stresses the sheer mental (and physical) strain of composition, while the privations and discomfort endured by the hapless poet are suggested by imagining him at work in a tiny attic (*parva . . . cella*, 28: reminiscent of the poet Cordus' living conditions in *Satire* 3). Rather than exposing the 'absurd grandeur of *sublimia carmina*', as Wiesen⁵¹ maintains, the *parva cella* (note the pointed juxtapositioning of the two adjectives) serves to draw attention to the discrepancy between the exalted nature of the poet's art and his squalid and demeaning living conditions; and the image of the emaciated poet is brilliantly captured and preserved for posterity, as it were, in the concluding phrase *imagine macra* (29). Throughout this passage (22-9), Juvenal's indignation at the futility of poetic endeavour in the absence of financial support - for that is the crux of the matter, as the prosaic *praesidia* (23) emphasises - is patent. He expresses this indignation forcefully in his utterly cynical advice to the self-deluding poet (*posce; dona; clude; pertunde; frange, dele* - notice how the imperatives reach a crescendo of destructiveness) and in his portrayal of the way in which the art of poetry has in effect been reduced to futile privation and drudgery.

Yet the cynicism which pervades this passage does not call into question Juvenal's *sympathy* for his fellow poets, whose desperate plight has already been portrayed with genuine understanding in lines 3-16. Juvenal certainly does not treat Telesinus' 'misguided' attitude with the same sneering contempt with which he berates Trebius in *Satire* 5; pity and understanding are far more evident, not only in the word *miser* (27), but also in the description of the hardships afflicting him. The focus, ultimately, is not on an ironic exposé of the intrinsic worthlessness of his poetry, but on the cause of the crisis affecting him and other poets. The attack on the rich upper classes for their greed and selfish neglect of the *diserti* is too sustained and single-minded throughout the *Satire* to suggest that Juvenal would have undermined his seriousness at the outset by denigrating the very people whose plight gave rise to his attack.

⁵¹ Wiesen 1973:472. See also Braund 1988:56-7.

Line 30 marks the beginning of the real attack on the *dives avarus*, whose dereliction of duty was hinted at earlier: *sí qua aliunde putas . . . praesidia* (22-3). The hollow trappings of recognition - an ivy garland and an emaciated bust - represent the sum total of the rich man's contribution to the welfare of the poet: *spes nulla ulterior*.⁵² It is as if the poet has become a mere object for the entertainment of onlookers. The comparison to young children gawking at a peacock is a brilliantly contrived simile, suggesting a babble of excitement - at a convenient distance, of course; for, like the *divites*, whose meanness prevents them from extending a hand of genuine and substantial support to their dependants,⁵³ the boys are reluctant to get too close to the source of their wonderment. After the emphatic *tantum admirari, tantum laudare* (31), Juvenal does not spell out what the rich man *should* be doing towards the welfare of poets (that is patently obvious), but accentuates the latter's plight by reflecting on the cruel reality that the prospect of embarking on an alternative career is becoming increasingly remote:

*sed defluit aetas
et pelagi patiens et cassidis atque ligonis.* (32-3)

The ensuing mood of cynical disillusionment is vividly portrayed in the next couplet:

*taedia tunc subeunt animos, tunc seque suamque
Terpsicoren odit facunda et nuda senectus.* (34-5)

⁵² Braund (1988:33-4) cites this line as an example of ironic undercutting: 'No direct criticism of the intellectuals is made. But their case is undermined by the suggestion that their aim in life is *ut dignus venias hederis et imagine macra* (29) and by the many other less than flattering visions with which the poem abounds . . .' I think that this misses the point: Juvenal is making the sardonic observation that the poet can expect *nothing* more substantial from the *dives avarus* - in other words, financial support; that is made clear by the very next sentence: *spes nulla ulterior*. It is not the poet's ambition that is being criticised, but the meanness of the so-called patrons.

⁵³ Hardie (1990:163) comments: 'His habit of giving praise alone to the poet implies both that he gives no money *and that he never criticises him* (my italics).' I think that this attempts to extract too much from the line: Juvenal's sole concern here is the reluctance to provide material support. Hardie's (160) conjecture that *lunonis* (32) suggests reference to the poet's own name *lunius* seems rather far-fetched. A more likely inspiration for the image may have been Hadrian's dedication of a bejewelled peacock to Hera/Juno (Pausanias 2.17.6) - another possible clue to the identity of the *Caesar* in line 1?

Wiesen⁵⁴ comments that 'the reader may perhaps sense a fellow-feeling for failed poets that could arise from Juvenal's own bitter experience', while Rudd⁵⁵ remarks that 'the section ends on a more subdued note'. I would go so far as to assert that 'poignant' would be a more apt description of the tone of these lines and that they reflect a very real empathy on Juvenal's part; and this empathy is not an isolated occurrence, as will be demonstrated below. Whether or not Juvenal is drawing on his own experience here, it is a remarkably sensitive evocation of the feeling of weary disillusionment (*taedia tunc animos subeunt*), which manifests itself in a complete loss of self-esteem (*se . . . odit*) and in a turning against the very source of inspiration on which the poet thought he could depend (*Terpsichoren odit*). The adjective *nuda* is anything but comic in the context: its proximity to *facunda* once again drives home the stark and shameful contrast between the high potential of the artist and the reality of the poverty which stifles that potential. The sense of wasted talent and inevitable destitution are made all the poignant by focusing on a man too old to contemplate an alternative career.

In an analysis of lines 32-5, Rudd⁵⁶ addresses a point which has an important bearing on the theme of the present discussion: it is the question of how sincere Juvenal is being when he makes the old and destitute poet talk wistfully about the lost opportunity of embarking on a military career. Does Juvenal really mean that he would have done better to join the army? In considering several passages which pertain to army life (8.51-2; 14.70-2; 10.133-7; 11.100-7; 16.7-12), Rudd's *modus operandi* is first to ask what abuse is under attack in each case: thus, for example, he points out that in *Satire* 8 Juvenal writes admiringly of the proletarian soldier because he is attacking a peculiarly stupid instance of snobbery, while in *Satire* 11 the soldier is represented as an uncouth philistine, but is nonetheless praised for his behaviour because Juvenal is castigating the luxury of later times. Rudd makes the following conclusion: 'All this simply illustrates the fact that the tone of a given passage is largely governed by the writer's immediate

⁵⁴ Wiesen 1973:472. See also the comments of A. Hardie 1990:153.

⁵⁵ Rudd 1976:94.

⁵⁶ Rudd 1976:94-5.

purpose' (my italics). There can hardly be any doubt that Juvenal's immediate purpose in this *Satire* is to expose once again the degeneracy of the upper classes, and that a *sympathetic* portrayal of the plight of writers and other intellectuals is more conducive to that purpose than an ironic belittling of his fellow writers. That Juvenal identifies with the latter, is made clear not only by, *inter alia*, his description of the dilemma facing the aged and destitute poet, but especially by lines 48–49, where he empathises with their sense of utter futility: *nos tamen hoc agimus tenuique in pulvere sulcos / ducimus et litus sterili versamus aratro*.

The first thirty five lines of the poem (and particularly the last four lines of that section) are *meant* to arouse sympathy for the impoverished poets and hostility against the patrons for their stinginess. It must be stressed that the overriding concern of this *Satire* is not an esoteric one, but almost literally the 'bread and butter' issue of the intellectual's access to enough money to survive and to practise his art. If this point is not recognised, then one runs the risk of misconstruing the intention of Juvenal's repeated focus on the intellectual's most basic requirements - as demonstrated, for example, by Wiesen's comment on lines 66–71: 'Again Juvenal interrupts the poet's grand illusions and drags him back to reality by reminding him of his basic physical needs.'⁵⁷ As will be argued below, it is precisely the *non-fulfilment* of those basic needs which is stifling artistic creativity.

The start of Juvenal's main attack (36ff) makes it clear that the *dives avarus* is not guilty of mere omission or apathy, but has developed, in his own interests, a number of devious 'tricks' (*artes*) to avoid fulfilling his obligations. This is a charge already alluded to in the sentence *didicit iam dives avarus / tantum admirari, tantum laudare disertos* (30–1) and one which Juvenal exploited to the full in his condemnation of the miserly patron Virro in *Satire* 5. Thus the *dives avarus* has the audacity to style himself as a bard second only to Homer (38), so that his own literary pretensions can give him the right *not* to subsidise anyone else. One of the poet's basic needs is a suitable venue for recitations, and even in this mundane area of patronage the miserliness of the patron

⁵⁷ Wiesen 1973:475.

is evident. The topic provides Juvenal with an ideal opportunity for a vivid description of what the unfortunate poet is forced to endure. Once again we see Juvenal employing the effective device of a contrast between the ideal (couched in 'elevated' language and imagery) and sordid reality: if the poet-client contemplates a recital, his sweet delusions of renown (*dulcedine famae succensus*, 39-40)⁵⁸ soon dissipate when he is confronted by the actual squalor of the venue (*maculosas . . . aedes*, 40), supplied, at no cost to himself,⁵⁹ by his patron. Juvenal dwells on the implied contrast between the cultured and refined ambience of a poetic recitation and the utter inappropriateness of the venue: the building which is 'magnanimously' pressed into service for the occasion (*servire iubetur*, 41) has long been derelict and barred-up (*longe ferrata*, 41), and has a door whose hinges squeal like a herd of frightened pigs.⁶⁰ The patron does not balk at providing a clique (*libertos . . . et magnas comitum . . . voces*, 43-4) for the occasion - because it costs him nothing to enlist the services of friends and lackeys - and he knows all about (*scit*, 43)⁶¹ the most advantageous positioning of the applauders. But none of their lordships (*nemo . . . regum*, 45) will extend his 'generosity' to cover the actual cost of hiring the benches, tiers of seats (together with their supporting scaffolding) and the armchairs, which impose the added burden of having to be returned after the

⁵⁸ The quest for *fama* was surely an integral part of the poetic 'scene' in ancient Rome, where there were no literary agents and publishers to stand between the artist and the public whose favour he courted. The heightened description of the poet's anticipation of success makes his disillusionment all the more acute, when he is confronted by the depressing reality of the squalid venue and the expense and inconvenience involved.

⁵⁹ See Courtney 1980:355.

⁶⁰ *Porcas* was conjectured for the *portas* of the manuscripts by Jessen (*Phil.* 1 [1889] 320-7). Rudd (1976:107) comments that 'it is certainly Juvenalian in spirit.' Apart from being swayed by the picturesque quality of the image, one could argue that the phrasing *in qua* (instead of the simple genitive *cuius*) is probably intended to suggest the cacophony inside the echoing emptiness of the derelict building. However, one should not dismiss the possibility that the manuscript reading *is* correct, and that Juvenal is expanding on the idea of a *ferrata domus*, whose door resembles the unwelcoming gates of a city under siege; see Courtney 1980:356. It may also be asked why Juvenal should have chosen *porcas*, as opposed to *porcos*: did his misogyny extend that far? He does, however, use *porcae* at 2.86, where it is quite appropriate in the context of the *Bona Dea* rites.

⁶¹ The verb *scit* suggests again that the patron is thoroughly calculating and that he has cultivated a repertoire of tricks (cf. *didicit*, 30 and *artes*, 36) to avoid expenditure on his client.

performance - presumably by the poet himself⁶². *Regum*, with its connotation of wealth, is aptly chosen to emphasise the singular meanness of the patron in his failure to offer financial assistance.⁶³

Attention has been drawn to similarities between Juvenal's description of the burdensome logistics of arranging a recital and a passage in the *Dialogus* of Tacitus. In the latter, M. Aper, who is pointing out the disadvantages of the poet's life, says: *nam et domum mutuatur et auditorium exstruit et subsellia conducit et libellos dispergit* (*Dial.* 9.4). Several details here are obviously reminiscent of elements of Juvenal's account: *commodat aedes* (40); *subsellia* (45); and *conducto . . . tigillo* (46) may be the equivalent of *auditorium exstruit*. Rudd argues that in view of the fact that the poet Saleius Bassus, whom Aper is using as an illustration, is also mentioned by Juvenal in line 80, 'it seems almost certain that Juvenal has this section of Tacitus in mind.'⁶⁴ Juvenal may well have been influenced by this passage, since he (like Aper / Tacitus) is dwelling on the difficulties which make life hard for poets. But it should be pointed out, in the first place, that there is only one instance of actual lexical concordance (*subsellia*), and, more pertinently, that both Tacitus and Juvenal are talking about matters which must have been standard routine at that time; furthermore, Juvenal seems to forego the opportunity to capitalise on the additional expense of programme distribution, mentioned in Tacitus' description, and his account contains considerably more elaboration of details.⁶⁵ Even if Juvenal *did* have the Tacitus passage in mind, it does not necessarily follow that he too was seeking to imbue his description with the 'anti-intellectual scorn' which characterises Aper's speech, as Wiesen would have one believe: 'Aper's speech shows how difficult it is to deplore the poet's life without

⁶² See Rudd 1976:107.

⁶³ Compare the use of *rex* in a very similar context in *Satire 5: fructus amicitiae magnae cibus: inputat hunc rex, / et quamvis rarum tamen inputat* (14-5).

⁶⁴ Rudd 1976:107.

⁶⁵ See Rudd 1976:107.

deploring the poet's work, for if one thinks that a writer is engaged in useless activity, his writings can scarcely escape the charge of uselessness.⁶⁶

There is absolutely nothing in Juvenal's account to suggest that the recitation itself is going to be fatuous or of a poor standard: the entire focus of this passage is on the wealthy patron's stinginess and the hardships which it imposes on his client. Recitations were obviously of vital importance to the career of any poet, and Juvenal draws attention to the simple truth that artistic aspirations can be rendered almost futile by the frustrating lack of assistance in even this mundane sphere.

This sense of futility and frustration (which was vividly portrayed by the imagery of lines 34-35: *taedia tunc subeunt animos, tunc seque suamque / Terpsichoren odit facunda et nuda senectus*) is the focus of more detailed treatment in lines 48-52:

*nos tamen hoc agimus tenuique in pulvere sulcos
ducimus et litus sterili versamus aratro.
nam si discedas, [laqueo tenet ambitiosum
consuetudo mali,]⁶⁷ tenet insanabile multos
scribendi cacoethes et aegro in corde senescit.*

The metaphor in the first two lines is not original,⁶⁸ but is highly appropriate in its symbolism of wasted effort. The thought underlying this passage has much in common

⁶⁶ Wiesen 1973:474. Wiesen draws attention to the following parts of Tacitus' *Dialogus* 9: *Nam carmina et versus . . . neque dignitatem ullam auctoribus suis conciliant neque utilitates alunt; voluptatem autem brevem, laudem inanem et infructuosam consequuntur . . . Et ut beatissimus recitationem eius eventus prosequatur, omnis illa laus intra unum aut alterum diem, velut in herba vel flore praecerpita, ad nullam certam et solidam pervenit frugem . . .*; and he points out that Aper scorns mythological poetry in particular: *Cui bono est, si apud te Agamemnon aut Iason diserte loquitur?*

⁶⁷ Missing from the Leiden manuscript and almost certainly a gloss; deleted by Housman. See Courtney 1980:356-7 and Braund 1982:162-6.

⁶⁸ See Ferguson 1979:220; Courtney 1980:356; Braund 1988:210.

with one of Martial's epigrams and, in view of Juvenal's use, too, of Horace and Virgil as *exempla* in lines 62 and 69, would seem to have been inspired directly by it:

*saepe mihi dicis, Luci carissime luli,
 "scribe aliquid magnum: desidiosus homo es."
 otia da nobis, sed qualia fecerat olim
 Maecenas Flacco Vergilioque suo:
 condere victuras temptem per saecula curas
 et nomen flammis eripuisse meum.
 in steriles nolunt campos iuga ferre iuveni:
 pingue solum lassat, sed iuvat ipse labor. (Ep. 1.107)*

Juvenal's handling of the image is considerably more forceful: not only is the 'barrenness' of present literary patronage stressed by the conglomeration of words like *tenui*, *pulvere*, *litus* and *sterili*, but the use of the first person adds a persuasive and emotive quality. It is precisely Juvenal's identification with his fellow poets which negates any attempt to read into these lines a denigration of contemporary poetry *per se*: Juvenal's concern here is not the quality of poetry produced, but the *futility* of literary endeavour in the sterile environment brought about by the dearth of financial assistance from patrons. But, as already shown in lines 34-5, it is not a futility that is easy to come to terms with. The compulsion to write is not something easily forsaken: the craving for excellence is like a noose about the neck or, worse still, an incurable disease which 'grows old' in one's sick heart.⁶⁹ Far from arousing feelings of disgust against poets and

⁶⁹ *Senescit* (line 52) echoes *senectus* in line 35 and may well provide another insight into Juvenal's own feelings. Certainly, lines 53ff seem to come from the heart. Anderson (1982:286), who has warned against the dangers of the 'biographical method', notes: 'In Satire 7 the speaker avoids speaking about himself, and yet a certain impression of his person penetrates the introduction.' That impression is certainly quite pronounced in the present passage.

their art,⁷⁰ these startling metaphors⁷¹ give expression to the really pitiful dilemma of poets who persevere against all odds. Horace also spoke of his compulsion to write:

*ne longum faciam: seu me tranquilla senectus
expectat seu mors atris circumvolat alis,
dives, inops, Romae, seu fors ita iusserit exul;
quisquis erit vitae scribam color. (Serm. 2.1.57-60)*

But what used to be a positive and sustaining *amor scribendi*⁷² in the case of Horace (who *did* enjoy the security of patronage) has become for Juvenal and his neglected fellow poets something negative and painful, and yet equally inescapable. It is thus not surprising that the lack of patronage has had a deleterious effect on the quality of poets and poetry. But when Juvenal speaks about the *vatem egregium, cui non sit publica vena, / qui nihil expositum soleat deducere, nec qui, / communi feriat carmen triviale moneta* (53-5), he is not indulging in mockery of such writers at the expense of a genuine and sympathetic concern about the dearth of *real* poetic talent in his day. The fact that there are uninspiring and unoriginal writers at work in such an environment is of far less significance, in this context,⁷³ than the fact that the miserliness of the rich is directly responsible for stultifying the latent talent of any *vates egregius*:

⁷⁰ Wiesen 1973:475 asks: 'But if poetry is a kind of mental cancer, then why should society reward its victims?' Similarly, Braund (1988:58): 'The fierce images of disease and degeneration (*cacoethes, aegro, senescit*) do not argue for his honorification by society but evoke an unsettling image of the poet as a leper of society.' Such interpretations fail to acknowledge that Juvenal may be depicting the dilemma of the committed but utterly frustrated artist in suitably painful and discordant imagery, and that this sad state of affairs is not the fault of the suffering poet but of the neglectful patron.

⁷¹ Braund (1988:40) recognises the 'novel and unparalleled vocabulary' used in the metaphor *scribendi cacoethes*, but does not allow this to deter her from asserting that it 'probably sounded clichéd.'

⁷² Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.10.

⁷³ Of course, when it suits his purpose, Juvenal can be far less sympathetic towards contemporary writers (e.g. 1.14: *expectes eadem a summo minimoque poeta*): see discussion above.

*hunc, qualem nequeo monstrare et sentio tantum,
 anxietate carens animus facit, omni acerbi
 inpatiens, cupidus silvarum aptusque bibendis
 fontibus Aonidum. neque enim cantare sub antro
 Pierio thyrsusque potest contingere maesta
 paupertas atque aeris inops . . . (56-61)*

Likewise, when Juvenal states that he cannot point out but only 'feel' the existence of a *vates egregius*, he does not intend this as mere disparagement of the poets of his day (himself included, as line 48 would imply) but is addressing a far more serious issue and one directly pertinent to the central theme of the poem: neither a Horace nor a Virgil would have risen to the heights that they did in the absence of adequate support from their patrons; the *dives avarus* of Juvenal's day was in effect preventing the flowering of such talent. Juvenal is talking about truly outstanding talent, and it would be strange if his contemporaries were to feel really aggrieved at the obvious truth of his assessment. He is not implying that contemporary poets are *unworthy* of patronage, but that the *lack* of patronage has prevented the development of a *vates egregius*. That the potential talent exists is implied by line 56: *hunc, qualem nequeo monstrare sed sentio*. Wiesen actually recognizes the possibility that 'Juvenal might claim that he cannot find a great talent because no writer has the ease and comfort to polish his art to high excellence', but diminishes its significance by concentrating on what he perceives to be Juvenal's characteristic shiftiness and elusiveness - in particular the way in which Juvenal 'ridicules by parody what he seems to admire' and the way in which he 'interrupts the poet's grand illusions and drags him back to reality by reminding him of his basic needs' ⁷⁴. Wiesen, however, resorts to parody as an explanation, because he cannot accept the simple thesis that Juvenal is accentuating the miserliness of the rich 'patrons' by exposing their failure to help their proteges with their most ordinary requirements. Rudd recognises the importance of the contrast: 'After these noble lines

⁷⁴ Wiesen 1973:475. Wiesen uses lines 66-71 to illustrate the latter point - see below.

[sc. 53-9] Juvenal introduces a jarring note - deliberately, because he is moving back down to the practical point of his argument.⁷⁵

It is indeed remarkable to what basic and mundane factors Juvenal attributes the malaise: the *vates egregius* can realise his potential only if his mind is untroubled by worry and bitterness (57-8) and enjoys a harmonious relationship with the creative forces of poetic inspiration (58-9);⁷⁶ and this state of mind is directly dependent upon financial security:

...neque enim cantare sub antro
Pierio thyrsusque potest contingere maesta
paupertas atque aeris inops, quo nocte dieque
corpus eget . . . (59-62)

Juvenal employs here the familiar technique of juxtaposing the sublime and the mundane, in order to stress the direct relationship between the poet's physical well-being and his creativity; and this is given added emphasis by the humorous picture of Horace poetizing on a full stomach: *satur est cum dicit Horatius 'euhoe'* (62). Rudd makes the pertinent observation that 'Juvenal cleverly chooses two of the most "mantic" passages of Horace, who normally operates on a much more conversational level', and that 'although satirical, there is no resentment in Juvenal's picture.'⁷⁷ While a visualisation of the 'short, rather tubby figure intoning *Bacchum in remotis* after a good dinner' might be amusing, I am inclined to think that what was uppermost in Juvenal's mind was a striking contrast between the sublimity of poetic composition and the poet's most basic needs. The essential seriousness of Juvenal's argument would seem to be

⁷⁵ Rudd 1976:96; he then cites lines 59-62.

⁷⁶ This is the antithesis of the state of mind portrayed in lines 34-5: *taedia tunc subeunt animos, tunc seque suamque / Terpsichoren odit facunda et nuda senectus*.

⁷⁷ Rudd 1976:97. The references are to Odes 2.19.5 and 7 (*Euhoe . . . Euhoe, parce Liber, parce gravi metuende thyrsos*).

confirmed by the following passage, in which freedom from anxiety (cf. *anxietate carens animus*, line 57) is stressed as a prerequisite for single-minded devotion to creativity:

*quis locus ingenio, nisi cum se carmine solo
vexant et dominis Cirrhae Nysaeque feruntur
pectora vestra duas non admittentia curas?* (63-65)

Not content with this, Juvenal reiterates his argument with reference to Virgil himself; and again he employs a similar technique:

*magnae mentis opus nec de lodice paranda
attonitae currus et equos faciesque deorum
aspicere et qualis Rutulum confundat Erinys.
nam si Vergilio puer et tolerabile dasset
hospitium, caderent omnes a crinibus hydri,
surda nihil gemeret grave bucina* (66-71).

Rudd⁷⁸ comments that 'again the characteristic tension is achieved by tossing a cheap blanket into the scene of divine enthusiasm.' Highet draws on his own experience as a penurious undergraduate in appreciating the essential truth of Juvenal's assertion that an epic poem could not be composed by a poet whose mind is aghast at the thought of buying a mere blanket.⁷⁹ Whether or not Juvenal is writing from his own experience, as Highet imagines, the contrast is vivid and effective. The stultifying effect of the lack of patronage on the level of creativity is strikingly symbolised by the imaginary

⁷⁸ Rudd 1976:97. Rudd states that with *hydri* and *facies deorum* Juvenal was thinking of the scene in *Aen.* 7.447-8, and that *bucina* comes from lines 519-20. He goes on to speculate that Juvenal chose this particular passage of Virgil, because the Bacchic passage in *Aen.* 7, where Amata cries *Euhoe Bacche!*, provided a link with the Bacchic passage in Horace. He also suggests that this in turn may have supplied a bridge to the next scene, in which Allecto assails Turnus. See also Courtney 1980:358 and Ferguson 1979:221.

⁷⁹ 1954:108: 'As an undergraduate I could not conceive how anyone could be aghast at the thought of buying a blanket. But later, I joined one of the groups of which Juvenal writes, and found that the monthly bill for electric light or the cost of a new rug was a very serious problem. Then I understood that the line made good sense and the antithesis good poetry.'

'enfeeblement' of one of Virgil's most powerful descriptions (i.e. the thought of the Fury losing her snaky locks and her trumpet falling silent). Furthermore, Juvenal makes it quite clear that the requirements expected of a concerned patron are actually very modest: all that the great Virgil needed was a *tolerabile hospitium* (possibly a deliberate understatement in view of what ancient sources say about Virgil's circumstances⁸⁰) and a *puer*.⁸¹

Juvenal's sympathy for the predicament of the poet who is denied the means of realising his potential, or of aspiring to greater heights, is revealed again in the following lines:

*poscimus ut sit
non minor antiquo Rubrenus Lappa coturno,
cuius et alveolos et laenam pignerat Atreus?* (71-3)

The debasement of the poet's art (strikingly emphasised by personifying the tragedy itself as the pawnbroker's customer) bears a close similarity to the earlier passage in which literary works suffer the indignity of being auctioned along with other 'odds and ends' (sc. 10-3), and may indeed be used to counter the argument that Juvenal is being ironically deflating in that description. It is difficult to believe that, in the present passage, Juvenal is being anything other than sympathetic towards Rubrenus or that his 'Atreus' is meant to invite ridicule.⁸² The question forms an apt conclusion to a section in which Juvenal has focused on the disturbing facts that (a) his age has produced no *vates egregius* (like Horace or Virgil) and (b) that this malaise is *not* the fault of the poets

⁸⁰ Rudd 1976:98.

⁸¹ If Juvenal had the slave-boy Alexis in mind he may have been playing down inappropriate associations here too: as Rudd (1976:99) remarks, 'the point is ruined if we think of a long-haired fancy-boy decanting Falernian.' See also Ferguson 1979:221.

⁸² Wiesen 1973:476 comments: 'even if poor Rubrenus Lappa had not been forced to pawn his trays and cloak to write his *Atreus*, he still would have produced only another inflated mythological poem.' See also Braund 1988:59. Yet there is nothing in this passage to suggest that Juvenal is ridiculing Rubrenus' work; on the contrary, his aim is to arouse sympathy (*poscimus ut . . .*) for the poet in his thwarted efforts to rise to greater heights.

themselves, but of the *dives avarus*. It is also appropriate that Juvenal immediately gives an example of the type of 'patron', whose meanness and selfishness are frustrating the efforts of writers like Rubrenus:

*non habet infelix Numitor quod mittat amico,
Quintillae quod donet habet, nec defuit illi
unde emeret multa pascendum carne leonem
iam domitum; constat leviori belua sumptu
nimirum et capiunt plus intestina poetae (74-8).*

We do not know the identity of Quintilla, but the likelihood is that she is Numitor's *amica* (as opposed to the *amicus* / *poeta* of the previous line) and that he is therefore ready to squander his money on a mistress; and the neglect of the poet-client is made all the more scandalous by his humiliating subordination to a pet beast. Not only is the last sentence striking in its sarcasm (note the plosive quality of *capiunt plus intestina poetae* and the emphatic positioning of the last word), but it also drives home the point - yet again - that the poets' deprivation by their miserly patrons is at the *most basic* level. It is a restatement of the point which Juvenal made when he said *satur est cum dicit Horatius 'euhoe'* (62), but here the imagery is cruder (*belua*, *intestina*) and the tone far less jocular.⁸³

Juvenal continues with the theme that what poets require from their patrons is *substantial* support (i.e. money), and that the trappings of recognition and praise (as described in lines 29-32) are not enough:

contentus fama iaceat Lucanus in hortis

⁸³ Wiesen (1973:476) still manages to detect a critical and mocking attitude on Juvenal's part towards the poet: 'The very suggestion of so absurd an alternative, starving poet or domesticated lion, is funny enough. But then to weigh and compare the relative size of poetical and leonine innards destroys most of the pity we might have felt for the rejected aspirant to Numitor's generosity. To spurn a poet and support a jungle beast may be a foolish decision, but can we blame Numitor for enriching his mistress Quintilla rather than the author of tired verses?' At no point in the description does Juvenal suggest that the poor quality of the poet's writing is at the root of the problem; it is a scathing indictment of Numitor alone.

*marmoreis, at Serrano tenuique Saleiio
gloria quantalibet quid erit, si gloria tantum est?
curritur ad vocem iucundam et carmen amicae
Thebaidos, laetam cum fecit Statius urbem
promisitque diem: tanta dulcedine captos
adficit ille animos tantaque libidine volgi
auditur. sed cum fregit subsellia versu
esurit, intactam Paridi nisi vendit Agaven. (79-87)*

At first, the mention of the poet Lucan, whose wealth and contentment are epitomised by his marble gardens, might appear to undermine the force of Juvenal's argument: for here *is* an example of a wealthy poet. However, while Lucan enjoyed both fame and riches, the latter were inherited and not the product of generous patronage.⁸⁴ This is not spelt out by Juvenal, and probably did not need to be. Instead, he cleverly exploits the notion of *fama*: the dead Lucan no longer has need of his wealth and can 'survive', so to speak, on his fame alone; but other poets, who are denied *his* financial advantages, cannot exist on glory alone, however great that might be. The self-satisfied contentment and opulence of Lucan is curtly dismissed (*iaceat*, 79) by Juvenal as something far removed from the reality confronting less fortunate poets like Serranus and the haggard (*tenui*, 80) Saleius.

The uselessness of fame alone to a poet is vividly illustrated by the cameo picture of Statius, who enjoys a popularity bordering on adulation. The intensity of this adulation is conveyed through imagery with erotic overtones:⁸⁵ his poem is personified as his mistress (*amicae*, 82); he fixes a 'date' for a meeting (*promisitque diem*, 84); the audience is enthralled by his sweetness (*dulcedine*, 84) and the crowd listens in rapture (*libidine*, 85); it is probable that *fregit subsellia versu* (86)⁸⁶ is intended to suggest the

⁸⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 16.17; Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.85.

⁸⁵ See Courtney 1980:360; Ferguson 1979:222.

⁸⁶ Jones 1982:479: 'It seems clear that Juvenal has in mind the *topos* of the bed damaged by love-making, suggesting that at the climax of the recitation the benches give way

result of sexual excitement, as well as wild applause; and the erotic element is present in the concluding reference to the virgin (*intactam*, 87) Agave. Juvenal is illustrating, in a far more graphic manner, the point that he made earlier: *didicit iam avarus / tantum admirari, tantum laudare disertos, / ut pueri lunonis avem* (30-2). Statius is merely a source of titillation exploited for momentary pleasure - a sort of literary 'one-night-stand.' Courtney⁸⁷ is correct when he observes that Statius is compelled to prostitute his talent - and the degradation is complete when he is forced to assume the role of a pimp and sell the 'virgin Agave' to Paris. Yet Juvenal's purpose is not to hold Statius up to ridicule: like the *celebres notique poetae* (3), who have to resort to bath-houses and bakeries in order to survive, he too is compelled to demean himself and his art.⁸⁸ The alternative is put quite bluntly: if he doesn't pander to the tastes of the masses, he starves (*esurit*, 87). Once again, it is the meanness of the nobility which is ultimately responsible for the plight of writers like Statius, and Juvenal contrives a particularly scathing indictment of that class: allusions to Paris' wielding of powers that should be the preserve of the nobility (*ille et militiae multis largitus honorem / semenstri vatum digitos circumligat auro*)⁸⁹ culminate in the sneering observation: *quod non dant procures, dabit histrio* (90). The scorn is made more pointed by the contrasting connotations of the two nouns.

Juvenal proceeds to exploit the embarrassing fact that some poets now have to abandon their traditional patrons and turn to a source of patronage as unsavoury as the world of theatre, because that is where the real power and influence reside. The scornful tone of line 92 is intensified by the personification of the librettos (as if they themselves can dispense favours) and by the plosive alliteration:

under the strain of the audience's involvement with the girl-poem.'

⁸⁷ Courtney 1980:360.

⁸⁸ Anderson (1982:285) goes so far as to talk of 'patent affection' on Juvenal's part. Helmbold and O'Neill (1959:102-3), on the other hand, argue that the 'Caesar' named in the first line of the satire is Domitian, who was the patron of Statius, and accordingly interpret the passage as hostile towards the poet. Bartsch (1994:131) argues that 'Statius and Quintilian provide distinct examples of Domitian's patronage, not the lack of it'; but this is to ignore the emphasis which Juvenal places on Statius' financial hardship.

⁸⁹ Cf. Highet 1954:24-5. On the weakness and decadence of old Roman families, typified by the names *Camerinos* and *Baream*, see Colton 1966:159.

tu Camerinos
et Baream, tu nobilium magna atria curas?
praefectos Pelopea facit, Philomela tribunos. (90-2)

However, Juvenal does not allow the unpalatable truth about the plight of such poets to distract his audience from the real target of his contempt. The next lines (like lines 8-12, 71-3 and 86-7) make a point of exonerating the unfortunate writers:

haut tamen invidias vati quem pulpita pascunt
quis tibi Maecenas, quis nunc erit aut Proculeius
aut Fabius, quis Cotta iterum, quis Lentulus alter? (93-5)

There is some doubt about the authenticity of line 93⁹⁰; but familiar elements are present, such as the pointed contrast between the associations of *vates* and *pulpita*; the direct address to the audience / reader (cf. lines 9-10); and the plosive alliteration. Even if the line is spurious, the author was certainly attuned to Juvenal's sympathetic attitude towards the poets. In any event, the next two lines make it abundantly clear that there *are* no longer any worthy patrons to whom they can turn for support; and the contrast between patrons past and present is neatly summed up in the couplet which concludes the section on poets:

tum par ingenio pretium, tunc utile multis
pallere et vinum toto nescire Decembri (96-7)

The 'bitterly sarcastic anaphora' (*tum . . . tunc*)⁹¹ makes the contrast very pointed; and the crux of Juvenal's complaint (*tum par ingenio pretium*) is rounded off with a note of sardonic humour in the 'conventional' images of suffering and deprivation of poets in better times- willingly endured *then*, in the knowledge that they would bring tangible rewards.

⁹⁰ See Courtney 1980:361.

⁹¹ Ferguson 1979:223.

Juvenal has been concerned particularly with the physical and mental manifestations of financial hardship; and so it is appropriate that the audience should be left with an impression of wan features and futile dedication, which recall salient aspects of the portrait in lines 28-9, for example: *qui facis in parva sublimia carmina cella, / ut dignus venias hederis et imagine macra*. The humour of lines 96-7 is similar to that in line 62 (*satur est cum dicit Horatius 'euhoe'*),⁹² but behind the jocular facade lies the grim reality of impoverishment, which writers like Horace did not have to endure, thanks to the generosity of their patrons. The dominant issue in this passage is that of rewarding talent and dedication fairly, and this is restated in the very next sentence: *vester porro labor fecundior, historiarum scriptores?* (98-99). One cannot, therefore, minimise the importance of the main thrust of Juvenal's argument by asserting instead that Juvenal 'leaves the reader with the idea that the essence of being a poet is the possession of a pallid face and the practice of grim abstemiousness at holiday time.'⁹³

Similarly, any attempt to interpret Juvenal's description of the labours of historians in a negative light (e.g. 'he reduces their production to an ever-growing heap of papyrus, to a physical mechanical act . . . a worthless pursuit')⁹⁴ must explain why Juvenal pointedly refers to the demanding requirements of the genre (*sic ingens rerum numerus iubet atque operum lex*, 102), and also explain away Juvenal's patent sympathy for the historian in the concluding line of this section (*quis dabit historico quantum daret acta legenti*, 104)⁹⁵. Juvenal is preoccupied with the futility of effort in the literary sphere, and the historians provide him with an excellent example of writers whose sheer effort (*plus temporis, olei plus, nullo . . . modo, millensima pagina*) earns such pitifully meagre

⁹² It seems very likely that the idea of abstaining from wine during the *Saturnalia* is intended to recall Horace, *Serm.* 2.3.2-6. If so, it is a good illustration of the truth of the assertion that there was a time when self-denial *did* bring rewards for poets. On this and other possible Horatian echoes see Rudd 1976:110-1.

⁹³ Wiesen 1973:478. Cf. Braund 1988:60.

⁹⁴ Braund 1988:60-61. See also Wiesen 1973:478.

⁹⁵ The tone is rendered more contemptuous by the likelihood that the reader of the gazette is a *slave*; see Ferguson 1979:223.

rewards.⁹⁶ The notion of intensive but unproductive labour is further accentuated by the use of 'ploughing' and 'harvest' imagery in line 103 (*quae tamen seges? terrae quis fructus apertae?*). One need look no further than the relevance to Juvenal's central argument of this aspect of historiography to explain why he gives historians a relatively summary treatment. It is not simply because his case may be weak here;⁹⁷ rather, he is exploiting a pertinent feature of that discipline to good effect. It is perhaps better to regard the short discussion of historians not as a separate entity, but as an integral part of his treatment of *writers* in general: such an interpretation, at any rate, would give the imaginary objection in line 105 (*sed genus ignavum, quod lecto gaudet et umbra*) a clear application to *all* 'creative' intellectuals who require quiet seclusion and not only to historians.⁹⁸ The essential unity of lines 1-104 is also suggested by the division between the 'ivory-tower' intellectuals (as line 105 characterises them) and those whose livelihood depends on a more 'practical' application of their learning (i.e. *causidici, rhetores, grammatici*).

The *causidici* provide an ideal counter to the belief that poets and historians deserve their poverty, through their lack of involvement in the 'real' world, while the more 'practical' intellectuals enjoy well-earned prosperity. Juvenal's rejoinder to the slur on the intellectuals is prompt and confident (*dic igitur*, 106) and emphasis is put on the lawyers' usefulness (*civilia . . . officia*, 106-7; note position of latter word) and the fact that their work is demanding (*magno in fasce . . . libelli*, 107). But, like the poets and historians, the lawyers' efforts bring meagre rewards and their poverty is both embarrassing and demeaning: if poets are reduced to undertaking menial jobs in order

⁹⁶ If Juvenal is intent upon satirising historians, it is remarkable that he foregoes the opportunity to comment on the *quality* of their work, instead of concentrating solely on the *effort* which they put into it.

⁹⁷ Courtney (1980:362) argues that historians 'must be included to represent prose writers, since history was at this time the most prominent branch of prose, but they were usually aristocratic, retired politicians and the like, not poor men in need of patronage.' See also Highet 1954:270-1.

⁹⁸ The connection may also be corroborated with reference to Quintilian's comment on the close connection between history and poetry: *est proxima poetis et quodammodo carmen solutum, et scribitur ad narrandum non ad probandum* (10.1.31).

to survive, lawyers are forced to dissemble and to affect an affluent lifestyle. It has been argued⁹⁹ that 'while Juvenal poses as the lawyer's defender, he also cleverly depicts them as frauds and empty windbags, always panting and blustering, but achieving nothing.' Braund¹⁰⁰ also finds the description of the lawyers full of ironic mockery: for example, *causidici* is a contemptuous alternative to *oratores*; *magno comites in fasce libelli* (107) and *magna sonant* (108) are indicative of their attempts to put on an impressive show, but 'all this effort quickly reduces them to bags of spit spraying the world with lies'; after deploring his poor remuneration, Juvenal deflates the lawyer in a parody of the contest for the arms of Achilles: the lawyer is made to look 'faintly absurd', because he takes the case more seriously than the *bubulco / iudice* (116-7); the meagre rewards which the lawyer receives (*siccus petasunculus et vas / pelamydum aut veteres, Maurorum epimia, bulbi / aut vinum Tiberi devectum, quinque lagonae*, 119-21) emphasise the incongruity between effort and reward, with the implication that they, like the poets (esp. 53-6), 'deserve as little as they get'; and, finally, the fact that the *pragmatici* take their share of the lawyer's fee (122-3) adds 'insult to injury' and 'the helplessness of the lawyer makes him rather inept.'

However, the persistent quest for irony should not be aided by selective interpretation, the down-playing of obvious empathy and understanding on Juvenal's part and by shifting the focus away from the central issue in this passage. Why, for example, should *causidici* necessarily be a contemptuous term rather than one which clearly denotes the pleaders of lawsuits (as opposed to the less specific term *oratores*) and which lays emphasis on the very 'practical' nature of that profession?¹⁰¹ Furthermore, when Juvenal deplores their wretched remuneration by comparing the total wealth of a hundred

⁹⁹ Wiesen 1973:479.

¹⁰⁰ Braund 1988:61-3.

¹⁰¹ The introduction to Tacitus' first *Dialogue* suggests that the word *causidicus* - notwithstanding Tacitus' lament at the current dearth of men worthy of the old-fashioned title *oratores* - was, in fact, in common use in Juvenal's day: *saepe ex me requiris, Iuste Fabi, cur, cum priora saecula tot eminentium oratorum ingeniis gloriaque floruerint, nostra potissimum aetas deserta et laude eloquentiae orbata vix nomen ipsum oratoris retineat; neque enim ita appellamus nisi antiquos, horum autem temporum disertis causidici et advocati et patroni et quidvis potius quam oratores vocantur.*

lawyers to that of a single charioteer (112-4), how can his use of the word *causidicorum* in this context possibly be contemptuous?¹⁰² The image of the lawyer as 'bags of spit spraying the world with lies' might be attractive to anyone intent upon extracting a satirical portrayal of lawyers from Juvenal's description; but the likelihood that the phrase *conspuitur . . . sinus* refers to an apotropaic practice¹⁰³ to avert Nemesis' anger at their boasting perhaps calls for a more restrained and less disparaging interpretation. The lawyers are clearly in the invidious position of having to lie about their real wealth in order to gain the confidence of potential clients (108-12), and the expediency of keeping up the *appearance* of affluence is expressly stated in lines 135-8 (see below). The lawyers' plight, in fact, nicely corroborates Umbricius' complaint in the third *Satire*: *hic vivimus ambitiosa / paupertate omnes* (3.182-3).

Against this background, Juvenal's portrayal of the lawyers' pretence is indicative of an understanding of their predicament rather than contemptuous ridicule (again, this may be compared with his attitude towards the poets at lines 5-6, who *nec foedum . . . nec turpe putarent / praecones fieri*); and the parody of the contest for the arms of Achilles (115ff) depicts the lawyer's plight in a clearly sympathetic manner: he is nervous (*pallidus*); the case is not a trivial one (*dicturus dubia pro libertate*, 116); he has to contend with a boorish jury (*bubulco / iudice*, 116-7); and the conduct of the case is a physical ordeal (*rumpe miser tensum iecur, ut tibi lasso . . .*, 117). The direct address to an imaginary lawyer (who is described as *miser*, 117), together with the essentially worthless honours that he can expect to receive (*virides, scalarum gloria, palmae*, 118), closely parallels his earlier sympathetic address to the epic poet in lines 27-9:

*frange miser calamum vigilataque proelia dele,
qui facis in parva sublimia carmina cella,*

¹⁰² Pertinent to the argument here is Juvenal's later reference (139-40) to Cicero's probable failure as a lawyer in contemporary Rome, if eloquence were the sole yardstick of ability. In this context he makes no attempt to distinguish between Cicero and the *causidici*, by referring to the former as an *orator*, for example; on the contrary, Cicero is put precisely into the shoes of one of his unfortunate counterparts in Juvenal's Rome.

¹⁰³ See Ferguson 1979:223 and Courtney 1980:364.

ut dignus venias hederis et imagine macra.

As in the case of the poets and historians, Juvenal's persistent focus is on the denial of adequate *financial* rewards to lawyers: *quod vocis pretium?* (119) puts the issue in the plainest possible terms. The 'truth' of his contention is shown by the derisory nature of the lawyer's compensation: *siccus petasunculus et vas / pelamydum aut veteres, Maurorum epimenia, bulbi / aut vinum Tiberi devectum, quinque lagonae* (119-21)¹⁰⁴ - a catalogue reminiscent of some of the insulting fare served up by Virro to his poor clients in *Satire* 5.

The fact that lawyers are forced by circumstances to present a facade of affluence, is skillfully elaborated in Juvenal's response to the interlocutor's complaint (124-5) that, despite his better performance in court, he will receive less than the aristocratic lawyer Aemilius: for the latter has in his forecourt a four-horse chariot made of bronze, which carries a triumphant ancestor, while he himself (a one-eyed statue mounted on a fierce charger) takes aim with a drooping spear as he contemplates battle (125-8).¹⁰⁵ The sarcastic mockery of the hollowness of aristocratic pretensions looks forward to the next *Satire*,¹⁰⁶ but the main purpose here is to drive home the point that, while the aping of aristocratic wealth usually results in financial ruin (*sic Pedo conturbat, Matho deficit, exitus hic est / Tongili*, 129-30), the lawyers are caught up in a system which imposes such behaviour on them:

¹⁰⁴ Such rewards are reminiscent of the lawyer Sabellus' payments, sarcastically itemised by Martial:

*farris semodius fabaeque fresae,
et turis piperisque tres selibrae,
et Lucanica ventre cum Falisco,
et nigri Syra defruti lagona,
et ficus Libyca gelata testa
cum bulbis cocleisque caseoque* (*Ep.* 4.46.6-11).

Juvenal heightens the contempt by using Greek names and by the racist sneer in *Maurorum*.

¹⁰⁵ On the satirical qualities of this description, see Alexander 1947:123-4; Killeen (1969:266) suggests that *curvatum* goes adverbially with *sedens*, describing the posture of a fighting horseman.

¹⁰⁶ The *gens Aemilia* is represented in exactly the same context at the beginning of the eighth *Satire*: . . . *et stantis in curribus Aemilianos* (3)

*[et tamen est illis hoc utile. purpura vendit]¹⁰⁷
 causicum, vendunt amethystina; convenit illi
 et strepitu et facie maioris vivere census,
 sed finem impensae non servat prodiga Roma. (135-8)*

Juvenal does not present an edifying portrait of figures like Tongilius, with his rhinoceros flask and his muddy and disruptive retinue at the baths, his Thracian litter-bearers, his desire to acquire slave-boys, silver plate, fluorspar vases and villas and his expensive clothing (130-4); but they are not so much satirical targets as the lamentable *symptoms* of the malaise. It is significant that, whereas the lawyer Matho was depicted as a thoroughly contemptible figure in the first *Satire* (*causicum nova cum veniat lectica Mathonis / plena ipso*, 32-3), he is here presented as a *victim* of circumstances (*sic . . . Matho deficit*, 129), caught in the grip of a hopelessly spendthrift Rome. However, Juvenal does not leave us merely with the unedifying image of self-imposed financial ruin: his understanding of the predicament of such people and realisation that they themselves are not ultimately to blame for it are made quite clear in lines 139-40, where the first person verb at the beginning of the sentence is an indication of his own sympathy:

*fidimus eloquio? Ciceroni nemo ducentos
 nunc dederit nummos, nisi fulserit anulus ingens.*

If Cicero himself could not rely on his oratorical skills in the Rome of Juvenal's day, how can lawyers of lesser talent be condemned unequivocally for adapting to the prevailing conditions? (Again, it is worth bearing in mind Juvenal's sympathetic treatment of the poets' predicament at the beginning of the poem). As Juvenal points out, the first question that a prospective client asks of you is: . . . *an tibi servi / octo, decem comites, an post te sella, togati / ante pedes* (141-3); and *that* is why (*ideo*) Paulus resorts to hiring a sardonius for a court appearance and why (*ideo* again) he earns more than Gallus and Basilus (another Juvenalian observation which has a peculiarly modern

¹⁰⁷ Omitted from *U*; deleted by Knoche.

application). The deplorable truth of the situation is bitterly summed up in the sentence: *rara in tenui facundia panno* (145) - not a general maxim, of course, but a comment on the scant respect accorded to the lawyer's training and oratorical ability *per se* in Juvenal's day. For lawyers like Basilus to rely on the simpler, old-fashioned methods (such as producing a *flentem . . . matrem* in court) or to expect one's fine oratory to get one a hearing would be an exercise in futility: their talents would be better appreciated and rewarded in Gaul or in Africa. Juvenal's description of the latter as the *nutricula* (148) of lawyers may be intended to be sarcastic; if so, the effect of the diminutive would underscore his contempt for 'mighty' Rome's failure to accord *causidici* their due recognition.¹⁰⁸

Once again it is to be stressed that Juvenal's central complaint in this *Satire* is the lack of *monetary rewards* for those who endeavour to rely on their intellect to make a living: *si placuit mercedem ponere linguae* (149); and the latter clause facilitates an appropriate transition to the next group of undervalued intellectuals whose plight Juvenal wishes to highlight: the teachers of rhetoric. In the introduction to the first *Satire*, he referred to his own training in rhetoric (*et nos / consilium dedimus Sullae, privatus ut altum / dormiret*, 15-7), with the probable implication that contemporary poetry was tainted with the artificiality of that branch of the educational system.¹⁰⁹ Now, however, his mockery of the nature of rhetorical training is more detailed and far more explicit:

declamare doces? o ferrea pectora Vetti,

¹⁰⁸ Wiesen 1973:480 remarks: 'Pettifogging pleaders who put their tongue up for sale but cannot make a living at Rome are scornfully advised to take themselves off to Gaul or Africa . . .' Likewise, Braund (1988:63) describes the phrase as 'disrespectful and sarcastic', referring in the relevant note to the use of *causidicus* instead of *orator* and to the 'contemptuous' diminutive *nutricula*. However, as has been suggested above, it may be incorrect to assume that Juvenal's use of the word *causidicus* is necessarily contemptuous; and one should perhaps be cautious about attributing sarcasm to the word *nutricula* as well: it does convey the ideas of care and nurturing, which are so conspicuously absent on Rome's part. Horace (*Ep.* 1.4.8) uses the word in a very positive sense: *quid voveat dulci nutricula maius alumno?*; so too Quintilian (*Decl.* 13.4): *casa nutricula*. The main objection to the above interpretations is that they ignore the whole thrust of Juvenal's complaint: the scorn is directed at a Rome which values oratorical training and prowess less than 'barbaric' foreigners do.

¹⁰⁹ See Courtney 1980:87.

*cum perimit saevos classis numerosa tyrannos.
 nam quaecumque sedens modo legerat, haec eadem stans
 perferet atque eadem cantabit versibus isdem.
 occidit miseros crambe repetita magistros.
 quis color et quod sit causae genus atque ubi summa
 quaestio, quae veniant diversa parte sagittae,
 nosse volunt omnes, mercedem solvere nemo. (150-7)*

While Juvenal certainly conveys the tediousness of the rhetorical 'syllabus', the target of his satire is *not* the teacher himself. His sympathy for the teacher, who is trapped in an invidious system¹¹⁰ is made abundantly clear: Vettius has to steel himself to endure the repetitive recitations; the rehashed nonsense proves almost fatal to the poor teachers (note the inclusion of *miseros* in this context); and, most significantly, it is the customers who, without exception, demand to be taught such 'expertise' by the teachers (*nosse volunt omnes*). And yet, as is to be expected, the teacher is not paid for his demanding duties: *volunt . . . mercedem solvere nemo*. To add insult to injury, the teacher is held responsible for the ineducability of the dolts in his class.

*'mercedem appellas? quid enim scio?' 'culpa docentis
 scilicet arguitur, quod laevae parte mamillae
 nil salit Arcadico iuveni, cuius mihi sexta
 quaque die miserum dirus caput Hannibal inplet,
 quidquid id est de quo deliberat, an petat urbem
 a Cannis, an post nimbos et fulmina cautus
 circumagat madidas a tempestate cohortes . . .'* (158-64)

One is left in no doubt about the teacher's desperation. His sheer frustration gives rise to the all-too-human response of vivid denigration of the pupil's lack of intelligence; furthermore, he would pay *any* price to have the boy's father experience what *he* is

¹¹⁰ Compare the predicament of the historian: *sic ingens rerum numerus iubet atque operum lex* (7.102).

forced to endure (165-6); and this wish elicits instant and heartfelt support from his colleagues in the profession:

*haec alii sex
vel plures uno conclamant ore sophistae
et veras agitant lites . . . (166-168).*

However, the teacher's yearning to escape from the *rhetorica* . . . *umbra* (173) to the 'battlefield' (*pugnam*) of the law-courts prompts Juvenal to reiterate his indictment of the paltry remuneration of lawyers: the price of a corn-coupon is the most he can expect to receive in that profession (*haec merces lautissima*, 175). Juvenal's contempt for the insultingly small rewards that the aspirant lawyer can expect to receive is forcefully conveyed in the form of a purpose clause, the effect of which is to jolt the person into a realisation that he is willingly and foolishly pursuing a futile ambition: *summula ne pereat qua vilis tessera venit / frumenti* (174-5).¹¹¹ Far from denigrating the *rhetoires* themselves, Juvenal gives a sympathetic portrayal of their utter boredom and frustration and of their yearning to abandon their irksome and unrewarding jobs, and even goes so far as to caution them against expectations of better remuneration as lawyers.

In his treatment of the plight of *causidici* and *rhetoires*, Juvenal does not explicitly blame the rich nobility for their poverty, since it would clearly be nonsensical to single out this class as solely responsible. However, in the *Satire* as a whole there is no doubt that the nobles are the villains of the piece, and in the conclusion of the section on the *rhetoires* he contrives once again to focus on the guilt of the rich nobility:

*tempta
Chrysogonus quanti doceat vel Pollio quanti
lautorum pueros, artem scindes Theodori. (175-7)*

¹¹¹ The same technique is employed at line 29 (*ut dignus venias hederis et imagine macra*) and at lines 117-8 (*ut tibi lasso / figantur virides, scalarum gloria, palmae*).

The willingness of the rich to lavish money on their sons' education in the more 'frivolous' accomplishment of music, leads to a scathing indictment, in lines 178-85, of their selfish greed and luxurious indulgence: six hundred thousand lavished on a suite of baths, and even more on a covered walk (the pampered fastidiousness of the master who can keep his mule's hooves spotless here in rainy weather is a masterly touch); an extravagant diningroom with columns of Numidian marble; and, as a crowning refinement - no matter what the cost of the mansion - servants with expert knowledge (*docte*, 184) of the arts of table-setting and seasoning. Against this background of lavish expenditure on material refinements is set the deplorable disregard of the rich for the proper education of their sons:

*hos inter sumptus sestertia Quintiliano,
ut multum, duo sufficient: res nulla minoris
constabit patri quam filius.* (186-8)

If the father displays so little concern for his son's education, what respect can he possibly have for the *educator*? This cameo provides a striking background to the final theme of the *Satire* and one which, in a sense, lies at the very root of the plight of all intellectuals: the failure to appreciate the true worth of the ordinary schoolteacher.

But, before embarking on this theme, Juvenal introduces a digression which has important implications for the validity of his argument: if sons are the victims of gross neglect by their fathers as far as their education is concerned, how then does one account for the considerable wealth of Quintilian, who was a *rhetor* to boot? On this passage Courtney¹¹² has the following to say:

The weakness of Juvenal's method of argument is very apparent here. He is insisting on the poverty of *rhetoires*, and inevitably mentions the most famous of them. The trouble is that he was a rich man from his professorial appointment and practice at the bar . . . and Juvenal has to

¹¹² Courtney 1980:373.

answer this objection which could be raised against his argument. His answer is feeble . . .

I would argue that by using Quintilian as an example of a youngster whose education was of little concern to his rich father, Juvenal is being *deliberately* provocative and begging the question which is asked in the very next sentence. Not only do Quintilian's accomplishments and success as a *rhetor* (despite his alleged deprivation) make the notion of neglecting a child's education all the more reprehensible, but, more importantly, they enable Juvenal to seize the initiative in disposing of the most obvious obstacle in the way of his argument. That Quintilian presented the most serious challenge to Juvenal's case here is shown by the lengths to which he goes to convince his audience that his success was so exceptional that it would be quite absurd to associate him with the fortunes of other lesser mortals. Quintilian was the darling of Fortune: *felix et pulcher et acer, / felix et sapiens et nobilis et generosus* . . . (190-1); the stars determine one's destiny from the outset: *distat enim quae / sidera te excipiant* (194-5), and Fortune can do the most extraordinary things: *si Fortuna volet, fiet de rhetore consul; / si volet haec eadem, fiet de consule rhetor* (197-8); *servis regna dabunt, captivis fata triumphum* (201). The thrust of Juvenal's argument - as if it really needs a more pointed statement - is summed up in the following line: *felix ille tamen corvo quoque rarior albo* (202). If Juvenal's description of Quintilian's charmed existence is tinged with malice,¹¹³ that can only serve to reinforce the perception that the fortunes of the great *rhetor* were so remote from those of his poor counterparts as to arouse bitter envy: *paenituit multos vanae sterilisque cathedrae* (203); and Juvenal concludes with emotive 'proof' of the truth of the latter observation by recalling the miserable fate of Thrasymachus and that of the destitute Secundus Carrinas, who poisoned himself in Athens. Thus, paradoxically, the exceptional success of Quintilian is exploited by Juvenal to accentuate the plight of *rhetoires* in general.

Against the background of the tragic failures of Thrasymachus and Secundus Carrinas, Juvenal delivers a prayer full of pathos:

¹¹³ See W.S. Anderson 1982:400-3.

*di maiorum umbris tenuem et sine pondere terram
spirantisque crocos et in urna perpetuum ver,
qui praeceptorem sancti volvere parentis
esse loco. (207-10)*

In the view of Braund, who echoes Wiesen's sentiments, this prayer 'is expressed with touching pathos . . . so touching and tender that we await the deflation.'¹¹⁴ According to the former, the deflation is supplied by a then-now contrast which, despite its 'superficial' praise of the good old days, is 'absurd in both its parts':

*metuens virgae iam grandis Achilles
cantabat patriis in montibus et cui non tunc
eliceret risum citharoedi cauda magistri;
sed Rufum atque alios caedit sua quemque iuventus,
Rufum, quem totiens Ciceronem Allobroga dixit. (210-4)*

The image of Achilles keeping a straight face in Chiron's presence provides a humorous and striking point of comparison in this context, and one should bear in mind that Juvenal is cleverly exploiting an aspect of this frequently represented scene¹¹⁵ which could probably be described as a 'novel' perspective. Braund terms the image 'bathetic' and supports Wiesen in his opinion that the appeal to the good old days is reduced to 'a parody of Roman nostalgia.' However, Juvenal is not averse to using humorous exaggeration as a vehicle for his indignation,¹¹⁶ and here he is exploiting the contrast of extremes of behaviour to good effect. The very notion of such extraordinary self-

¹¹⁴ Braund 1988:65-6. See also Wiesen 1973:481-2.

¹¹⁵ See Courtney 1980:376.

¹¹⁶ The description of the appalled reaction of the shades in the underworld (2.149ff) at the arrival of the perverts in their midst is a good example: the humour in fact draws attention to the enormity of their decadence. Mythology is also exploited for comparative purposes in *Satire* 5, for example, where the rotten fruit served to the guests is contrasted with Virro's choice apples *quorum solo pascaris odore, / qualia perpetuus Phæacum autumnus habebat, / credere quae possis subrepta sororibus Afris* (150-3).

control and respect, albeit mythical, simply serves to accentuate the deplorable fact that *real* teachers are now subjected to physical assault, let alone mere mockery, by their own pupils.

If the *rhetoires* have cause to feel aggrieved about their low status in the eyes of parents and pupils alike and about their poor pay, then the plight of the *grammatici* is scandalous. The latter - even more so than the *rhetoires* - fulfil the important role of being *in loco parentis*, and thus give particular relevance to the sentiments expressed in lines 207-10. The *grammatici* are the lowest paid and most shabbily treated of the intellectuals engaged in the public domain, and thus provide the climax to Juvenal's indictment of the (rich) parents who exploit them.¹¹⁷ The portrayal of the *grammaticus* is both highly emotive and sympathetic, while the anger and contempt directed at those responsible for his debasement are more pronounced than anywhere else in the *Satire*. The *grammaticus* is paid even less than the *rhetoire* (215-6); to make matters worse, he (like the lawyer at 122-3) suffers the additional humiliation of having to forfeit some of it to the *paedagogus* and to the *dispensator* (218-9); and the extent of this humiliation is emphasised by the comparison to the petty and demeaning haggling of a pedlar over a mat or blanket (220-1). The poor teacher is ironically 'ordered' (*cede . . . et patere inde aliquid decrescere*, 219-20) to accept this reduction of his fee,

*dummodo non pereat mediae quod noctis ab hora
sedisti, qua nemo faber, qua nemo sederet
qui docet obliquo lanam deducere ferro,
dummodo non pereat totidem olfecisse lucernas
quot stabant pueri, cum totus decolor esset*

¹¹⁷ This provides a far simpler (and 'dramatically' satisfying) explanation of why Juvenal treated the intellectuals in the order that he did. Attempts have been made to see a deliberately contrived inversion of the order employed by Suetonius in his *De Viris Illustribus* (see Braund 1988:45-6 for discussion and references), but rely on a good deal of conjecture because only the part dealing with the *grammatici* survives *in toto* (gaps have to be 'filled in', using Jerome's use of Suetonius' work for his Latin version of Eusebius' chronological tables). Furthermore, one has to account for the awkward fact that Jerome includes an entry on philosophers, who have no place in Juvenal's work.

Flaccus et haereret nigro fuligo Maroni. (222-7)

The debasement of the role of the *grammaticus* is powerfully conveyed by the description of the environment in which the teacher is expected to work: cramped, dark and malodorous; and the image of the soiled and soot-encrusted copies of Horace and Vergil is a most effective symbol of that debasement.¹¹⁸ As if that is not enough, the teacher's humiliation is exacerbated by having to take legal action to secure payment.

Throughout this passage, of course, Juvenal is using exaggeration for dramatic effect, but there can be no doubt that his intention is to arouse sympathy for the lot of the down-trodden *grammaticus*, rather than to imply that the *grammaticus* himself is to be held responsible for his invidious predicament. That this is the case is shown even more clearly by the direct and forceful attack on the parents of the pupils for their unreasonable and pedantic expectations of the teacher:

*sed vos saevas inponite leges,
ut praeceptori verborum regula constet,
ut legat historias, auctores noverit omnes
tamquam ungues digitosque suos, ut forte rogatus,
dum petit aut thermas aut Phoebi balnea, dicat
nutricem Anchisae, nomen patriamque novercae
Anchemoli, dicat quot Acestes vixerit annis,
quot Siculi Phrygibus vini donaverit urnas.* (229-36)

Juvenal leaves the audience/reader in no doubt that such pedantry is insisted on by the *parents* themselves; *they* are the ones who impose the *saevas . . . leges* to which the teacher is bound to conform; it is *they* who expect the teacher's encyclopaedic knowledge to be at their beck and call at the most inappropriate times and places (this, surely, is a timeless complaint of all academics). The picture that Juvenal presents of

¹¹⁸ Any modern teacher who has had the dubious pleasure of distributing grubby and defaced texts of Shakespeare to a class of recalcitrant schoolchildren will testify to that.

the hapless *grammaticus*, trapped between the unreasonable expectations and the disrespect of his 'customers', is very reminiscent of the dilemma of the *rhetor*, described in lines 150ff. Yet the position of the *grammaticus* is even more invidious than the latter's and Juvenal's attack on the parents becomes even more bitter and sarcastic:

*exigite ut mores teneros ceu pollice ducat,
ut si quis cera voltum facit; exigite ut sit
et pater ipsius coetus . . . (237-9)*

It is not so much the arrogance of these expectations¹¹⁹ that Juvenal is exposing - together with the implication that the parents are shirking their own responsibilities - as their ignorance of the squalid reality which their own children represent to the teacher:

*. . . ne turpia ludant,
ne faciant vicibus. non est leve tot puerorum
observare manus oculosque in fine trementis. (239-41)*

¹¹⁹ Juvenal's exposure of the impossible demands made on the teacher has an interesting parallel in this extract from a recent speech-day address: 'From the point of view of the parents, the list of expectations is fairly straightforward. The school is to ensure that their child has the best teacher in each of his or her subjects, and we are to know the child individually, even though they acknowledge this to be impossible with the numbers. We are to educate the child properly in drugs, smoking, exercise, first aid, careers and work experience; provide for their social development and run dancing lessons; ensure that nobody steals in the school, and personally see to the detection and return of any stolen property; we must maintain their children's manners, haircuts, clean shoes, proper speech, train them in public speaking and the conduct of meetings. We are to educate them in taking initiatives, learning leadership, expose them to a variety of sports and musical instruments, personally supervise their filling in of their diary, make sure that they do their homework, teach them woodwork and hobbies and trout fishing and make sure that they have a particularly good grounding in maths, Science and English, and we must, of course, provide for their community service programmes and their sex education. We are expected to insist on and maintain firm and strong discipline in the school, except when their child is involved in a consequent penalty, when we must avoid being too narrow, too harsh and or un-christian . . .' (Address by Mr J. Pluke, *Maritzburg College Magazine*, No. 128 (1994), 9).

Few passages in Juvenal can match this for withering contempt and smouldering *indignatio*;¹²⁰ and the concluding couplet not only intensifies the condemnation of the parents' arrogance and ignorance, but also returns to the central theme of the *Satire* - the grossly inadequate remuneration which the intellectuals receive from the rich:

‘haec’ inquit ‘cura; sed cum se verterit annus,
accipe, victori populus quod postulat, aurum.’ (242-3)

Courtney's comment on these lines is most apt: ‘thus brains are dragged down to the level of brawn . . . and the *grammaticus* gets in a year what a gladiator gets for a single success.’¹²¹

In his description of the plight of the *grammatici*, Juvenal is unequivocal in presenting them as the down-trodden and exploited victims of the rich; the latter, on the other hand, are characterised as arrogant, insensitive and mean - an impression strongly reinforced by the tone and substance of the concluding pronouncement. To claim that ‘it is hard to have unalloyed sympathy with the *grammaticus*’ and that the adverse comparison with the pay of the *victor* ‘may seem to be no more than poetic justice’¹²² is, therefore, entirely unconvincing.

Throughout this *Satire* Juvenal has presented the debasement of the intellectuals as the consequence of impoverishment, and this in turn is to be attributed primarily to the

¹²⁰ Wiesen (1973:482) is still intent upon implicating the *grammaticus* in the blame for the malaise affecting his profession: ‘The gross obscenity that concludes the list of the teacher’s duties seems to sum up for Juvenal the ugliness of his life and the stupidity of his work.’

¹²¹ Courtney 1980:380. Courtney explains that a victorious gladiator was paid 500 sesterces if *auctoratus* or 400 if a slave by the *editor*, cf. Ferguson 1979:229-30. Davey (1971:11) makes the interesting suggestion that *victori* does not mean ‘charioteer’ (whose rewards Juvenal implies at 7.113 were quite substantial), or ‘gladiator’ (whose rewards were fixed and therefore unaffected by the people’s demands), but that it refers rather to a successful litigant (i.e. to the teacher, who sues for his pay). Juvenal uses the term in this context at 1.50: *at tu victrix, provincia, ploras*. Thus *populus postulat* would refer to the audience at a trial, and *annus* to the *annus litium* (i.e. the legal term).

¹²² Braund 1988:68.

selfishness of the rich. The fact that Juvenal has reached the end of his satire 'without praising the natural gifts or meritorious achievements of one single contemporary poet, historian, rhetor or teacher'¹²³ is not an indication of hostility towards intellectuals: his indictment of the rich consists precisely in exposing the *negative* effects of the dereliction of their duty as the sector of society whose patronage and sense of values should have fostered the development of all intellectual pursuits, whether purely 'creative' or 'applied'. When Juvenal says that he cannot point out a single contemporary poet of extraordinary talent or describes the tedious irrelevance of the subjects taught by the *rhetor* and the *grammaticus*, he makes it abundantly clear that he does not hold the practitioners responsible: on the contrary, they are sympathetically portrayed as the unfortunate victims of poverty through circumstances beyond their control. If Juvenal had really been intent upon denigrating poets and other intellectuals, he would not have focused on the destructive role of the *dives avarus* with such vigour and consistency. The prominence of this theme alone militates against theories such as those of Braund and Wiesen, which impute an almost schizophrenic vacillation on Juvenal's part between sympathy and ironic deflation.¹²⁴

¹²³ Wiesen 1973:482.

¹²⁴ The effect of the application of such a theory is illustrated by the following excerpts from Braund's discussion of Juvenal's treatment of the poets: 'On the surface, the message . . . is sympathetic, but sympathy is wiped away . . .' (55); 'Here again, the surface message is one of sympathy . . . But the apparent sympathy is undermined . . .' (55); 'Lines 13-16 restore the tone to a sympathetic level . . . though this might seem an odd compliment which slightly detracts from the sympathy' (55); 'The speaker's sympathies are wholly with the intellectuals, we might think... But the magnificent effect is capped by a bathetic and uncomplimentary phrase . . .' (55-6); 'Superficially, there is sympathetic acknowledgement of the poet's hard work . . . But these very details simultaneously detract from our sympathy for the poet' (56); 'On the surface, the speaker is expressing sympathy . . . But discordant notes cause the pathos "to evaporate before our eyes", as Wiesen says' (57); 'With the sarcasm of *artes*, . . . the attack becomes more direct and irony takes a back seat for a while. But not entirely . . .' (57); 'The speaker's sympathy for poets is reaffirmed . . . But the following lines distance the speaker from the poets . . .' (57-8); 'On the surface he is complaining that the true poet . . . But what a revelation is line 56 . . .' (58); 'The next passage . . . makes it clear that a poet is at the bottom of every patron's list of priorities . . . Irony soon intervenes to make a deplorable fact a ridiculous one' (59); 'The sympathetic tone now restored . . . But the seriousness of this allegation is undermined . . .' (59-60); 'So the section on poetry ends with an apparently scathing attack on the aristocracy's delegation of responsibility for patronage . . . Yet this is not without its sting in the tail' (60).

CHAPTER 5

Virtus or *Vitia*?

Juvenal on the Nobility in the Eighth *Satire*

Juvenal's eighth *Satire* is addressed to an aristocrat called Ponticus and takes the form of a *suasoria* on the theme of true *nobilitas*. Highet introduces his commentary on this *Satire* with the following observation:

Until *Satire* Seven, Juvenal had never had a good word for any emperor. Then, quite unexpectedly, he praised Caesar for favouring literature. He always hated and despised the aristocrats of his own time. But now, in the eighth *Satire*, we are even more surprised to find him talking in terms of friendship to a Roman noble . . . But the Seventh *Satire* at least began on a hopeful note, and now the Eighth offers positive advice to a young man who wishes to make his character and to help his country.¹

In similar vein, Anderson has referred to 'the generally hopeful mood of the poem.'² However, while it may be true that in this *Satire* Juvenal makes less use of pure *indignatio* as a rhetorical technique than he did in his earlier *Satires*,³ it would be

¹ Highet 1954:113 and 114.

² Anderson 1982:287.

³ Fredericks (1972:111): 'Juvenal's Eighth *Satire* abandons the mood of pure *indignatio* so prevalent in his early satires . . .' I would disagree, however, with Anderson (1982:287), who states: 'In any case, indignation has nothing to do with this poem.' While Juvenal does not here rely upon the standard devices appropriate to indignation (e.g. rhetorical questions, exclamations, apostrophes, etc.) his portraits of degenerate aristocrats are redolent of contempt and indignation.

misleading to believe that Juvenal is now intent upon presenting a more hopeful and positive outlook: just as the acknowledgement of the emperor's patronage at the start of *Satire* 7 served as a spring-board for a sustained indictment of the *dives avarus*, so the ostensibly 'positive' theme of *Satire* 8 actually provides a vehicle for yet another expose of the decadence of the Roman aristocracy. Juvenal's real purpose is made quite obvious by the fact that he 'offers his positive advice in terms of negative examples and most often conducts his case by telling Ponticus how not to behave.'⁴ This emphasis on the negative points to satirical attack as the predominant motive behind the poem, and recognition of this would obviate uncomfortably ambivalent assessments such as Highet's:

It is a curious poem, astringent and sour. It can scarcely have been very soothing for young Ponticus . . . At any rate it is a novelty for Juvenal to take such apparently sincere interest in any nobleman, and to give such positive advice, even though he surrounds it with destructive criticism.⁵

The truth is that Ponticus' welfare is as close to Juvenal's heart as the generosity of the emperor in *Satire* 7. The latter's positive role as a patron of the arts is completely overshadowed by a lengthy and unremitting denunciation of the *divites avari*; similarly, it is not the 'constructive' advice to Ponticus which leaves the most vivid impression, but rather the destructive caricature of the nobility.⁶ At no stage does Juvenal imply that Ponticus has any admirable qualities or even the potential to rise above his degenerate counterparts; he is a mere name with unmistakably aristocratic connotations, whose sole function is to facilitate a scathing (and entertaining) denunciation of the decadence of his class and a mockery of the hollowness of its pretensions.⁷ As Fredericks

⁴ Fredericks 1972:11; cf. Courtney 1980: 383.

⁵ Highet 1954:116.

⁶ Cf. Fredericks 1972:111-2: 'Juvenal thus seems more intent on providing humorous descriptions of vice than positive moral exhortations . . .'

⁷ Ferguson 1979:248: 'But the poem, like others, is an indictment, and if Ponticus is an invention, he is merely a peg on which to hang an indictment.'

observes: 'Ponticus is not Everyman; he is the representative of the degenerate aristocrats who are the satiric object of this satire.'⁸

In a more recent study of the eighth *Satire*, Susanna Braund⁹ focuses on the character of the 'speaker'. An analysis of the literary antecedents to *Satire* 8 leads her to conclude that the material of the poem is unoriginal and trite, a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theme. However, the criticism that Juvenal's use of commonplaces - to employ a less pejorative term - would have made his work appear trite and clichéd to his contemporaries is of doubtful validity: satire as a genre deals with deviations from accepted norms, and the audience's familiarity with those norms facilitates the satirist's goal of arousing moral indignation. Would any devout Christian, for example, find a preacher's condemnation of contemporary vice less valid because he consistently refers, in thoroughly familiar language and imagery, to the same ethical standards that the Church has used for nearly two thousand years? It will be argued below that Juvenal's emphasis on the traditional and familiar concepts of what constitutes true *virtus* serves to accentuate the degeneracy of the contemporary aristocracy and the hollowness of their claims to superior status on the grounds of birth alone.

Braund argues, furthermore, that 'throughout the poem Juvenal has maintained suspense as to the speaker's moral character, by alternating moralising with non-moralising content, by bolstering his stance as a moralist and then deflating his authority'¹⁰ This, of course, is a further manifestation of the irony which Braund sees as a salient feature of the seventh *Satire*.¹¹ However, just as the latter premiss is open to serious question,¹² so is the argument that Juvenal would deliberately blunt the sharpness of his satirical attack by creating a trite 'speaker' in the form of a 'pseudo-

⁸ 1972:113.

⁹ Braund 1988:69-129.

¹⁰ Braund 1988:121-2.

¹¹ Braund 1988:110-1.

¹² See previous chapter.

moralist' and thus detracting from his moral seriousness.¹³ Braund remarks that the largely negative and harshly critical content of *Satire* 8 suggests that Juvenal's 'speaker' is 'more interested in criticism than reform.'¹⁴ This could hardly have been surprising to an audience already familiar with Juvenal's scathing denunciation of the aristocracy in his previous *Satires*. Juvenal has neither lessened his antipathy towards the aristocracy nor has he compromised his role as a forthright critic of their failings; indeed the very first line of the poem sets the stage for an exercise in mocking criticism rather than positive teaching.

The *Satire* opens in a direct and challenging manner:

*Stemmata quid faciunt? quid prodest, Pontice, longo
sanguine censer, pictos ostendere vultus
maiorum et stantis in curribus Aemilianos . . . (1-3)*

However, what at first might seem to be an invitation to a serious and straightforward debate soon acquires a satirical flavour:

*et Curios iam dimidios umeroque minorem
Corvinum et Galbam auriculis nasoque carentem . . . (4-5)*

¹³ Braund 1988:98. Later (103) she comments: 'He may be creating a trite character in the speaker, but this does not preclude him from investing his treatment of the nobility theme with a novel and intricate web of motifs and imagery.' If Juvenal had really been intent upon creating an impression of triteness one would have expected him to have made this clearer by less inventive presentation. Braund also suggests (109-10) that Juvenal's pseudo-moralist in *Satire* 8 may have been modelled upon the 'Socrates' in Persius' fourth *Satire*. She contrasts the 'harsh, severe and stern' tone of the strict moralist with the 'gratuitous and prurient details' which he uses to describe Alcibiades' shamelessness in displaying his depilated private parts while sunbathing (lines 33-41), and argues that these details 'undermine Socrates' stance as a moralist.' On the contrary, it can be argued that the hypocrisy of the playboy-politician is exposed in a most amusing and convincing manner (compare Juvenal's use of the straight-talking whore who exposes the bogus-moralists in *Satire* 2) and that it is fallacious to believe that Persius is creating a 'pseudo-moralist', on the assumption that his audience would find such language 'unpleasant'. One wonders how sensitive Catullus and Martial were to the danger that the crudeness of some of their invective might have posed to their own credibility.

¹⁴ Braund 1988:83.

This is not the first occasion when Juvenal has used dilapidated or 'mutilated' statuary both as a symbol of aristocratic decadence and, more particularly, as a mocking reminder of their hollow pretensions to privileged status. In the seventh *Satire* the aristocratic lawyer's claim to the maximum fee for a court appearance is justified on the following ironic grounds:

*huius enim stat currus aeneus, alti
quadriiuges in vestibulis, atque ipse feroci
bellatore sedens curvatum hastile minatur
eminus et statua meditatur proelia lusca.* (125-8)

Here, too, the comically deflating detail (*lusca*) is reserved for the end of the sentence for maximum effect. The theme of *Satire* 8, of course, provides scope for a more sustained use of this metaphor of long-since faded and atrophied glory; and a further debunking effect is achieved by the phrase *fumosos . . . magistros* (8). Juvenal's manipulation of the imagery is remarkable: first, the use of the *names* of the personages whom they represent (i.e. *Aemilianos*, *Curios*, etc.) imbues the statues with a living presence, as it were; and second, while that 'presence' reinforces their descendants' claims to privilege, the decayed state of the ancestors is not only symbolic of the demise of the values of a bygone era but also suggestive of the decadence and neglect of the contemporary nobility (in the same way as poorly cared-for treasures in a modern museum might arouse contempt for the current custodians and invite unfavourable comparisons with their ancient forebears).¹⁵ The symbols which the nobles take refuge in become, ironically, watchful and reproachful observers; and this idea is cleverly captured in the concluding clause: *si coram Lepidis male vivitur* ('if under the Lepidi's eyes your life is evil').

Military prowess traditionally constitutes one of the nobles' most persuasive claims to honour and respect, and this is a sphere in which Juvenal can make embarrassing

¹⁵ Fredericks (1972:115) points out how the words *dimidios*, *minorem*, *carentem* and the diminutive *auriculis* suggest how diminished the great houses really are.

comparisons between the 'good old days' and the decadent present: hence the satirical portrait in *Satire* 2 of the foppish Otho fussing over his make-up on the battlefield¹⁶ and the reference to Virro's adornment of his drinking cup with jewels which a manly warrior like Aeneas would have used to decorate his scabbard.¹⁷ Thus the symbolism of the ancestral statues, which call to mind the military prowess and self-discipline of a bygone age, is quite lost on the present generation of aristocrats:

*effigies quo
tot bellatorum, si luditur alea pernox
ante Numantinos, si dormire incipis ortu
luciferi, quo signa duces et castra movebant?* (9-12)

The noun *bellatorum* has a more obvious connotation of martial vigour than would the more common *ducum*, *militum* or *imperatorum*, and this serves to accentuate the contrast between the old-fashioned warriors and their effete descendants. So, too, does the idea of gambling, which Juvenal used in *Satire* 1 as a symptom of greed and moral decay; and it is interesting to note that in that context he also alludes to the corruption of the military ideal.¹⁸ The contrast between the ideal and the reality is then painted in even more lurid colours:

*cur Allobrogicis et magna gaudeat ara
natus in Herculeo Fabius lare, si cupidus, si
vanus et Euganea quantumvis mollior agna,*

¹⁶ *Sat.* 2.99-109.

¹⁷ *Sat.* 5.43-45. In similar vein is the deploring, in *Sat.* 6. 287-93, of the decay of the old-fashioned martial spirit and the consequent spread of enervating luxury.

¹⁸ *et quando uberior vitiorum copia? quando
maior avaritiae patuit sinus? alea quando
hos animos? neque enim loculis comitantibus itur
ad casum tabulae, posita sed luditur arca.
proelia quanta illic dispensatore videbis
armigero!* (*Sat.* 1.87-92).

On the illegality of gambling see Courtney 1980:103 and 387.

*si tenerum attritus Catinensi pumice lumbum
 squalentis traducit avos emptorque veneni
 frangenda miseram funestat imagine gentem?
 tota licet veteres exornent undique cerae
 atria, nobilitas sola est atque unica virtus.* (13-20)

The ancestry of the Fabii, as described here, is represents the epitome of masculine vigour: the honorific *Allobrogicis* is testimony to the ancestors' ability to surpass the formidable barbarians in strength and valour, as one would expect from a *gens* that claims descent from Hercules himself (note the juxtapositioning of *Herculeo* and *Fabius*). To the ideas of virility and bravery are added, perhaps, the notions of old-fashioned piety and family pride with the reference to the Herculean *Iar*. Accusations of *cupiditas*, *vanitas* and physical softness are damaging enough in this context, but nothing could convey the idea of degeneracy more effectively than the outward manifestation of sexual depravity: the images of soft (*tenerum*), pumiced buttocks and rough, virile shagginess (*squalentis*)¹⁹ provide a particularly sharp and startling contrast (reminiscent of the description of the stern and 'upright' philosopher in *Satire* 2, whose bristly limbs mask the sordid truth that he has a smooth anus, swollen with piles)²⁰. The disgracing of the *gens* is symbolised in the most graphic manner by the public smashing of the miscreant's own statue. Not only does the thoroughly ignoble crime of poisoning constitute ample reason for such punishment²¹, but Juvenal contrives to conclude his illustration of the essential hollowness of such symbols *per se* - no matter how many of

¹⁹ The same motifs are used later in the poem, where the *resinata iuventus* and *crura . . . levia* of Rhodes and Corinth are unfavourably contrasted with *horrida . . . Hispania* (112-6)

²⁰ *Sat.* 2.11-3. Fredericks (1972:116-7) points out that the antithesis between the depilated Fabius and his rugged ancestors 'establishes the theme of "trading", since the degeneracy of the descendants caricatures their ancestors' glories' and that 'this is re-emphasised in numerous oxymora, in which two contradictory terms are placed together and one term "translates" the other' - e.g. *mulio consul* (148); *citharoede principe* (198) and *mimus nobilis* (198-9).

²¹ *Funestat* ('pollutes with murder') is a striking word. The particular heinousness of this crime is exploited to good effect in the Neronian passage (211-30). Ferguson (1979:234) draws attention to the 'remarkable combination of sounds' in line 18.

them are on display - by emphasising their *actual* fragility (note the prominent position of *frangenda*).²²

For Braund, the detailed treatment of the degeneracy of the descendant in lines 14-8 'marks a slide into material not appropriate for a moralist.'²³ Braund believes that the poem is animated by a mechanism of 'moralising, degeneration into inappropriate material, and return to moralising.' In other words, the speaker 'poses as a moralist initially in his material and tone, but degenerates into unmoralistic material and/or a humorous/cynical/sensational tone and treatment', and 'on becoming aware that his mask has slipped, he sets it straight by a swift return to the earlier material and tone', thus revealing his pose as a pseudo-moralist.²⁴ Juvenal, however, was writing a *satire* and not a moral treatise (the same point could be made about his intention in the second *Satire*); and recourse to humorously shocking or sensational material for rhetorical effect was, after all, a characteristic of the genre; even Horace illustrated that in *Sermones* 1.2. It cannot be denied that images of the governing elite pumicing their buttocks and having recourse to the ignoble 'weapon' of poison are very effective in driving home the truth of the maxim: *nobilitas sola est atque unica virtus* (20). Perhaps,

²² Fredericks (1976:117) makes the apt comment: 'The whole satire may be viewed as a poetic exegesis of this central symbol [i.e. the fore-ordained smashing of Fabius' *imago*, which is the central symbol of violence in the poem], for it is a paradox that the very thing the nobles care about the most - their *stemma* - will escape their grasp in the end because their own worthlessness, decadence, and criminality invalidate their glorious lineage.'

²³ Braund 1988:111-2.

²⁴ Braund 1988:108-12. Braund maintains that 'the allusions to Seneca in lines 8, 11-2 and 13-4 help establish the speaker's apparent identity as a moralist.' However, these supposed allusions are at best tenuous. Would Juvenal's audience really have had Seneca spring to mind on hearing the words *fumosos equitum . . . magistros* (8), because that author used the phrase *fumosis imaginibus* (*Ep.* 44.5)? Braund's case is hardly strengthened by the fact that the identical phrase (*fumosi imagines*) was also used by Cicero (*Pis.* 1.1). Would the mundane combination *dormire incipis* (11) have made the listeners instantly recall Seneca's *incipit Buta dormire* (*Ep.* 122.12)? And are we to attribute Juvenal's use of the famous Fabian cognomen *Allobrogicus* (13) to the fact that Seneca wrote: *quid nuper Fabium Persicum . . . sacerdotem non in uno collegio fecit nisi Verrucosi et Allobrigici et illi trecenti . . . ?* (*Ben.* 4.30.2)? The barbaric associations of the word had already appealed to Juvenal when he used the phrase *Ciceronem Allobroga* in the seventh *Satire* (line 214). Even if these specific connections cannot be entirely discounted, there are hardly sufficient grounds for believing that Juvenal was consciously cultivating the image of a moralist in the Senecan mould.

too, one should ask whether the members of the audience present at the recitals were, in their own minds, listening to an ambivalent and vacillating 'speaker' created by the poet standing before them, or to the acerbic and entertaining Juvenal himself, who could exploit the scope and licence of the genre to such brilliant effect.

When Juvenal states that *nobilitas* quite simply consists in *virtus* alone (line 20), when he makes *mores* the 'badge of office' of true aristocrats and office holders (lines 21-3) and tells Ponticus that he has an obligation (*debes*) to display these qualities to him (line 24), and when he says that recognition of his noble status is dependent upon his being blameless in word and deed and a champion of justice (lines 24-7), he is not merely adopting the role of a moralist and thus proclaiming his *own* virtue: he is being taunting and provocative by dwelling on qualities which the greater part of the *Satire* will show to be so conspicuously absent from the contemporary nobility.²⁵ The underlying mockery is made quite clear by what follows:

*quocumque alto de sanguine rarus
civis et egregius patriae contingis ovanti,
exclamare libet populus quod clamat Osiri
invento. (27-30)*

This comically exaggerated and outlandish comparison, tainted with the hysterical behaviour of Juvenal's despised Egyptians, puts more emphasis on the *rarity* of such a phenomenon than on any hope that Ponticus might fulfil that role. The sarcastic humour is reminiscent of the following lines from *Satire* 6:

*Tarpeium limen adora
pronus et auratam lunoni caede iuvencam,*

²⁵ Fredericks (1976:118) points to the irony of the advice, in that Juvenal proposes no return to the vigour of the ancestors and the glories of the past (which would have appealed to the pride of the aristocracy), but instead advocates 'a simple morality of *virtus* (ethical virtue, not military valor), *mores* (morals, not *mos maiorum*), and *bona animi* (not wealth, *bona*).²⁵ This advice would not appeal to any of the aristocrats in the poem and is 'really offered as a criticism of improper values the aristocrats hold dear.'

*si tibi contigerit capitis matrona pudici.
 paucae adeo Cereris victus contingere dignae,
 quarum non timeat pater oscula. necte coronam
 postibus et densos per limina tende corymbos. (6.47-52)*

The next sentence, with its clever play on the true and false concepts of noble lineage, restates the question posed at the very beginning of the *Satire*: *quis enim generosum dixerit hunc qui / indignus genere et praeclaro nomine tantum / insignis?* (30-2); and once again the point is amplified with satirical humour:

*nanum cuiusdam Atlanta vocamus,
 Aethiopem Cycnum, pravam extortamque puellam
 Europen; canibus pigris scabieque vetusta
 levibus et siccae lambentibus ora lucernae
 nomen erit Pardus, Tigris, Leo, si quid adhuc est
 quod fremat in terris violentius. ergo cavebis
 et metues ne tu sic Creticus aut Camerinus (32-8)*

This passage bears a strong resemblance to a section of one of Horace's *Sermones*, in which examples are given of euphemistic nicknames attached to people afflicted with physical and other defects.²⁶ However, whereas Horace's intention is well-meant²⁷,

26 *strabonem
 appellat paetum pater, et pullum, male parvus
 si cui filius est, ut abortivus fuit olim
 Sisyphus; hunc varum distortis cruribus; illum
 balbutit scaurum, pravis fultum male talis.
 parcius hic vivit: frugi dicatur. ineptus
 et iactantior hic paullo est: concinnus amicis
 postulat ut videatur. at est truculentior atque
 plus aequo liber: simplex fortisque habeatur,
 caldior est: acris inter numeretur (Serm. 1.3.44-53)*

27 *vellem in amicitia sic erraremus et isti
 errori nomen virtus posuisset honestum.
 at pater ut gnati, sic nos debemus amici,
 si quod sit vitium, non fastidire . . . (41-4)*

Juvenal's is malicious (*deridens dicere verum!*): as with the earlier description of the mutilated statues, Juvenal wants his audience to savour images of stunted growth, deformity, and debility.²⁸ This is surely not a stern-faced and serious moralist talking, but a sardonic and witty satirist; as Fredericks points out, 'this passage is a sure hint that the poem is really a humorous explication of vice and not a moral tract.'²⁹

The *exordium*, with no fewer than sixteen references to aristocratic *gentes* or honorific titles in the space of 38 lines, provides a clear enough indication that Juvenal's satirical attack is aimed at the nobility in general, and not merely at several decadent individuals from that class. However, a more detailed focus on specific *exempla* is the satirist's most potent weapon; and Juvenal proceeds to illustrate the truth of his assertion that an aristocratic name *per se* is worthless, by engaging a noble, Rubellius Blandus, in an embarrassing debate. The latter, taunted with being full of his inherited importance (*tumes alto Drusorum stemmate*, 40), duly retorts with sneering arrogance ('*vos humiles . . . volgi pars ultima nostri, / quorum nemo queat patriam monstrare parentis, / ast ego Cecropides*', 44-6), and thus invites the humiliation he deserves. The satirist's response is full of irony and ridicule: *vivas et originis huius / gaudia longa feras* (46-7).³⁰ The absurd vanity of his epic pedigree is brought face to face with the plain truth that the lowest stratum of society (emphasised repeatedly: *ima plebe . . . de plebe togata . . . hinc*)³¹ produces men who can excel in skills which the aristocrats have traditionally regarded as their hallmarks: eloquence (note the pointed juxtapositioning of *plebe* and

. . . opinor,
haec res et iungit, iunctos et servat amicos (53-4)

²⁸ Fredericks (1972:119) argues for a rather precise symbolism in several of the images. He sees the misshapen girl as a metaphor for the criminal *nobiles*, the mangy dogs as a metaphorical return to the depilated Fabius, and the savagery of the wild beasts as the metaphorical equivalent of the ferocity of the *bellatores*.

²⁹ Fredericks 1972:119.

³⁰ Fredericks (1972:120) and Courtney (1980:393) point out the probable irony of *vivas*, in view of the paradoxical *tua vivit imago* in line 55.

³¹ Brown (1972:374) suggests the deletion of *solet hic defendere causas / nobilis indocti*, on the grounds that these words spoil the clearly marked 'tricolon crescendo'.

Quiritem), legal expertise (sometimes for the benefit of *nobilis indocti*!) and military initiative (*petit . . . industrius*). The latter word, positioned at the end of the sentence, makes the ensuing contrast all the more pointed:

at tu

*nil nisi Cecropides truncoque simillimus Hermae.
nullo quippe alio vincis discrimine quam quod
illi marmoreum caput est, tua vivit imago. (52-55)*

Blandus is a mere name without substance (*nil nisi Cecropides*); and the image of the mutilated Herm not only emphasises the notion of impotence (or more specifically, *lost* potency), but also aptly recalls the symbolism of the crumbling and decaying statues at the beginning of the poem.³² One may suspect that Juvenal chose the Greek patronymic deliberately to facilitate the use of this clever metaphor, quite apart from his readiness to satirise the hellenocentric tendencies of the Roman aristocracy! The imagery is exploited further with malicious glee: the aristocrat *might* be alive, but his 'animation' is like that of a robot (to use an anachronistic simile).

The derisive tone is maintained with the mock-epic *Teucrorum proles* (absurdly inappropriate after the comparison with the mutilated herm) and with the reflection that there is more straightforward honesty employed in assessing the worth of 'dumb animals':

*dic mihi, Teucrorum proles, animalia muta
quis generosa putet nisi fortia. nempe volucrem
sic laudamus equum, facili cui plurima palma
fervet et exultat rauco victoria circo;*

³² Braund (1988:113) maintains that the directness and irreverence of the metaphor 'devastates the speaker's moralising pretensions'. However, the satirical jibes which establish the predominant tone of the poem within the first four or five lines must have made it clear to the audience - as if they needed to be reminded - that Juvenal was first and foremost a *satirist*; his listeners were thus more likely to have listened in anticipation of his sarcastic humour than in consternation that a 'moralist' should lapse into irreverence.

*nobilis hic, quocumque venit de gramine, cuius
clara fuga ante alios et primus in aequore pulvis.* (56-61)³³

Rubellius Blandus' utterly effete and hollow 'nobility' is made even more laughable and contemptible by the ensuing focus on the simple qualities of strength and speed, on which the continued recognition of the 'aristocratic' pedigree of a race-horse depends. The analogy with the Roman nobility is given added point by the words *quocumque venit de gramine*; and those in Juvenal's audience who shared his opinion of the pretentious claims of the aristocracy must have relished the insulting inferences of the following lines:

*sed venale pecus Coryphaei posteritas et
Hirpini, si rara iugo victoria sedit.
nil ibi maiorum respectus, gratia nulla
umbrarum; dominos pretiis mutare iubentur
exiguus, trito ducunt epiraedia collo
segnipedes dignique molam versare nepotes.* (62-67)

Unlike their human counterparts, the 'aristocrats' of the race-track (note the venerable connotations of the names *Coryphaei* and *Hirpini*) cannot rely on *maiorum respectus* or *gratia . . . umbrarum* to save them from an ignominious end; and the striking phrase *segnipedes . . . nepotes*³⁴ recalls the earlier mockery of the nobility for their lack of energy and initiative, when compared to notable achievers produced by the lowest dregs (*ima plebe*, 47) of the populace. The notion that a responsibility rests with the members of the nobility to *do* something positive of their own accord to justify their inherited status has been prominent from the opening sentence of the poem (*stemmata quid faciunt?*). Also important is the notion that the nobility is not only indebted to their

³³ On the question whether *palma* means 'palm of hand' or 'palm of victory', see Braund 1981:221-3, who favours the latter.

³⁴ *Segnipedes* is a *hapax legomenon*; see Courtney 1980:396. The connection with the Roman nobility is enhanced by the deliberately epic connotation of the adjective; Fredericks (1972:121) describes it as 'a striking satiric epicism'.

ancestors for their privileged position but also accountable to the populace at large which continues to recognise the achievements of those ancestors; hence the forthright statement from an 'outsider': *prima mihi debes animi bona* (24). Both of these ideas are emphasised in the concluding challenge to Rubellius Blandus:

*ergo ut miremur te, non tua, primum aliquid da
quod possim titulis incidere praeter honores
quos illis damus ac dedimus, quibus omnia debes.* (68-70)

Juvenal can confidently hold up Rubellius Blandus as an example of a noble who represents the very antithesis of such ideals (. . . *iuvenem quem nobis fama superbum / tradit et inflatum plenumque Nerone propinquo*, 71-2); and the notion of a sense of responsibility to the community at large is reiterated in the negative observation: *rarus enim ferme sensus communis in illa / fortuna* (73-4).³⁵ The futility of reliance on inherited glory (*quid prodest, Pontice, longo sanguine censi* . . . ?, 1-2) is picked up again (with appropriate metaphors), when Juvenal turns once more to the addressee of the poem:

*sed te censi laude tuorum,
Pontice, noluerim sic ut nihil ipse futurae
laudis agas. miserum est aliorum incumbere famae,
ne conlapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis.
stratus humi palmes viduas desiderat ulmos.* (74-8)

Juvenal then lays down succinct guidelines for Ponticus' conduct in office: he is to be a *bonus miles*, a *tutor bonus* and an *arbiter* . . . *integer*. Of course, after his satirical portrayal of the decadence of the aristocracy and his emphasis on the extraordinary rarity of such qualities amongst the contemporary nobility (*rarus / civis et egregius*, 27-8), Juvenal's audience probably suspected a measure of irony in these expectations.

³⁵ Cf. Juvenal's imaginary appeal to the patron Virro in *Satire 5*: *solum / poscimus ut cenes civiliter. hoc face et esto, / esto, ut nunc multi, dives tibi, pauper amicis* (111-3). The notion of a *sensus communis* is also present at 1.92-3, 7.128 and 15.131-47.

Their suspicions would have been confirmed by the exaggerated terms in which he goes on to describe the degree of integrity and idealism expected of Ponticus as a witness in a court of law:

*ambiguae si quando citabere testis
incertaeque rei, Phalaris licet imperet ut sis
falsus et admoto dictet periuria tauro,
summun crede nefas animam praeferre pudori
et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas. (80-84)*

Fredericks comments aptly: ' . . . instead of developing his thoughts in any serious, ethical arguments he treats the subject once more with humour . . . But the example goes too far, and any serious moral point is lost in declamatory deflation.'³⁶ However, the humour is tinged with malice when the point is made - with exaggerated imagery - that the aristocrat's wealth cannot compensate for his 'spiritual' death (a state somewhat reminiscent of that suggested earlier by *tua vivit imago*, 55):

*dignus morte perit, cenet licet ostrea centum
Gaurana et Cosmi toto mergatur aeno (85-6)³⁷*

These images of luxurious indulgence lead appropriately into the theme of provincial governorship - the realm of aristocratic greed and corruption *par excellence* - and lend a rather unsavoury flavour to the words *expectata diu . . . provincia* (87). Ponticus, in his role as *rector*, is urged to control his anger;³⁸ but it is the need to control his *avaritia*

³⁶ Fredericks 1972:121-2.

³⁷ Fredericks (1972:122) suggests that *aeno* (86), by a pun, also recalls Phalaris' bull - another brazen vessel in which victims were immersed - and that the impression is thus created 'that living like a contemporary noble (a moral, metaphorical death - *dignus morte perit*) is more of a "death" than anything Phalaris could dish out.' Similarly, Courtney (1980:397) points out that 'his *aenum* is a living death (85) as surely as the bronze bull of Phalaris (82) is a literal one; yet he maintains that lines 85-6 are 'not well fitted into the argument.'

³⁸ Braund (1988:114) comments: 'the speaker instructs Ponticus on behaviour . . . in terms which clearly distinguish him from the speaker of the earlier Books: instead of laying

which Juvenal dwells on - a favourite theme, which Juvenal proceeds to develop yet again to the detriment of the nobility:

*pone irae frena modumque,
pone et avaritiae, miserere inopum sociorum:
ossa vides rerum vacuis exucta medullis.* (88-90)

Fredericks³⁹ observes that 'the satirist's plea that Ponticus should take pity on the poor provincials has more emphasis on "poor" than it does on pity.' The reason, of course, is that the poverty of the provincials can be attributed directly to the rapacity of the governing class, which is typified by Capito and Tutor (an ironically selected name in view of *tutor bonus* in line 79!), who are pointedly referred to as *piratae Cilicum* (94). Since the Cilicians were notorious pirates themselves, the Roman governors were, by implication, even more villainous! Juvenal ostensibly uses the fate of Capito and Tutor to illustrate the advisability of obeying the laws and the orders of the senate, because of the substantial rewards for 'good men' on the one hand and the dire consequences for those who abuse their authority on the other. However, the homily on good governorship and the merits of the 'system' is immediately overshadowed by a cynical digression, in which the satirist offers candid advice to one of the victims of plunder perpetrated by aristocratic governors:

*sed quid damnatio confert?
praeconem, Chaerippe, tuis circumspice pannis,
cum Pansa eripiat quidquid tibi Natta reliquit,
iamque tace; furor est post omnia perdere naulum.* (94-7)

claim to *indignatio*, he condemns *ira*.' Juvenal, however, is referring simply to the need to control one's temper in dealing with provincials - which is hardly identical to the sense of moral indignation which, according to him (1.79), inspired his satire. Besides, *Satire* 8 is not entirely free of *indignatio*, as Braund herself notes (see pp. 111 and 113). Note also Fredericks (1972:120): 'In these lines on Rubellius Blandus, Juvenal borrows a Horatian model, to be sure, but the thrust of the argument has all the savagery of the indignant satirist.'

³⁹ Fredericks 1972:122.

Whatever the purpose of the boat-fare,⁴⁰ it is clear that Juvenal is intent upon further denigrating the nobility, whose criminal greed is aided and abetted by the system which it manipulates to its advantage, and that he is sympathising with the plight of the underdog in his vain hope of seeing justice done.⁴¹

Likewise, the cynical expediency of the advice offered in the next section has the effect of focusing even more attention on the greed, sacrilege and effete character of the nobility (in much the same way as the cynical Tiresias in Horace's *Sermones* 2.5 exposes the contemptible nature of the grasping and ignoble Ulysses):

*non idem gemitus olim neque vulnus erat par
damnorum sociis florentibus et modo victis.
plena domus tunc omnis, et ingens stabat acervos
nummorum, Spartana chlamys, conchylia Coa,
et cum Parrhasii tabulis signisque Myronis
Phidiacum vivebat ebur, nec non Polycliti
multus ubique labor, rarae sine Mentore mensae.
inde Dolabellae atque hinc Antonius, inde
sacrilegus Verres referebant navibus altis
occulta spolia et plures de pace triumphos.
nunc sociis iuga pauca boum, grex parvus equarum,
et pater armenti capto eripietur agello,
ipsi deinde Lares, si quod spectabile signum,*

⁴⁰ There seem to be three possible interpretations: 1) the fee paid to Charon; 2) the fare to Rome (in order to prosecute the governors); 3) the fare for the trip home, after the trial in Rome. The cynical tone of the passage would make (2) the least attractive interpretation. The earlier question *sed quid damnatio confert?* (94) suggests that Juvenal is thinking of the futility of having recourse even to the legal system in such instances, and *post omnia* (97) most probably refers to that as well as to the suffering beforehand. Since (1) remains somewhat obscure without some reference to Charon or the Underworld, (3) seems to be the most likely interpretation. See Courtney 1980:399.

⁴¹ Cf. Juvenal's attitude at 1.49-50: *exul ab octava Marius bibit et fruitur dis / iratis, at tu victrix, provincia, ploras*. Even after a 'successful' prosecution of a governor, the provincials still suffer the consequences of their losses.

*[si quis in aedícula deus unicus; haec etenim sunt
pro summis, nam sunt haec maxima. despicias tu]⁴²
forsitan inbellis Rhodios unctamque Corinthon
despicias merito: quid resinata iuventus
cruraque totius facient tibi levia gentis?
horrida vitanda est Hispania, Gallicus axis
Illyricumque latus; parce et messoribus illis
qui saturant urbem circo scenaeque vacantem;
quanta autem inde feres tam dirae praemia culpae,
cum tenuis nuper Marius discinxerit Afros?
curandum in primis ne magna iniuria fiat
fortibus et miseris. tollas licet omne quod usquam est
auri atque argenti, scutum gladiumque relinques
et iaculum et galeam; spoliatis arma supersunt (98-124).*

Why does Juvenal focus on the *private* possessions of the provincials and describe them in such detail? Clearly because he wants to impress on his audience the unscrupulous greed of the nobility for self-enrichment, a characteristic well exemplified by *sacrilegus* Verres in particular. The epic-sounding phrase *navibus altis*⁴³ in this squalid context and the oxymorons 'hidden spoils' and 'peace-time triumphs' are clever satirical touches. The emotive effect of the phrase *ossa . . . rerum vacuis exucta medullis* (90) is sustained in the examples of the provincials' meagre possessions which will continue to be seized: *iuga pauca boum, grex parvus equarum, pater armenti, agello*.⁴⁴ The fact that these are not luxury items but simple things on which their very

⁴² Deleted by Manso, but see objections of Courtney 1980:401-2.

⁴³ Reminiscent, for example, of Virgil's *de navibus altis* (Ciris 389); *de puppibus altis* (Aen. 10.287); *celsis in puppibus* (Aen. 1.183); *celsas navis* (Aen. 4.397).

⁴⁴ The phrase *capto . . . agello* is yet another jibe at the military capabilities of the contemporary aristocracy.

livelihood depends is a harsh indictment of the Romans' ruthlessness and greed.⁴⁵ Their conduct is made even more shocking by the inclusion of *ipsi* . . . *Lares* in the catalogue of plunder; far from showing respect for the provincials' religious beliefs, they commit sacrilege simply because a statue might take their fancy (*spectabile*), and even if it is the only image (*deus unicus*) in the shrine.⁴⁶

The mockery of the nobility's lack of *virtus* in the military sphere, which featured as early as lines 9-18 and which reappeared in lines 51-2 and 107-9, is the main purpose of Juvenal's warnings to Ponticus about the dangers of taking on nations like *horrida* . . . *Hispania* (116).⁴⁷ When he tells Ponticus that he is right to despise the unwarlike Rhodians and the perfumed Corinthians but to keep clear of the hairy Spaniards and other barbaric nations, what he is really implying is that the contemporary nobility is no match for them in terms of courage and strength. The references to the *resinata iuventus* of Rhodes and Corinth and to their *crura* . . . *levia* are uncomfortably reminiscent of the aristocrat's pumiced buttocks described in line 16. This reinforces the impression of almost similar effeteness and effeminacy on the part of the contemporary Roman nobility, while the word *horrida* (116) mockingly attributes to the Spaniards the sort of robustness which the nobility's 'hairy' (*squalentis*, 17) forefathers once possessed. The ineffectual nobles are taunted further when Juvenal warns Ponticus to leave even the reapers (*messoribus*) of North Africa well alone; and the implied inferiority of the Romans' strength and resolve is accentuated by the barbed reference to the capital's dependence on those foreigners (*qui saturant urbem*) and to its decadence (*circo scenaeque vacantem*). Rome's reliance on the African grain supply is again alluded to in the warning about the severe consequences (*tam dirae* . . . *culpae*, 119) for anyone who disrupts it; while the nobles' self-interest and rapacious greed are

⁴⁵ The governors' conduct is made all the more shameful by emphasis on the fact that the property is seized from Rome's *allies*, rather than from her enemies: *nunc sociis* . . . *eripietur* (108-9).

⁴⁶ Courtney (1980:401) draws attention to the pathos of *unicus* and the diminutive *aedicula* (line 111).

⁴⁷ Tacitus' *Germania* and *Agricola* also comment, by implication, on the *imbellis* nature of the Roman nobility.

mockingly exposed yet again with the question *quanta autem inde feres . . . praemia?* and with the explanation that the Africans offer little scope for further plunder since the noble Marius⁴⁸ went so far as to strip them of their money-belts.⁴⁹

However, the most important reason for the expedient policy which Juvenal is advocating is the military capability of the provincials; and when he concludes this section with his dire warning in this regard (121ff.), the effect of the emphasis on the bravery of the provincials (*fortibus* - note prominent position) and on their weapons (*scutum, gladium, iaculum, galeam, arma*) is to denigrate the resolve and military capability of men of Ponticus' class. And, in the manner of Tiresias who relishes Odysseus' discomfiture in Horace's satire⁵⁰, Juvenal emphasises the unpalatable 'truth' of his warning with an exaggerated appeal to the authority of the Sybilline Books (125-6).

The following passage, which resumes the advice on a governor's proper conduct (before the digression at line 94), provides a clear illustration of Juvenal's satirical preoccupation with negative behaviour; the importance of having a *sancta cohors comitum* is expanded by a series of antithetical examples:

*si tibi sancta cohors comitum, si nemo tribunal
vendit acersecomes, si nullum in coniuge crimen
nec per conventus et cuncta per oppida curvis
unguibus ire parat nummos raptura Celaeno,*

⁴⁸ Marius Priscus, governor of Africa in A.D. 97-98, who was prosecuted and condemned for extortion and for *saevitia*. Also mentioned at 1.49. See Courtney 1980:96.

⁴⁹ The most likely meaning of *discinxerit*, and possibly a wry explanation of why Vergil's *discinctos Afros* (*Aen.* 8.724) had flowing robes (because their belts had been stolen!); see Courtney 1980:403. Courtney maintains that *tenuis* (120) is proleptic (i.e. that Marius' theft made them poor) and that it hardly has the paradoxical meaning that he robbed those who were already poor. On the contrary, the notion that Marius' victims were already poor and that he had to resort to stripping them physically makes his deed appear even worse.

⁵⁰ *o Laertide, quicquid dicam, aut erit aut non:
divinare etenim magnus mihi donat Apollo.* (*Serm.* 2.5.59-60)

*tum licet a Pico numeres genus, altaque si te
nomina delectant omnem Titanida pugnam
inter maiores ipsumque Promethea ponas* (127-33).

The sneering references to the long-haired boy selling verdicts and to the Harpy-like wife might be lurid exaggerations, but they are at least - to the shame of the governing class - rooted in the reality of decadence and corruption. The references to divine ancestry, on the other hand, are patently absurd⁵¹ and are a mocking 'concession' to the utterly pretentious genealogical fantasies of the nobility (cf. the derisive treatment of Rubellius Blandus' claims to descent from Cecrops in lines 46-57). Juvenal then reverts to the theme of degeneracy which he exploited in the first 18 lines of the *Satire*, and once again the very figures which the contemporary nobility flaunts as evidence of its superiority assume the roles of persecutors and avengers:

*quod si praecipitem rapit ambitio atque libido,
si frangis virgas sociorum in sanguine, si te
delectant hebetes lasso lictore secures,
incipit ipsorum contra te stare parentum
nobilitas claramque facem praeferre pudendis
omne animi vitium tanto conspectius in se
crimen habet, quanto maior qui peccat habetur
quo mihi te, solitum falsas signare tabellas,
in templis quae fecit avus statuamque parentis
ante triumphalem? quo, si nocturnus adulter
tempora Santonico velas adoperta cucullo?* (135-45)

By now Juvenal has associated the nobility with an almost exhaustive list of crimes and reprehensible traits: gambling, greed, effeminacy, poisoning, plundering, sacrilege, judicial corruption, ambition, cruelty, forgery, cowardice, luxury, lust and adultery. While

⁵¹ Especially the notion of Prometheus as an ancestor, since according to legend he created humans from clay.

he ostensibly advises Ponticus and his class not to indulge in such ignoble behaviour, the impression created is that the nobility *is indeed* thoroughly corrupt and unworthy of its inherited status and respect. Juvenal's technique so far has been 'impressionistic': the negative picture of the nobility has been constructed with relatively brief vignettes and fleeting images of vice and corruption; and these make a stark contrast with the positive traits and values which he present as 'lost' ideals, dear only to the memory of their more illustrious and worthy ancestors, whose statues 'look on' dumbfounded.

Now the negative impression already created is heightened by a vivid and much more detailed focus on an individual who illustrates some of the worst excesses of degeneracy. Once again, the notion of behaving scandalously in the 'presence' of the ancestors (a motif which Juvenal exploits very effectively in the first twenty lines of the *Satire* and which he revives in lines 135-45) is brilliantly incorporated in the introduction to the character sketch of the repulsive Lateranus:⁵²

*praeter maiorum cineres atque ossa volucris
carpento rapitur pinguis Lateranus, et ipse,
ipse rotam adstringit sufflamine mulio consul,
nocte quidem, sed Luna videt, sed sidera testes
intendunt oculos. (146-50)*

⁵² The identity of this Lateranus is uncertain. Courtney (1980:406) says that he appears to be referring to Plautius Lateranus, who was consul designate in A.D. 65 - but who was executed for complicity in Piso's conspiracy in 65 before he could assume office - and whom Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.53) describes as *corpore ingens*. Ferguson (1979:239), however, suggests that Juvenal was describing T. Sextius Lateranus, who was consul in A.D. 94. He points out that the reference to Nero (170) does not invalidate this identity, since Juvenal elsewhere (4.38) refers to Domitian as 'Nero'; he also adds that Juvenal 'is less likely to gird at an opponent of Nero.' One cannot, however, discount a Neronian context that easily: the references to military activity on the rivers of Armenia and Syria and on the Rhine and Hister (i.e. the boundaries of the Empire) are appropriate to Nero's reign (see Courtney 1980:409). Perhaps the issue of historical accuracy should not be pressed too hard: the fact that Plautius Lateranus was consul designate could have been accurate enough for satirical purposes; and exaggeration here is almost certainly matched by the lurid details of Lateranus' private life. It is possible, too, that the reference to Nero's 'bodyguard' is another sarcastic jibe to denigrate Lateranus' character further (by association with the former's nefarious night-time escapades?). The description of Lateranus would seem to be a more detailed and vivid illustration of the sort of decadence alluded to in lines 14-7 of the exordium.

Courtney comments: 'To drive oneself instead of being driven . . . was undignified . . . but hardly the moral scandal Juvenal considers it.'⁵³ However, focus on the relatively trivial can be a powerful weapon in the hands of a satirist,⁵⁴ and Lateranus' sudden appearance on stage makes a vivid and dramatic impression, a picture full of contrasts: although he is obese (*pinguis*), he rushes past (*rapitur*); he is riding in an ordinary 'runabout' (*carpento*)⁵⁵, but this vehicle is 'speedy' (*volucris* - note the humorous effect of the positioning of *carpento* after the adjective and at the beginning of the next line); the repetition *ipse, ipse* suggests a revelation of great importance, but it turns out to be the utterly mundane *rotam adstringit sufflamine*; yet the satirical effect consists in the very incongruity of a noble's stooping to perform such a task⁵⁶; he is a 'consul', yet he is also a 'muleteer' (the indignity of this is accentuated by the later reference to his decidedly ungallant *iumentis* (154); he tries to conceal his behaviour (*nocte quidem*), but the heavens (*Luna, sidera*) know what he is up to. His increasingly degenerate behaviour is shown by his diminishing sense of shame⁵⁷, and the inevitability of this progressive degeneration is emphasised by the use of the future tense: by the end of his consulship (*honoris*, 150 - deliberately ironical), he will be displaying his riding-whip in broad daylight (*clara . . . luce*, 151); what is more, he will not only be unembarrassed to meet an old friend (*occursum numquam trepidabit amici / iam senis*, 152-3; the latter word suggesting old-fashioned respectability), but will actually greet him with a

⁵³ Courtney 1980:406.

⁵⁴ Courtney (1980:239) remarks that 'it is the satirist's device to use triviality to point his attack.' One can see the same technique used as the main vehicle of attack in the fourth *Satire*.

⁵⁵ A *carpentum* was a two-wheeled, covered carriage, used especially in town and by women. See Courtney 1980:406 and Ferguson 1979:239.

⁵⁶ We should perhaps be careful not to underestimate the significance of such '*infra dig*' behaviour in the eyes of a class whose reputation depended, inevitably, on keeping up appearances (Juvenal would probably have found rich satirical material in the indiscretions of members of the British Royal family!). Juvenal focused earlier on the 'indignity' of a noble driving himself (*nam lora tenebat / ipse*, 1.61-2). The modern world can provide a parallel in a much humbler context: teachers who commute by bicycle can probably vouch for the amused, if not scornful, attention of their pupils, to whom one's mode of transport is perceived as an eloquent status symbol.

⁵⁷ A progression well illustrated in *Satire* 2.83ff: *foedius hoc aliquid quandoque audebis amictu; / nemo repente fuit turpissimus . . .*, etc.

nonchalant flick of his whip; and, worse still, he will lower himself to the most menial level by unbundling hay and spreading out barley for his mules (*maniplos / solvet et infundet iumentis hordea lassiss*, 153-4).⁵⁸

The image of the muleteer effects a smooth transition to a picture of far more shocking degeneracy: the sacrilegious swearing of an oath to a foreign goddess of muleteers in the very midst of an ancient and holy Roman rite:

*interea, dum lanatas robumque iuvenum
more Numae caedit, Iovis ante altaria iurat
solam Eponam et facies olida ad praesepta pictas.* (155-7)

A particularly bizarre contrast is created between the sacredness and solemnity of the *feriae Latinae* (suggested by the references to the traditional sacrificial victims, the revered founder of Roman religious practices and the swearing of an oath before the altars of Jupiter) and the squalid perversion of those qualities in the following line (the effect is intensified by the shockingly inappropriate appearance of *solam Eponam* at the beginning of the line after *Iovis ante altaria iurat*, and by the thought that Jupiter's majesty could be superseded by a deity whose realm is a 'stinking stable'). What was initially presented as a breach of decorum (i.e. Lateranus' predilection for driving and caring for his own team of animals) has been skilfully manipulated into something far beyond mere social decadence; and Juvenal proceeds to effect an equally skilful transition to a picture which casts an even more lurid light on the degeneracy of this representative of the nobility:

*sed cum pervigiles placet instaurare popinas,
obvius adsiduo Syrophoenix udus amomo
currit, Idymaeae Syrophoenix incola portae,*

⁵⁸ Fredericks (1972:127) makes the perceptive observations that 'the *virga* of the consul's office (mentioned as such previously in lines 23 and 136) is for Lateranus the mule-driver's rod (*virga*, 135)' and that 'the *manipuli* (153) are not companies of Roman soldiers but the bundles of hay Lateranus feeds his horses.'

*hospitis adfectu dominum regemque salutat
iam cum venali Cyane succincta lagona* (158-62).

This is Juvenal at his scathing best. Not only is the forcefulness of his sneering exposé accentuated by the plosive alliteration of the first line, but vocabulary and ideas associated with the celebration of rites like the *feriae Latinae* (*instaurare*, *pervigiles*)⁵⁹ are given a thoroughly perverted meaning in the context of orgiastic ‘celebrations’. The obsequious attentions of the Syrian Jew are described with Juvenal’s characteristic loathing of eastern immigrants, and the sibilance of line 159 and the pointed repetition of *Syrophoenix* (together with the probably contemptuous reference to the Capenan gate)⁶⁰ are particularly effective in conveying that loathing. But, of course, the real contempt is aimed at the Roman noble who can lower himself to associate with such a *hospes* and to enjoy what *Cyane succincta* and her *venali . . . lagona* have to offer.⁶¹

This passage, together with the climactic description of the company kept by Lateranus (lines 171-82), must rank with the best of Juvenal’s portrayals of moral corruption. It is difficult to believe that Juvenal’s listeners – already familiar with similar *tours de force* in the second and sixth *Satires*, for example – would have allowed their enjoyment of it to be clouded by strait-laced misgivings that Juvenal’s moralising ‘gives way to less honourable interests first with his shocking picture of Lateranus’ religious disrespect (e.g. the gaudy *facies . . . pictas* 157), then with the description, possibly with salacious overtones, of Lateranus’ reception at a vulgar bar (158-62)⁶². Indeed they would probably have felt cheated if Juvenal’s scathing satire had dissipated into genuine moralising!

⁵⁹ Courtney (1980:408) points out that, in a religious context, *instaurare* means ‘to celebrate solemnly’. The irony is helped by the fact that *vigiles* could be applied to the festival of *feriae Latinae* as well; *popinas*, at the end of the line, provides a sudden and unexpected twist to the line of thought. See also Ferguson 1979:240.

⁶⁰ Cf. *Sat.* 3.10-16. See discussion by Courtney 1980:409.

⁶¹ Ferguson (1979:240) points out that ‘there is a double meaning, for any such container may symbolise the *vulva*.’ *Succincta* would reinforce such associations.

⁶² Braund 1988:116.

The conventional exoneration of youthful waywardness (*defensor culpa dicet mihi 'fecimus et nos / haec iuvenes'*, 163-4) is introduced at this juncture simply to make Lateranus' depravity all the more reprehensible:

*esto, desisti nempe nec ultra
fovisti errorem. breve sit quod turpiter audes,
quaedam cum prima resecentur crimina barba.
indulge veniam pueris: Lateranus ad illos
thermarum calices inscriptaque linthea vadit
maturus bello Armeniae Syriaeque tuendis
amnibus et Rheno atque Histro. praestare Neronem
securum valet haec aetas. (164-71)*

The extent of Lateranus' decadence is captured by the stark contrast between the broad sweep of the borders of the Roman empire, for the control of which his birth and upbringing should have equipped him, and the seediness of the 'dives' which he habitually frequents. A similar contrast between the 'grand ideal' of noble leadership and the sordid reality is seen in the next passage:

*mitte Ostia, Caesar,
mitte, sed in magna legatum quaere popina:
invenies aliquo cum percussore iacentem,
permixtum nautis et furibus ac fugitivis,
inter carnifices et fabros sandapilarum
et resupinati cessantia tympana galli.
aequa ibi libertas, communia pocula, lectus
non alius cuiquam, nec mensa remotior ulli.
quid facias talem sortitus, Pontice, servum?
nempe in Lucanos aut Tusca ergastula mittas (171-80).*

Juvenal's sense of the dramatic is brilliantly illustrated here. It is as if Juvenal takes his audience with him as he follows Lateranus as he makes his way purposefully⁶³ under the ancient equivalent of garish neon lights into a veritable den of iniquity. There we see Lateranus' pretensions to noble rank utterly discredited, as he is depicted on terms of actual physical intimacy with a 'house of horrors' array of the most disreputable dregs of society. One can imagine Juvenal conveying his utter contempt and disgust by giving full value to the 's' and 'f' sounds which animate lines 173-6; and the description of 'the silent drums of a sprawling eunuch priest' is a marvellous symbol of morally and physically debilitating depravity! The very physical intimacy between this representative of the upper classes and the lowest strata of society provides graphic 'evidence' of the absurdity of noble claims to privilege: Lateranus' destruction of the social barriers between the classes is act of gross betrayal of traditional norms - hence the repeated emphasis on the negation of the distinguishing effects of social etiquette and customs in lines 177-8.

These lines are a good illustration of what Courtney refers to in another context as Juvenal's 'attachment to traditional Roman values and his indifference to purely ethical values.'⁶⁴ Confronted with such an example of depraved decadence, Ponticus really has no option but to agree with Juvenal's assertion that even a slave guilty of such conduct would deserve the harshest punishment (179-80). But Juvenal's purpose is not merely to decry the misdemeanours of notorious *individuals*: such people are symptomatic of the degeneracy of their *whole class*. The broader purpose behind Juvenal's characterisation of Lateranus is made quite clear by his concluding indictment of the nobility as a whole:

*at vos, Troiugenae, vobis ignoscitis et quae
turpia cerdoni Volesos Brutumque decebunt.* (181-2)

⁶³ Does the verb *vadit* (168), with its military connotations, suggest an 'expedition' of sorts? If so, this is another instance of Juvenal's satirical treatment of the traditional military prowess of the nobility (cf. 1.88-92 and 5.43-5).

⁶⁴ Courtney 1980:384.

The grandiloquent *Troiugene* is, of course, absurdly inappropriate after the portrayal of Lateranus' utterly ignoble conduct, while the repeated pronoun (*vos, vobis*), the condemnatory tone and the reference to aristocratic names which hark back to Rome's distant past underscore the collective guilt of the nobility.

The revelations about Lateranus are shocking enough, but Juvenal can tantalize his audience with even worse examples to discredit the nobility: *quid si numquam adeo foedis adeoque pudendis / utimur exemplis, ut non peiora supersint?* (183-4). The examples are worse, because the vice is no longer clandestine but exhibited *in public*: whereas Lateranus disgraced the reputation of his class in the relative privacy of a 'down town' establishment, Damasippus (already disgraced by bankruptcy: *consumptis opibus*, 185) and Lentulus take to the theatrical stage. Both play parts quite out of keeping with any sense of decorum expected of the nobility: a shrieking ghost and a criminal whose crucifixion is enacted on stage (the latter affording Juvenal the opportunity for a sardonic aside: *iudice me dignus vera cruce*, 188).⁶⁵ These examples should not be seen merely as humorous bathos after the promise of *peiora*: for a noble to resort to performing mimes and farces represents to Juvenal a travesty of traditional norms⁶⁶ as subversive and deplorable as the transformation of a barber into a millionaire, whose wealth can challenge that of the patricians, or the wearing of Tyrian purple and a gold ring by Crispinus, that *pars Niliacae plebis*.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Martial (*De Spectaculis* 7) describes the fate of a condemned criminal, whose portrayal of the robber Laureolus culminated in his *actual* execution in the arena.

⁶⁶ See the discussion of Nero below.

⁶⁷ *Sat.* 1.26.

For Juvenal, the malaise of the nobility affects the society as a whole,⁶⁸ and the common people are also to blame for allowing themselves to be caught up in the decadent antics of men like Damasippus and Lentulus and thus to encouraging them. Yet Juvenal's criticism of the shamelessness of the populace is clearly secondary to his disgust at the fact that such nobles *willingly* humiliate and degrade themselves.⁶⁹

*nec tamen ipsi
ignoscas populo: populi frons durior huius,
qui sedet et spectat triscurria patriciorum,
planipedes audit Fabios, ridere potest qui
Mamercorum alapas. quanti sua funera vendant
quid refert? vendunt nullo cogente Nerone,
nec dubitant celsi praetoris vendere ludis.
finge tamen gladios inde atque hinc pulpita poni,
quid satius? mortem sic quisquam exhorruit, ut sit
zelotypus Thymeles, stupidi college Corinthi?
res haut mira tamen citharoedo principe mimus
nobilis. (188-99)*

⁶⁸ Juvenal's consciousness of the pervasive effects of vice is well illustrated by the conclusion to *Satire* 2:

*sed quae nunc populi fiunt victoris in urbe
non faciunt illi quos vicimus. et tamen unus
mollior ardenti esse indulsisse tribuno.
aspice quid faciant commercia: venerat obses,
hic fiunt homines. nam si mora longior urbem
indulget pueris, non umquam derit amator.
mittentur braciae, cultelli, frena, flagellum:
sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores. (162-70)*

⁶⁹ Cf. his scathing indictment of Trebius for his lack of self-respect (5.1-5; 170-3). Juvenal's criticism of the populace has a parallel in a passage from Tacitus (*Ann.* 16.4.4): *et plebs quidem urbis, histrionum quoque gestus iuvare solita, personabat certis modis plausuque composito. crederes laetari, ac fortasse laetabantur per incuriam publici flagitii.*

The extent of the nobility's self-degradation is emphasised by a series of increasingly bizarre oxymorons: *triscurria patriciorum*; *planipedes* . . . *Fabios*; *Mamercorum alapas*,⁷⁰ which are echoed later by the juxtaposed phrases *citharoedo principe* and *mimus nobilis* (198-9); and the notion of nobles acting out deaths of stage characters becomes aptly symbolic of their own moral demise or negation of their noble status⁷¹. What makes it worse is the fact that they actually 'sell' the essence of their identity for profit and that they do so of their own accord: *vendunt nullo cogente Nerone, / nec dubitant* . . . *vendere*, 193-4). At a point where the audience might suspect that Juvenal is overstating his case, the notorious and historically undeniable stage antics of the emperor Nero are cleverly alluded to as a role model and the ultimate proof that the corruption of the nobility extends throughout its ranks.

Could there be anything worse than the notion of a death willingly acted out in public to the disgrace of the actors involved? Juvenal presents the possibility of the ultimate act of self-degradation by a noble as something almost too bizarre to contemplate: *haec ultra quid erit nisi ludus?* (199); and then he proceeds to show that the unimaginable has actually happened, *and* in the most shameful circumstances:

et illic

dedecus urbis habes, nec murmillonis in armis

⁷⁰ The fool who subjects himself to cuffs is used elsewhere (5.171-3) as a symbol of extreme degradation and lack of self-respect. Here the notion is intensified by choosing a name used by the Aemilii which has legendary connections with Pythagoras or Numa. If the name was also intended to suggest Mamers (i.e. Mars), this would contribute further to the desired effect. To the series of oxymorons one may add the phrase *stupidi collega Corinthi* (197), where *collega* is possibly intended to play on the idea of a colleague in the Roman magistracy; see Fredericks 1972:128; Courtney 1980:414.

⁷¹ The various interpretations of lines 192-3 are discussed by Courtney 1980: 412-3. The meaning of *sua funera* as 'their moral suicide' is the most attractive: Juvenal used this idea in line 85 (*dignus morte perit*), while the context in question includes two passages which play on the idea of real vs. imaginary death (187-8 and 195-7). Furthermore, the 'death' motif is continued in the context of the gladiatorial arena. Griffith (1962:256-61) argues that Juvenal is referring to the nobles' participation in 'theatricals of the baser sort [e.g. Martial's description of Laureolus' crucifixion on stage, *Spect.* 7], not even those put on by an emperor (*nullo cogente Nerone*), but, worse still, in those staged by a mere praetor, and a vulgarian praetor at that' [Celsus was probably of plebeian origin].

*nec clipeo Gracchum pugnantem aut falce supina;
 damnat enim talis habitus [sed damnat et odit,
 nec galea faciem abscondit].⁷² movet ecce tridentem.
 postquam vibrata pendentia retia dextra
 nequiquam effudit, nudum ad spectacula voltum
 erigit et tota fugit agnoscendus harena.
 credamus tunicae, de faucibus aurea cum se
 porrigat et longo iactetur spira galero.
 ergo ignominiam graviolem pertulit omni
 vulnere cum Graccho iussus pugnare secutor. (199-210)*

This passage is indeed a far more shocking (and skilfully contrived) indictment of decadence than the description of the nobles on the theatrical stage. Gracchus' appearance in the arena is scandalous - not merely because of his distinguished ancestry, but even more so because he is brazen enough to appear as the lowest type in the gladiatorial hierarchy and thus dispense with equipment which would give him some anonymity (i.e. a helmet). He is also incompetent (*retia . . . nequiquam effudit*, 204-5) and cowardly (*tota fugit . . . harena*, 206). The description bears a close resemblance to a passage in the second *Satire*, where the appearance of the same Gracchus as a *retiarius* is held up as an example of depravity surpassing even that of male homosexuals' attempts to fall pregnant⁷³. In that passage Gracchus' behaviour is presented as a climactic example of degeneracy and cannot be interpreted as deliberate bathos (however it might appear to our way of thinking),⁷⁴ and so one should guard against underestimating the seriousness with which Juvenal again presents him

⁷² Deleted by Hermann; supported by Courtney 1980:415.

⁷³ *vicit et hoc monstrum tunicati fuscina Gracchi,
 lustravitque fuga mediam gladiator harenam
 et Capitolinis generosior et Marcellis
 et Catuli Paulique minoribus et Fabius et
 omnibus ad podium spectantibus, his licet ipsum
 admoveas cuius tunc munere retia misit* (143-8)

⁷⁴ See the discussion by Courtney 1980:121-2.

in the eighth *Satire* as an illustration of the extent to which the noble ideal has degenerated. What is more, Juvenal strives to make his deed even more abominable: the revelation of his Salian regalia⁷⁵ makes his appearance in the arena an act of religious sacrilege as well. No wonder his opponent was overcome with shame at realising that he had routed not only a noble but a member of a sacred brotherhood.⁷⁶

Yet, despite the shame which they have brought upon the reputation of the nobility, reprobates like Gracchus, Damasippus and Lentulus cannot stand accused of the heinous crimes committed by even more notorious members of their class. Nero's shadow has been lurking in the background (72, 170, 193 and 198); now, with a clinching rhetorical question, Juvenal brings him on stage as the epitome of noble degeneracy:

*libera si dentur populo suffragia, quis tam
perditus ut dubitet Senecam praeferre Neroni?
cuius supplicio non debuit una parari
simia nec serpens unus nec culleus unus.
par Agamemnonidae crimen, sed causa facit rem
dissimilem. quippe ille deis auctoribus ultor
patris erat caesi media inter pocula, sed nec
Electrae iugulo se polluit aut Spartani
sanguine coniugii, nullis aconita propinquis
miscuit, in scena numquam cantavit Orestes,
Troica non scripsit. quid enim Verginius armis
debuit ulcisci magis aut cum Vindice Galba,*

⁷⁵ The likelihood that the *galerus* and *spira* are items of Salian dress is discussed by Courtney (1980:415-6). Such an interpretation would seem to be corroborated by the specific reference to Gracchus as a Salian priest in *Satire* 2 (lines 125-6); furthermore, the word *ergo* (209) establishes a direct connection between the *ignominiam* (209) and the *galerus* and *spira* in the preceding line.

⁷⁶ Ferguson's explanation (1979:243) that 'Juvenal suggests that he is ashamed to be pitted against such a mountebank' does not account sufficiently for the extent of the opponent's shame as described in lines 209-10.

quod Nero tam saeva crudaque tyrannide fecit? (211-223)

If Lateranus' behaviour was probably intended as a detailed illustration of the decadence alluded to in lines 14-7 of the exordium, there can be little doubt that the noble who disgraces his clan through dealing in poison (17-8) - the climactic example of ignoble conduct in the exordium - foreshadows the account of Nero, the arch-degenerate. It is in order to drive home the latter point that Juvenal exploits the comparison between Nero and Orestes.⁷⁷ Both were guilty of murdering their mothers, but that is where the similarity ends. Orestes had the sanction of the gods to commit the deed as an act of just retribution. Nero, unlike Orestes, had no such 'just cause'; he murdered not only his mother, but a sister and wife too (of course, Juvenal's audience would have been well aware that Nero's murders extended well beyond those of his own 'Electra' and 'Hermione').⁷⁸ As a murderer, he was all the more despicable because he resorted to the cowardly and ignoble method of poisoning⁷⁹; and (a masterly satirical touch) he disgraced himself by performing the very role of Orestes - *on the stage*!⁸⁰ The

⁷⁷ Juvenal certainly was not the first to make the analogy, as a lampoon preserved by Suetonius (6.39) would suggest: 'Alcmaeon, Orestes, and Nero are brothers. Why? Because all of them murdered their mothers.' (Translated from the Greek by Robert Graves).

⁷⁸ In the portrayal of Nero as a latter-day 'Orestes', the neatness of the analogy allows no mention of his other family victims: his adoptive father, Claudius; his adoptive brother, Britannicus; his aunt, Domitia Lepida; another aunt, Domitia; and another wife (Octavia or Poppaea, depending on who is meant in line 219).

⁷⁹ Compare Juvenal's more detailed excursus on the heinous nature of this crime in the sixth *Satire* (610ff) and especially the distinction he draws between crimes of passion and coldly calculating murder:

*credamus tragicis quidquid de Colchide torva
dicitur et Procne; nil contra conor. et illae
grandia monstra suis audebant temporibus, sed
non propter nummos. minor admiratio summis
debetur monstris, quotiens facit ira nocentes
hunc sexum et rabie iecur incendente feruntur
praecipites, ut saxa iugis abrupta, quibus mons
subtrahitur clivoque latus pendente recedit.
illam ego non tulerim quae computat et scelus ingens
sana facit* (643-52).

⁸⁰ A performance also referred to by Suetonius (*Nero*, 21): *inter cetera cantavit . . . Orestem matricidam*.

decadence and degeneracy of the latter-day 'Orestes' could not have been better symbolised. Once again, one should be careful not to underestimate the scandalousness of a noble, let alone an Emperor, taking to the theatrical stage in Juvenal's time and thus to see in this simply a humorous anticlimax.⁸¹ It is significant that, in Tacitus' account (*Ann.* 15.67), Subrius Flavius also gives prominence to Nero's theatrical appearances as a reason for his hatred of the emperor: *odisse coepi, postquam parricida matris et uxoris, auriga et histrio et incendarius extitisti*. Braund⁸² recognises the parallels between this list and the Juvenal passage, but still maintains that the latter is 'humorously presented': 'Although the speaker reflects Subrius Flavius' judgement of Nero . . . , with only the fire omitted, that, of course is a simple list, whereas the speaker's sequence destroys his argument: how can anyone rate histrionics as more serious than matricide?' Dio does, when he focuses on that scandal above all the others:

⁸¹ A cursory survey of Tacitus' account of Nero leaves one in no doubt that Juvenal's emphasis on the emperor's histrionics would not have given his audience the impression that he was motivated primarily by an ironic sense of humour:

vetus illi cupido erat curriculo quadrigarum insistere nec minus foedum studium cithara ludicrum in modum canere (*Ann.* 14.14.1);

ne tamen adhuc publico theatro dehonorearetur, instituit ludos Iuvenalium vocabulo . . . (*Ann.* 14.15.1). [The morally corrupting influence of the theatre is given particular prominence in the ensuing lines];

. . . *nec quemquam Romae honesto loco ortum ad theatri artes degeneravisse, ducentis iam annis a L. Mummii triumpho qui primus id genus spectaculi in urbe praeberit* (*Ann.* 14.21.2);

nihil adversum haec Neroni provisum. etiam fortis viros subitis terreni, nedum ille scaenicus, Tigellino scilicet cum paucis suis comitante, arma contra ciet (*Ann.* 15.59.3);

quin et verba Flavi vulgabantur, non referre dedecori si citharoedus demoveretur tragoedus succederet, quia ut Nero cithara, ita Piso tragico ornatu canebat (*Ann.* 15.65.2);

interea senatus propinquo iam Iustrali certamine, ut dedecus averteret, offert imperatori victoriam cantus adicitque facundiae coronam qua ludicra deformitas velaretur (*Ann.* 16.4.1);

et plebs quidem urbis, histrionum quoque gestus iuvare solita, personabat certis modis plausuque composito. crederes laetari, ac fortasse laetabantur per incuriam publici flagitii. sed qui remotis e municipiis severaque adhuc et antiqui moris retenti Italia, quique per longinquas provincias lascivia in experti officio legationum aut privata utilitate advenerant, neque aspectum illum tolerare neque labori inhonesto sufficere . . . (*Ann.* 16.4.4 - 5.1).

⁸² Braund 1988:119.

Seneca, however, and Rufus, the prefect, and some other prominent men formed a plot against Nero; for they could no longer endure his disgraceful behaviour, his licentiousness, and his cruelty . . . Asper, when asked by the emperor the reason for his attempt, replied: "I could help you in no other way." And the response of Flavius was: "I have both loved and hated you above all men. I loved you, hoping that you would prove a good emperor; I have hated you because you do so-and-so. I cannot be a slave to a charioteer or lyre-player."⁸³

Braund's⁸⁴ attempt to explain away the prominence which Vindex accords this misdemeanour (Dio, 63.22.3-6), by arguing that the Gauls were more likely to be horrified by Nero's dramatic performances than by the horror of murder and matricide, is unconvincing: elsewhere, Dio focuses at some length on the shame incurred by members of the nobility by performing in public (62.17.3-4; 62.19.1-4; 63.9.1-6) and attributes Thrasea's execution partly to the fact that he would never listen to the emperor's singing and lyre-playing (62.26.3). It is interesting that Dio (62.6.4) also makes Boudicca refer mockingly to Nero's lyre-playing as a symbol of degeneracy. One may also question the assertion that Juvenal, unlike Subrius Flavius, makes no reference to Nero's incendiarism. The last item in Juvenal's catalogue, *Troica non scripsit*, could well have been intended to remind the audience of one of the emperor's most notorious alleged crimes: . . . *quia pervaserat rumor ipso tempore flagrantis urbis inisse eum domesticam scaenam et cecinisse Troianum excidium, praesentia mala vetustis cladibus adsimulantem* (Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.39.3); similarly, Suetonius (6.38.2): *hoc incendium e turre Maecenatiana prospectans laetusque 'flammae' ut aiebat 'pulchritudine' Halosin Illi in illo suo scaenico habitu decantavit*. Thus the climax of Juvenal's catalogue refers not only to Nero's pretensions as a composer (that Nero *did* compose is indicated by Suet. *Vitell.* 9.2 and by Tac. *Ann.* 14.16.2), but also - in a subtle way - to his role as an *incendarius*.

⁸³ Dio 62.24.1-2 (translated by E. Carey).

⁸⁴ Braund 1988:238.

Courtney, therefore, is right to caution against viewing Nero's singing as a humorous anticlimax to the catalogue of his misdeeds: Juvenal 'must mean what he says, for if he had intended a joke he would not have ruined it by continuing for seven more lines after 223.⁸⁵ Nero's reign could indeed be described as *saeva* and *cruda*, but those epithets could also be used to describe the reigns of other emperors. It was Nero's theatrical antics, however, which provided his critics with the most bizarre and conspicuous proof of his degeneracy; and, for Juvenal, Nero is the ultimate illustration of the fact that *virtus* and *nobilitas* are not the inevitable products of impressive *stemmata*, *longus sanguis* and the possession of ancestral portraits and effigies:

*haec opera atque hae sunt generosi principis artes,
gaudentis foedo peregrina ad pulpita cantu
prostitui Graiaeque apium meruisse coronae.
maiorum effigies habeant insignia vocis,
ante pedes Domiti longum tu pone Thyestae
syрма vel Antigones seu personam Melanippes,
et de marmoreo citharam suspende colosso. (224-30)*

The first line might have introduced a genuine eulogy in different circumstances, but here the context makes plain the scathing sarcasm of *opera* and *generosi* and the clever ambivalence of *artes*; and Juvenal makes Nero's noble Roman ancestry all the more absurd and despicable by stressing his adulation of things Greek (if Juvenal had been speaking through his friend Umbricius here, he might well have said: *non possum ferre, Quirites, Graecum principem!*). Lines 225-6 are remarkable for their compression, accentuated by plosive alliteration, of sneering words and phrases. Nero's shameful exhibitionism (*foedo . . . cantu*) is likened to that of a whore eagerly soliciting (*gaudentis . . . prostitui*) the favours of *foreign* clientele (*peregrina ad pulpita*); and the rewards for services rendered are not monetary, but risible and un-Roman tokens (*Graiae . . . apium*

⁸⁵ Courtney 1980:384. Courtney comments that 'this is one of the most striking indications of his attachment to traditional Roman values and his indifference to purely ethical values.'

. . . *coronae*). Into this context of an utter travesty of the noble ideal, Juvenal reintroduces the motif with which the *Satire* began: the significance of ancestral portraits. Now, instead of merely witnessing the degenerate behaviour of their descendants, they are to be defiled in a direct manner by being festooned with the very symbols of decadence (*insignia vocis, longum . . . Thyestae syrma, Antigones seu personam Melanippes*).⁸⁶ The metaphor of statuary also provides Juvenal with the opportunity for a particularly damning parting shot in line 230: Nero's megalomania, philhellenism, theatrical exhibitionism and self-adulation are all combined in the image of a colossal statue of himself adorned with - a *cithara*!

The supreme irony of the word *generosus* in respect of such individuals is continued in the references to nobles whose inherited worth is belied by the most heinous and potentially disastrous of crimes, high treason:

*quid, Catilina, tuis natalibus atque Cethegi
inveniet quisquam sublimius? arma tamen vos
nocturna et flammis domibus templisque paratis,
ut braccatorum pueri Senonumque minores,
ausi quod liceat tunica punire molesta* (231-5).

The impeccable genealogy of Catiline and Cethegus is cleverly juxtaposed with a crime whose ignominy is conveyed in the most vivid and emotive terms: their violence was *nocturna*; its aim was not mere political power, but the destruction of the Romans' *domus* and even *templa*; and, just as Nero's degeneracy was tainted by foreign influences, so the infamy of Catiline and Cethegus was made more disgraceful by their barbaric alliances.

⁸⁶ Fredericks (1972:129) makes an apt comment on this passage: 'The *stemma* of a Roman family is visible no longer; the Emperor has now earned the *Graia corona* instead. The *insignia* are not those for triumphs or other great deeds on the state's behalf, but *insignia vocis*. The military valor of the great Domitii is debased by Nero's Greek tragic costuming. The Roman who should be highest of all in esteem - namely, the *Princeps* - is the least Roman and most Greek of all we have yet seen in the poem.'

This brief, but telling, focus on two of the most notoriously *ignoble* products of the Roman nobility has another, more important function in the structure of the *Satire*: it serves as an introduction to an embarrassing illustration of the fact that the true nature of *virtus* has often been demonstrated by those who are technically *ignobiles* (a theme foreshadowed by lines 47-52). The Catilinarian conspiracy, of course, provides the paradox *par excellence*:

sed vigilat consul vexillaque vestra coerces.
hic novus Arpinas, ignobilis et modo Romae
municipalis eques, galeatum ponit ubique
praesidium attonitis et in omni monte laborat.
tantum igitur muros intra toga contulit illi
nominis ac tituli, quantum +in+⁸⁷ Leucade, quantum
Thessaliae campis Octavius abstulit udo
caedibus adsiduis gladio; sed Roma parentem,
Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit. (236-44)

The contrast between the nobles' inherited status and Cicero's complete lack of such an advantage could not be more pointed (*novus, ignobilis, eques*), and emphasis is put on the latter's alertness, energy and decisiveness (*vigilat, coerces, ponit, laborat*). To demonstrate that Cicero indeed displayed the *animi bona*, which he earlier insisted (line 24) were the essence of true nobility, Juvenal resorts to a daring comparison. Both Cicero and Octavian earned the title *pater patriae*; but, whereas the latter 'grabbed' glory to further his own interests (*sibi . . . abstulit*) by the wholesale slaughter (*udo . . . gladio, caedibus adsiduis*) of fellow citizens (*Thessaliae campis*, i.e. Philippi) as well as of foreign enemies (*Leucade*, i.e. Actium), Cicero had honour 'conferred' upon him (*contulit*) by his selfless devotion to the interests of Rome itself (*muros intra*) and to the duties of his office (*toga*). The honour bestowed on Cicero was, furthermore, truly

⁸⁷ *sibi* conjectured by Jahn; but Courtney (1980:420) does not believe that *in* has been plausibly emended.

deserved because it was the spontaneous reaction of a 'free' Rome (*Roma . . . libera*), and not, by implication, the fawning response to autocratic power.

Juvenal is able to strengthen his argument considerably by extolling the true *virtutes* of yet another *ignobilis* from Arpinum. Marius is presented as the perfect exemplar of humility, physical vigour, perseverance, dutifulness and patriotism - a figure reminiscent of Cincinnatus:

*Arpinas alius Volscorum in monte solebat
poscere mercedes alieno lassus aratro;
nodosam post haec frangebat vertice vitem,
si lentus pigra muniret castra dolabra.
hic tamen et Cimbros et summa pericula rerum
excipit et solus trepidantem protegit urbem,
atque ideo, postquam ad Cimbros stragemque volabant
qui numquam attigerant maiora cadavera corvi,
nobilis ornatur lauro collega secunda* (245-53).

The picture of the young Marius is undeniably romanticised and enlivened with rhetorical exaggeration,⁸⁸ but to interpret it as a 'debunking passage' is to suggest that Juvenal is quite gratuitously introducing something which detracts from the point which he has just made in his decidedly *unsatirical* portrayal of Cicero's achievements and which he goes on to stress with equal seriousness in his account of the *Decii* (254-8). Juvenal is intent upon presenting Marius' mental and physical resilience as being diametrically opposed to the spineless decadence of the sort of noble whom he scornfully described in lines 15-6 as *cupidus* and *vanus et Euganea quantumvis mollior agna*. And when he describes the phenomenal size of the German corpses, the

⁸⁸ The validity of several of Winkler's (1983: 34-5) criticisms of Juvenal's description is questionable: 'Marius...is characterised as *lassus aratro*, as if, in plowing the field, he himself were pulling the plow behind him like one of the oxen' (Winkler thus betrays his ignorance of the effort demanded of the ploughman!); 'The future general and savior of Rome (249-50) is ever so *lentus* in building camp with his *pigra dolabra*' (thus ignoring the force of the conditional clause).

intention is not only to extol Marius' military capabilities but also to recall his earlier mockery of the contemporary nobility for its inability to cope with enemies like *horrida* . . . *Hispania* (116). The superiority of the humble *Arpinas* is nicely summed up by the observation that his *nobilis* . . . *collega* had to be content with 'second prize' in what was, in effect, a contest in *virtus*.

Juvenal intensifies his debunking of the mystique of noble ancestry by focusing on increasingly 'common' people who have displayed the very qualities which constitute *unica* . . . *nobilitas* (20):

*plebeiae Deciorum animae, plebeia fuerunt
nomina; pro totis legionibus hi tamen et pro
omnibus auxiliis atque omni pube Latina
sufficiunt dis infernis Terraeque parenti.
[pluris enim Decii quam quae servantur ab illis.]* (254-8)

It is with obvious relish that Juvenal dwells on the plebeian ancestry of the Decii and the fact that their heroic self-sacrifice was deemed sufficient by the gods themselves for the entire (*totis, omnibus, omni*) Roman army. Line 258 may well be spurious,⁸⁹ but it captures the essence of the uncomfortable truth with which Juvenal is confronting the nobility. Even more damaging to noble pretensions is the fact that one of Rome's most revered kings (*regum ultimus ille bonorum*, 260) was of servile origin: *ancilla natus trabeam et diadema Quirini / et fascis meruit* (259-60). Not only is Servius' humble origin stressed by the emphatic positioning of *ancilla* (cf. *plebeiae*, 254), but the verb *meruit* indicates that he *earned* his status (further enhanced by association with Romulus, i.e. Quirinus) rather than inherited it. The phrase *regum ultimus ille bonorum* is immediately followed by a contrasting reference to one of the archetypal instances of despicable conduct by the upper echelon of the nobility, an act of high treason which recalls the deeds of Catiline and Cethegus and which appears all the more disgraceful in the same context as the heroic deeds of Mucius Scaevola, Horatius Cocles and Cloelia:

⁸⁹ See Courtney 1980:421-2.

*prodit laxabant portarum claustra tyrannis
exulibus iuvenes ipsius consulis et quos
magnum aliquid dubia pro libertate deceret,
quod miraretur cum Coclite Mucius et quae
imperii finis Tiberinum virgo natavit.* (261-3)

Fredericks observes that

in returning . . . to the legendary times of the early Republic - the period Livy says in his preface he likes the best - the satirist attacks the very origins of aristocratic pride. He uses the same sources the *nobiles* would employ in making an argument to the past and to tradition, but he argues that the nobles overrate their own claims, for many who ought to have been their inferiors have exercised the highest virtue.⁹⁰

Juvenal's strategy is made abundantly clear in the conclusion to his survey of the events surrounding the establishment of the Republic, when he focuses on the admirable conduct of yet another person of humble origin - the slave Verginius, who had the courage to expose the traitors (*occulta ad patres produxit crimina servus*, 266) and who, Juvenal wryly suggests, deserves the same respect as the noble Brutus (*matronis lugendus*, 267). His final observation on the severity and the justness of the punishment meted out to the sons of Brutus (*at illos verbera iustis / adficiunt poenis et legum prima securis*, 267-8) serves to discredit the nobles' cause even further.

The result of Juvenal's 'survey' of Rome's history (231-68) is to create an overwhelmingly negative impression of the nobility's claim to inherited status: not only does he draw attention to signal acts of villainy by individual nobles, but (more significantly) the positive deeds performed by *equites*, plebeians and slaves are cited

⁹⁰ Fredericks 1972:131.

not so much for their own sake as to the detriment of the nobility.⁹¹ Ever since they were presented with the images of *Curios iam dimidios umeroque minorem / Corvinum et Galbam auriculis nasoque carentem* (4-5), Juvenal's listeners could have been in no doubt that they were listening to a *satirist* rather than a *moralist*.⁹² Juvenal's overriding concern in this poem is a to deliver another stinging attack on the nobility, this time for its specious reliance on 'inherited worth'; and, when he addresses Ponticus directly again in the coda, his mocking tone and confident manner are the same as those which he employed from the very beginning of the poem. The only difference, probably, is that the audience would have laughed even louder at the witty punch-line, which delivers the *coup de grace* to the nobles' pretensions about their ancestry:

*malo pater tibi sit Thersites, dummodo tu sis
 Aeacidae similis Volcaniaque arma capessas,
 quam te Thersitae similem producat Achilles.
 et tamen, ut longe repetas longeque revolvās
 nomen, ab infami gentem deducis asylo;
 maiorum primus, quisquis fuit ille, tuorum
 aut pastor fuit aut illud quod dicere nolo* (269-275).

The play on Homeric genealogy is a satirical reminder of the pretentious ancestry so valued by some members of the nobility - rather reminiscent of Rubellius Blandus' boast about being *Cecropides* (46) and of Juvenal's mocking 'concession' to aristocratic fantasies when he tells Ponticus that, if he proves to be an honest governor, then 'you may trace your line to the woodpecker king; and if you hanker after loftier names, you may count the entire formation of Titans - yes, and Prometheus himself - among your

⁹¹ Cf. Malnati (1988:134): 'The fact that Juvenal is able to single out *novi homines*, such as Cicero and Marius, who were able to comply with the expectations set for and of the aristocracy, makes the aristocratic degeneracy all the more reprehensible.'

⁹² I think that Juvenal's audience would have been somewhat mystified by Braund's (1988:121-2) assertion that 'throughout the poem Juvenal has maintained suspense as to the speaker's moral character, by alternating moralising with non-moralising content, by bolstering his stance as a moralist and then deflating his authority.'

forebears.' It is also a neatly symbolic answer to the opening question of the *Satire*, *stemmata quid faciunt?*: better to be the son of the boorish Thersites, *provided that* you turn out like the hero Achilles, than to be the son of the noble Achilles, and yet turn out to be a despicable and degenerate Thersites. Had Juvenal been intent upon reforming the conduct of the contemporary nobility, he might have ended the poem with this instructive metaphor. However, his aim was predominantly satirical and this is shown beyond doubt by his wickedly humorous observation at the end: the nobility's much vaunted genealogy, to be quite frank, is utterly fallacious and a vain attempt to conceal the embarrassing truth about its thoroughly 'ignoble' origins! Nonetheless, this mocking 'revelation' in no way diminishes the validity of Juvenal's concept of what constitutes true nobility; in fact, if one looks beyond the humour, it actually corroborates it.

Braund, however, believes that Juvenal has created a speaker who 'has aspired to the title of moralist through his regurgitation of both negative and positive clichés about *nobilitas*' but whose 'many lapses' into 'non-moralising content' (especially in the last four lines of the poem) 'render him a parody of a moralist.'⁹³ What Braund labels as 'clichés' might well have been received less critically and suspiciously by Juvenal's contemporaries, who, as one modern commentator observes, 'were not afraid of commonplaces.'⁹⁴ One imagines that Juvenal's audience would have been far less interested in his exposition of familiar norms than in his frequent and more sustained 'lapses' into brilliant satire.

⁹³ Braund 1988:122.

⁹⁴ Kenney 1963:47. Kenney's assessment is worth quoting more fully: 'If pressed, I should not quarrel with a judgement of Juvenal that saw him as no more than a poet of moving and memorable commonplaces . . . But even that, considering how long those commonplaces had been on the lips of men before Juvenal gave them utterance in the form that they are familiar to us, is no faint praise. The ancients were not afraid of commonplaces, and I do not see why we should be.'

CHAPTER 6

Queering the Patron's Pitch:

The Real Satirical Target of Juvenal's Ninth *Satire*

When television cameras record a police raid on a 'high class' brothel or a newspaper publishes an interview with a male prostitute, whose clientele includes politicians and clergymen, public interest tends to focus less on the suppliers of such services than on the identities and sexual proclivities of their eminent customers. After all, one is not unduly surprised by the candour of a prostitute's revelations or by his or her lack of coy decorum; but how intriguing it is to learn, for example, that the cabinet minister with a blue-blooded lineage and a propensity to expound on the sanctity of marriage has a sexually-frustrated wife, that he has been submitting regularly to a gigolo and that 'his' children bear a striking resemblance to the latter! What a fascinating commentary is made on contemporary *mores* by the disclosures of the male lover!

If the likes of Virro and Naevolus had been in the audience when Juvenal gave his first reading of the ninth *Satire*, who (one might imagine) would have been more embarrassed? Hardly the latter: the brashness of his disclosures suggests that in all probability he would have been impervious to the guffaws and sniggers of the audience; furthermore, Juvenal's opening address to Naevolus (1-26) leaves little scope for any more really embarrassing revelations about *him*. What else would one have expected from *his* type, a professional gigolo who could accommodate both sexes?

But the gulf between expectations and realities in the case of the aristocrat and the system of patronage really does provide opportunity for damaging satirical comment. Juvenal's *modus operandi* here may be compared with his highly effective and

entertaining use of Laronia's accusations in the second *Satire* (36-5). There, too, a disreputable character turns the tables on hypocritical perverts by her unabashed candour; one positive quality which Laronia and Naevolus share is, ironically, a complete *lack* of hypocrisy.¹ A few excerpts will suffice:

'respice primum
et scrutare viros, faciunt peiora; sed illos
defendit numerus iunctaeque umbone phalanges.
magna inter molles concordia. non erit ullum
exemplum in nostro tam detestabile sexu.
Tedia non lambit Cluviam nec Flora Catullam:
Hispo subit iuvenes et morbo pallet utroque . . .' (2.44-50)

'notum est cur solo tabulas inpleverit Hister
liberto, dederit vivus cur multa puellae.
dives erit magno quae dormit tertia lecto.
tu nube atque tace: donant arcana cylindros.
de nobis post haec tristis sententia fertur?
dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas.'
fugerunt trepidi vera ac manifesta canentem
Stoicidae; quid enim falsi Laronia? (2.58-65)

Several recent discussions of the ninth *Satire* have tended to focus on the characterisation of Naevolus, with less importance attached to the significance of the poem within the context of Juvenal's bitter indictment of both the decadence of the

¹ Juvenal gives explicit recognition to this factor in the case of the homosexual Peribomius and others like him:

verius ergo
et magis ingenue Peribomius; hunc ego fati
inputo, qui vultu morbumque fatetur.
horum simplicitas miserabilis, his furor ipse
dat veniam . . . (2.15-9).

nobility and the subversion of the system of patronage, themes which are accorded particular prominence in Book 3 as a whole. Braund, for example, in a chapter entitled 'Ironist and Victim',² concentrates almost exclusively on the characterisation of the 'speaker' and of Naevolus; while Courtney, in the introduction to his commentary on this *Satire*, states:

In appearance it is an attack on an unnamed passive pervert (like most of those assailed in Two) for his meanness to his client . . . It looks then like another assault on the miseries and humiliations of client life from a different side to that treated in Five. This impression is not entirely false, and generalised bitterness at such patrons breaks through (48-9) even where it is not wholly appropriate . . . The present attack however is double-edged; in fact the main point of the poem is Naevolus' unwitting revelation of his own true character.³

Hightet, however, attaches somewhat more importance to the role of Naevolus' patron:

Poor Naevolus is not the only subject of the satire. Behind him is Virro, his patron and accomplice, a much more sinister figure . . . The vicious Naevolus reveals himself. Virro is not directly described; but his vices come out with remorseless clarity . . . The poem is therefore a satire not on one type of man, but on two: the rich pervert and his cold shallow accomplice. But if we look at it again, we see that it is Juvenal's last attack on the relationship of patron and dependant.⁴

² Braund 1988:130-77.

³ Courtney 1980:424. The brief discussion of the 9th *Satire* by Ramage, Sigsbee and Fredericks (1974:154-5) focuses almost exclusively on the character of Naevolus.

⁴ Hightet 1954:119-20. Similarly, Ferguson 1979:253: 'But if Naevolus exposes himself, he exposes also the shifty, shadowy, paltry figure of Virro behind him . . . It is a damning indictment.' That Virro is indeed Naevolus' patron and the target of his invective is also assumed, for example, by Friedländer 1969:18-9; Green 1967:201; Ramage, Sigsbee and Fredericks 1974:154; McKay and Shepherd 1976:208. Anderson (1982:287) appears to regard Virro both as the patron and as representative of his type. However, Courtney (1980:424)

It is the aim of the present discussion to reinforce the contention that Juvenal's purpose in writing the ninth *Satire* was to go well beyond the satirising of the gigolo Naevolus. In metaphorical terms, the latter assumes the function of an illuminated mirror, which both reflects and highlights the degeneracy of the nobility (represented by Virro - see note 4) and the deplorable state of the system of patronage which can spawn patrons like the latter and clients like Naevolus. An analogy may be drawn between the satirical roles of client and patron in this *Satire* and those of Trebius and Virro in the fifth: 'In 5 the wretched clients are castigated for their servility, and most of the comic effects are at their expense. Yet the host Virro comes off worse . . . While the guests are subjected to Juvenal's ridicule, his hatred is reserved for Virro.'⁵

The ninth *Satire* differs markedly in form from the other two poems in Book 3 in that it employs a dialogue structure throughout; but, in terms of content, it may be seen as an amalgamation of key elements of the previous two *Satires*: first, the meanness of patrons (*dives avarus*, 7.30; *mollis avarus*, 9.38) and second, the moral laxity and degeneracy of the nobility (the shadow of Lateranus, for example, lurks behind Virro - see below). Yet, despite this common ground, the ninth *Satire* adopts a far more *humorous* approach to the subject matter than its predecessors: after all, any work

maintains that it is 'quite unwarranted' to identify Naevolus' patron with Virro (cf. M.M. Winkler 1983:139. Braund (1988:242) regards the use of Virro's name as 'ambivalent': 'it could denote Naevolus' particularly stingy patron or a type, any rich patron (cf. 5.149 *Virro . . . et reliquis Virronibus*). But given that Trebius' patron Virro is named seven times in *Satire* 5, whereas this is the only time his name appears in *Satire* 9, this is probably a type, evoking *Satire* 5, as Naevolus is keeping secret his patron's name by oblique reference.' While it is impossible to be absolutely certain that Virro and Naevolus' patron are one and the same, it would seem logical to regard the person who is described as 'drooling' with lust (35) at the sight of a naked male as the same person whose sexual deviations are described so graphically in lines 43-6. Furthermore, the labelling of the patron as both *avarus* and *mollis* (38) is certainly suggestive of the miserly Virro in *Satire* 5, who, like the patron in 9, keeps a careful tally of what he has given his client (*inputat*, 5.14 and 15; *computat*, 9.40) and whose homosexuality is hinted at by the description of his cup-bearer (*flos Asiae*, 5.56). It may also be significant that, like the Virro in *Satire* 5 who savours the prospect of profiting from the wills of childless couples (5.137-9), Naevolus' patron also looks forward to benefiting from legacies (9.87-90). Yet another link may be detected in the description of Virro's discreet overtures by means of love letters (36-7) and in the reference to the patron's *munera . . . secreta* (53). Finally, to suggest that the utterly candid Naevolus would have any scruples about identifying his mean patron is hardly convincing.

⁵ Rudd 1986:37.

which presents a patron-client relationship as consisting in *officia* of a perverted sexual nature and treats the grievances of the 'self-sacrificing' but under-rewarded client with ostensible sympathy can only be a bizarre parody of that institution. Juvenal's own role in the *Satire* also offers scope for entertaining humour: less abrasive and openly cynical than Horace's Tiresias (*Sermones* 2.5), who causes Ulysses to reveal his unscrupulous greed, he nonetheless resembles him in the way in which he cleverly leads Naevolus to expose the utter sordidness of his relationship with his patron.⁶ And, just as Horace's parody masks a serious indictment of the practice of *captatio*, so the revelations which Juvenal coaxes from Naevolus draw attention to the actual perversion of *nobilitas* and *clientela*, which Juvenal has satirised with such consistency.

Juvenal must have established an instant rapport with his audience with his startling and highly entertaining caricature of Naevolus' distraught expression:

*Scire velim quare totiens mihi, Naevole, tristis
occurras fronte obducta ceu Marsya victus.
quid tibi cum vultu, qualem depensus habebat
Ravola dum Rhodopes uda terit inguina barba?
[nos colaphum incutimus lambenti crustula servo.]
non erit hac facie miserabilior Crepereius
Pollio, qui triplicem usuram praestare paratus
circumit et fatuos non invenit. unde repente
tot rugae? (1-9)*

The portrait of Naevolus is sketched with a rapid trio of similes, somewhat reminiscent of the patter of a risqué comedian who is skilled at engaging the attention of the audience with a barrage of hilarious 'one-liners'. Not only do the disparate images create a vivid impression of a face at once agonised, wild-eyed, mortified and haggard (and thus arouse curiosity as to the reason for such a state), but the seemingly

⁶ Braund (1988:145-6) lists a number of probable allusions to Horace, *Sermones* 2.5.

gratuitous obscenity in lines 3-5⁷ indicates to the audience that Naevolus is the sort of person who can be the butt of scurrilous humour (one could even say that there is a hint of this attitude on the part of the satirist in the reference to the satyr Marsyas in line 2). The mocking tone and the readiness of the poet to indulge in shocking obscenity at the expense of Naevolus, before he has had a chance to say anything, ensure that Juvenal will have his audience laughing *with* him as he proceeds to mock Naevolus under the guise of friendly concern. The dramatic change in Naevolus' mental and physical state is accentuated by the recalling of his former self (the description of him as a respectable, suave 'gentleman' turns out, in retrospect, to be full of irony in view of the sordid revelations which Juvenal later makes about him):

*certe modico contentus agebas
vernā equitem, conviva ioco mordente facetus
et salibus vehemens intra pomeria natis* (9-11).

Juvenal continues his mock commiseration with further details of Naevolus' physical malaise, which must be symptomatic of a serious psychological setback (his feigned concern even gives rise to a rather sententious discourse on the *mens sana in corpore sano* syndrome, as he inveigles himself into Naevolus' confidence). But here again there is an intriguing hint of sexual deviation in the reference to his once depilated legs⁸:

*omnia nunc contra, vultus gravis, horrida siccae
silva comae, nullus tota nitor in cute, qualem
Bruttia praestabat calidi tibi fascia visci,
sed fruticante pilo neglecta et squalida crura.
quid macies aegri veteris, quem tempore longo*

⁷ Courtney (1980:427-8) argues for the retention of line 5, pointing out that *lambere* is also used in the obscene sense at 2.49: *Tedia non lambit Cluviam nec Flora Catullam*. One could add that the *double entendre* of *colaphum* (cf. 2.53: *luctantur paucae, comedunt coloephia paucae*) is a further indication that it is Juvenal who is indulging in witty elaboration of the joke for the audience's enjoyment.

⁸ The unsavoury implications of this are clear from 2.11-3 and 8.16-7; cf. Martial's description of a gigolo, *crura gerit nullo qui violata pilo* (5.61.6).

*torret quarta dies olimque domestica febris?
deprendas animi tormenta latentis in aegro
corpore, deprendas et gaudia; sumit utrumque
inde habitum facies. igitur flexisse videris
propositum et vitae contrarius ire priori (12-21).*

With the grandiloquence of lines 16-7 and the positive connotations of *propositum* (21),⁹ Juvenal contrives to create an impression of a really regrettable decline in Naevolus' fortunes. The irony of *propositum*, and indeed of Juvenal's professed concern, is immediately apparent in the revelation about what Naevolus' *vita prior* used to consist in:

*nuper enim, ut repeto, fanum Isidis et Ganymedem
Pacis et advectae secreta Palatia matris
et Cererem (nam quo non prostat femina templo?)
notior Aufidio moechus celebrare solebas,
quodque taces, ipsos etiam inclinare maritos .(22-6)*

The disreputable nature of Naevolus' 'profession' is accentuated by notions of sacrilege (Ceres being a particularly chaste goddess)¹⁰ and by the unfavourable comparison to a notorious *moechus*¹¹ - although, of course, it is possible that the comparison is intended as ironic praise of Naevolus' prowess in this regard! But it is the final disclosure of what even Naevolus himself has been discreet about which leaves the audience in no doubt whatsoever about the true and startling extent of his sexual promiscuity. Courtney makes an accurate assessment of the tenor and purpose of this passage:

⁹ Ferguson (1979:240) draws attention to the mock-epic style of these lines and the often favourable connotation of *propositum*.

¹⁰ See Courtney 1980:430.

¹¹ Aufidius is mentioned in this capacity by Martial (5.61.10).

So, with an arresting gross colloquialism (*inclinare*), the real character of Naevolus suddenly comes into the open in the last line of the introductory speech, whereas until now words suggesting standards of ethics have been applied to him (*propositum* 21 cf. 10.325 *modico contentus* 9, *animi tormenta* 18).¹²

Naevolus, however, is utterly impervious to the shame of such revelations; and his matter-of-fact preoccupation with job prospects and pay issues (like some modern union representative) and his presumptuousness in adopting a stance of Stoic fatalism to dignify his sordid activities are all the more bizarre in the circumstances:

*'utile et hoc multis vitae genus, at mihi nullum
inde operae pretium. pingues aliquando lacernas,
munimenta togae, duri crassique coloris
et male percussas textoris pectine Galli
accipimus, tenue argentum venaque secundae
fata regunt homines, fatum est et partibus illis
quas sinus abscondit. nam si tibi sidera cessant,
nil faciet longi mensura incognita nervi . . .'* (27-34)

Highet has provided a useful analogy for Naevolus' candour and obliviousness to the scandal of his lifestyle: 'He speaks with the pathos of a drug-pedlar explaining that things have got very difficult since the police have doubled their narcotic squads and set a stronger watch on incoming ships.'¹³ Naevolus' 'crass materialism'¹⁴ and utter

¹² Courtney 1980:425. However, as has been argued above, hints about Naevolus' unsavoury character have been skilfully interwoven with Juvenal's ostensibly sympathetic observations on his deteriorating physical condition. The revelation in line 26 thus forms the climax to the characterisation of the real Naevolus rather than a sudden disclosure of the truth.

¹³ Highet 1954:119; cf. Courtney 1980:425: 'He represents himself as all wounded innocence, and shows no trace of moral sensibility about his profession, in which he does not see anything remarkable; it is just a job like any other . . .'

¹⁴ Winkler 1983:111.

insensitivity to the moral implications of his occupation persist throughout the poem and constitute the basis of Juvenal's characterisation of Naevolus.

However, although he is repulsive in almost every respect, he does display one quality which commands attention: his matter-of-fact attitude towards his remuneration (or lack of it) for 'services rendered' and his unabashed reference to the size of his penis (as if it were merely an artisan's tool) serve to establish him from the outset as an absolutely candid and outspoken character, who, like Laronia in *Satire 2*, 'pulls no punches'. It is in this capacity that he becomes a potent weapon in Juvenal's attack on the decadence of the nobility. As a measure of his forthrightness, Juvenal makes his first and only reference to Virro particularly memorable by its revolting portrait of the man. Whereas Naevolus is clinically objective about sex, Virro is satirised as a secretive and slobbering pervert, who is controlled by his homosexual urges:

*quamvis te nudum spumanti Virro labello
viderit et blandae adsidue densaeque tabellae
sollicitent . . . (35-7)*

Courtney observes that the parody of Homer (*Od.* 16.294; 19.13) in line 37 'underlines degeneracy from manliness to effeminacy'.¹⁵ What is particularly striking is that the mockery is put into the mouth of Naevolus: odious as the latter may be, he is paradoxically superior to Virro in that he is *not* effeminate and sexually submissive (*pathicus*). Indeed, one of the main points of Juvenal's satirising of the patron is that *he* has become dependent on the sexual prowess of his own client (see below).

Naevolus' complaint about his unfair treatment by his patron is a masterpiece of sustained parody. The main elements of Naevolus' complaint - the lack of adequate financial rewards; the haggling over facts and figures; the meanness of his patron; his insistence that he 'pulls his weight' as a responsible client; his laudable concern for the well being of his patron's family; his expectations of a bequest of land; his inability to

¹⁵ Courtney 1980:431.

pay his rent and to provide for his slave; his pointed references to his patron's wealth; his resentment at being 'let down' by an uncaring patron; his allegation that the lowliest of slaves has a better lot than he does; his defamatory remarks about his patron; his anxiety about the latter's vindictiveness and his wistful contemplation of financial security in the future - all of these must have featured in countless disputes between clients and patrons. Yet here the 'machinery' of the system of patronage is seen at work in the most bizarre circumstances: the sordid sexual *officia* of a *cinaedus-clientis* for his *pathicus-patronus*. The perversion of the mundane to the lascivious is skilfully contrived in the following passage:

quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis avarus?
"haec tribui, deinde illa dedi, mox plura tulisti."
computat et cevet. ponatur calculus, adsint
cum tabula pueri; numera sestertia quinque
omnibus in rebus, numerentur deinde labores.
an facile et primum est agere intra viscera penem
legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae?
servus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum
quam dominum. sed tu sane tenerum et puerum te
et pulchrum et dignum cyatho caeloque putabas.
vos humili adseculae, vos indulgebitis umquam
cultori, iam nec morbo donare parati? (38-49)

The root of the problem is the patron's miserliness. This patron, however, is not merely *avarus*; he is also *mollis*. These two elements are brilliantly juxtaposed in the next image: while the patron does his sums (*computat*), he wiggles his buttocks seductively (*cevet*). 'Five thousand' in the credit column initiates the utterly mundane process of drawing up a balance sheet.¹⁶ Next thing to be assessed: the client's *labores*. Managing his patron's bakery? Concluding a lucrative export contract? Rallying supporters for the

¹⁶ Note the banality of the preparations (the abacus is to be set up; the slave-clerks must be there with their ledgers) and the systematic process followed (*numera . . . numerentur deinde*).

next election? No - something far more onerous, but a task nonetheless conducted competently and efficiently in the face of trying obstacles (and here one might imagine some other client complaining about the technical problems experienced in undertaking a trading voyage into uncharted waters: *an facile et primum est agere intra sinum navem ingentem atque illic latenti occurrere scopulo?*).

Naevolus' aggrieved reference to the better lot of a slave who ploughs his master's field is couched in imagery which slides easily into an obscene sense: to Naevolus his *penis Jegitimus* is quite simply a sturdy ploughshare - the right tool for the job - while his patron's *viscera* are mere sods to be cleft.¹⁷ Against the crude functionality of his sexual duties Naevolus mockingly juxtaposes, and so ruthlessly deflates (lines 46-7),¹⁸ Virro's romantic delusions about his physical attractiveness.¹⁹ Juvenal's attack is not directed at an isolated example of aberrant behaviour in the person of Virro, but at the degeneracy of the patron-class in general. We are thus reminded of this when Naevolus directs his anger at all those patrons (*vos*) who are afflicted by the *morbus* of passive homosexuality²⁰ and who are mean towards their clients - in other words, the *molles avari*.

Naevolus' ruthless exposure of his despicable patron becomes even more intriguing when he reveals that the latter's passivity is that of a woman who receives love gifts

¹⁷ Perhaps a disgusting parody of the ploughshare and furrow imagery as used by Ovid (e.g. *A.A.* 2.671) and Lucretius (*De Re. Nat.* 4.1272-3); cf. also Juvenal's *notissima fossa* (2.10).

¹⁸ It makes far more sense to interpret these words as mockery aimed at the unlovely patron (i.e. Virro with his *spumanti* . . . *labello* 35 - if one accepts the identification), than as words addressed by Naevolus to himself, *pace* Ferguson 1979:250.

¹⁹ *te . . . blandae adsiduae densaeque tabellae . . . sollicitent* (35-7); *cevet* (40).

²⁰ Courtney (1980:432) remarks that 'Naevolus has a cheek to call it this, and evidently despises those on whom he preys.' However, corrupt as Naevolus may be, he is not guilty of being an even more despised *pathicus*.

from a suitor. Not only is his masculinity subverted²¹, but his role of patron is transformed into that of a client who receives the *sportula*:

*en cui tu viridem umbellam, cui sucina mittas
grandia, natalis quotiens redit aut madidum ver
incipit et strata positus longaue cathedra
munera femineis tractat secreta kalendis.* (50-3)

After the sarcastic exclamation *en*, Virro's effeminacy is emphasised by the itemising of typically feminine gifts (*umbellam, sucina . . . grandia*), by the reference to the sort of couch used by women (*cathedra*) and by the placing of this scene in the context of the Matronalia (*femineis . . . kalendis*). Furthermore, whereas Naevolus is unashamedly candid about his relationship with his patron, the latter guiltily conceals his deviant behaviour (*secreta . . . munera*). Naevolus' vindictive mockery of Virro's lasciviousness is resumed when he calls him *passer*,²² and he proceeds to give substance to his allegations of meanness by drawing attention to his patron's considerable wealth (cf. the numerous details in *Satire* 5 which allude to Virro's wealth):

*dic, passer, cui tot montis, tot praedia servas
Apula, tot milvos intra tua pascua lassas?
te Trifolinus ager fecundis vitibus implet
suspectumque iugum Cumis et Gaurus inanis
(nam quis plura linit victuro dolia musto?),
quantum erat exhausti lumbos donare clientis
iugeribus paucis!* (54-60)

Here again Naevolus presents us with a bizarre travesty of the patron-client relationship by coolly measuring this patron's indebtedness to his client in terms of the latter's

²¹ The utter disgrace of a male's usurping of the female's role is powerfully conveyed by *Satire* 2.83-116.

²² On *passer* as a symbol of salaciousness see Fordyce on Catullus 2.

sexual exhaustion; and the point is given added emphasis by saying that a few acres (a modest request in the circumstances) should be presented directly to his *lumbi*, thus preserving the animal imagery by having his loins 'put out to pasture'. The request is concluded with what suggests initially a touching concern on Naevolus' part for the welfare of a peasant family on his patron's estate; but this is suddenly twisted into yet another damning indictment of Virro's decadence:

*meliusne hic rusticus infans
cum matre et casulis et conlusore catello
cymbala pulsantis legatum fiet amici? (60-2)*

The reference to the cymbal-bashing friend at once recalls Lateranus' eunuch acquaintance in *Satire 8* (*resupinati cessantia tympana galli*, 176) and his secret world of promiscuous homosexuality, and thus taints Virro with the 'sin' of eastern decadence as well. The latter's churlishness and meanness in the face of his client's quite reasonable complaints (together with a commendable empathy with his suffering slaves!) is once again the focus of the next few lines:

*"improbus es cum cum poscis" ait. sed pensio clamat
"posce," sed appellat puer unicus ut Polyphemi
lata acies per quam sollers evasit Ulixes.
alter emendus erit, namque hic non sufficit, ambo
pascendi. quid agam bruma spirante? quid, oro,
quid dicam scapulis puerorum aquilone Decembri
et pedibus? "durate atque expectate cicadas"? (63-9)*

There can be no doubt that Naevolus has the 'moral' advantage over his patron here, despite the fundamental immorality of their relationship. Naevolus, after all, *does* have a case: as a client he has fulfilled his irksome *officia* and can thus expect adequate recompense from his 'satisfied' patron; and his conviction that his demands are legitimate is conveyed by the confidence and vigour with which he counters his patron's accusation of impertinence. Once again, the humour lies in the fact that a thoroughly

conventional dispute between client and patron revolves around a shockingly degenerate type of *officium*.²³

Stung by the unfairness of his patron's attitude, Naevolus taunts him with a series of revelations that make Virro even more pathetic and contemptible:

*verum, ut dissimules, ut mittas cetera, quanto
metiris pretio quod, ni tibi deditus essem
devotusque cliens, uxor tua virgo maneret?
scis certe quibus ista modis, quam saepe rogaris
et quae pollicitus. fugientem saepe puellam
amplexu rapui; tabulas quoque ruperat et iam
signabat; tota vix hoc ego nocte redemi
te plorante foris. testis mihi lectulus et tu,
ad quem pervenit lecti sonus et dominae vox.
instabile ac dirimi coeptum et iam paene solutum
coniugium in multis domibus servavit adulter.
quo te circumagas? quae prima aut ultima ponas?
nullum ergo meritum est, ingrate ac perfide, nullum
quod tibi filiulus vel filia nascitur ex me?
tollis enim et libris actorum spargere gaudes
argumenta viri. foribus suspende coronas:
iam pater es, dedimus quod famae opponere possis.
iura parentis habes, propter me scriberis heres,
legatum omne capis nec non et dulce caducum.
commode praeterea iungentur multa caducis,
si numerum, si tres implevero. (70-90)*

²³ As H.A. Mason (1963:100) remarks, 'the life of the poem is in the bizarre effect of putting into his mouth remarks quite out of keeping with his overt activity.'

The tension between the normal workings of patronage (with its ideals of loyalty and mutual service) and the sordid perversion of this particular patron-client relationship is brilliantly sustained in this passage. Ignore the actual nature of Naevolus' services to his patron, and he *can*, ironically, be described as a *deditus . . . devotusque cliens* (71-2). In response to his patron's own requests and promises (*quam saepe rogaris / et quae pollicitus*, 73-4) and in the interests of latter's reputation he took it upon himself (with considerable effort on his part: *tota vix hoc ego nocte redemi*, 76) to save his marriage by ensuring that he and his wife did not remain childless; not only did he save Virro from embarrassing gossip, but he also saw to his continued financial well-being (lines 87-8). His contribution was what one might have expected from a client with his particular talents (i.e. the ability to save marriages - lines 79-80). In all this Naevolus showed himself to be loyal, resourceful, energetic and, above all, *virile*.

But how does the patron emerge from this episode? He is far more despicable than Naevolus: he is sexually impotent and has to resort to begging the services of a gigolo, a living example of a *truncus Herma*!²⁴ And in his subsequent treatment of his client he really is *ingratus* and *perfidus*.²⁵ But most damning of all is the fact that this patron is *dependent on his own client* in the most embarrassing manner imaginable. He is so ineffectual that he truly deserves to be ridiculed by Naevolus, who, with Chaucerian gusto, describes in mortifying detail how he blubbered outside his own bedroom door while his 'hired help' did what he was incapable of doing, how he made Virro's bed rattle and squeak and his wife moan with ecstasy. He ruthlessly exposes his deviousness in falsely parading the offspring as proof of his own virility (*argumenta viri*), and he torments him further by suggesting that he will be even better off if he (Naevolus) enables him to qualify for the privileges of the *ius trium liberorum*.

²⁴ Juv. *Sat.* 8.53.

²⁵ Winkler (1983:117) suggests that 'because Naevolus is responsible for the children's existence and, for all practical purposes becomes their "mother", his feminine vexation at the patron's ingratitude expresses itself in tones typical of an abandoned woman.' However, to attribute a feminine role to Naevolus would be at odds with Juvenal's careful depiction of him as virile and potent in comparison with the real husband.

It is pertinent to ask whether Juvenal's audience at this stage would have been more concerned with the propriety of Naevolus' actions than with the devastatingly effective portrayal of a *nobilis* who was further removed from the concept of *virtus* than any of his counterparts in *Satire* 8. Braund²⁶ begs the question when she says:

So although Naevolus' sexual services can be seen as a logical extension of the client's duties towards his patron, the incongruity of the complaint and the activities of the man uttering it, in particular, Naevolus' total contempt for his patron, *towards whom he should express respect* (my italics), ensure that we are thoroughly alienated from Naevolus.

Surely the whole point of Naevolus' revelations is to show how just how contemptible his patron is?

So, when Juvenal says *iusta doloris, / Naevole, causa tui* (90-1), it would be wrong to interpret that comment as entirely ironical.²⁷ On one level it is, because Juvenal obviously does not subscribe to the principles which govern Naevolus' lifestyle; and, from a dramatic point of view, a show of sympathy is a means of eliciting more revelations from Naevolus. However, on another level, it is possible (as has been argued above) to see Naevolus as being superior in several respects to his thoroughly odious patron. There is no doubt that Juvenal is exploiting Naevolus' candour and resentment to good advantage, by maintaining an attitude of ironic concern about his physical and mental state; but if, as has been imagined before, both Naevolus and his patron were present in Juvenal's audience, it is clear whose discomfiture would be the focus of attention. Juvenal is cleverly playing client off against patron: while he discreetly distances himself sufficiently from the prostitute Naevolus in his humorous

²⁶ Braund 1988:140.

²⁷ As does Braund (1988:151), for example. Winkler (1983:117) notes that 'the patron's *ingratia* and *perfidia* provide an ironic contrast to the *officia* of his *deditus devotusque cliens*, Naevolus. At least Naevolus finds some sort of approval for his outraged sense of *pietas* in the words of the satirist who briefly interrupts at this point in their conversation.'

portrait of him in the first 26 lines, he nonetheless uses him as a highly effective weapon against the likes of Virro, in the same way as he employs Laronia in *Satire 2*.

The effect of Juvenal's prompting of Naevolus to describe Virro's reaction to his complaint (*contra tamen ille quid adfert?*, 91), is once again to intensify the audience's antipathy towards the patron rather than the client:

*'neglegit atque alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum.
haec soli commissa tibi celare memento
et tacitus nostras intra te fige querellas;
nam res mortifera est inimicus pumice levis.
qui modo secretum commiserat, ardet et odit,
tamquam prodiderim quidquid scio. sumere ferrum,
fuste aperire caput, candelam adponere valvis
non dubitat. nec contemnas aut despicias quod
his opibus numquam cara est annona veneni.
ergo occulta teges ut curia Martis Athenis'* (92-101).

The audience is already well aware of Naevolus' cynicism and cold objectivity towards his own 'profession' (*utile et hoc multis vitae genus*, 27; *an facile et primum est agere intra viscera penem*, etc., 43-6; *instabile . . . coniugium in multis domibus servavit adulter*, 79-80). So, when Naevolus refers to himself as a *bipedem . . . asellum*, the imagery is a variation on a familiar theme.

However, for Virro the implications are far more damaging: his lust takes on a bestial quality, and yet it is the grotesquely *passive* lust of a *pathicus*. There is certainly an element of humorous irony in Naevolus' sudden plea for confidentiality; but there seems to be a more serious purpose behind his expression of misgivings.²⁸ The satirist is able to intensify his indictment of perverts like Virro by drawing attention to still more

²⁸ Ferguson (1979:251) seems to detect a more serious undertone when he remarks: 'This passage harks back to the perils of free speech at the end of the first satire.'

reprehensible character traits which are the antithesis of *nobilitas*: murderous vindictiveness and the capacity to use 'ignoble' methods of gaining revenge. The symbiosis of sexual perversion and deadly ruthlessness is succinctly expressed in line 95 (*nam res mortifera est inimicus pumice levis*), and, together with the reference to the ability of the rich to resort to poisoning, is a reminder of what Juvenal had to say on this subject in the previous *Satire*:

*cur Allobrogicis et magna gaudeat ara
natus in Herculeo Fabius lare, si cupidus, si
vanus et Euganea quantumvis mollior agna,
si tenerum attritus Catinensi pumice lumbum
squalentis traducit avos emptorque veneni
frangenda miseram funestat imagine gentem?* (8.13-8)

The parody of Vergil's *Eclogues* 2.69 (*A Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit?*) is appropriate, given the theme of homosexuality and the loose correspondence of Naevolus' patron to the haughty Alexis.²⁹ The Vergilian address is, of course, humorously ironic and a reminder that Juvenal is careful not to identify too closely with the disreputable Naevolus; but the real point of Juvenal's response is to emphasise, with malevolent satisfaction, that the decadent behaviour of the nobility can *never* be kept secret:³⁰

*o Corydon, Corydon, secretum divitis ullum
esse putas? servi ut taceant, iumenta loquentur
et canis et postes et marmora. claude fenestras,
vela tegant rimas, iunge ostia, tollite lumen,
e medio fac eant omnes, prope nemo recumbat;*

²⁹ See Courtney 1980:438 and Ferguson 1979:251. Ferguson also points out the parallel between Vergil's conclusion that 'there are plenty of good fish in the sea' and Juvenal's climax at line 130.

³⁰ A point stressed, for example, at 8.136-9 and 8.146-50.

*quod tamen ad cantum galli facit ille secundi
 proximus ante diem caupo sciet, audiet et quae
 finxerunt pariter libarius, archimagiri,
 carptores. quod enim dubitant componere crimen
 in dominos, quotiens rumoribus ulciscuntur
 baltea? nec derit qui te per compita quaerat
 nolentem et miseram vinosus inebriet aurem.
 illos ergo roges quidquid paulo ante petebas
 a nobis, taceant illi. sed prodere malunt
 arcanum quam subrepti potare Falerni
 pro populo faciens quantum Saufeia bibebat.
 vivendum recte, cum propter plurima, tum est his
 [idcirco ut possis linguam contemnere servi]
 praecipue causis, ut linguas mancipiorum
 contemnas, nam lingua mali pars pessimi servi. (102-21)³¹*

The elaborate description of the slaves' propensity for damaging gossip drives home the fact that their masters' secrets will inevitably be exposed. There is only one safeguard: *vivendum recte*. This ironic advice, given in full awareness of its futility, is not aimed at Naevolus, but at the rich patrons. Courtney,³² however, focuses on the irony with *Naevolus* in mind, as does Braund:

In all this, the speaker is luxuriating in more irony at Naevolus' expense. He advocates a pragmatic argument for good behaviour, namely that you ought to lead an upright life because if you *don't*, you always get found

³¹ Housman's restoration of 118-21: *tum est his / praecipue causis, ut linguas mancipiorum / contemnas, nam lingua mali pars pessimi servi*; see discussion by Courtney (1980:439-40).

³² Courtney 1980:426: 'evidently he sees no contradiction between *recte vivere* and his own life'.

out - an argument which is utterly wasted on Naevolus, for whom *vivere recte* is probably impossible.³³

Of course, there *is* irony in the fact that Naevolus' own lifestyle is far from 'upright' - just as there is irony in his sudden concern about confidentiality - but the main thrust of this passage is aimed at the secretive *dives* (102): the slaves referred to at 103 (*servi*), at 114-5 (*illos . . . illi*) and at 119 (*mancipiorum*) are *his* slaves, not Naevolus' (who, in any event, is hardly likely to have enjoyed the luxury of owning a *libarius*, *archimagiri* and *carptores*).

The parody of a genuinely aggrieved client is sustained by Naevolus' bizarre lapse into maudlin (and touchingly 'poetic') reflection on the bitterness of dashed expectations and the cruel transience of life:

*'utile consilium modo, sed commune, dedisti.
nunc mihi quid suades post damnum temporis et spes
deceptas? festinat enim decurrere velox
flosculus angustae miseraeque brevissima vitae
portio; dum bibimus, dum certa, unguenta, puellas
poscimus, obrepit non intellecta senectus.'* (124-9)

Ferguson notes that these lines giving expression to popular Epicureanism (N.B. *utile*, 124) are 'powerfully ironic in view of the repulsive character who speaks them'³⁴, while Courtney also focuses on the incongruity between the speaker and his sentiments:

This thought is expressed in terms of elevated and affecting pathos with delicate imagery, all of which would be appropriate to an irreproachable and sympathetic character; the fact that Naevolus, like Acanthis in

³³ Braund 1988:153-4.

³⁴ Ferguson 1979:252.

Propertius . . . , sees nothing incongruous in such language issuing from his mouth shows how insensitive he is to his moral degradation.³⁵

However, despite the humour of Naevolus' lament, these lines really serve as a platform for a general indictment of the perversion of the system of patronage by pathic *amici* like Virro. If Naevolus is made to maintain his role as the dutiful client with a valid grievance, Juvenal sustains *his* role as the ostensibly concerned and sympathetic adviser;³⁶ and, under the guise of comforting advice, he displays his contempt for the moral degradation of the pathic *patronus* and, of course, for the perversion of the system of patronage.³⁷

*ne trepida, numquam pathicus tibi dent amicus
stantibus et salvis his collibus; undique ad illos
convenient et carpentis et navibus omnes
qui digito scalpunt uno caput. altera maior
spes superest, tu tantum erucis inprime dentem
[gratus eris, tu tantum erucis inprime dentem.] (130-4A)³⁸*

³⁵ Braund 1980: 426-7.

³⁶ Courtney (1980:427) remarks: 'Nevertheless Juvenal's general presentation suggests that he does not lack a certain general compassion for Naevolus; moral condemnation need not be one-sided and preclude pity.'

³⁷ Braund (1988:155), however, sees Naevolus as the real target of scorn: 'Although the speaker appears to adopt Naevolus' viewpoint in giving his reassurance, i.e. that Rome is and will remain the centre of attraction for passive homosexuals, we know from his earlier moral stance and from his propensity for irony that we must invert his statement to understand him correctly. This reveals scorn for the man who chooses to make his living sexually.'

³⁸ Courtney (1980:442) makes the following comment: 'The text however looks as if the first hope is not the patron but the fact that Rome is the cynosure of perverts; and in that case the second, greater hope is not mentioned. Moreover *haec exempla* in 135 at the moment has no reference; Juvenal must have mentioned some men from whose example Naevolus could take heart . . . The *altera maior spes* was perhaps to turn, like Martial's Charidemus and Gillo, to *vetulae beatae*. This would suit the reference to the aphrodisiac *eruciae* . . . A substantial portion then of the text must have been lost (suggesting that Naevolus turn to old women and naming some men who have done this) . . .' However, there appears to be good enough reason to leave the text as it stands, *with* the repetition of the advice to resort to aphrodisiacs and *without* postulating some reference to *vetulae beatae*: first, the *altera maior spes* could simply

This portrayal of Rome as a haven for the degenerate and the perverted is reminiscent of the conclusion to the second *Satire*, where the capital is seen as the source of far-spreading corruption:

et tamen unus
Armenius Zalaces cunctis narratur ephebis
mollior ardenti sese indulsisse tribuno.
aspice quid faciant commercia: venerat obses,
hic fiunt homines. nam si mora longior urbem
indulget pueris, non umquam derit amator.
mittentur braciae, cultelli, frena, flagellum:
sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores. (2.163-70)

Lines 130-3 form the climax of Juvenal's indictment of the perversion of the relationship between patron and client; and in the phrase *stantibus et salvis his collibus* one can detect an underlying pessimism about the possibility of moral salvation, similar to that expressed in *Satire* 1:

nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat
posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores,
omne in praecipiti vitium stetit. (1.147-9)

It is Naevolus who has the last say in this *Satire*; and to the very end he presents the paradoxical combination of a shameless *cinaedus* and a loyal *cliens*, whose devotion

be the improved chance of finding favour (*gratus*) offered by aphrodisiacs; second, the *exempla* may be interpreted as referring to the role-model of the man who employs aphrodisiacs, the plural form reflecting the repetition of the advice; third, the very repetition of *tu tantum erucis inprime dentem* serves to accentuate the utter debasement of a system of patronage in which the client's acceptability and security are dependent on the measure of his sexual prowess; and, finally, the focus on the homosexual relationship between patron and client in this satire militates against the 'intrusion' of females into this context (there is, after all, no reason why *gratus* should not refer to his attractiveness to a male admirer, and why the use of aphrodisiacs should not be appropriate in a homosexual context: Naevolus did complain (43-4) about the rigours involved!).

to his *officia* and quite modest expectations³⁹ arouse a measure of sympathy for his grievances against his *patronus*:

*'haec exempla para felicibus; at mea Clotho
et Lachesis gaudent, si pascitur inguine venter.
o parvi nostrique Lares, quos tunc minuto
aut farre et tenui soleo exorare corona,
quando ego figam aliquid quo sit mihi tuta senectus
a tegete et baculo? viginti milia fenus
pigneribus positis, argenti vascula puri,
sed quae Fabricius censor notet, et duo fortes
de grege Moesorum, qui me cervice locata
securum iubeant clamoso insistere circo;
sit mihi praeterea curvus caelator, et alter
qui multas facies pingit cito; sufficiunt haec.
quando ego pauper ero? votum miserabile, nec spes*

³⁹ In *Satire* 14, Juvenal suggests that the equestrian census of 400,000 sesterces is sufficient for a modest standard of living: *acribus exemplis videor te cludere? misce / ergo aliquid nostris de moribus, effice summam / bis septem ordinibus quam lex dignatur Othonis* (14.322-4). Courtney (1980:443) draws attention to the modest rate of interest (5%) which would allow Naevolus his desired income of 20,000 - less than the 2,000 per month, which Martial (3.10) mentions as an adequate income. Similarly, his requirement of only two porters (surely the absolute minimum for a litter!) is by no means extravagant. Braund (1988) makes an unconvincing attempt to counter this impression by arguing that the Moesians are bodyguards rather than porters, 'given that at least six slaves are required to carry a litter' (p.259) and that 'they must be of top quality' (p.156): Petronius (*Sat.* 96.4) mentions *duo lecticarii* and Naevolus' stipulation that they should be *fortes* would indicate simply that adequate strength would compensate for their small number. It is, furthermore, hardly convincing to argue that the joking reference to what was deemed extravagant in 275 B.C. (when Fabricius was censor) is indicative of 'a massive amount'. Braund also describes his wishes for an engraver and an artist (lines 145-146) as 'really extravagant in their triviality'. They are indeed remarkable desires, but what is really striking is not so much the notion of extravagance as the bizarreness of a character like Naevolus wishing to have his portraits preserved for posterity (cf. Trimalchio's ridiculous yearning for 'immortality'). It is also significant that when Naevolus yearns to be merely *pauper* (147), he has in mind a modest sufficiency (cf. 9-10: *certe modico contentus agebas / vernam equitem*): see Courtney (above, n.3) 444. On balance there seems to be no great difference between Naevolus' desired lifestyle and the portrait of the erstwhile *verna eques* which Juvenal provides in the early part of the *Satire* (lines 9-11).

*his saltem; nam cum pro me Fortuna vocatur,
adfixit ceras illa de nave petitas
quae Siculos cantus effugit remige surdo.*' (135-50)

Once again, if one overlooks the obscenity in line 136 and the possible *double entendre* of *figam* in line 139, this could be a genuine 'hard luck' story of any *ordinary* client - and a client with a simple and touching piety to boot! But, of course, it is the unblushing and matter-of-fact reference to his dependence on his sexual organ, amid talk of *Clotho*, *Lachesis* and his *Lares*, which sustains the satirical incongruity between Naevolus the *cinaedus* and Naevolus the *cliens*. And this incongruity is seen too in the absurdity of a character like Naevolus' hankering after prominence in the public eye (i.e. his desire for *multas facies* and to be seen riding high in his litter in the *clamoso . . . circo*).

The poem has come full circle, in that Naevolus' gloomy concluding speech corroborates Juvenal's professed concern about his mental and physical state in the first 21 lines of the *Satire*. The last four lines leave us with an image of a pitiful client who is utterly pessimistic about an improvement in his circumstances. Yet the audience cannot forget that the direct cause of his misery and pessimism is the figure at whom he has directed his anger so eloquently in the body of the poem: the *mollis avarus*, who, like *Fortuna*, treats his complaints with utter contempt: *neglegit atque alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum* (92).

CHAPTER 7

Satires 10-14:

Quando Maior Avaritiae Patuit Sinus?

In the opening poem of Book 1, Juvenal defines the subject matter of his satire as *quidquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas, / gaudia, discursus* (1.85-6). This could serve equally well as a preface to the wide-ranging tenth *Satire*;¹ and the similarities extend beyond this broad definition of his theme. Given the philosophical nature of this poem, with *tranquillitas* as its ostensible focus, it is remarkable to what extent it is still coloured by the typically Juvenalian asperity, pessimism, cynicism and sardonic humour and infused with echoes of his earlier satirical targets.

The observation *nocitura toga, nocitura petuntur / militia* (10.8-9) is illustrated, initially, by a brief reference to the perils of eloquence (*mortifera est facundia*, 10) - a theme to be developed later - and to the fate of Milo of Croton, who trusted too much in his physical strength (*viribus ille / confisus periit*, 10-11). What follows is a theme which is given a very familiar prominence: *nimia congesta pecunia* (12); but now there is emphasis on the idea that inordinate wealth brings with it its own *nemesis* (*sed plures . . . / strangulat*, 12-3), a point made, one feels, with a degree of satisfaction on Juvenal's part. The conviction that ultimately the excessively wealthy and powerful get their 'just deserts' is especially prominent in Book 4 - starting with Sejanus, who, by hankering after *nimios . . . honores et nimias opes*, was preparing a 'lofty tower' whose

¹ The similarity is corroborated by Juvenal's discussion of Democritus: *tum quoque materiam risus invenit ad omnis / occursus hominum* (47-8) . . . *ridebat curas nec non et gaudia volgi, / interdum et lacrimas* (51-2).

fall would be all the more devastating (10.104-7).² The staggering disparities in wealth in Roman society, which was a cause of such bitter and consistent resentment in the earlier *Satires*, is again emphasised in stark terms: *quanto delphinis ballaena Britannica maior* (14); and the assertion that the acquisition of money is the most frequent object of prayer (*prima fere vota et cunctis notissima templis / divitiae, crescant ut opes, ut maxima toto / nostra sit arca foro*, 10.23-5) brings to mind the earlier cynical observation that wealth might as well have its very own temple in the Roman *forum*.³

The corrupt and decadent world of the aristocratic rich is again evoked by the mention of the *egregias Lateranorum . . . aedes* (17),⁴ while the mention of *magnos Senecae praedivitis hortos* (16) brings to mind earlier instances where park-like estates were advertisements of inordinate wealth and luxury, and even of criminality.⁵ Even more evocative of Juvenal's contempt for the elite is the brilliantly contrived association between luxury and murderous treachery: *sed nulla aconita bibuntur / fictilibus; tunc illa time cum pocula sumes / gemmata et lato Setinum ardebit in auro* (25-7). We have here not only the despicable and typically aristocratic penchant for poison⁶ but also the common contrast between aristocratic corruption and the goodness of the simple country life.

² Similarly, the fates of Pompey and Crassus (10.108-11) and Hannibal (147-6). The notion that just retribution is inherent in greed and excess also underlies the much earlier description of the wealthy glutton who succumbs to a sudden heart-attack in the bath (1.142-4: *poena tamen praesens . . .*). For a fuller consideration of the theme of just retribution, see the discussion of *Satire 13* below.

³ *quandoquidem inter nos sanctissima divitiarum
maiestas, etsi funesta Pecunia templo
non habitat, nullas nummorum ereximus aras,
ut colitur Pax atque Fides, Victoria, Virtus
quaeque salutato crepitat Concordia nido* (1.112-6).

⁴ Who could fail to allow the caricature of the contemptible Lateranus in *Satire 8* (146-62) to colour this allusion to excessive wealth?

⁵ *criminibus debent hortos, praetoria, mensas . . .* (1.75); *contentus fama iaceat Lucanus in hortis / marmoreis . . .* (7.79).

⁶ Cf. *Sat.* 1.69-72; *Sat.* 6.133-4, 610-33, 657-61; *Sat.* 8.17.

When Democritus is envisaged surveying a *praetor* and his retinue on a public occasion in Rome, not only is the scene reminiscent of Juvenal himself observing the passing scene in *Satire 1* (lines 30ff.), but the whole passage is infused with the latter's antipathy towards the ostentation and arrogance of the nobility and brings to the fore, yet again, the corrupt and mercenary nature of the patron-client relationship:

*perpetuo risu pulmonem agitare solebat
Democritus, quamquam non essent urbibus illis
praetextae, trabea, fasces, lectica, tribunal.
quid si vidisset praetorem curribus altis
extantem et medii sublimem pulvere circi
in tunica Iovis et pictae Sarrana ferentem
ex umeris aulaea togae magnaeque coronae
tantum orbem, quanto cervix non sufficit ulla?
quippe tenet sudans hanc publicus et, sibi consul
ne placeat, curru servus portatur eodem.
da nunc et volucrem, sceptro quae surgit eburno,
illinc cornicines, hinc praecedentia longi
agminis officia et niveos ad frena Quirites,
defossa in loculos quos sportula fecit amicos. (10.33-46)*

The last four lines, in particular, smack of the tone and satirical technique evident in the first *Satire*: noteworthy are the belittling *volucer* to describe the Roman eagle, the ironic reference to *Quirites*, and its emphatic and parallel positioning with the equally ironic *amicos*. The unjustified status of the Roman elite is further emphasised in the subsequent lines, where it is pointed out that *summos posse viros et magna exempla duros / vervecum in patria crassoque sub aere nasci* (49-50): an uncomfortable truth which was given particular prominence in the eighth *Satire*.⁷

⁷ 8.49-50; 236-9; 245-8.

The fickleness of fortune clearly has a central role to play in the tenth *Satire*, and the fate of Sejanus provides Juvenal with a vehicle for a *tour de force* of satirical writing. Not only does the downfall of Sejanus illustrate the ultimate futility of the quest for wealth and power, but it also serves as an indictment of the state of Roman politics under autocratic rulers. The malaise is brilliantly conveyed by the bathos of the final phrase, a stinging indictment of the *turba Remi* (73), whose base and fatuous preoccupations were also deplored in *Satire* 8:⁸

*iam pridem, ex quo suffragia nulli
vendimus, effudit curas; nam qui dabat olim
imperium, fasces, legiones, omnia, nunc se
continet atque duas tantum res anxius optat,
panem et circenses. (77-81)*

However, it is the vivid account of the behaviour of the vengeful mob which shows that Juvenal has lost none of his powers of description and of incisive comment. Like an expert news-cameraman, he focuses in dramatic detail on the feverish industriousness of the vandalizing crowd:

*descendunt statuae restemque secuntur,
ipsas deinde rotas bigarum inpacta securis
caedit et inmeritis franguntur crura caballis.
iam strident ignes, iam follibus atque caminis
ardet adoratum populo caput et crepat ingens
Seianus . . . (58-63)*

and the startling reversal of fortune is conveyed with sardonic humour, in terms of a literal melting-down and degrading transformation of Sejanus' image: *deinde ex facie toto orbe secunda / fiunt urceoli, pelves, sartago, matellae* (63-4). The conventional and civilized trappings of joy and thanksgiving (*pone domi laurus, duc in Capitolia magnum*

⁸ 8.117-8.

/ *cretatumque bovem*, 65-6) seem bizarrely inappropriate in this context of savage retribution and morbid fascination:

*Seianus ducitur unco
spectandus, gaudent omnes. 'quae labra, quis illi
vultus erat! numquam, si quid mihi credis, amavi
hunc hominem . . . '* (66-9);

As a further comment on the duplicity and self-interest to which human nature is capable of resorting, Juvenal gives us this cynical cameo, in which one of the crowd advocates an ostentatious and expedient display of emotion:

*'pallidulus mi
Bruttidius meus ad Martis fuit obvius aram;
quam timeo, victus ne poenas exigit Ajax
ut male defensus. curramus praecipites et,
dum iacet in ripa, calcemus Caesaris hostem.
sed videant servi, ne quis neget et pavidum in ius
cervice obstricta dominum trahat.'* (82-8)⁹

The account of Sejanus' fatal ambition provides an ideal preface to the rhetorical question, *sed quae praeclara et prospera tanti, / ut rebus laetis par sit mensura malorum?* (97-8); and it leads naturally to the extolling of the simple and humble lifestyle, a theme already given prominence in *Satire 3* and one which was obviously of increasing significance to Juvenal (as suggested by *Satire 11* in particular). The humorous caricature of the ragged aedile performing the most humdrum of duties

⁹ On the probability that Ajax here symbolizes Tiberius, bent on revenge against the citizens who have failed to protect him sufficiently, see Courtney 1980:463 and Ferguson 1979:260.

underscores the validity of the point being made and reminds one of earlier uses of exaggeration for similar effect:¹⁰

*huius qui trahitur praetextam sumere mavis
an Fidenarum Gabiorumque esse potestas
et de mensura ius dicere, vasa minora
frangere pannosus vacuis aedilis Ulubris?* (99-102)

The fates of the politically ambitious, like Sejanus, Pompey and Crassus, provide compelling corroboration of Juvenal's concluding observation, expressed with typically striking imagery: *ad generum Cereris sine caede ac vulnere pauci / descendunt reges et sicca morte tyranni* (112-3).

When Juvenal turns to the dangers of eloquence in the next section of the poem, his description of the fate of Cicero is described in an equally vivid and memorable manner (*ingenio manus est et cervix caesa, nec umquam / sanguine caesidici maduerunt rostra pusilli*, 120-1), and his account of Demosthenes as the victim of his father's well-meaning hopes is a masterly blend of sadness and sardonic humour:¹¹

*dis ille adversis genitus fatoque sinistro,
quem pater ardentis massae fuligine lippus
a carbone et forcipibus gladiosque paranti
incude et luteo Volcano ad rhetora misit.* (129-32)

¹⁰ E.g. 3.230-1: *est aliquid, quocumque loco, quocumque recessu, / unius sese dominum fecisse lacertae*; 3.5: *ego vel Prochytam praepono Suburae*. The exaggerated nature of such comparisons is clearly not intended to undercut the validity of the underlying argument; similarly, the idealized portrayal of village life at 3.168-92 does not prompt scepticism about Juvenal's belief in the values of such a lifestyle. This rationale also applies to his exaggerated description of the almost animalistic inhabitants of the Golden Age in *Satire* 6.

¹¹ Juvenal's wry mockery of the system of rhetorical education (1.15-17; 7.150-77) endures in this passage; so, too, at the climax of his mockery of Hannibal: *i, demens, et saevas curre per Alpes / ut pueris placeas et declamatio fias* (10.166-7).

It is passages such as these that show that Juvenal's impulse towards powerfully evocative and emotive imagery is a constant element of his creative technique.

In *Satire* 8, Juvenal presents mutilated portrait-busts as the symbols and reproachful observers of the decay of aristocratic *virtus*.¹² In *Satire* 10, he uses similar imagery to equally disparaging effect:

*bellorum exuviae, truncis adfixa tropaeis
lorica et fracta de casside buccula pendens
et curtum temone iugum victaeque triremis
aplustre et summo tristis captivos in arcu
humanis maiora bonis creduntur. (133-7)*

Juvenal's attitude towards the true nature of *virtus* remains consistent, and his condemnation of those who are seduced by the hollow trappings and self-aggrandizement of military conquest could well have been included in the eighth *Satire*: *tanto maior famae sitis est quam / virtutis. quis enim virtutem amplectitur ipsam, praemia si tollas?* (10.140-2).¹³

Juvenal's debunking of Hannibal's reputation is as sardonically humorous as his belittling of the heroes of the epic poets in *Satire* 1: the great leader's advance from Africa to Italy is described in quasi-epic manner,¹⁴ until it begins to dissolve into ridicule with *diducit scopulos et montem rumpit aceto* (153) and the anticlimactic description of the ultimate goal of his long and arduous campaign: *'acti' inquit 'nihil est, nisi Poeno*

¹² 8.1-20.

¹³ The latter point is reminiscent of his condemnation of a corrupt provincial governor in *Satire* 1: *quid enim salvis infamia nummis?* (48).

¹⁴ *hic est quem non capit Africa Mauro
percutsa oceano Niloque admota tepenti
rursus ad Aethiopum populos aliosque elephantos.
additur imperiis Hispania, Pyraeneum
transilit. opposuit natura Alpemque nivemque: (148-52)*

milite portas / frangimus et media vexillum pono Subura (155-6).¹⁵ The mockery becomes more explicit when Hannibal is described as a *ducem . . . luscum*, borne on a *Gaetula . . . belua* (158),¹⁶ and as a *magnus mirandusque cliens . . . ad praetoria regis* (161-2), the latter evoking earlier portrayals of the humiliation of the *salutatio*.

Of all the themes in *Satire 10*, it is the description of the indignities and trials of old age which evokes most strongly the sardonic humour and skillful use of visual detail, so characteristic of the early poems.¹⁷ Juvenal's conviction that it is foolish to pray for a long life is made especially persuasive by his initial focus on the physically repulsive, a description heightened by the epic simile which devolves into laughter at the very end with its unexpected, but apt, point of comparison:

*deformem et taetrum ante omnia vultum
dissimilemque sui, deformem pro cute pellem
pendentisque genas et talis aspice rugas
quales, umbriferos ubi pandit Thabraca saltus,
in vetula scalpit iam mater simia bucca. (191-5)*¹⁸

The rapid shifts of focus, entertaining hyperbole, and brilliantly contrived images hold the reader's attention as effectively as Umbricius' hilarious and biting caricature of the

¹⁵ In the light of Juvenal's attitude towards the *Subura* in *Satire 3*, this lends a particularly mocking touch to the ultimate futility of Hannibal's ambitions; cf. also the bathos of *Subura* with that of *anulus* in line 166.

¹⁶ Cf. the dismissive references to Jason's exploit (*unde alius furtivae devehat aurum / pelliculae*, 1.10-11) and to the tragic tales of Theseus and Daedalus and Icarus (*mugitum labyrinthi / et mare percussum puero fabrumque volentem*, 1.53-4).

¹⁷ In view of his reference to his *contracta cuticula* at 11.203, this probably had an element of wry self-mockery.

¹⁸ Ferguson (1979:267) suggests *Garamantis* (a parody of Virgil *Aen.* 4.198) for the problematic *iam mater*, but perhaps Juvenal had in mind the image of a flabby female ape in suckling condition, i.e. ' . . . wrinkles, such as an ape - now that she is a mother - etches on her baggy jowls.' Perhaps, too, the reference to an ugly *female* ape was intended to make the comparison more repulsive.

Greeks in *Satire 3*.¹⁹ Like the Greeks, *all* old men share the same unlovely characteristics: their bodies have the shakes, their voices quaver; their heads are hairless, their noses run like babies' and they puree their bread between toothless gums.²⁰ The cruel truth of senility's misery is emphasized in the next couplet with a note of wry humour (*usque adeo gravis uxori natisque sibique, / ut captatori moveat fastidia* Cosso, 201-2), and there follows a relentless analysis of what makes old age thoroughly unbearable. Sexual impotence, of course, provides scope for the cruellest satire:

*nam coitus iam longa oblivio, vel si
coneris, iacet exiguus cum ramice nervus
et quamvis tota palpetur nocte, iacebit.
anne aliquid sperare potest haec inguinis aegri
canities? quid quod merito suspecta libido est
quae venerem adfectat sine viribus?* (204-9)

The combination of graphic detail, mockery and censoriousness is just as evident here as it is in *Satires 2* or *6*.²¹

When Juvenal turns to the numerous ailments which afflict the aged, he indulges in an extended elegiac parody:

¹⁹ Fredericks (1976:188) comments on the use of hyperbole here: 'These grotesque, sensual, physical deformities are therefore accumulated into one intensely exaggerated list, in order to deflate empty wish-fulfilments. As a composite or unified conception judged for atmosphere, the description of the horrors of old age is clearly unrealistic, an exaggeration, but its *function* is certainly realistic: to jolt men out of unrealistic wishes that old age will somehow prove an attainable ideal - old age is attainable all right, Juvenal says, but it is no ideal.'

²⁰ *una senum facies, cum voce trementia membra
et iam leve caput madidique infantia nasi;
frangendus misero gingiva panis inermi.* (198-200)

²¹ E.g. in the exposé of the pathetic homosexuals, whose hypocrisy is revealed through the eyes of a surgeon (2.1-13), or in the description of the sexual antics during the *Bona Dea* ceremony (6.314-34) - where (ironically) *nil ibi per ludum simulabitur, omnia fient / ad verum, quibus incendi iam frigidus aeo / Laomedontiaes et Nestoris hirnea possit* (324-6)

*praeterea, minimus gelido iam in corpore sanguis
 febre calet sola, circumssilit agmine facto
 morborum omne genus, quorum si nomina quaeras,
 promptius expediam quot amavent Oppia moechos,
 quot Themison aegros autumnno occiderit uno,
 quot Basilus socios, quot circumscripsent Hirrus
 pupillos, quot longa viros exorbeat uno
 Maura die, quot discipulos inclinet Hamillus;
 percurram citius quot villas possideat nunc
 quo tondente gravis iuveni mihi barba sonabat. (217-26)*

What is particularly striking about these images is not so much their startling incongruity in this context,²² but the unmistakable resonance they have with attitudes and issues which are so prominent in the earlier poems. Not only is there Juvenal's preoccupation with sexual vice and deviance and with fraudulent self-enrichment, but we are reminded yet again of his resentment of the prosperity of his social inferiors, especially lowly immigrants, in the reference to the barber-turned-millionaire.²³ Juvenal's penchant for exploiting sexual perversion or impropriety for satirical effect is seen a few lines later, when he envisages an old man maliciously disappointing his would-be heirs:

*nam codice saevo
 heredes vetat esse suos, bona tota feruntur
 ad Phialen; tantum artificis valet halitus oris,
 quod steterat multis in carcere fornicis annis. (236-9)*

If this had been a displaced fragment, who would have dreamed of finding a home for it outside of Books 1 and 2?

²² Cf. Fishelov's (1990:378-9) comment on this passage: 'Needless to say, these . . . are not innocent, neutral examples, but rather are another manifestation of Juvenal's inclination to utilize any opportunity in order to hurl satirical arrows in different directions.'

²³ This, of course, is a repetition of 1.25.

When Juvenal develops the theme *rara est adeo concordia formae / atque pudicitiae* (297-8), he first alludes to Lucretia's fate (293-4), as a warning to mothers who pray that their daughters should turn out beautiful; and he emphasizes the point with the grotesque notion of Verginia willingly exchanging her beauty for Rutila's ugliness (*gibbum*, 294).²⁴ Then, turning to the 'curse' of physical beauty in the male, he produces a passage which is very reminiscent of the earliest *Satires*. In its preoccupation with moral corruption stemming from sexual license, its mood of cynical pessimism, its attachment to idealistic notions of old-fashioned rectitude and its gratuitous misogyny, it bears a striking resemblance to parts of *Satires* 1, 2 and 6 in both tone and content:

filius autem

*corporis egregii miseros trepidosque parentes
semper habet: rara est adeo concordia formae
atque pudicitiae. sanctos licet horrida mores
tradiderit domus ac veteres imitata Sabinos,
praeterea castum ingenium voltumque modesto
sanguine ferventem tribuat natura benigna
larga manu (quid enim puero conferre potest plus
custode et cura natura potentior omni?),
non licet esse viro; nam prodiga corruptoris
improbilas ipsos audet temptare parentes:
tanta in muneribus fiducia. nullus ephebum
deformem saeva castravit in arce tyrannus,
nex praetextatum rapuit Nero loripedem nec
strumosum atque utero pariter gibboque tumentem.
i nunc et iuvenis specie laetare tui, quem*

²⁴ Juvenal uses the word *gibbus* twice elsewhere: at 10.309, where it denotes a hunchback, and at 6.109, where it describes a 'hump' or 'bump' on the nose (*praeterea multa in facie deformia, sulcus / attritus galea mediisque in naribus ingens / gibbus*, 106-9). In view of the fact that Juvenal specifically refers to *faciem* at 10.293 (*sed vetat optari faciem Lucretia qualem / ipsa habuit*), it is likely that *gibbus* is used here in the latter sense. See Tengström 1980:36-8.

*maiora expectant discrimina. fiet adulter
 publicus et poenas metuet quascumque mariti
 ex ira debet, nec erit felicius astro
 Martis, ut in laqueos numquam incidat. exigit autem
 interdum ille dolor plus quam lex ulla dolori
 concessit: necat hic ferro, secat ille cruentis
 verberibus, quosdam moechos et mugilis intrat.
 sed tuus Endymion dilectae fiet adulter
 matronae. mox cum dederit Servilia nummos
 fiet, et illius quam non amat, exuet omnem
 corporis ornatum; quid enim ulla negaverit udis
 inguinibus, sive est haec Oppia sive Catulla?
 deterior totos habet illic femina mores. (295-323)*

The prejudices and, indeed, the central thesis of *Satire 6* are even more forcefully recalled in the following section, where Juvenal describes the fate of Gaius Silius,²⁵ who was foolish enough to fall for the charms of the wife of the emperor Claudius:

*elige quidnam
 suadendum esse putes cui nubere Caesaris uxor
 destinat. optimus hic et formosissimus idem
 gentis patriciae rapitur miser extinguendus
 Messalinae oculis; dudum sedet illa parato
 flammeolo Tyriusque palam genialis in hortis
 sternitur et nitu decies centena dabuntur
 antiquo, veniet cum signatoribus auspex.
 haec tu secreta et paucis commissa putabas?
 non nisi legitime volt nubere. quid placeat dic.
 ni parere velis, pereundum erit ante lucernas;
 si scelus admittas, dabitur mora parvula, dum res*

²⁵ His fate is described by Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.12.26-38.

*nota urbi et populo contingat principis aurem.
dedecus ille domus sciet ultimus. interea tu
obsequere imperio, si tanti vita dierum
paucorum. quidquid levius meliusque putaris,
praebenda est gladio pulchra haec et candida cervix. (329-45)*

The fate of Silius, who was a victim of both circumstances and of the unspeakable Messalina,²⁶ makes an apt conclusion to Juvenal's demonstration of the futility of prayers and ambitions. In the face of such an overwhelmingly pessimistic view, the only logical solution is to adopt a lifestyle of simplicity and self-sufficiency, free of harmful ambitions. If any prayers are to be made (and here Juvenal treats the subject in a characteristically wry manner: *ut tamen et poscas aliquid voveasque sacellis / exta et candiduli divina tomacula porci*, 354-5),²⁷ these are his suggestions:

*orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano.
fortem posce animum mortis terrore carentem,
qui spatium vitae extremum inter munera ponat
naturae, qui ferre queat quoscumque labores,
nesciat irasci, cupiat nihil et potiores
Herculis aerumnas credat saevosque labores
et venere et cenis et pluma Sardanapalli.
monstro quod ipse tibi possis dare; semita certe
tranquillae per virtutem patet unica vitae. (356-64)*

The extolling of hardship over enervating luxury, the controlling of one's desires and the emphasis on *virtus* as the key to a tranquil life are quite consistent with the *modus*

²⁶ His clandestine marriage to the wife of the emperor, while he was away at Ostia, was obviously treasonable. The mere mention of Messalina brings to mind the lurid indictment of her shameless nymphomania at 6.115-32.

²⁷ Fishelov (1990:381) remarks: 'The jocular tone of lines 354-5 seems to signal to us that this conventional prayer, like all the others, is not immune from Juvenalian playful pessimism.'

vivendi emanating from the earlier *Satires*, notably the eighth. However, the advice that one should *nesciat irasci* has been interpreted as a signal departure from his former manner, an unequivocal and 'programmatically' rejection of the anger which was a salient characteristic of the early poems. The element of cynical and mocking detachment evident in Book 4 has been seen as the central characteristic of a new and deliberately contrived *persona*, whose complete transformation in respect of *indignatio* is shown, it is argued,²⁸ by Juvenal's advocating of a state of mind *qui . . . nesciat irasci* (10.359-60) and by his ridiculing of Calvinus, in *Satire* 13, for displaying excessive anger (e.g. *flagrantior aequo / non debet dolor esse viri nec volnere maior*, 13.11-2; *rem pateris modicam et mediocri bile ferendam, / si flectas oculos maiora ad crimina*, 13.143-4).

Here it is important to differentiate between the real and the ideal. It is, after all, a very human trait to give vent to one's anger, while at the same time recognizing the futility or destructiveness of the emotion; indeed, Juvenal himself draws attention to the power of human emotions in the lines preceding his philosophical 'credo': *nos animorum / impulsu et caeca magnaue cupidine ducti . . .* (350-1). And, again, it is important to take cognizance of the nature of the satirical theme in each instance: in *Satire* 1, where explicit mention is made of his *ira* or *indignatio*,²⁹ Juvenal is reacting to overwhelming, and luridly depicted, proof of the vice and decadence permeating Roman society; whereas, in *Satire* 10, the central theme is human *folly* rather than sin and the poem is essentially *didactic* rather than *invective* (nonetheless, as the preceding discussion has attempted to show, it is remarkable to what extent Juvenal's preoccupation with vice and injustice is allowed to permeate the tenth *Satire*). That Juvenal's injunction at 10.360 should *not* be interpreted as an assertion that anger is an entirely unjustifiable

²⁸ E.g. Braund 1997:68: 'The later *Satires* present a rejection of *indignatio* which is initiated obliquely in *Satire* 9, the last poem in Book III, and made explicit briefly for the first time at the close of *Satire* 10, the opening poem of Book IV. *Satire* 13, the programmatic poem to Juvenal's fifth book, confronts the matter head-on, with an unsympathetic presentation of an angry man. This seems to invite reassessment of the angry speaker of the early books by offering a negative perspective on *indignatio*;' cf. Courtney 1980:446.

²⁹ 1.45 (*quid referam quanta siccum iecur ardeat ira*); 1.79 (*si natura negat, facit indignatio versum*).

emotion is suggested by his comments on what he deems excessive anger on the part of his friend Calvinus in *Satire 13* (see below).

Satire 11, which uses the *cena* theme to focus on the virtues of frugality and the simple life (*voluptates commendat rarior usus*, 208), is a logical development of the concluding sentiments of the preceding *Satire*. This cohesiveness may be seen as another indication that Juvenal's interest had *in reality* shifted towards contemplation of the advantages of the tranquil life.³⁰ As Courtney remarks,

one cannot but feel that Juvenal has given up the rich men of his day as beyond redemption. He makes no attempt to direct his teaching at them or to convert them to his way of thought, but focusses on persuading men of his own station not to let themselves be carried away by luxury which they cannot afford and should not want.³¹

However, while the ostensible purpose of this *Satire* is to affirm positive principles, it also serves as another platform to denounce the greed and decadence of the upper classes in particular.³² Rutilus (probably an impoverished aristocrat)³³ exemplifies the ruinous consequences of extravagant gourmandizing. His reckless expenditure on food has driven him to the ultimate degradation in Juvenal's view: voluntary enrolment in the

³⁰ The personal reflection at 203-4 reinforces this.

³¹ Courtney 1980:490. Similarly, Ferguson 1979:278: 'It was easy and natural for J[uvenal] to turn his invective against aristocratic *luxuria* into such a form [i.e. the *cena* theme]. He was now mellower: somewhere he had come under Epicurean influence . . . The tenth satire had offered a constructive message. This too is positive . . .'

³² See McDevitt 1968:174.

³³ This may be inferred from his notoriety (*omnis / convictus, thermae, stationes, omne theatrum / de Rutilo*, 3-5) and probably from the analogy with a *pauper Apicius* (3).

gladiators' school.³⁴ People like Rutilus are in the grip of an addiction (*quibus in solo vivendi causa palato est*, 11), so much so that their creditors can be sure of confronting them at the entrance to the *macellum* (9-10). It is ironic that those who can least afford it spend lavishly on their appetites: *egregius cenat meliusque miserrimus horum / et cito casurus iam perlucente ruina* (12-3), an observation that recalls a similar remark made in *Satire 3*.³⁵ Juvenal's exaggerated portrayal of their desperate means of securing cash acquires a certain credibility in this era of drug addiction:

*interea gustus elementa per omnia quaerunt
numquam animo pretiis obstantibus; interius si
attendas, magis illa iuvant quae pluris ementur.
ergo haut difficile est perituram arcessere summam
lancibus oppositis vel matris imagine fracta . . .* (14-18)

When Juvenal turns from those who, like Rutilus, cannot afford their extravagance to those who can, his *exemplum* comes from the class of people to whom he shows such contempt in Book 1, the *nouveau riche*:

*refert ergo quis haec eadem paret; in Rutilo nam
luxuria est, in Ventidio laudabile nomen
sumit et a censu famam trahit.* (21-3)

Ventidius is an example of the types whom *ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum / extollit quotiens voluit Fortuna iocari*, as described by Umbricius in the third *Satire* (39-40); and

³⁴ *nam dum valida ac iuvenalia membra / sufficiunt galeae dumque ardent sanguine, fertur / non cogente quidem sed nec prohibente tribuno / scripturus leges et regia verba lanistae* (5-8). On the disgrace for an aristocrat to appear in the arena, cf. 8.199-210.

³⁵ *commune id vitium est: hic vivimus ambitiosa / paupertate omnes* (3.182-3). Central to both passages is the question of living beyond one's means; however, in the latter instance, Juvenal is concerned not so much with *luxuria* as with the pressure to 'keep up appearances' in Rome - particularly as far as dress is concerned (*hic ultra vires habitus nitor*, 180).

he was used in the same context in *Satire 7*.³⁶ Presumably, Juvenal's contempt would have been intensified by the knowledge that Ventidius had once been a mule-driver.³⁷ The possession of inordinate wealth and lavish expenditure remain consistent satirical targets for Juvenal:

*illum ego iure
despiciam, qui scit quanto sublimior Atlas
omnibus in Libya sit montibus, hic tamen idem
ignorat quantum ferrata distet ab arca
sacculus. (23-7)*

The image here is very reminiscent of the portrayal of the reckless gamblers in *Satire 1*: *neque enim oculis comitantibus itur / ad casum tabulae, posita sed luditur arca* (89-90); and, when he goes on to describe the ruinous consequences of excessive expenditure on food -

*quis enim te deficiente crumina
et crescente gula manet exitus, aere paterno
ac rebus mersis in ventrem fenoris atque
argenti gravis et pecorum agrorumque capacem? (38-41) -*

there is a similar resonance with another passage from the first *Satire*: *nam de tot pulchris et latis orbibus et tam / antiquis una comedunt patrimonia mensa* (1.137-8). The shamelessness of these spendthrift absconders and the decadence of a society which condones such conduct are satirized with cynical contempt, providing yet another reminder that, when the subject matter prompts it, Juvenal readily has recourse to his characteristic *indignatio*:

³⁶ *si Fortuna volet, fies de rhetore consul;
si volet haec eadem, fiet de consule rhetor.
Ventidius quid enim? quid Tullius? anne aliud quam
sidus et occulti miranda potentia fati? (7.197-200)*

³⁷ *mulas qui fricabat consul factus est (Aulus Gellius 15.4).*

*non praematuri cineres nec funus acerbum
 luxuriae sed morte magis metuenda senectus.
 hi plerumque gradus: conducta pecunia Romae
 et coram dominis consumitur; inde, ubi paulum
 nescio quid superest et pallet fenoris auctor,
 qui vertere solum, Baiae et ad ostrea currunt.
 cedere namque foro iam non est deterius quam
 Esquilias a ferventi migrare Subura.
 ille dolor solus patriam fugientibus, illa
 maestitia est, caruisse anno circensibus uno.
 sanguinis in facie non haeret gutta, morantur
 pauci ridiculum et fugientem ex urbe Pudorem. (44-55)*

After such a sustained satirical attack on the *luxuria* and moral laxity which pervade Roman society, it comes as something of a surprise to discover that the ostensible purpose of this poem is to invite someone to dinner.³⁸ Yet there is more to it than that; the invitation is in reality the vehicle for a contrasting picture of a personal lifestyle characterized by simplicity and restraint: *experire hodie numquid pulcherrima dictu, / Persice, non praestem vita et moribus et re . . .* (56-7). However conventional this *topos* might be, Juvenal's portrayal of what the occasion promises for his guest clearly stems from his delight in his farm at Tibur,³⁹ and, importantly, the positive sentiments

³⁸ The name *Persicus* appears at *Satire* 3.221 as the wealthy arsonist who profited from his crime. If Juvenal had this person in mind, it would suggest that he might have chosen him as the indirect target of his attack on *luxuria* and not as a genuine guest figure. There was an historical *Paulus Fabricius Persicus*, who was consul in AD 34; it is therefore possible that the addressee was a descendant and contemporary of Juvenal's, although Courtney (1980:490) believes that he could not have been an actual friend of the poet, on the grounds that the scabrous lines 186-9 'could never be addressed to such.' Perhaps, but one should also remember that *Satire* 6 was composed by Juvenal.

³⁹ *de Tiburtino veniet pinguissimus agro
 haedulus et toto grege mollior, inscius herbae
 necdum ausus virgas humilis mordere salicti,
 qui plus lactis habet quam sanguinis, et montani
 asparagi, posito quos legit vilica fuso.
 grandia praeterea tortoque calentia feno
 ova adsunt ipsis cum matribus, et servatae*

harmonize with those expressed in earlier poems. The emphasis on the wholesomeness of his lifestyle (*nam cum sis conviva mihi promissus, habebis / Evandrum* . . . , 60-1), the extolling of the rustic simplicity and self-sufficiency of figures like Curius (*parvo quae legerat horto / ipse focus brevibus ponebat holuscula*, 78-9) and the nostalgia for such lost qualities (e.g. Curio's contentment with the simplest of fare)⁴⁰ are traits evident, both explicitly and implicitly, in the earlier poems.⁴¹ Wiesen rejects the notion of hypocrisy in Juvenal's extolling of the simple life:

' . . . Juvenal has in this very poem guaranteed the essential truth of his description by insisting that he is no hypocrite, that his actions *do* suit his fine words, by asserting strongly that he does live a purer and better life than the people who are the targets of his attack.

*experiere hodie numquid pulcherrima dictu,
Persice, non praestem vita et moribus et re,
si laudem siliquas occultus ganeo, pultes
coram aliis dictem puero sed in aure placentas.* (56-9)

parte anni quales fuerant in vitibus uvae . . . (65-72)

⁴⁰ *sicci terga suis rara pendentia crate
moris erat quondam festis servare diebus
et natalicium cognatis ponere lardum
accedente nova, si quam dabat hostia, carne.
cognatorum aliquis titulo ter consulis atque
castrorum imperiis et dictatoris honore
functus ad has epulas solito maturius ibat
erectum domito referens a monte ligonem.* (82-9)

⁴¹ On the wholesome country life, cf. 3.18-20, 171-9, 190-2, 223-31; on models of simple virtue, cf. 2.72-4; 6.287-91; 8.236-68; on nostalgia for lost traditions and values, cf. 3.18-20, 84-5, 168-70, 312-4; 6.342-5. Against this background, the attempt by Jones (1990 [1]:164-5) to argue that 11.77-116 go further than indicating the bankrupt values of the Persicus type and 'also satirize the moralistic response to luxury' is unconvincing.

Why should we not believe this declaration of honesty? If we refuse to trust so simple and forthright a statement, we are not entitled to credit anything at all which Juvenal says anywhere.⁴²

The contrast between past and present values and between the old and the contemporary elite is nicely symbolized by the furnishings of the dining-rooms, described in lines 90-8:

*cum tremere autem Fabios durumque Catonem
et Scauros et Fabricium, rigidique severos
censoris mores etiam collega timeret,
nemo inter curas et seria duxit habendum
qualis in Oceani fluctu testudo nataret,
clarum Troiugenis factura et nobile fulcrum;
sed nudo latere et parvis frons aerea lectis
vile coronati caput ostendebat aselli,
ad quod lascivi ludebant ruris alumni.*

The notion of down-to-earth simplicity and homeliness is enhanced by the picture of the country children romping about the couch, the latter being yet another illustration of Juvenal's evidently tender interest in children.⁴³ In extending this notion of unspoiled simplicity to the Roman soldier of the past, Juvenal proceeds to paint a picture that, to modern sensibilities, probably constitutes the quintessence of boorishness.⁴⁴

tunc rudis et Graias mirari nescius artes

⁴² Wiesen 1963:460.

⁴³ Note especially the touching remark about of his young servants in lines 152-3: *suspirat longo non visam tempore matrem / et casulam et notos tristis desiderat haedos*; cf. also 3.175 and 7.207-10. See Colton 1979:1-3.

⁴⁴ E.g. Winkler (1983:38): 'The satirist then goes on to portray the rudis miles of those days (100-10), giving again a vivid picture of an uncultivated bumpkin and rustic ignoramus, unhampered by any sense of appreciation of art.'

urbibus eversis praedarum in parte reperta
magnorum artificum frangebat pocula miles,
ut phaleris gauderet ecus caelataque cassis
Romuleae simulacra ferae mansuescere iussae
imperii fato, geminos sub rupe Quirinos
ac nudam effigiem in clipeo venientis et hasta
pendentisque dei perituro ostenderet hosti.
ponebant igitur Tusco farrata catino:
argenti quod erat solis fulgebat in armis. (100-9)

However, the argument that Juvenal's portrayal of the 'Golden Age' was hardly likely to be gratuitously debunking⁴⁵ should also be applied to his depiction of the old Republican heroes. One should be wary of attributing ironic mockery to a writer whose technique so often consists in stark contrast (to read the fifth *Satire* in that way, for example, would make nonsense of Juvenal's obvious purpose in writing that poem). When he describes the soldier as *rudis* - juxtaposed with the characteristically sneering reference to things 'Greek' (i.e. the lofty-sounding *Graias*, instead of *Graecas*) - he is focusing on the *absence* of *luxuria* rather than suggesting an embarrassing boorishness; *rudis* is similarly used in a positive sense in his description of his young carver as *tirunculus ac rudis* (143). There are other details which militate against any theory of ironic undercutting: the 'manly' use of silver to decorate only their weapons (*argenti quod erat solis fulgebat in armis*, 109 - recalling a point made in *Satire* 5);⁴⁶ the serving of their simple food on unpretentious earthenware (*ponebant igitur Tusco farrata catino*, 108; compare Umbricius' approving reference to Italian simplicity);⁴⁷ and the

⁴⁵ See discussion of *Satire* 6, pp. 89-92.

⁴⁶ *nam Virro, ut multi, gemmas ad pocula transfert / a digitis, quas in vaginae fronte solebat / ponere zelotypo iuvenis praelatus larbae* (5.43-5).

⁴⁷ *fictilibus cenare pudet, quod turpe negabis / translatus subito ad Marsos mensamque Sabellam / contentusque illic Veneto duroque cucullo* (3.168-70). In *Satire* 11, Juvenal also refers to his *plebeios calices et paucis assibus emptos* (145).

emphasis on the uncontaminated and unsophisticated nature of the 'original' Jupiter and his antipathy towards foreign contamination of the 'authentic' Italian or Roman:

*his monuit nos,
hanc rebus Latiis curam praestare solebat
fictilis et nullo violatus Iuppiter auro.
illa domi natas nostraque ex arbore mensas
tempora viderunt; hos lignum stabat ad usus,
annosam si forte nucem deiecerat eurus. (114-8)⁴⁸*

It is hard to see how the very obvious thrust of Juvenal's argument here would be strengthened by counteractive mockery. In addition, it would seem that Juvenal takes particular care *not* to allow his idealized portrayal of the utter simplicity of the early Roman soldiers to lapse into burlesque, when he makes a point of stressing how different people must have been in those days: *omnia tunc quibus invidias, si lividulus sis* (110). Similarly, Juvenal's representation of his *own* simple lifestyle in *Satire 11* might seem to us exaggerated and romanticized, but it is difficult to believe that he is deliberately debunking or undercutting what is intended to accentuate the contrasting *luxuria* of the Roman elite.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Compare his wistful conception of the sacred grotto in *Satire 3*: *quanto praesentius esset / numen aquis, viridi si margine cluderet undas / herba nec ingenuum violarent marmora tofum* (3.18-20).

⁴⁹ Winkler (1983:37), on the other hand, detects consistent irony; e.g. he asserts that, in being depicted as harvesting little heads of cabbage and cooking them himself on a modest hearth, 'this splendid example of the *mos maiorum* [sc. Curius] is stripped of all his respectability'; and he maintains that the 'picture of a Cincinnatus-type *par excellence*, shouldering his hoe and eagerly hastening home from his work in the mountains to this kind of dinner, appears to be particularly idiotic.' However, this portrayal of an unpretentious lifestyle should be compared with Horace's description of that of Scipio and Laelius, where the intention is certainly not to debunk:

*quin ubi se a volgo et scaena in secreta remorant
virtus Scipiadae et mitis sapientia Laeli,
nugari cum illo et discincti ludere, donec
decoqueretur holus, soliti. (Serm. 2.1.71-4)*

This picture of *virtus* and *simplicitas* provides a platform for another attack on the enervating effects of *luxuria* on Rome's elite. The following passage represents the direct antithesis of the type of meal (and occasion) to which Juvenal is inviting Persicus:

*at nunc divitibus cenandi nulla voluptas,
nil rhombus, nil damma sapit, putere videntur
unguenta atque rosae, latos nisi sutinet orbis
grande ebur et magno sublimis pardus hiatu
dentibus ex illis quos mittit porta Syenes
et Mauri celeres et Mauro obscurior Indus,
et quos deposuit Nabataeo belua saltu
iam nimios capitique graves. hinc surgit orexis,
hinc stomacho vires; nam pes argenteus illis,
anulus in digito quod ferreus. (120-9)*

Here we have an effeteness which requires the titillation of luxurious trappings to stimulate jaded appetites, a suggestion implicit in the description of Virro's jewel-encrusted drinking goblets in *Satire 5*.⁵⁰ The equating of the exotic with corruption and decadence, together with the contrasting emphasis on the wholesome simplicity of the native Italian, is extended to the description of his servants: he has no need of a carver trained by a foppish foreigner (*discipulus Trypheri doctoris*, 137) in the art of dismembering the creatures of *haute cuisine*: sows' bellies, hares, boars Scythian pheasants, flamingoes, antelope and Moorish gazelles.⁵¹ The fact that the *maestro* employs dummies made of elmwood accentuates the notion of hollow pretentiousness, and the whole image is strongly evocative of the earlier description of Virro's

⁵⁰ 5.37-45.

⁵¹ As in *Satires 3* and *6*, the use of several pretentious-sounding Greek terms accentuates the mocking distaste: *pygargus* (138); *phoenicopterus* (139).

ostentatious carver.⁵² Juvenal's servants are *not* fashionable Phrygians or Lycians purchased from the slave-market at a high price (147-8),⁵³ but the sons of a *pastor durus* or of a *bubulcus* (151), whose innocence and lack of sophistication are evident from their uniform and functional dress (*a frigore tutus*, 146; *idem habitus*, 149); from their short hair combed only for the occasion (*tonsi rectique capilli / atque hodie tantum propter convivium pexi*, 149-50); from the fact that they understand only their native language (*cum posces, posce Latine*, 148);⁵⁴ from their longing for their *longo non visam tempore matrem / et casulam et notos . . . haedos* (152-3); and especially from their ingenuous expressions and sense of modesty inherent in their sexual immaturity (the latter providing Juvenal with yet another opportunity for a snide remark about aristocratic decadence):

*ingenui voltus puer ingenuique pudoris,
qualis esse decet quos ardens purpura vestit,
nec pupillares defert in balnea raucus
testiculos, nec vellendas iam praebuit alas,
crassa nec opposito pavidus tegit inguina guto.* (154-8)

This ideal of the native Italian ethos untainted by foreign fashions, a notion particularly prominent in the third *Satire*, is succinctly captured in the next three lines:

*hic tibi vina dabit diffusa in montibus illis
a quibus ipse venit, quorum sub vertice lusit.*

⁵² *structorem interea, ne qua indignatio desit,
saltantem spectes et chironomunta volanti
cultello, donec peragat dictata magistri
omnia; nec minimo sane discrimine refert
quo gestu lepores et quo gallina secetur.* (5.120-4)

Note gain the sneer in *chironomunta*.

⁵³ Cf. Virro's *flos Asiae* (56).

⁵⁴ The morally corrupting influence of the Greek language is well caricatured at 6.187-95.

[namque una atque eadem est vini patria atque ministri.] (159-61)⁵⁵

The point is made doubly emphatic by the ensuing description of the type of 'cabaret' enjoyed by the rich elite. Again, we meet a passage which would not have been out of place in Books 1 and 2:

*forsitan expectes ut Gaditana canoro
incipiant prurire choro plausuque probatae
ad terram tremulo descendant clune puellae,
[spectant hoc nuptae iuxta recubante marito
quod pudeat narrare aliquem praesentibus ipsis]⁵⁶
inritamentum veneris languentis et acres
divitis urticae. [maior tamen ista voluptas
alterius sexus];⁵⁷ magis ille extenditur, et mox
auribus atque oculis concepta urina movetur.
non capit has nugas humilis domus. audiat ille
testarum crepitus cum verbis, nudum olido stans
fornice mancipium quibus abstinet, ille fruatur
vocibus obscenis omniue libidinis arte,
qui Lacedaemonium pytismate lubricat orbem;
namque ibi fortunae veniam damus. alea turpis,
turpe et adulterium mediocribus: haec eadem illi
omnia cum faciunt, hilares nitidique vocantur. (162-78)*

⁵⁵ There is some doubt about the authenticity of the last line, described by Courtney (1980:510) as 'a vapid verse composed to explain 159-60.' Likewise, Ferguson (1979:285): 'possibly a versified gloss.'

⁵⁶ Omitted in some MSS or variously placed in the text; Courtney (1980:510) believes that they are 'certainly spurious', because they are feeble and irrelevant; Ferguson (1979:285), on the other hand, remarks that 'the thought and expression are not unworthy of J.'

⁵⁷ Deleted by Jachmann.

Juvenal has not laid aside his bitter contempt for the rich nobility: decadence is endemic in that class (note, especially, the sneering *namque ibi fortunae veniam damus* and the fact that their disgraceful behaviour is glossed over with the 'endearing' epithets *hilaes nitidique*). Nor has he lost any of his capacity for brilliantly satirizing the morally enervated: the lascivious Spanish dancers, with their undulating buttocks and castanets; the rich man, whose jaded appetite (like his sexual desire) needs an 'aphrodisiac'; the fact that he wets himself in his excitement;⁵⁸ the language of the rich man's diningroom, so foul that it would turn heads in a stinking brothel; the image of gobs of saliva lubricating the marbled floor of the diningroom (note again the xenophobic sneer in *Lacedaemonium pytismate*); the typically aristocratic vices of gambling and adultery (the mere mention of which recalls the aura of reckless indulgence which surrounds earlier descriptions of these 'sins')⁵⁹ - all these details combine to produce a picture of lurid moral depravity, every bit as vivid as his description of the athletic 'Amazon' in *Satire 6* (413-433).

Even when he urges Persicus to cast aside his cares and to relax when he comes to dinner (183-5), Juvenal uses the opportunity to create another cameo in the mould of his shocking portrait of Messalina returning from the brothel (6.115-35):

*non fenoris ulla
mentio nec, prima si luce egressa reverti
nocte solet, tacito bilem tibi contrahat uxor
umida suspectis referens multicia rugis
vexasque comas et voltum auremque calentem.* (185-9)

This startling picture makes the sort of care mentioned in the following lines seem quite trivial by comparison (*pone domum et servos et quidquid frangitur illis / aut perit, ingratos ante omnia pone sodales*, 191-2), and it provides another good illustration of

⁵⁸ Cf. 6.63-5: *chironomon Ledam saltante Bathyllo / Tuccia vesicae non imperat, Apula longum, / sicut in amplexu, subito et miserabile gannit.*

⁵⁹ E.g. 1.54-61, 87-93; 6.82-132; 8.9-12.

Juvenal's predilection for exploiting the satirical possibilities of adultery and sexual misconduct in particular.

It has already been noted that this *Satire* is ostensibly positive in purpose and that this consists largely in the portrayal of the type of lifestyle which Juvenal himself professes to lead.⁶⁰ That this element of the poem should be interpreted as autobiographical, however conventional the sentiments might be, is suggested by the distinctly personal conclusion, in which Juvenal somewhat smugly holds himself aloof from the Circus which so enthralls the entire populace⁶¹ and in which he refers to his own wrinkled skin and to his preference for sunbathing over public events (203-4). However, the mellow 'Epicurean' overtones of this poem and the more personal notes it contains cannot disguise the continued presence of Juvenal's deep-seated antipathies, his fierce moral convictions and prejudices and, above all, his capacity for brilliant and biting satire. Juvenal's technique in this poem is remarkably similar to that employed in *Satire 7*: the use of an ostensibly positive theme as a platform for an attack on vice and degeneracy.

The same might be said of *Satire 12*:

In the Twelfth Satire, a basically non-satiric theme (the welcome home) is surprisingly used to launch satiric attacks on greed and corruption. The friend is a greedy merchant, an urban type from whom the (apparently rustic) narrator increasingly distances himself. The other urban type at

⁶⁰ E.g. 56-76 (a challenge to Persicus to see whether he abides by his precepts for a simple lifestyle, and a description of the menu); 129-60 (his simple cutlery and his innocent serving-boys); 179-82 (the type of dinner entertainment he will be offering).

⁶¹ His disdain is clear from his barbed reference to the praetor as *praeda caballorum* (for other mocking portrayals of praetors, see 1.128-30; 10.36-40; 14.267), and from his remark about the likely behaviour of the masses if the 'Greens' had lost: *nam si deficeret, maestam attonitamque videres / hanc urbem veluti Cannarum in pulvere in victis / consulibus* (11.199-201).

issue is the *captator*, a soulless manipulator who, like the merchant, seeks only money.⁶²

The poem begins with an exaggerated expression of thanksgiving for Catullus' narrow escape from drowning:

*Natali, Corvine, die mihi dulcior haec lux,
qua festus promissa deis animalia caespes
expectat. niveam Reginae ducimus agnam,
par vellus dabitur pugnanti Gorgone Maura;
sed procul extensum petulans quatit hostia funem
Tarpeio servata lovi frontemque coruscat,
quippe ferox vitulus templis maturus et arae
spargendusque mero, quem iam pudet ubera matris
ducere, qui vexat nascenti robora cornu. (1-9)*

The mock solemnity becomes quite apparent when he introduces a bizarrely inappropriate simile: *si res ampla domi similisque adfectibus esset, / pinguior Hispulla traheretur taurus et ipsa / mole piger* (10-12).⁶³ The exaggerated nature of the poet's happiness and gratitude provides an appropriate prelude to the mock-epic account of Catullus' narrow escape. Juvenal's description would find a modern parallel in a not-too-convincing creation of a storm scene on a film-set, using a painted backdrop and flickering lights (indeed, the artificiality of it all is made plain when he remarks: *omnia fiunt / talia, tam graviter, si quando poetica surgit / tempestas*, 22-4):

nam praeter pelagi casus et fulminis ictus

⁶² Smith 1989:297. See also Ramage (1978:221-37), who treats the poem as a study of true and false friendship. Helmbold (1956:14-23) regards the poem as 'quite inferior' in its present form and as 'one of the strangest productions in Latin literature.'

⁶³ The obviously grossly obese Hispulla is possibly the same woman who is mocked for her infatuation with a tragedian at 6.74, although there is no suggestion there that she is very fat.

*evasit. densae caelum abscondere tenebrae
 nube una subitusque antemnas inpulit ignis,
 cum se quisque illo percussum crederet et mox
 attonitus nullum conferri posse putaret
 naufragium velis ardentibus. (17-22)*

The real point of the mocking hyperbole becomes clear with the characterization of Catullus. He represents a familiar type in Juvenal's array of satirical targets: the effete embodiment of *avaritia* and *luxuria*. Such traits are made clear from the nature of the goods which he is forced to throw overboard: *vestem / purpuream teneris quoque Maecenatibus aptam* (38-9) - a dig at his pampered and effeminate character;⁶⁴ *argentum* (43); *lances / Parthenio factas* (43-4); *urnae cratera capacem / et dignum sitiente Pholo vel coniuge Fusci* (44-5) - another example of typically Juvenalian bathos;⁶⁵ *bascaudas et mille escaria, multum / caelati, biberat quo callidus emptor Olynthi* (46-7). The notion of such a person being put in the predicament of choosing between his precious possessions and certain death was clearly a source of delicious amusement to Juvenal: the pain of jettisoning his valuables could be likened to that experienced by a beaver sacrificing its own testicles in order to escape with its life (34-6)! Juvenal's 'praise' for Catullus' sacrifice is clearly ironic, but it also serves as another indictment of avarice in general:

*sed quis nunc alius, qua mundi parte quis audet
 argento praeferre caput rebusque salutem?
 non propter vitam faciunt patrimonia quidam,
 sed vitio caeci propter patrimonia vivunt. (48-51)⁶⁶*

⁶⁴ Cf. the repulsive and wealthy forger in *Satire 1*, who is described as *multum referens de Maecenate supino* (66).

⁶⁵ One is reminded of the bibulous female at 6.425ff.

⁶⁶ The last two lines are rejected by some scholars as an interpolation intended to answer the preceding question; see discussion in Courtney 1980:523. Green (1998:199) and Ferguson (1979:290-1) see no compelling reason to question their authenticity. The conviction is certainly in keeping with Juvenal's attitude in *Satire 1* (e.g. 112-3).

After the 'epic' description of Catullus' deliverance (52-82), Juvenal resumes his ironically pious and elaborate preparations for the sacrifice of thanksgiving (*ite igitur, pueri, linguis animisque faventes* . . . , 83-92). Juvenal's suspiciously attentive behaviour is intended to serve as a dramatic device, facilitating a sudden shift of focus to an attack on greed of a particularly unscrupulous kind - *captatio*:

*neu suspecta tibi sint haec, Corvine, Catullus,
pro cuius reditu tot pono altaria, parvos
tres habet heredes. libet expectare quis aegram
et claudentem oculos gallinam inpendat amico
tam sterili; verum haec nimia est inpena, coturnix
nulla umquam pro patre cadet. sentire calorem
si coepit locuples Gallitta et Pacius orbi,
legitime fixis vestitur tota libellis
porticus, existunt qui promittant hecatomben . . . (93-101)*

As a particularly odious embodiment of greed and dishonesty and as a practice which strikes at the very heart of true *amicitia*, legacy-hunting features prominently in the *Satires*,⁶⁷ but here the theme is accorded special prominence. Earlier, Juvenal spoke contemptuously of those whose greed drove them to indulge in 'unnatural' and repulsive sexual activity: *[illi] qui testamenta merentur / noctibus, in caelum quos evehit optima summi / nunc via processus, vetulae vesica beatae* (1.37-9). In *Satire 12*, his contempt for the *captatores* is conveyed through the use of satirical hyperbole of the type used in his denunciation of women in *Satire 6*: these types would be prepared to lead elephants to the altar, if they could;⁶⁸ if need be, they would be willing to sacrifice

⁶⁷ 1.37-44; 3.128-130; 4.18-19; 5.97-98; 6.38-40; 10.202; 16.54-56. Ramage (1978:235) draws particular attention to the relationship between *captatio* and *amicitia* in *Satires* 5 and 12 and to the 'violent antithesis that Juvenal is trying to develop between his concept of friendship and the legacy-hunter's idea of what it should be.'

⁶⁸ The elaborate discussion of the elephant is probably intended to emphasize the strangeness and foreignness of the animal (*nec Latio aut usquam sub nostro sidere talis / belua concipitur*, 103-4, accentuated by its association with Hannibal and Pyrrhus), in order to make the behaviour of *captatores* like Pacuvius and Novius all the more reprehensible: *nulla igitur*

(*mactare*, 115) the tallest and most attractive of their slaves, or place sacrificial garlands (*vittas*, 118) around the heads of their young slave-boys and slave-girls; and, even worse, such an unscrupulous type would be willing to offer up his own daughter, *si qua est nubilis illi / Iphigenia domi* (118-9)!

Juvenal pretends to concede that legacy-hunting really *is* worthwhile (*laudo meum civem, nec comparo testamento / mille rates*, 121-2) and to wish Pacuvius prolonged good fortune (*vivat Pacuvius quaeso vel Nestora totum, possideat quantum rapuit Nero, montibus / aurum exaequet*, 128-9); but then comes the unpalatable truth about his invidious position in society: *nec amet quemquam nec ametur ab ullo* (130). The conviction that evil or disgraceful conduct ultimately rebounds on the guilty is a theme which Juvenal dwells on at greater length in *Satire 13*.

Recent discussion of the thirteenth *Satire* has tended to focus on the ironic or parodic treatment of several features of the typical *consolatio*. In this instance, the 'bereavement' and 'grief' of the addressee are satirically represented by Calvinus' financial loss (through fraud) and by his intense anger.⁶⁹ More importantly, the poem has been interpreted as a categorical rejection of the *indignatio* which characterizes Books 1 and 2:

In *Satire 13*, then, the new Democritean satirist expressly condemns anger and indignation as illegitimate means of dealing with evil. Calvinus, the victim of a perjurer, emerges before our eyes a fool, a hypocrite, and a vindictive, inhuman monster; and by the same token the indignant

mora per Novium, mora nulla per Histrum / Pacuvium, quin illud ebur ducatur ad aras . . . (111-2).

⁶⁹ See, especially, Anderson 1982:281-3, 350-6; Edmunds 1972:59-73; Morford 1973:26-36; and, most recently, Braund 1997:68-88.

satirist of Books 1 and 2 is implicitly condemned as inadequate to face this fallible world of ours.⁷⁰

However, while Calvinus certainly is ridiculed for his excessive reaction to the wrong done to him and for his naïveté,⁷¹ it is important to recognize that Juvenal does not condemn anger *per se*, but rather excessive anger. The cause of Calvinus' anger, as he stresses,⁷² is really trivial when compared to the enormity of other vices and crimes which beset humanity and calls for a measure of restraint on his part:

*quid sentire putas homines, Calvine, recenti
de scelere et fidei violatae crimine? sed nec
tam tenuis census tibi contigit, ut mediocris
iacturae te mergat onus, nec rara videmus
quae pateris: casus multis hic cognitus ac iam*

⁷⁰ Anderson 1982:355; cf. Braund 1997:68.

⁷¹ *stupet haec qui iam post terga reliquit / sexaginta annos Fonteio consule natus? / an nihil in melius tot rerum proficis usu? (16-18); dic, senior bulla dignissime . . . (33).*

⁷² This point is made on no fewer than five other occasions in the course of the poem:

*intercepta decem quereris sestertia fraude
sacilega. quid si bis centum perdidit alter
hoc arcana modo, maiorem tertius illa
summam, quam patulae vix ceperat angulus arcae? (71-4)*

*si nullum in terris tam detestabile factum
ostendis, taceo, nec pugnis caedere pectus
te veto nec plana faciem contundere palma . . . (126-8)*

*rem pateris modicam et mediocri bile ferendam,
si flectas oculos maiora ad crimina . . . (143-4)*

*humani generis mores tibi nosse volenti
sufficit una domus; paucos consume dies et
dicere te miserum, postquam illinc veneris, aude. (159-61)*

*nempe hoc indocti, quorum praecordia nullis
interdum aut levibus videas flagrantia causis;
[quantulacumque adeo est occasio sufficit irae.] (181-3)*
(Last line deleted by Heinrich)

*tritum et e medio Fortunae ductum acervo.
ponamus nimios gemitus. flagrantior aequo
non debet dolor esse viri nec vulnere maior. (5-12)*

The loss of ten thousand sesterces, one might venture to suggest, would hardly have warranted a mention in the context of Books 1 and 2; if Calvinus were the victim of crimes such as those catalogued in *those* poems, then he could justifiably give vent to *flagrans dolor* and more than *mediocris bilis*. However, Calvinus' over-reaction to the wrong that he has suffered and his naïveté not only form the basis of a mock-*consolatio*; they also serve the more important purpose of providing a platform for yet another attack on the vices which he has attacked with such obsessive fervour in earlier poems: the greed and shameless crookery which prevail in Roman society. The extent to which Juvenal dwells on these vices, in presenting Calvinus himself as a victim of his own *avaritia*, is a significant dimension of this *Satire*.⁷³ Immediately after his initial mockery of Calvinus' disproportionate sense of outrage, he reinforces his standpoint with a vigorous denunciation of contemporary greed and dishonesty, a picture very reminiscent of those vices portrayed in the first and third *Satires*.⁷⁴

*quae tam festa dies, ut cesset prodere furem,
perfidiam, fraudes atque omni ex crimine lucrum
quaesitum et partos gladio vel puxide nummos?
rari quippe boni - numera - vix sunt totidem quot
Thebarum portae vel divitis ostia Nili.*

⁷³ See Jones 1993:88: 'The purpose of the passage (126ff) is to suggest that greed is the paramount emotion and that this is the cause of Calvinus' lack of proportion.'

⁷⁴ On the supremacy of wealth and profit in Roman society, cf. 1.112-3: *quandoquidem inter nos sanctissima divitiarum / maiestas*; 3.137-41: *da testem Romae tam sanctum quam fuit hospes / numinis Idaei, procedat vel Numa vel qui / servavit trepidam flagranti ex aede Minervam: / protinus ad cenum, de moribus ultima fiet / quaestio*; on the brazen flouting of moral and religious scruples and their ineffectualness in curtailing dishonesty, cf 1.48: *quid enim salvis infamia nummis?*; 1.74-6: *probitas laudatur et alget; / criminibus debent hortos, praetoria, mensas, argentum vetus et stantem extra pocula caprum*.

*nona*⁷⁵ aetas agitur peioraque saecula ferri
 temporibus, quorum sceleri non invenit ipsa
 nomen et a nullo posuit natura metallo.
 nos hominum divomque fidem clamore ciemus
 quanto Faesidium laudat vocalis agentem
 sportula? dic, senior bulla dignissime, nescis
 quas habeat veneres aliena pecunia? nescis
 quem tua simplicitas risum vulgo moveat, cum
 exigis a quoquam ne peieret et putet ullis
 esse aliquod numen templis araeque rubenti? (23-37)

Juvenal has clearly not altered his pessimistic views on the extent of the greed and the blatant contempt for moral and religious scruples which prevail in Roman society.⁷⁶ What is new is his conviction that the perpetrators of such crimes do not escape punishment in the long run.⁷⁷ This is the central theme of the poem, stated at the outset:

*exemplo quodcumque malo committitur, ipsi
 displicet auctori. prima est haec ultio, quod se
 iudice nemo nocens absolvitur, improba quamvis
 gratia fallaci praetoris vicerit urna. (1-4)*

It is important to note that, despite his angry denunciation of vice in Books 1 and 2, Juvenal never suggests that revenge against wrongdoers is a realistic prospect for the

⁷⁵ On the significance of *nona*, see McGann 1968:509-14.

⁷⁶ These themes are kept in focus; e.g. 60-70; 75-6; 91-4; 100-5; 134; 144-60.

⁷⁷ Contrast this with the helplessness of the outraged victim or onlooker, as exemplified by the crooked and rapacious provincial governor at 1.48-50, who revels in his ill-gotten gains and his apparent immunity from punishment. On the theme of crime, vice and retribution in the *Satires* in general, see Frøelund 1981:155-68. Edmunds (1972:63-73), on the other hand, doubts that one should take seriously the suggestion that the force of conscience is so strong that the malefactor is really worse off than his victim.

victims of vice or for himself as a satirist.⁷⁸ At most, his 'revenge' consists in exposing those guilty of criminal or decadent behaviour, as implied by his extolling of both Lucilius and Horace for performing precisely that role:

*ense velut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens
infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens est
criminibus, tacita sudant praecordia culpa.
inde ira et lacrimae.* (1.165-8)

*haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna?
haec ego non agitem?* (1.51-2)

The guilty conscience is, in a sense, the ally of the satirist in exposing the wrongdoer and avenging the victim; and it is this satisfying conviction which Juvenal develops for the consolation of Calvinus in the thirteenth *Satire*.⁷⁹ It has already been pointed out that in the earlier Books Juvenal does not advocate personal vengeance, and in *Satire* 13 he openly criticizes revenge as a reprehensible female trait: *continuo sic collige, quod vindicta / nemo magis gaudet quam femina* (191-2) - an opinion corroborated, for example, by his portrait of the murderous Pontia in *Satire* 6.⁸⁰ How, then, does one reconcile this aversion to vengeance with his *positive* use of the term at the beginning

⁷⁸ Juvenal expresses a desire for 'revenge' against the tedious poets who bore him so at the beginning of *Satire* 1: *numquamne reponam . . . ? / inpune ergo mihi recitaverit ille togatas, / hic elegos? inpune diem consumpserit ingens / Telephus . . .* (1-4); but this can hardly be interpreted as a programmatic statement that he intends to exact retribution for all the wrongs perpetrated in Roman society. The realization that his role is a limited one is perhaps implied in the much-quoted passage: *si natura negat, facit indignatio versum / qualemcumque potest, quales ego vel Cluvienus* (1.79-80). Furthermore, there is the obvious point that Juvenal's express intention of targetting the dead (1.170-1) precludes any notion of revenge against the actual perpetrators of vice; instead, he holds an embarrassing mirror up to the ugly face of contemporary society.

⁷⁹ Cf. Jones 1993:83: 'It is clear that the rhetorical strategy of *Sat.* 13.192-249 is not to reduce Calvinus' desire for revenge, but to satisfy it.' Jones, however, argues that the hopes of indirect revenge are 'tenuous' and that, by 'purveying such palpably unbinding hopes he [the speaker] is playing on and revealing Calvinus' misplaced and obsessive values' (91).

⁸⁰ 6.637-42.

of the poem (*prima est haec ultio, quod se / iudice nemo nocens absolvitur*, 2-3)? The answer must lie in the distinction between *active* vengeance on the part of the victim (which Juvenal finds distasteful, if not impractical)⁸¹ and the notion of a vengeful *nemesis* inherent in the actions of the criminal (which he has come to see as an unfailing source of *consolatio*).

It would seem that the aggressiveness of the early poems has been tempered somewhat by an attitude of cynical resignation:

*ducimus autem
hos quoque felices, qui ferre incommoda vitae
nec iactare iugum vita didicere magistra. (20-2)*

But one should not ignore the probability that, in the context of his criticism of Calvinus' lack of perspective, *incommoda vitae* refer to trivial grievances. Nonetheless, Juvenal is now able to adopt a more philosophical outlook, sure in the knowledge that the wicked cannot ultimately escape the *nemesis* of a guilty conscience.⁸²

*cur tamen hos tu
evasisse putes, quos diri conscia facti
mens habet attonitos et surdo verbere caedit
occultum quatiente animo tortore flagellum?
poena autem vehemens ac multo saevior illis
quas et Caedicius gravis invenit et Rhadamanthus,
nocte dieque suum gestare in pectore testem. (192-8)*

⁸¹ In Calvinus' case, he makes it clear that the normal channel of restitution is no longer open to him: *improba quamvis / gratia fallaci praetoris vicerit urna* (3-4).

⁸² I agree with Courtney (1980:536), who states: 'The philosophers, whose consolations Juvenal had rejected at 19 sqq. and 120 sqq., here show a better way. This change of attitude seems to me to make it plain that Juvenal has altered his tone; the irony of the first half of the poem has given way to seriousness, and I regard it as mistaken to continue interpreting the second part in ironical terms.'

Juvenal's relishing of this *poena* . . . *multo saevior* and his vivid portrayal of the agony of a guilty conscience in lines 211-35⁸³ provide a forceful illustration of the opening words of this *Satire*.⁸⁴ The above passage is really the crux of the poem: ultimately we can feel vindicated by the mental, if not physical, torment of wrongdoers. Indeed, so reassuring is the conviction, that Juvenal insists that a person who merely contemplates a crime endures the guilt of the deed (*facti crimen habet*, 210) and that the criminal cannot even resort to religious piety to secure peace of mind (*pecudem spondere sacello / balantem et Laribus cristam promittere galli / non audent*, 232-4). Nor can salvation lie in reform, because sinners are inherently incapable of the latter (*tamen ad mores natura recurrit / damnatos fixa et mutari nescia*, 239-40). This belief, of course, is quite consistent with his fatalistic pronouncement in *Satire 1*: *nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat / posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores, / omne in praecipiti vitium stetit* (1.147-9).

⁸³ The intensity of the guilty party's mental anguish - like that of Lady Macbeth - is dramatically conveyed by physical actions, e.g.:

*perpetua anxietas nec mensae tempore cessat
faucibus ut morbo siccis interque molares
difficili crescente cibo, Setina misellus
expuir, Albani veteris pretiosa senectus
displicet; ostendas melius, densissima ruga
cogitur in frontem velut acri ducta Falemo.* (211-4)

*hi sunt qui trepidant et ad omnia fulgura pallent,
cum tonat, exanimes primo quoque murmure caeli,
non quasi fortuitus nec ventorum rabie sed
iratus cadat in terras et vindicet ignis.* (223-6)

⁸⁴ Braund (1997:77) sees a satirical motive here: 'It is as if he said. "If (my parody of a) conventional consolation doesn't help you, then I'll give you a *real* "consolation" of the type you want to hear, a "consolation" which satisfies you in its promise of punishment of vengeance"; and, in similar vein: 'By adopting his opponent's viewpoint, the speaker shows clearly how contemptible is the lust for vengeance' (79). However, this argument is negated by the fact that Juvenal introduces the theme of retribution in the first line of the poem; his detailed description of the mental suffering of the sinner for Calvinus' (and, no doubt, his own) satisfaction is simply an elaboration of this theme. Juvenal certainly does regard personal revenge as demeaning (see lines 189-92), but I am not persuaded that his professed satisfaction at the mental torment of wrongdoers is satirical hyperbole: there is a difference between exacting personal revenge and deriving satisfaction from the conviction that wrongdoers are fated to be punished through the agency of their guilty consciences. To give an analogy: a modern Christian might oppose capital punishment, yet still find solace in, or even relish, the 'certainty' of eternal damnation for a murderer.

Juvenal has clearly not altered his pessimistic and cynical view of the extent to which traditional Roman *mores* are being undermined by dishonesty and greed; however, he does now counterbalance the mood of pessimism which dominated the earlier poems by asserting that the guilty are ultimately doomed to fall prey to their own consciences and their incorrigible ways. If one harks back to the feelings of impotent rage created by the portraits of villains like Marius in *Satire 1*,⁸⁵ who behave with an air of arrogant impunity, then the conclusion to *Satire 13* represents a confident resolution of feelings of despair:

*quisnam hominum est quem tu contentum videris uno
flagitio? dabit in laqueum vestigia noster
perfidus et nigri patietur carceris uncum
aut maris Aegaei rupem scopulosque frequentes
exulibus magnis. poena gaudebis amara
nominis invisī tandemque fatebere laetus
nec Drusum nec Teresian quemquam esse deorum.* (243-9)

Again, the relishing of the thought that justice will ultimately be done is not to be seen as 'utterly inappropriate and grim joy',⁸⁶ nor is the attitude here a contradiction of that expressed in lines 181-92, where he accuses the *indocti* of excessive anger (*praecordia . . . flagrantia*) in the face of trivial provocation (*levibus . . . causis*), provided one makes the crucial distinction between personal vengeance wreaked by the injured party and punishment effected, inevitably, by a guilty conscience and habitual criminality.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ 1.48-50.

⁸⁶ Braund 1997:83. Juvenal's opinion of the bestial Egyptians in *Satire 15* betrays no aversion to harsh punishment, where he believes it is deserved: *nec poenam sceleri invenies nec digna parabis / supplicia his populis . . .* (15.129-30)

⁸⁷ Cf. Courtney (1980:560), who 'cannot see that there is any contradiction: 181sq. . . deal with the infliction of punishment by the injured party personally, whereas here the fact that punishment is not inflicted by him but comes nevertheless is a proof that after all there is justice in the world and therefore a cause for rejoicing.'

It is not necessary to attribute Juvenal's standpoint in *Satire* 13 to a new and artificially contrived *persona*. His calmer and more rational outlook can be ascribed to factors related to his own observation and experience. First, criminality and decadence seem to have reached a level where society itself is incapable of effecting a change for the better.⁸⁸ Second, in Juvenal's view, the gods are ineffectual and humans' piety is mere lip-service.⁸⁹ By implication, therefore, it is human beings who are ultimately responsible for morality; hence the emphasis, in *Satire* 13, on the lessons of experience.⁹⁰ The development of a more philosophical and contemplative dimension to Juvenal's writing is not necessarily a calculated pose, but is quite plausible in one who has clearly found fulfilment in a more 'Epicurean' outlook. It would not be fanciful to believe that Juvenal's more overt emphasis on *tranquillitas* and *simplicitas* could also have stemmed, to some extent, from an actual improvement in his financial circumstances. Slight as the

⁸⁸ A consistent conviction: *nona aetas agitur peioraque saecula ferri / temporibus, quorum sceleri non invenit ipsa / nomen et a nullo posuit natura metallo* (13.28-30); cf. 1.87; 147-9.

⁸⁹ *tam facile et primum est superos contemnere testes,
si mortalis idem nemo sciat. aspice quanta
voce neget, quae sit ficti constantia vultus.
per Solis radios Tarpeiaque fulmina iurat
et Martis frameam et Cirrhaei spicula vatis,
per calamos venatricis pharetramque puellae
perque tuum, pater Aegaei Neptune, tridentem,
addit et Herculeos arcus hastamque Minervae,
quidquid habent telorum armamentaria caeli.* (75-83)

*'decernat quodcumque volet de corpore nostro
Isis et irato feriat mea lumina sistro,
dummodo vel caecus teneam quos abnego nummos . . .
...ut sit magna, tamen certe lenta ira deorum est.* (92-4; 100)

*sic animum dirae trepidum formidine culpae
confirmat, tunc te sacra ad delubra vocantem
praecedat, trahere immo ultro ac vexare paratus.
nam cum magna malae superest audacia causae,
creditur a multis fiducia. mimum agit ille, . . .* (106-10)

The apparent impotence of the gods is also implicit in the description of acts of sacrilege in lines 147-53. Also pertinent is the imaginary mockery of Jupiter's ineffectualness in lines 113-9, which is very reminiscent of his berating of Mars in *Satire* 2 (lines 126-32)

⁹⁰ E.g. 18-22; 120-5.

evidence may be, the details which he furnishes about his farm at Tibur suggest a life of relative contentment;⁹¹ and it is worth noting, as Highet has pointed out, that 'in his latest satires he speaks more warmly than before of the generous impulses of friendship.'⁹² It is, of course, unfortunate that Juvenal does not give a clear indication that this property was acquired at a relatively late stage of his life or whether it was thanks to inheritance or to an unusually generous act of patronage.⁹³ Nevertheless, some indication that the acquisition of this property marked a belated improvement in Juvenal's circumstances is not entirely lacking: it would appear from *Satire 3* that at an earlier stage of his life he had to go as far as Aquinum to escape the pressures of urban life - which he might not have done, had he already owned his estate at nearby Tibur.⁹⁴

The very fact that Juvenal focuses so frequently on greed and other vices in this poem shows that he has not forsaken the role which he projects in *Satire 1*. If he has made any conscious alteration in his satirical role or technique, it is his development of a 'philosophical' rationale to counteract the apparent ineffectualness of *indignatio* as a means of retribution.⁹⁵ To seek solace in the belief that the perpetrators of crimes cannot, in the long run, escape just punishment may constitute a change in outlook; but such a change can occur for reasons other than a desire to fashion a new literary *persona*.

⁹¹ The farm could supply sufficient produce (11.65-76); it was staffed by a foreman and his wife (11.69), a herder of sheep and goats (11.151; 66; 153) and a cowherd; all of whom lived on the farm (11.151-3). In addition, the sons of these workers were employed in Juvenal's town house in Rome (11.151).

⁹² Highet (1954:17) cites *Sat.* 12.10-6, 93-5, 128-30; *Sat.* 13; *Sat.* 15.140-58.

⁹³ Possibly the former, in view of his mention of *nostrum . . . lovem Laribusque paternis* (12.89).

⁹⁴ 3.318-22.

⁹⁵ The notion of escape or flight, as found at the beginning of *Satires 2* and *3*, is a recognition of that.

Satire 14, despite its positive advice on the upbringing of children, is given its main impetus by Juvenal's preoccupation with the vice of *avaritia*.⁹⁶ At the same time, the didactic purpose of the poem clearly springs from the poet's love of children, a trait which Highet, with good reason, describes as 'genuine'.⁹⁷ Juvenal's predilection for dwelling on the negative, even when the theme is ostensibly positive (as illustrated by his treatise on the nature of true *virtus* in *Satire* 8), is evident from the outset, with an indictment of irresponsible parents:⁹⁸

plurima sunt, Fuscine, et fama digna sinistra
*[et quod maiorum vitia sequiturque minores]*⁹⁹
et nitidis maculam haesuram figentia rebus,
quae monstrant ipsi pueris traduntque parentes. (1-3)

It is also typical that Juvenal should immediately illustrate the point with portraits of gamblers and gluttons, figures which feature prominently in the tableaux of decadence in *Satire* 1, especially. Even the military metaphor is familiar; so, too, the disgust at the thought of a gluttonous geriatric, an attitude which harmonizes well with the extolling of the simple lifestyle in *Satire* 11.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ On echoes of Martial in this *Satire*, see Colton 1977:234-46.

⁹⁷ Highet (1954:145) points out that 'the proof that it is genuine is that it forces its way into his poetry against his will', citing as an example the fact that Juvenal makes even the odious Virro in *Satire* 5 (137-45) capable of tenderness towards children, 'at the cost of breaking the consistency of his character-sketch'. Juvenal's interest in children and their welfare is also attested at 3.175-6; 6.629-42; 7.187-8; 11.152-5; and 15.134-40.

⁹⁸ Cf. 7.187-8: *res nulla minoris / constabit patri quam filius*.

⁹⁹ Omitted by PFU; deleted by Calderinus; see Ferguson 1979:305.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. 1.91-2: *proelia quanta illic dispensatore videbis / armigero*; and, at 8.9-12, the perversion of manliness is similarly emphasised: *effigies quo / tot bellatorum, si luditur alea pernox / ante Numantinos*. The image of 'gray-haired voracity' is reminiscent of, and even more repellent than, the portrayals of the elderly glutton at 1.94-5 and 1.139-45 (note the use of *gula* in the latter passage as well), while the description of the luxurious fare is reminiscent of Virro's feast in *Satire* 5.

*si damnosa senem iuvat alea, ludit et heres
 bullatus parvoque eadem movet arma fritillo.
 nec melius de se cuiquam sperare propinquo
 concedet iuvenis, qui radere tubera terrae,
 boletum condire et eodem iure natantis
 mergere ficedulas didicit nebulone parente
 et cana monstrante gula. (4-10)*

Also consistent are his aversion to cruelty and his empathy with the lot of the slave;¹⁰¹ while the reference to the fostering of a gentle disposition in a child and restraint in the face of minor transgressions echoes exactly his attitude towards Calvinus' excessive anger in *Satire 13*:

*mitem animum et mores modicis erroribus aequos
 praecipit atque animas servorum et corpora nostra
 materia constare putat paribusque elementis,
 an saevire docet Rutilus, qui gaudet acerbo
 plagarum strepitu et nullam Sirena flagellis
 conparat, Antiphates trepidi laris ac Polyphemus,
 tunc felix, quotiens aliquis tortore vocato
 uritur ardenti duo propter lintea ferro? (15-22)*

The third example of parental decadence, adulterous sexual promiscuity, is also one that is given particular prominence in the earlier poems. The shocking way in which the corruption of innocence is presented here is another good example of Juvenalian *indignatio*; indeed, the notion of a daughter being able to 'rattle off' the names of her mother's lovers would have been well-suited to the context of *Satire 6*:

*rusticus expectas ut non sit adultera Largae
 filia, quae numquam maternos dicere moechos*

¹⁰¹ Cf. 1.92-3; 6.219-23 and 486ff; 13.126-7.

*tam cito nec tanto poterit contexere cursu
ut non ter deciens respiret? conscia matri
virgo fuit, ceras nunc hac dictante pusillas
implet et ad moechum dat eisdem ferre cinaedis.* (25-30)

In *Satire 1*, it suited Juvenal's mood and purpose to make a gloomy pronouncement about moral degeneracy in Roman society: *nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat / posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores, / omne in praecipiti vitium stetit* (1.147-9). There is nothing in *Satire 14* to suggest that he has revised his views about the extent of moral corruption or about the proclivity of the younger generation towards vice;¹⁰² and the injunction to parents to be positive role-models¹⁰³ does not serve, ultimately, to offset the pessimistic portrayal of Roman vices which increasingly dominates this poem (a similar pattern is observable in *Satire 8*, where what purports to be an exposition of the nature of true *virtus* is predominantly an attack on decadence

¹⁰² *sic natura iubet: velocius et citius nos
corrumpunt vitiorum exempla domestica, magnis
cum subeant animos auctoribus. unus et alter
forsitan haec spernant iuvenes, quibus arte benigna
et meliore luto finxit praecordia Titan,
sed reliquos fugienda patrum vestigia ducunt
et monstrata diu vetens trahit orbita culpa.* (31-7)

¹⁰³ *abstineas igitur damnandis. huius enim vel
una potens ratio est, ne crimina nostra sequantur
ex nobis geniti, quoniam dociles imitandis
turpibus ac pravis omnes sumus, et Catilinam
quocumque in populo videas, quocumque sub axe,
sed nec Brutus erit Bruti nec avunculus usquam.
nil dictu foedum visuque haec limina tangat
intra quae pater est. procul, a procul inde puellae
lenonum et cantus pernociantis parasiti.
maxima debetur puero reverentia, si quid
turpe paras, nec tu pueri contempseris annos,
sed peccaturo obstet tibi filius infans.* (38-49)

Even in this ostensibly positive passage, Juvenal still manages to harp on the dearth of admirable role models in contemporary society.

and vice).¹⁰⁴ There is no reason to doubt that Juvenal is serious when he says *maxima debetur puero reverentia* (47),¹⁰⁵ but it is significant that, after the emphasis on the importance of sound parental guidance in lines 38-85,¹⁰⁶ the poem not only dispenses with positive precepts, but develops into another single-minded attack on *luxuria* and *avaritia*. Once again, we are made to feel that we are *still* in the company of that satirist who, in Book 1, inveighed against such vices so fervently and picturesquely. His portrayal of megalomaniac extravagance has several characteristic touches: the use of foreign marble to 'taint' the wholesome integrity of places like Tibur and Praeneste; the insinuation of *hubris* on the part of the builder; and the sneer at the eunuch Posides, who (to make matters worse) was an ex-slave and one of those immigrant upstarts who caused Umbricius to complain, *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem* (3.60-1):¹⁰⁷

*aedificator erat Caetronius et modo curvo
litore Caietae, summa nunc Tiburis arce,
nunc Praenestinis in montibus alta parabat
culmina villarum Graecis longeque petitis
marmoribus vincens Fortunae atque Herculis aedem,*

¹⁰⁴ Stein (1970:34) sees the poem as 'a statement of Juvenal's traditionalism and comprehensive pessimism' rather than as 'a catalogue of Rome's vices, with particular emphasis on *avaritia*.'

¹⁰⁵ Cf. the importance which he attaches to education at 7.207-10.

¹⁰⁶ Corn (1992:314) maintains that the analogy between rôles of humans and birds in the inculcation of habits in their young (73-85) is intended to be ironic: 'the placement of such supposedly important thoughts next to vultures eating carrion is laughable.' There would perhaps be some merit in this argument if this were the only comparison; however, Juvenal stresses the validity of the precept *sic natura iubet* (31) by describing three species of birds, each of which teaches its young to hunt or scavenge for its natural food. It is perhaps also worth reflecting on the possibility that Juvenal's Roman audience might have been less shocked than we would be by the notion of carrion birds circling the corpses of crucified victims.

¹⁰⁷ The spoiling of these Italian towns by 'high-rise' buildings clad in imported marble is reminiscent of the desecration of the *ingenuum* . . . *tofum* of Egeria's spring at 3.20; on Juvenal's aversion to luxurious and foreign building materials, see also 7.182; 11.175. Posides was the freedman of Claudius (Suet. *Claud.* 28) and, according to Pliny (*NH* 31.2.5), built a set of baths at Baiae. It would seem that he was also well-known for his mansion at Rome.

ut spado vincebat Capitolia nostra Posides. (86-91)

The last line provides further proof that one does need always to resort to Books 1 and 2 for examples of *indignatio*! And this sneer at a foreign interloper is followed by another, almost gratuitous, outburst against the Jews - a caricature of Jewish religious and social customs which foreshadows the derisive portrayal of Egyptian beliefs and dietary practices in *Satire 15*.¹⁰⁸ The whole passage is a clever corroboration of the significance of the paternal role, but one cannot help feeling that this takes second place to Juvenal's indulgence of his anti-Semitic prejudices:¹⁰⁹

*quidam sortiti metuentem sabbata patrem
nil praeter nubes et caeli numen adorant,
nec distare putant humana carne suillam,
qua pater abstinuit, mox et praeputia ponunt;
Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges
ludaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt ius,
tradidit arcano quodcumque volumine Moyses:
non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.
sed pater in causa, cui septima quaeque fuit lux
ignava et partem vitae non attigit ullam. (96-106)*

Juvenal now turns to the dominant theme of greed and miserliness, both of which reflect especially badly on parents, because they are the only vices which children are inherently reluctant (*inviti*, -108) to practise; and, of course, the fact that they are *taught* focuses attention squarely on the role of the parent.¹¹⁰ The rest of the poem, which

¹⁰⁸ Juvenal's contempt for the Greeks is also expressed, yet again, in an aside in line 240: *si Graecia vera*.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. *Sat.* 3.13-6; *Sat.* 6.159-60; 541-7; *Sat.* 8.160.

¹¹⁰ The key role of the parent is emphasized in lines 75-85 by a persuasive analogy with the way in which various birds teach their offspring about their natural prey. O'Neill (1960:251)

catalogues the destructive effects of these traits, is a renewed attack on a vice which was given particular prominence in *Satire 1*;¹¹¹ and the fundamentally corruptive influence of *avaritia* is emphasised in lines 173-8:

*inde fere scelerum causae, nec plura venena
miscuit aut ferro grassatur saepius ullum
humanae mentis vitium quam saeva cupido
immodici census. nam dives qui fieri volt,
et cito volt fieri; sed quae reverentia legum,
quis metus aut pudor est umquam properantis avari?*

This vice is especially reprehensible, because it usually embodies an element of hypocrisy, a trait which Juvenal found so repellent in the case of the bogus moralists in *Satire 2* and which he portrays here in a remarkably similar manner:¹¹²

*fallit enim vitium specie virtutis et umbra,
cum sit triste habitu vultuque et veste severum,
nec dubie tamquam frugi laudetur avarus,
tamquam parcus homo et rerum tutela suarum
certa magis quam si fortunas servet easdem
Hesperidum serpens aut Ponticus. (109-14)*

points out that the word *iubentur* (108) links this section of the poem with the theme of parental influence introduced in lines 1-3 and that 'we are reminded of it from time to time, for instance at 119ff., 191ff., 210ff., 235ff. and also at 208-9, unless these last verses are interpolated.'

¹¹¹ The symbiosis of greed and miserliness is seen at 1.92-5 (*simplexne furor sestertia centum / perdere et horrenti tunicam non reddere servo? / quis totidem erexit villas, quis fercula septem / secreto cenavit avus?*) and at 1.139-40 (*sed quis ferat istas / luxuriae sordes?*) The illustration of the gradual process by which meanness is inculcated (*sunt quaedam vitiorum elementa*, 123) echoes an earlier statement to that effect: *nemo repente fuit turpissimus* (2.83).

¹¹² Cf. 2.1-15, especially the paradoxical *tristibus obscenis*. Hypocrisy and pretence are illustrated earlier in *Satire 14* (lines 59-69), where a father is more concerned that his house should appear spotless in the eyes of a guest than that it should be *sanctam . . . omni . . . sine labe . . . vitioque carentem* for the benefit of his own son.

This portrait of meanness is developed with vivid hyperbole, the description of the stale scraps which the miser cannot bring himself to discard being reminiscent of that of the disgusting fare served up to Trebius in *Satire 5*; ¹¹³ and attention is drawn once again to the familiar relationship between greed and criminal dishonesty (*dicere vix possis quam multi talia plorent / et quot venales iniuria fecerit agros*, 150-1) and to the absence of any sense of guilt on the part of those who fraudulently enrich themselves (*sed qui sermones, quam foeda bucina famae! / 'quid nocet haec?' inquit . . .*, 152-3).

Contemporary greed for land-ownership is accentuated by comparison with the laudably modest expectations of the veterans of the wars against Carthage and Pyrrhus, who were happy to receive *vix iugera bina* (163), despite their hardships (*pro multis . . . vulneribus*, 163-4); and their contentment with their tiny allotments and simple lifestyle is illustrated by the following cameo:

*saturabat glebula talis
patrem ipsum turbamque casae, qua feta iacebat
uxor et infantes ludebant quattuor, unus
vernula, tres domini; sed magnis fratribus horum
a scrobe vel sulco redeuntibus altera cena
amplior et grandes fumabant pultibus ollae.
nunc modus hic agri nostro non sufficit horto. (166-72)*

¹¹³

*servorum ventres modio castigat iniquo
ipse quoque esuriens, neque enim omnia sustinet umquam
mucida caerulei panis consumere frusta,
hesternum solitus medio servare minutal
Septembri nec non differre in tempora cenae
alterius conchem aestivam cum parte lacerti
signatam vel dimidio putrique siluro
filaque sectivi numerata includere porri.
invitatus ad haec aliquis de ponte negabit. (126-34)*

This is obviously an idealized portrayal, but it would be wrong to allow modern fastidiousness to suggest a satirical or debunking motive on Juvenal's part.¹¹⁴ The effect intended here would seem to differ little from that created by the description of Curius in *Satire 11*: *Curius parvo quae legerat horto / ipse focus brevibus ponebat holuscula* (11.78-9). One would be hard pressed to explain why Juvenal should have wanted this analogy with his own simple fare to have been interpreted in an ironical way.¹¹⁵ Furthermore, it was argued earlier¹¹⁶ that his description of the hardy *montana uxor* in *Satire 6* should not be interpreted as an ironic caricature, but rather as a means of contrasting the primitive robustness and chastity of women in the age of Saturn with the effeteness and moral laxity of Roman women in more contemporary periods. In *Satire 14*, the pregnant wife and the four infants who play about her in the crowded cottage conjure up a very similar image of primitive, but homely, simplicity.¹¹⁷ The intention of Juvenal's idealized portrayal of life in the distant past invites comparison with Lucretius' positive description of the 'earth-born generation', which could find contentment in the simplest of lifestyles.¹¹⁸

Reverting to the theme of the father's role in instilling the right values into his sons, Juvenal contrasts a Hernican, Vestinian or Marsian father, who exhorts his sons to be content with a life of hardy simplicity,¹¹⁹ with his ambitious modern counterpart, who is intent on inculcating the profit motive in his child. This vignette reflects several typically Juvenalian prejudices. The simple countryman's conviction that foreign Tyrian purple

¹¹⁴ See, for example, Winkler 1983:43-6; Corn 1992:314.

¹¹⁵ A case in point is the use of diminutives in both descriptions: if *holuscula* can be used without satiric intent in Curius' case, why should *glebula* necessarily stress 'the satiric point' (Winkler 1983:44) in *Satire 14*?

¹¹⁶ See above, pp.

¹¹⁷ The child-bearing capacity of the woman (*feta*) is a positive attribute; contrast Juvenal's contempt for the upper-class women who shun their natural role (6.594).

¹¹⁸ *De Rerum Natura* 5.925ff. Juvenal's *contingunt homini veteris fastidia quercus* (184) echoes Lucretius' *sic odium coepit glandis* (5.1416).

¹¹⁹ '*vivite contenti casulis et collibus istis, / o pueri*' . . . / . . . '*panem quaeramus aratro, / qui satis est mensis*' (179-82).

is the embodiment of *scelus atque nefas* (188) has much in common with Juvenal's depiction of it as a symbol of foreign *luxuria* and something tainted by its current association with despicable characters like Crispinus.¹²⁰ Juvenal's contempt for grasping lawyers, like the corpulent Matho in *Satire 1*,¹²¹ is evident in the father's equating of the profession with a military career or any 'low' trade as a means of becoming rich, and his sneering attitude towards those who voluntarily try their hand at anything for profit has not changed since *Satire 3*.¹²²

*aut vitem posce libello,
sed caput intactum buxo narisque pilosas
adnotet et grandes miretur Laelius alas;
dirue Maurorum attegias, castella Brigantum
ut locupletem aquilam tibi sexagesimus annus
adferat; aut, longos castrorum ferre labores
si piget et trepidum solvunt tibi cornua ventrem
cum lituis audita, pares quod vendere possis
pluris dimidio, nec te fastidia mercis
ullius subeant ablegandae Tiberim ultra,
neu credas ponendum aliquid discriminis inter
unguenta et corium: lucri bonus est odor ex re
qualibet. illa tuo sententia semper in ore
versetur dis atque ipso love digna poeta:
"unde habeas quaerit nemo, sed oportet habere." (193-207)*

¹²⁰ 1.26-7 (*vena Canopi / Crispinus Tyrias umero revocante lacemas*); 6.246 (*endromidas Tyrias*); 7.134 (*spondet enim Tyrio stlattia purpura filo*); cf. Lucretius' comments on the luxury of purple garments (5.1423).

¹²¹ 1.30-3; cf. 7.106-12.

¹²² 3.29-40. Such entrepreneurs are rather different from the indigent poets in *Satire 7*, whose poverty compels them to engage in menial occupations.

From this point onwards, Juvenal intensifies his attack on *avaritia* and his mood becomes as cynical and pessimistic as it was in *Satire 1*. There he insisted *nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat / posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores* (1.147-8); now he gives the eager father the sarcastic assurance:

‘dic, o vanissime, quis te
festinare iubet? meliorem praesto magistro
discipulum. securus abi: vinceris, ut Ajax
praeteriit Telamonem, ut Pelea vicit Achilles.
parcendum est teneris; nondum implevere medullas
maturae mala nequitiae. (211-16)¹²³

As soon as his protégé sports a beard, he will be committing types of crimes worthy of inclusion in the catalogue of criminals in *Satire 1*.¹²⁴

*falsus erit testis, vendet periuria summa
exigua et Cereris tangens aramque pedemque.
elatam iam crede nurum, si limina vestra
mortifera cum dote subit. quibus illa premetur
per somnum digitis! nam quae terraque marique
adquirenda putas brevior via conferet illi;
nullus enim magni sceleris labor. (218-24)*

¹²³ The pessimistic prediction is reinforced a few lines later with several striking metaphors (see note 125).

¹²⁴ The subject matter of this passage invites comparison with the crimes described at 1.75-8 and would have made an equally effective precursor to the pronouncement: *si natura negat, facit indignatio versum* (1.79). Not surprisingly, attention is also drawn to the plight of the most prominent victims of *avaritia* in the earlier poems: *cum dicis iuveni stultum qui donet amico* (235).

As if such crimes are not shocking enough, the deadly consequences of inculcating *avaritia* in the young are illustrated by a series of metaphors¹²⁵ which culminate in some grimly humorous advice to the imperilled father. The murder of kin (as emphasized in Book 1),¹²⁶ is made all the more heinous when it is accomplished through poisoning:

*iam nunc obstas et vota moraris,
iam torquet iuvenem longa et cervina senectus.
ocius Archigenen quaere atque eme quod Mithridates
composuit: si vis aliam decerpere ficum
atque alias tractare rosas, medicamen habendum est,
sorbere ante cibum quod debeat et pater et rex. (250-5)*

Having shown the potential of greed to prompt the worst of crimes, Juvenal turns from the theme of parental responsibility to demonstrate the stupidity of those who willingly undergo danger and discomfort in their quest for wealth. These are not wicked people, but fools, and this section of the poem (like *Satire 10*, as a whole) accordingly invites a more detached and mocking stance:

*monstro voluptatem egregiam, cui nulla theatra,
nulla aequare queas praetoris pulpita lauti,
si spectes quanto capitis discrimine constant
incrementa domus . . . (256-9)
tanto maiores humana negotia ludi (264).*

Juvenal's scorn is reserved for those who hanker after profits which they do not actually need (*tu propter mille talenta / et centum villas temerarius*, 274-5) and who willingly face the hazards of sailing to achieve that end; their behaviour is symptomatic of *furor* (284).

¹²⁵ The delinquent son is likened to a reckless charioteer (*quem si revoces, subsistere nescit / et te contempto rapitur metisque relictis*, 231-2); to a raging fire (*ergo ignem, cuius scintillas ipse dedisti, / flagrantem late et rapientem cuncta videbis*, 244-5); and to a lion which turns on his trainer (*trepidumque magistrum / in cavea magno fremitu leo tollet alumnus*, 246-7).

¹²⁶ 1.69-72; 6.610-42.

The risk that a tightrope-walker takes is at least justifiable: *victum illa mercede parat, brumamque famemque / illa reste cavet* (273-4). Juvenal's characteristic sarcasm is again evident in his portrayal of the avaricious sea-trader as a *perditus ac vilis sacci mercator olentis / qui gaudes pingue antiquae de litore Cretae / passum et municipales Iovis advexisse lagonas . . .* (269-71),¹²⁷ and in his belittling description of the merchant's ultimate reward as *concisum argentum in titulos faciesque minutas* (291). Also striking is the cleverly ironic conclusion to the account of the forlorn and wretched merchant, who now depends for his survival on a painting of the very storm which dashed his hopes:

*sed cuius votis modo non suffecerat aurum
quod Tagus et rutila voluit Pactolus harena,
frigida sufficient velantes inguina panni
exiguusque cibus, mersa rate naufragus assem
dum rogat et picta se tempestate tuetur.* (298-302)

Yet the dangers of *avaritia* are not confined to the quest for wealth: *misera est magni custodia census* (304). With a typically stark contrast between the nervousness and restlessness of Licinus, who is frantic about the threat of fire to his fine possessions, and the contentment and equanimity of Diogenes, who is quite satisfied with his non-combustible jar, Juvenal makes a strong case for the advantages of moderation:

*sensit Alexander, testa cum vidit in illa
magnum habitorem, quanto felicior hic qui
nil cuperet quam qui totum sibi posceret orbem
passurus gestis aequanda pericula rebus.* (311-4)¹²⁸

¹²⁷ A jibe almost as contemptuous as the description of Crispinus in *Satire 4*: *magna qui voce solebat / vendere municipales fracta de merce siluros* (4.32-3). Schreiber suggests *acquirens* for *ac vilis*.

¹²⁸ Cf. Seneca (*Ben.* 5.4.4) on Diogenes: *multo potentior, multo lucupletior fuit omnia tunc possidente Alexandro*.

This section of the poem invites comparison with Horace's urging of the importance of the principle of moderation in *Sermones* 1.1. Yet, as conventional as this theme might be, there is no reason to doubt that a strong element of personal conviction lies behind it. The philosophical standpoint is, after all, quite consistent with that advocated in *Satire* 11. Furthermore, it has already been argued above that this Epicurean outlook could well have been shaped by Juvenal's own changed circumstances at the time that he wrote this Book. While both poems differ significantly from those in Books 1 and 2, in that they incorporate *positive* advice, they are nevertheless unmistakable products of Juvenal's deep-seated abhorrence of *avaritia* and *luxuria* in all their manifestations. The attack on greed in *Satire* 14 is characterized not only by a good deal of biting satire but also by an overriding pessimism, which is given pointed expression in the answer to the question: *mensura tamen quae / sufficiat census, si quis me consulat, edam* (316-7).¹²⁹ The ideal (*in quantum sitis atque fames et frigora poscunt*, 318) is patently unviable in the contemporary Roman context; and the disdainful concession, *misce / ergo aliquid nostris de moribus* (322-3), is followed by examples of rampant greed for the addressee to aspire to:

*effice summam
bis septem ordinibus quam lex dignatur Othonis.
haec quoque si rugam trahit extenditque labellum,
sume duos equites, fac tertia quadringenta.
si nondum implevi gremium, si panditur ultra,
nec Croesi fortuna umquam nec Persica regna
sufficient animo nec divitiae Narcissi,
indulsit Caesar cui Claudius omnia, cuius
paruit imperiis uxorem occidere iussus. (323-31)*

This is a skillfully contrived indictment of a society whose upper and middle echelons are permeated by greed. Juvenal's cynical attitude towards the equestrian *census* is

¹²⁹ This is somewhat reminiscent of the preface to the flurry of shocking *exempla* in *Satire* 1: *si vacat ac placidi rationem admittitis, edam* (1.21).

again brought to the fore by its specific association with Otho's legislation concerning the seating arrangements in the theatre. His cynicism no doubt stems not only from the indignity of seeing low-born upstarts 'usurping' the best seats in the theatre (a point vividly expressed in *Satire 3*)¹³⁰, but also from the fact that the law was promulgated by a grotesque effeminate.¹³¹ Yet, Juvenal suggests, even the prized equestrian census is not enough nowadays: not even two or three times that amount, or even the fabulous wealth of Croesus or Persia, will satisfy the rapacity of the Roman who frowns and pouts at the prospect of a mere 400,000 sesterces. However, this flight of fantasy suddenly acquires a particular relevance for contemporary Rome, when a recent and notorious instance of *avaritia*¹³² is once again associated with criminal wickedness. This example makes a particularly cogent conclusion to the poem, for the corruptive potential of greed, which was stressed earlier in the poem,¹³³ is seen at work in the highest echelon of Roman society; and it is all the more shocking in that the agent of destruction was a Greek upstart of servile origin.¹³⁴

130

"exeat" inquit,
*"si pudor est, et de pulvino surgat equestri,
 cuius res legi non sufficit, et sedeant hic
 lenonum pueri quocumque ex fornice nati,
 hic plaudat nitidus praeconis filius inter
 pinnirapi cultos iuvenes iuvenesque lanistae."
 sic libitum vano, qui nos distinxit, Othoni.* (3.153-9)

Cf. the freedman from the Euphrates, complete with perforated ear-lobes, whose *quinque tabernae / quadringenta parant* (1.105-6).

¹³¹ 2.99-103. For Otho's alleged homosexual relations with Nero, see Suet. *Otho* 2 and Martial *Ep.* 6.32.2.

¹³² Narcissus' fortune was reputed to have been a hundred times larger than the equestrian *census* (Suet. *Claudius* 28; Pliny *NH* 33.47.134).

¹³³ 173-6; cf. 1.48; 75-6; 112-4.

¹³⁴ In a way, a grimly real illustration of Umbricius' sneer at 3.71-2: *Esquilias dictumque petunt a vimine collem, / viscera magnarum domuum dominique futuri.*

CHAPTER 8

Blowing on the Embers:

Juvenal and the Egyptians in *Satire* 15

In his discussion of Juvenal's fifteenth *Satire*, entitled 'Philosophers and Cannibals', Richard McKim observes that the poem 'has traditionally been an object of distaste and neglect.'¹ He describes the tirade against the Egyptians as 'a tissue of hysterical racism, stupid morbidity, and smug self-congratulation' and concludes that 'on the traditional assumption of identity between the *Satire*'s first-person bigot and its author, it seems merely another unpleasant document in the history of bigotry.' McKim endeavours to give a more palatable interpretation of the *Satire*'s purpose, and scope for this is provided by the dichotomy which the *persona* theory postulates between the author and his 'speaker'. Rejecting the assumption that Juvenal is giving expression to his own views, he suggests that Juvenal is presenting the character of his 'speaker' to the reader for critical inspection and that his intention is to direct the reader's scorn 'not against the Egyptians whom his speaker is attacking but against the speaker himself for his delusion that Roman society is superior.'²

As noted in Chapter 1, the concept of a violently indignant speaker designed to arouse the scorn or antipathy of the audience has been accorded particular importance in the sphere of Juvenal's *Satires* by W.S. Anderson,³ who sees this as the solution to the

¹ McKim 1986:58. McKim also draws attention to samples of the negative verdicts on the poem in Scobie 1973:53-63.

² McKim 1986:59.

³ See Anderson 1982:9.

problem of Juvenal's 'sincerity': by maintaining a distinction between Juvenal and the 'speaker' he creates for the *Satires*, we can call the speaker genuinely indignant, 'but we must also add that Juvenal has so portrayed him that his prejudices and exaggerations are unacceptable, and for sound poetic reasons.'⁴ By way of example, Anderson points to Juvenal's universal denunciation of women in the sixth *Satire* and maintains that 'reading or listening to such ranting, the Roman audience recognised the untruth and reinterpreted the described situations, stimulated by the *Satires*, more accurately.' More recently Anderson himself has interpreted the fifteenth *Satire* along such lines:

I have tried to show that the satirical speaker in this poem acquires a definitive character in the course of his ranting speech, a character so bigoted, racist and extremist Roman (to say nothing about its inaccuracy or dishonesty with historical facts), that he alienates his audience.⁵

This represents a modification of Anderson's earlier opinion that 'while he utterly condemns Egypt, he preaches a positive creed that he expects to win favorable hearing among his Roman audience, exempt from such vice.'⁶ S.G. Fredericks, influenced by the latter interpretation, maintained that Juvenal, going beyond the incident of Egyptian cannibalism, was generalising his attack against the practice: 'cannibalism is by this view more important to the overall meaning of the satire than the qualifying adjective "Egyptian".'⁷ In similar vein, D. Singleton has argued that 'it is not the Ombites whom Juvenal wishes to condemn so much as the cruelty of men in general.'⁸

⁴ Anderson 1982:10.

⁵ Anderson 1987:211.

⁶ Anderson 1982:283.

⁷ Fredericks 1976:175.

⁸ Singleton 1983:206.

All the above views have the following in common: first, a reluctance to accept that, for Juvenal, the horrific deed perpetrated by the Ombites simply provided a perfect vehicle for a scathing and triumphant indictment of the Egyptians, whom he loathed so intensely; and second, a conviction that the poem was inspired by something more subtle or complex than mere xenophobia and that it was even altruistic in nature.⁹

Anderson suggests that, instead of assuming that the 'speaker' in this poem is Juvenal, one should start from the assumption that he is an unidentified person whose character and ethical position will be revealed by what he says:

if he proves to be a bigoted and irrational racist Roman, it should be legitimate to conclude that he is not Juvenal; that he is a rather fallible character through which Juvenal obliquely conveys a more acceptable viewpoint.¹⁰

This, however, immediately begs several questions. Why indeed should the views expressed here *not* be a fair reflection of the author's own outlook?¹¹ Is it safe to assume, from a twentieth century vantage point, that Juvenal's audience would have regarded his antipathy towards the Egyptians as entirely absurd?¹² Should one not also

⁹ Thus, for example, Wehrle 1992:57: 'The real theme of J.15 is not cannibalism. Nor is the satire a one-sided attack on Egyptian culture. Rather it is a humanistic plea; its theme is man is less than beast.'

¹⁰ Anderson 1987:204.

¹¹ McCabe 1986:81, makes the following cautionary comment: 'The presence of this character [sc. a satirist whom the audience is expected to reject because of his objectionable and offensive ways] in Jacobean drama is sufficient evidence for Anderson to assume that the satiric speaker in Juvenal's *Satires* is of the same overly-indignant type whom the audience is expected to reject as a moral extremist. That the Jacobean writers were writing nearly fifteen hundred years after Juvenal, and in a different genre, and had no better crystal ball than we have, has not discouraged these conjectures.'

¹² Anderson 1987:204 himself acknowledges that Juvenal's stance as a despiser of the Egyptians was not unusual for a Roman and draws attention to Vergil, *Aen.* 8.698: *omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis*, as indicative of the Roman attitude towards Egyptian religion. When Augustus was asked whether he would like to see the bull-god Apis, he is reputed to have said that he worshipped gods, not cows (Cassius Dio 51.16.5). Popular

consider the possibility that, at this stage of his career, Juvenal could count on the support of a like-minded audience and that he pandered to the tastes of such a following with the theme of the fifteenth *Satire*?

I would argue, therefore, that the horrific deed perpetrated by the Ombites provided Juvenal with an ideal opportunity to indulge his hatred of the Egyptians,¹³ that he set about skilfully exploiting the prejudices of his audience and that his exaggerations, manipulations and distortions - far from calling his credibility into question - made his satirical attack more forceful and entertaining. Rationality and objectivity (whatever the writer's pretensions to truthfulness might be) are not the essence of effective satire.¹⁴ one has only to reflect on how the success of the highly entertaining indictment of the Greeks in the third *Satire* and the savagely humorous attack on women in the sixth *Satire* must have depended (*pace* Anderson) to a great extent on the readiness of Juvenal's listeners or readers to forget about 'fair play' and to respond positively and with smug enjoyment to his satirical licence. There can be nothing more damaging to the effectiveness of satire than criticism based on *really* calm and objective reasoning, even though Juvenal himself appeals to the rationality of his listeners.¹⁵ That is why blatantly racist, sexist or 'sick' jokes in 'appropriate' situations can still elicit laughter from people who, in normal circumstances and in a dispassionate and objective frame of mind, might react quite differently. One may venture to suggest that Juvenal was undaunted by the canons of modern classical scholarship or 'political correctness' when he composed the fifteenth *Satire*.

ridicule of Egyptian religious practices is also reflected, for example, in several passages from Cicero's *De Nat. Deor.*, e.g. 1.29; 1.36 (*ipsi qui inidentur Aegyptii*).

¹³ It is hard to accept Wehrle's (1992:59) contention that the Egyptians are a 'mere exemplum - an exemplum of perverse humanity.'

¹⁴ Swift's *A Modest Proposal* is a case in point.

¹⁵ *si vacat ac placidi rationem admittitis, edam* (1,21). I am not convinced by Anderson's (1982:301) assertion that Juvenal is being ironic in his introduction and that he is 'amusing himself' with an elaborate over-statement. A passionate and emotive speaker will often stress the 'truth' or 'logic' of his or her reasoning - and mean it. One need look no further than the realm of politics to confirm that.

It is also important to consider the probable expectations or 'mind-set' of Juvenal's listeners or readers when they approached the fifteenth *Satire*. Those who were acquainted with his previous *Satires* must surely have been conscious of his consistently hostile attitude towards eastern immigrants, Egyptians in particular. Indeed, Juvenal's harping on this theme might be construed as evidence of his confidence in eliciting a positive response to his fifteenth *Satire*. The intensity of that hostility is amply demonstrated by his sneering description of Crispinus in the first *Satire* - a description which is both comparatively elaborate and prominently positioned in the opening tirade with which he justifies his role as a satirist:

*cum pars Niliacae plebis, cum verna Canopi
Crispinus Tyrias umero revocante lacernas
ventilet aestivum digitis sudantibus aurum
nec sufferre queat maioris pondera gemmae,
difficile est saturam non scribere . . . (1.26-30)*

It is significant that the notion of decadent *luxuria*, which Juvenal associates with the Egyptians in *Satire* 15 (*horrida sane / Aegyptos, sed luxuria, quantum ipse notavi, / barbara famoso non cedit turba Canopo*, 15.44-6), is present at the very outset. It is Crispinus again who is used to set the tone of the fourth *Satire*: *monstrum nulla virtute redemptum / a vitiis, aegrae solaque libidine fortes / deliciae, viduas tantum aspernatus adulter* (4.2-4). What is more, the paradoxical combination of barbarism and *luxuria*, which is a central element of Juvenal's attack in the fifteenth *Satire*, is foreshadowed several times in the fourth:

*multa videmus
quae miser et frugi non fecit Apicius. hoc tu
succinctus patriae quondam, Crispine, papyro?
hoc pretio squamae? (4.22-5)*

purpureus magni . . . scurra Palati,

*iam princeps equitum, magna qui voce solebat
vendere municipes fracta de merce siluros . . .* (4.31-3)

While the individual, Crispinus, is a particular focus of Juvenal's animosity in the earlier *Satires*, his antipathy towards Egypt and the Egyptians in general is quite evident - even in an incidental manner, as seen in his sneering references to Rome's moral corruption being enough to earn the condemnation of even Canopus (6.84), Egyptian vinegar as a suitable dressing for the cannibalising of a son's head (13.84-5) and the grotesquely large breasts of Egyptian women (13.163). In his reaction against Eastern cults, whose increasing popularity is a clear manifestation of the perversion of Rome's traditional values and customs, the Egyptian cult of Isis is a particular target of his mockery and hostility in the sixth *Satire*: in the same way as the *sacri fontis nemus et delubra*, where Numa used to meet the nymph Egeria, have been 'defiled' by the invasion of Jewish 'squatters'¹⁶, so another site steeped in Roman history and tradition has been 'desecrated' by the outlandish and un-Roman temple of Isis, *antiquo quae proxime surgit ovilii*.¹⁷ Juvenal's contempt for the deities and practices of the cult is patent in his mockery of the religious fanaticism and gullibility of women:

*ergo hic praecipuum summumque meretur honorem
qui grege linigero circumdatus et grege calvo
plangentis populi currit derisor Anubis . . .
illius lacrimae meditataque murmura praestant
ut veniam culpae non abnuat ansere magno
scilicet et tenui popano corruptus Osiris* (6.532-4; 539-41)

¹⁶ *Sat.* 3.11-4.

¹⁷ *Sat.* 6.529. The reference is to the Campus Martius, where the *centuriae* were separated into 'sheep-pens' for voting purposes.

Against this background, then, and in the light of Juvenal's derisive and hostile attitude towards eastern peoples in general (including the Greeks)¹⁸, the fifteenth *Satire* must have begun on a thoroughly familiar note for those acquainted with his earlier *Satires*; indeed, Juvenal exploits that familiarity with the opening rhetorical question: *quis nescit . . . qualia demens / Aegyptos portenta colat?* The very consistency of his xenophobic attitude throughout his *Satires* suggests that, allowing for the heightening effect of his rhetoric, Juvenal is probably expressing his *own* convictions and prejudices.¹⁹ It therefore seems to me rather implausible that his listeners or readers would have drawn a distinction between the motives behind his contempt for Crispinus or for the Jews,²⁰ for example, in the earlier *Satires* and those behind his condemnation and mockery of the Egyptians in the fifteenth, finding his bigotry and racism in the latter deliberately 'alienating' (as Anderson would have one believe). The difference is that the satirical attack here is far more focused and sustained. The result is a *tour de force* of xenophobia - less humorous than Umbricius' extended invective against the Greeks in

¹⁸ Well illustrated, for example, by a passage in the third *Satire*: *quamvis quota portio faecis Achaei? / iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes / et linguam et mores et cum tibicine chordas / obliquas necnon gentilia tympana secum / vexit et ad circum iussas prostare puellas*, etc. (3.61ff).

¹⁹ Cf. Highet (1974:321-7), who warns against the dangers of assuming that a distinction should always be drawn between the expressed attitudes of an author and his actual convictions. More recently, Peter Green (1989:240-55), has argued vigorously against any critical theory 'that completely removes Juvenal's work from the man himself and his historical context.'

²⁰ E.g. 3.13-6; 3.296; 6.157-60; 6.542-7; 8.160; 14.96-106. The latter passage is especially pertinent to the opening 13 lines of the fifteenth *Satire*, in which Juvenal mocks Egyptian beliefs and practices; there can be little doubt that both passages are infused with the same prejudicial outlook and satirical tone:

*quidam sortiti metuentem sabbata patrem
nil praeter nubes et caeli numen adorant,
nec distare putant humana carne suillam,
qua pater abstinuit, mox et praeputia ponunt;
Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges
Iudaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt ius,
tradidit arcano quocumque volumine Moyses:
non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.
sed pater in causa, cui septima quaeque fuit lux
ignava et partem vitae non attigit ullam.*

the third *Satire*, but equally effective in manipulating the prejudices of a Roman audience.

It is hard to conceive of a more damning indictment of any race or people than 'incontrovertible proof' that its behaviour and practices place it outside the norms of humanity, and even of the animal world. This is what Juvenal endeavours to prove in respect of the Egyptian race as a whole, and the cannibalistic frenzy of the Ombites provides him with his 'trump card'. The *Satire* is a masterpiece of persuasive and manipulative propaganda: instead of plunging *in medias res* with a shocking indictment of the atrocity, Juvenal skilfully ingratiates himself with his audience by laughing *with them* at the bizarre (but well known) objects of Egyptian idolatry: the first sentence, *quis nescit . . . qualia demens / Aegyptos portenta colat?*, is reminiscent of the comedian's opening gambit: 'You all know the one about . . .' The rapport established by the rhetorical question is consolidated by the mocking and emphatic *demens* and by the sneering Greek ending of *Aegyptos*, while the ensuing images of crocodiles, ibises bulging with snakes and monkey-idols are calculated to arouse the derision of a Roman audience. Furthermore, the travesty of 'normal' religious behaviour is accentuated by the inappropriateness, in the context, of the verbs *colat*, *adorat*, *pavet* and *venerantur*. Even the references to the 'magical' lyre sounds (*magicae . . . chordae*, 5) emanating from Memnon's statue and the dilapidated state of the latter (*dimidio*, 5)²¹ and of the once-mighty Thebes (*vetus Thebe centum iacet obruta portis*, 6) seem calculated to denigrate.

The ridiculous and divisive variety of animal fetishes is emphasised (*pars haec, illa . . . illic . . . hic . . . illic*) and the catalogue of sacred creatures reaches the height of absurdity with the mention of *aeluos* (7), *piscem fluminis* (7) and *canem* (8): creatures whose worship must have seemed laughable to a Roman audience.²² The

²¹ Cf. 8.4: *Curios iam dimidios*.

²² Cf. Cicero, *Tusc.* 5.78: *Aegyptiorum morem quis ignorat, quorum imbutae mentes pravitatis erroribus quamvis carnificinam prius subierint quam ibim aut aspidem aut faelem aut canem aut crocodilem violent?* This passage is remarkably similar, both in content and in form, to the opening sentence of Juvenal's *Satire* and it is tempting to see it as the inspiration for the

outlandishness of such religious practices is made even more remarkable by the fact that *whole towns* venerate dogs. The climax to the sentence (*nemo [sc. venerantur] Dianam*, 8) cleverly entrenches the perception that the Egyptians, with their multitude of theriomorphic 'gods', are utterly primitive in comparison to the Romans, with their more sophisticated and 'civilised' concept of divinity. The mention of the Egyptian worship of dogs artfully facilitates the transition to the Roman Diana, goddess of the hunt and patroness of hounds.

The mocking tone is sustained when attention is shifted to the dietary taboos of the Egyptians - a carefully contrived prelude to the cannibalism incident. The notion of sinfulness in violating the 'sanctity' of leeks and onions must have struck a Roman audience as quite bizarre (*porrum et caepe nefas violare et frangere morsu*, 9), and one can imagine the laughter prompted by the wickedly satirical aside: *o sanctas gentes, quibus haec nascuntur in hortis / numina!* (10-11). Fredericks makes some pertinent observations on the satirical qualities of the first twelve lines of this poem:

Juvenal has thus debased the objects of Egyptian piety, has transformed their gods into animals and vegetables, and has converted Egyptian religion into something grotesque. The prologue is immediate evidence that Juvenal's work is truly satire, a poetry which distorts and exaggerates facts for effect, and not accurate anthropology.²³

He also points out that much of the wit in these lines consists in the contradiction between the religious language (*portenta*, *colat*, *adorat*, 2; *pavet*, 3; *effigies*, *sacri*, 4; *venerantur*, 8; *nefas violare*, 9; *sanctas*, 10; *numina*, 11; *nefas*, 12) and the 'bizarre animals and lowly vegetables which are the objects of reverence.'

The Egyptians' abstention from such normal foodstuffs, including sheep and goats (11-2), is made to appear absurd from a Roman perspective, and the catalogue of

latter. On Egyptian animal-cults, see Green 1998:214-5.

²³ Fredericks 1976:176.

prohibitions creates the impression of extraordinary fastidiousness. That impression is suddenly shattered by the almost laconic observation: *carnibus humanis vesci licet* (13). The positive connotation of the word *licet*²⁴, together with the general context of religious observance, has the bizarre effect of 'elevating' cannibalism almost to the level of a divinely ordained rite among the Egyptians - a gross distortion, obviously, and a statement that demands explanation. However, that bald statement of 'fact' could not be proved convincingly by a straightforward account of the single incident of cannibalism in the desert; and so the satirist sets about preparing the mind of the listener to believe that the cannibalism of the Ombites was utterly without parallel and thus irrefutable proof that the Egyptians in general are uniquely sub-human.²⁵

Juvenal's opening strategy is to lay particular emphasis on the *historicity* of the incident; and he achieves this in the first instance by a humorous contrast between the fictional *unreality* of well-known mythical accounts of cannibalism and the horrific *truth* of the Egyptian atrocity.²⁶ The listener or reader - who might well be *attonitus* at the wild improbability of *carnibus humanis vesci licet* - is put into the place, as it were, of the incredulous Alcinous and his companions who mockingly dismiss Ulysses' fantastic tales and accuse him of inventing stories of cannibalism (*fingentem inmanis Laestrygonas et Cyclopas*, 18). Anderson²⁷ sees this invented incredulity as an example

²⁴ Singleton (1983:201) argues that the word means much more than merely 'it is permitted', but rather 'it is conceded by every law and observance'.

²⁵ McKim (1986:62-3), commenting on Juvenal's 'unfair' inference that cannibalism was condoned in Egypt, states that, 'if we read the poem as a dramatic monologue, we open up the possibility that Juvenal is satirizing the irrationality of his speaker's prejudiced mind rather than merely indulging a prejudice of his own.' However, this is belied by the carefully contrived ruses (see below) to shift attention away from the irrationality of his assertion.

²⁶ Powell (1979:188-9) suggests that Juvenal's account is probably based on 'some kind of religious celebration whose significance the dyspeptic and xenophobic Roman did not understand: that 'more likely the attack was a cultic attack that arose from a mythical conception' and that we cannot 'disunite from religious myth the dismembering and eating of the cadaver by the followers of Seth, the god who dismembered Osiris and wounded the Eye of Horus, both gods with intimate ties to Dendera.' Powell provides an intriguing explanation of what might have inspired Juvenal's denunciation of the Egyptians, but it is fair to say that, for the satirist, ignorance of the truth would certainly have been no impediment in this instance.

²⁷ Anderson 1987:206.

of the satirist's 'tendentiousness' and believes that 'once the mood of doubt starts prevailing, the Phaeacians themselves would have to disappear', since 'their way of life is quite as incredible in its way as the savagery of the monsters.' However, this is to exercise a degree of criticality and rationality, the very *suspension* of which contributes to the effectiveness of satire: one does not, for example, allow the political cartoonist's penchant for exaggeration and distortion to nullify the 'truth' of the underlying satirical message he may be making. Juvenal is relying on an imaginative response from the reader to his 'irreverent' manipulation of a well-known Homeric tale - in much the same way as he does when he invited the reader in the second *Satire* to visualise the ghosts in the Underworld insisting on purification upon the arrival in their midst of the souls of homosexual perverts.²⁸ The 'Homeric' interlude in the fifteenth *Satire* is lively and humorous, and the concluding lines have the effect of putting the audience momentarily at ease with its scepticism:

*sic aliquis merito nondum ebrius et minimum qui
de Corcyraea temetum duxerat urna:
solus enim haec Ithacus nullo sub teste canebat* (24-6)

But, while scepticism might be justified in the case of Ulysses' tales, such an attitude is untenable as far as *Juvenal's* story is concerned, and the contrast with *solus, nullo sub teste* and *canebat* is pronounced:²⁹

*nos miranda quidem sed nuper consule lunco
gesta super calidae referemus moenia Copti . . .* (27-8)

²⁸ *Sat.* 2.149-58.

²⁹ I cannot agree with Singleton's assertion (1983:202) that 'the satirist is of course in just the same position as the imagined Odysseus' and that the formulation *miranda . . . sed* is 'an invitation to scepticism'. The precise references to *recent* time and place provide a pointed contrast with the realm of Homeric myth and constitute a far stronger claim to credibility (and this is accentuated later by the phrase *nostro . . . aevo*, 31-2).

Now that he has left his audience with little reason to doubt the *historical truth* of what he is about to describe, Juvenal explains why the incident of Egyptian cannibalism should be regarded as *uniquely* depraved and horrific; and the following lines are of crucial importance to his thesis that the Egyptians are utterly devoid of humanity:

*nos volgi scelus et cunctis graviora coturnis;
nam scelus, a Pyrrha quamquam omnia syrmata volvas,
nullus apud tragicos populus facit. accipe nostro
dira quod exemplum feritas produxerit aevo. (29-32)*

From the very first line of this *Satire* Juvenal's mockery has been directed at the Egyptians *collectively* (*demens Aegyptos*); and now, capitalising on the skilfully created impression that their absurd religious practices are incontrovertible proof of their *dementia*, he proceeds to 'justify' the statement *carnibus humanis vesci licet* (13). This *scelus* was not the deed of a deranged individual, but of an *entire people* - a point which is given particular emphasis, both by the repetition inherent in *volgi* and *populi* and by the comparison with the most horrific atrocities which tragedy can offer. Juvenal does not allude to any specific tragical episode; nor does he need to, because he has scored a 'palpable hit' here: however dreadful the crimes of Medea or Atreus, for example, might have been, they were *not* committed by a whole people acting in unison.

McKim states that 'it is hard to see why Atreus' single-handedness makes his cold-blooded domestic atrocity any less appalling than the tribesmen's impersonal fit of mob violence.'³⁰ The answer is that it is easier to come to terms with the action of a deranged individual - however appalling it might be - than with an atrocity perpetrated by a large group of people acting in concert.³¹ Furthermore, it is hardly likely that the Roman

³⁰ McKim 1986:62; cf. Singleton 1983:202: 'If there is one thing that this incident is not, it is "worse than all the crimes of tragedy". The name Thyestes at once suggests itself to the reader.'

³¹ Geoffrey Dahmer's cannibalism horrified the world; but how would the world have reacted if *all* the people in his neighbourhood had participated in dismembering and devouring the victims? That is a hypothetical example; the atrocity perpetrated by mutinous Cambodian

reader (and, more particularly, the listener at a recitation) would have stopped to reflect critically on fine points such as 'it is not even true that tragedy systematically ignores the misdeeds of a people' and that 'Euripides seems quite concerned to register the way warfare twists the character of a people and distorts their humanity.'³²

One can imagine that Juvenal must have felt well satisfied at producing this 'trump card', before proceeding with the tale of Egyptian bestiality, which he has hitherto tantalisingly delayed. And to make sure that his audience sees this crime in its true perspective, he puts it in a universal context: the Egyptians represent the nadir of bestiality and degeneracy in an age which, in his estimate, has surpassed all others in decadence:³³ *accipe nostro / dira quod exemplum feritas produxerit aevo* (31-2). Fredericks remarks on the religious significance of the word *dira* and its frequent association with portents and other exceptional phenomena (thus looking back to *portenta* in line 2 and the other religious terminology in the opening passage); and he goes on to observe that

the preternatural, even monstrous, quality of Egyptian religion is thereby reinforced. *Feritas* looks forward to the act of cannibalism, viewed as pathology, to imply that the Egyptians who behave like animals are reduced to the level of beasts by their savagery.³⁴

troops provides a real and recent parallel: 'Soldiers defiantly displayed the mutilated fly-covered corpse of one of their officers whom they had killed in . . . dispute. They had eaten his lungs, liver, heart, biceps and calves . . . Villagers who had gathered around giggled as one soldier playfully stuck a cigarette in the corpse's mouth . . . Cannibalism has been frequent practice in the Cambodian war, though the prisoners were almost invariably captured prisoners or enemy corpses.' (*Los Angeles Times*, 6 April 1975; quoted by Vermeule 1979:94).

³² Anderson 1987:206.

³³ E.g. 1.81-7: *ex quo Deucalion nimbis tollentibus aequor / navigio montem ascendit sortesque poposcit . . . quidquid agunt homines . . . nostri farrago libelli est, / et quando uberior vitiorum copia?*; and 1.147-9: *nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat / posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores, / omne in praecipiti vitium stetit.*

³⁴ Fredericks 1976:179.

Juvenal is intent upon vilifying the Egyptian nation as a *whole*, and if the prejudicial attitude which he has created through his mockery of their religious customs is to be sustained, he must not 'take sides' in the conflict between the Ombites and the Tentyrans, thus allowing sympathy for the victim and his tribe to offset his hostility towards the Egyptians in general. His aloof contempt is evident at the outset of his description of the incident: even though the tribes were neighbours (*finitimos*, 33), they were incapable of resolving a *vetus atque antiqua simultas* (33); their mutual hatred is so intense (*immortale odium et numquam sanabile vulnus*, 34) that it still rages unabated (*ardet adhuc*, 35). This inability to exist according to civilised norms is pointedly emphasised later in the *Satire*, when Juvenal reflects on the humane qualities inherent in communal living (lines 147-8). Both tribes are equally to blame (*summus utrimque . . . furor volgo*, 35-6) and their deadly hostility stems ultimately from their bizarre and divisive religious beliefs (which Juvenal has already held up to scorn in the introduction to the *Satire*): *quod numina vicinorum / odit uterque locus, cum solos credat habendos / esse deos quos ipse colit* (36-8).

McKim³⁵ is of the opinion that Juvenal's 'speaker' is made to exemplify the same sort of intolerance towards the religions of the two Egyptian tribes as they display towards one another's. Viewed calmly and objectively, his attitude *is* intolerant; but, from a satirical point of view, is it not more likely that Juvenal would have elicited smug agreement from his audience rather than accusations of hypocrisy and double standards? Singleton's assessment seems to me to be more realistic:

There is . . . a world of difference between the educated Roman's contempt for the bizarre and fanatical, and the frenzied exclusiveness of these two Egyptian peoples. It is exclusiveness that is the object of the satire at this juncture. . .³⁶

³⁵ McKim 1986:60-1.

³⁶ Singleton 1983:203.

Juvenal's description of the actual incident of cannibalism is also clearly characterised by his antipathy towards the Egyptians in general, as opposed to the single group responsible for the atrocity. At the outset there seems to be a deliberate avoidance of focusing attention on the latter (*alterius populi*, 39; cf. *pars altera*, 73), as if to imply that either group - given the background sketched in lines 33-8 - was equally capable of such behaviour. Not only does the occasion chosen for the aggression (*tempore festo*, 38) make it all the more reprehensible, but the blame cannot be directed at merely 'rabble' elements (*rapienda occasio cunctis / visa inimicorum primoribus ac ducibus*, 39-40). Their intentions are made to appear utterly spiteful (*ne / laetum hilaremque diem, ne magnae gaudia cenae / sentirent positis ad templa et compita mensis*, 40-2); but, at the same time, Juvenal cleverly manages to overlay any possible sympathy for the victims with a sneer at the decadent nature of that festive occasion: *pervigilique toro, quem nocte ac luce iacentem / septimus interdum sol invenit*, 43-4).

This in turn provides a platform for a mocking digression, calculated to intensify the contempt of his audience for the Egyptian race: as pointed out above, the Egyptians display (in Juvenal's view) a paradoxical and particularly loathsome combination of 'uncouthness' and *luxuria* of the most decadent sort. And yet, despite the fact that the Egyptian race is *horrida* (44), it displays none of the martial vigour which Juvenal admiringly attributed to *horrida . . . Hispania*,³⁷ for example: the aggressors are cowardly in relying upon the inebriation of their enemies to ensure a *facilis victoria* (47), yet the description of the victims is also full of contempt (*madidis et / blaesis atque mero titubantibus*, 47-8). Juvenal's scorn for both parties is accentuated further in the following lines, where the indignity of *virorum saltatus* is compounded by the attendance of a *negro*³⁸ musician:

³⁷ Sat. 8.116.

³⁸ There is more to this than the mere implication that they could not afford a skilful Alexandrian (thus Courtney 1980:600); there are several instances where Juvenal plays on such prejudices: 2.23: *loripedem rectus derideat, Aethiopem albus*; 5.52-5 *tibi pocula cursor / Gaetulus dabit aut nigri manus ossea Mauri / et cui per mediam nolis occurrere noctem, / clivosae veheris dum per monumenta Latinae*; 6.598-601: *nam si distendere vellet / et vexare uterum pueris salientibus, esses / Aethiopis fortasse pater, mox decolor heres / impleret tabulas numquam tibi mane videndas*; 8.32-3: *nanum cuiusdam Atlanta vocamus, / Aethiopem Cycnum*

*inde virorum
saltatus nigro tibicine, qualiacumque
unguenta et flores multaeque in fronte coronae:
hinc ieiunium odium (48-51)*

The opening skirmish is presented as a laughable parody of a real battle: the latter is described scornfully as a *rixa* (52), and the signal for attack does not take the form of a trumpet-blast, but of verbal insults (*iurgia*, 51). The initial clash is described in such a way as to give the impression of the wild fisticuffs of two gangs of brawling louts:

*dein clamore pari concurritur, et vice teli
saevit nuda manus. paucae sine volnere malae,
vix cuiquam aut nulli toto certamine nasus
integer. aspiceres iam cuncta per agmina voltus
dimidios, alias facies et hiantia ruptis
ossa genis, plenos oculorum sanguine pugnosc (53-58)*

Yet such horrific mutilations are not enough for the likes of the Ombites and the Tentyrans; this is mere child's play (*ludere se credunt ipsi tamen et puerilis / exercere acies*, 59-60), because there are no corpses to 'stamp on' (*calcent* - another indication of their inhuman savagery). All this, it must be remembered, stemmed from a resolve by one group to deny the other the pleasure of a feast (lines 38-44); now both groups are swept away by a desire to kill merely for the sake of killing (*et sane quo tot rixantis milia turbae, / si vivunt omnes?* (61-2). The violence then becomes more deadly with the recourse to weapons; but these weapons - *saxa* - are intended (like *saevit nuda manus*, 54) to exemplify further the 'primitiveness' of the Egyptians, and they are sneeringly described as *domestica seditio / tela* (64-5). This contempt for the Egyptians is entrenched in an extended and disparaging comparison with the physical

strength of heroes of a different age; and this passage, like lines 31-2, serves to epitomise the degeneracy of the Egyptian race:

. . . *nec hunc lapidem, qualis et Turnus et Ajax,
vel quo Tydides percussit pondere coxam
Aeneae, sed quem valeant emittere dextrae
illis dissimiles et nostro tempore natae.
nam genus hoc vivo iam decrescebat Homero,
terra malos homines nunc educat et pusillos;
ergo deus, quicumque aspexit, ridet et odit.* (65-71)

This passage, with its sardonic comparison with the mighty rock-hurlers of epic,³⁹ makes a fitting climax to the denigration of the Egyptians' prowess as warriors. McKim⁴⁰ argues that Juvenal makes his speaker's comparison 'self-defeating', because 'instead of belittling the Egyptians as barbarians by contrast to the heroes, the effect for the reader is to portray the heroes as barbarians themselves, and rather clownish ones'; and he justifies the latter point by maintaining that despite their superior size and strength, the heroes 'were stone-throwers all the same, bashing each other's backsides.' However, this seems to me a highly improbable motive to impute to a passage which has focused so consistently on the laughingly *unheroic* (and, indeed, *unRoman*) qualities of the Egyptians as fighters: quite simply, Juvenal is exploiting the epic comparison to give added point to the sneeringly dismissive *domestica seditioni / tela* (64-5).

Nor is it likely, as Anderson⁴¹ believes, that 'the satirist exposes himself to our dissatisfaction'; because 'the standard which the satirist uses to condemn the Egyptians, epic and normal combat, can all too easily be turned against the satirist and his snobbish Roman ethics' (and he goes on to ask: 'What people had ever committed

³⁹ E.g. *Iliad* 12.380; *Aen.* 12.896.

⁴⁰ McKim 1986:64.

⁴¹ Anderson 1987:208.

more crimes as a nation than the Roman people through their centuries of imperialistic and ruthless warfare?'). This is to introduce a degree of critical introspection and balance which is quite at variance with Juvenal's *modus operandi* and (most probably) with his expectations of his audience. Would Juvenal's listeners or readers *really* have dulled their enjoyment of his satirical attack on the *demens Aegyptos* by soberly reflecting, like Anderson, along the following lines: 'anyone who has watched TV coverage of protests and riots in any country today would recognise that stones serve any mob as weapons; nationality has no bearing'? The attitude of the imaginary god, which concludes Juvenal's digression, captures precisely the attitude of the satirist *and* the reaction which he hopes to elicit from his audience: *ridet et odit* (71).

The comparison in lines 65-71 is a satirically effective digression, but it does interrupt the flow of the narrative; hence the pointed resumption of the description of the intensifying violence: *a deverticulo repetatur fabula* (72).⁴² As announced at the beginning of the narrative, Juvenal's tale is one of *feritas* (32), and the description of the actual act of cannibalism succeeds brilliantly in convicting the Egyptians of inhuman brutality. Most striking is the rapidity with which the horrific deed is performed:

*labitur hic quidam nimia formidine cursum
praecipitans capiturque. ast illum in plurima sectum
frusta et particulas, ut multis mortuus unus
sufficeret, totum corrosis ossibus edit
victrix turba . . .* (77-81)

⁴² Courtney (1980:601) cites Horace *Serm.* 1.1.108, 1.6.45 and 1.7.9 as examples of the satirist's emphasis on the informality of composition. *Satire* 15 is characterised by a particularly focused theme (*accipe nostro / dira quod exemplum feritas produxerit aevo*, 31-32), and Juvenal's role at this point is that of a dramatic story-teller who is intent upon maintaining the rapport with his audience. It is interesting to compare his style here with that adopted in the fourth *Satire* (which is also characterised by extended narrative): *sed nunc de factis levioribus* (4.11); *incipi, Calliope. licet et considerare: non est / cantandum, res vera agitur. narrate, puellae / Pierides, prosit mihi vos dixisse puellas* (34-6). I cannot therefore agree with McKim's statement (1986:64, note 21) that line 72 dramatizes 'the speaker's characteristic garrulity.'

The unfortunate victim is dismembered and devoured on the spur of the moment - an unmistakably bestial form of behaviour, which is succinctly defined later in lines 130-1: *in quorum mente pares sunt / et similes ira atque fames*. The very spontaneity of this act of cannibalism is, of course, intended to be contrasted with the agonising soul-searching which preceded the pitiful experience of the Vascones (93ff). The behaviour of the devouring mob may be compared to the notorious feeding frenzy of piranhas.

The peculiar inhumanity of the Egyptians' deed is that it was a *collective* act - a point given particular emphasis in the introduction (lines 29-31) - and this feature dominates the description of the devouring of the victim: the latter is chopped up *in plurima* for the benefit of the *many* (*ut multis mortuus unus / sufficeret*); he is eaten by the *whole crowd* (*turba*). Nor is this to be thought of as some communal feast in the human domain, with a semblance of ceremony. The Egyptians' remoteness from the norms of civilised behaviour is shown, furthermore, by the fact that the mob dispensed with cooking vessels and even spits and was *contenta cadavere crudo* (83) in its animalistic urge to sate its hunger instantly (how Juvenal must have savoured the appropriately harsh alliteration of this phrase!); and the sardonically humorous reference,⁴³ in the following lines, to the 'father figure' of human civilisation cleverly reinforces the perception of the gulf which separates the Egyptians from the rest of humanity - for it was his gift of fire which brought about the fundamental distinction between the beasts' devouring of their meat raw and the civilised humans' habit of cooking it:

*hic gaudere libet quod non violaverit ignem,
quem summa caeli raptum de parte Prometheus
donavit terris; elemento gratulor, et te
exultare reor* (84-7)

⁴³ An alternative reading, *Prometheu, / donasti*, was suggested by Griffith (1969 [1]:387), in order to make better sense of *te*.

Singleton⁴⁴ has remarked on the curious restraint with which Juvenal proceeds to describe the actual devouring of the victim:

The moment of death is not described at all, we do not hear the victim's pleas for mercy or his shrieks of pain, we are not, as we well might have been, and are elsewhere in Juvenal (3.261-7), invited to consider his wife and small children at home, waiting for the father who will never return. Juvenal does not permit the victim to exist as a human being. For us, as for the Ombites, he appears merely as a source of meat.

The focus is indeed not on the suffering of the victim but on the horror of an atrocity committed by a whole *populus*. It is the *collective* guilt of the latter which is the salient feature of the description of the behaviour of the mob; and that guilt is made all the more unforgivable by the sensuous delight which every single one of them took in that ghastly feast:

*sed qui mordere cadaver
sustinuit nil umquam hac carne libentius edit;
nam scelere in tanto ne quaeras et dubites an
prima voluptatem gula senserit, ultimus ante
qui stetit, absumpto iam toto corpore ductis
per terram digitis aliquid de sanguine gustat. (87-92)*

Juvenal now proceeds to demonstrate that the utter bestiality of the Egyptian mob, which culminates in this lurid and nauseating image, is without parallel amongst human beings. He confidently shows his audience that it will simply not do to point to other historical instances of cannibalism in order to exonerate the Egyptians: the circumstances which drove the Vascones, for example, to resort to *alimentis talibus*⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Singleton 1983:204.

⁴⁵ The relatively bland and euphemistic connotation of this phrase contrasts markedly with the Egyptians' devouring of *cadavere crudo* (83; *cadaver* repeated at 87) and *corpore* (91) - a calculating choice of vocabulary on Juvenal's part.

were quite different (*res diversa*, 94). They did so merely to *survive* (*produxere animas*, 94) in the face of overwhelming hardships; and while the Egyptians were motivated by inexcusable *dira feritas* (32), the Vascones in their misery were forced to succumb to *dira egestas*:

*sed illic
fortunae invidia est bellorumque ultima, casus.
extremi, longae dira obsidionis egestas. (94-96)*

Juvenal lays particular stress on the fact that, for the unfortunate Vascones, cannibalism was an agonising *last resort* (in contrast to the Egyptians' instantaneous dismemberment of their victim and lip-smacking voracity), that their plight excited pity rather than revulsion and that even in the eyes of the gods their action could be exonerated (unlike the Egyptians' atrocity, whose heinousness is reflected in the fact that the divine element of fire, *summa caeli raptum de parte* (85), was not tainted by it):

*post omnis herbas, post cuncta animalia, quidquid
cogebat vacui ventris furor, hostibus ipsis
pallorem ac maciem et tenuis miserantibus artus,
membra aliena fame lacerabant, esse parati
et sua. quisnam hominum veniam dare quisve deorum
ventribus abnueret dira atque inmania passis
et quibus illorum poterant ignoscere manes
quorum corporibus vescebantur? (99-106)*

This passage is both emotive and convincing in its argument. It therefore seems to me highly unlikely that Juvenal intended his audience to conclude that the Egyptian atrocity was not so heinous after all, by reflecting on the fact that 'the real cause of the hopeless plight was the Roman army that ringed the cities and demanded unconditional surrender' and that 'this is what organised warfare can achieve, indeed, was able to achieve two hundred years ago under Roman genius: it could force a poor people to

mass cannibalism.⁴⁶ Anderson notes that Juvenal does not mention the identity of the besiegers, but maintains that ‘the story was too well known for this fact to slip by the audience.’ However, it is unnecessary to read any ulterior motive into this omission. Quite simply, Juvenal is preoccupied with the relative culpability of the Egyptians and the Vascones in resorting to cannibalism, and it is hard to believe that the audience’s attention was meant to be ‘side-tracked’ from this central issue into a probing analysis of the ultimate cause of the Vascones’ plight. Anderson’s astute observation might well have been of interest to the analytically-minded observer, but for the satirist and his audience it would probably have been irrelevant.

Juvenal’s intention to isolate the Egyptians from the rest of humanity in the mind of his audience is given further impetus, when he places the heinousness of the Egyptian atrocity in a ‘universal’ ethical context. Whereas the Vascones could not be expected *in those times* to be guided by the tenets of Stoic philosophy, *now* the civilising influence of Graeco-Roman culture is the common heritage of the whole world. Juvenal does not need to remind his audience of the shocking fact that the *dira feritas* of the Egyptians is a *contemporary* phenomenon (*nuper consule Iunco*, 27; *nostro . . . aevo*, 31-2):

melius nos
Zenonis praecepta monent [nec enim omnia quidam
*pro vita facienda putant]*⁴⁷ *sed Cantaber unde*
Stoicus, antiqui praesertim aetate Metelli?
nunc totus Graias nostrasque habet orbis Athenas,
Gallia caesidicos docuit facunda Britannos,
de conducendo loquitur iam rhetore Thyle (106-12)

⁴⁶ Anderson 1987:208-9.

⁴⁷ Deleted by Francke; ‘probably interpolated’, according to Courtney 1980:604.

McKim,⁴⁸ citing evidence that the Stoics did in fact condone cannibalism, seizes upon the apparent irony in the reference to Stoic principles in this context and argues that 'we are bound to suppose not, as the commentators do, that Juvenal is mistaken, but that he presents his speaker as mistaken.' If the Stoics' condoning of cannibalism also included the frenzied dismemberment of one's victims (which it surely did not) and if indeed we are to assume that Juvenal and his audience were keenly aware of the fact that the Stoics numbered cannibalism among 'things indifferent' (which is debatable),⁴⁹ then indeed there would be a nice irony here. But Juvenal is not impressing upon his audience the horrors of cannibalism *per se*,⁵⁰ so much as the unspeakable and spontaneous barbarity of the Egyptians. The Vascones are redeemed not only because it was *dura egestas* which drove them to commit cannibalism, but also because - unlike the Egyptians - they were characterised by *nobilitas*, *virtus* and *fides* (lines 113-114); and to 'cap' his argument he alludes to another alleged incident of cannibalism forced upon the equally admirable inhabitants of Zacynthus (i.e. Saguntum).⁵¹

⁴⁸ McKim 1986:65.

⁴⁹ Valerius Maximus, commenting on the cannibalism at Numantia, seems unaware of such an ethical 'loophole': *nulla est in his necessitatis excusatio; nam quibus mori licuit, sic vivere necesse non fuit* (7.6 ext. 2). Courtney's suggestion (1980:604) that, when Juvenal refers to *Zenonis praecepta*, he is likewise thinking of the Stoic willingness to commend suicide, is a far more plausible deduction. It seems likely that such an interpretation prompted the probable interpolation in lines 107-8. The likelihood that Juvenal was actually ignorant of the Stoic attitude towards cannibalism, rather than indulging in deliberate and subtle irony, is strengthened by his own admission at 13.120-3:

*accipe quae contra valeat solacia ferre
et qui nec Cynicos nec Stoica dogmata legit
a Cynicis tunica distantia, non Epicurum
suspicit exigui laetum plantaribus horti.*

⁵⁰ It is significant that his own attitude towards the townsfolk who were driven to cannibalism in order to *survive* (lines 93-106) is actually sympathetic and understanding, although he is obviously not advocating such conduct.

⁵¹ Courtney (1980:606) notes that there is no historical record of cannibalism during the siege of Saguntum and that it was probably 'a rhetorical invention'. The most likely source for Juvenal's use of the story is Petronius (*Sat.* 141). Once again we see the effective use, in a satirical context, of a statement which would probably not stand up to close scrutiny in a less licentious genre.

Throughout this passage, of course, there has been the obvious implication that the *Egyptians'* action cannot be condoned in any way and that they represent the antithesis of the 'noble' and pitiable Vascones and Saguntines.⁵² Now Juvenal corroborates the feelings of his audience with a series of rhetorical questions:

*tale quid excusat Maeotide saevior ara
Aegyptos?*⁵³ *quippe illa nefandi Taurica sacri
inventrix homines, ut iam quae carmina tradunt
digna fide credas, tantum immolat; ulterius nil
aut gravius cultro timet hostia.* (115-9)

McKim⁵⁴ detects a deliberate irony in the allusion here to Diana (in her Greek guise as Tauric Artemis) as a goddess to whom human sacrifices are made, since Juvenal earlier presented her as being worthier of worship than the strange deities of the Egyptians (lines 7-8). In his opinion the 'speaker' is oblivious of the fact that his previous elevation of Diana is undermined by the second reference, and concludes that 'Juvenal is playing his speaker's prejudices for laughs and plants the irony there for us to seize on.' Yet *how* obvious, it must be asked again, would such an irony have been to Juvenal's audience? Are we to assume that his listeners or readers would have instantly associated *illa Taurica inventrix* with the Roman Diana? If anything, it would appear that Juvenal is doing his best to *divert* attention from such an association by means of a highly allusive reference.⁵⁵ It seems far more likely that the comparison was chosen, not for any subtly ironic purpose, but because it provided an example of a strange and barbaric *religious* rite involving human sacrifice, which was nonetheless *less* horrifying

⁵² Fredericks (1976:185) expresses the contrast succinctly: 'the barbarians of Spain can be pardoned since they *passively endured* to commit a monstrous act when they were forced to cannibalism, while the Egyptians *actively committed* a monstrous crime' (my italics).

⁵³ Here I follow the punctuation suggested by Courtney (1980:605).

⁵⁴ McKim 1986:60.

⁵⁵ The Taurians of the Crimea made human sacrifices to a goddess called Opis, whom the Greeks identified with Artemis.

than the cannibalism 'sanctioned' (*carnibus humanis vesci licet*, 13) by Egyptian religion. Furthermore, if Juvenal really is planting an irony there 'for us to seize on', why is this followed by a passage whose purpose is quite clearly to establish beyond doubt the unparalleled barbarity and loathsomeness of the Egyptians? Are we to imagine that Juvenal intends his audience to dwell upon this 'irony' at the expense of its enjoyment of the vigorous and sustained attack in the ensuing lines?:

*quis modo casus
inpulit hos? quae tanta fames infestaque vallo
arma coegerunt tam detestabile monstrum
audere? ane aliam terra Memphitide sicca
invidiam facerent nolenti surgere Nilo?
qua nec terribiles Cimbri nec Brittones umquam
Sauromataeque truces aut inmanes Agathyrsi,
hac saevit rabie inbelle et inutile volgus
parvula fictilibus solitum dare vela phaselis
et brevibus pictae remis incumbere testae.
nec poenam sceleri invenies nec digna parabis
supplicia his populis, in quorum mente pares sunt
et similes ira atque fames. (119-31)*

Like the god who was earlier envisaged as displaying a mixture of laughter and loathing towards the Egyptians (*ridet et odit*, 71), Juvenal's audience is meant to react both with horror at the degree of their savagery and with contemptuous mockery of their essential unmanliness and worthlessness.⁵⁶ Once again the Egyptians are shown to be uniquely

⁵⁶ McKim (1986:66) maintains that 'non-belligerence should by rights be to the cannibals' *credit*, modifying their barbarism.' In similar vein, Anderson (1987:210) argues that 'war is a regular conditioner of cannibalism in the various privations, especially long sieges, that occur. To be unwarlike, then, is to cause fewer atrocities such as those among the Basques and to inflict fewer casualties.' This, however, is to ignore the fact that Juvenal's intention is quite clearly to denigrate the Egyptians as being essentially decadent, unheroic and 'bestial' in their aggression (cf. especially lines 44-71) - a far cry from any notions of laudable pacifism and *virtus*.

inhuman and despicable. The dispassionate and objective reader might question Juvenal's assertion that the Cimbrians, Britons and other outlandish barbarians were less savage than the Egyptians, but Juvenal is skilfully manipulating the prejudices of his audience - in much the same way as a witness of Nazi atrocities in the concentration camps could exploit that horrible truth to deny the German race as a whole any vestige of humanity. Propaganda is effective not only through its focus on the negative, but also through its omission of contradictory or mitigating evidence. Juvenal allows no mitigating factors or redeeming qualities in the Egyptians' favour, and thus more easily leads his audience to conclude that the human concepts of punishment and retribution are rendered ineffectual by an evil of this magnitude.⁵⁷

The fundamentally *inhuman* and bestial nature of the Egyptians is starkly captured in the phrase *in quorum mente pares sunt / et similes ira atque fames* (130-1), descriptive of minds controlled by the most basically instinctive impulses. Juvenal proceeds immediately to capitalize on the resultant sense of alienation from the Egyptian race by juxtaposing a contrasting and highly emotive discourse on the nature of true humanity. Above all, it is the quality of compassion which distinguishes human beings from brute beasts (*separat hoc nos / a grege mutorum*, 142-3):

*mollissima corda
humano generi dare se natura fatetur,
quae lacrimas dedit. haec nostri pars optima sensus.
plorare ergo iubet causam dicentis amici
sqaloremque rei, pupillum ad iura vocantem
- circumscriptorem, cuius manantia fletu*

⁵⁷ McKim (1986:67) sees this statement as indicative of the speaker's 'lust to make them [ie. the Egyptians] suffer' and that this therefore detracts from his extolling of the human virtue of compassion in lines 131ff. However, history has shown that human beings (and their religions) have regularly reconciled compassion for the suffering with the severe punishment of sinners. It is an all-too-human reaction, when confronted by evidence of horrific cruelty, to wonder whether *any* retribution - human or divine - can atone for such inhumanity. It is hard to believe that a 2nd century Roman audience would have confused the concept of just retribution in this instance with a 'lust to make them suffer'. McKim's phrase imparts a misleading connotation to Juvenal's words.

*ora puellares faciunt incerta capilli.
 naturae imperio gemimus, cum funus adultae
 virginis occurrit vel terra clauditur infans
 et minor igne rogi. quis enim bonus et face dignus
 arcana, qualem Cereris volt esse sacerdos,
 ulla aliena sibi credit mala? (131-42)*

The images in this passage are deliberately sentimental and provide an appropriately heightened idealisation of human tenderness to contrast with the exaggerated depiction of Egyptian inhumanity. McKim⁵⁸ speaks of 'that curious list of examples', alleging, for example, that the phrase *causam dicentis* (134) 'recalls for the reader the *causidici* . . . hardly the types for whom Juvenal would ever be caught shedding tears', and that in referring to the pleader's *squalor*, 'Juvenal could only expect his reader to recall that such melodramatic efforts to milk sympathy from the court had been an object of derision since the *Apology* of Socrates.' Yet it can be argued that the very familiarity of such emotive imagery serves to elicit spontaneous agreement from the listener rather than carefully considered scepticism: emotive oratory is often aided, rather than hindered, by the exploiting of the familiar and the conventional. McKim goes on to remark that

the speaker's feelings for the weeping boy become equally suspect as he lingers over the boy's "girlish" locks and sexually ambiguous beauty (*ora incerta* 137), and thus unwittingly reveals that his "compassion" is at bottom libidinous.

This seems to me to be an unnecessary inference: the description is undeniably sentimental, but one need read no more than that into it; and if Juvenal's intention is subtly libidinous, it is strange that this should be followed a little later by an image which proclaims quite the opposite (*quis enim bonus et face dignus / arcana, qualem Cereris volt esse sacerdos* . . . , 140-1).

⁵⁸ McKim 1986:67.

It would probably be wrong to interpret Juvenal's digression on the true nature of humanity as primarily 'a positive plea for pity and fellow-feeling which represent the best human emotion.'⁵⁹ Its motive is essentially negative: to reinforce the perception of the gulf which separates the Egyptian race from the rest of humanity. When Juvenal reflects on the fundamental difference between man and beast, he does not need to remind his audience that the inability of the two Egyptian communities to co-exist in harmony (*inter finitimos vetus atque antiqua simultas, / inmortale odium et numquam sanabile vulnus, / ardet adhuc Ombos et Tentura*, 33-5) and the appalling barbarity of which one group was guilty subvert every characteristic of humane co-existence described in the following lines:⁶⁰

*separat hoc nos
a grege mutorum, atque ideo venerabile soli
sortiti ingenium divinorumque capaces
atque exercendis pariendisque artibus apti
sensus a caelesti demissum traximus arce,
cuius egent prona et terram spectantia. mundi
principio indulsit communis conditor illis
tantum animas, nobis animum quoque, mutuus ut nos
adfectus petere auxilium et praestare iuberet,
dispersos trahere in populum, migrare vetusto
de nemore et proavis habitatas linquere silvas,*

⁵⁹ Fredericks 1976:185-6.

⁶⁰ Anderson (1982:210) makes the following comment on lines 153-7: 'These so-called developments presuppose a permanent condition of hostility among peoples, and therefore human society has become a series of fortified cities on permanent war footing. Human beings are normally hostile to each other, and culture has merely exacerbated the destructivity of expectable human conflicts.' Likewise, McKim (1986:68) describes Juvenal's examples as 'laughably inapposite, for they come from that least compassionate of social phenomena, warfare . . . Clearly the speaker is once again shooting himself in the foot.' However, neither commentator seems to attach any importance to the fact that for Juvenal's audience the realm of war must have provided the most obvious examples of *concordia* amongst embattled human beings, and that the 'war' between the Ombites and Tentyrans exemplified the antithesis of this virtue. Even the reference to a 'fallen comrade' (*lapsum . . . civem*, 156) is reminiscent of the plight of the unfortunate individual who stumbled in the desert.

*aedificare domos, laribus coniungere nostris
 tectum aliud, tutos vicino limine somnos
 ut conlata daret fiducia, protegere armis
 lapsum aut ingenti nutantem volnere civem,
 communi dare signa tuba, defendier isdem
 turribus atque una portarum clave teneri. (142-58)*

Juvenal's reflection on the nature of humanity leads to a general observation on the 'fall of mankind'. Human beings now display less fellow-feeling and compassion than even serpents and wild beasts - another example of effective satirical licence. Yet the lack of *concordia* amongst human beings in general and their warlike aggression almost pale into insignificance in the face of what those Egyptians perpetrated. Juvenal can confront his audience with cogent 'proof' that the Egyptians represent the nadir of human depravity:

*sed iam serpentum maior concordia. parcit
 cognatis maculis similis fera. quando leoni
 fortior eripuit vitam leo? quo nemore umquam
 expiravit aper maioris dentibus apri?
 Indica tigris agit rabida cum tigride pacem
 perpetuam, saevis inter se convenit ursis.
 ast homini ferrum letale incude nefanda
 produxisse parum est, cum rastra et sarcula tantum
 adsueta coquere et marris ac vomere lassi
 nescierint primi gladios extendere fabri
 aspiciamus populos quorum non sufficit irae
 occidisse aliquem, sed pectora, braccchia, voltum
 crediderint genus esse cibi. (159-71)*

With this comment Juvenal has cleverly contrived to return to, and to corroborate, his laconic observation with which he introduced his nauseating tale: *carnibus humanis vesci licet* (13); and the note of grim humour is sustained in the concluding lines:

*quid diceret ergo
vel quo non fugeret, si nunc haec monstra videret
Pythagoras, cunctis animalibus abstinuit qui
tamquam homine et ventri indulsit non omne legumen?* (171-4)

McKim⁶¹ is quick to seize upon what he perceives as Juvenal's 'implicit joke' here, in that he deliberately makes his speaker commit the 'climactic blunder' of forgetting that at the beginning of the poem (lines 9-12) he portrayed the Egyptians themselves as selective vegetarians:

he no doubt expects us to view selective vegetarianism as equally idiotic in both cases, and this final authorial irony serves to knock the props from under the speaker's exaltation of philosophy by implying that all it did for Pythagoras was to make him eat like an Egyptian.

However, this is yet another instance where one is asked to believe that an audience would have been so caught up in its detection of an apparently glaring inconsistency on the author's part, that the intended impact of Juvenal's 'parting shot' would have been nullified. To an audience already made smugly aware, from line 106 onwards, of the gulf which separated Graeco-Roman civilization from Egyptian barbarity, the dietary fastidiousness of Pythagoras served one immediate purpose: to emphasize his own civilized abhorrence of a practice which the Egyptians regarded as something normal and even divinely sanctioned (*carnibus humanis vesci licet*, 13). Furthermore, it is hardly likely that Juvenal's audience would have equated the laughable Egyptian belief in the 'sanctity' of a range of vegetables (note especially the satirical force of lines 10-1: *o sanctas gentes, quibus haec nascuntur in hortis / numina!*) with Pythagoras'

⁶¹ McKim 1986:69-70.

abstention from beans: in the Egyptians' case their vegetarian taboos are made quite absurd and meaningless by their indulgence in cannibalism; in Pythagoras' case his abomination of cannibalism is accentuated by his abstention from a particular vegetable type, because of its specifically *human* associations.⁶²

The conclusion to this *Satire*, far from undercutting its satirical effect by diverting the audience's attention to the speaker's 'climactic blunder', provides a good illustration of the opportunism of Juvenal's satirical method: he relies on the force of his humour or argument to capitalize on its *immediate* context and the spontaneous audience response, and not to be weakened by the dulling overlay of contemplative analysis.⁶³ To the objective, thoughtful and unprejudiced listener, Juvenal might indeed have stood accused of bigotry and illogicality; but, for an audience eager for a laugh and ready to indulge its own racial, cultural and religious prejudices, he must have been the source of extraordinarily witty and entertaining satire. It is therefore hard to believe that Juvenal's real purpose in writing this *Satire* was to present himself (or his 'speaker', as others would have it) as more deserving of ridicule and contempt than the despicable Egyptians, whom he satirizes so skilfully and vigorously. To attribute a subtly self-critical motive to this Roman diatribe against the Egyptians might well satisfy modern notions of 'political correctness', but it also introduces a dimension to which Juvenal and his audience would have reacted, I suspect, with *risus* and *odium*.

⁶² Rudd's phrase 'certain vegetable dishes' loses sight of the fact that Juvenal refers quite specifically to *beans*, with their special significance in a Pythagorean context. Whatever the actual reason for this dietary taboo (see J. Ferguson 1979: 322, for a summary of the various theories), it seems very likely that Juvenal is playing on a popular notion that the eating of beans had 'cannibalistic' overtones for Pythagoreans (e.g. their association with souls of the dead). Such an interpretation is corroborated by the context, where Juvenal quite clearly attributes Pythagoras' abstention from animal flesh to the conviction that human souls could exist in animal bodies.

⁶³ Courtney (1980:612) makes a valid observation: 'Juvenal's declamation is not concerned to arrive at a consistent moral evaluation of abstinence from meat and vegetables, but only with its application for its immediate effect of whipping up the reader's feelings in each context, even two opposite applications within the same satire.' On Juvenal's habit of keeping in focus just the immediate effect he sought to produce see also Courtney 1980:34-5 and the remarks of L. Friedländer (1969:40).

CHAPTER 9

Conclusion

This study has presented Juvenal's *Satires* as the fundamentally coherent and plausible product of the author's own personality, convictions and circumstances. It has therefore challenged the view that the dichotomy which the *persona* theory creates between the author and his notional 'speaker' provides the basis for a better insight into the factors which shaped the poems. In particular, it has argued that not only can the perceived shift away from Juvenal's characteristic *ira* and *indignatio* after Books 1 and 2 be explained without recourse to the notion of a deliberately refashioned *persona*, but that the image of the author which emerges from the later Books is, in essence, still remarkably evocative of the satirist who creates such an indelible and 'definitive' impression in the early *Satires*.

It is important to take into account the characteristics or 'dictates' of satire as a genre: within the context of Roman literature, satire was unique in providing the critical observer with a platform for a distinctly personal response to the perceived ills of society;¹ and the emphasis on a candid, if not consistently aggressive, treatment of foibles and vice is a salient feature of all the Roman satirists. The more intense the writer's own grievances and viewpoints were, the more likely it was that such factors would have a direct influence on his choice of theme and literary technique.

While it cannot be denied that writers sometimes project personalities and attitudes which differ from their own, it is equally true that a literary work may be intended as an accurate, or substantially accurate, reflection of an author's character and outlook at the

¹ It may be argued that the historiographical and epistolary forms provide scope for personal comment on social and moral issues, but neither has that as a definitive purpose.

time of writing. In the case of an emotive genre like satire, allowance should obviously be made for an element of exaggeration or intensification of a writer's projected feelings for rhetorical effect: 'exaggeration is the very essence of satire.'² This might, technically, be regarded as falling within the ambit of *persona*-creation; yet there is a significant difference between the sort of 'spontaneous' misrepresentation which results from warming to one's theme and the deliberate creation of an entirely bogus authorial *persona*.

This study has not attempted to deny that, on the whole, the later Books are less aggressive in manner. However, it has suggested that this shift towards a more moderate and 'philosophical' approach in some of the later *Satires* is partly explicable in terms of a *natural* alteration in the author's own outlook and circumstances. Also relevant to the satirist's manner and technique is the nature of the theme: some themes provide an ideal vehicle for angry invective; others call for a more analytical and reasoned treatment (see below).

In countering the perception that Juvenal was systematically recreating a literary *persona* by progressively abandoning the stance of an irate and indignant critic, the discussion of the *Satires* as a whole has focused on features of the later poems which suggest a strong affinity to the attitudes, interests and satirical manner of the earlier works: it is indeed remarkable how often one encounters passages in these later poems, which are the unmistakable product of the satirical talent evident in the forceful writing of Books 1 and 2. This affinity tends to confirm the impression that the *Satires* share the 'stamp' of a fundamentally consistent and definite authorial personality: in the words of Peter Green, 'a class-conscious, resentful, well-read, xenophobic, envious, slightly down-at-heels provincial poet.'³ In similar vein, Balsdon describes Juvenal as an 'authoritarian' personality, characterized by 'general ethnocentrism, also by excessive conformity, rigidity, concern with status, a tendency to see the world as harsh

² Wiesen 1963:467.

³ Green 1989:252.

and unfriendly and an inclination to favour strong punishment of deviants and offenders.⁴

In focusing on what are perceived to be the *real* authorial personality and outlook and in attributing changes to the author's own circumstances or current interests, there is obviously a danger of falling prey to the dangers of the so-called 'biographical fallacy'. Such a danger, as stressed earlier, is all the more real when there is a dearth of reliable biographical information about a writer; however, this does not mean that one should shy away from the judicious use of details and inferences which are inherently plausible. No one would now venture to offer a portrait of Juvenal's life as confident in its detail as that presented by Highet, for example.⁵ However, while it is accepted that early accounts of Juvenal's life have contributed a number of fanciful elements (notably his alleged banishment to Egypt by Domitian),⁶ it would seem equally perverse to ignore or downplay the significance of several key biographical factors of which we can be reasonably sure. On balance, the brief portraits offered by Green and Balsdon above would seem to be informed more by plausible inference than by fanciful conjecture.

There is no compelling reason (aside from the belief that all Roman poets habitually and misleadingly complained of straitened financial circumstances) to reject the notion that in his earlier Books Juvenal was genuinely writing from the standpoint of a disaffected client. Apart from his obvious empathy with the maltreated client-class, his

⁴ Balsdon 1979:37-8.

⁵ Highet 1954:40-1.

⁶ Courtney (1980:9) remarks that the story probably arose 'simply from Juvenal's phrase *quantum ipse notavi* (15.45)'. Nonetheless, while one should remain highly sceptical about his alleged exile in the form of a military appointment when he was over eighty years of age, there seems to be little doubt that Juvenal's knowledge of and antipathy towards things Egyptian (as evidenced by *Satire* 15 in particular) stemmed from personal observation. This, of course, need not imply an actual visit to that country (thus Friedländer 1895:17: 'Dass er in Aegypten gewesen ist, sagt er selbst 15,45'); as Green (1989:250) points out, 'this [personal observation] need not have been in Egypt. Rome (as Juvenal himself stresses at xenophobic length and frequency) was jam-packed with foreigners, Egyptians included.'

own participation in the irksome ritual of the *salutatio*⁷ is confirmed by Martial's portrait of his friend trudging sweatily through the noisy streets to the *limina . . . potentiorum*.⁸ If one is careful not to confuse *paupertas* with destitution and if one attaches due importance to a dependant's own perception that his talents and efforts are undervalued by a society characterized by enormous disparities in wealth (as suggested very clearly by the analogy of the poet Martial), the intensity of Juvenal's bitterness towards the *dives avarus* is quite understandable. Furthermore, this attitude is a key factor not only in *Satires* 1, 3 and 5, where the invidious lot of the neglected client features prominently, but also in Book 3, where the focus on the shabby treatment of poets and other intellectuals in the seventh *Satire* has a pronounced autobiographical resonance.

The discussions of *Satires* 1-6 have emphasised Juvenal's own resentment as a neglected dependant and his contempt for the corrupt Roman elite as the dominant factors which give the first three Books their basic coherence. However, while *Satires* 7, 8 and 9 are not characterised to the same extent by the strident invective which is the hallmark of the earlier poems, the notion that the image of the 'indignant' satirist is deliberately abandoned, albeit tentatively, after Book 2⁹ is less convincing, if one gives due weight to the types of themes treated in the third Book and to the nature of the satirical vehicle used in each instance.

The theme of the seventh *Satire* lends itself less to a loud denunciation of shocking immorality and more to a systematic exposé of the plight of intellectuals. So, too, the eighth *Satire* is more analytical in its response to the serious question, *stemma quid faciunt?*; while the ninth employs a dialogue form, in which an ostensibly sympathetic speaker elicits shocking and damning revelations from a client about his contemptible

⁷ *iubet a praecone vocari / ipsos Troiugenas, nam vexant limen et ipsi / nobiscum* (1.99-101).

⁸ *Ep.* 12.18.1.6.

⁹ Anderson 1982:295. It is interesting to note, however, that Juvenal does not appear to have abandoned Lucilius as a source of inspiration: see Hightet 72:379.

patron. The less strident expression of *ira* and *indignatio* in Book 3 should not be taken as proof that the satirist has contrived a new *persona*: the three poems still serve to convey Juvenal's deep-seated resentment at the plight of the client-class and his contempt for the upper echelons of society, to whose greed and decadence he ascribes the destruction of the traditional *mores* and the dysfunctional nature of the client-patron relationship. Whether Juvenal employs angry denunciation, sarcasm, grim humour or even pathos, this does not disguise the fundamental consistency of both the satirical targets and the authorial personality which emerges from the first three Books.¹⁰

This factor alone should make one very sceptical of theories which not only detect a deliberately altered *persona* but seek to invest it with a pose of ironic ambivalence towards the client-class. Juvenal's empathy with the plight of the disgracefully neglected intellectuals in *Satire 7* and his condemnation of the effete and corrupt elite in *Satires 8* and *9* are clear and forthright: the shift in satirical technique away from aggressive invective towards a more analytical treatment of the themes in *Satires 7* and *8* (as indeed befits the subject matter) and towards wryly ironic humour in the sordid dialogue with Naevolus in *Satire 9* are not to be interpreted as the manifestation of a refashioned authorial *persona*.

While he labels Book 3 'transitional' in respect of its features and its speaker, Anderson maintains that Juvenal abandoned his indignant satirist 'conclusively' in Book 4 and announced 'the laughing Democritus' as his new model.¹¹ Human folly, rather than wickedness, is the target of the tenth *Satire*.¹² It is therefore quite appropriate that

¹⁰ It is worth pointing out that, while both Juvenal and Horace recognized fearless aggressiveness as Lucilius' salient characteristic (Juv. 1.19-20; 165-7; Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.62-8), he too was capable of writing in a more philosophical or didactic vein - as evidenced by the homily on *virtus* (W 1196-1208).

¹¹ Anderson 1982:295.

¹² *omnibus in terris, quae sunt a Gadibus usque
Auroram et Gangen, pauci dinoscere possunt
vera bona atque illis multum diversa, remota
erroris nebula. quid enim ratione timemus
aut cupimus? quid tam dextro pede concipis ut te*

Juvenal's *exempla* should be presented more as objects of derision (*cachinni*, 31) than as targets of passionate invective; thus, for the purposes of this poem in particular, the 'laughing Democritus' provides an apt and well-known precedent for the satirist. However, the prominence given to the attitude of this philosopher in the introduction to this poem should not be interpreted as a clear pronouncement by Juvenal that Democritus is to be his consistent model from this point onwards, and that this therefore represents an unequivocal rejection of *ira* and *indignatio* as justifiable emotions. This much is made clear by the thirteenth *Satire*, where Calvinus is criticized not for anger *per se*, but for anger out of all proportion to the wrong done to him.

As stressed above, the very nature of the theme of the tenth *Satire* calls for a less aggressive and strident attack. The follies of human beings are, as implied by Juvenal's 'invocation' of Democritus and Heraclitus, enough to make one laugh or cry; and that is why he presents the attitudes of *both* the 'laughing Democritus' *and* the 'weeping' Heraclitus as appropriate responses: *iamne igitur laudas quod de sapientibus / ridebat, quotiens a limine moverat unum / protuleratque pedem, flebat contrarius auctor?* (10.28-30). Furthermore, his recognition of the relative ease of resorting to mocking laughter and his wonderment at the fact that Heraclitus had tears enough to shed¹³ hardly invalidate pathos as a suitable emotion;¹⁴ this, after all, is precisely the emotion elicited by several of the *exempla* in this poem.¹⁵ While *rigidi censura cachinni* (10.31) is the dominant satirical technique used to mock mankind's futile aspirations in the tenth *Satire*, it is not necessary to see this as a conscious and total rejection of *indignatio*;

conatus non paeniteat votique peracti? (10.1-6)

¹³ *sed facilis cuivis rigidi censura cachinni: / mirandum est unde ille oculis suffecerit umor* (10.31-2). Anderson's (1982:345) interpretation of line 32 (that the satirist 'expresses amazement - not admiration - that tears could come to any man's eyes at the sight of such manifest folly') is inaccurate.

¹⁴ Eichholz (1956:65): 'This tone will be one of harsh mockery, and that is why there will be little room left for pathos or for any but the most cynical brand of humour. Everything henceforth is to be viewed through the pitiless eyes of a Democritus.'

¹⁵ On pathos see Lawall 1958:25-31.

indeed, the numerous instances of harsh and censorious *humour* in Books 1 and 2 show that this particular satirical weapon is very compatible with *ira* and *indignatio*.¹⁶

As suggested above, the subject matter might render anger or indignation an inappropriate or less effective satirical technique: for example, when attention is focused on pathetic or laughable folly rather than on vice or depravity. The importance of theme as a major determinant of the satirical method or technique employed is equally evident in the fourth Book.¹⁷ Here, the themes lend themselves, in general, to a more consistently didactic approach, reminiscent of Horace's *Sermones*: in *Satire* 10, the 'right and wrong objects of prayer'¹⁸ (. . . *pauci dinoscere possunt / vera bona atque illis multum diversa, remota / erroris nebula*, 10.2-4); in *Satire* 11, the simple lifestyle (a theme succinctly summed up in the concluding sentence: *voluptates commendat rarior usus*, 11.208); and, in *Satire* 12, a warning against greed (*sed quis nunc alius, qua mundi parte quis audet / argento praeferre caput rebusque salutem*, 12.48-9).

From the outset of Book 1, Juvenal has focused persistently on *avaritia*, in all its manifestations, as a root cause of the malaise in Roman society; and this vice continues to play a dominant role in Book 3 (particularly in *Satires* 7 and 9). Not only

¹⁶ E.g. the mockery of contemporary poets for the tedious irrelevance of their mythological themes (1.1-14; 52-3); the glutton who eats himself to death (1.140-6); the embarrassing revelation of the 'moralist's' passive homosexuality (2.11-3); Laronia's spirited attack on the bogus moralists (2.36-63); the appearance and antics of effeminates like the chiffon-clad advocate (2.65-81), the male worshippers of *Bona Dea* (2.83-116), and the bizarre 'wedding' of Gracchus (2.117-48); the imaginary encounter between the souls of such people and those of the *Curii*, *Scipiones*, *et al.* in the Underworld (2.157-9); Umbricius' caricature of the Greeks (3.58-118); the absurdity of Domitian's cringing and sycophantic *amici* debating the fate of a fish (*Satire* 4); the mocking account of the dinner that awaits the spineless Trebius (*Satire* 5); and the caricatures of the various female types in the sixth *Satire*, such as the female athlete whose behaviour invites ridicule (6.246-64: *et ride positis scaphium cum sumitur armis*). However much descriptions such as these were intended to express Juvenal's *ira* and *indignatio*, it is impossible to deny that they rely for their effectiveness on a good measure of *rigidi censura cachinni*.

¹⁷ This is diametrically opposed to Anderson's (1982:344) view: 'In order to adopt a satirist of this nature [sc. Democritus], Juvenal had to introduce some radical changes into his works, not only changing the tone and manner of the speaker, *but also altering the very material which he chose to discuss* (my italics).'

¹⁸ As defined by Courtney 1980:446.

does *avaritia* come under further attack in *Satires* 11, 12 and 13, but the prominence given to it in *Satire* 14 (where he manipulates the original theme of parental responsibility into a concerted attack on greed) provides cogent evidence of the extent to which the satirist is preoccupied with this most pernicious of social evils.¹⁹ These poems also illustrate the fact that, even when Juvenal adopts a more didactic or reflective approach, his urge towards acerbic satire is far from suppressed; and, as in the cases of *Satires* 7 and 8, he shows his predilection for using ostensibly positive themes as platforms for attacks on vice and depravity. Similarly, when other satirical themes congenial to his ingrained prejudices present themselves (such as an appalling act of barbarism perpetrated by the despicable Egyptians), that urge can readily find expression through the poet's innate propensity towards *ira* and *indignatio*. Furthermore, Books 4 and 5 provide ample evidence the very qualities which characterize the so-called 'angry' satirist of the first two Books: vigorous and persistent denunciation of contemporary greed and other vices, strong moral convictions,²⁰ brooding pessimism and cynicism and, not least, an acerbic wit and a genius for crafting powerfully evocative images.

It is true that, in *Satires* 10-14, a sense of what is 'right' is conveyed in a more positive manner, rather than merely implied through the use of predominantly negative *exempla*; and that, despite his avowed independence and even ignorance of the main schools of philosophical thought,²¹ Juvenal shows a particular interest in the Epicurean virtue of *tranquillitas*: *monstro quod ipse tibi possis dare; semita certe / tranquillae per virtutem*

¹⁹ See Wehrle 1992:30.

²⁰ 'Juvenal wants us to believe that his purpose in writing satire is moral and that his conduct of his own life entitles him to assume the role of ethical teacher. No available information proves otherwise. A subsequent examination of the moral character of the poems themselves will serve to demonstrate that the traditional concept of their essentially ethical nature is more correct than current opinion would hold, that Juvenal, though by no means consistent in his thinking, does regard society from an ethical point of view . . .' (Wiesen 1963:471).

²¹ *accipe quae contra valeat solacia ferre
et qui nec Cynicos nec Stoica dogmata legit
a Cynicis tunica distantia, non Epicurum
suscipit exigui laetum plantaribus horti* (13.120-3)

patet unica vitae (10.363-4).²² This, however, is not a wholly new trait; such an ideal was already evident in *Satire* 3.²³ It is quite reasonable to attribute the development of a more 'philosophical' or reflective approach to factors other than purely artistic contrivance: it is one thing to nurture a developing interest, another to contrive such an interest as an objective literary artefact. It is possible, for example, that this new dimension to his writing arose in the course of time out of the realization that angry protests could effect no real changes for the better and that some solace could be derived from a more detached perspective.²⁴ Related to this is the comforting conviction, voiced in *Satire* 13, that ultimately wickedness finds its *nemesis* in the torture of a guilty conscience, if it does not actually fall prey to its own reckless persistence. For one steadfastly convinced that he lived in an age of unsurpassed and incorrigible vice, in which the gods were apparently ineffectual, it was probably both satisfying and logical to cultivate such a perspective.

This explanation is obviously conjectural, but it does provide a plausible basis for explaining Juvenal's more philosophical and didactic tendencies in Books four and five. One should also not lose sight of the fact that the poet's age could well have contributed to shifts of both attitude and interest.²⁵ Juvenal's own admission in *Satire* 11 that his wrinkled skin would rather bask in the warmth of the Spring sunshine and forgo public

²² On the philosophical background and literary influences, see Courtney 1980:446-54.

²³ Juvenal speaks of Baiae's *gratum litus amoeni / secessus* (3.4-5), in contrast to the perils, noise and squalor of Rome, while Umbricius provides a wistful portrayal of the relaxation and simple self-sufficiency of life in country towns (3.171-92; 223-31).

²⁴ This is implicit in his pessimistic outlook (e.g. 1.147-9: *nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat / posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores, omne in praecipiti vitium stetit*).

²⁵ Based on the assumption that Juvenal was born in c. 60 and that Book 5 was almost certainly produced after 127 (see Courtney 1980:1-2), he was probably between 60 and 65 when he composed Book 4. Anderson (1982:290, note 9) also attaches importance to the time-factor, but solely in terms of a conscious and deliberate deviation on Juvenal's part from his former manner: '... some twenty years have passed since the publication of Book 1, enough time to allow Juvenal to reconsider the manner of his satirist.'

events²⁶ and the implication that the advanced age²⁷ of his addressee in *Satire* 13 should have made him less naïve about the extent of vice and dishonesty in the world are illuminating details, whose significance should not be overlooked.

The evidence is tenuous, but sufficient to suggest that the shifts in tone and focus in Books 4 and 5 could also be attributed, in part, to Juvenal's circumstances and state of mind at that time. Green, for example, sees a close connection between the characteristics of Juvenal's writings and his personal circumstances, suggesting that he

perhaps had once enjoyed a modest competence, went through a spell of shabby poverty in his fifties, and towards the end of his life seems to have found some kind of financial security once again. The house in Rome - apparently a family legacy - the little farm out at Tivoli, with its homespun servants, the relaxed tone of meditation that marks many of the later satires: these things are not, surely, mere calculated literary affectations, designed to enhance a new *persona*.²⁸

In stressing the basic consistency of Juvenal's personality and attitudes through the *Satires* as a whole, *Satire* 15 provides powerful corroboration of the view that theme is a major determinant of the satirical manner adopted. The merciless attack on the Egyptians is not to be seen as a consciously contrived return to the 'old style' or, more fancifully, as an exercise in self-mockery. Rather, it is clear proof that Juvenal has *not* forsaken his inherently aggressive xenophobia, which was so prominent in Books 1 and 2 (and evident - sometimes quite gratuitously - in several of the later poems): given the appropriate stimuli, Juvenal responds in characteristic manner. But for the

²⁶ *nostra bibat vernum contracta cuticula solem / effugiatque togam* (11.203-4).

²⁷ *stupet haec qui iam post terga reliquit / sexaginta annos Fonteio consule natus?* (13.16-17).

²⁸ Green 1989:252; cf. Courtney 1980:9: 'This lends some color to the suggestion that the change of tone perceptible in Book 4 and to a lesser extent in 5 . . . and the emphasis on *tranquillitas* in Ten . . . may be at any rate partly due to an amelioration in his personal circumstances.'

incontrovertibly late date of this *Satire*, one might venture to suggest that some scholars would respond enthusiastically to any suggestion that *Satire* 15 belonged among Juvenal's earlier works.

In conclusion, the same might be said of the partially extant *Satire* 16, on which Ferguson makes the following observation: 'mood technique and vocabulary are authentically those of J[uvenal]: indeed one might argue that the return to an attack on the power-structure of Rome is a return to his old self.'²⁹ This bitterly ironic extolling of the 'advantages' of military life might well have been a daring attack on the dominant role of the military (the Praetorian Guard, in particular) in contemporary Roman power-politics;³⁰ but what is very apparent is Juvenal's familiar championing of the underdog. The invidious position of the civilian, compared to that of the soldier, on the 'battle-ground' of the law courts, is portrayed with as much sarcastic bitterness as is the lot of the indigent client in *Satires* 1 and 3.³¹ The description of the hapless civilian, cowed by the oafish and menacing arrogance of the military 'judiciary', has much in common with Umbricius' lamenting of the helpless resignation expected of the poor citizen at the mercy of a brutish thug in the third *Satire*:³²

*commoda tractemus primum communia, quorum
haut minimum illud erit, ne te pulsare togatus
audeat, immo, etsi pulsetur, dissimulet nec
audeat excussos praetori ostendere dentes*

²⁹ Ferguson 1979:323.

³⁰ See Ferguson 1979:325-6; Courtney 1980:613.

³¹ Clark (1988:118-20) draws attention to two themes which accord well with the author's attitudes and concerns in Book 1: the army itself has become an agent of corruption in Roman society at large (here one is reminded of the indictment at the end of *Satire* 2: *et tamen unus / Armenius Zalaces cunctis narratur ephebis / mollior ardenti sese indulsisse tribuno*, 2.163-5); and, more pertinently, the military tradition has been perverted into a means of self-enrichment (cf. 14.193-8, where a father advises his son to become a centurion, *ut locupletem aquilam tibi sexagesimus annus / adferat*).

³² *Sat.* 3.278-301.

*et nigram in facie tumidis livoribus offam
 atque oculum medico nil promittente relictum.
 Bardaicus iudex datur haec punire volenti
 calceus et grandes magna ad subsellia surae . . . (16.7-14)*

Not only do we see here brilliantly evocative details, such as the row of bulging calf-muscles (could not these 'thugs' have joined the cavalcade of disreputable types in *Satire* 1 or been included amongst the street hazards described in *Satire* 3?),³³ but we are also struck by Juvenal's ability to drive home the iniquity of any situation in a succinct and memorable manner:

*citius falsum producere testem
 contra paganum possis quam vera loquentem
 contra fortunam armati contraque pudorem. (32-4)*

At the same time, one is yet again reminded that Juvenal's brilliant eye for unusual and highly evocative visual detail is a persistent feature of his writing throughout the *Satires*. It is these qualities of 'perception and penetration' (to borrow the words of Richard Jenkyns)³⁴ which suggest a directness and close engagement with the subject matter which are somehow at odds with the concept of a dissimulating mask.

The sixteenth *Satire*, incomplete as it is, represents another facet of Juvenal's wide-ranging satirical scope (*quidquid agunt homines . . .*, 1.85 sqq.). To try to explain his hostile attitude against the background of his hypothetical sojourn in military exile would be a tempting, but futile, exercise. More instructive are the correlations which it, like *Satire* 15, shows with the salient character traits which are so powerfully conveyed in the first *Satire*, and its reminder of the assertion made at the outset of Book 1: *facit indignatio versum*. That one can still feel the presence of the bitter and acerbic

³³ Juvenal probably had those bulging calves in mind when he made Umbricius complain: *et in digito clavus mihi militis haeret* (3.248)!

³⁴ Jenkyns 1982:219.

pessimist of that first *Satire* is not the effect of calculated mask-changing, but a further indication that the *Satires* as a whole should be seen as a reflection of the author's *own* personality and perspective.

Bibliography

- | | | |
|-------------------------|--------|--|
| Abrams, M.H. | 1958 | <i>The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition</i> , New York (first published 1953, Oxford) |
| Adams, J.N. | 1982 | <i>The Latin Sexual Vocabulary</i> , London. |
| Adamietz, J. | 1972 | <i>Untersuchungen zu Juvenal</i> , Wiesbaden |
| Ahl, F. | 1984. | 'The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome', <i>AJPh</i> 105:174-208 |
| Alexander, W.H. | 1947 | 'Juvenal 7.126-128', <i>CP</i> :123-4 |
| Allen, W. <i>et al.</i> | 1970 | "Martial: Knight, Publisher, and Poet", <i>CJ</i> 65: 345-57 |
| Anderson, W.S. | 1955 | 'Juvenal. Evidence on the Years A.D. 117-128', <i>CPh</i> 50:255-7 |
| | 1956 | 'Recent Work in Roman Satire (1937-1955)', <i>CW</i> 50:33-40 |
| | 1964 | 'Recent Work in Roman Satire (1955-1962)', <i>CW</i> 57:293-301; 343-8 |
| | 1970 | 'Recent work in Roman Satire (1962-1968)', <i>CW</i> 63:181-94; 199; 217-22 |
| | 1981-2 | 'Recent Work in Roman Satire (1968-1978)', <i>CW</i> 75:273-99 |
| | 1982 | <i>Essays on Roman Satire</i> , Princeton |
| | 1987 | 'Juvenal Satire 15: Cannibals and Culture', <i>Ramus</i> 16:203-14 |
| Armstrong, D. A. | 1989 | <i>Horace</i> , New Haven |
| Baldwin, B. | 1967 | 'Cover-Names and Dead Victims in Juvenal', <i>Athenaeum</i> 45: 304-12 |
| Balsdon, J.P.V.D. | 1979 | <i>Romans and Aliens</i> , London |

- Bardon, H. 1977 'Reflexions sur réalité et Imaginaire chez Juvénal', *Latomus* 36:996-1002
- Bartsch, S. 1994 *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*, Cambridge Mass./London
- Bastomsky, S.J. 1990 'Rich and Poor: the Great Divide in Ancient Rome and Victorian England', *G&R* 37, No.1, April 1990:37-43
- 1993 'A Short but Frank Explanation of Juvenal Sat.6.5f', *Scholia* 2:86-9
- Beaton, R.J. 1984 *The Indebtedness of Juvenal to the Satires of Lucilius* (Diss. State University of New York at Albany)
- Bramble, J.C. 1974 *Persius and the Programmatic Satire: a Study in Form and Imagery*, Cambridge
- 1982 'Martial and Juvenal' in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II Latin Literature* edd. E.J. Kenney & W.V. Clausen, Cambridge, 597-623
- Braund, S.H. 1981 'Juvenal 8.58-9', *CQ* 31:221-3
- 1982 'Juvenal 7.50-52', *Phoenix* 36:162-6
- 1988 *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*, Oxford
- (ed.) 1989 *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*, Exeter
- 'City and Country in Roman Satire', in *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*:23-47
- 1991 'Juvenal - Misogynist or Misogamist?', *JRS* 82:71-86
- 1995 'A Woman's Voice? - Laronia's Role in Juvenal Satire 2', in *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*, edd. R. Hawley and B. Levick, London
- 1996 [1] Juvenal: Satires Book 1, Cambridge
- 1996 [2] 'The Solitary Feast: a Contradiction in Terms?' *BICS*

- 41:37-52
- Braund, S. H. Morton
1997 'A Passion Unconsoled? Grief and Anger in Juvenal *Satire 13*', in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature* edd. S. Morton Braund and C. Gill, Cambridge, 68-88
- Brown, P.G.McC. 1972 'Two Passages in Juvenal's Eighth Satire', *CQ* 22:374-5
- Cairns, F. 1979 *Tibullus. A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge
- Clack, J. 1974 'The Structure of Juvenal 4. A Reprise', *CB* 50:77-8
- Clark, M.E. 1988 'Juvenal Satire 16. Fragmentary Justice', *ICS* 13:113-25
- Cloud, D. 1989 'The Client-Patron Relationship: Emblem and Reality in Juvenal's First Book' in *Patronage in Ancient Society*, ed. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, London.
- Cloud, J.D. & Braund, S.H.
1982 'Juvenal's Libellus - a Farrago?', *G&R* 29:77-85
- Coffey, M. 1963 'Juvenal Report for the Years 1941-1961', *Lustrum* 8:161-215
- 1976 *Roman Satire*, London
- Colton, R.E. 1965 [1] 'Dinner Invitation: Juvenal 11.56-208', *CB* 42:41-5
- 1965 [2] 'Juvenal's Second Satire and Martial', *CJ* 61:68-71
- 1966 [1] 'Echoes of Martial in Juvenal's Third Satire', *Traditio* 22:403-19
- 1966 [2] 'Juvenal and Martial on the Equestrian order', *CJ* 61:157-9
- 1966 [3] 'Juvenal on Recitations', *CB* 42:81-5
- 1974 'Juvenal and Martial on Women Who Ape Greek Ways', *CB* 50:42-4
- 1976 [1] 'Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire and Martial', *CB* 52:13-5
- 1976 [2] 'A Client's Day: Echoes of Martial in Juvenal's First

- Satire', *CB* 52:35-8
- 1977 'Echoes of Martial in Juvenal's Tenth Satire', *Hermes* 105:234-46
- 1979 'Children in Juvenal and Martial', *CB* 56:1-3.
- 1991 *Juvenal's Use of Martial's Epigrams: a Study of Literary influence*, Amsterdam
- Corn, A.M. 1992 '"Thus Nature Ordains": Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire', *ICS* 17 (Part 2): 309-22
- Courtney, E. 1980 *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London
- Cuccioli, R. 1991 'The Banquet in Juvenal Satire 5', *Leeds Latin Seminar VI*:139-43
- Davey, F. 1971 'Juvenal 7.242ff.', *CR* 21:11
- Duncan-Jones, R. 1982 *The economy of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge
- Earl, D.C. 1967 *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome*, London
- Eden, P.T. 1985 'Juvenalia', *Mnemosyne* 38:334-52
- Edmunds, L. 1972 'Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire', *RhM* 115:59-73
- Edwards, C. 1993 *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge
- 1997 'Unspeakable Professions: Public Performance and Prostitution in Ancient Rome', in *Roman Sexualities*, ed. by J. Hallett and M. Skinner, Princeton, 66-95
- Ehrenpreis, I. 1974 *Literary Meaning and Augustan Values*, Charlottesville
- Eichholz, D.E. 1956 'The Art of Juvenal and his Tenth Satire', *GR* 3:61-9
- Elliott, R. C. 1982 *The Literary Persona*, Chicago and London
- Felton, K. and Lee, K.H. 1972 'The Theme of Juvenal's Eleventh Satire', *Latomus* 31:141-6
- Ferguson, J. 1958 *Moral Values in the Ancient World*, London
- 1979 *Juvenal: The Satires*, New York
- Fishelov, D. 1990 'The Vanity of the Reader's Wishes: Rereading

- Juvenal's Satire 10', *AJPh* 111:370-82
- Flintoff, T.E.S. 1990 'Juvenal's Fourth Satire', *Leeds Latin Seminar* VI:121-37
- Fordyce, C.J. 1973 *Catullus: a Commentary*, Oxford
- Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. (ed.) 1998 *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*, London
- Fredericks, S.C. 1971 'Calvinus in Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire', *Arethusa* 4:219-31
- 1972 'Rhetoric and Morality in Juvenal's 8th Satire', *TAPhA* 102:111-32
- 1973 'The Function of the Prologue (1-20) in the Organisation of Juvenal's Third Satire', *Phoenix* 27:62-7
- 1976 'Juvenal's Fifteenth Satire', *Illinois Classical Studies* 1:174-89
- 1979 'Irony of Overstatement in the Satires of Juvenal', *ICS* 4:178-91
- Fredricksmeyer, H.C. 1990 'An Observation on the Programmatic Satires of Juvenal, Horace and Persius', *Latomus* 49:792-800
- Freudenburg, K. 1993 *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*, Princeton
- Friedländer, L. 1895 *D. Junii Juvenalis Saturarum Libri V mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*, Leipzig (reprinted 1962, Amsterdam)
- 1969 *Essays on Juvenal* (translated by J. Martyn, Amsterdam)
- Frøelund J. B. 1981-2 'Crime, Vice and Retribution in Juvenal's Satires', *C&M* 33: 155-68
- 1986 'Martyred and Beleaguered Virtue. Juvenal's Portrait of Umbricius', *C & M* 38:185-17

- Frye, N. 1944 'The Nature of Satire', *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly* 14:75-89
- 1957 *Anatomy of Criticism*, Princeton
- Gelzer, M. 1969 *The Roman Nobility* (trans. R. Seager), Oxford
- Gérard, J. 1976 *Juvénal et la Réalité Contemporaine*, Paris
- Gold, B. K. (ed.) 1982 *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, Austin
- Gold, B. K. and Morton Braund, S. (ed.)
- 1998 'Vile Bodies: Roman Satire and Corporeal Discourse', *Arethusa*, Volume 31, Number 3
- Gowers, E. 1993 *The Loaded Table. Representations of Food in Roman Literature*, Oxford
- Green, P. 1967 *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires*, Penguin
- 1974 *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires*, Penguin
- 1998 *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires*, Penguin
- 1989 'Juvenal Revisited', in *Classical Bearings: Interpreting Ancient History and Culture*, London 1989
- Griffith, J.G. 1962 'Juvenal and Stage-Struck Patricians', *Mnemosyne* 15:256-61
- 1969 [1] 'Frustula Iuvenaliana', *CQ* 19:379-87
- 1969 [2] 'Juvenal, Statius, and the Flavian Establishment', *G&R* 16:134-50
- 1970 'The Ending of Juvenal's First Satire and Lucilius, Book XXX', *Hermes* 98:56-72
- Hallett, J.P. 1997 'Female Eroticism and the Denial of Roman Reality in Latin Literature', in *Roman Sexualities*, ed. by J.P. Hallett and M.B. Skinner, Princeton, 255-73
- Hardie, A. 1983 *Statius and the Silvae: Poets, Patrons, and Epideixis in the Greco-Roman World*, Liverpool
- 1990 'Juvenal and the Condition of Letters: the Seventh

- Satire', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*. Sixth Volume
- Helmbold, W.C. 1956 'Juvenal's Twelfth Satire', *CP* 51:14-23
- Helmbold, W.C. and
O'Neill, E.N. 1956 'The Structure of Juvenal 4', *AJPh* 77:68-73
1959 'The Form and Purpose of Juvenal's Seventh Satire',
CP 54:100-8
- Hight, G. 1951 'Juvenal's Bookcase', *AJP* 72:369-94
1954 *Juvenal the Satirist*, Oxford
1962 *The Anatomy of Satire*,
1974 'Masks and Faces in Satire', *Hermes* 102:321-37
- Hodgart, M. 1969 *Satire*, London
- Hopkins, K. 1983 *Death and Renewal*, Cambridge
- Hutchinson, G.O. 1993 *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal: a Critical Study*, Oxford
- Jenkyns, R. 1982 *Three Classical Poets*, London
- Jones, F. 1982 'A Note on Juvenal Sat.7.86', *CQ* 32: 478-79
1983 'Towards an Interpretation of Juvenal *Satire* 11',
AClass 26:104-7
1987 'Trebius and Virro in Juvenal 5', *LCM* 12:148-54
1989 'Juvenal *Satire* VII', in *Studies in Latin Literature*
V:444-64 (ed. by Deroux, C.: *Coll. Latomus* No. 206)
1990 [1] 'The Persona and the Addressee in Juvenal *Satire*
11', *Ramus* 19:160-8
1990 [2] 'The *Persona* and the *Dramatis Personae* in Juvenal
Satire Four', *Eranos* 88:47-59
1993 'Juvenal, *Satire* 13', *Eranos* 91.2:81-92
- Kennedy, A.J. 1989 'Ancient Antecedents of Modern Literary Theory',
AJPh 110: 492-8
- Kennedy, G. 1972 *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.-
A.D. 300*, Princeton

- Kenney, E.J. 1962 'The First Satire of Juvenal', *PCPS* 8:29-40
 1963 'Juvenal: Satirist or Rhetorician?', *Latomus* 22:704-20
- Kernan, A. 1959 *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*,
 1965 *The Plot of Satire*, New Haven
- Kilpatrick, R.S. 1973 'Juvenal's 'Patchwork' Satires: 4 and 7', *YCIS* 23:229-41
- Knoche, U. 1975 *Roman Satire* (trans. E.S. Ramage), Bloomington
- Konstan, D. 1993 'Sexuality and Power in Juvenal's Second Satire', *LCM* 18.1:12-4
 1995 'Patrons and Friends', *CP* 90:328-42
 1997 *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge
- Lacey, K. (transl.) 1986 Cicero: Second Philippic Oration, Warminster
- LaFleur, R.A. 1975 'Amicus and Amicitia in Juvenal', *CB* 51:54-8
 1979 'Amicitia and the Unity of Juvenal's First Book', *ICS* 4: 158-77
- Lawall, G. 1958 'Exempla and Theme in Juvenal's Tenth Satire', *TAPhA* 89:25-31
- Levi, P. 1997 *Horace: a Life*, London
- Lindo, L.I. 1974 'The Evolution of Juvenal's Later Satires', *CP* 69:17-27
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1995 *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*, New Haven and London
- Mack, M. 1951-2 'The Muse of Satire', *Yale Review* 41:80-92
- MacMullen, R. 1982 'Roman Attitudes to Greek Love', *Historia* 31:484-502
- Maebblestone, H. 1985 'Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes', *Mnemosyne* 38:156-8
- Malnati, T.P. 1988 'Juvenal and Martial on Social Mobility', *CJ* 83:133-41

- Marache, R. 1989 'Juvénal - peintre de la société de son temps', *ANRW* II 33.1:592-639
- Martyn, J.R.C. 1964 'Juvenal on Latin Oratory', *Hermes* 92:121-3
- 1970 'A New Approach to Juvenal's First Satire', *Antichthon* 4:53-61
- 1985 'Juvenal III.108', *Latomus* 44:394-7
- Mason, H.A. 1963 'Is Juvenal a Classic?' in *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire*, ed. J.P. Sullivan, London
- Mayer, R. 1989 'Friendship in the Satirists' in *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*, ed. S.H. Braund, Exeter:5-21
- McCabe, K. 1986 '"Was Juvenal a Structuralist?" A Look at Anachronisms in Literary Criticism', *G&R* 33 No.1:78-84
- McDevitt, A.S. 1968 'The Structure of Juvenal's Eleventh Satire', *G&R* 15:173-9
- McGann, M.J. 1968 'Juvenal's Ninth Age (13.28ff)', *Hermes* 96:509-14
- McKay, A.G. and Shepherd, D.M. 1976 *Roman Satire*, Houndmills Basingstoke
- McKim, R. 1986 'Philosophers and Cannibals. Juvenal's 15th Satire', *Phoenix* 40:58-71
- Morford, M. 1973 'Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire', *AJP* 94:26-36
- 1977 'Juvenal's Fifth Satire', *AJP* 98:219-45
- Motto, A.L. and Clark, J.R. 1965 'The Mythos of Juvenal 3', *TAPhA* 96:267-76
- O'Neill, E.N. 1960 'The structure of Juvenal's fourteenth Satire', *CP* 55:251-3
- Ogilvie, R.M. 1980 *Roman Literature and Society*, Harmondsworth
- Parmer, J.H. 1991 'Juvenal 3.41-48', *Latomus* 50:395-9
- Powell, B.B. 1979 'What Juvenal Saw: Egyptian Religion and Anthropophagy in Satire 15', *RhM* 122:185-9
- Quinn, K. 1979 *Texts and Contexts: The Roman Writers and their*

- Audience*, London
- Ramage, E.S. 1978 'Juvenal, Satire 12: on Friendship True and False', *ICS* 3:221-37
- Ramage, E.S., Sigsbee, D.L. and Fredericks, S.C. 1974 *Roman Satirists and their Satire*, New Jersey
- Reekmans, T. 1971 'Juvenal's Views on Social Change', *AncSoc* 2:117-61
- Richlin, A. 1984 'Invective Against Women in Roman Satire', *Arethusa* 17:67-80
- 1993 'Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law Against Love between Men', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3 (no.4):523-73
- Romano, A.C. 1979 *Irony in Juvenal*, Hildesheim/New York
- Ronnick, M.V. 1994 'Ratio Studiorum in Juvenal's Satire 7.1 and Cicero's *Pro Archia* 1.1', *Scholia* 3:91-4
- Rudd, N., 1964 'The Style and the Man', *Phoenix* 18:216-31
- 1966 *The Satires of Horace*, Cambridge
- 1976 *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*, Cambridge
- 1986 *Themes in Roman Satire*, London
- 1991 *Juvenal: The Satires*, Oxford
- Saller, R.P. 1982 *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge
- 1983 'Martial on Patronage and Literature', *CQ* 33 (i): 246-57
- 1989 'Patronage and Friendship in Early Imperial Rome: Drawing the Distinction', in *Patronage in Ancient Society*, ed. A. Wallace-Hadrill, London
- Scott, I.G. 1927 *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal*, Northampton, Mass.

- Seager, R. 1977 'Amicitia in Tacitus and Juvenal', *AJAH* 2:40-50
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 1982 *Profile of Horace*, London
- Shero, L.R. 1923 'The *Cena* in Roman Satire', *CP* 18:126-43
- Sherwin-White, A.N. 1967 *Racial Prejudice in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge
- Singleton, D. 1972 'Juvenal 6.1-20 and Some Ancient Attitudes to the Golden Age', *G&R* 19:151-64
- 1983 'Juvenal's Fifteenth Satire: A Reading', *G&R* 30, No.2:198-207
- Smith, W.S. 1989 'Greed and Sacrifice in Juvenal's 12th Satire', *TAPA* 119:287-98
- Snowden, F.M. 1970 *Blacks in Antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass.
- 1983 *Before Color Prejudice*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Stein, J.P. 1970 'The Unity and Scope of Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire', *CP* 65:34-6
- Stewart, R. 1994 'Domitian and Roman Religion: Juvenal, Satires Two and Four', *TAPhA* 124:309-32
- Sullivan, J.P. 1963 (ed.) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire*, London
- 1991 *Martial: the Unexpected Classic*, Cambridge
- Syme, R. 1949 'Personal Names in *Annals* I-VI', *JRS* 39:6-18
- 1979 'Juvenal, Pliny and Tacitus', *AJP* 100:250-78
- 1984 *Roman papers* vol. III, ed. A.R. Birley (Oxford)
- Taylor, L.R. 1968 'Republican and Augustan Writers Enrolled in the Equestrian Centuries', *TAPhA* 99:469-86
- Taylor, R. 1997 'Two Pathic Subcultures in Ancient Rome', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 7 (no. 3):319-71
- Tengström, E. 1980 *A Study of Juvenal's Tenth Satire. Some Structural and Interpretative Problems*, Göteborg
- Townend, G.B. 1974 'The Literary Substrata to Juvenal's Satires', *JRS* 63:148-60

- Toynbee, J.M.C. 1971 *Death and Burial in the Roman World*, New York
- Ullman, B.L. 1950 'Psychological Foreshadowing in the Satires of Horace and Juvenal', *AJPh* 71:408-16
- Vermeule, E. 1979 *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*, Berkeley
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1989 'Patronage in Roman society: from Republic to Empire', in *Patronage in Ancient Society*, ed. Wallace-Hadrill, London
- Walters, J. 1998 'Juvenal, *Satire* 2: Putting Sexual Deviants on Show', in *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*, ed. L. Foxhall and J. Salmon, London, 148-54
- Warmington, E.H. (ed. and trans.) 1938 *Remains of Old Latin*, Loeb Edition, London
- Waters, K. 1964 'The Character of Domitian', *Phoenix* 18:49-77
- Watts, W.J. 1976 'Race Prejudice in the Satires of Juvenal', *AClass* 19: 83-104
- Wehrle, W.T. 1991 *The Satiric Voice: Program, Form and Meaning in Persius and Juvenal*, Diss. University of Southern California, Los Angeles (DA 52 1991-2 3270A)
- White, P. 1974 'Ecce iterum Crispinus', *AJP* 95:377-82
- 1978 'Amicitia and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome', *JRS* 68:74-92
- 1982 'Positions for Poets in Early Imperial Rome', in B.K. Gold (ed.), *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin):50-66
- Wiesen, D.S., 1963 'Juvenal's Moral Character, an Introduction', *Latomus* 22:440-71
- 1973 'Juvenal and the Intellectuals', *Hermes* 101:464-83
- Wilson, P.F. 1995 'A "Complete Catalogue of Sexist Slurs": Juvenal's Sixth Satire and Bob Dylan's *Just Like a Woman*,

- LCM 20.1&2:4-9
- Winkler, M.M. 1983 *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal*, Hildersheim
- 1995 'Alogia and Emphasis in Juvenal's Fourth Satire', in *Critical Studies in Greek and Roman Literature*, ed. A.J. Boyle, Vol. 24 No. 1: *Roman Literature and Ideology II*: 59-81
- Witke, E.C. 1962 'Juvenal 3, an Eclogue for the Urban Poor', *Hermes* 90:244-6
- 1970 *Latin Satire: The Structure of Persuasion*, Leiden
- Woodman, A.J. 1983 'Juvenal 1 and Horace', *G&R* 30:81-4
- Woodman, A.J. and Powell, G.F. (ed.) 1992 *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*, Cambridge