

The Invisibility of Juvenal

James Uden

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2011

© 2011

James Uden

All rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

The Invisibility of Juvenal

James Uden

This dissertation offers a reading of Juvenal's *Satires*. It maintains that Juvenal consciously frustrates readers' attempts to identify his poetic voice with a single unitary character or persona. At the same time, it argues that Juvenal's poems are influenced in both form and theme by cultural trends in the early second century. The arguments staged in these poems constitute a critique of aspects of Roman intellectual culture in the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian.

Contents

Preface

1. Provoking the Charge: Epic Poet and Reticent Informer in *Satire One*

The Recitation Hall (Part One)

The Paradox of Contemporary Epic

The Satirist as *Delator*

The Crisis of Criticism

Satiric Voices in Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus*

The Recitation Hall (Part Two)

2. The Invisibility of Juvenal

'Atopic Topology': The Thirteenth Oration of Dio Chrysostom

Juvenal's Second *Satire*: Strategies for Speech and Disguise

Secrecy and Violence in *Satire Nine*

3. *Satire Four*: Playing the Panegyrist

The Art of Exaggeration

The Emperor over Nature

Natural Reversal and Fish Savagery

The Perils of Panegyric Speech

4. Cynic Philosophy and Ethical Education in *Satires* Ten and Fourteen

Debasing the Coinage

The Laugh of Democritus and the Cynic Ideal

Satire Fourteen: The Domestication of Ethical Teaching

5. *Satire* Twelve: Repetition and Sacrifice in Hadrianic Rome

Horatian Ritual and the “New Augustus”

Substitution and Sacrifice: Animals and Humans in *Satire* Twelve

The Gods and their *Captatores*

Reading across Books: Atheism and Superstition in *Satire* Thirteen

Appendix: Martial 12.18 and the Dating of Juvenal’s First Book

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks must go first to Gareth Williams, friend and mentor for the past half-decade. His support and unfailing confidence in me has always given me courage in my own ideas. Katharina Volk has been a shining academic example and valued friend over the same period. Kristina Milnor, Nancy Worman and Suzanne Saïd all had a profound impact on me in profoundly different ways, and I thank them for their generosity with their time, knowledge, and advice. I could not now imagine a place I would prefer to have spent my formative years as a classicist than Columbia, and for that I must also thank Alan Cameron, Marco Fantuzzi, Helene Foley, Liz Irwin, Elizabeth Scharffenberger, Deborah Steiner, and Jim Zetzel. Colette Boudreau, Selina Rivera and Gerry Visco also deserve thanks for eradicating any chance of boredom in the day-to-day running of the department. For financial support over this time, I thank Columbia for a graduate student fellowship, and the University of Sydney for three years' support on a Cooper Travelling Scholarship.

Joy Connolly, Kirk Freudenburg, Paul Allen Miller, and Alessandro Schiesaro kindly read individual chapters, and I thank them for their comments and criticisms. Brian Hook sent me unpublished work. I would like to thank Kirk Freudenburg (again) and Craig Williams for being part of my dissertation committee.

On a more personal note, I am grateful to the University of Sydney Classics Department for my early training in Classics, especially Dexter Hoyos and Lindsay and Pat Watson.

Maggie, Peter, and Rob Uden (my family) always supported me to pursue my ambitions in academia, even when it seemed to be far from a viable career choice. Erik Hamer has, for the past 10 years, been a solid friend, and the source of many, many books. Adam Winkel has influenced me in so many ways over the past 3 years, and I thank him for everything, along with Penny, Quevedo, Sunday Bob, and the other unforgettable inhabitants of apartment 63. Finally, I must acknowledge two teachers and scholars without whom I would never have become a classicist in the first place: Emily Matters and Frances Muecke.

*Experiar igitur, ut possum, quamquam
oppletis auribus tuis, ut sic dixerim, insusurrare,
sine aemulandi fiducia, cupidus imitandi.*

(Panegyrici Latini 12.1.5)

PREFACE

This study of Juvenal's *Satires* is guided by two basic ideas. First, rather than adopting any coherent persona throughout the *Satires*, Juvenal is invisible. The social criticism of his poems is transmitted through a crowd of voices, which constantly shift and are frequently inconsistent with one another, and the satirist consciously frustrates attempts to tie these voices to any unitary authorial persona. Second, despite this personal invisibility, rather than being detached from the political context in which they were produced, the five books of *Satires* engage closely and critically with the characteristic ideological controversies of the Trajanic and Hadrianic periods. The development from the earlier to the later books, usually charted in terms of a change in Juvenal's satiric persona, should instead be linked to broader cultural shifts at Rome across the three decades of the poems' composition. Neither timeless nor late, Juvenal is, in every sense, a satirist of the second century, in both theme and technique.

The past fifty years have changed how we read Juvenal's poetry, and Latin poetry in general. Highet's *Juvenal the Satirist* (1954) was the last bastion of the strongly biographical approach. Influenced by Alvin B. Kernan's study of Renaissance satire (1959), and more broadly by New Criticism, William S. Anderson reacted against this biographical approach by emphasizing instead that Juvenal's poetic voice is precisely that – a deliberately constructed poetic voice, or *persona* ('mask'), which ought not to be interpreted as a direct reflection of the satirist's own beliefs. In his view, the angry speaker of the first and second books is a farcical, incompetent figure; then, as the books progress, the angry attacks of this

figure are replaced with a more circumspect irony.¹ ‘Persona theory’ was consistently presented in the scholarship as a corrective to the supposed naïveté of the biographical approach, but in fact it shares its basic premises. To speak of Juvenal’s persona is to imply that the poems construct a character that can be read from his poems, a character with at least enough internal coherence to be the recognizable object of satire. The reading process still involves connecting dots to assemble a composite picture of a speaker – albeit a speaker now understood as a fictional character rather than the author as historical figure. But then this approach typically involves constructing a picture of the author, too, and the cool control and (implicitly liberal) views of Juvenal the satirist are contrasted with the character that speaks in his poems.

But rather than attempting to delineate the characteristics of Juvenal’s persona, we might better ask why he constantly frustrates the attempt. Unlike the other Roman verse satirists, Juvenal says almost nothing about himself, and rarely refers to his own experience as an ethical lesson or standard. His alienating, off-kilter poems, with their crowds of unknowable targets and their purposefully unbalanced structures, are an elaborate rhetorical exercise in self-concealment. In chapter two of this study, I demonstrate how Juvenal’s paradoxical combination of forceful indignation and personal ‘invisibility’ can be paralleled in other strands of early second-century intellectual culture, and particularly in the Greek sophistic displays associated with the Second Sophistic. On the other hand, it is precisely in the reader’s attempt to locate, define, and assess the nature and identity of the voices of his

¹ Anderson’s articles are collected in *Essays on Roman Satire* (1982). His approach was developed most prominently by Winkler (1983) and Braund (1988) and (1996). Keane (2006: 138-40) and Rosen (2007: 220-23) have expressed dissatisfaction with the way the persona approach insulates the satirist’s voice from social reality and diminishes its responsibility for the views it espouses, concerns already aired by Braund (1997: 40).

poems that the *Satires* communicate their message. It is key to *Satire* ten, for example, for the reader to realize the philosophical specificity of the poem's Cynic speaker, and his incongruence with Juvenal's other speakers. The uncomfortably extreme argument advanced in that poem therefore becomes a satiric critique on the dangerous extremism of contemporary Cynics. The questions about divine justice and the role of the gods in *Satire* thirteen, rather than being set out explicitly as in a philosophical dialogue, are instigated precisely by the reader's task of disentangling the atheist from the superstitious voice in that poem. Much of the force of *Satire* four, on panegyric, consists in realizing the similarity between the voice of the satirist and that of the panegyrist, two forms of rhetorical discourse that depend on fictionalization and exaggeration as a protreptic to a particular view of the Empire. The fast-moving, ever-elusive 'identity parade'² of the Second Sophistic is transformed, in Juvenal's texts, into a vehicle not merely for rhetorical display, but for vital, and pointedly Roman, cultural critique.

Needless to say, this vision of Juvenal involves expanding our sense of the satirist's contact with his surrounding intellectual milieu. Latinists' instinct to use genre to organize and understand ancient literature emerges nowhere more strongly than in the case of Roman satire, the genre which, in the ubiquitously-quoted words of Quintilian, is 'wholly ours'.³ Institutionally as well as generically, this is a Latin form, for Latinists, and the canon created by Quintilian for the purposes of Roman educational syllabi has proved an all-too convenient heuristic tool for modern literary critics in understanding these poets' texts. Moreover, the movement dubbed the New Latin by Don Fowler introduced to the discipline, in the nineteen-eighties and nineties, more refined critical tools than ever to interpret the

² Whitmarsh (2005: 32).

³ 10.1.93: *satura quidem tota nostra est*.

sophisticated and playful diachronic relationships Roman poets establish with one another through allusion, thereby further re-entrenching genre as the focus of study. Yet the (undeniable and well-studied) parallels between the extant Roman verse satirists should not lead us to the erroneous impression that they write merely to engage in self-referential conversation with each another. Nor is Juvenal unaware of the vast elision of historical distance and circumstance that such a conversation involves. Rather, he uses allusions to previous poets to measure the distance between his own period and theirs; he rings changes to stock satiric situations to illustrate new ideological concerns; and he certainly does not limit his reading and experience to the small, circumscribed canon of Roman verse satire.

Juvenal is writing in a period of unique cultural interchange between Roman and Greek in the Roman Empire. In the second century, Greek display oratory, Cynic philosophy, and scholarly interests in Greek literature and mythology became, more than ever before, an issue of public interest and influence, rather than the leisure activity of elite Roman *otium*. The parochial and anachronistic culture of Latin poetic *recitatio* in which Juvenal situates his first *Satire*, and his very choice to write in the genre of hexametric verse satire, is not unaffected by the cultural trends of the early second century. Rather, the very contrived Romanness of his poetry is a response to the cultural fluidity of the world around him, very much akin to the willful cultural blindness to Rome exemplified in many Second Sophistic Greek authors. As Greek-speaking contemporaries do with authentic ‘Attic’ identity, Juvenal engages in a quest to articulate an essential Roman position apart from Greece precisely *because* of the inextricable political and cultural interdependence of Roman and Greek in this period. Moreover, far from being insulated from contemporary trends, as I hope to demonstrate, the cultural influences that shaped, for example, the orations of Dio Chrysostom, are perceptible

in the theme and form of Juvenal's *Satires*. The later, Hadrianic books of *Satires*, especially, are pronounced in their sense of ideological competition with Greek forms of ethical teaching and philosophy. Juvenal is not only aware of these trends, but critiques them.

This view of Juvenal's work requires that it be particularly sensitive to cultural change in Rome under the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. Indeed, Juvenal's five books could well be considered a kind of microcosm of Rome in the first three decades of the second century, with its shifting ideological pressure points. The satirist in the Trajanic books is concerned with the re-articulation of a space for free expression in a Rome still reeling from the rule of Domitian (*Satire one*). The surge of interest in Greek sophists, to which Pliny was witness in his letters, is evident in *Satire three*; their emphasis on the mutability of identity provokes an investigation of Roman notions of self-hood in that poem. Panegyrists in the era after the Flavians, including Pliny, need now to reconsider the ideological impact of presenting the emperor as openly divine, and this is the theme of Juvenal's critique of panegyric in *Satire four*. The Hadrianic books demonstrate a new interest in philosophy and religion closely attuned to the cultural interests of the new emperor himself. In *Satire ten*, Juvenal specifically targets the Cynics, whose potentially corrosive philosophy was enjoying popularity and influence at every social level throughout the Roman Empire in the early second century. In *Satire twelve*, he offers a critique of the Hadrianic culture of religious revival, the emperor's own claims to embody a new Augustus, and Rome's own incessant habit of cultural repetition. At the height of the Empire's geographical expanse, and in light of the emperor's own itinerancy, *Satire fifteen* raises the question of where Roman identity is truly to be found, and what lingering characteristics can distinguish Roman from foreign in an age when, as the panegyrists were fond of putting it, Rome *was* the world.

I hope to substantiate the claims made above for the aims of each of these *Satires* in the following five chapters. The Juvenal who will, I hope, emerge from these pages is a far more elusive satirist than previous critics have emphasized, one who uses silence and contradiction to provoke readers into reassessing their views. He is also, quite simply, *more* of a satirist, and my emphasis has been throughout on Juvenal's critical engagement with the world around him. It is not, of course, a comprehensive study of Juvenal's poetry. Necessarily, I have been selective in the poems treated and the themes highlighted. The happy circumstance of my getting a job, and the time constraints it imposed, meant that two planned chapters – one a joint chapter on *Satires* 3 and 8, and another on *Satire* 15 – had to be shelved, but I hope they will form part of this study at a later stage. Translations are my own, though I acknowledge the influence of Green (1998) and Braund (2004) in particular. The text throughout is Clausen's revised OCT. Courtney's invaluable 1980 commentary is cited by name alone.

1. Provoking the Charge: Epic Poet and Reticent Informer in *Satire 1*

Juvenal's first *Satire* begins at a recitation held in the house of 'Fronto' (1.12). Although no completely secure identification can be made – and Fronto is not an uncommon name – the commentators suggest that this is Titus Catus Caesius Fronto, suffect consul in September-December 96, certainly an eminent and wealthy man, and thus perhaps a likely candidate to hold a *recitatio* in his villa.¹ Juvenal flits by this Fronto, barely identified, who then takes his place amongst the *Satires'* immense accumulation of names. But this is Juvenal's way. The allusive references throughout the *Satires* cast to us the responsibility of pinning names on specific individuals, implicating the reader in the project of the satire, leaving us to confirm suspicions and make connections between his web of named and unnamed individuals.

What, then, of T. Catus Caesius Fronto's connections? He was, for example, as Syme suggested, a relative of the epic poet Silius Italicus, perhaps his son or nephew, a connection that may add particular point to Juvenal's lambasting of the staleness of epic themes.² Martial addresses an epigram (1.55) to an apparent patron named Fronto, and though identification is no more secure there than here, Catus Fronto may be that Fronto, too.³ Martial describes him as 'the famous glory of the soldiery and the toga' (*clarum militiae...togaeque decus*, 2), alluding to success in both a military career and as an orator. The poem contrasts urban

¹ On this Fronto, see Ferguson (1987: 97). Von Premerstein (1908), instead, suggests an alternate identification with an earlier Fronto (*CIL* 5.2386). In addition to these two, at least three further Frontos were consuls in 80, 86 and 90 respectively: see Howell (1980: 237). The scholiasts (Wessner 1931: 3, 237) assume a reference to yet another Fronto, the famous orator M.Cornelius Fronto, but he is certainly too late.

² Syme (1958: 88).

³ See Howell (1980: 237).

existence in Rome, amid marble and morning *salutatio*, with a rustic ideal, and Juvenal will echo both the sentiments and details of this contrast between city and country throughout the *Satires*. Catus Fronto is also connected with some rather volatile and high profile politics. Grainger (2003) may push the evidence too far in identifying Catus Fronto as the prime mover in a senatorial plan to assassinate Domitian,⁴ but Fronto's role in the period immediately after Domitian's death is reasonably clear. Elites hastened to bring accusations against the *delatores* ('informers') who had profited under Domitian, resulting in a flurry of prosecutions. Cassius Dio attributes to Fronto a disapproving remark that resulted in Nerva attempting to bring this flurry of accusations to an end: 'It is bad to have an emperor who allows nobody to do anything', he is supposed to have said, 'but worse to have one who lets everybody do everything'.⁵ Later, in January 100, we hear of Catus Fronto playing the defense role in a prosecution conducted by Pliny and Tacitus. The man prosecuted (for extortion as a provincial governor) is Marius Priscus, whose apparently inadequate sentence is satirized by Juvenal in this very poem (1.49-50). Remarking on his ability to extract sympathy from a jury, Pliny says that Fronto, in his defense speech, 'filled his sails with the wind, as it were, of pathos'.⁶ At least if we pin Juvenal's Fronto on to T. Catus Caesius, it is in this orator's recitation hall that Juvenal impels himself to hoist his own 'sails' (*utere velis*, 149) and begin his *Satires*, blown by the wind not of pathos, but of outrage and indignation.

The possible connections sketched here for Fronto - encompassing the Latin epic tradition, the threat of informers, and the prosecution of crime – embody in miniature the major themes of the programmatic first *Satire*, Juvenal's grandiose opening statement of his own critical

⁴ Note the criticisms of Roche (2003).

⁵ Dio 68.1.3. These connections are noted also by Freudenburg (2001: 233, 238).

⁶ *Ep.* 2.11.3: *vela...quodam velut vento miserationis implevit.*

position and poetic form. Everything about this text seems to reach beyond its grasp. Juvenal's lengthy tirade (171 lines of high-volume rhetoric) is dwarfed by its own impossible ambition to see every vice and name every kind of criminal within its lines, indeed to encompass all human emotion (85-6), from the very dawn of time (81-2). The form he adopts is suitably grandiose and unimpeachably Roman: an imposing kind of epic to match the mythological epics declaimed in Fronto's recitation hall.

I argue here that rather than being 'mock-epic' (a misleading and unsubtle classification), Juvenal develops his form as a continuation of an emphatically Roman tradition of epic poetry as social criticism, and yet also achieves a deliberate incongruity by shuttling the traditional machinery of epic poetry into the present, a temporal incongruity that impresses upon the listener a constant sense of Rome's decline. Juvenal's relationship with the present is not, though, an uncomplicated one, and this poem is also notable for its apparent relinquishing of the task of contemporary criticism, since Juvenal says in the final lines that he will direct his indictments toward the ashes of the dead. The poem as a whole is frustratingly indirect in its attacks, railing against types more than named personalities. I argue that the poem both epitomizes and comments upon a Trajanic 'crisis of criticism', also observable in Pliny and Tacitus, according to which anyone who attempts to criticize a contemporary by name risks being perceived as an informer. Juvenal's satiric predecessors Lucilius and Horace were both aware of the similarities in the social tasks of the informer and the satirist, and the two poets, respectively, boldly embraced and nervously avoided this comparison. Juvenal might seem to shrink from this role, too, given the horror of informers in his collection and especially in this poem. Freudenburg's (2001) influential reading of the *Satires* thus encodes a kind of failure into the very fabric of Juvenal's text; satire, thoroughly

enervated from its proud Lucilian origins, becomes a kind of ‘ghost-assault’, a ‘self-defeating’ and ‘Quixotic’ fight against the shadows of the past. But silence is always Juvenal’s sharpest weapon, and the entire poem, I argue, is aimed at provoking readers into outrage at unprosecuted crime, goading them into the task of accusation, converting readers, not the satirist himself, into informers. Juvenal’s reticence about becoming an *accusator* marks his text as a typical product of the crisis of criticism; and yet, by diagnosing the conditions that discourage critical speech in Trajanic Rome, the poem performs a valuable critical task of its own.

1. The Recitation Hall (Part One)

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 5

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 10

pelliculae, quantas iaculetur Monychus ornos,

Frontonis platani convolsaque marmora clamant

semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae.
expectes eadem a summo minimoque poeta.
et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus, et nos 15
consilium dedimus Sullae, privatus ut altum
dormiret. stulta est clementia, cum tot ubique
vatibus occurras, periturae parcere chartae. (1.1-19)

Am I always to be just an audience member? Will I never avenge myself, harassed so many times by the *Theseid* of hoarse Cordus?

Can this man recite his toga-clad comedies to me without punishment, that man, his elegies? Will this massive *Telephus* have consumed my day without punishment, or this *Orestes*? The large book's margins are already full up, the scrawl has run onto the back, and it's not over.

No-one knows his own home better than I know the grove of Mars, or the cave of Vulcan, adjoining Aeolian crags.

What the winds are doing, which shades Aeacus is tormenting, where that other guy got the gold of his pilfered pelt, the immense size of Monychus' projectile timber -

these are the things Fronto's plane trees and reverberating marble always scream, and his columns, cracked through the constant reciting.

You get the same things from the greatest poet and the least.

I too snatched my hand out from under the teacher's cane, and counseled Sulla to sleep the deep sleep of a private citizen.

When you run into so many divine singers everywhere,
it's a fool's mercy to spare paper destined for death.

Juvenal's opening scene of *recitatio* articulates the cultural and literary space, rife with contradictions and tensions, in which the satirist imagines his own productions. For Freudenburg (2005), this is, specifically, our first vision of a cultural conflict between Roman and Greek that will remain a persistent theme throughout the *Satires*. Juvenal fulminates against the mythological topics not only because they are trite, but 'because they are not Roman: every Theseus, or Orestes, or Monychus that he encounters as a set-piece produced by a Roman, speaking in Latin, in the recitation halls of Rome is, to this critic's scarred and paranoid way of thinking, yet another unwelcome incursion into his life by some grasping, pushy foreigner, the sort that, he says, he has to deal with daily on the city's streets' (2005: 79). Freudenburg is surely right to highlight this tension between Greek and Roman; but the point of this *recitatio* is not that it is part-Greek, but that it is all too Roman. The other genres of poetry recited evoke an almost quaintly old-fashioned Roman atmosphere. One man recites elegies, a genre in which Quintilian says we Romans 'challenge the Greeks' (*Graecos provocamus*, 10.1.93), and which found its most prominent models amongst the Augustans. Another recites comedies – and not, as Juvenal denotes with pointed specificity, 'comedies in Greek dress' (*comoediae palliatae*) but 'comedies in Roman dress' (*comoedia togatae*), an archaic form of soberly Roman theatre that was virtually extinct in the period.⁷ The writers of epic, meanwhile, may contribute to a tradition that seems stale, late, and diluted (Cordus'

⁷ On the *togatae*, see Corbaud (1899); von Albrecht (1997: 97-8). On the soberness of 'our toga-clad comedies', see Sen. *Ep.* 8.8.

name, in fact, means a weak, late-born sheep).⁸ They do, however, write in a tradition that has long been embraced by Romans, and as these poets describe (once again) the ‘*lucus Martis*’ or the ‘*antrum Vulcani*’ (note the Romanized forms of the gods’ names), they contribute even now to that tradition. Moreover, as Henderson (1995) has demonstrated, Juvenal’s references to these scenes, which appear dismissingly vague, in fact suggest a thorough familiarity with the works of the Flavian epicists (including but not limited to Valerius Flaccus, long suspected as a target), and the scenes chosen recall their engagement with Vergil and poetic debates over abstruse mythological questions. Juvenal expects from his reader knowledge of, rather than mere apathy towards, the contours of the Roman epic tradition.⁹

If Juvenal bemoans attending such recitations, it is worth noting that complaints about *recitationes* constitute no less of a tradition, and a tradition into which the satirist keenly inserts himself.¹⁰ Horace’s stated aversion to *recitatio* as crassly popularizing is well-known (cf. *Ep.* 1.19.41-4; *Sat.* 1.4.74-5), as is Petronius’ farcical characterization of Eumolpus, the tiresome enthusiast of poetic recitation, in his *Satyricon*.¹¹ But the most famous critique of a *recitatio* is to be found in Juvenal’s satiric predecessor Persius: at 1.13-23, Persius mocks the popularity of public recitations by perversely imagining an excited audience of Roman toughs dissolving into sexual submissiveness through the charm of the reciting poet. When Juvenal begins his *Satires* by recalling Persius’ theme, there is literary continuity but historical elision, since much has changed in the Roman cultural scene since Persius.

⁸ *OLD* s.v. *cordus*. On the weakness of *cordi*, conceived out of season or kept too long in the womb, cf. Plin. *HN* 8.187, Varr. *De Re Rust.* 2.1.19.

⁹ Henderson (1995: 111-8) = (in abbreviated form) Henderson (1999: 260-4).

¹⁰ On the history of the *recitatio* in Rome, see Dalzell (1955); Dupont (1997); Markus (2000).

¹¹ See Conte (1996).

Juvenal's contemporary Pliny the Younger recalls the early Empire as a sort of *recitatio* Golden Age, relating how, when the emperor Claudius was walking on the Palatine and heard a recitation being delivered by the historian Marcus Servilius Nonianus (a man whom, incidentally, Persius apparently revered like a father), Claudius left his *negotium* and came immediately to join the audience.¹² By contrast, in Pliny's (and Juvenal's) own time, he says, people are slow to form an audience at *recitationes*, and if they do come, they leave early; and even though Pliny boasts that he always makes good on promises to attend recitations, he rather drearily describes it as a matter of duty, rather than any kind of Persius-style aesthetic ecstasy.¹³ The constant promotion of *recitationes* and explanations of their usefulness by Pliny indirectly attests to flagging enthusiasm for the institution.¹⁴ In *Ep.* 6.21, for example, he latches on to the recitations of a 'Vergilius Romanus' to counter claims that the current literary scene had become 'exhausted and spent' (*lassa et effeta*, 1). Vergilius Romanus, whose very name is an advertisement for the dyed-in-the-wool Roman-ness of *recitationes*, has written a tactfully inoffensive imitation of an Old Comedy, which Pliny praises to the skies, though Romanus is completely unknown to us, and even to the addressee of Pliny's letter (3), and the audience at the recitation was 'small' (*paucis*, 2). Aper in Tacitus' *Dialogus* presents a cynical picture of the difficulties involved in holding a *recitatio*: poets have to hire a venue and seating, then beg for people to attend, and any resultant improvement to one's station is excessively hard-won.¹⁵ Of course, it fits Aper's argument in the *Dialogus* to exaggerate the hardships of the poet's existence. But his disenchantment with *recitationes*

¹² Plin. *Ep.* 1.13.3. Nonianus and Persius: *Vit. Pers.* 1.17; Syme (1964: 415).

¹³ *Ep.* 1.13.1-2, 5-6. Hoffer (1999: 163) detects a (flattering) political undercurrent: 'Now that literature is free again, and free to flourish, the audience is also free not to attend'. Cf. *Ep.* 3.18.4: no-one in Rome really ever has time to attend *recitationes* (though people did make time for his own).

¹⁴ See esp. *Ep.* 7.17, 8.21.

¹⁵ *Dial.* 9.3-4.

finds a parallel in a later *Satire* of Juvenal himself, in which the satirist depicts the squalidness of the houses the wealthy make available, and the lack of material benefits accruing from recitations even to popular poets such as Statius.¹⁶

Henderson's characterization of Juvenal's first *Satire* as a 'stark demystification of the business of public presentation of poetry' (1995: 103) fits Aper's speech in the *Dialogus* – but it does not fit Juvenal, who is indeed very much engaged in the mystification of *recitatio* as an elite Roman institution, perpetuating, anachronistically, the myth of an impregnable Roman literary tradition. The hyperbolic *incipit* 'always' (*semper*, 1) begins a string of words or phrases that associate the *recitatio* with repetition and inevitability: 'so many times' (*totiens*, 2) the *Theseid* has harassed him; nameless figures 'will have recited' (*recitaverit*, 3); Fronto's marble 'always' (*semper*, 14) re-echoes these *recitationes*; his columns have cracked through 'constant' (*adsiduo*, 13) reciting; you encounter 'so many' poets 'everywhere' (*tot ubique vatibus*, 17-8); paper 'will' go to waste (*periturae*, 18). The *Orestes* is 'not yet finished' (*necdum finitus*, 6). Juvenal may forge a link with his early Imperial predecessors in bemoaning the tiresomeness of poets endlessly reciting their works in the houses of wealthy Romans; but he is there, and they are reciting, and that is what counts in perpetuating the myths of the institution. Like Juvenal, who says that the massive *Telephus* 'will have consumed' his entire day (4), Pliny says that contemporaries frequently complained that *recitationes* waste their days.¹⁷ As a result, they do not attend. Juvenal, on the other hand, attends, *semper*.

¹⁶ *Sat.* 7.39-52; 82-7.

¹⁷ *Ep.* 1.13.4.

The very Roman-ness of the *recitatio* is part of the passage's tendentious cultural mythologizing, since recitations of the Trajanic period take place against an ever-broadening cultural field. 'While recitation was the high point of culture for Roman gentleman of Pliny's circle', says Fantham (1996: 213), 'they would have to compete for public attention with the Greek visitors, orators, rhetoricians, and philosophers who dazzled large public audiences with their performances midway between sermon and lecture.' Indeed, Pliny's letters on the *recitatio* can be contrasted with his images of the popular excitement generated by visits from speakers such as the sophist Isaeus (*Ep.* 2.3) or the celebrated philosopher Euphrates of Tyre (*Ep.* 1.10), whose name, no less symbolic than that of Vergilius Romanus, epitomizes the flow of Eastern culture into Rome.¹⁸ At the arrival of the latter, Pliny hyperbolically claims that 'if ever our Rome flourished in the liberal arts, it is flourishing at its height right now'.¹⁹ Juvenal's brand of Roman satire runs self-consciously against the grain. Something of that heady enthusiasm for Greek intellectualism makes itself felt in the very recitation hall of Fronto in which Juvenal opens his *Satires*. The structure of Juvenal's lines directly juxtaposes the massive ash trees (*ornos*, 11) thrown by the centaur Monychus in one speaker's poem with the plane trees (*platani*, line 12) Fronto has growing amongst his marble statues and columns. Non-native to Italy, plane trees were a source of Greek cultural capital flaunted by wealthy Romans, and Pliny the Elder disapprovingly cites instances of Romans' importation of plane trees with particular cultural associations.²⁰ But plane trees as a backdrop for rhetorical display are reminiscent specifically of Plato's *Phaedrus*, a work of almost unequalled popularity amongst Greek writers of the second century, where a tall, spreading

¹⁸ On Euphrates' celebrity (he was the most famous philosopher of the period, according to the later testimony of Eusebius), see Frede (1997), Jones (2003: 160-2).

¹⁹ *Ep.* 1.10.1: *Si quando urbs nostra liberalibus studiis floruit, nunc maxime floret.*

²⁰ *H.N.* 12.5.9-12. For plane trees as the chi-chi accoutrements of pretentious Romans, compare the anonymous figure skewered in Martial 12.50, whose villa has *daphnonas, platanonas et acrios pityonas* (line 1) – but no dining room or bedroom.

plane tree forms part of the idyllic landscape in which Socrates and Phaedrus discourse about love and rhetoric.²¹ In other Second Sophistic texts, the plane tree becomes shorthand for evoking a Platonic milieu.²² Thus, even this erstwhile stronghold of Roman cultural tradition, Fronto's *recitatio* hall, is decked out with the apparatus of Greek intellectualism.

In fact, this hall, in which Juvenal opens his *Satires*, may be an effective synecdoche for Trajanic Rome: Juvenal will debut his vehemently, nostalgically Roman satires in a cultural scene in which Greek kinds of rhetorical display were enjoying an unparalleled prominence. Juvenal's insistence on the Roman-ness of his own form is best understood as a kind of defense against precisely this prominence of Greek rhetorical forms. Juvenal says that he will charge 'in the same field' as the 'son of Aurunca' (*Auruncae...alumnus*, 20), identifying the satirist Lucilius not by his genre or style but by his autochthonous connection to Campania, and claiming metaphorically to traverse the same literary and geographical space. Juvenal's periphrasis for the urbane Horace also recasts his predecessor with a curiously old-fashioned Italian identity: he is 'the Venusian lamp' (*Venusina...lucerna*, 51), associated wholly with his birthplace Venusia in southern Italy, though Horace himself only explicitly names the place once, and his father made sure he left early on.²³ The Italian emphases in introducing both predecessors are hardly coincidental; Juvenal presents satire as something hardy, traditional, and pointedly not Greek. Quintilian too, of course, had recently dubbed satire

²¹ *Phaedr.* 229A-230D. On the *Phaedrus* in the second century, see Trapp (1990). Hardie (1997: 30), remarking on this passage, ingeniously suggests a 'playful etymological nexus' in the phrase *Frontonis platani*, linking Fronto (from *frons*, 'forehead'); *platanus*, thought to derive from πλατύς ('broad'); and Plato, whose name was also etymologized to mean 'broad forehead', or to refer to the 'breadth' of his interpretation.

²² See Trapp's appendix of second century allusions to the *Phaedrus*' landscape (1990: 171). That the plane tree could, in itself, summon memories of Plato's *Phaedrus* in Latin writers is neatly demonstrated by Cic. *De Orat.* 1.28.

²³ *Sat.* 2.1.35; *Sat.* 1.6.71-5.

‘wholly ours’ (10.1.94), and when Juvenal traces a lineage through Lucilius, Horace and (by allusion if not name) Persius, he may well have had Quintilian’s tendentious generic narrative in mind, implicitly endorsing his claim to the Roman-ness of the form, and even mimicking Quintilian’s exclusions (Ennius? Turnus? Sulpicia?).²⁴ Juvenal is very far, then, from Horace’s claim (however ludic or evasive) that Lucilius ‘hangs entirely’ on the writers of Greek Old Comedy. But the purpose of referring to generic predecessors is now also different: whereas Horace was keen to distinguish himself from Lucilian influence and articulate his own space and originality within the genre,²⁵ Juvenal’s statements about his predecessors seem to seek solidarity more than originality. Despite varying widely from the strategy and tone of these previous poets, the satirist shores up his complaints about modern life with the weight of a satiric tradition, constituted, as with any tradition, in its strategic invocation in the context at hand.²⁶

Dupont (1997) has stressed the importance for Roman nobles of participating in the *recitatio*, an institution that bestowed social prestige and communicated elite values in a period in which opportunities for traditional political *oratio* had been largely foreclosed. This is a milieu Juvenal mocks, but has reason to perpetuate, for it is his own. Far from being the object of *odium*, the *recitatio* hall in which Juvenal announces his *Satire* is an image of inclusion. ‘I too’ shared these poets’ educational background and their training in declamation, he repeats emphatically (*et nos...et nos*, 15), not separating himself from the

²⁴ Of course, our knowledge of Juvenal’s allusions to these other satirists is hamstrung by the loss of most of their texts, though traces of influence have nonetheless been postulated: Coffey (1979); Richlin (1992: 132). It is worth remembering that, since we have so little of the other ‘famous’ satirists whom Quintilian predicts will ‘be remembered today and in the future’ (*clari hodieque et qui olim nominabuntur*, 10.1.94), our constellation of Roman verse satirists is missing significant stars.

²⁵ *Sat.* 1.4, esp. lines 6-13; Rudd (1966: 86-131).

²⁶ Hinds (1998: 123-144).

reciting *vates* but keenly ingratiating himself into their midst. It is significant also that Juvenal, for all his complaints, is, at the *recitatio*, literally inside, especially since he will go on in the rest of his *Satires* so often to depict the struggles of Romans to enter the houses of wealthy men. Indeed, this *recitatio* hall, which in Juvenal's description blurs the lines between an actual and a figurative place, where mythological characters seem to enjoy a life of their own, vexing *auditores* and consuming days and shattering marble – *this* is Juvenal's home, or so he suggests ('no-one knows his own home better than I know the grove of Mars...'), he says at 7-8). Monti (1978: 129) is surely right to point out that the use of the word *auditor* in line 166 of the *Satire* suggests that Juvenal conceives of his satires as a form naturally destined for recitation (cf. 3.321, *saturarum auditor*). But the recurrence of this word *auditor* also casts our mind back more immediately to the first line of this very poem (*semper ego auditor...?*), suggesting that we have never in fact left Fronto's recitation hall, and this poem is to be understood as Juvenal's performance in that space.²⁷ As the *Satire* develops, Juvenal produces his own epic to match those of the other reciting poets in Fronto's hall. His *Satires* will be no less Roman, grand, and long; but they will draw their *materia*, incongruously, from the stuff of current daily life, producing a kind of 'contemporary epic' for Trajanic Rome.

2. The Paradox of Contemporary Epic

Humorous, critical poetry about contemporary life proliferated in Juvenal's time, written in a genre that lent itself to such commentary – epigram. Satirical epigram is the dominant form

²⁷ It is worth considering how this affects the impact of the satire as a whole. Are we to imagine, for example, Juvenal making accusatory glances around the hall as he complains that people nowadays owe their 'gardens and palaces' to 'criminal charges' (75)?

of Greek epigram in the late first and second centuries, developed by Lucillius and Nicarchus and their followers, anthologized during the reign of Hadrian (?) by Diogenianus and preserved in reasonable bulk in the eleventh book of the *Palatine Anthology*.²⁸ Greek epigrams attributed to the emperors Trajan and Hadrian themselves are there also preserved (11.418; 9.137, 387). In Latin, Martial made epigram the exclusive mode for his vision of daily life in Rome, and critics have noted its peculiar appropriateness. Epigram's brevity, its affectation of spontaneity, its tension between monumentality and ephemerality, and its cacophonous juxtapositions within the epigram book – all this seems to capture something of life in Flavian and Trajanic Rome, which is cramped, crowded, energized by violent contrasts, and frequently all too short.²⁹ In all these respects, epic differs from epigram, and, indeed, it is precisely by contrast with epic that Martial presents his epigrams as critically engaged with real life. Martial rejects the imaginary monsters of mythological verse for a kind of verse 'about which life can say – that's mine' (10.4.8), for a page that 'smacks of humanity' (10.4.10). He discourages an addressee from taking up tragedy or epic by saying: 'let life read and recognize her own ways' (8.3.20). Juvenal also spurns mythological epic in the opening scene of his first *Satire*, in lines that, as often pointed out, deliberately recall Martial's earlier rejection of epic mythology in favor of epigrammatic realism.³⁰ Yet Juvenal's opening *recusatio* sets the stage for a famous irony, since, having ostensibly rejected epic, the satirist goes on to exhibit in his first *Satire* a bombastic poetic style that exploits and intensifies the genre's connections with epic in imagery, language, length and meter.³¹ Contemporary Rome's hypocrisy, perversity and crime are immortalized in

²⁸ Bowie (1990: 53-66); Nisbet (2003).

²⁹ Fitzgerald (2007); Rimell (2008).

³⁰ Colton (1991: 36-8); Schmitz (2000: 37-8); Freudenburg (2005: 83-6).

³¹ On the last of these, see Jones (2008), who demonstrates that Juvenal's hexameter technique is closer to that of non-satiric hexameter poets than were the earlier satirists, resulting in verse of a 'palpably more

inappositely epic dress. There is a certain critical reflex to brand this technique ‘mock-epic’ or ‘epic parody’, but such phrases are misleading, since Juvenal is rarely parodying epic itself.³² Rather, by casting his vision of Roman *mores* in epic mould, Juvenal pushes to its extreme an idiosyncratically Roman idea of epic’s proper themes. His satires are informed by a tradition of epic as a national vision of the Roman state, though here the epic apparatus is shuttled with deliberate and pointed incongruity into contemporary life, with all its banausic indignities. It is not the genre that is incongruous, but the time. Juvenal creates ‘contemporary epic’, while consistently emphasizing the paradox of that idea.

An excellent introduction to Juvenal’s employment of epic technique is offered by a famous scene in the first *Satire*, in which gambling is described as an epic duel:

Quando

maior avaritiae patuit sinus? alea quando

hos animos? Neque enim oculis comitantibus itur

ad casum tabulae, posita sed luditur arca.

literary general tenor’ (at 364). Jones’ article is presented as a response to the now oft-cited paper of Powell (1999), who makes a trenchant case against Juvenal’s use of the ‘grand style’, arguing that any high-style diction in his poetry is immediately undermined or undercut. ‘The whole point of the grand style’, says Powell, ‘is that it has to be sustained. The slightest bathos or incongruity, even if unintentional, will ruin it’ (at 327). Powell’s description of Juvenal’s constant modulation between linguistic registers is, in fact, an excellent reminder of the highly-wrought literariness of Juvenal’s style – and not, surely, proof that his dominant mode is ‘argumentative conversational discourse’ (316). Nor need we accept Powell’s conflation of consistent linguistic register with poetic ‘seriousness’ (316). The humor and irony of Juvenal’s linguistic ‘undercutting’ do not preclude him from being a serious social critic – humor is, of course, the vehicle for any satirist’s critique. If Juvenal wrote in an entirely undiluted epic style, we would hardly take him more seriously as a satirist. Finally, Powell’s argument about the register of individual words may be accepted, it seems to me, while still endorsing the long-held impression that Juvenal writes a ‘grand’ style of satire – satire that mirrors epic language, stock scenes, length and self-importance, all as part of its social critique.

³² Cf. Baines (2003:220) on the inadequacy of critical appeals to ‘mock-epic’ in describing satire’s engagement with epic motifs. See also Winkler (1989), who stresses the ethical role of epic language in Juvenal’s *Satires*, adopting the vatic and didactic function traditionally belonging to hexameter verse.

proelia quanta illic dispensatore videbis
armigero! (1.87-92).

When did greed's lap open more widely? When
 did dice-play capture men's hearts like this?
 Men essay chance at the game-board, flanked
 not by their purses – they stake their treasure-chest.
 What great battles you'll see there, with the croupier
 bearing arms!

Merely to brand this vignette 'mock-epic' is to limit the passage's broad cultural associations and satiric force. The modulation between gambling table and epic battlefield is cleverly calibrated: the impersonal passive *itur* (89) has an archaizing, military flavor;³³ *casus tabulae* (90), as Braund demonstrates (1996: 97), spoofs the stock phrase *casus belli* (90); and *posita* (90) here means both 'to stake' and to 'set in battle position'.³⁴ But if the humor of these lines stems from the difference between gambling and epic battle, the criticism stems from their similarity. Gambling and warfare share elements of chance, intense competition, and high stakes, and they are frequently assimilated in Roman culture. Polybius likened Hamilcar's strategies as a general to that of a player of draughts (πεπτευτῆς); Julius Caesar uttered the famous phrase 'let the die be cast' before crossing the Rubicon; and Octavian was said to have beaten Antony in games at dice as a gloomy foreshadowing of his military victory.³⁵

³³ Cf. Horsfall (2000: 363) on *Aen.* 7.553.

³⁴ *OLD* s.v. *pono* 13 (a); 1 (c).

³⁵ Polyb. 1.84; Plut. *Caes.* 32.6; Plut. *Ant.* 33.3.

Many surviving game-boards and other dicing paraphernalia are inscribed with martial slogans celebrating Roman successes, underscoring the thematic connection between gambling and war.³⁶ On the other hand, references to gamblers as soldiers tend to emphasize the gamblers' dereliction of propriety and duty. The panegyrist of the *Laus Pisonis* includes a long passage (190-208) describing, in terms of an epic battle, Piso's great skill in the dice game called *ludus latrunculorum* ('the little soldiers' game').³⁷ In this text, the mismatch between trivial accomplishments and epic description implicitly highlights the lapse of opportunities for actual martial valor in Nero's Rome. An anonymous second-century sermon against gambling, thought by some to be the oldest Christian tract in Latin, also inveighs against the ills of gambling in martial terms:³⁸ here the gamblers' hands are imagined as their own 'arms-bearers' (*armigera*), initiating 'brotherly discord' (*fraternitas discordans*), 'armed for their own peril' (*ad periculum sui armatae*). Rather than mere 'epic parody', Juvenal's description of gambling as an epic battle calls to mind a wider complex of associations between gambling and war, associations limited neither to epic nor satire.

But the best gloss on Juvenal's gambling scene is the later satires of Juvenal himself, where he twice returns to this same thematic conjunction of gambling and war. In *Satire* 8 (9-12), the satirist asks the noble Ponticus what good the *imagines* of his warrior ancestors do if he gambles right in front of them, and until the dawn, when they would in their day have been out launching battle. In *Satire* 14, which targets the vices 'parents demonstrate and pass onto

³⁶ Purcell (1995: 25-6). Purcell mentions, for example, one Roman game-board with the inscription VIRTUS IMPERI[I] HOSTES VINCTI LUDITE ROMANI [*CIL* 13, 3865 = *ILS* 8627a]: 'Empire's courage! Enemies in chains! Romans – play on!'. Braund (1996: 96) draws an intriguing parallel with a series of epigrams in the Codex Salmasianus that describe a game of *tabula* in martial terms (*Anth. Lat.* 182-5 SB).

³⁷ Richmond (1994). On the etymology of *latrunculus*, see Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* 7.52.

³⁸ [Cypr.] *De aleatoribus* (*CSEL* 3.3.92-104); cf. Carroll (1991).

their progeny' (14.3), the satirist imagines the child heir of an inveterate gambler already engaged in dicing, shaking in his dice-cup the 'same weapons' as his father (4-5). Although one passage deals with good *exempla* and the other with bad, these scenes are strikingly parallel in a specific sense. In both, the gambler is pictured together with his ancestors, as if we are encouraged to trace the degeneracy, to sketch the path of an almost infantile regression (indeed, the gambler in *Satire* 14 is literally a child). The epic language of the gambling scene in the first *Satire* ensures that a damning comparandum is kept forever in frame, and here too, in a sense, contemporary figures are juxtaposed with their 'ancestors' – that is, the kings and heroes of epic verse, the poetic form in which the Roman state celebrated its founding and saw the idealizing mirror of its own traditions. Throughout the *Satire*, such juxtapositions constantly measure the distance between the satirist's flawed contemporaries and the heroes hymned in epic. Every mismatch between epic glory and contemporary vice suggests its own miniature genealogy of national decline.

In the final section of the first *Satire*, Juvenal explicitly references the final section of Vergil's *Aeneid*, citing 'Aeneas pitted against the fierce Rutulian' (162-3) as typical of the picturesque, 'safe', mythological themes he rejects in his satiric verse. The reference implicitly aligns Juvenal's first *Satire* with Rome's national epic, while also cynically suggesting that the story of Aeneas, in which Rome had invested so much, is just that – picturesque mythology. Sure enough, the distorted vision of the *Aeneid* refracted in Juvenal's *Satire* is appropriately demythologized: here, the 'sons of Troy' (*Troiugena*, 100) stand in line for the morning dole along with everyone else. Meanwhile, one man's epic *furor* lies in slaying, not a rival warrior such as Turnus, but a hundred sesterces (*furor sestertia centum/ perdere*, 92-3). Overcome, Juvenal sarcastically urges money to 'conquer' (*vincant divitiae*,

110). Most like a mythological monster is the voracious, gluttonous patron, who ‘will devour the finest things of the woods and sea’ (*optima silvarum...pelagique vorabit*, 135), a vast gullet able to consume an entire boar (*quanta est gula quae sibi totos ponit apros*, 140-1). He will get his punishment, says Juvenal, when he goes off to the baths bloated by an entire undigested peacock, and dies a grotesque death, a tale soon recounted as a *fabula* (‘story’/ ‘myth’) at other dinner parties (142-5). These lines recall Persius’ similar scene at *Satires* 3.98-106, but the image equally recalls Petronius’ *Bellum Civile*, in which Rome herself is personified as an over-indulged banqueter, submerged in her own filth and lolling from sleep, sunk in a decadence only ‘frenzy, war and passion stirred by the sword’ could dissolve.³⁹ Indeed, Petronius’ *Bellum Civile* provides a parallel for Juvenal’s *Satire* more broadly. Adopting a voice that readers of Juvenal will find instantly familiar, the first sixty lines of the epic sample declaimed by Petronius’ character Eumolpus consist of a lengthy and broad-ranging indictment of moral failings in the Roman state prior to the Civil War, condemning Romans’ taste for luxury, their lust, gluttony, and political corruption. As Slater remarks, ‘the genre could as easily be satire as epic’ (1990: 196). Whatever that poem’s vexed connection with Lucan’s *Bellum Civile*, Lucan’s searing epic of ‘license given to crime’ (*iusque datum sceleri*, 1.2) has its own strong satiric voice, as has long been recognized.⁴⁰ Both Lucan and Petronius are valuable reminders that Roman epic is by no means limited to, or defined by, the mythological topics rejected by Juvenal.

³⁹ *BC* 58-60 [= *Satyr.*119]: *hoc mersam caeno Romam somnoque iacentem/ quae poterant artes sana ratione movere/ ni furor et bellum ferroque excita libido*. On this passage, see Connors (1998: 110).

⁴⁰ See e.g. Butler (1909: 117): ‘He will not let the story tell itself; he is always harping on its moral and political significance. As a result, we get long passages that belong to the region of elevated political satire. They are not epic, but they are often magnificent’. But perhaps they *are* epic – at least, epic of a particularly Roman kind. For Lucan’s influence on Juvenal, see Winkler (1989: 428-9).

Viewed in the wider context of Latin epic poetry, ‘epic satire’ turns out not to be much of an oxymoron at all – in fact, commentary on civic *mores* may have been conceived as a native part of the Roman epic tradition. Ennius, who also composed Rome’s first *Satires*, wrote the much-quoted line ‘the Roman state depends on old-time morals and men’ (*moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque*, 156 Skutsch) as part of his epic *Annales*, presenting his narrative of Roman military glories as, at the same time, a commentary on (and celebration of) the contemporary Roman state. In this work, Ennius performed a Juvenalian move long before Juvenal, recasting real figures from Roman history (some from very recent history) in the fictional guise of Homeric epic. The move is also fundamentally Roman: although historical epic was not a Roman invention (it can be traced back at least to Choerilus of Samos’ fifth century epic on the Persian Wars), ‘national epic’ was. Ennius – and also Naevius, who like Ennius was both epicist and satirist (of sorts)⁴¹ – innovated by adopting epic as the vehicle for the communication of national values, writing not as itinerant poets but as new Romans seeking ‘not simply to record and extol but to understand the scope and meaning of the Roman achievement’ (Goldberg 1995: 147). Juvenal (and Lucan and Petronius) focus on the breakdown of national values in their hexameters, but their use of epic to comment on the *mores* of the Roman state has its precedent in the very founders of the Roman epic tradition. In one of the surviving fragments of the *Annales*, Ennius says: ‘You who wish the Roman state to advance on the right path, and Latium to increase, it is worth your while to listen’.⁴² It is not certain that Ennius is here referring to his own work, and Elliot (2007) is surely right to remind us that many lines of the *Annales* must originally have been part of characters’ speeches, and therefore shaded with irrecoverable nuances. But ancient satirists saw

⁴¹ Naevius, at least according to later tradition, is said to have written plays that lampooned leading members of state: Gell. 3.3.15.

⁴² 494-5 (Skutsch): *audire est operae pretium procedere recte/ qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere voltis.*

something familiar in the tone: the lines are cited by both Varro in his *Menippean Satires* and Horace in his *Satires*.⁴³ Neither are ‘epic parody’, so much as the recognition in Ennius’ epic of a voice that was already proto-satirical, a natural origin-point and predecessor of the satirists’ own form.

The paradox of writing ‘contemporary epic’ lies not in the adoption of epic language and motifs for satiric themes, but rather in placing them entirely in the present, so that the grandiose scope and totalizing vision typical of the epic genre is shrunk to fit the small events of the everyday.⁴⁴ Juvenal emphasizes this paradox in the poem’s contradictory and disorienting references to time. The section on greed begins with a vertiginous acceleration through epic chronology: we begin at the beginning, with the Flood (‘Ever since rainclouds set the ocean waters rising...’, 1.81-2), and the satirist heralding a poetic project of universal scope (‘Everything men do....’, 1.85-6).⁴⁵ But, in an abrupt *volte face*, he then restricts his focus to one topic, and strands his epic in modernity. ‘When was the supply of flaws more plentiful?’, he asks, then driven onwards by a pun (*uberior* means ‘more plentiful’ or ‘richer’), ‘when did Greed’s lap open more widely?’⁴⁶ Who of our ancestors built so many villas or dined so extravagantly (1.94-5)? Now (*nunc*, 95) the tiny handout sits in the doorway; already (*iam*, 123) the dole-cheater’s trick is well known; now (*iam*, 139) there will be no hangers-on around the table. The sense of disorienting acceleration through time occurs

⁴³ Var. *Men.* 542, apud Non. 478.16; Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.37-8. For Horace’s use of Ennian allusion in crafting his poetic persona (though not with reference to these particular lines), see Hardie (2007).

⁴⁴ Of course, one other form of ‘contemporary epic’ was written in Imperial Rome: panegyric epic, typified by the likes of Statius’ poem about Domitian’s German wars and Caninius Rufus’ poem on Trajan’s Dacian Wars. This form motions in the opposite direction to Juvenal, attempting to inflate everyday events to the level of epic. Its skewering comes in the fourth *Satire*.

⁴⁵ On the flood myth of Deucalion and Pyrrha, see Lorenz (2004), who suggests that recalling the story here aligns Juvenal’s persona with the avenging anger of Jupiter.

⁴⁶ 1.87-8: *et quando uberior vitiorum copia? Quando/ maior avaritiae patuit sinus?*

again in the vignette beginning at line 127. Juvenal sarcastically says that the client's day is marked out by 'beautiful order' (*pulchro ordine*, 127). The notion is proverbial; Ischomachus in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* argues that 'there is nothing as useful or beautiful for men than order', lines translated by Cicero and Columella.⁴⁷ But that order is immediately eschewed by Juvenal himself. He speeds straight from the morning, with abbreviated reference to the *salutatio* and business in the forum (128), to some point after dinner, when 'old and exhausted clients abandon their prayers' (*veteres lassique clientes/ vota deponunt*, 132-3), departing, unfed, from their patrons' door-steps.

There is another prominent image of 'order disrupted' in the poem: the dole line (95-116), which the outraged speaker insists on rearranging, metonymically, according to the progression of Roman history. The first group singled out of the 'toga-clad crowd' (96) are the 'sons of Troy' (*Troiugenas*, 100). When a foreigner 'born on the Euphrates' (104) pushes to the front of this line ahead of tribunes and praetors, he upsets both Roman hierarchy and Roman chronology. 'Why should I hesitate to defend my place?', he asks (*cur...dubitemve locum defendere*, 1.103), referring to his place of birth as much to his place in the line. What good is senatorial status, the foreigner goes on to say, if he is rich while Corvinus is reduced to herding rented sheep (106-8), an allusion not only to the straitened circumstances of an old senatorial family, but also to the humble shepherding of early Rome. By contrast, the satirist in his own voice dismisses the foreigner as having recently (*nuper*, 111) arrived in Rome, and sarcastically says that he 'need not cede' to the honor of the tribunate (*sacro ne cedat honori*, 110). This last line, as the commentators note, reworks a line from Vergil's *Aeneid* (*nec cedit honori*, 3.484), describing Andromache bestowing gifts on Ascanius – the Trojan giving way

⁴⁷ Xen. *Oec.* 8.3; Col.12.2.4.

to the future Roman – as Ascanius is about to set off on Rome’s foundational voyage. The allusions refer insistently to a traditional aetiology of the Roman state, but this allusive narrative is disrupted by the action of the episode – the foreigner advances ‘out of line’ to prominence based on financial success, not origin or tradition.

In a passage that wielded an almost inescapable influence over later poets, Vergil, in the proem to the third *Georgic*, resolved to lead the Muses in triumph to Rome, rejecting trite mythological topics in favor of accounts of the emperor’s glories. Vergil chooses ‘national epic’ over mythological themes. When Juvenal rejects mythological topics he, in a sense, makes the same choice, fashioning a new kind of national epic, a contemporary epic, for new and (as Juvenal depicts them) grim times. What, too, of satire’s ‘time’? ‘Satire is not so much antithetical to epic as its natural successor’, suggests Baines (2003: 233). If epic is the stuff of foundations, of bygone glory and forgotten virtue, then satire is trapped in modernity, with its failures and flaws, and Juvenal’s use of epic language expresses a constant sense of the degeneration of the depraved present. On the other hand, pressures on critical speech in Rome mean that the satirist has a troubled connection with the present. There are restrictions imposed on indicting contemporaries for those failures and flaws. Juvenal’s outrage is conditioned by a keen awareness of the danger of *nominatim* criticism, for the satirist is not the only member of Roman society engaged in the dangerous task of exposing vice.

3. The Satirist as *Delator*

At the close of Juvenal's first *Satire*, an anonymous interlocutor emerges from the crowd to warn the satirist of the dangers posed by those who attempt publicly to criticize their contemporaries.

*qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita, vehatur
pensilibus plumis atque illinc despiciat nos?
“cum veniet contra, digito compesce labellum:
accusator erit qui verbum dixerit “hic est”. (1.158-161).*

So, if a man has given poison to three uncles, should
he just ride by on feathered cushions
and look down on us from on high?
“When he comes by, press your finger to your lips:
anyone who has said the words “that’s him!” will be an informer”.

The anonymous interlocutor warns Juvenal anxiously that satirical accusation and legal accusation may too easily be conflated, to the satirist's peril. Braund, in her commentary, develops this legal sense of lines 160-1. She paraphrases: ‘Keep quiet when *he* (i.e. the rich poisoner) comes by; if you so much as say “That’s the man who...”, you’ll be treated as if you accused him in court’ (1996: 109). There is a strategic allusion here to Persius 1.28, in which that poem's interlocutor extols the great benefits of literary celebrity: “But it's a beautiful thing when people point at you and say “that’s him!”⁴⁸ What was once the pleasant

⁴⁸ 1.28: *at pulchrum est digito monstrari et dicier “hic est”.*

reward for a successful satirist is now perceived as the act of an informer.⁴⁹ But commentators have not lingered much on the implications of the broader cultural equivalence suggested here between the satirist – a figure who uncovers others’ flaws in his poetry – and the informer (*accusator/ delator*), that hated and feared cultural type of Roman Imperial public life, who makes his fortune uncovering others’ crimes in court.⁵⁰

The interlocutor’s warning about being perceived as an *accusator* is consonant with a longstanding Roman aversion to playing such a role. Already in the Republic period, *accusator* was an opprobrious term for an orator who habitually or over-vehemently acts as prosecutor; thus, in the *De Officiis*, Cicero advised his son that ‘it is both dangerous, and also a stain on your reputation, to give occasion to be called an *accusator*’, and advised that he observe moderation in the amount of cases prosecuted.⁵¹ The aversion to *accusatores* became even more acute in the Imperial period, when those looking to advance their fortune and position could profit from the neuroses of suspicious emperors, and nobles’ positions were

⁴⁹ Trappes-Lomax (2000: 725-6) objects to the text of line 161 on two grounds: ‘in itself *hic est* is something that great men like to hear’; and ‘if saying *hic est* is the offense, *dixerit* refers to the same act as *erit* and should be in the same tense’. Thus he suggests changing *qui* to *cui*, so that the line reads ‘To whomever he [i.e. the poisoner] has said the words ‘that’s him!’’, that man will be your accuser’. The warning of the interlocutor would then concern the ease with which the rich man can appoint someone else to do the work of accusation. But the emendation has no MS support, and results in unnecessarily contorted Latin, since it requires a shift in grammatical subject between the two third person verbs in the line. Moreover, since the interlocutor has told the satirist in the previous line to keep his mouth shut, it is more natural to assume the satirist as the subject of the verb *dixerit*. Nor is the tense objection fatal, since pointing out a criminal is imagined as a completed act in the future; from that point hence the satirist will be regarded as an *accusator*. The thought of the line is compressed, but no change should be made to the text.

⁵⁰ For an overview and prosopography of *delatores* in the Imperial period, see Rutledge (2001). Rutledge notes that the words *delator* and *accusator* are synonymous in Tacitus, and both cover a wide range of activities in the Imperial sources: ‘Either word could refer to one who denounces or lays information, the one who prosecutes, or both; indeed, the term can arguably be extended to include those acting as a witness against someone with whom our sources sympathize’ (2001: 10). Cf. Powell (2010: 236): ‘a *delator*’s household could combine the functions of lawyer’s chambers and detective agency’. On the legal processes open to the *delator* in the Imperial age, see Fanizza (1988); Rivi re (2001).

⁵¹ *De Off.* 2.14.50: *Id cum periculosum ipsi est, tum etiam sordidum ad famam, committere, ut accusator nominere*. On the *accusator* as a type in Republican oratory, see Rutledge (1999).

rendered increasingly insecure by opportunistic informers. Such, at least, is the gloomy picture offered by Juvenal's contemporaries. Tacitus presents an unforgettably vivid picture of Imperial *delatores* as lowborn and opportunist (*Ann.* 1.74.1-3), morally depraved (*Hist.* 4.44.2) and murderous and bestial (*Hist.* 4.42.4, 16.29.1).⁵² Pliny's series of letters about M. Aquilius Regulus, perhaps the most notorious of the *delatores* of his period, contemptuously (or strategically) paint Regulus as the exact inversion of all Pliny's own values as orator, aristocrat and friend.⁵³ Religious texts from the period preserve the first-century rhetoric against informers in a way that perseveres to the present day. The twelfth of the eighteen daily benedictions spoken by observant Jews (the עמידה) is a prayer directed against informers.⁵⁴ The Christian tradition retains a horror of informers as a result of the Gospels' characterization of Judas Iscariot.

Juvenal's sinister, suspicious vision of *delatores* throughout his *Satires* is, thus, very much of its time.⁵⁵ In the fourth *Satire*, Juvenal imagines the shore immediately teeming with informers ready to bring an action to claim ownership of the miraculous turbot for the emperor (4.48), and there are informers amongst Domitian's inner circle in the *concilium* scene later in that poem. In the third *Satire*, a Stoic teacher (perhaps Egnatius Celer) is depicted as a murderer and an informer on his friend (3.116-7). Earlier in the first *Satire*, we see an unnamed *delator magni amici* ('informer of a powerful friend' [or 'patron'], 33), who

⁵² On the metaphors used by Tacitus to describe *delatores*, see Walker (1960: 65, 101). Rutledge (2001) attempts to establish the partiality of such descriptions, underlining the role of informers in law enforcement under the Empire.

⁵³ Hoffer (1999: 55-8).

⁵⁴ The prayer, added to liturgy in the first century, is thought to have been directed against Jews who had become Christian and served as informers for the Roman government (Liber 1950: 348-9); text in Sacks (2009: 218).

⁵⁵ See Powell (2010) on the negative picture of *delatores* in Juvenal, who, as Powell stresses, are not merely 'informers' in the modern sense, but rather professional prosecutors.

will ‘snatch away at speed whatever is left of the eaten-up elites’, and whom even Baebius Massa and Mettius Carus, themselves notorious informers, nervously try to placate (1.33-6). The imagery here, of a wild animal that needs to be mollified, and of the nobility being ‘eaten up’, finds analogies in contemporaneous texts.⁵⁶ The interlocutor’s concern at the close of the first *Satire*, though, is less of informers than of *being* an informer, or at least being perceived as one. This concern is justified: the closeness of the satirists’ activities to that of the informer is a central theme of the poem. But whereas Lucilius seems self-consciously to have identified satiric accusation with legal accusation, and Horace strove to keep them apart, in Juvenal’s text satiric accusation is presented as an ambivalent substitute for legal accusation – one that seems at first less effective, but may in the end be perfectly suited to the exigencies of its times.

Roman satire found itself embroiled from the very first with issues of free critical speech and its legal (and ethical and aesthetic) restrictions.⁵⁷ In the *Epistle to Augustus*, Horace presents an aetiological narrative of native Latin literary outspokenness, in which the abusiveness of the so-called Fescennine verses amongst the archaic Romans led to the establishment of a provision in the XII Tables to curb their excess. In a show of somewhat recondite learning (the XII Tables would by his time have had no efficacy as a source of law), the lawyer Trebatius will cite this provision against Horace himself at *Satires* 2.1.82-3.⁵⁸ There is somewhat fuller (but still fragmentary) evidence from the extant verses of Lucilius to attest to

⁵⁶ Cf. Juv. 1.34: *de nobilitate comesa* with Tac. *Ann.* 2.27.1, of the activities of informers: ‘things were then discovered for the first time that would eat away at the state for so many years’ (*tum primum reperta sunt quae per tot annos rem publicam exedere*). On *delatores* compared to wild animals, cf. the passages quoted by Rutledge (2001: 15).

⁵⁷ Generally on Roman satire and the law, see LaFleur (1981); Cloud (1989); Gérard (1989); Keane (2006: 73-104).

⁵⁸ For discussion, see LaFleur (1981: 1817-9); Brink (1982: 197-8).

their composition and reception in an environment of combative speech between elites. Oft-cited fragments from Lucilius' thirtieth book show the remains of what appears to have been an argument between the satirist and one of his targets, who complains of the 'charges laid falsely' against him in (presumably Lucilius') verse,⁵⁹ and accuses Lucilius of engaging in a sinister kind of surveillance of his targets⁶⁰ and delighting in abuse and libel.⁶¹ Of course, this need reflect an actual argument no more than the later satirists reflect reality in the literary critical arguments they stage in their own verse to discuss the ethical limits of satirical speech. But, in Lucilius' case, the argument about surveillance and slander is undergirded by a pervasive concern throughout the fragments for the revelation of crime, and for wrongdoers to be held to account. 'Let your [senatorial?] order bring to light the crimes it has committed, then', he says in one fragment.⁶² 'They thought they could do wrong without punishment and they could easily repel their enemies through high birth'.⁶³ When he turns to attack individuals, the direct *nominatim* attack must have made Lucilius seem already to Republican audiences like a kind of legal accuser. Indeed, although context is unfortunately lacking, Lucilius represents himself in his verses (either literally or metaphorically) as caught up in the process of legal accusation: 'That's why I am resolved to do the opposite and pursue him and lay a charge against this man' [*nomen deferre*, a technical legal phrase and the

⁵⁹ 1078W: *Haec tu insimulas? Nonne ante in corde volutes?* ('Are these the charges you lay against me falsely? Don't you want to consider them closely beforehand?') Cf. W77, W913-5 for similar objections to allegations made (either by or against) the satirist.

⁶⁰ 1083W: *Quid servas quo eam quid agam? Quid id attinet ad te?* ('Why do you keep guard on me wherever I go and whatever I do? What is it to you?') In another fragment from the thirtieth book, Lucilius (?) says that he 'knows all your stains and black marks' (*scire tuas omnes maculasque notasque*, 1070W; cf Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.5).

⁶¹ 1085W: *Gaudes cum de me ista foris sermonibus differs* ('You delight in spreading abroad those bad reports about me in your satires'). Griffith (1970) connects book 30 of Lucilius with Juvenal's first *Satire*.

⁶² 772-3W: *Proferat/ ergo iamiam vester ordo scelera quae in se admiserit*.

⁶³ 270-1W: *Peccare impune rati sunt/ posse et nobilitate facul propellere iniquos*. Lucilius reserves indignation elsewhere for those whose offences go 'without punishment'. At 57W, he describes a man 'foul and thieving, without punishment' [*impune*]. In 249W, he asks the gods whether it is their will that 'you whore around without punishment' [*impune lupervis*].

etymological origin of the word *delator* under the Empire].⁶⁴ Or, conversely: ‘You have the whole story. I’m afraid of being accused’ [*accuser*].⁶⁵ Judging, at least, from the extant fragments, satirical mockery and legal accusation are part of a continuum in Lucilius’ verse. Impugning others for their crimes is key to the satirist’s social task; satirist and informer coalesce.

The *delator* figure continues to occupy a prominent space in Horace’s programmatic poems. Here, though, the relationship has been reversed and the *delator* is presented as the antitype of the satirist, a violent extreme against which Horace can communicate his own moderate sensibilities. In *Satire* 1.4, Horace invokes the figures of ‘fierce Sulcius and Caprius’, who walk around ‘badly hoarse with writs, both a great fear to bandits’.⁶⁶ These, as the scholiasts tell us, were notorious *delatores*, though Ullman (1917: 117-8) argued that they were more likely rival satirists – in fact, the pun in *libellis* (‘writs’ or ‘little books’) seems deliberately to set up this ambiguity between satirist and informer. Striking fear into the heart of criminals, these *delatores* recall the writers of old Comedy (upon whom Lucilius ‘entirely depends’, 1.4.6), who would mark out for punishment anyone ‘bad or a thief’ (1.4.3-5). But this is *not* the way with Horace, whose *libelli* are not for wide sale (1.4.71), who is not in the business of exposing criminals for the world to see, and who assures his audience that he is not to be feared. Keane (2006: 78-9) offers a sensitive analysis here: pushing against Horace’s claims, she finds more of a *delator* in Horace’s satirist than he himself claims, a somewhat insidious

⁶⁴ 863-4W: *Quapropter certum est facere contra ac persequi/ et nomen deferre hominis*. 804W also speaks of laying a charge; whether by or against Lucilius is unclear.

⁶⁵ 813W: *Habes omnem rem; timeo ne accuser*. If the text is right, Lucilius attacks an informer in W446-7: ‘Tullius Quintus, the informer, makes him the heir, and everyone else lost the case’ (*hunc Tullius Quintus/ index heredem facit, et damnati alii omnes*). We know of one actual charge brought by Lucilius – against a playwright who defamed him *nominatim* on the stage (*Rhet.ad Her.* 2.19).

⁶⁶ 1.4.65-7: *Sulcius acer/ ambulat et Caprius, rauci male cumque libellis,/ magnus uterque timor latronibus*.

figure who (in these very lines) accuses men of being *delatores* and thieves but does so in private *libelli*, behind closed doors. Horace's imitator, Donne, is much more openly circumspect about this doubleness. In his fourth *Satire*, he imagines himself as morally and legally endangered by his very willingness to attack vice: '...as burnt venom'd Leachers doe grow sound/ by giving others their soares, I might growe/ Guilty, and he free' (4.134-6). In Scodel's words, Donne 'fears exchanging roles with his interlocutor, whereby he would turn, morally as well as legally, into a "traitor", while the gossip-and-possible-informer would go "free" of both criminal prosecution and moral guilt' (2005: 371).⁶⁷ Donne makes explicit what remains implicit in his model, Horace: the perilous similarity between the satirist and the informer.⁶⁸

In *Satire* 2.1, Horace goes further in the attempt to separate legal and satiric accusation, rejecting the image of the *delator* for Lucilius as well as for himself. For his own part, Horace famously says that his pen will not attack anyone alive, but is instead to defend him against others, like a 'sword concealed in its sheath' (*ensis/ vagina tectus*, 40-1). The implicit contrast with Lucilius suggests that the earlier satirist was much freer in using his pen as a weapon. Yet Horace idealizes Lucilius' relationship with his audience by focusing on the *amicitia* between Lucilius and his elite patrons Scipio and Laevius. Thus, though he may have been keen in his satirical attack, Lucilius (widely read in this period of the Republic amongst elite readers) nonetheless becomes a paradigm not for the *delator* but, much more

⁶⁷ Cf. also Patterson (1984: 93): 'For Donne, the human product of state censorship is not the heroic individual whose outspokenness deserves written memorial, but the deeply divided and half-felonious self'. Donne's image of poet as leech alludes to *Ars Poetica* 475-6, where Horace attributes a somewhat sinister harmfulness to the poet: 'indeed, the man he has caught, the poet holds and kills with his words/ like a leech who will not let go of the skin until gorged with blood' (*quem vero arripuit, tenet occiditque legendo/ non missura cutem nisi plena cruoris hirudo*).

⁶⁸ An identification between poet and informer is also observed by Barchiesi (1993: 171-3) in Ovid's incriminating allusions to earlier writers of love poetry in *Tristia* 2.

comfortably, for a satirist who enjoyed the patronage and friendship of those in power. True, Lucilius first dared to ‘strip off the hide’ of his targets’ pretensions, exposing their inner lives to view (62-5). Accentuating the legal metaphor, Horace says that he ‘took a hold of’/ ‘summoned before a court’ the first men amongst the people (*primores populi arripuit*, 70).⁶⁹ Yet Horace says that Scipio and Laevius were not offended by Lucilius’ wit; withdrawn from their public lives, they would ‘sport’ and ‘trifle’ (*nugari...ludere*, 73) with Lucilius, engaged not in satiric prosecution, but in satiric play.⁷⁰ The theme of *amicitia* between satirist and elites is obliquely reiterated in the image of the poet’s unreserved openness with his own books: ‘he would entrust his secrets to his books as to faithful friends’ (*ille velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim/ credebat libris*, 30-1) – no informers here. Lucilius, despite the pungency and potency of his attacks and style, is not opposed to, but integrated within a circle of elites. The reason for this sanitized vision of Lucilius is, of course, so that he can be used as a mirror for Horace’s own friendship with Augustus (lines 74-7: a comparison coyly denied but nevertheless clearly suggested).

Juvenal’s Imperial age re-imagining of Lucilius could not be more divorced from Horace’s idealistic vision of the satirist entrenched within a circle of sympathetic elites, or from Horace’s assertion on his own part that he will keep his sword sheathed in self-defense. Here, Lucilius strikes fear into the heart of the powerful, acting for the prosecution, not the defense:

*ense velut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens
infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens est
criminibus, tacita sudant praecordia culpa.*

⁶⁹ For the legal pun in *arripunt*, see Muecke (1993) ad loc.

⁷⁰ On satire and ideas of ‘play’, see Habinek (2005).

inde ira et lacrimae. (1.165-8).

Whenever Lucilius roars, flashing fire, as if with his sword unsheathed,
 the hearer whose conscience is frozen through crimes
 goes red with shame. His heart sweats from its unspoken guilt.
 Then – anger and tears.

This is a new, very threatening vision of Lucilius, and one that justifies the fears of the imaginary interlocutor that a satirist in the Imperial era avowedly following in his footsteps (cf. at 19-21) will likely be viewed as an *accusator*. The Horatian focus on elite *amicitia* is dispensed with; this Lucilius is like Horace's *delatores*, avenging figures who strike fear into the heart of criminals (*Sat.* 1.4.67-8). Indeed, though the epic aspects of Juvenal's Lucilius have been well noted in the past,⁷¹ this nightmarish vision of the satirist blazing with his sword unsheathed is equally redolent of contemporaneous descriptions of Imperial *delatores*. When the notorious Neronian-era *delator* Eprius Marcellus denounced Thrasea Paetus in the senate with a vicious speech of condemnation, Tacitus describes him as 'fierce and threatening, flashing fire in his voice, his expression, his eyes'.⁷² Speaking of the informers under the age of Tiberius, Tacitus says that the ineffectual were punished, but 'any informer who really had his sword unsheathed was, as it were, inviolable'.⁷³ The sword Lucilius wields in Juvenal is the sword Horace said he would keep in its sheath, a sword that symbolizes satiric potency. But, once the connection between satirist and *accusator* has been made, it

⁷¹ See esp. Connors (2005: 129-131).

⁷² *Ann.* 16.29.1: *torvus ac minax, voce vultu oculis ardesceret*. Vergil could have said the same of Turnus. Cf. *Aen.* 12.101-2: *his agitur furiis, totoque ardentis ab ore / scintillae absistunt, oculis micat acribus ignis*. 'He is driven by these furies, flashing fire./ sparks fly from his whole face, fire shines in his fierce eyes'.

⁷³ *Ann.* 4.36.3: *ut quis dstrictior accusator, velut sacrosanctus erat*.

looks just like the sword of the *accusator*, whose eloquence is a ‘breast-plate and sword in battle, both a defense and, at the same time, a weapon’.⁷⁴ Pliny, in a letter to Tacitus, reports a stylistic maxim of perhaps the best known of all Imperial *delatores*, M. Aquilius Regulus, in which his eloquence is again conceptualized as a weapon: ‘you think that every point should be gone over in a case. I see the jugular straightaway and I press down on that’.⁷⁵ The fierceness of Lucilius’ attack, and the freedom with which he names contemporaries, puts him deliberately close to the Imperial *delatores* who share the same traits. Moreover, the description of the anger he stirs in his targets suggests the possibility of no less fierce reprisals. The hearer will grow red, then ‘anger and tears’ will follow. *Whose* anger and tears is left unstated, no doubt deliberately, since the satirist/*delator* and his targets are embroiled in a cycle of rhetorical violence. The hearer’s reaction suggests that equally epic retaliation is not far away.⁷⁶ Think it over before ‘the battle-horns sound’, warns the interlocutor (1.169). Once war has begun, it is too late to retreat (169-170).

What of Juvenal himself? The consequences of becoming an *accusator* are predicted to be spectacularly severe:

pone Tigillinum, taeda lucebis in illa

⁷⁴ Tac. *Dial.* 5.5: *non hercule lorica et gladius in acie firmitus munimentum quam reo et periclitanti eloquentia, praesidium simul ac telum...*. Aper in this section of the *Dialogus* is ostensibly articulating general truths about eloquence, but the fact that he gives the *delator* Eprius Marcellus as the preeminent example of this oratorical mode makes the connection with informers clear. When Maternus refers back to this part of Aper’s speech (at 12.2), he speaks disparagingly of the contemporary ‘use of this lucrative, blood-stained eloquence, recently arisen, born from bad character, and, as you said, Aper, found in place of a weapon’ (*lucrosae huius et sanguinantis eloquentiae usus recens et ex malis moribus natus, atque, ut tu dicebas Aper, in locum teli repertus*).

⁷⁵ *Ep.* 1.20.14: *Tu omnia quae sunt in causa putas exsequenda; ego iugulum statim video, hunc premo.*

⁷⁶ Redness, anger, tears: the same complex of images occurs when Statius’ Theseus is stirred to indignation, having heard Evadne’s speech about the injustices of Creon: ‘he grew red, moved by her tears, and was incited to just anger’ (*rubuit.../permotus lacrimis; iusta mox concitus ira*, Stat. *Theb.* 12.588-9).

*qua stantes ardent qui fixo gutture fumant,
et latum media sulcum deducit harena (155-7).*

“Depict Tigillinus, and you’ll burn on that pine-wood torch,
where men stand, flashing fire and smoke, their throats pierced
[...]
and it traces a broad furrow amidst amphitheater sand.⁷⁷

The interlocutor gives a nightmarish example of what can happen to those who satirize men in power. You will be burnt as a human torch in the amphitheatre, the interlocutor says, if you name Gaius Ofonius Tigillinus in your poetry, a Prefect of Nero from 62-8. There is a pun on Tigillinus’ name: a *tigillum* is a beam of wood placed above the hearth, hence ‘place [pone] the *tigillum*, and you’ll burn’.⁷⁸ The humor lightens a scene that seems, after all, an inordinately extreme punishment to be meted out to a satirical poet. But the context, once again, blurs the satirist with the *delator*. Ofonius Tigillinus (or Tigellinus) is ominously connected to a history of imperial accusation. *Maiestas* trials were reintroduced in Nero’s time by Cossutianus Capito, Tigillinus’ son-in-law and ‘minion’ (Bradley 1973: 177), in order to prosecute Antistius Sosianus for reciting satirical poetry.⁷⁹ Tigillinus survived a role in Nero’s death and flourished even under Galba, achieving a long posthumous reputation as a notorious villain of the Imperial administration.⁸⁰ While readers’ minds would thus have

⁷⁷ Housman is likely correct to posit a missing line between 156 and 157; a more explicit subject for *deducit* (‘the body’ *vel sim*) seems necessary.

⁷⁸ OLD s.v. *tigillum*; cf. esp. Plaut. *Aul.* 301, where *tigillum* is a poetic metonymy for fire.

⁷⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 14.48.

⁸⁰ Kragelund (1988: 500-3). Particularly interesting is Tigillinus’ appearance as the arch-villain of Philostratus’ *Life of Apollonius*; in one episode (4.44-5), he attempts to bring a charge of *maiestas* against

been sent back to the trials of the past, the amphitheatrical punishment described by Juvenal also recalls the punishment meted out to *delatores* in the present. Suetonius (*Tit.* 8.5) records that Titus marched *delatores* into the amphitheater, had them beaten with scourges and clubs, then sold them into slavery or deported them. Pliny (*Pan.* 34-5) commemorates the theatrical spectacle with which Trajan punished *delatores* of Domitian's era: they were bound up in the amphitheater with their necks craned back, forced to meet the crowd's gaze (*supina ora retortasque cervices*), then corralled onto boats and abandoned to the whims of a stormy sea. Pliny celebrates the ironies of this punishment: he imagines the informers impaled by the storm on reefs that had earlier been the fate of many innocent men, marooned on islands now the dwelling place of men wrongly exiled through their efforts, robbed of their own wealth just as they had robbed others of theirs. Martial's epigram on the punishment of *delatores* in the arena similarly accentuates the irony of their punishment.⁸¹ In this context, the image of the *delator*/satirist burning in the arena is redolent not only of Tigillinus' vengeful prosecutions, but, as in the ironic punishments described by Martial and Pliny, represents an ironic literalization of the satirist's own offence: he will burn for writing whatever he wishes 'with his spirit aflame' (*animo flagrante*, 152), after the manner of 'blazing Lucilius' (*Lucilius ardens*, 165). The lines traced by his pen will also be grotesquely literalized as the line traced by his corpse, as it is dragged through the amphitheater's sand.⁸²

Apollonius himself, but Apollonius causes the text of the writs to disappear, then bests Tigillinus in a Pilate-like interrogation.

⁸¹ *De Spec.* 4.3-4: *traducta est †getulis† nec cepit harena nocentis/ et delator habet quod dabat exilium* ('[the crowd of informers] was dragged through [...], and the amphitheater's sand could not contain the guilty. The informer suffers the exile he used to impose').

⁸² *Sulci calami* = the 'furrows' of the pen; cf. Quint. 1.1.27, and frequently in later Latin: Thraede (1965: 93-116). Similarly, Freudenburg (2001: 245) points to the programmatic associations of the verb *deducere* (157) to illustrate the 'literary dimension of the victim's 'broad trench''.

The warnings of the interlocutor are presented as a key turning point for Juvenal's entire poetic project, supposedly derailing his Lucilian ambitions and redirecting him to criticism only of the safely dead (170-1). This is partly a commentary on the genre of Roman verse satire, as many have noted. Juvenal draws attention to the loss of Lucilian *libertas*, which is registered as a kind of present absence in each of the Roman verse satirists.⁸³ Yet Juvenal's indignant protest to the interlocutor at lines 158-9 (is the poisoner simply to ride on by, and, by implication, go free?), though briefly dismissed, carries a certain weight of its own, a contrasting view to the interlocutor's (and Cicero's) instinctive horror of being labeled an 'accusator'. The trade-off quickly sketched in this exchange, between keeping silent and seeing the criminal go unpunished, or satirizing him and being labeled an *accusator*, strikes a real, contemporary nerve. Quintilian had addressed just such a compromise in a chapter of the *Institutio Oratoria* (12.7), in which he attempts to revise Cicero's precepts in *De Officiis* 2.14.50 about the undesirability of being an *accusator*. Of course, any noble person would prefer to defend rather than prosecute, but nonetheless, Quintilian says, the ideal orator 'will not shudder at the mere name of 'accusator'...For the laws themselves would have no force unless they are defended by the fitting voice of a prosecutor. If it is not permitted to demand penalties for crimes, then crimes may as well be legal'.⁸⁴ This is the oratorical bind faced by elites in a rhetorical environment suffused, as our sources suggest, with a fear of *delatores* – a crisis of criticism, where *nominatim* attacks upon individuals for their offenses carries with it the risk of being perceived as an informer, but keeping silent carries the opposite risk of criminals going free. This is, in fact, precisely the bind into which Juvenal plunges us in the first *Satire*, since what this poem emphatically is *not* is a direct accusation of his

⁸³ Braund (1996: 116-9, 2006:418-421) outlines the ways in which this ironic end is patterned on similar moments in the programmatic poems of the previous Latin satirists.

⁸⁴ 12.7.1: *non tamen ita nomen ipsum accusatoris horrebit...Nam et leges ipsae nihil valeant nisi actoris idonea voce munitae, et si poenas scelerum expetere fas non est prope est ut scelera ipsa permissa sint...*

contemporaries for their crimes: throughout the poem, we are stirred and provoked and harangued into anger at the excrescence of modern vice, yet Juvenal himself refrains from literal accusation of contemporaries for their crimes. Ultimately, then, contrary to the warnings of the interlocutor at the close of the poem, the *Satire* brings to life not the similarity of the satirist and the *accusator*, but rather the *failure* of Juvenal to embody the *accusator* warranted by the crimes of contemporaries. Yet, while the poem exposes this crisis of criticism, it also, in its own frustrating indirection, offers a way out. For by goading us into moral indignation, yet leaving it to us to fix charges on to specific contemporary personages, it is *we* who become the *accusatores*, not the poet himself.

4. The Crisis of Criticism

In the prologue to his treatise *De Clementia*, addressed to the young emperor Nero, Seneca hymns the importance of mercy for the virtuous ruler, all too aware of the injustices committed under the previous three emperors, and yet unaware of the violence to be perpetrated under the current one. According to Seneca, when the emperor turns over his thoughts in his mind, he should be able to say to himself (in an image already familiar): ‘I have kept my sword hidden – or, rather, in its sheath’.⁸⁵ Yet Seneca is equally striking in describing the opposite character flaw. ‘Pardons should not be overly common. For when the distinction between good and bad people is removed, confusion ensues, and an irruption of

⁸⁵ 1.1.3: *conditum, immo constrictum apud me ferrum est.*

vice'.⁸⁶ The warning here given by Seneca in relation to the Imperial exercise of clemency is reminiscent of similar arguments made to demonstrate the civic necessity of accusing fellow citizens for their crimes. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* recommends that prosecutors remind jurors of the 'dangers and troubles' that would follow if criminals were allowed indiscriminately to commit crimes, and Cicero repeats this advice in his *De Inventione*.⁸⁷ Thus, despite Cicero's warning to his son in the *De Officiis* about the undesirability of being labeled an *accusator*, he also says in the *Pro Roscio Amerino* that 'it is useful to have many *accusatores* in the state, so that audacity is restrained by fear'.⁸⁸ Cicero is prepared even to excuse those who accuse an innocent man, since, as he says, 'it is more expedient that an innocent man be acquitted than that a guilty man not face trial'.⁸⁹ Quintilian restates Cicero's arguments, but with a cautiousness informed by the experience of living in an era in which there were indeed 'many *accusatores*'. In Quintilian's words, 'those who cannot be led to better ways by reason are held in check only by fear'.⁹⁰ While men who make a life out of accusing others (*accusatoriam vitam vivere*) are little short of 'brigands', there is nonetheless a noble role for those willing to prosecute others. 'To drive out some internal disturbance [through prosecuting] is akin to fighting in defense of the fatherland' (*propugnatoribus patriae*).⁹¹

⁸⁶ 1.2.2: *non tamen vulgo ignoscere decet; nam ubi discrimen inter malos bonosque sublatum est, confusio sequitur et vitiorum eruptio.*

⁸⁷ *Rhet. ad Her.* 2.30.48; *De Inv.* 1.53: 101-2.

⁸⁸ *Pro Rosc. Am.* 20.55: *Accusatores multos esse in civitate utile est, ut metu contineatur audacia.*

⁸⁹ 20.56: *utilius et autem absolve innocentem quam nocentem quam nocentem causam non dicere.*

⁹⁰ 12.7.2-3: *qui radione traduci ad meliora non possunt, solo metu continentur.*

⁹¹ 12.7.3: *pestem intestinam propulsare cum propugnatoribus patriae comparandum...* On the fear of being perceived as an *accusator*, cf. also Dio, *Or.* 45.9, where Dio claims that he did not send word to the Emperor on a particular matter in order that he not 'seem to be accusing certain men and disparaging the city' (ἵνα μὴ δοκῶ κατηγορεῖν τινῶν μηδὲ διαβάλλειν τὴν πόλιν).

A letter of Pliny sheds light on the way in which a contemporary figure may cast himself in just the role Quintilian has in mind, the prosecutor as *propugnator patriae*, while also illustrating the dangerous ambiguities of that role, the ease with which it can slip into the much more sinister aspect of the *delator*. In *Ep.* 9.13, Pliny recounts to his young addressee Umidius Quadratus the events of his prosecution of Publicius Certus, a man who, in his turn, had some violent hand in the prosecution of Helvidius Priscus.⁹² Pliny proudly emphasizes in his letter the dangers of undertaking this prosecution, no doubt because the danger of appearing opportunistic and self-serving was an immanent one. After Domitian's death, he says that he waited out the initial period, when people were seizing the opportunity to attack their personal enemies, until anger (*ira*) reverted to justice (*iustitia*).⁹³ Not 'private obligations' but 'public justice' and 'indignation at the deed' and 'thought of a precedent' spurred Pliny on, or so he insists.⁹⁴ Nonetheless, when he first raised the charge, the senators instinctively recoiled at the personal attack, anxiously imploring him to 'let us who stayed alive remain alive!'⁹⁵ Evidently they saw his prosecution as a possible revival of the Domitianic-era *delatores*. One of Pliny's consular friends counseled him gravely against proceeding for fear of Pliny's making himself a 'marked man' (*notabilis*, 9.13.11) in the eyes of future Emperors, a scene in which Pliny grandiloquently casts himself as an epic hero of Vergilian mould: "What is this audacity?" (*quid audes?*), asks his friend. "Whither do you rush?" (*quo ruis?*) "Into the path of what dangers do you cast yourself?" (*quibus te periculis*

⁹² As Sherwin-White (1960: 492) notes in his discussion of the letter, although Pliny insists that he brought the 'proper charge' (*proprio crimine*, 9.13.4) against Certus, he does not say here what the precise charge was. On the letter and its relationship to Juvenal's first *Satire*, see also Freudenburg (2001: 231-4).

⁹³ 9.13.4: *...languidior in dies ira ad iustitiam redisset.*

⁹⁴ 9.13.3: *Sed non ita me iura privata, ut publicum fas et indignitas facti et exempli ratio incitabat.*

⁹⁵ 9.13.8: *Salvi simus, qui supersumus.*

obicitis?)⁹⁶ Pliny responds to his friend's fears with an equivalent quote from Vergil, explicitly assuming the mantle of an epic hero, quoting Aeneas' words to the Sibyl before he enters the Underworld (*Aen.* 6.105): 'I have foreseen all this and turned it over in my mind already' (*omnia praecepi atque animo mecum ante peregi*). He is undeterred from his mission – his speech is met with miraculous attention, then applause (9.13.18) – the Senators tolerate no further speech of defense on Certus' behalf (9.13.19). Finally, Pliny is embraced and celebrated, in his own words, for reviving 'a custom, already long in disuse, of taking thought for the common good at the risk of arousing enmities of one's own'.⁹⁷ The prosecution is cast as a victory not merely over a single criminal, but rather as a victory for prosecution itself.

In Pliny's account, his moral indignation at an individual's crimes is matched by the courage to attack one by name. But Pliny's letter, maybe despite itself, also brings to life the warnings of the first *Satire*'s imaginary interlocutor about being perceived as an informer. Freudenburg (2001: 233) points out that Pliny has deliberately omitted his own personal windfall from the prosecution, since the treasury post that Certus was forced to vacate was soon afterwards occupied by Pliny himself. Yet Pliny seems to give it away in the opening of his letter, when he introduces the prosecution to his young addressee as 'truly splendid material for attacking the guilty, avenging the downcast, advancing oneself'.⁹⁸ A prosecution was traditionally seen

⁹⁶ On the Vergilian reminiscences in the scene, see Marchesi (2008: 36-7), who links the worried friend's words to *Aen.* 10.811, where Aeneas speaks to Lausus (*Quo moriture ruis maioraque viribus audes?*). But Hecuba's worried cry '*quo ruis?*' to Priam (*Aen.* 2.520), as the old man girds for battle, is perhaps the epic's most memorable iteration of the phrase, and the more pertinent here.

⁹⁷ 9.13.21: ...*quod intermissum iam diu morem in publicum consulendi susceptis propriis simultatibus reduxissem.*

⁹⁸ 9.13.2: *magnam pulchramque materiam insectandi nocentes, miseros vindicandi, se proferendi.*

as a respectable way for a fledgling Roman orator to improve his standing,⁹⁹ but this open statement of self-advancement conflicts with the strenuous insistence on the public good throughout the letter – and, in any case, Pliny is no fledgling orator. Equally disquieting is his apparent relish at attacking (‘truly splendid material’): Quintilian counseled the good kind of prosecutor never to appear as if he had undertaken any accusation willingly, and attributes a ‘delight in accusing’ (*accusandi voluptate*, 11.1.57) to the notorious Cassius Severus, an early Imperial precedent for the *bad* kind of prosecutor (though perhaps, in his own way, a true Imperial satirist).¹⁰⁰ By contrast, the ideal orator will accuse others of crimes ‘not out of a desire to punish the guilty, but out of a desire to emend vice and correct morals’.¹⁰¹ At the close of the letter, Pliny relates a rumour that when Certus died, he had a vision of Pliny threatening him with a sword (9.13.25). An unsheathed sword – the symbol of Lucilian satire in Horace, of the ‘profitable and bloody eloquence’ of the *delatores*, and (as I have argued) of Juvenal’s vision of Lucilius-as-*delator* in the first *Satire* – is here wielded by Pliny, whose prosecution seems at the last to be uncomfortably close to those of the *delatores* to which he strenuously opposes himself. At the end of the letter, he appears not as the prudent Aeneas of book 6, but rather as the Aeneas of the epic’s closing lines, standing with sword over Turnus and ready to land troubling blows. For all of Pliny’s confident trumpeting of the public good in his letter, his text seems trapped in the bind described by Juvenal’s imaginary interlocutor: *accusator erit qui verbum dixerit “hic est”* (*Sat.* 1.161). The conflicts within Pliny’s text effectively mark out the oratorical environment dramatized and explored in Juvenal’s poem:

⁹⁹ Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 34, Plut. *Luc.* 1.1, Apul. *Apol.* 66.

¹⁰⁰ On Cassius Severus as the forefather of a vicious rhetorical style later associated with *delatores*, see Winterbottom (1964: 20-2). Tacitus says that Cassius was banished after he had ‘defamed distinguished men and women in his mocking writings’ (*viros feminasque inlustris procacibus scriptis diffamaverat*, *Ann.* 1.72), and the sources about him are almost universally hostile. He was ‘a professional satirist rather than a professional accuser’, says Winterbottom (1964: 91).

¹⁰¹ 12.7.2: *non poenae nocentium cupidus sed emendandi vitia corrigendaque mores*. Ussani argues that the *correctio morum* is a specifically Domitianic theme in the *Institutio Oratoria* (2008: 13-55).

in his text, the *indignitas facti* of Pliny's letter (9.13.3) has reached boiling point, but here the cultural imperative to suppress *nominatim* criticism is made equally explicit.

Seneca in his *De Clementia* had threatened grand-scale 'confusion...and irruption of vice' (*confusio...et vitiorum eruptio*) if offenses were to go without proper punishment. Juvenal brings this 'confusion...and irruption of vice' to garish poetic life in the lengthy first tirade of his first *Satire* (lines 22-80). Juvenal careers at breakneck speed through a cavalcade of vice, each vignette crashing into the next, as if the speaker's attention is constantly being distracted by some new outrage. All that unifies these disparate scenes is the crimes' failure to be punished. As if following Cicero's rhetorical instructions, we are constantly reminded of the proliferation of criminal activity should wrongdoers not be prosecuted. The only way really to *be* someone in Rome is to commit some act worthy of exile and imprisonment, Juvenal says (73). The wealthy owe their extravagant lifestyles to 'crimes' (or, perhaps, with the *delatores* in mind, to 'criminal charges', *criminibus*, 75). Juvenal reserves special indignation for the travesties of legal process that allow criminals to evade effective prosecution. One *spoliator pupilli* ('defrauder of his ward') intimidates people with his herds of hangers-on (*populum gregibus comitum premit*, 46), and is 'condemned with an ineffectual sentence' (*damnatus inani iudicio*, 48). 'What does "loss of citizen rights" mean, anyway, if the money's still safe?', asks Juvenal incredulously.¹⁰² Business is booming for the ambulance-chaser Matho (32-3), if the opulence of his 'new litter' is any indication.¹⁰³ Legal procedures have become a mockery: estates are divided according to the size of each legacy-hunter's

¹⁰² 1.48: *quid enim salvis infamia nummis?*

¹⁰³ A *causidicus* ('ambulance chaser') is a lawyer who charges for his services. The word was used pejoratively and suggests unscrupulousness: Quintilian, for example, compares the noble orator he seeks to educate to the mercenary *causidicus* (12.1.25). Matho's financial success seems to have been rather short-lived, since in a later book of Juvenal's, he has gone bankrupt (7.129).

genitals (40-1); wives are swindled of their right to inherit property (55-6);¹⁰⁴ wills are forged (67-8). Poisoners brazenly send out dead husbands to burial while the people talk – but only talk (*per famam et populum*, 72). We are surrounded by every kind of un-prosecuted or ineffectively prosecuted vice: this is the *farrago* of Juvenal's *libellus*: the 'mixed fodder' of his 'little book/ legal writ' (86). Of particular pertinence here is Juvenal's cynical reference to the prosecution of a 'Marius', almost certainly Marius Priscus, governor of Africa in 97-8. Marius enjoys a comfortable lifestyle in exile while his extorted province weeps, says the satirist (1.49-50), one more instance of a criminal inadequately punished for his crimes. The topicality is striking: Juvenal's audience must have started like Octavia at *tu Marcellus eris* to hear Marius' name amid the catalogue of unprosecuted vice. But this blow cuts especially deep, since the very high-profile prosecution of Marius was conducted on behalf of the province by none other than Pliny and Tacitus (*Ep.* 2.11; 6.29), and the orator engaged in Marius' defence was T. Catus Caesius Fronto, who, as we have seen, may be the same Fronto in whose recitation hall the entire poem is being declaimed.

Yet Juvenal provokes us to do more than observe vice: throughout the first *Satire*, we are challenged to spurn complacency and restraint in the face of other people's wrongdoing and to feel personally affronted by others' crimes. We are, in short, provoked into becoming *accusatores*. 'For who is so tolerant of unjust Rome, so steely-hearted that he can restrain himself? (30-1).¹⁰⁵ When a man is seducing his greedy daughter-in-law, 'who can get to sleep'? (77).¹⁰⁶ We are forced to assume the role of wronged parties: the men who earn

¹⁰⁴ 1.55-6, where, however, the precise legal situation is debated: 'when a pimp accepts an adulterer's property, if the wife has no right to inherit...' (*cum leno accipiat moechi bona, si capiendi/ ius nullum uxori*).

¹⁰⁵ 1.30-1: *Nam quis iniquae/ tam patiens Urbis, tam ferreus ut teneat se...*

¹⁰⁶ 1.70-1: *quem patitur dormire nurus corruptor avarae.*

legacies at night ‘are supplanting you’ (*te summoveant*, 37). ‘You, victorious province, weep’ while Marius enjoys his exile (*tu victrix, provincia, ploras*, 50). The poisoner ferried by on his litter looks down on *us* (*illinc despiciat nos*, 159). The satirist himself champs at the bit. ‘*Haec ego non agitem?*’, he asks at 52 – ‘can’t *I* attack these things?’ Laying claim to the *nominatim* criticism of Lucilius, in words that commentators have suspected may cite the earlier satirist directly, he challenges indignantly: ‘Whose name do I dare not say?’ (*cuius non audeo dicere nomen*, 153). But for all his *indignatio* and his provocations, Juvenal conspicuously refrains from becoming an *accusator*, frustratingly prone himself to the restraint he disparages in his audience. His own accusations seem inefficacious: he targets anonymous figures (a *leno*, a *moechus*, a *signator falsi*, a *corruptor*, 55, 65, 77), guilty parties hidden behind pseudonyms (*puer Automedon*, *melior Lucusta*, 61, 71), and insignificant figures unidentifiable with any certainty perhaps even in Juvenal’s time (*Gillo*,¹⁰⁷ *Proculeius*, 40). Rome is ‘unjust’ (30), yet Juvenal prosecutes silhouettes. Indeed, there is a kind of caginess even at the level of syntax: throughout, Juvenal eschews direct statements in the indicative, instead framing his accusations in long strings of subordinate clauses (*cum...cum...cum...cum*, 22-28; cf. 37-9, 46-8; 55-61; 64-8), or as rhetorical questions that implicitly demand an affirmative response from his audience (30-39; 45-8; 51; 58-61; 62-8), thereby relying upon his audience to make the direct accusation.

The failure that marks the conclusion of the poem – the anonymous interlocutor derails Juvenal’s purported plans to criticize his contemporaries – in fact characterizes the poem as a whole. The satirist challenges his audience to express outrage at vice while he simultaneously

¹⁰⁷ That is, unless Gillo refers to Juvenal’s contemporary Q. Fulvius Gillo Bittius Proculus, suffect consul in 98, and – another (albeit later) Fronto connection – a member of the Arval Brethren with T. Catus Caesius Fronto in 101 and 105: Ferguson (1987: 103).

circumvents his own accusations, shooting off just so many vain cannonades. Yet Juvenal's provocative combination of professed frankness and authorial restraint means that the label of *accusator* redounds constantly not upon the satirist, but rather upon *us*. A comparison might be drawn here with reflections on frank speech by a contemporary figure who also had experienced the rule of Domitian and was no less haunted by it than Juvenal or Pliny.

Epictetus' *Discourses* 4.13, the final lecture recorded by Arrian in the text we have, and perhaps, Starr suggests, placed in that position 'as an enduring warning' (1949: 22), deals with the perils of frank speech – not to the speaker, but to the audience.¹⁰⁸ When someone speaks to us frankly (*ἀπλῶς*), there arises in us a natural instinct to respond with equal frankness, whether because that seems fair, or because we do not want to seem as if we are hiding things ourselves, or because those who speak frankly seem worthy of our confidence (4.13.1-5). But speakers who profess their own frankness are not to be trusted for that reason alone. Epictetus cites instances of entrapment in Rome – soldiers out of uniform approach civilians and start speaking ill of the Emperor, and once people take their frank speech as a sign of ingenuousness and begin to do the same, they are arrested (4.13.5). Of course, exercising due care over the liberty of one's speech was a basic ethical precept: 'consider frequently what you say, and about whom, and to whom you say it', Horace counsels the outspoken Lollius in *Epistles* 1.18.¹⁰⁹ But in Epictetus' teaching, a constant suspicion of others' speech is deliberately engendered as a philosophical response to the Rome of the *delatores*, where desire for advancement in the Emperor's court, or an office, or an

¹⁰⁸ For what we know of Epictetus' life in Rome, see Millar (1965), who dates Arrian's attendance at Epictetus' lectures in Nicopolis to 108. Chester Starr's article (1949) attempts to link Epictetus' experiences as an emancipated slave in Rome to his philosophy, which is primarily concerned, in this account, with freeing man from the 'fear of force' (at 20). Starr's convictions about the timeliness of Epictetus' philosophy extend to his own time, as is clear from the explicit and implicit assimilations of Domitian's 'tyranny' to that of the Nazis in his article; in this respect, Starr (1949) is profitably read together with Starr (1948), esp. at pages 445-6.

¹⁰⁹ *Ep.* 1.18.68: *quid, de quoque viro, et cui dicas saepe videto.*

inheritance, or ‘thirty thousand other things’, are liable to loosen tongues (4.13.22).

‘Confidences require trust and trustworthy judgments’, Epictetus says – ‘but where can one readily find such things these days?’¹¹⁰

The Epictetan parallel suggests that we ought to approach Juvenal’s *Satire*, and its seeming safety, with a fair degree of suspicion. For whose side is Juvenal really on? In other poems, he clearly manipulates listeners’ sense of security and his own allegiances, to produce a vivid poetic simulacrum of similar anxieties in contemporary Rome. Compare, for instance, the fifth *Satire*, depicting gross iniquities at a rich man’s dinner party. In this poem, Juvenal goads his audience into anger about injustices between patrons and clients, not merely by depicting inequalities of power, but by dramatizing them in the relationship between satirist and audience. Juvenal traps his audience in a position of impotent frustration, daring them to speak while constantly emphasizing the perils involved in doing so. In the hectoring opening, Juvenal warns ‘you’ that if you are not ashamed of your life-choice, and if you are ‘able to suffer’ (*potes...pati*) indignities (the boiling point of every incipient satirist), then – even if you spoke out, Juvenal would not believe you.¹¹¹ Anyone of ‘you’ who attempts to speak like a free man in this tyrannical banquet is thrown outside (125-7); anyone of ‘you’ who says “‘cheers” to the host’ (or, literally, “‘drink!” to the king’, with overtones of Imperial poisonings) is ‘reckless’ and ‘done for’.¹¹² At the same time, Juvenal urges the clients not to be mute actors in the comedy their host is malevolently staging (157-8). *He* wants to see you passively suffering, ‘compelled’ to express anger merely through ‘tears’ and ‘with teeth

¹¹⁰ 4.13.23-4 οἱ ἀπόρρητοι λόγοι πίστεως χρεῖαν ἔχουσι καὶ δογμάτων τοιούτων· ταῦτα δὲ ποῦ νῦν εὐρεῖν ῥαδίως;

¹¹¹ 5.5: *quamvis iurato metuum tibi credere testi* (‘I would hesitate to believe your testimony, even on oath’).

¹¹² 5.129-130: *quis vestrum temerarios usque adeo, quis/ perditus, ut dicat regi “bibe”?*

clenched' (159-60). If anyone can speak for us, it is the satirist, who boldly indicts the host's tyranny to his face at lines 107-113, in ingratiating terms that suggest that Juvenal is on *our* side. 'We demand one thing: that you dine with *us* like citizens' (*solum/ poscimus ut cenes civiliter*, 111-2). Yet, if we are not yet speaking ourselves, then we become the target of the satirist's climactic recriminations. 'If you can endure all this, then you *deserve* it, too' (*omnia ferre/ si potes, et debes*, 170-1). 'You sit there in silence' (*tacetis*, 169) he rails, no doubt motioning to the audience, who are necessarily sitting there in silence, since they are listening to this poem. If you are not afraid to suffer (*pati*) harsh whippings, then 'this is the kind of patron [or 'friend', *amico*] you deserve', he says, with sardonic reference both to Virro and to himself.¹¹³ Juvenal here creates a nervous atmosphere deliberately similar to that in the tyrant-run dinner party. We hope we have found a patron who will say '*una simus*' (18), 'let us stick together', but he could turn on us at any moment.

Juvenal provokes and goads listeners into speech in the first *Satire* equally by playing on the audience's sense of outrage and sense of shame. He comes on like Quintilian's *propugnator patriae*, but ends up more like Epictetus' soldier, professing his own frankness while challenging the audience to indulge theirs. His lines on the frightful *delator* of *Satire* one are worth reconsidering in this light:

magni delator amici

et cito rapturus de nobilitate comesa

quod superest, quem Massa timet, quem munere palpat

¹¹³ 5.172-3: *nec dura timebis/ flagra pati, his epulis et tali dignus amico* – the parting malediction of the satirist's first book.

*Carus, ut*¹¹⁴ *a trepido Thymele summissa Latino* (1.33-6).

There's the informer of a great friend [or 'patron'],
 sure to snatch away at speed whatever is left
 of the eaten-up elites. Massa fears him, and Carus
 placates him with gifts, like Thymele, sent by trembling Latinus.

'Not naming the *delator*', comments Viansino, 'increases his terrifying aura'.¹¹⁵ So it does – in fact, an entire symphony of suggestions in these lines provoke nervous suspicions about the informer. Who is he? *When* is he? Baebius Massa and Mettius Carus both gained notoriety as informers under Domitian, so if the *delator* belonged to their era, he would then be safely gone.¹¹⁶ But if he is safely gone, why is he not named like the other two? If he is safely gone, why does Juvenal use the future participle, which allows readers to suspect that his 'snatching away' of imperial power is still to occur?¹¹⁷ Perhaps Massa and Carus are here to be understood not literally but as by-words for informers, just as Lucusta is a by-word for poisoners (71); in that case, 'Massa' and 'Carus' may not be so long gone after all. In fact, in Martial's twelfth book, dated to 101 or 102, Carus already appears as a by-word for an

¹¹⁴ This text follows Braund (2004), accepting Heinrich's emendation *ut* for the MS *et*. See discussion below.

¹¹⁵ 'Non dicendo il nome del delatore, ne accresce l'auerola terrificante' (2007: 166). The identity of this *delator* was an ancient controversy. Scholia on this point (where chronology is as garbled as in Juvenal it is deliberately confused) give three possibilities: the first suggestion is the Stoic philosopher Heliodorus, but 'some say' another philosopher of Trajan's era, and 'others', the *causidicus* Demetrius (Wessner 1931: 5). Gérard (1976: 44-54) makes an argument for Publicius Certus (Pliny's prosecutorial target) as the unnamed *delator*, which the most recent commentary finds the 'least speculative' solution (Stramaglia 2008: 41).

¹¹⁶ On the careers of Massa and Carus, see Rutledge (2001: 202-4; 245-6). Massa was another figure prosecuted by Pliny, and he does not infrequently mention his success (*Ep.* 3.4.4-6; 6.29.8; 7.33.4-8).

¹¹⁷ Cf. the possible ambivalence of *cito*, both 'at speed' and 'soon': *OLD* s.v. *cito* 1, 2.

informer, and Massa (prosecuted for corruption) as a by-word for a thief.¹¹⁸ What, then, of Latinus and Thymele (line 36)? In the explanation first offered by Heinrich (1838: 44-5), the sight of Massa and Carus anxiously placating the *delator* is so absurd that it recalls a scene from an adultery farce acted by these two famous Domitianic mime actors. The lines recall a poem of Martial (1.5), in which Martial urges Domitian to lay aside his seriousness as ruler and read his witty epigrams as he would watch a show of ‘Thymele and that mocker, Latinus’ (*Thymelen spectas derisoremque Latinum*, 5). But here in Juvenal the line between fiction and reality is quite unclear, since Latinus himself, both a successful actor and an intimate of Domitian, was also suspected of being an informer;¹¹⁹ indeed, if we accept the MS *et* instead of Heinrich’s *ut* in line 36, ‘trembling’ Latinus appears in this very line as another informer who fears the nameless *delator* of line 33. On the other hand, Latinus’ name was ‘proverbial for acting, and was used in subsequent generations (*CIL* 14, 2408 Aelius Latinus)’ (Ferguson 1987: 134), and Thymele reappears as a name in later books of Juvenal (6.66, 8.197), so here too both names could conceivably be by-words for other, contemporary, figures. Since none of these figures can be assigned definitely to the past, the *delator* of line 33 cannot be assigned definitely to the past either.

The uncertainties here typify uncertainties generated constantly throughout Juvenal’s *Satires*.

Juvenal rails against countless individuals. Some have familiar names, some, unfamiliar.

Others are anonymous, either because they represent ‘types’, or because their names have

¹¹⁸ 12.25.5 (Carus); 12.28.2 (Massa). On the dating of Martial 12, see Friedländer (1886: 65-7). Pliny urged Tacitus to include an account in his historical works of Pliny’s prosecution of Massa, on the grounds that it should stand as an *exemplum* (*Ep.* 7.33.9); he hopes that the incident will become ‘more famous, more illustrious’ (*notiora, clariora*, 7.33.10). It is not known whether Tacitus complied, but Massa remained famous: his name appears 350 years later in a list of well-known *delatores* by Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* 5.7.3).

¹¹⁹ Suet. *Dom.* 15.3; schol. ad *Sat.* 4.53; cf. Rutledge (2001: 244).

been deliberately withheld.¹²⁰ Some figures seem dredged up from the past, though for an audience trained to view the present through the *exempla* of Roman history, figures from the past quite commonly ‘reappear’ in the present. Moreover, his audience was no doubt familiar with the idea of attacks on the past commenting, as the scholia put it, *figurate* (‘allusively’) on the present.¹²¹ The exact targets of Juvenal’s criticisms are very often unclear, not so much because of our loss of contemporary details, but because of the text’s own deliberate confusion of names and chronology. Rather than thereby avoiding the anxiety and stigma of *nominatim* criticism, the resultant destabilization in fact *creates* an anxiety to pin satirical attacks on to known persons, since if the unnamed *delator* cannot be accounted for through some secure identification, he may still be here. Specifically, indeed, the text provokes accusation, by creating an atmosphere of indignation at individuals’ crimes, and alternating professions of frankness with pauses of restraint. Thus, the *hic est* moment is set up by the satirist for the audience through carefully orchestrated suggestions, but that final stage of pinning the accusation on a contemporary figure falls to the audience, who thereby become the *accusatores*, not the satirist himself. The ‘gaps’ in Juvenal’s attacks rely on their audience to be filled, and the anxious uncertainties engineered by the *Satires* are a provocation to do so.

In the final two lines of the poem, Juvenal says that he will ‘see what is permitted against those whose ash is covered by the Flaminian and Latin roads’ (*experiar quid concedatur in illos/ quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina*, 1.170-1). The lines read as a victory of

¹²⁰ On names in Juvenal, see Hightet (1957: 289-294) (= Plaza 2009: 299-304), arguing for Juvenal’s criticism of contemporaries by ‘cover-names’; similarly, Lutz (1960); Baldwin (1967), arguing against Hightet; Friedländer (1895: 99-106) (=1969: 63-8); Ferguson (1987); Jones (2007: 59-60).

¹²¹ So, in the *Vita*, we are told that ‘Juvenal aroused suspicion of satirizing the present allusively’ (*venit ergo Iuvenalis in suspicionem, quasi tempora figurate notasset*, *Vit. Iuv.* 4). Cf. schol. ad. 1.1 (*per figuras*), 10.4 (*figurate*), 10.22 (*figurate*).

sorts for the interlocutor, who seems to have convinced the satirist that direct accusation is too dangerous to undertake – though, even here, if Juvenal wished to quell anxiety out of a sudden concern for his own safety, his assurance to nervous *auditores* remains strangely ambiguous (are all those indicted in his verse already dead? Or only those buried under these roads? Or only the *nobiles*?)¹²² This apparent eleventh hour capitulation to the dangers of direct accusation marks a swerve in the satiric tradition, signaling Juvenal’s failure to assume the mantle of Lucilius, in whose texts legal and satiric accusation are openly conflated. The poem associates Lucilian attack with fire (*Lucilius ardens*, 1.165); Juvenal’s focus on ashes feels late indeed. At the same time, this failure dramatizes a broader cultural crisis. The text is caught up in a familiar rhetorical bind: one either accuses the guilty by name and risks being perceived as a *delator*, or else suffers the guilty to go un-prosecuted. Ultimately, as I have argued here, in purportedly evading the stigma of the *delator*, Juvenal replaces direct criticism with a poetic mode that in fact embodies and replicates the Rome of the *delatores*, a mode which operates on suggestion and suspicion. The satirist’s silences are his best weapon. The text implicates the audience in its own indignant aggression – but it tempts *them* to strike.

5. Satiric Voices in Tacitus’ *Dialogus de Oratoribus*

Tacitus’ *Dialogus* tells us more than any other text about the conditions of public speech under the Flavians and their successors, not despite, but because of its manifold silences,

¹²² Cf. Courtney (1980: 119): ‘Juvenal simply means the dead in general’; Stramaglia (2008: 115): ‘G. si riferisce probabilmente soprattutto ai p o t e n t i defunti’; Baldwin (1967: 308-9): ‘...these two lines do not mean that Juvenal is going to attack the dead...Rather is the passage descriptive of the nobles...the sense is *generic*, not temporal’. Plaza (2006: 50) suggests that the indeterminacy is the point: ‘...what is most important to notice is that it is precisely the joke that allows for the different readings, that it multiplies meanings and above all indicates that there are hidden meanings present (under ground?)’.

ironies and ambiguities. Rather than offering an abstract analysis of the decline of Roman oratory, it is a text itself shaped by the cultural pressures its characters describe. The effect that the *delatores* have had on contemporary oratory is everywhere apparent (though the word *delator* itself is never uttered). The conversation Tacitus claims to recall took place the day after Curiatus Maternus had given a reading of his *Cato*, a play that is ‘said to have offended the sensibilities of those in power’ (*offendisse potentium animos diceretur*, 2.1) – not, as Gallia (2009) argues, the emperor himself, but likely successful *delatores*, who could use the play as a pretext for prosecuting Maternus. The partisan of contemporary oratory in the dialogue, M. Aper, cites the notorious *delatores* Eprius Marcellus and Vibius Crispus, ‘neither one notable for their morality’ (*neuter moribus egregius*, 8.3), as support for the argument that eloquence can bring fame, power and material success. When Aper exults eloquence as a *praesidium simul ac telum* (‘a defense and also, at the same time, a weapon’, 5.6), one suspects that Aper himself is no stranger to their activities. Maternus explicitly disclaims this account of eloquence, asserting that the use of eloquence as a weapon is ‘born from bad morals’ (*ex malis moribus natus*, 12.2), recalling that the ‘golden age’ of the poets was free of both ‘orators and accusations’.¹²³ Yet the ostensibly civil tone of their own conversation is constantly rankled by echoes of accusation and attack, as if even private discourse between elites is here infiltrated by an anxious preoccupation with courtroom accusation. Their private discussion is cast as a criminal trial: Maternus says that Aper never ceases to ‘attack and pursue’ (*agitare et insequi*, 4.1) the poets, and so he takes up their ‘defense’ (4.1; cf. 24.2, 25.7), while Secundus volunteers to act as the ‘judge’ (5.1). Later, Aper, ‘girding himself for the opposition’ (*in contrarium accingi*, 16.3), brashly declares that

¹²³ *Dial.* 12.3: *Ceterum felix illud et, ut more nostro loquar, aureum saeculum, et oratorum et criminum inops...* Maternus’ later suggestion that such a golden age has already arrived (‘What need is there for voluntary accusations, when offences are so occasional and so minor?’, 41.4) is a key indication that Maternus is engaging in ‘doublespeak’ in his later speech: see Bartsch (1994: 108).

he will not allow ‘this age to be condemned by this conspiracy of yours’ (16.4). After Aper’s speech, famous orators stand ‘accused’ (*incusato*, 26.6).¹²⁴ Characters in the conversation make ‘attacks’ and ‘fight’,¹²⁵ just as the activities of contemporary orators are described as fights and battles. These metaphors suggest that the boundary between private conversation and prosecutorial attack in this world can all too easily be crossed. Perhaps in response to this, and in stark contrast to the Ciceronian dialogues by which he was influenced, Tacitus conspicuously excepts himself from the conversation depicted in the text.¹²⁶ At the dialogue’s uneasy end, Aper and Maternus jest that they will ‘charge’ each other (*criminabimur*, 42.2) with offenses against the parties they have criticized in their dialogue. But nobody could ‘charge’ Tacitus for any sentiments expressed in the text: they would have to find him first.

If this milieu fits the one evoked in Juvenal’s first *Satire*, the presence of a loud satirical voice in the text brings the *Dialogus* even closer to Juvenal. The character of Vipstanus Messalla has been identified as a spokesman for Quintilian’s educational principles, or as a classicist and a neo-Ciceronian, or merely as an aristocratic elitist. His speeches have excited less comment than those of the other characters, overburdened as they are with generalities and truisms.¹²⁷ Yet Gowing captures something important about the character when he notes that Messalla is ‘something of an extremist’ (2005: 115). Indeed he is – not to mention

¹²⁴ Cf. 11.1 (Maternus) *parantem...me non minus diu accusare...*

¹²⁵ Cf. 24.1 (*impetu*); 25.2 (*pugna, repugno*).

¹²⁶ On the implications of Tacitus’ non-appearance as a character in the *Dialogus*, and the resultant inability to pin any one character’s argument to the convictions of the author, see Levene (2004: 192-195), Syson (2009: 49-50).

¹²⁷ On Messalla’s identification with Quintilian’s (and Cicero’s) educational principles, see Brink (1989: 484-494); Calboli (2003). Levene (2004: 185), while arguing for a certain conceptual sophistication in Messalla’s account of literary history, nonetheless concedes that ‘it is easy to be dismissive of Messalla’s arguments’; cf. Penwill (2003: 131): Messalla has ‘little to offer except superficial platitude’. Even the other characters seem to tire of his long-winded moralistic divagations (cf. Maternus’ insistence at 27.1 and 33.1 that he redirect his attention back to the issue at hand).

angry,¹²⁸ excitable,¹²⁹ argumentative,¹³⁰ and liable to hyperbole,¹³¹ a man who subordinates specific arguments about the causes of oratorical decline to shrill, broad-brush indictments of the degeneracy of contemporary morals.¹³² Such alone might suggest a resemblance between Messalla's characterization in the *Dialogus* and Juvenal's first book of *Satires*. But Messalla also resembles Juvenal in his idealizing nostalgia;¹³³ his disdain for foreigners;¹³⁴ and his scorn for male effeminacy, actors and gladiatorial shows.¹³⁵ Moreover, although the links between Messalla's ideas in the *Dialogus* and intertexts with Cicero and Quintilian should not be ignored, it is worth noting that the themes of his speech would also be handled later by Juvenal, in particular in his fourteenth *Satire*, which deals with the education of children. Yet the most pertinent point of contact between the first *Satire* and the *Dialogus*' own satirical voice is that both seem to perform a similar function within the text – both brashly announce their own intention freely to criticize the present, and encourage others to do the same, while simultaneously blunting this criticism and drawing attention to their own rhetorical impotence. Like Juvenal, Messalla's satirical performance stages its own frustration.

¹²⁸ *Dial.* 27.1 (*iratus*).

¹²⁹ Cf. Mayer, on *hercule* (*Dial.* 26.2): 'Messalla is excited; he has just used this exclamation' (2001: 172).

¹³⁰ Cf. *Dial.* 42.1: we see Messalla, at the very end, as the sun goes down on the dialogue, saying that there are many things to which he would still like to object.

¹³¹ Cf. e.g. his claim that children nowadays learn vice 'almost in the womb' (*paene in utero*, 29.3). Amongst other stylistic traits, Mayer notes 'the climactic array of adjectives of number (*multa, plurimis, omnium*)' in Messalla's speeches (2001: 45).

¹³² Cf. esp. *Dial.* 28.1-3 on the 'forgetting of olden-day morality' (*oblivione moris antiqui*) and the spread of vices (*vitia*) from Rome into Italy and abroad. Even stylistic arguments in Messalla's speeches are colored by his indignation against moral vice; cf. his attacks on the moderns' 'wantonness of word choice' (*lascivia verborum*, 26.2), the 'permissiveness of their arrangement' (*licentia compositionis*, 26.2), or his disdain for Cassius Severus' innovation in 'setting aside modesty and chastity in word choice' (*omissa modestia ac pudore verborum*, 26.4).

¹³³ *Dial.* 28.4 (*pridem...*); 34.1 (*apud maiores...*)

¹³⁴ *Dial.* 15.3, 29.1.

¹³⁵ Effeminacy: *Dial.* 26.1. Actors and gladiatorial shows: *Dial.* 29.3

It has not been much stressed that, although the conversation of the *Dialogus* is initiated by the characters' concerns about Maternus' outspoken literary works, and although Maternus' curiously contrary later speech seems to raise the specter of restrictions on critical speech, it is Messalla in the *Dialogus* whose speeches insist most openly upon the need for free criticism of contemporaries, and indeed claim to employ that freedom. 'I will not be afraid to single out people by name', he says at 26.8 (*non verebor nominare singulos*), and he taunts Aper for being too over-cautious to do the same. Aper, he says, has been 'content to criticize by name' (*detrectasse nominatim*, 26.7) the orators of old, but has not exhibited the same outspokenness with contemporaries. Messalla's language amplifies Aper's own military metaphors, drawing up battle lines between orators of different periods so as to turn the debate about oratory into an imaginary civil war: 'I was waiting for Aper to produce another line of soldiers for us, and name a greater or at least equal number of orators, from which we might set one man against Cicero, another against Caesar, and so on, in single combat'.¹³⁶ For his own part, Messalla warns his audience that his abrasive method of *nominatim* criticism may 'graze their ears' (*ures vestras perstringat*, 27.2), and Maternus, goading Messalla on, encourages him to employ that 'olden-day freedom of speech, from which we have degenerated even more than from eloquence'.¹³⁷ Messalla's warning that his free speech may 'graze the ears' of his listeners is an allusion to Horace, *Odes* 2.1.17-8, 'now and at every instant you graze our ears with the threatening rumbling of battle trumpets' (*iam nunc minaci murmure cornuum/ perstringis auris*), a poem heralding the arrival of Asinius Pollio's *Histories* of the civil war. Messalla's outspokenness is thus again augmented by an image of belligerence – and again colored with a subtle civil war allusion. The Horatian intertext also

¹³⁶ *Dial.* 26.6: ...*aliud nobis agmen produceret, pluresque vel certe totidem nominaret, ex quibus alium Ciceroni, alium Caesari, singulis deinde singulos opponeremus*. The choice of orators here seems hardly accidental, since both Cicero and Caesar met their deaths at the sword of their fellow citizens.

¹³⁷ *Dial.* 27.3: *utere antiqua libertate, a qua vel magis degeneravimus quam ab eloquentia*.

calls up the shadow of Pollio's *Histories*, a text that embodied just the kind of 'olden-day freedom of speech' for which Maternus is nostalgic.¹³⁸ Messalla, it might be added, also harbors a nostalgia for Republican *libertas*, though not so much for free political speech as, pertinently, for free recrimination of one's peers. The uninhibited and eristic atmosphere of Republican oratory meant that no orator, he says, could make a foolish or ill-advised statement *impune* (34.3), 'without punishment'. Messalla excuses the habit of the Republican orators to critique each other harshly (*invicem se obtrexerunt*, 25.5) as a 'human flaw', and reserves particular admiration for Brutus who 'made his personal judgments known with frankness and directness'.¹³⁹

While the moralistic criticism of the speeches of Messalla seems removed from the explicitly political concerns of Maternus and Aper, his presentation of the speeches as potentially offensive dovetails with the key issues of the *Dialogus*. The dialogue, as already noted, is initiated by concerns that Maternus is said to have 'offended the sensibilities of those in power' (*offendisse potentium animos*, 2). Later, Aper counsels Maternus that a poet's zeal is 'more liable to offend' (*obnoxium sit offendere*, 10.5) than that of an orator; if nobles need 'offend the ears of those in power' (*potentiorum aures offendere*, 10.8), better to do so as part of the nobler duties of an advocate. Yet Messalla insists upon, precisely, the freedom to offend. In fact, Messalla says that it is quite in his habit that 'many people are offended' (*multos offendi*, 32.7) by his discourses, though they ought not to be: he himself is 'not

¹³⁸ Cato, the subject of Maternus' dangerously provocative play, was a central figure of Pollio's *Histories* (*Carm.* 2.1.24). On the *Histories*, see Morgan (2000), who argues that Pollio's work represented precisely the negotiation of a space for free political expression in literature in the late Republic. On the sense of *perstringis auris*, which 'suggests a blow that causes shock rather than injury', see Nisbet & Hubbard (1978: 21).

¹³⁹ *Dial.* 25.6: *simpliciter et ingenue iudicium animi sui detexisse*. But Messalla's own judgment of Brutus is suspiciously lacking in frankness and directness: he goes on to ask whether Brutus would have been 'envious of Cicero, when he seems to me not even to have envied Caesar?' (*An ille Ciceroni invideret, qui mihi videtur ne Caesari quidem invidisse?*) – leaving unmentioned Brutus' hand in murdering Caesar.

offended' (*non sum...offensus*, 27.2) by Aper's arguments, 'nor should you be' by his (*nec vos offendi decebit*, 27.2). 'I have no regrets for the things I've said', he makes clear early in the dialogue.¹⁴⁰ In a phrase rather reminiscent of Horace's reference to a generic 'law' for his *Sermones* (2.1.1-2), Messalla states what he calls 'the law of this kind of conversation', that anyone can 'proffer their personal judgment without damaging another's feelings'.¹⁴¹ Thus, Messalla claims to mark out a space for free criticism of one's peers unburdened by the fear of endangering oneself through offense, a fear otherwise immanent in the *Dialogus*.

That such an undertaking is impossible is demonstrated by the way in which the *Dialogus* itself forestalls Messalla's own outspokenness. After Messalla, Secundus and Aper establish the preliminaries for Messalla to begin his speech in section 16.1-3, Aper unexpectedly steps in and speaks until the end of section 23. When Messalla does begin his speech, he moves through a refutation of Aper's treatment of the ancients, then builds momentum, until he boldly declares in section 26 that he will not be afraid to single out people by name, 'so that, once concrete examples are set forth, the stages by which our eloquence has been weakened and diminished may become more readily apparent'.¹⁴² But this potentially unique project is driven off the tracks before it can begin. "*Parce*" (27.1), interjects Maternus. 'Spare us!' – the use of the word is similar to the English phrase 'spare us the details', while also hinting ominously at the real dangers of offense.¹⁴³ When Messalla resumes his speech, his project has changed: rather than the *nominatim* criticism of orators he had earlier promised, he

¹⁴⁰ *Dial.* 15.2: "*neque illius*" inquit "*sermonis mei paenitentiam ago...*"

¹⁴¹ *Dial.* 27.2: *...sciatis hanc esse eius modi sermonum legem, iudicium animi citra damnum adfectus proferre.*

¹⁴² *Dial.* 26.8: *...quo facilius propositis exemplis adpareat quibus gradibus fracta sit et deminuta eloquentia.*

¹⁴³ *OLD* s.v. *parco* 2(b); 3(a)

instead delivers a rather toothless indictment of contemporary oratorical education. The thorough-going reminiscences of Cicero and Quintilian in this speech suggest less that Messalla is a cipher for these figures in the dialogue, than that his character has been forced by the text to hide behind familiar views. His second speech smacks of cliché because – to employ the frank criticism of which Messalla himself would approve – it is clichéd: much of it, in lines of thought and phrasing, is modeled with remarkable closeness on passages from Cicero that were already well-known.¹⁴⁴ No doubt that is safe enough. But it is hardly the risky material one expects Messalla to deliver, after he had stated his fearlessness in naming contemporaries and warned his audience of his propensity to offend. Juvenal's first *Satire* stages just this kind of derailment: its indignation at un-prosecuted crime aims to incense the reader, provoking the audience towards *nominatim* accusation, while the interlocutor's warnings at the conclusion of the poem simultaneously foreclose the possibility of the poet himself taking up that role. Each offers a studied frustration of reader expectations, but this frustration has its own satirical force. The brashness and bravado of the desire to criticize frankly makes all the more apparent, when they do not, the gap between what elites want to say and what they are permitted to say.

One final point is worth noting on the connection between the first *Satire* and the *Dialogus*. The satirist figure in Tacitus' text, who advocates frank criticism of contemporaries, is also the figure with clearest connections to the *delatores*. As Aper obliquely reminds the others at section 15.1 – in case they had forgotten – Vipstanus Messalla is the half-brother of none other than M. Aquilius Regulus, the notorious Imperial *delator* whose exploits were

¹⁴⁴ So, e.g. *Dial.* 30.5; cf. *Cic. De Orat.* 1.20, with Mayer's comments: 'It will be noted how Cicero's language is carefully reworked here and in what follows. A Ciceronian ideal needs his words for its expression'. Cf. Luce (1993: 20-1). The detailed parallels with Cicero's rhetorical works are assembled by Klaiber (1914).

scornfully depicted by Pliny. Moreover, though Tacitus presents a flattering description of Messalla in the *Histories*, calling him ‘a man with distinguished ancestors and excellent himself, who alone brought some culture to the battlefield’,¹⁴⁵ Messalla’s most famous exploit was nonetheless his dramatic display of fraternal affection for Regulus. Still too young to enter the Senate, while his brother was being prosecuted for his actions as a vicious *accusator*, Messalla, in Tacitus’ account, managed to sway some jurors not by offering any line of defense of his brother’s actions, but by offering to suffer himself the perils they planned to mete out to Regulus.¹⁴⁶ Penwill (2003) has offered acute observations on the ways in which the characters’ awareness of Messalla’s connections to Regulus affect the course of the conversation in the *Dialogus*. We know that the other characters have visited Maternus to warn him about offending *potentes* with his plays. Messalla, on the other hand, simply arrives, late, uninvited and unannounced, for what reason we are never told, and ‘from this point on the discussion is devoted to the issue of the decline of oratory and the reasons for it. The politically sensitive discussion is over’ (Penwill 2003: 132).¹⁴⁷ Those already wary of Messalla’s connections to the notorious *delator* will find their suspicions become more pressing as Messalla delivers his satirical tirades; the image of eloquence as a weapon, for example, which Maternus disdains as the brutal legacy of the *delatores*, is enlarged upon by Messalla, who demonstrates no ethical discomfort with it at all.¹⁴⁸ Elements of Messalla’s

¹⁴⁵ *Hist.* 3.9: ...*claris maioribus, egregius ipse et qui solus ad id bellum artis bonas attulisset.*

¹⁴⁶ *Hist.* 4.42. As Penwill comments, Tacitus’ anecdote ‘argues a closeness and sense of familial obligation outweighing any other moral or personal considerations’ (2003: 144). For Aquilius in Martial, see 1.12, 1.82, with Citroni and Howell

¹⁴⁷ So also Strunk (2010: 257-8).

¹⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. *Dial.* 26, in which Messalla, speaking of Cassius Severus, attacks not his use of eloquence as a weapon, but that he does not use it as a weapon well enough: ‘he is disordered in his very weapons of choice, and often is thrown off balance in his enthusiasm to strike. He doesn’t fight – he brawls’ (*ipsis etiam quibus utitur armis incompositus et studio ferendi plerumque deiectus, non pugnat, sed rixatur*). For Messalla’s use of the military metaphor, cf. *Dial.* 32.2-3, 34.2-3, 34.5; Gugel (1969: 74-5).

characterization are also consonant with what we know of his brother.¹⁴⁹ It may be, in fact, that Messalla is a kind of stand-in in the text for his brother Regulus – after all, standing in for his brother was what Vipstanus Messalla was most famous for doing. These insistent suspicions that a *delator* may be present even in this very conversation heighten the anxiety permeating the work as a whole about the immanent dangers of political offense. But, from another perspective, the text itself seems caught in precisely the crisis of criticism identified by Juvenal’s first *Satire*. Messalla, for all his anger and cliché, argues something of great value in advocating for the uninhibited criticism of contemporaries, yet this argument is put in the mouth of the character most strongly suspected of being a *delator*. Again, the warning of Juvenal’s anonymous interlocutor holds true.

6. The Recitation Hall (Part Two)

Tacitus’ *Dialogus* begins with an orators’ debate about poetry – Aper is indignant that Maternus has neglected the life of an orator to further his pursuits in verse, and he and Maternus debate the choice of poetry as a vocation over the duties of public life. In a sense, Juvenal’s first *Satire* begins with the same scene. Once the audience or reader has progressed through the first *Satire*’s catalogue of un-prosecuted vice, and the intentional frustration of its prosecution in the closing section of the poem, another view of the *recitatio* emerges for the second-time-reader, in which the hall of reciting poets is a scene of displaced courtroom aggression, with the allegedly insipid poets just so many elites facing the same crisis of

¹⁴⁹ Regulus is also portrayed by both Martial and Pliny as acerbic about contemporary standards of oratory and as a nostalgic classicist in his own style. Pliny (*Ep.* 1.5.11) records a hostile comment by Regulus in court about ‘Satrius Rufus, who makes no attempt to emulate Cicero and is content with the eloquence of the current era’ (*Satrius Rufus, cui non est cum Cicerone aemulatio et qui contentus est eloquentia saeculi nostri*). No doubt Martial’s ingratiating comparison of Regulus’ eloquence with that of Cicero in one of his epigrams (4.16) flatters Regulus’ own ideas. Martial also, pertinently, addresses to Regulus an epigram (5.10) on the fashion of preferring ancient writers over modern ones.

criticism dramatized by the satirist himself.¹⁵⁰ Here too, with a rather pathetic incongruity, the satirist rails against offenses (of a sort) going unpunished. ‘Harried’ (*vexatus*) by the work of ‘loud Cordus’ (*rauci Cordi*, 2), he asks ‘Will this man have recited his toga-clad comedies to me without punishment (*impune*, 3)..?... Will this massive *Telephus* have eaten up my day without punishment (*impune*, 4)..?’ In the very first line of the poem, Juvenal casts himself as an *auditor* (1) – not an *accusator* – desperate to ‘avenge himself’ (*reponam*, 1: literally to ‘put back’, as opposed to the *delatores*, who, etymologically, ‘take away’). *Stulta est clementia* (17) he declares axiomatically at line 17, ‘mercy is foolish’; but his slogan, or so it might be, for the entire poem, is here applied not to those who cause actual death (cf. 69-72) but only to the ‘sparing’ of ‘paper destined for death’ (18). The other poets’ themes at the *recitatio* no less enact fantasies of prosecuting and avenging crime, yet are no less haunted than Juvenal by retribution that becomes ineffectual or self-defeating. One poet’s hero is Orestes (6), tragedy’s archetypal avenger of crime,¹⁵¹ tormented by the Furies for his own quest to punish; another chooses to depict Aeacus, the judge of the underworld, now ‘torturing shades’ (10); another depicts Jason’s heist of the ‘gold of the stolen fleece’ (10), the heroic exploit scornfully reduced to the level of common larceny. Other poets fix upon figures of aggression, such as Mars (8) or the centaur Monychus (11), whose most extended appearance in previous Latin literature is his indignant speech to the other centaurs chiding them for failing to destroy the hermaphrodite Caeneus and rousing them to attack.¹⁵² Outside

¹⁵⁰ *Recitatio* is itself a word drawn from the legal domain – its primary meaning (and only meaning, until the Imperial period), is the reading out of legal documents in court (*OLD* s.v. *recitatio* (a)). One kind of recitation is thus exchanged for the other.

¹⁵¹ He is called merely *ille ultor*, ‘that avenger’, at *Sat.* 8.216-7.

¹⁵² *Ov. Met.* 12.498-509. Larmour (2003) expounds the mythological themes in the recitation hall as foreshadowings of the collection as a whole, arguing that ‘the text continually invites the reader to connect the allusions to mythical figures and events with the satirist and the speaker’ (at 61).

the hall, a vast panorama of crimes goes unprosecuted, but inside, the persistence and vehemence of these speakers leaves marble reverberating and columns cracked (11-12).

It is particularly relevant to the scene that, in the brief account of his education Juvenal gives at lines 15-7, the single *suasoria* he recalls performing is a speech advising Sulla to give up his dictatorship. ‘I too’, he says, ‘counseled Sulla to sleep the deep sleep of a private citizen’.¹⁵³ Rather than indulging in the fantasy of political power offered by many declamation themes, Juvenal rehearses for retirement. As part of his rhetorical training, he once outlined arguments for the very choice these reciting poets all seem to have made, which is also Maternus’ choice in the *Dialogus*: to sleep the sleep of a private citizen, to devote one’s energies to literary recitation and not to the life of a politically engaged orator. Yet, as almost all commentators on the *Dialogus* have noticed, Maternus’ presentation of the poet’s avocation, idyllic and free from the pressures of a political career (*Dial.* 12-3), is disingenuous given the avowedly political nature of his poetic activity and the dangers to which he is subject. Maternus chooses poetry not as a safe alternative to criticism of contemporary figures, but as a new vehicle for it; and, if his *Cato* has been overly reticent, he tells his worried friends, then his *Thyestes* promises to be more biting still (*Dial.* 3). Thus, a pretended retreat into ‘safe’ poetry masks a new, keener engagement in social critique. Similarly, the absence of *nominatim* attacks throughout Juvenal’s first *Satire*, and his capitulation to the warnings of the anonymous interlocutor in the poem’s final section, might suggest that Juvenal has chosen withdrawal, reciting angry but ultimately harmless poetry among the epicists in Fronto’s hall. The truth is more complex. The first *Satire* indicts the contemporary crisis of criticism, the fear of speaking out at the risk of being perceived a

¹⁵³ *Sat.* 1.15-7: *et nos/ consilium dedimus Sullae, privatus ut altum dormiret.*

delator. Its images of transferred aggression, oratorical impotence, and the constraints upon *nominatim* attack are a cynical reflection of the contemporary rhetorical scene. Yet it is through poetry that Juvenal also fashions his escape. By arousing indignation about vice and fostering outrage over the non-prosecution of crime – then forcing the listeners to determine the precise identity of ambiguously-named figures – he transforms his audience into *delatores*, implicitly challenging them to pin roaming charges onto known identities and to specify the contemporary force of the attacks. *We* are challenged to respond, and become the object of scorn if we do not. Safe complacency, which he once counseled to Sulla, is now, we are urged, impossible. Juvenal himself remains as elusive as ever, and this characteristic authorial elusiveness is the subject of the next chapter.

2. The Invisibility of Juvenal

A central paradox animates all of Juvenal's poetry. He is at once the loudest of the surviving Roman verse satirists, and the most elusive, the hardest to see. The first sentence of Juvenal's work – *semper ego auditor tantum?*, 'Am I always to be merely a listener?' – announces a poetic project in which the satirist, that strongly emphatic *ego*, will no longer remain silent, will confront the listener with questions he or she is challenged to answer, and will brook no understatement (*semper...tantum*). Even when working through his complex Latin off the polite printed page, we are induced to conjure up a wilder voice, exclaiming these hexameter, epic-sounding verses in a grandiose display of indignation. Yet, despite the promise of that emphatic initial *ego* in the opening line, Juvenal frustrates any attempt to learn much about him. Highet, who stitched together the most detailed biography for Juvenal, concedes that 'although he was writing satire, which is one of the most personal types of literature, he endeavored to conceal his personality' (1954: 2).¹ In Henderson's words, 'the sense of self writing Juvenal's texts is etiolated or at vanishing point... This author is the decentred void of a rhetorical *persona*, used up and exhausted in representations' (1999: 194). It is as if one of the galleries of busts he likes to mock in elite households had sprung to life – a series of loud, accusing, disembodied heads.²

¹ Highet (1954), drawing from a sole surviving inscription (*CIL* 10.5382), the testimony of the scholia, and scarce hints in the poems, constructed a biography with the following basic elements. Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis, born in Aquinum (now Aquino), ascends through the ranks by virtue of his talent in rhetoric; he has his career cut short by a sentence of exile from Domitian; he returns to Rome embittered, impecunious, and eager for poetic revenge; finally he finds perspective, and some measure of calm, by converting late in life to Epicurean philosophy.

² Busts: 2.4-7; 7.128; 8.9-12; 19-25, 144, 226-300; 14.306-7.

The satirist affords us only the briefest glimpses of himself in the *Satires*, and these moments are recognizable less as the incidents in an individual's life than as metonymy for the kind of poetry he is producing. He says, for example, that he received an education in rhetoric and participated in declamation (1.15-7).³ At 1.25, he recalls that as a young man he was shaved by the now-wealthy Crispinus, though the line itself is also notable as a punning reference to Juvenal's own name.⁴ 'Surely I'm allowed to fill up my spacious wax tablets at the midpoint of the crossroads?', he later challenges – an image that figures the satirist as the conglomeration of urban influences, a blank canvas to be filled by a fast-moving traffic of characters and themes.⁵ Indignation fires his verses, the kind 'you would expect from me, or Cluuienus'.⁶ This is scant information with which to construct a picture of the speaker, and other aspects of his poetry positively frustrate any such attempt. The opaqueness of the targets of many of his *Satires* – a bustling crowd of names, blending the identifiable and unidentifiable, the current, historical and fictional – render it more difficult to locate the speaking voice securely in any one place, class or time.⁷ Then there is Juvenal's habit of ventriloquizing other voices within his poems, and his use of proxy narrators such as Umbricius in *Satire 3* and the female Laronia in *Satire 2*, who may or may not reflect the sentiments of the speaker. Equally, there are *Satires* with glaring structural imbalances (4, 7,

³ For Juvenal's use of declamatory situations, see De Decker (1913); Braund (1997b); and on this fleeting autobiographical 'memory', Keane (2002: 225-30).

⁴ 1.25: *quo tondente gravis iuueni mihi barba sonabat*. See Barchiesi & Cucchiarelli (2005: 221) on the 'pun (*iuueni mihi = Iuuenali mihi*)' (2005: 221). The phrasing also references a line at the beginning of someone else's poetic career, Vergil: cf. *Ecl.* 1.28: *candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat*.

⁵ So Larmour (2007: 180). 1.63-4: *nonne licet medio ceras implere capaces/ quadruvivo*.

⁶ 1.79-80: *facit indignatio versum/ qualemcumque potest, quales ego vel Cluuienus*. The point of this anticlimactic comparison seems to lie precisely in Cluuienus being an unknown and otherwise insignificant poet; his name may be a joke *kat'antiphrasin* (cf. *clueo* – to be famous, to be known).

⁷ Cf. Larmour (2003: 62): 'The satirist himself is visible only as a reflection in the faces of the victims he targets: the camera pans around the crowd constantly, in a dizzying, nauseating motion, but never gives us a direct view of the speaker'.

12, 14), each a set of oddly-shaped and ill-fitting puzzle pieces, whose argument depends for its emphases and continuities on the construction job of listeners and readers. In yet other poems, his voice seems coherent in itself, but he propounds ideas disturbingly at odds with positions he takes elsewhere, as I will argue for the strident Cynic argument of *Satire* 10, and the sardonic atheist's laugh in *Satire* 13.⁸ The introduction of shadowy interlocutors and addressees in the later books, such as Corvinus in *Satire* 12 or Fuscinus in *Satire* 14 (whose identity is 'as dark as his name', Ferguson 1987: 98), involve the satirist in conversations with equally unknowable figures, contributing even further to the sense of distance between poet and listener.⁹

Juvenal's avoidance of self-description is not, I suggest, a simple consequence of his 'rhetorical' mode of poetry. Rather, I argue that the *Satires* self-consciously draw attention to their author's invisibility. The inability to grasp with any precision the true identity of the speaker becomes a theme in many of the poems, acquiring a different significance within different contexts. His *Satires*, in which notorious figures from Roman history jostle with obscure nonentities from the back-alleys of contemporary life, bring to life an entire Roman tradition, in which chronology has been collapsed. The resultant vista sees figures from Quirinus to Quintilian intermingling with one another; yet in this disorienting world, lacking firm grounding in place and time, the satirist's own identity becomes impossible to perceive with any clarity. Of course, a writer can never literally 'disappear' in his work, in the sense of

⁸ Cf. Hooley (2007: 131) on the 'simple fact that Juvenal is not consistent in the presentation of his "self" or his persona in his poetry'.

⁹ See Fredericks (1973: 226-7) on the aloofness and distance of the narrator in the later *Satires*.

abdicating control over its course and shape.¹⁰ Quite the opposite: a performance in which a reciting poet is perceived to disappear is a consummate display of rhetorical skill, and part of this performance involves drawing attention to his own disappearance. His invisibility must be brought into view if it is to be perceived at all. The ways in which Juvenal does this must be demonstrated by close analyses of the texts, since the elusiveness of his voice is coded in different ways, depending on the themes of the poem at hand. In the two *Satires* considered here (2 and 9), Juvenal draws attention to his own invisibility through a thematic emphasis on disguise, secrecy, and the manipulation of identity, themes that implicitly highlight his own techniques of rhetorical identity manipulation. His *Satires* critique a world in which people constantly attempt to hide their true natures, reverse their social and gender roles, and selectively relive moments from a glorious historical past; yet these means of displaying and defending one's identity in contemporary Rome are also the key elements of Juvenal's own poetic mode.

The distinctiveness of Juvenal's technique in the *Satires* becomes clear when set next to the other Roman verse satirists. Horace is, in every sense, the central character of his *Satires*. His life, his friends, his ethics, his conversations, his household, and his body are constantly in view. Lucilius, at least according to Horace, lay open his entire life in his poetry as if on a votive tablet (*Sat.* 2.1.32-4). Difficult, frustrating, entangling Persius lays nothing open: *scribimus inclusi*, he says ('we write closed up', *Sat.* 1.13), 'in secrecy, we speak' (*secrete loquimur*, *Sat.* 5.21). But Persius' *libellus* is still dominated by his presence: it begins with a poem that dramatizes and debates his mode of composition and ends with a poem in which he

¹⁰ Cf. Blondell on Plato: 'Despite his "anonymity" within the dialogues, a named author cannot disappear entirely behind the masque of his characters, eschewing responsibility for what are, after all, *his* productions' (2002: 43).

departs, and the personal reminiscences and bodily metaphors in the intervening texts constantly call their author to mind.¹¹ To say that these poets write about themselves is not to say that the images they provide are not carefully controlled, if not distorted, or perhaps even deliberately fragmented and incoherent. The persona of Horace in the first book of *Satires* begins as a ‘disembodied’ voice (Zetzel 1980: 68), and its development is so full of contradictions and self-parody that Gowers can call the book ‘a kind of anti-autobiography’, a ‘patchy’ and inconsistent account of a personality who wants to be seen both as a somebody and a nobody in Augustan Rome (2003: 60). Henderson casts Persius’ *libellus* as ‘near-solipsistic’ in its focus on Persius’ own mental process, and ‘readers must cut, paste up, and gloss over these performances of interiority for themselves’ (1999: 244). No satirist (or any writer), then, is ever truly or completely ‘visible’. But a distinction should be drawn. Satire, for these other poets, is an intensely reflexive mode. The satirist’s self *is*, in a sense, his satires: an *exemplum* (good or bad) of its ethics and a symbolic embodiment of its form.¹² If the satiric character spouting criticism and advice is not always earnest or reliable or even coherent or the same, nonetheless, a lot of poetic energy goes into describing what he is like. This is scarcely the case for Juvenal, except to the extent that we are made aware that we do not know him at all.

Parallels for the deliberate elusiveness of Juvenal’s voice in his *Satires* may best be sought, not in previous generations of Roman satirists, but rather in the rhetorical and cultural trends of the period in which he wrote. Self-promotion in second-century Rome, and the careful fashioning of a public identity, were frequently accompanied by self-concealment. The

¹¹ See Reckford (2009: 151-160) on Persius’ *libellus* as an evolving process of authorial self-analysis.

¹² Barchiesi & Cucchiarelli (2005: 209-210): ‘It is actually *through his own body* that the satirist finds a complete and economical means for expressing his own poetic consciousness’ [emphasis original].

sophists caused an immense stir throughout the Empire in Juvenal's period, garnering personal celebrity and cultural power through performances in which their own voices were carefully veiled, and their relationship with the present confounded. When performing a declamation, they sought to give voice to figures from the Greek historical past, collapsing chronology in their use of anachronistically pure Attic Greek as well as in their themes. 'The highest goal of the declamation', Schmitz argues, 'was that the speaker make himself invisible as completely as possible, and disappear behind his role'.¹³ A particularly successful example is found in the surviving declamation of Marcus Antonius Polemo – who, despite his famous haughtiness and opulence, enjoyed high favor with both Trajan and Hadrian – in which the sophist not only inhabits the contrasting roles of Callimachus and Cynegirus, arguing over their sons' honors in the Battle of Marathon, but recreates historical scenes, issues elaborate invocations to the gods, and impersonates a variety of other voices to support or contradict his argument.¹⁴ On the other hand, intense attention was given to the bodily comportment of the speaker himself, so that this illusionistic form of oratory became a vehicle for asserting a speaker's manliness: 'Read the declamation of Polemo', said Herodes Atticus, 'and you will know a *man*'.¹⁵

Polemo's paradoxical combination of forcefully masculine self-presentation and rhetorical 'disappearance' can be paralleled more generally in the culture of the second century. Zanker

¹³ 'Höchstes Ziel einer historischen μελέτη war es, daß sich der Sprecher möglichst vollständig selbst unsichtbar machte und hinter seiner Rolle verschwand' (1997: 229).

¹⁴ Text, translation and notes in Reader (1996); on Polemo's imperial favor, see Phil. VS 53-5. The declaimer gives vivid life to the dead, a motive reflected in the speech's outlandish personifications: here a hand, though severed, carries on the pursuit of the enemy (1.11) and a corpse is 'more warlike than the living' (2.53).

¹⁵ Phil. VS 539: "τὴν Πολέμωνος" ἔφη "μελέτην ἀνάγνωτε καὶ εἴσεσθε ἄνδρα", cited by Whitmarsh (2005: 33). Polemo was also famous as a physiognomist (his treatise on physiognomy survives in Arabic translation and in late antique Latin and Greek epitomes), and he therefore was himself in the business of 'knowing' men: Gleason (1995).

(1995) writes of the ‘costumes’ worn by individuals in this ‘age of living classicism’, which aimed to ‘demonstrate the unbroken continuity of classical culture’ (250-2). Fashions of hair and dress among elites in the second-century cultivated the stereotypical appearance of the intellectual, and busts assimilated their model’s appearance so closely to that of a historical Greek personality that ‘the subject’s individuality is all but lost’ (229). As Zanker puts it, Hadrian’s program to restore great ancient monuments ‘encouraged people to believe that they were not simply living in a dream world’ (251).¹⁶ Disorientation from time and place was a positive goal. These tendencies are the frequent object in the mid-second century satirical works of Lucian, although Lucian’s own Atticizing, his creative reinvention of figures and scenes from Classical literature, and his self-conscious exploration of notions of Greek identity, mark him as particularly exemplary of the concerns of his age. Moreover, while many of his satirical dialogues are written in the first person, and a number of his works are apparently autobiographical, a clear view of the ‘real’ Lucian is notoriously difficult to secure.¹⁷ As Goldhill (2002: 61) notes, Lucian only names himself six times in a corpus of some eighty works, and four of those instances are in titles and headings. When he does refer to himself, he makes the audience aware of the elusiveness of his identity. When Lucian is hauled before an Athenian court by Rhetoric and Dialogue in the *Doubly Accused*, Justice complains that no name has been entered on the indictment, and Hermes presses for the trial to continue under the anonymous moniker ‘Syrian orator’.¹⁸ The reader who insists upon delineating the true identity of the speaker Loukianos is led off the trail by, for example, the teasing closeness of his ‘favorite nom de plume’ (Baldwin 1961: 203), ‘Lykinos’; or, in

¹⁶ Hadrian’s revivalism and the ‘dream-world’ of Hadrianic Rome are a target of Juvenal’s twelfth *Satire*, as I argue in chapter 5.

¹⁷ See Saïd (1993); Whitmarsh (2005: 82-3).

¹⁸ *Bis Acc.* 29.14

one instance, by a funerary epigram casting the author in the role of Odysseus, the archetypal trickster, in an autobiographical narrative, the *True History*, which he declares from the outset to be false.¹⁹ The fact that Lucian's self-conscious disguising of his identity appears in satires preoccupied with others' acting, pretension and hypocrisy only serves to heighten the irony. Like Juvenal, Lucian exceeds at the very game he indicts others for playing.²⁰

Juvenal's combination of forcefully loud rhetoric and evasive 'invisibility' therefore finds significant parallels amongst other second-century authors, and suggests a possible identification with a broader contemporary milieu than is usually proposed in studies of the genre of Roman verse satire. There is admittedly some danger of over-statement here. True, to speak of Juvenal as a Latin author of the Second Sophistic – as has been claimed more justly for the later second-century authors Apuleius (Sandy 1997, Harrison 2000) and the 'Christian sophist', Tertullian (Barnes 1985) – would be to overrate the extent of the commonalities and misrepresent the lines of influence. Yet it is far from improbable to suppose that the form and themes of Juvenal's texts respond to, and are partly shaped by, the second-century cultural phenomena now bracketed together by modern scholars under the broad term of the 'Second Sophistic'. He shares with many texts of the period the same

¹⁹ *Ver.Hist.* 2.28: 'Lucian, dear to the bless gods, saw all/ then returned to his own dear land'.

²⁰ Whether Lucian read Juvenal is an old and vexed problem. The parallels between Juvenal and Lucian's *Nigrinus* are examined by Mesk (1912), (1913); cf. Hartmann (1907), arguing that parallels between the writers should be attributed to similarities in social context. Courtney (1980: 624-9) cautiously advocates direct dependence on the basis of a select number of verbal reminiscences. My argument for similarities in their self-presentation suggests a shared milieu, and not necessarily that Lucian had read Juvenal, although it is not impossible that he had. If we believe the author himself (no trusty guide, to be sure), he had visited Rome (*Nigr.* 2) and even served the Roman government as a prefect in Egypt (*Apol.* 1), so, although he would have spoken Greek, he could hardly have avoided Latin (see Gassino 2009 on Lucian's relationship to the Latin language). If he does not mention Juvenal by name, it would be naïve to interpret Imperial Greek authors' reticence in referring to Roman authors as mere ignorance. At very least, the complaints Lucian airs in the *Nigrinus* and the *On Salaried Posts* about the downtrodden state of *clientes* and the insinuation of Greeks into positions in Roman households suggest that, if he had not read Juvenal, he at least had extensive knowledge of the Roman social situations Juvenal describes.

tendency to treat past and present as an unbroken continuity, resulting in deliberate anachronism; a similar self-consciousness in assuming and exchanging carefully-contrived speaking roles; and a certain cultural parochialism knowingly out of step with the fluid cultural exchange between Greek and Roman in the second century.²¹ There is a shared sense of individuals speaking not on their authority, but rather giving voice to a tradition of critical speech. On the other hand, if Juvenal writes with an eye to the self-conscious persona creation of the Greek sophists, and to Romans who similarly affected the masks of philosophers and intellectuals, his is the caustic perspective of, precisely, a satirist. He inures his listener, in a world of illusion and appearance, to ‘put no faith in a face’ (*frontis nulla fides*, *Sat.* 2.8). Indeed, his own elusive speaking voice provides a good training in skepticism. For if Polemo intends to hide his face by crafting a recognizable persona in his declamations, for Juvenal, the hiding is the thing. Like Lucian later in the century, the poet’s manipulation of his speaking voice is implicitly presented as an evasive and tricky disguise. As I hope to demonstrate in the close readings, this act of disguise can be alternately provoking, confounding, teasing, and sinister. The non-appearance of a clearly-defined speaker assumes a different significance depending on the themes of the poem.

In this chapter, I offer three readings of three separate texts, not as ‘representative examples’ per se, but as individual performances within the same cultural field. I begin not with Juvenal but with Titus Flavius Cocceianus Dio (Dio Chrysostom), the itinerant sophist and Cynic philosopher of the late first and early second century, whose thirteenth *Oration* depicts an invective against Roman *luxuria*, supposedly delivered in Rome. While that invective serves as the climax of Dio’s speech, the remainder of the oration offers an aetiology for his position

²¹ On the willful cultural blindness to Rome and Latin literature in many Imperial Greek writers, the classic account is that of Bowie (1974).

of social critic, which deliberately abstracts his critical voice from any grounding in Roman *Realia*, presenting Dio as the embodied echo of the Greek past. The themes of this speech find parallels in the much more savage attacks of Juvenal's second *Satire*, which focuses on various forms of intellectual and sexual disguise in contemporary Rome. While lambasting Romans for their vain attempts to hide their identities under manly costumes and Greek philosophical pretense, Juvenal tauntingly alludes to his own textual disguise, assuming, at a pivotal moment, the identity of a woman who encourages readers to look around and 'scrutinize men'. Finally, I offer a reading of the ninth *Satire* and its imagery of secrecy and violence. The poem is a parodic vision of an unsettled *domus*, which deliberately recalls the Imperial household. But in this *Satire* also Juvenal articulates the fullest and most convincing programmatic image for his own satiric texts: here, Rome has not one, but an irrepressible multiplicity of critical voices, and secrecy is impossible for everyone – except the satirist himself.

1. 'Atopic Topology': The Thirteenth Oration of Dio Chrysostom

In his forty-fifth *Oration*, Dio Chrysostom presents himself in terms reminiscent of many other writers and orators of the Trajanic period, as a martyr to frank criticism, who dared to criticize the emperor Domitian openly and suffered exile as a result.²² He did not stoop to flattery, nor did he postpone his challenging of the *princeps* until it was safe to do so, but issued his attacks on the most powerful man in the Empire in widely disseminated speeches (45.1). The third-century biographer Philostratus (*Vit Soph* 488) gives a somewhat different story, that Dio was never exactly ordered to leave Rome, though he did disappear from sight,

²² On this pose in contemporary Latin authors, see Freudenburg (2001: 215-234).

and he traveled throughout the Empire in fear from ‘the tyrants at Rome’.²³ After his reprieve, although consistently critical of the Romans’ claims to universal power, Dio also flaunted his influence and favor in Rome, composing his series of *Kingship Orations* for the edification of Trajan himself and (allegedly) delivering them to the *princeps* in person.²⁴ At the beginning of the thirteenth *Oration*, which gives a much more detailed account of his exile from Rome and the philosophical conversion he says he experienced in his wanderings, he provides a rather different (and more enigmatic) version of his fateful exilic *error*, although his self-presentation continues to show him enmeshed impressively as an advisor of Rome’s upper echelons.²⁵ Here he says that he was exiled on account of his alleged friendship (φιλία) with a man ‘of no low station’ (οὐ πονηροῦ, 1) who was ‘extremely close to those then in favor and in power’ (τῶν δὲ τότε εὐδαιμόνων τε καὶ ἀρχόντων ἐγγύτατα ὄντος, 1). He was said to be this man’s ‘friend and advisor’ (φίλον...καὶ σύμβουλον, 1). No names are named. Perhaps they were already known – or perhaps the anonymity of these important men has just the desired whiff of intrigue and importance about it.

Yet after this opening, establishing his claims for Roman influence and standing, the ensuing narrative of his exile takes on a decidedly mythic and literary cast. He describes his visit to

²³ On Dio’s career, see Moles (1978), counseling a healthy skepticism toward interpreting his self-presentation as historical fact. He is mentioned by Pliny in the context of a provincial dispute: *Ep.*10.81.

²⁴ For Dio’s attitude toward Rome, see Moles (1995); Salmeri (2000); and Perry (2007), who compares Dio’s criticisms of Rome with that made by the author of the biblical book of Revelation. Whitmarsh (2001: 325-7) reviews the question of the performance of the *Kingship Orations*, suggesting that their delivery to the emperor in person is a fiction.

²⁵ On the background to the speech, see Verrengia (2000: 66-92); Moles (2005). The title preserved with the oration posits Athens as its place of delivery, though this cannot be proved conclusively. Moles suggests a date of 101 for the delivery of the speech, which would make it exactly contemporary with Juvenal’s first book (see Appendix One). It is generally maintained that the speech is incomplete, yet it is worth considering the possibility that the oration is in fact complete, and that the bathetic final sentence, stylistically consistent with Dio’s ‘loose’ style throughout the orations, represents a final deflation of Roman pretensions. Dio says that although the Romans lack true *paideia*, they have nonetheless been competent in the past at learning things they wanted to learn: “I’m referring to horse-riding, arrow-shooting and fighting in armor” (λέγω δὲ ἵππικὴν καὶ τοξικὴν καὶ ὀπλιτικὴν).

the Delphic oracle, which commended him to a life of philosophical wandering and instruction, then his assumption of the mantle of wandering Cynic, and his conversion to a philosophical life of preaching throughout the Empire. When he relates his eventual return to Rome at the end of the oration, the position of ‘advisor’ he re-assumes is now described in the ideals of Cynic cosmopolitanism. He gradually articulates a new identity for himself in a long conditional clause (sections 31-4): addressing the Romans ‘in large crowds assembled at one place’, he tells them that if they should find someone who could instill real virtue in them, ‘finding teachers from some place...not caring whether he was Greek, Roman, Scythian, or Indian’, then that man the Romans should ‘establish on their Acropolis, and order by decree that all the young men frequent him regularly...’. Dio then offers a sample of his teaching, a condemnation of Rome’s exorbitant luxury and pyramidal culture of dependency of others (sections 34-5):

ὅσῳ γὰρ ἄν, ἔφην, πλείων ἢ τε ἀνδρεία καὶ ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἡ σωφροσύνη γίγνηται παρ’ ὑμῖν, τοσοῦτῳ ἔλαττον ἔσται τὸ τε ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ χρυσίον καὶ τὰ ἐλεφάντινα σκεύη καὶ τὰ ἠλέκτρινα καὶ κρύσταλλος καὶ θύον καὶ ἔβενος καὶ ὁ τῶν γυναικῶν κόσμος καὶ τὰ ποικίλματα καὶ αἱ βαφαί, καὶ ξύμπαντα ἀπλῶς τὰ νῦν ἐν τῇ πόλει τίμα καὶ περιμάχητα, ἐλαττόνων αὐτῶν δεήσεσθε· ὅταν δὲ ἐληλυθότες ἦτε ἐπ’ ἄκρον ἀρετῆς, οὐδενός· καὶ οἰκίας μικροτέρας καὶ ἀμείνους οἰκήσετε, καὶ οὐ τοσοῦτον ὄχλον θρέψετε ἀνδραπόδων ἀργῶν καὶ πρὸς οὐδὲν χρησίμων· τὸ δὲ πάντων παραδοξότατον· ὅσῳ γὰρ ἄν εὐσεβέστεροι καὶ ὀσιώτεροι γένησθε, τοσοῦτῳ ἐλάττων ἔσται παρ’ ὑμῖν

ὁ λιβανωτὸς καὶ τὰ θυμιάματα καὶ τὰ στεφανώματα,
καὶ θύσετε ἐλάττους θυσίας καὶ ἀπ' ἐλάττονος δαπάνης,
καὶ τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος τὸ νῦν παρ' ὑμῖν τρεφόμενον πολὺ
ἔλαπτον ἔσται...

'...“For”, I said, “the more manliness you have amongst you, and justice and wisdom, the less silver you will have, and gold, and furnishings of ivory and amber, crystal, citron-wood, ebony, female cosmetics, adornments and dyes. Frankly, *everything* now considered honorable and worth fighting for in this city you'll need less, and, whenever you attain the peak of virtue, you won't need at all. And you'll live in smaller but better dwellings, and you won't maintain such a great crowd of lazy good-for-nothing low-lives. The biggest paradox of all: the more pious and god-fearing you become, the less frankincense and and incense offerings and garlands you'll have, and you'll make fewer sacrifices and at less expense, and the entire multitude of people now maintained by you will diminish greatly in size...”

Roman luxuriousness and effeminacy are valid enough targets of reproach, but there is a certain vagueness in this attack. If Dio had really had personal experience of corruption and tyranny at Rome's higher echelons, he could presumably have fashioned a far more pointed and timely critique. His targets are the perennial foils of the greedy rich and the lazy

dependents. So is this a specific (and therefore falsifiable) indictment of Roman society as it stands at the end of the first century, or a picturesque embellishment on a timeless rhetorical theme? In fact, this vagueness, this contrast between his grounding in Roman society and the abstractness of his Greek philosophical identity, is deliberately cultivated. The *time* of his speech is left unclear: Dio's odd reference to the Acropolis blurs contemporary Rome with classical Athens in a kind of double vision. The quaint notion that young men should be legally compelled to hear him philosophize is reminiscent not of Rome but of a philosopher's ideal state, or perhaps the declaimers' 'sophistopolis', Russell's term for the timeless, imaginary city in which the plots of Greek historical declamations take place.²⁶ Nor is there a firm sense of place. The speech as a whole is marked by what Moles has suggestively termed 'atopic topology', employing deliberately contradictory and disorienting references to space.²⁷ When Dio visits the Delphic oracle, its response is described as ἄτοπον (9) – 'strange', or, better, 'out of place', 'a word congenial to this writer's spatial metaphoric' (Whitmarsh 2001: 161). The oracle tells him to continue his wandering and nascent philosophizing until he reaches the 'very end of the earth' (τὸ ἕσχατον...τῆς γῆς, 9), which, according to the logic of the oration, turns out to be Rome itself, deliberately inverting the panegyric topos that exalted Rome as the center of the world.²⁸ The character in a Platonic dialogue who has reached the point of *aporia* is one who, etymologically, has 'no way' (ἀ-πόρος) left to go, discursively and philosophically stopped in one place. Dio's self-presentation, by contrast, embraces a sense of wandering at every level, an inability and unwillingness to become identified with a specific place and time.

²⁶ Russell (1983: 21-39).

²⁷ The notion is not unique to the thirteen *Oration*: 'This play with seemingly "atopic" topology as the central structuring device of a speech is paralleled in the *First Kingship*, *Olympicus*, *Charidemus* and *Borystheniticus*' (Moles 2005: 126).

²⁸ Moles (2005: 126).

Moreover, Dio's open avowal that he is engaging in a process of imitation serves to complicate further his own self-presentation. Who speaks? Even as we imagine Dio standing in place and delivering this ostensibly autobiographical oration, he makes that question intentionally difficult to answer.²⁹ When Dio first began criticizing others (καταμεμφόμενος, 14), he says explicitly that he had recourse to Socrates' 'old argument' (λόγον ἀρχαίον, 14), not pretending that it was his own, in the confidence that the strength of old arguments does not evaporate over time (15). Later he reiterates the idea, deliberately drawing attention to the paradox of addressing the problems of the present by mimicking the criticisms of the past: 'I gave almost the same lectures [as Socrates], old and clichéd', he says (σχεδόν τι τὰ αὐτὰ διελεγόμεν ἄρχαία καὶ φαῦλα, 29), but, throughout the Empire, people demanded these antique lessons as insights into the present. In place of an authoritative critical voice, we are encouraged to hear the constant echoes of other texts. Upon arriving back at Rome, he frames this use of the past as a question of authority: if he is simply 'imitating' (μιμούμενος, 30) the words of Socrates, a man whom 'all the Greeks marveled at for his wisdom' (30), he can surely then not himself be regarded by the Romans as a fool. That is to say, his authority, unlike that of Socrates himself, comes precisely from being a copy. Dio is not a critic drawing from his personal experience in Rome's upper echelons, from his own observations of Rome throughout the Empire, or even from his own insight and learning. In a manner deliberately abstracted from the rhetoric of individual authority, he presents himself as an embodiment of an entire tradition of Socratic speech. This is a tradition which 'the Greeks love' – not, of course, the historical Athenians who in

²⁹ Whitmarsh (2001: 163).

fact put Socrates to death, but ‘the Greeks’, a collective, a-historical cultural identity constructed in opposition to the Romans.

At the center of his oration, Dio gives us a long sample of his own brand of Socratic imitation (sections 16-27). He begins to deliver a protreptic oration he claims Socrates originally delivered himself, a ‘brave’ and ‘undisguised’ (ἀνυποστόλως) rebuke of the Athenians for their indifference to true *paideia*, which is adapted and elaborated from a speech of Socrates in Plato’s *Clitophon*. Yet the speech of Socrates in the *Clitophon* was *already* an imitation, a parodic impersonation of Socratic protreptic delivered by Clitophon as part of that work’s implicit argument about the limitations of protreptic oratory as a mode of philosophical instruction.³⁰ Dio’s speech is thus (in neatly Platonic fashion) a copy of a copy; and, to make matters more complex, the *Clitophon* is itself also a work squarely *about* Socratic imitation.³¹ The dialogue clearly depicts Clitophon as a wayward kind of student: as well as his distorted view of protreptic, which is hardly the fundamental Socratic mode, he seems to want ‘a solution, an answer, “Truth” on a plate...But others must continue to seek it for themselves, not gather round listening to Socrates as if to a guru’ (Rutherford 1995: 100). But if this is a commentary on Socratic learning, the work provides an equally damning view of those who set themselves up as Socratic teachers. Clitophon says that he tried in vain to obtain answers

³⁰ The structure of the *Clitophon* is notoriously odd, consisting mostly of this long protreptic speech by Clitophon in imitation (or rather parody) of Socrates; he is frustrated that Socrates’ protreptic can ‘wake us up’ (408c3) to the need for philosophical enquiry but not produce justice in itself. Slings (1999) has advocated most influentially for the interpretation of the dialogue in which the genre of protreptic, not Socrates himself, is the target of critique. Plato’s authorship of the *Clitophon*, accepted in antiquity but cast in doubt since Ficino, has increasingly become accepted again; see the summary of the arguments for authenticity in Slings (1999: 227-234) and the references in Bowe (2007: 245).

³¹ Moles (2003: 115-6) helpfully examines the incorporation of *Clitophon* material in the oration, though I cannot concur with his conclusion that Dio ‘largely discards the irony’ of the original and ‘uses the *Clitophon* image of Socrates as a representative of moral virtue at its most robust and uncompromising’. The fact that the *Clitophon* is already skeptical about the notion of Socratic imitation heightens, rather than eliminates, the irony in Dio’s imitation of its picture of Socrates.

to philosophical questions from Socrates' 'contemporaries, co-aspirers [συνεπιθυμητῶν, a mocking neologism] or companions, or however we should label their relationship to you' (408c6). These followers, would-be Socratic duplicates, end up occupying precisely the opposite role in the dialogue as the slow-witted foils of Socratic questioning, yet are also mockingly praised for being 'extremely quick-witted' (409a4) and giving 'extremely smart' responses (409d4). The wayward student Clitophon himself is also, of course, an imitator: he crafts a long speech in imitation of Socrates, apparently conceiving of philosophical instruction as a script that can be repeated, an idea the text mocks through its incongruous application of artistic and theatrical terms. Clitophon says that Socrates rebukes men 'like a tragic god on the crane', speaking in 'hymns' (407b1-2, an image Dio repeats, *Or.*14), and his pastiche protreptic clothes banal sentiments in pretentiously over-elaborate musical metaphors.³² The dialogue illustrates the philosophical emptiness of performing Socrates – who, after all, was at pains to emphasize that there *was* no script, that he had no knowledge to convey except the awareness of ignorance.

All of Dio's play with the imitation of others has the paradoxical result of underlining his own personal dazzling rhetorical mastery. Dio does not have a single persona – a juggler might as well have only one ball. There is a sense rather of a mask being constantly over-painted: Dio as Cynic wanderer,³³ Dio as Cynic wanderer as Socrates, Dio as Cynic wanderer as Clitophon as Socrates. But if the speech is an aetiology for his return to Rome and his self-appointed position as social critic, how does this conscious manipulation of his speaking voice, and his deliberate 'disappearance', affect our interpretation of his message? Although

³² So, at 407c7-d1: 'And yet it's because of this playing false notes and lapsing behind the beat, and not because the foot is out of time with the lyre, that brother behaves towards brother and cities toward cities without rhythm or harmony, feuding and making war and perpetrating and enduring the worst crimes'.

³³ Itself a carefully-contrived disguise: Moles (1978: 96-100).

the element of play and playfulness should not be excluded, it would surely be inadequate to deduce, from the self-consciousness of his imitation, that Dio is a ‘mock-philosopher’, the ‘parody of a moralist’, or similar. Dio is animating traditions of critical speech, adroitly reactivating elements from the Greek past in his own personas. This ‘Greek’ past has become, in Dio’s contemporary context, not a local tradition but a cultural currency in use all throughout the Roman Empire. The union of geographical and discursive ‘wandering’ in Dio’s self-presentation expresses that decentralization. His is a decentered voice in a scattered and sprawling Empire, existing in a ‘no place’ that escapes precise identification.³⁴

This last point is communicated particularly strongly in the proem to a larger work preserved as Dio’s forty-second *Oration*.³⁵ Here he offers a striking image of the fragmentation of his textual self. He hyperbolically asserts that ‘practically all men know my speeches, and they distribute them in every direction, just as boys in the cities sing popular songs as the sun is setting’ (4). They deliver the speeches to one another, adding and subtracting as they go, an ongoing cycle of imitation in which Dio himself, rather than Socrates, is the model. It is as if Roman networks of trade had been appropriated and imagined as conduits, not for the luxurious merchandise Dio elsewhere condemns, but for sophistic emulation and influence. The commercial metaphor reaches a climax at the end of the extant portion of the speech:

ὥστε οὐκέτι ὀβολοῦ, καθάπερ εἶπέ τις, εὐπορον ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς

³⁴ Cf. Whitmarsh (2001: 162): ‘The dominant theme here [in the thirteenth *Oration*] is of decentralization, both geographically and semiotically’. Note that Dio links particulars of his Socratic *persona* in the thirteenth *Oration* to the social conditions of the Empire. The nature of urban experience at Rome makes it ‘impossible’ to meet interlocutors in twos or threes ‘besides wrestling-schools and covered walkways’, so he makes addresses to crowds of great numbers instead (31). The scripted nature of his Socratic philosophizing is to be attributed partially to his wandering from place to place throughout the Empire, where he is constantly asked to give (in effect) repeat performances (11-13).

³⁵ See Hight (1983: 84) on the incomplete nature of the preserved text.

πρίασθαι τὴν ἐμὴν σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ κύψαντα ἀνελέσθαι χαμάθεν.
 σχεδὸν οὖν παραπλήσιον πεπόνθασιν οἱ ἐμοὶ λόγοι τῷ κεράμῳ
 τῷ Τενεδίῳ· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖθεν πᾶς μὲν ὁ παραπλέων ἐμβάλλεται
 κέραμον, οὐδεὶς δὲ ὑγιή διακομίζει ῥαδίως, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ σαθρὸν
 ποιήσαντες ἢ συντρίψαντες ὄστρακα ἔχοντες λανθάνουσιν
 αὐτούς.

‘No longer can people easily obtain my wisdom from the marketplace at an obol, as someone put it – they just bend down and pick it off the ground. So my speeches enjoy much the same fate as the pottery of Tenedos. For every ship that sails from that place puts pottery on board, but none transports it intact with ease. They crack or smash it without even noticing, and are left with potsherds (42.5).

Dio imagines his orations as so many smashed and broken potsherds circulating on ships, an image (as Elizabeth Irwin suggests to me) suggestive of Athenian ostracism (citizens inscribed the name of the person to be driven from their city on potsherds, *ostraka*). The island of Tenedos is known elsewhere for its pottery,³⁶ hence its literal significance here. But it is also a key image in the mythology of Rome’s empire-building: it is a ‘key-point in all the Troy-tale’ (Austin 1964: 39), an ‘exceedingly famous island’ (Verg. *Aen.* 2.21-2), origin-point of Laocoon’s terrifying snakes, and the place from which the Greeks launched their

³⁶ Plut. *De Vit. Aes. Al.* 2.

final attack on Troy.³⁷ Dio's corpus is imagined to extend from this origin point throughout the Empire, and, being read by 'all people', his fragmented textual self is co-extensive with the limits of the Roman world. As a Roman social critic, Dio speaks not from a firmly grounded individual position in a recognizable place and time, but, as the abstract embodiment of a tradition, to the entire Empire.

Similarly to Dio, when Juvenal launches his own criticism against the degeneracy of contemporary Rome, he speaks less as an individual of privileged insight than as the embodiment of a tradition. For Juvenal, of course, it is the Roman literary and historical tradition. By reviving historical *exempla* from Rome's past to express his outrage about the present, he, no less than Dio, deploys 'old' arguments – and old characters and old scripts – against contemporary problems. Yet, despite the emphatically Roman orientation of his ideology, the techniques of the Juvenalian satirist are strikingly similar to those of Dio's Socratic imitator. In both speakers, there is a paradoxical combination of forceful (indeed, forcefully masculine) self-presentation, and the rhetorical concealment of the speaker's own individual identity. Despite Juvenal's deliberate *ideological* detachment from the sophistic milieu of the early second century, shared emphases in technique suggest that, stylistically, his rhetorical *Satires* are not separate from this cultural movement in early second-century Rome. These aspects are observable in no poem better than *Satire* two, in which Juvenal is most teasingly explicit about his capacity for rhetorical disappearance.

2. Juvenal's Second *Satire*: Strategies for Speech and Disguise

³⁷ *Aen.*2.203, 255; *Petr. Sat. [Troiae Halosis]* 89.29-34. Cf. Halliday (1934) on Tenedos in literature and myth.

Juvenal's second *Satire* is typically read as a poem concerned with exposure, but it is equally a poem about concealment. It takes as its target male sexual deviance, and particularly those *cinaedi* who try to hide their proclivities behind some rugged, philosophical, or religious cover. Rather than exposing deviant bodies, though, I suggest here that the satirist is fascinated instead with *disguise*, the ways in which individuals attempt to use outward appearance to manipulate the perception of their identities. Sexual desire stands at the fault-line between what can and cannot be concealed, manipulated, or changed. Latin literature is full of rumors that rugged men are actually passive sexually, and *Satire 2*, in one sense, accords with the widespread ancient conviction that the concealment of sexual desire can only go so far. Sexual passivity in this poem is a 'disease' (*morbus*, 17; 79-91), and Juvenal chalks one man's effeminacy up to 'the Fates' (16-7). Although men who marry each other might wish to bear children, 'nature cedes no power over their bodies to their minds'.³⁸ Nature cannot be circumvented or beguiled. Yet the poem itself thrills to the detailed description of clothing and cosmetics rather than bodies, lingering over all the colors and shapes of the dresses men wear to express their desires and dupe *natura*. These disguises are also consistently associated with different forms of speech. The satirist charts different configurations in the gaudy openness of his targets' costumes and the openness or restraint of their speech. This proliferation of speakers in Juvenal's poem naturally suggests questions about the real speaker, the poet himself – but he is the best disguised of all. Attempts to know *his* true identity are derailed by the absence of autobiographical references, by the jumble of historical and mythological references confounding any secure sense of place and time, and by the satirist's proclivity for imitating the voices of others – in a taunting and significant instance in this poem, the voice of a woman, Laronia. Juvenal begins:

³⁸ 139-140: *nil animis in corpora iuris/ natura indulget.*

*Ultra Sauromatas fugere hinc libet et glaciale
Oceanum, quotiens aliquid de moribus audent
qui Curios simulant et Bacchanalia vivunt.
indocti primum, quamquam plena omnia gypso
Chrysiippi invenias; nam perfectissimus horum
si quis Aristotelen similem vel Pittacon emit
et iubet archetypos pluteum servare Cleanthas.
frontis nulla fides; quis enim non vicus abundant
tristibus obscaenis? castigas turpia, cum sis
inter Socraticos notissima fossa cinaedos? (2.1-10)*

I just want to escape, past the Sauromatae and the glacial Ocean,
whenever those men, who imitate the Curii but live like
it's the Bacchanalia, dare anything about morals.

First, they have no learning, though you'd find their whole home
full of plaster busts of Chrysippus. If anyone has bought
a life-like Aristotle, or a Pittacus, or orders his originals of Cleanthes
to stand sentry by his wall – then he's the most exquisite among them.
Put no faith in a face. For what street isn't crowded with straight-faced
deviants? You condemn shameful acts. But, between those Socratic
faggots, you're their most famous place to drill.

Juvenal signals the milieu of his satire at once: it is the world of philosophic imitation, of degenerate *Socratici* (10), and particularly those Romans whose affected admiration for stern Roman *exempla* is undermined by their interest – so common in the second-century, as the success of Dio and others confirms – in Greek philosophers.³⁹ For Dio, imitation is presented as lived experience. Authority is gained through embodying a copy, not merely owning one. Juvenal’s satirical picture of poseurs collecting philosophers’ busts makes their emulation seem pathetically shallow, and the drive to collect material objects runs parodically counter to the philosophical ideas they must have been espousing. They are easy proof of the intellectual poverty of Roman emulation of the Greeks. At the same time, this gallery of men with their busts seems very well-aligned with a culture in which people self-consciously crafted personas for themselves, a process that lends itself to comparison with sculpted human forms.⁴⁰ Both human and statue are the product of craft and mimesis; the men who ‘model themselves on’ the Curii (*simulant*, 3) clamor over ‘models’ (*similem*, 6) of Greek philosophers. Juvenal takes the further parodic step of flipping the relationship between owner and statue, original and copy. So, the man owning the most busts is the most ‘finished’ of them (*perfectissimus horum*, 5), as if he has himself become a work of art subject to aesthetic appraisal.⁴¹ Conversely, his Cleanthes statues are personified, and their owners order them to stand sentry over the rest of their precious collection.⁴² They, not their owners,

³⁹ The familiarity of the theme in contemporaneous Latin literature attests both to the prestige of philosophical learning in the period and the suspicion with which it was held. Cf. Trapp (2007: 18-27, 226-257) on the ‘two-way tension between *philosophoi* and conventional elite culture’ in Imperial Rome.

⁴⁰ Cf. particularly Favorinus’ *Corinthian Oration* (= [Dio] *Or.* 37), in which the famous hermaphrodite sophist discusses (and at times ventriloquizes) a statue of himself in Corinth, simultaneously explaining and exhibiting his own education and cultural formation; cf. Rosenmeyer (2001: 255) on Alciphron’s similar use of a statue to ‘explore the issue of a doubled self’.

⁴¹ For *perfectus* in the praise of art, cf. Cic. *Brut.* 18.70, *De Div.* 1.13.23;

⁴² Most commentators translate *pluteum* as ‘book-shelf’, and translate ‘he orders the book-shelf to hold the originals of Cleanthes’ *vel sim.* But this is unnecessarily to blunt the force of *servare* (‘to guard’), and to miss the military connotations of *pluteus*, which, though it came to mean a dividing screen between rooms

are originals (*archetypos*, 7 – the plural itself presents a paradox). ‘Put no faith in a face’, Juvenal says (8) – but whose face? The choice is dizzying in a house full of busts. Similarly, *tristibus obscaenis* is a phrase of shimmering ambiguity: as listeners (or readers), we are left to decide which of these two words is functioning as the adjective and which the noun, and yet ‘in characters of such doubleness there might well be a question which of their opposite qualities is the true and underlying one and which the surface modification’ (Wiesen 1989: 715).

Satire two’s opening section inveighs against sexual hypocrites, the kind of men whose hairy arms are betrayed by a depilated (and hemorrhoid-ridden) anus (11-13). As the poem develops, the satirist shifts targets to those who flaunt their violations of Roman sexual propriety openly. Thus the text has been read as a general expression of contempt for those who have traded in their dignity as elite Romans for positions of sexual passivity and effeminacy. In the analysis of Walters (1998), for example, the poem is a kind of *flagitatio*, which exposes *cinaedi* and transforms them into a spectacle for listeners’ condemnation.⁴³ Yet, once Juvenal turns to cases of ‘open’ effeminacy, his focus is never on bodies so much as on cosmetics and dress, the means by which male bodies are distorted or concealed.⁴⁴ His overwhelming concern remains the manipulable relationship between inner and outer self. So, at lines 65-81, Juvenal attacks Creticus, who wears a gauzy, translucent toga while he is

in a house, was originally a protective wall in siege warfare (*OLD* s.v. *pluteus* 1, 2). Hence, as Powell (2010: 226) explains, ‘the collector orders the busts of Cleanthes to occupy the *pluteus* as though they were slaves on sentry duty’. On the poem’s recurrent military metaphors, see Anderson (1982: 211-219).

⁴³ Konstan (1993), and Nappa (1998) emphasize the interconnection between sexual roles and other categories of power relationship in Roman society: ‘Juvenal suggests not that Rome is full of homosexuals and that this is bad, but that Rome is losing its vigor through a continuous reversal of social paradigms (Nappa 1998: 92).

⁴⁴ For dress as a theme in the *Satire*, see Braund & Cloud (1981: 206) and Braund (1996: 170-1); cf. Plaza (2006: 158): ‘the main vice remains cross-dressing’. Richlin (1993: 541-554) analyses the references to dress as demarcating and stigmatizing *cinaedi* as an organized subculture at Rome.

pleading cases, an outfit that arouses ‘amazement’ from onlookers (67), and is, for the satirist, more shameful than complete nakedness (71). Juvenal then promises a horror ‘more foul than this clothing’ (82), but the next offence is clothing again, perpetrated by a cult of transvestite priests. When Apuleius describes a similar transvestite cult (*Met.* 8.26-30), he exposes the priests’ outrageous sexual exploits, not merely their cross-dressing. But Juvenal expatiates on the outfits, offering an account of their ribbons (84), necklaces (85), eye-shadow and eye-liner (93-5), golden hairnet ‘filled with an abundance of hair’ (96), their tartan tunics, and their greenish-yellow satin (97).⁴⁵

Juvenal’s next scandal is marriage between Gracchus and a male trumpeter, an event so monstrously unnatural that he likens it to prodigies of women giving birth to animals (123), and he articulates the antagonism between these men’s desire and their bodies, since nature has forbidden them from giving birth themselves (137-142). But the upending of social convention is strikingly expressed again in terms of clothes: the man who once carried sacred shields as part of Salian ritual now ‘puts on flounces, and a long dress, and an orange bridal veil’ (124) – and the statue of Mars will not even shake his helmet in protest (130). Even *this* outrage is outdone (*vicit*, 144) by the fact that Gracchus also fights as a gladiator, ‘wearing a tunic’ (*tunicati*, 143).⁴⁶ Finally, after invoking the shades of Rome’s virile past, Juvenal ends

⁴⁵ See Braund (1996) ad loc. for the types of garments described, and Hopman (2003) on the color symbolism. Sexual innuendo is not absent from these lines (the cult drinks from phallic-shaped drinking glasses, for example, at line 95). But any expectation that the satirist will expose the priests’ hinted sexual debauches is quashed in favor of lengthy description of their clothes. We glimpse their bodies only at the end of the episode, when Juvenal ironically recommends castration, so that they can dispense with a body-part already ‘superfluous’ (*supervacuum*, 116).

⁴⁶ So also at *Sat.* 8.199-210. Cerutti & Richardson (1989) demonstrate from a number of sources (including this one) the existence of a class of gladiators called the *retiarum tunicati* – effeminate mock-fighters who are trotted out in the amphitheater as a comic spectacle – though of course the mention of Gracchus’ tunic at 143 also contributes to the complex of clothing imagery throughout the *Satire*.

by considering the spread of Roman effeminacy among conquered peoples, imagining the effects of Romanization on one prisoner-of-war:

*sed quae nunc populi fiunt victoris in urbe
non faciunt illi quos vicimus. 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
induerit pueris, non umquam derit amator,
mittentur braciae, cultelli, frena, flagellum.
sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores (2.166-170).*

The things that are now done in the city of the victors,
the conquered don't do; and yet, one Armenian, Zalaces,
more effeminate than all the ephebes, is said to have
compromised himself for a lusting tribune.

Look at the impact of our exchange! He had come as a hostage,
but here, men are made. For if boys' long lingering
clothes them in Rome, they'll never be without a lover, and
they'll dispense with their trousers, their knives, bridles and whip.

That's how they bring teenage-toga morality back home to Armenia.

Induerit (168) is Nisbet's emendation for the manuscripts' *indulsit*, defended on the basis that it 'suits the reference to clothing in 169 *bracae*, 170 *praetextatos*' (1995: 234).⁴⁷ Indeed, this conclusion is a culmination of a network of clothing imagery throughout the poem. Hardened youths from the provinces are induced to take off their trousers. They attract lovers, and, paradoxically, by stripping themselves of the marks of their own culture, are 'clothed in' Rome. The city's *praetextatos mores* are a kind of booty radiating outwards from conqueror to conquered, instead of the other way around. Earlier in the same *Satire*, Juvenal has viewed Roman sexual corruption as a kind of disease.⁴⁸ Here at its close he articulates the more dislocating idea of Roman culture as clothing, with its suggestion of something external and separable from inner identity, an ambiguity that recalls the opening of the poem. This notion of culture-as-clothing fits well with the sophistic milieu: Lucian's dialogues repeatedly satirize the allegedly widespread habit of imitating *paideia* merely by assuming certain clothes.⁴⁹ A Rome in which 'men are made' (*fiunt homines*, 167) is one highly aware of the artificial process of crafting a public identity.⁵⁰

Yet amid this milieu of performance and imitation, Juvenal's emphasis is instead on contamination and coercion. The difference is summed up in Juvenal's evocative corruption of an old proverb at line 81: 'once it's seen its fellow grape, another grape takes on its taints' (*uvaeque conspecta livorem ducit ab uva*, 81). The saying elsewhere refers to competitive

⁴⁷ Watt (2002: 299) conjectures *incolcat* (delay 'trains' boys in Rome), which is flatter, though it makes good sense of the dative *pueris*.

⁴⁸ Especially at lines 79-81, 127-8; see Martyn (1970b); Braund & Cloud (1981: 204) the poem finds as 'its centre-piece the image of infection spreading outwards'.

⁴⁹ Whitmarsh (2001: 259-262). Cf. also Tertullian's *De Pallio*, a highly satirical consideration of the relationship between clothes, nature, and cultural identity. A change of clothes becomes sinful, argues Tertullian, only when it attempts to change the wearer's nature (transvestitism is the chief example, 4.1-4.4).

⁵⁰ This phrase is itself artificially 'made' from an earlier phrase in the poem – *fiunt homines* is a deliberate (if ungrammatical) echo of *populi fiunt* in line 162 (where *populi* is properly genitive, not nominative).

emulation (cf. Otto s.v. *uva*); here it refers to spreading disease. The reversal whereby the manly Armenian becomes sexually passive is expressed in lines 162-165 in a grimly schematic series of polarities: conqueror/ conquered (*victoris...quos vicimus*), Greek/ Latin (*ephebus...tribunus*), one/ all (*unus...cunctis*), A/ Z (*Armenius Zalaces*). Juvenal repeatedly uses the basic verb *facio*, flipping back and forth between active and passive: things which ‘are done’ in Rome (*fiunt*, 162) the conquered don’t ‘do’ (*faciunt*, 163); see what exchange ‘does’ (*faciant*, 166); here men are made, or ‘done’ (*fiunt*, 167). While the targets of Juvenal’s invective earlier in the second *Satire* earned his scorn precisely by their flipping between active and passive roles, the reversals here evoke the powerlessness of the prisoner-at-war, who is himself manipulated by an entire culture of sexual corruption. Thus, he is ‘clothed in Rome’. Artemidorus, no less critical a second-century observer of the Second Sophistic than Juvenal (albeit from the Greek perspective), similarly depicted the vulnerability of provincials to Roman influence in terms of clothing. Foreigners who wear the Roman toga in dreams will suffer sickness and unemployment, he says (2.3). A dream about the Greek god Pan wearing Roman clothing in the Forum is ill-omened, since it portrays something uprooted from its proper place (4.72).⁵¹

Juvenal’s attacks on his targets throughout the poem are not limited to their sexual behavior or their clothes. Equally notable are his references to their *speech* – and frequently their critical (even, satiric) speech. The secrecy or openness of their sexual behavior corresponds to the boldness or reticence of their talk. The would-be philosophers at the opening of the poem, who hide their intellectual inanity and their sexual proclivities, shun the philosophical

⁵¹ These dreams recall Artemidorus’ best-known criticism of Rome, when he likens the acquisition of Roman citizenship to decapitation, since a Greek thereby loses his former name and status (1.35); see Bowersock (2004).

conversation in which they should be engaged ('conversation is sparse for them', 14). Instead, they have a 'great lust for staying quiet' (*magna libido tacendi*, 14), a phrase that captures their hypocritical combination of pretended seriousness and sexual abandon (cf. *tristibus obscaenis*, 9). Their shaggy hair 'promises a fierce spirit' (*promittunt atrocem animum*, 12), but their depilated anuses suggest otherwise. By contrast, Peribomius' sexual openness and lack of disguise constitute a kind of confession – 'he admits (*fatetur*) his affliction in his face and his walk' (17). This Peribomius is described as embodying a kind of *simplicitas* (18), an openness or frankness: precisely the word, in fact, that Juvenal uses to describe the frank criticism of prior generations in *Satire one*.⁵² Creticus, the pleader with the transparent toga, is also imagined as embodying frankness of speech. 'You fierce, unrestrained champion of freedom', Juvenal taunts him, 'you're see-through' (*acer et indomitus libertatisque magister, / Cretice, perluces*, 77-88). As the commentators observe, *acer et indomitus* is lifted from Lucan's description of Caesar, who, like a fiery lightning bolt – or a satirist – gives free vent to his rage,⁵³ and the 'freedom' Creticus champions could refer to Republican ideals (his name represents the bluest of blue blood; cf. *Sat.8.38*), his preference for wispy clothing, or his speech.⁵⁴ In one sense, the fierceness with which he defends liberty contrasts with the effeminacy of his gauzy clothing. In another sense, see-through clothing is an eminently appropriate metaphor for someone who openly champions *libertas* in the law-courts, refusing to veil himself decently in the art of safe criticism.

⁵² 1.52-4: *unde illa priorum/ scribendi quodcumque animo flagrante liberet/ simplicitas?* ('Where is earlier generations' frankness to be found, for writing whatever their blazing spirits wished?')

⁵³ Luc. 1.146: *acer et indomitus, quo spes quoque ira vocasset* ('fierce and unrestrained, wherever ambition and anger summoned him').

⁵⁴ Powell (2010: 235) draws an apt parallel with a passage in Quintilian, who praises oratory in which the speaker's character 'shines through' (*mores dicentis ex oratione perluceant*, 6.2.14). In Creticus' case, we see too much. In Lucian's *Teacher of Rhetoric*, another text conflating sexuality and speech (Gunderson 2000: 149-183), the sophist parodically advises his students to appear in translucent togas, leaving shame at home (15).

Similarly, part of the horror of the cult of effeminate priests for Juvenal is their license of speech: they swear women's oaths (98), there is 'no shame in their language' (*nullus verbis pudor*, 110), and they have the 'freedom of speaking' in an effeminate voice (*fracta voce loquendi/ libertas*, 112). Seneca's oft-quoted maxim *talis oratio qualis vita* ('a man's speech is like his life', *Ep.*114.1) holds particularly true.

But what, then, of the satiric speaker *proprio nomine*, Juvenal? Here is the pivotal point in *Satire* two, bringing to a head the poem's themes of sexuality, speech and disguise; for no one in the poem is better disguised than the speaker himself. Like Dio, Juvenal criticizes Rome from a viewpoint that is deliberately inscrutable. There are first-person verbs here (*ego...imputo*, 16-17, *quaero*, 76), but no body to which to attach them. For all his indignation, Juvenal never invokes himself, his experience, or his way of life as a model or standard. Instead, the satirist moves in and out of different voices. Juvenal ventriloquizes the unknowable everyman 'notorious Varillus', for instance, who is shocked at the hypocrisy of one Sextus (equally unknowable, 21-2). He scripts and plays all the roles of the cross-dressing priests (89-90), then in a conversation between two men chatting about an upcoming marriage between two men (132-5). Like Dio, he flouts any precise sense of time. 'Recently' (*nuper*, 29) the emperor has contravened his own legislation against adultery, he says, and 'just now' (*modo*, 160) the Orkneys have been captured (in fact an event under Agricola in 84). Gracchus appears in this poem as one half of his famous historical brotherhood (24) and then again in modern form, as a homosexual bride (117), an outrage which, in a kind of temporal circularity, redounds back upon Rome's ancestors ('o father of Rome, whence this gross impiety against the shepherds of Latium?').⁵⁵ Moreover, through the prominent

⁵⁵ 2.126-7: *o pater Urbis,/ unde nefas tantum Latii pastoribus?*

metapoetic emphasis on the manipulation of identity, Juvenal self-consciously draws attention to the way he veils his own speaking voice. Posing as an exposure of others, the *Satire* is also a manifesto for the satirist's disguise.

Juvenal's most audacious manipulation of his speaking voice is his extended impersonation of a woman, Laronia, at lines 36-63. In a blatant, teasing irony, the satirist, who has throughout the poem condemned men who adopt the dress of women, himself adopts a female persona, performing a kind of textual transvestitism.⁵⁶ Laronia is introduced in terms deliberately reminiscent of Juvenal's own entrance as the frustrated auditor in the recitation hall of *Satire* one – she breaks her silence because she 'can't bear' (*non tulit*, 36) a certain hypocrite 'shouting so many times' (*clamantem totiens*, 37) for adultery to be prosecuted.⁵⁷ Her outburst is a second satiric debut. She complains that women are blamed unfairly for their immorality, when in fact effeminate men are worse, assuming women's roles and perpetrating shameless crimes. As Braund says, Laronia is 'subordinate to and manipulated by the speaker', and thus her 'woman's voice turns out to be *écriture masculine*' (1996: 215). Yet there is something very knowing about this particular *scripta puella*. In Laronia, the satirist has created a character wise to his tricks. *Respice primum/ et scrutare viros*, she enjoins her listeners at lines 44-5: 'first of all, look closely and scrutinize men'. What is the force of that *re*? 'Look closely'; but perhaps also 'look back' or 'look behind'.⁵⁸ 'Scrutinize

⁵⁶ Henderson (1999: 196): 'she is the satirist in drag'. But how can we be sure that this outraged 'Laronia' (who sarcastically asks the effeminate men where they buy their perfume, 40-2) is not *already* a man in drag? Put no faith in a face. (I owe this mischievous suggestion to Gareth Williams).

⁵⁷ Cf. 1.1-2: 'Will I never avenge myself, harassed so many times by the *Theseid* of hoarse Cordus?' (*numquamne reponam/ vexatus totiens rauci Theseide Cordi*). As we saw in chapter 1, the violent atmosphere of the original recitation hall opening of the first *Satire* also expresses frustration over the non-prosecution of crimes.

⁵⁸ *OLD* s.v. *respicio* 2 (c) 'to take a look at (in order to examine)'; 2 (b) 'to look round and see, notice behind someone'.

men', she says: if we look closely enough, perhaps we can expose the satirist's transvestitism, and she goads us into trying. The metapoetic reading is bolstered by the imagery in this passage of weaving, an archetypal figure for literary composition, with its attendant associations of craft, trickery, lightness of touch and slenderness of thread. The usurpation by men of this female role earns Laronia's particular ire (54-7), and she likens the male author/weaver to Penelope, Arachne, and a shaggy *paelex*.⁵⁹ Laronia's outburst contains images of speech stifled or expressed: she complains about the conspiracy of effeminate men that silences protest ('solidarity is firm between the soft', *magna inter molles concordia*, 47) and about the 'grave' opinions passed on her sex (*tristis sententia*, 62). Ultimately, she recommends that wives keep their own secrets and foster their own conspiracies (60-1). After her speech is over, Juvenal commends her precisely for exposing the truth: she has sung things 'true and openly visible', and 'what of it was false?'⁶⁰ Jones skeptically comments that 'Juvenal's exaggerated *imprimatur* on the speech must be intended to provoke the audience into disbelief' (2007: 140). But the mark of the satirist pulling the strings is there at the very beginning, when he says that Laronia delivers her tirade not in frustrated rage but rather '*subridens*', 38 – 'smiling wryly', or, literally, 'smiling underneath' – the kind of ironic smile that suggests that one knows more than one is letting on.⁶¹ The supreme demonstration of

⁵⁹ 2.54-7: *vos lanam trahitis calathisque peracta refertis/ vellera, vos tenui praegnantem stamine fusum/ Penelope melius, levius torquetis Arachne, /horrida quale facit residens in codice paelex* ('You men lead the thread, bring back the finished wool, and fill the baskets. You turn the spindle, laden with slender thread, better than Penelope, more lightly than Arachne, the typical task of a distraught mistress sitting on the block'). For effeminate males metaphorically called 'mistresses', see *TLL* s.v. *paelex* C (1); the adjective with which it is qualified, *horrida*, probably has its metaphorical significance of 'distraught' (cf. *Ov. Am.* 2.16.19; *Juv. Sat.* 3.212), although its more literal sense 'bristly' fits the *hispidamembra* of the targeted *cinaedi* very well. Could *residens in codice* ('sitting on a block') mean, more pointedly for the satirist, 'residing in a book?' In the skeptical analysis of Winsbury (2009: 24), 'Roman authors, copyists and booksellers of [Martial]'s time knew about the codex format using parchment, but only in unusual circumstances chose to use it'.

⁶⁰ 2.64-5: *vera ac manifesta canentem...quid enim falsi Laronia?*

Juvenal's ability to veil his speaking voice is his creation of this character, who actively enjoins us to expose his textual conspiracy.

Juvenal's second *Satire* both occupies and parodies a world in which individuals craft for themselves highly self-conscious philosophical and rhetorical personas. Juvenal's poem luxuriates in elaborate, scandalizing descriptions of costumes and manipulated identities, yet it also displays the poet's own ability to cloak his speaking voice in tauntingly ironic disguises. This poem of metaphorical 'disappearance' is framed by images of the poet's own imagined flight to the borders of the Empire. As Dio did in the thirteenth *Oration*, Juvenal makes his entrance by announcing his exit: he wants to 'escape, past [*ultra*] the Sauromatae and the glacial Ocean' (1-2), that is, to the Empire's very margins. This is an expression of outrage at all of the hypocrites with philosophical pretensions. But a subtle sense of competition is also perceptible: he hates when those hypocrites 'dare anything' about morals, as he himself is daring to speak about morals, and he is offended 'first' by the fact that they 'have no learning' (*indocti primum*, 4). Moreover, this self-exile in protest against contemporary *mores* fits all too well into the milieu of philosophical poseurs, since first and second-century Roman philosophers garnered prestige, and credibility as critics of Rome, precisely by celebrating their exile from Rome. Seneca could point to his exile by Claudius, Musonius Rufus by Nero, Dio and Epictetus by Domitian, Favorinus by Hadrian, and according to later tradition, the author of Revelation suffered exile by Domitian, too.⁶² Of course, Juvenal himself was also said to have suffered exile by Domitian, a penalty attributed

⁶¹ This wry smile is a hallmark of ironic, urbane, verbal one-upmanship; a nice example is in Varr. *De Re Rust.* 1.2.25 ('Scrofa had given a wry smile, because he was well aware of the books but loathed them, and Agrasius thought he was the only one who knew them'). Cf. Sen. *Cons ad Helv.* 13.7; Tac. *Dial.* 11.1; and cf. Lyne's (1987: 98) delicate appreciation of Jupiter's detached smile (*subridens*) in the *Aeneid*.

⁶² Eus. *HE* 3.17-20. On the cultural cachet and metaphorical possibilities of exile among Imperial Greek writers, see Whitmarsh (2001: 133-80); in Seneca, Williams (2006).

to his criticism of the actor Paris and his influence in court (*Sat.* 7.90-2), but a story surely broadly indebted to this same cultural myth, whereby one's credentials as a philosopher or social critic were guaranteed by exile at the order of a tyrant from the city of Rome.⁶³

At the end of the poem, Juvenal arrestingly combines two opposing images of displacement from Rome: he imagines himself and his contemporaries led as prisoners-of-war in the Underworld before the shades of Republican heroes, then in the same breath trumpets the expansion of the borders of the Empire into ever-more remote regions:

*illic heu miseri traducimur. arma quidem ultra
litora Iuvernæ promovimus et modo captas
Orcadas ac minima contentos nocte Britannos...* (*Sat.* 2.159-61).

There – the horror! – we are paraded in disgrace. Yes, and beyond Iuerna's shores we have advanced our arms, beyond the recently captured Orkneys and the Britons, content with the shortest night...

The first person plural verbs – *traducimur...promovimus...vicimus* (163)) – beg the question of where the satirist is to be found. There, below? Or here, above? Or *ultra* (cf. the first word of line 1), 'beyond'? Does he really share this fantasy of Imperial expansion (indeed a fantasy, since, as Courtney points out, the invasion of Iuerna's shores – Ireland – never took place)? Or does he share the shame of moral defeat before the stern judges of the past? These brief allusions to personal identity are as shadowy as any in Juvenal's poetry. The angry

⁶³ *Vit. Iuv.* 5 (Wessner 1931: 1); schol. ad *Sat.* 7.90-2 (Wessner 1931: 126); cf. Sid Apoll. 9.271-3 (likely but not certainly a reference to Juvenal). Byzantine sources repeat the story: see Highet (1954: 239).

satirist is everywhere in his poems, and his claustrophobic volume is hard to escape; and yet his poems are marked equally by his disappearance, and no amount of scrutiny of our speaker can afford a clear view.

3. Secrecy and Violence in *Satire Nine*

Satire 9 seems to repeat many of the same elements from *Satire 2*. This is Juvenal's other poem focusing on sexual deviancy, depicting the client Naevolus' assumption of sexual responsibilities in the household of the pathic Virro. This is also the only dialogue in the *Satires*, a poetic exchange between Naevolus and the satirist. By framing his voice in dramatic terms as a character in a dialogue, Juvenal might seem to offer a unique opportunity for us really to *see* him, to conceive of his speaking voice as a coherent dramatic personality. Yet the central concern of the Juvenalian voice in the dialogue is secrecy, and the themes of conspiracy and silence in his lengthiest speech become another programmatic advertisement of his invisibility. Moreover, whereas the satirist 'disappeared' in *Satire 2* into a dizzying milieu of mimesis and disguise, flaunting his own ability to play the game of conscious identity manipulation, the silences of *Satire 9* are far more threatening. In crafting a portrait of a household destabilized from within, Juvenal creates a tense world of indirect threats, miscommunications, and malevolent rumor-mongering, with reminiscences of the Imperial household.

Scire velim quare totiens mihi, Naevole, tristis

occurras fronte obducta ceu Marsya victus.

quid tibi cum vultu, qualem deprensus 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? certe modico contentus agebas
vernarn equitem, conviva ioco mordente facetus
et salibus vehemens intra pomeria natis.
omnia nunc contra... (9.1-12)

I'd love to know why you run into me so often
 with grim expression and knitted brow, like Marsyas defeated.
 What's with your look? It's the kind of look Ravola had, caught
 polishing Rhodope's crotch with his sodden beard.
 We land blows on the slave who licks the pastries.
 But your face won't be sadder than Crepereius Pollio!
He goes around, ready to offer triple the interest rate,
 and doesn't find a fool to take it. Where'd you suddenly get
 so many wrinkles? Why, you used to be content with moderation –
 the home-born *eques*, the witty dinner-guest with biting jokes
 and a strident wit bred within city-bounds.
 Everything's different now...

The ninth *Satire* projects an individual voice – the client Naevolus, with his outraged protest against his patron Virro – against the ongoing background noise of Juvenal’s own scattered allegations and allusions. Naevolus will tell a scandalous story about the household to which he is attached: he satiates the sexual desires of both his pathic patron and his wife, and has even fathered his patron’s children, because he is unwilling, or unable, to do so himself.

From the beginning, he has the ‘grim expression’ (2), the ‘grave face’ (*vultus gravis*, 12), and the shaggy hair (14-15) of the sexual hypocrites targeted in *Satire 2*, but in his case it is the result of having abandoned a life of debauchery. Juvenal tells us that, before being tied to one household, Naevolus used to be one of the depilated men enjoying sexual celebrity with both men and women. The satirist’s ponderous explication at lines 18-21 of the obvious claim that one’s lifestyle is reflected in one’s appearance reads as a parody of a physiognomist’s lecture.⁶⁴ Physiognomists garnered much cultural prestige in this period by detecting hidden perversions among unlikely suspects.⁶⁵ But here there is a neat reversal, for if their skill resides in detecting a *cinaedus*’ hidden disease beneath healthy exteriors, Juvenal deduces from unhealthy exteriors that Naevolus has left his presumably quite happy life as a philanderer. Naevolus’ physical changes have corresponded also to the loss of his former wit,

⁶⁴ 9.18-21: ‘One can detect the torments of a soul lying low in a sick body, and detect its pleasures, too, since our appearance derives its bearing from both. So you seem to have shifted your ethical orientation, and to be tracing an opposite path from before’ (*deprendas animi tormenta latentis in aegro corpore, deprendas et gaudia; sumit utrumque/ inde habitum facies. Igitur flexisse videris/ propositum et vitae contraries ire priori*).

⁶⁵ Gleason (1995). Detecting the *cinaedus* was a kind of archetypal physiognomic feat. Dio (*Or.* 33.53-4) and Diogenes Laertius (7.173) both tell the story of a famous physiognomist (Diogenes Laertius identifies him with the Stoic Cleanthes), whose abilities were put to the test. A rugged man was brought to him, dressed in a Cynic’s coarse cloak, with shaggy hair and knitted brow, and Cleanthes was confounded as to his inner flaw – until he sneezed, at which point the physiognomist declared instantly that he was a *cinaedus*. The hypocrites of Juvenal’s second *Satire* have Cleanthes busts in their house (7): better to have him on your side.

and, as others have noted, he is described as having been a particularly Horatian kind of wit.⁶⁶ Now he looks like ‘Marsyas defeated’ (2) – a mythological image of an artist quashed, but also, in an Imperial context, a peculiarly Roman description of (political, economic) freedom lost. A statue of Marsyas stood in the Forum Romanum,⁶⁷ erected (it has been suggested) by C. Marcus Rutilus Censorinus during the Struggle of the Orders as a lasting symbol of the *plebs*’ freedom from debt slavery.⁶⁸ Naevolus is back in thrall.

The description of Naevolus as a kind of Horatian wit – as another satirist – has led to a widely-accepted interpretation in which Juvenal in this poem confronts his double (or, as Plaza nicely puts it, his ‘underground self’). The satirist, according to this reading, deliberately complicates his poem’s moral drive through an ironic dialogue with his own voice. Bellandi (1974: 291) thus regarded the poem as a kind of ‘self-parody’, emphasizing Juvenal’s extreme isolation; Braund (1988:170), as an ‘allegory of the procedure of satire’, in which the poet dramatizes the constraints upon his freedom of speech.⁶⁹ Yet the introduction of Naevolus as a speaking character makes all the more evident the *differences* in Juvenal’s approach to the task of social criticism. All the while Naevolus’ character is coming into view – with a back-story, physical description and specific complaint – the constant buzz of incidental allegation continues unabated in the background. This is Juvenal’s way throughout

⁶⁶ See Plaza (2006: 165-6): Naevolus is represented as a kind of *scurra*, a witty dinner-guest, a character very much like that of Horace in his *Satires*, and Juvenal’s description of him as ‘content with moderation’ (*modico contentus*) suggests some lip-service to Horatian ethics.

⁶⁷ Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.119-121, and the other passages gathered by Small (1982: 127-142).

⁶⁸ Morstein-Marx (2004: 99-100). Copies were erected in free cities of the Empire as a symbol of their freed status. Cf. Serv. ad *Aen.* 3.20: *sed in liberis civitatibus simulacrum Marsyae erat, qui in tutela Liberi patris est*; Macrobian *Sat.* 3.12: *Lyaeus vero, id est Liber, urbibus liberatis est deus, unde Marsyas eius minister in civitatibus libertatis est indicium.*

⁶⁹ Rosen (2007: 207-242) further argues that Juvenal uses the split voice to draw attention to the inherent difficulty in the satiric genre of isolating any clear moral voice. He raises but dismisses the idea that Naevolus’ and Juvenal’s satiric techniques differ significantly from one another (227n.21).

the *Satires*: sustained criticism against precise targets is far rarer than the spray of bullets against a panorama of various targets, some recognizable, but many not. The contrast is especially evident in this opening, in which Juvenal and Naevolus make similar criticisms, but the objects of Juvenal's criticisms are comparatively indistinct. Whereas Naevolus will accuse his patron of sexual indiscretions at scandalous length, Juvenal casually accuses an otherwise unknown 'Ravola' of sexual indiscretions in a simile at 3-4. Whereas Naevolus protests at length at the economic injustices to which he is subject in Virro's household, a humiliating reference to the impoverished Crepereius Pollio rolls off Juvenal's tongue at 6-8 (he is also otherwise unknown, except for a second mention at *Sat.* 11.43). The imagery used is redolent of the exposure and punishment of vice (*deprendus*, 3...*nos colaphum incutimus*, 6; cf. *deprendas*, 18, *deprendas*, 19), but while Naevolus is loud and direct, Juvenal is insidiously off-hand. Moreover, the more clearly Naevolus emerges as a coherent character, the more fragmented and unknowable Juvenal's own voice seems. What is *his* back-story? His facial expression? His location? The tensions inherent in this contrast between the two voices become especially evident when Juvenal begins to accuse his companion with the same off-handedness:

*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. (2.22-6)*

In fact recently, as I recall, you used to frequent Isis' shrine,

and Ganymede's statue at the Temple of Peace,
 and the secret rites of the imported Mother on the Palatine,
 and Ceres' temple – for which temple *doesn't* have women on sale?
 You were a lecher more famous than Aufidius, and
 – something you keep silent – you would lay their husbands, too.

This is a finely-drawn picture of two individuals who ought never to trust one another. The tone is conversational, if not quite colloquial.⁷⁰ The Latin is elliptical and compact, intimating a shared familiarity between the two characters.⁷¹ *Nuper* ('recently' 22) seems to signal the beginning of an anecdote, and *ut repeto* ('as I recall') suggests a kind of casual imprecision. Yet Juvenal's subsequent enumeration, over three lines, of the temples at which Naevolus found lovers seems, on the contrary, deliberately and unnervingly precise, as if the satirist wants to fit all his charges, so to speak, on one indictment. Naevolus, on the model of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, has turned recent and prominent public works – the *Templum Pacis* was erected by Vespasian – into places of erotic opportunity, and the unflattering characterization of him as a *moechus* (24) does not suggest chummy complicity on Juvenal's part.⁷² Rather, the satirist is engaging again in his brand of off-hand incrimination: he treats these charges as common knowledge, since Naevolus is 'more notorious than Aufidius' (another incidental allegation, whoever Aufidius was), and in the same breath exposes a secret (*quodque taces*, 26). Naevolus' later urging of Juvenal to keep quiet about his complaints (93-4) (a request

⁷⁰ The speedy dactyls of line 22, the conjunctions *enim* and *nam* in close vicinity, the parenthesis in 24, and the repetition of *et* (reminiscent of Horace's satiric hexameters) all suggest the lively, halting rhythms of speech.

⁷¹ *Ganymedem* (22) = *statuam Ganymedis*; *Pacis* (23) = *templum Pacis*; *secreta* (23) = *secreta mysteria* [?]; cf. Courtney ad loc.: 'This word has not been satisfactorily explained'; *Cererem* (24) = *templum Cereris*.

⁷² See Williams (2010): *moechus* is an 'unflattering term' (at 88)...it 'signifies a man who pursues inappropriate women' (at 380 n.36).

violated by the very writing of the poem) is prompted by this faithlessness early on. There is a premium on knowledge. If the client is economically downtrodden, he wields power over his patron in having *seen* everything in his household and penetrated its every part.⁷³ He has witnessed his patron at intimate moments fondling ‘secret’ gifts (*secreta*, 50-4), has an inventory of his patron’s properties (54-7), knows his children’s parentage (82-5), and is ready to expose these secrets. But the satirist in turn has penetrated Naevolus’ secrets; he knows where he has been, even among the ‘secret’ mysteries (*secreta*, 23). The invisibility of the satirist takes on a sinister cast here; he may know you, but you cannot know him.

To speak of sinister strains in a poem best known for its salacious sexual details may seem overwrought, especially since recent interpretations have encouraged us to view Naevolus ironically, as a laughable and unpleasant figure met with condescension by the satirist. Yet the picture Naevolus gives us of Virro’s household is at least as unsettling as it is funny. The sterility of the patron, and the displacement of the sexual drive on to his social subordinate, has led to a kind of destabilization from within. Indeed, although some have interpreted the satire as a reflection on the corruption of the client-patron relationship, Naevolus has an even broader iconic status as an ‘outsider within’, a figure threatening to unsettle the hierarchies of power that structure the Roman household, and elite society at large.⁷⁴ Many of Naevolus’ witticisms in his protest against his patron in fact constitute subtle reminders of the dangers

⁷³ See Braund (1988: 163-170) for secrecy as a central theme. The link between Naevolus’ sexual penetration of his master and his knowledge of his household’s secrets is not coincidental. *Secretum* has a well-attested sexual sense – Nadeau (1983: 153) cites Petron. 17, 112; Gell. 9.10; cf. Adams (1983: 56, 116) – and Nadeau has estimated that ‘in more than half the passages of Juvenal where the noun or the adjective occurs’ the sexual overtones are in play. Cf. the Greeks at *Sat.* 3.109-113, who penetrate all members of the household sexually, since, in a punning climax, ‘they want to know the household’s *secrets* and therefore be feared’ (*scire volunt secreta domus atque inde timeri*).

⁷⁴ On the client-patron relationship as the poem’s central theme, see Martyn (1970: 60-1); Bellandi (1974); Tennant (2003). On the ‘outsider-within’, see Parker (1998). As he argues, wives and slaves in Roman thought are ascribed the same vices of licentiousness, gluttony and treachery, thereby justifying constant paternalistic surveillance and control.

he could conceivably pose. A clear example is in line 37, ‘one of [Juvenal’s] wittiest classical parodies’ (Mason 1963: 103), in which Naevolus laments the unprofitable nature of being a client of Virro, even one who is highly-favored:

*quamvis te nudum spumanti Virro labello
viderit et blandae adsidue densaeque tabellae
sollicitent, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος.* (9.35-7)

...even though Virro watches you, and his lips are
foaming, and his constant, ingratiating, unceasing love-letters
harass you: ‘for no man can resist the allure of – a *cinaedus*’.

The line quoted is from the *Odyssey* (16.294, 19.13): Odysseus is planning the slaughter of the suitors in his household and advising his son to remove the weaponry from the dining hall, and the joke lies in Naevolus’ *paraprosdokian* ending of κίναιδος for the original σίδηρος (‘steel’). Yet the wit here only serves to defuse the more threatening underlying image of Odysseus, disguised as a beggar in a coarse cloak, laying the household to waste; and, lest we forget it, Naevolus is at pains throughout the rest of the poem to emphasize his likeness to Odysseus, even when the comparison is very strained.⁷⁵ He too is a beggar of sorts, in a coarse cloak (28-30), hiding something under its folds (*quas sinus abscondit*, 33).

⁷⁵ 9.63-5: Naevolus says that he has only one slave, just like ‘the single broad eye of Polyphemus, on account of which the wily Ulysses made his escape’; 148-150: Naevolus says that, although he supplicates Fortune, her ears are still stuffed with the same wax used by Odysseus’ crew to muffle the sounds of the Sirens (the link is ‘extremely oblique’: Rosen 2007: 228). Readers might also detect a more general resemblance between the social-climber Naevolus and Horace’s parodic portrait of Odysseus as a *captator* in *Sat.* 2.5: Braund (1988: 145-6).

The simmering atmosphere of possible violence boils over at 97-9, when Naevolus says that the man whose secrets you know will ‘not hesitate to take up his sword, split your head open with a club, set a candle burning by your door’ (*sumere ferrum,/ fuste aperire caput, candelam adponere valves/ non dubitat*). He therefore urges the satirist to keep his secrets as quiet as the Areopagus (101) – the Athenian court presiding over homicide cases.

In another literary pastiche, Naevolus reproaches his patron in outraged terms for his ‘ingratitude’ and ‘treachery’, in a manner deliberately reminiscent of Dido, an equally famous outsider figure: ‘Is it no service – none! – you ingrate, you traitor! – that your little son, your daughter were fathered by me?’⁷⁶ Naevolus’ fiery indignation at having fathered his patron’s children ironically recalls Dido’s lament at *not* having mothered the children of Aeneas.⁷⁷ In response, Juvenal’s goading and sarcastic quips to Naevolus cast him insultingly as a slave who knows his place, likening him to Ganymede at (47-8), and, at 102, to Corydon, evoking precisely the moment of *Eclogue 2* in which Corydon resolves not to compete with his rich master.⁷⁸ By contrast, when Naevolus likens himself to a rustic slave, the tone is distinctly anti-pastoral (‘the slave ploughing a field’, he says, ‘is less unhappy than the one ploughing his master’, 45-6).⁷⁹ The description of his duties is again suggestive of possible or threatened violence: ‘or do you think it’s easy and straightforward to drive a proper-sized penis into your master’s guts/ and there run into yesterday’s meal?’ (43-4). *An facile et*

⁷⁶ 9.82-3: *nullum ergo meritum est, ingrate ac perfide, nullum/ quod tibi filiulus, quod filia nascitur ex me?*

⁷⁷ So Bellandi (1974: 297-9). Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.138-9 (*parvolus...Aeneas nec filia*); 4.305 (*perfide*), 4.366 (*perfide*).

⁷⁸ 9.102: *O Corydon, Corydon....*; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 2.69.

⁷⁹ The image of Naevolus as a slave, rather than a free *cliens*, occurs already in Juvenal’s initial description of him as a *vernā equitem* (‘house-born *eques*’, 10). Similarly, Martial accuses a free man who continually fathers children by his slave-girls of ‘filling his home and estate with house-born *equites*’ (*domumque et agros implet equitibus vernis*, 1.84.4).

pronus est agere intra uiscera penem: the appearance of *penem* at the end of line 43 is another joke *paraprosdokian* – in fact, the exact same joke as before, since the line could just as naturally have ended with *ferrum* (σίδηρον) instead of *penem*.

Many other texts of Juvenal's period are eloquent about Roman elites' fears of becoming vulnerable to the threat of this kind of destabilization from within. 'Do you see how susceptible we are to so much danger, insult, and mockery?', asked Pliny (*Ep.*3.14.5), scandalized by the recent murder of a master by his slaves. The jurist Gaius Cassius Longinus in Tacitus' *Annales* laments that 'we have entire nations in our households, with different rituals, and scruples that are foreign, or non-existent. Only through fear will you keep those dregs in check' (14.44). But if Naevolus' protest garishly dramatizes widespread fears about subordinates overstepping their boundaries, the fractures in Virro's household recall specific fractures in the Imperial household. The Emperor Titus fathered no sons. His brother and successor, Domitian, fathered a single son, who died as an infant. His heir, Nerva, was already old at the time of accession, and died childless. Despite the comforting prominence of images of children and paternity in the iconography of his reign, Trajan fathered no sons either, and, though Juvenal could not have foreseen it, neither would his successor Hadrian.⁸⁰ The fact that the office of emperor was no longer transmitted through biological kinship gave rise to an entire new ideology of rule, enshrining the idea that merit, not bloodline, had become the determinative factor in choosing an heir; but this was, as Syme perceived, a necessary adjustment to biological reality, and Marcus Aurelius was not hesitant to resume dynastic succession once a son made it possible to do so.⁸¹ The imperial bedroom had

⁸⁰ On children as a political symbol in Trajanic iconography, see Rawson (2001). Hadrian's successor, Antoninus Pius, fathered two sons, but they died before he assumed the position.

⁸¹ See Syme (1970: 126-7, 132-4). Pliny is a prominent spokesman for the ideology of adoptive succession: see *Paneg.* 5.1-8.6.

remained vacant of natural heirs all throughout the period Juvenal was writing and reciting the *Satires*, and the apologists for adoptive succession had turned this sterility into an institution.⁸² Moreover, while largely free of civil and military disturbance (though executions did take place), Hadrian's accession was accompanied by rumors of private scandal, suggesting a household not so far from that of Virro, in which a lack of natural heirs allowed for the advancement of ambitious outsiders and the straying affections of a powerful wife. Ancient sources almost universally attribute Hadrian's adoption to the machinations of Trajan's wife Plotina, and the story spread that Trajan was already dead when Hadrian became his 'son'.⁸³ The proem of Juvenal's seventh *Satire* celebrates (almost certainly) Hadrian's accession, and the eighth *Satire* engages in a critical discourse about the value of blood-lines ('what's the good of a family tree?' Juvenal challenges, in its very first line). While *Satire* 9 clearly is not interpretable in all its particulars as political allegory, the entire third book has a public frame, and the fears of familial destabilization brought to life in Naevolus' character redound all the way to Rome's most powerful *familia*. Indeed, the paradigmatic nature of the imperial household for private Roman households was well-enshrined in the ideology of the Empire. Pliny in his *Panegyricus* praised Trajan for preserving not only himself, but all around him from *domestica infamia*; yet, as he subtly reminds the new *princeps*, anyone can be exposed, the emperor most of all. For 'fortune

⁸² Newlands' comments on *Silvae* 3.4 suggest that a similar culture prevailed already in the court of Domitian: 'The Palatine is filled not with children and heirs but with a changing succession of pretty slave boys, *priores deliciae famulumque greges* (55-6), who now give way to [the eunuch courtier] Earinus... The supreme artifice of the court finds ultimate expression in its negation of the biological drive for reproduction' (2002: 116).

⁸³ See Dio 69.1.1-4 (describing Plotina's affections for Hadrian as ἐξ ἐρωτικῆς φιλίας); *HA* Hadr. 4.8-10; Eutrop. 8.6.1. Aurel. Vict. 13.12. No doubt the hostility of the later historiographical tradition toward Hadrian accounts largely for the enshrining of these rumors as history: Galimberti (2007: 15-30).

uncovers not only emperors' homes, but their very bedrooms and innermost retreats. It projects and unveils their every secret for rumor to hear'.⁸⁴

In the only long speech by Juvenal's character in the dialogue – the only place in *Satire 9* where, we might say, we are offered a clear view of the satirist – he enlarges on just this theme, of the impossibility of secrecy in contemporary Rome and the inevitability of exposure. Despite its length (and textual uncertainties), it is worth quoting in full:

*o Corydon, Corydon, secretum divitis ullum
esse putas? serui ut taceant, iumenta loquentur
et canis et postes et marmora. claude fenestras,
vela tegant rimas, iunge ostia, tolle lucernam,* 105
*e medio fac eant omnes, prope nemo recumbat;
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* 110
*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* 115
*arcanum quam subrepti potare Falerni
pro populo faciens quantum Saufeia bibebat.*

⁸⁴ *Paneg.* 83. On the role of the emperor's private life in conceptualizations of his power, see Milnor (2005, esp. 80-93); Vout (2007).

uiuendum recte, cum propter plurima, tum ex his
[idcirco ut possis linguam contemnere serui].
praecipue causis, ut linguas mancipiorum 120
contemnas; nam lingua mali pars pessima serui.
[deterior tamen hic qui liber non erit illis
quorum animas et farre suo custodit et aere.]

O Corydon, Corydon, do you think a rich man can have a single
 secret? His slaves may keep quiet, but then his mules will talk,
 and his dog, his door-posts, and his marble floors. Close the windows!
 Pull the shades across the peepholes! Lock the doors! Remove the lamp!
 Tell everyone to disperse, and don't let anyone sleep close by.
 No use – what the master does at the cock's second crow,
 the first shopkeeper you see will know before dawn, and
 he'll also hear whatever stories the pastry-chefs, the head-cooks,
 and the carvers have cooked up. For what charge do they hesitate to compose
 against their masters? How often do they avenge beatings with rumors?
 Nor is there ever a drunkard to meet you at the cross-roads,
 when you're not in the mood, and intoxicate your poor ears.
 So you should ask *them* what you asked me to do a little while ago:
 tell them to stay quiet. But they enjoy betraying a secret more than
 drinking stolen Falernian wine, as much as Saufeia drank
 while she was sacrificing on behalf of the people.

You should live aright. For a lot of reasons. But especially
 [because then you can ignore the tongue of your slave]
 so that you can ignore the tongues of your slaves:
 for the tongue of a bad slave is his worst part.
 [But worse still is the man who'll never be free
 of the very people he maintains with his bread and cash].

The picture that Pliny gave in the *Panegyricus* of a panoptic court, subject to constant outside view, is universalized by Juvenal into a general (and sinister) vision of contemporary Rome. Surrounded by babbling voices always eager to attack, the head of any elite household cannot help but have his secrets exposed. All the effort and energy of Naevolus' protest against Virro, his undermining of the household and revelation of its deepest secrets, is suddenly presented as part of the everyday mechanics of Roman society, an inevitable occurrence rather than (as Naevolus would have it) a heroic, Odyssean feat. Secrets are impossible. Furthermore, as Juvenal presents it, the truth of the revelation seems entirely secondary to the damage it can inflict on a person's reputation. Hence, the deliberate promulgation of (false?) rumors becomes a way of taking vengeance against masters for the beatings they have inflicted (111-2). If the final two lines are genuine, they frame the speech by reinforcing the poem's persistent paranoia about the outsider within. The greatest threat comes from the household, which is not a sanctuary, but a war-zone.

Considered as part of the dialogue, Juvenal's long speech about the vulnerability of masters to their subordinates is not an especially apt response to Naevolus' fear of retribution from

his patron Virro (nor, it should be stated, does Juvenal evince much solidarity with the pathetic and hapless *patres familias*, who are doomed to have their secrets exposed, or else become the target of false rumors).⁸⁵ Indeed, the two voices in the dialogue never seemed more different from one another. Naevolus, we remember, was once a Horatian kind of wit (9-11), and in his immediate response to the satirist's speech, he enters a kind of lyrical reverie, in lines so evocative of the later Horace that they read like a Horatian cento.⁸⁶ Juvenal's satiric voice, on the other hand, never seemed so un-Horatian. Although vitiated by numerous textual problems, lines 118-121 seem to represent the Juvenalian satirist's humorously inept failure at moralizing in the Horatian mould: he issues the quintessential Horatian ethical imperative to 'live aright' (*vivere recte*) – but for what reason? Well, 'for many reasons', he explains hurriedly; then, in fact, for just one reason (to 'ignore the tongue of your slave'). He is no Horace, and his vision of a world in which secrecy is impossible and exposure is inevitable is totally foreign to his Roman satiric predecessors. Lucilius composed poems and stripped off people's outer skins (*componere carmina...detrahere et pellem*, Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.63-4), scouring the city with salt (1.10.3-4); Horace set out to 'tell truth with a laugh' (1.1.23-4) and inure people to his own techniques of self-counsel (1.4.103-128). These satirists presented themselves, however playfully or disingenuously, as individuals uniquely privileged with insight and charged with a particular social role. But in Juvenal's vision of contemporary Rome, *everyone* is a satirist. A man's household is constantly 'composing'

⁸⁵ Naevolus' fears of retribution: 9.93-101. This lack of fit is highlighted within the poem itself, when Naevolus objects that the satirist's disquisition on the vulnerability of masters of households does not respond specifically to his plight: 'The counsel you've just given is useful, but it applies to everyone. What's your advice to me now, when time's been lost and hopes beguiled?' (*utile consilium modo, sed commune, dedisti./ nunc mihi quid suades post damnum temporis et spes/ deceptas?*, 9.124-6).

⁸⁶ 9.126-129: 'For the delicate, fleeting bloom – the briefest part of a poor, unhappy existence – hastens to an end. While we drink, while we ask for garlands, perfumes, women, old age encroaches unperceived' (*festinate enim decurrere velox/ flosculus, angustae miseraeque brevissima vitae/ portio; dum bibimus, dum sarta, unguenta, puellas/ poscimus, obrepat non intellecta senectus*'). 'The beautiful poetry of 9.126-9 is worthy of a better setting', judges Highet (1954: 274). It is certainly alien.

(110) charges against him; the cooks (archetypal authorial figures in Latin literature, as Gowers 1992 demonstrated) are forever ‘inventing’ (*finxerunt*, 109) stories; drunkards are always on hand to tell tales (113), presumably tales embarrassing to their bosses (‘the drunken man would fill you up with the secrets of his masters’, the scholiast elaborates).⁸⁷ Allegation is endemic. If the slaves keep quiet, the very house will begin critiquing its inhabitants (103-4). Horace might have inveighed against the unethical figure who ‘cannot keep a secret’ (1.4.84-5), but he did not live in a Rome where secrets are impossible.

Readers who have sensed programmatic significance in *Satire 9* are therefore on firm ground, but the equivalences have been precisely inverted. Naevolus is the kind of satirist Juvenal is *not*. Naevolus has a defined location and identity. Like Horace, he is very keen to tell you about himself. He has a firm and specific target whom he attacks directly, and his personal stakes in the attack are never less than clear. By contrast, Juvenal’s *Satires* are an ongoing cycle of scattershot allegations and inventions, rarely lingering long on any specific target, never establishing a coherent authorial identity, cloaked in ‘atopic topology’, preferring merely to bring to life a Rome full of loud and diverse accusing voices.⁸⁸ The satirist will also reveal your secrets. Indeed, his protest at line 114-5 that he is *not* engaged in the same exposure of secrets as numberless drunkards, cooks and slaves is already suspect given his earlier exposure of Naevolus’ secrets (25-6), and it is also counterweighed by the density of self-references in this speech; for this sinister Rome of countless critical voices is precisely the milieu in which the *Satires* are imagined to be produced. The marble floors at 105 recall

⁸⁷ Wessner (1933: 160).

⁸⁸ It is difficult to see why line 119 was interpolated into the text, since, to adopt the classifications of Tarrant (1987), it is neither emendation, imitation nor interpretation (unless, as is rather unlikely, the interpolator wished merely to clarify that *mancipium* = *servus*). But here is one of those fortuitous insertions that happens to have its own harmonious irony, since the repetitions of this section evoke the very prattling of underlings that the interpolator tells us we should ignore.

the marble floors that ‘shout’ back at their audience (*marmora clamant*) in the programmatic opening of the first *Satire* (1.14), and the drunkard at the crossroads of line 112 recalls Juvenal’s own fleeting self-image at 1.64, filling wax tablets at the crossroads. Juvenal fits one of his trademark incidental allegations, against Saufeia, into his claim that others enjoy betraying secrets at 115-117, but these lines themselves refer back to Juvenal’s *own* earlier attack on Saufeia (6.314-334), and specifically his exposure of her scandalous sexual behavior at the *secret* rites (*secreta*, 6.314).

Here, in this jumbled polyphony of indistinct critical voices, is the ideal programmatic image for Juvenal’s *Satires*. Yet his emphasis in this speech on the impossibility of secrecy also paradoxically emphasizes Juvenal’s own ability to maintain his own secrecy. As with the constant repetition of images of deception and disguise in *Satire 2*, Juvenal’s sarcastic invocation to the hapless *patresfamilias* to ‘pull the shades across the peepholes’, ‘lock the doors’ and (if Nisbet’s emendation is correct), ‘remove the [Horatian?] lamp’⁸⁹ ironically flaunts the fact that Juvenal himself has managed to do just these things in the performance of his text. Throughout his poems, he has covered over the cracks (*rimas*, 9.105), the peepholes that might have allowed a sight of the author through his wall of representations.⁹⁰ Juvenal assumes a deliberate inscrutability, animating instead a babble of critical voices from Roman history and contemporary life, unanchored from chronology, and endlessly engaged in a cycle of allusion and allegation. In a period captivated by the rhetorical performances of

⁸⁹ Nisbet (1995: 250-1), for the MS *tollite* (or *tollito*) *lumen*. The ‘Venusian lamp’ (*Venusina...lucerna*) is Juvenal’s periphrasis for Horace’s *Satires* at 1.51.

⁹⁰ Cf. Don Fowler’s (2000: 156-167) reading of that most famous *rima*, in Ovid’s story of Pyramus and Thisbe, as symbolizing the restrictions inherent in language itself, which can only ever facilitate partial communication and understanding.

imported speakers and by the ‘identity parade’ of the Second Sophistic,⁹¹ this evasiveness constitutes its own deliberate and beguiling rhetorical performance. In a panoptic Rome, of seeing and being seen, Juvenal, at least in his texts, is invisible.

In *Satire 9*, echoes of the Imperial household were discernible in Juvenal’s satiric picture of the household of Virro. But Juvenal had already transferred his criticism from the private to the Imperial sphere once before, and far more explicitly, in the fourth *Satire*. As I argue in the next chapter, Juvenal uses this poem to critique a different strand of contemporary rhetoric: panegyric. His picture of the incompetent and imperiled flatterers of Domitian reflect the conditions under which contemporary panegyrists, such as Pliny, produce panegyric for a new emperor, Trajan. Central elements of the poem, particularly the divinity of the emperor, reproduce, in satiric fashion, contemporary ideological concerns about how to represent the emperor in the new, post-tyrannical, Trajanic regime. But Juvenal also adopts the magnifying, fictionalizing voice of the panegyrist, and his own unbalanced and swollen poem mirrors panegyric’s own lack of proportion. Juvenal inhabits a new voice, and, restlessly, shifts the target of his critique.

⁹¹ Whitmarsh (2005: 32).

3. *Satire Four: Playing the Panegyrist*

In order to provide a suitably lofty beginning for his undertaking, when Juvenal begins his account of the summit meeting of Domitian in *Satire four*, in which his senators debate how to cook a giant turbot, the satirist invokes the Muse Calliope. There is an obvious (and humorous) disjunction here between the grandiosity of the epic invocation and the ridiculousness of Domitian's frantic summit meeting on the fate of the fish. A poet truly inspired can give an epic sheen to even the most trivial or absurd of the emperor's exploits. If Domitian's triumph over the Chatti was as much of a charade as later writers claimed, then Statius' panegyric epic on the war, the *De Bello Germanico*, will have demonstrated that point very nicely.¹ But these lines are also a fitting introduction to Juvenal's account of the *concilium* in that they exemplify the kind of pretense, flattery and anxiety that Juvenal will depict constantly amongst those addressing the Emperor:

*Incipe, Calliope. licet et considerare: non est
cantandum, res vera agitur. narrate, puellae
Pierides, prosit mihi vos dixisse puellas.* (4.34-5)

Begin, Calliope! And you can sit down, too.

This isn't a poetry recitation – this is the truth.

Tell the story, young ladies of Pieria! (and may it

¹ Suetonius (*Dom.* 6.1) said that Domitian launched a campaign against the Chatti 'unprovoked' (*sponte*) and his successes were 'variable' (*varia*). Afterwards, when he celebrated his double triumph over the Chatti and the Dacians in 89, Tacitus (*Agr.* 39) famously describes people being bought from traders and dressed up to impersonate captives. It is generally accepted that Statius' panegyric epic, the *De Bello Germanico* (of which four lines survive, see below) celebrated this very victory (but cf. Hardie 1983: 61, who posits an earlier date of 83).

benefit me to have called you young ladies).

The court poet survives by artfully twisting the truth to please his audience and benefit himself. Juvenal in these lines represents that figure's satirical extreme, a speaker whose audaciousness is matched only by his incompetent transparency. The irony of *non est cantandum* ('this is not a poetry recitation') is, of course, that this *is* a poetry recitation, insofar as what we are hearing is a satire written in verse. This speaker therefore begins by challenging what we think we are hearing or seeing: *ceci n'est pas une pipe*. After barking out commands to the venerable Muses (*incipe...licet considerare...narrate*), the speaker then tries to win favor by drawing attention to his addressing the Muses, who are as old as poetry itself, as 'young ladies'. 'A poor joke' says Courtney, reasonably enough; but the lameness of this rhetorical move is, in a sense, the whole point. This is precisely the kind of blatant flattery that the characters in the *concilium* will offer all throughout the poem in their praise of the fish and of Domitian himself. The only difference is that here the speaker is humorously transparent in his self-interest, drawing attention to the flattering word *puellae* and then asking that it 'benefit him' (*prosit*) to have said it.

There is also palpable irony in the insistence that the subject matter of the poem is not fiction, but *res vera* ('something true'). Although there is a tradition of asserting the truth at the opening of fabulous narratives to parody historians (we might think of Lucian's *True History*, or the similar assertion at the opening of Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* that *haec ita vera*, 1.1), the habitual need to assert that what one was speaking was sincere and true had become characteristic of panegyric in this period. For Bartsch (1994: 149-162), the *Panegyricus* of

Pliny is obsessively keen to highlight its own sincerity, to such an extent, in fact, that it ends up testifying to a ‘widespread consciousness that the time when sincerity was possible is itself a lost feature of the more distant past’ (162). A similar preoccupation is evident in Pliny’s letters. When speaking about his panegyric, he emphasizes that he delivered ‘true praise’ (*veris laudibus*, 3.18.2) and says, more generally about panegyric, that ‘something that was so hated as false, has now become so beloved, as something true’.² When writing to Caninius Rufus, who is planning a panegyric on Trajan’s Dacian wars, Pliny advises him to adopt full poetic trappings in praising the emperor. In a manner close to Juvenal’s invocation of Calliope, Pliny tells him to invoke the gods to aid him in his poetic task, numbering Trajan himself amongst those immortals who could lend inspiration. But, though the style may take flight, Pliny again insists on the truth and sincerity of the panegyric, hailing Rufus’ putative subject matter as ‘so much the stuff of poets and stories, yet its facts are absolutely true’.³

As Juvenal begins his account of the council of Domitian, the voice he adopts is similar to that of the panegyrist, who strenuously asserts the truth of his poetic account of the Roman ruler. Yet this speaker is, at the same time, a parodic panegyrist, who incompetently lays bare the self-interest motivating his flattery. This invocation is therefore an apt beginning to a *Satire* that critiques the culture of praise in Trajanic Rome; for, although the poem rails

² 3.18.7-8: *res antea tam invisum quam falsa, nunc ut vera ita amabilis facta est*. On ‘truth’ and ‘falsity’ in antiquity, see Gill & Wiseman (1993). Panegyric is often negatively associated with falsity in antiquity, as Rees (2010: 105-8) demonstrates; cf. Lucian, *De hist.conscr.* 40-41. Although Pliny’s is the only Imperial Latin prose panegyric to survive in full (before Late Antiquity), Pliny says that the content of panegyrics was *nota, vulgata, dicta* (‘known, common, and said before’: *Ep.* 3.13.2). As Cameron says, ‘it is hard to get a real sense of the extent to which these showpieces of oratory... were regular concomitants of urban life’ (1991: 82).

³ 8.4.1-2: *tam poetica et quamquam in verissimis rebus tam fabulosa materia*. Tacitus (*Agric.* 39) describes the triumph of Domitian that Statius commemorated in his verse panegyric as ‘false’ (*falsum*); it would have been interesting to see how Statius’ poem labored to make that event, retrospectively, ‘true’.

vigorously against the emperor Domitian, the poem's aim is not to attack that safe target, but rather to illustrate the similarity between satire and panegyric, to parody typical motifs of panegyric discourse, and to expose the conditions under which panegyric was produced. This target is evident even in the apparently disconnected opening attack on the Egyptian parvenu Crispinus (1-33), in which the speaker demonstrates the same skills he will later employ in the account of Domitian – a talent for magnification of the insignificant, with an over-exaggerated rhetorical vigor that seeks to demonstrate its own sincerity.⁴

The *Satire* also parodies specific panegyric motifs. The poem's central conceit, of a huge turbot miraculously presenting itself for the consumption of the emperor, alludes to the widespread notion of the Emperor's divine control over the natural world. Prodigies and miracles were a stock ingredient of panegyric from Hellenistic times; but panegyrists since the Flavian period tended to attribute such miracles to the divine agency of the Emperor himself.⁵ The fourth *Satire* deflates this idea with its grandiose account of a most banal miracle, the catching and cooking of a big fish, and the disjunction between the epic apparatus and this extreme banality serves to emphasize the flexibility of the rhetoric of imperial 'miracles'. Moreover, the nightmarish and chaotic fluidity Juvenal depicts between humans and the natural world – fish and courtiers are identified with one another, and the

⁴ On the structure of the poem, see Anderson (1957: 71), who argues for the chiasmic alternation of serious and trivial attacks in the sections on Crispinus and Domitian (*scelera:nugae :: nugae:scelera*). But the poem's sense of disproportion and imbalance is more central to its meaning than this schema would suggest; and in any case, as I argue here, the real sting of the poem comes in its elaborate and over-extended treatment of *nugae*, not *scelera*.

⁵ See Cic, *Part. Or.* 73: 'Even more frequently one should add ornamental details [to a panegyric], such as amazing or unexpected events; things foreshadowed by omens, prodigies or oracles; or things which will seem to have happened through divine influence or fate' (*adhibendendaque frequentius etiam illa ornamenta rerum sunt, sive quae admirabilia et nec opinata, sive significata monstris, prodigiis, oraculis, sive quae videbuntur ei de quo agimus accidisse divina atque fatalia*). Statius, *Silvae* 1.6 is a striking example, in which the Emperor's beneficence at the Saturnalia is celebrated as if a series of miraculous natural events.

turbot becomes a simulacrum of Rome – makes a mockery of panegyrists’ image of an ordered natural world under the emperor’s divine control. Juvenal’s parody is also very timely, since, in the wake of Domitian’s openly divine aspirations, the issue of whether the emperor should be characterized as divine was a particularly sensitive one. The first audience of Juvenal’s *Satire* would have been reminded of the most prominent recent example of the form, the *Panegyricus* of Pliny, where the representation of the divinity of the emperor represents a kind of ideological crux.⁶ As Rees (2001) has shown, Pliny touts Trajan’s unpretentious “*civilitas*” at some points in the speech, but at others casts the emperor in the role of divine, omnipotent divinity, taking care not to draw attention to the contradiction between the two.⁷ Pliny walked a high-wire of panegyric tact. Exactly where sensitivity was required, Juvenal’s parodic panegyrist is tactlessly blunt.

Moreover, the council structure of the bulk of the poem, in which we see Domitian’s courtiers responding to this prodigy and addressing the emperor, allows Juvenal to parody the conditions of encomiastic speech in Imperial Rome.⁸ The courtiers’ praise of the fish is

⁶ Pliny’s *Panegyricus* was delivered in 100, both as a speech of thanksgiving to Trajan for Pliny’s appointment to the suffect consulship, and as a protreptic to Pliny’s particular vision of the Roman state at the outset of Trajan’s reign. Pliny was reworking and giving recitations of the speech over the next two years at least (Sherwin-White 1966: 250).

⁷ On the ideal of the *civilis princeps*, see Wallace-Hadrill (1982). On the subject of Pliny’s description of Trajan as divine in the *Panegyricus*, Bartsch comments: ‘In large measure, Pliny’s effusions are different from prior ones only in that their author announces their absence before he unveils their presence’ (1994: 164). Waters (1969: 397) argued that, despite representations of Trajan such as that of Pliny, he did not in fact discourage contemporaries from presenting him as divine. Indeed, Roche (2003b) suggests that Trajan promoted an even more autocratic image of himself as divine than his predecessor: ‘...in the supremacy of the notion of his super-human status and divine selection, Trajan, more so than Domitian, proved himself to be the paradigm of late-antique and medieval representations of supreme power and kingship’ (at 446).

⁸ I should confess that there is a certain fluidity in my discussion between ‘flattery’, ‘praise’ and ‘panegyric’, but it is one which is mirrored in the fourth *Satire* itself. It is true that the *Satire* does not literally depict the delivery of a panegyric, in the sense of a prepared piece of rhetorical praise; rather, we are shown courtiers more informally and spontaneously flattering the emperor in a council setting, but the satire works constantly to expose the artifice behind this ‘spontaneous’ flattery through its allusions to recognizable panegyric tropes.

sycophantic, hyperbolic, and even patently detached from reality, as in the case of the blind courtier Catullus, who delivers his encomium of the fish looking the wrong way. Moreover, Juvenal emphasizes at every turn the atmosphere of compulsion and antagonism in which aristocrats play their roles as flattering courtiers (their *partes*, line 2). Fear lies behind the courtiers' praise, and hatred courses below the emperor's benign façade. At the conclusion of this puppet show, the pretenses of both parties are punctured: for all the aristocrats' flattery, the emperor is imagined drenched in their blood, their efforts at survival in vain. Meanwhile, the emperor himself lies assassinated at the poem's end, not at the hands of the ultimately ineffective aristocracy, but of rebelling workmen, the *cerdones*, whose very namelessness signals their alienation from this world of distinguished, but impotent, elites. Brutal reality intervenes – except for Juvenal himself, who is as elusive and invisible as ever. He is referred to only fleetingly here, as the 'little brother of a giant' (*fraterculus gigantis*, 98), and the associations of this phrase with both mockery and gigantomachy capture his satiric stance against those who felt compelled to hail emperors as gods.

It should be stated from the outset that, despite any perceived opposition between encomium and invective, the poem's vicious attacks on the emperor Domitian bolster rather than diminish its connections to panegyric. It is no coincidence that the most extreme expressions of hatred in the poem – the picture of Domitian 'mangling the half-dead world' (37-8) like a wild animal, and his corpse drenched in the blood of others (154) – recall not invective but (as the commentators note) Pliny's *Panegyricus*. Pliny presented Domitian in that speech as 'that most enormous beast', who, 'hidden away as if in a kind of cave, would lick up his relative's blood at one moment, then emerged at another moment to murder and kill the

leading citizens'.⁹ The denigration of predecessors was an accepted institution of the Empire, and yet it acquires a particular emotional significance in panegyric, where the vigorous hatred of a previous emperor can seem to guarantee the sincerity of love for the current one. Pliny heralds the freedom Trajan has established for citizens to attack previous emperors and, indeed, says that it is their duty to do so. As he puts it, 'no-one loves good emperors enough, if they do not hate the bad emperors' (*Paneg.* 53.2: *neque enim satis amarit bonos principes, qui malos satis non oderit*).¹⁰ The *satis...satis* correlative construction challenges subjects to balance love and hate in equal proportion, and in the final paragraph of Pliny's speech, the panegyrist himself claims to have done just that: 'I love the best emperor, then, to the same extent that I hate the worst one'.¹¹ Pliny describes it as the 'first duty of pious citizens' to attack predecessors who are unlike the current emperor.¹² Panegyric itself, subversively, turns the satiric impulse to criticize into a badge of enthusiastic adherence to the current regime.

Because of this kinship between satire and panegyric, Braund (1993) argued that Juvenal's poem – indeed, Roman satire in general – fulfils essentially the same conservative social function as panegyric, denigrating the previous emperor and praising the current one. Moreover, while Trajan himself is absent from Juvenal's poem, his damning vision of Domitian implicitly commends the opposite virtues to Trajan, in a kind of fun-house *speculum principis*; thus the satire can 'be viewed as a disguised form of flattery and

⁹ *Paneg.* 48.3: *illa immanissima belua...cum velut quodam specu inclusa nunc propinquorum sanguinem lamberet, nunc se ad clarissimorum civium strages caedesque proferret.*

¹⁰ Cf. at 53.5: Pliny reckons it among Trajan's greatest gifts to his citizens that they can avenge themselves every day (*cotidie*) on the wicked emperors of the past.

¹¹ *Paneg.* 95. 4: *si denique in tantum diligo optimum principem, in quantum invisus pessimo fui.*

¹² *Paneg.* 53.2: *primum...piorum civium officium est, insequi dissimiles.*

affirmation of the present regime' (at 68).¹³ Of course, Braund's reading raises a key issue: the absence of Trajan in the poem. For as much as the poem tempts us to see satire and panegyric as flip sides of the same rhetorical coin, the silence of any explicit flattery of Trajan is a determinative difference between the two forms. We see the techniques of the panegyrist, but there is a god-shaped blank where the emperor should be. Rather than reading this silence as implicit flattery, I argue here that by forcing attention precisely on the techniques of panegyric speech, it is the speakers themselves who become the object of Juvenal's satire. Juvenal parodies a rhetorical culture of magnifying and fictionalizing in a poem that has at its center not the glorious picture of a benevolent ruler, but the debate over a giant fish – an incident not only banal, but obviously and pointedly untrue; and here contemporary panegyrists are meant to see their own unflattering mirror.

1. The Art of Exaggeration

Juvenal's attack on Crispinus in the first part of *Satire* four is a bravura display of blame against a whipping boy of little consequence, except to establish credentials for the speaker in expressing *odium* against the inner circle of a previous regime. If attacking predecessors is a pious duty, then Juvenal's excessive expression of hatred demonstrates, with a sardonic grin, just how good a citizen he can be. Yet given Crispinus' ultimate lack of consequence, this extravagantly vehement attack also demonstrates the speaker's abilities in inflation and magnification, valuable skills in a genre that 'rendered exaggeration an art form' (Rees 2002:

¹³ On denigration of predecessor in Juvenal, see also Ramage (1989). Fitzgerald (2007: 114-5) argues that Martial's intermingling of panegyric themes with epigrams attacking private figures similarly highlights the connection between panegyric and invective, which 'can seem to be two versions of the same thing'.

26). Crispinus is later seen in Domitian's inner council (108-9), but here he is attacked for his own crimes. Juvenal hails Crispinus' *adventus* with 'exclamatory syntax':¹⁴

*Ecce iterum Crispinus, et est mihi saepe vocandus
ad partes, monstrum nulla virtute redemptum
a vitiis, 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?
nemo malus felix, minime corruptor et idem
incestus, cum quo nuper vittata iacebat
sanguine adhuc vivo terram subitura sacerdos (4.1-10).*

Look! Here's Crispinus again – I summon him often to play a part. He's a monster. His vices are unredeemed by a single virtue. He's weak and effeminate, strong only in his lust, an adulterer who spurns only the unmarried. So what does it matter how long his colonnades are, where he exhausts his cattle, or how big the shaded grove where he's carried, or the extensive house and estate he's purchased close to the forum? No-one wicked is happy, least of all a seducer, and an impious one at that. A priestess recently slept with him, in her veil;

¹⁴ On exclamatory syntax in panegyric, used 'to elevate narrative into celebration', see Rees (2010: 116-8).

now, with the blood still pumping, she'll go down under the earth.

In the first *Satire*, Crispinus was introduced as a native of Canopus in Egypt, given to the tasteless flaunting of his newfound wealth. Although the name Crispinus is frequent in Roman verse satire, Juvenal's character may well be the same Crispinus mentioned in Martial, who has access to the ear of Domitian and also owns a purple Tyrian cloak.¹⁵ No other contemporary seems to have thought him especially important. Yet, while previously guilty only of gaucherie, the excited rhetoric of *Satire 4* now transforms this Crispinus into a 'monster', a man of such vile and universal criminality that his faults are not redeemed by 'a single virtue' (2). Juvenal, excited and outraged, indicts Crispinus for the seduction of a Vestal Virgin, who will be condemned and buried alive (8-10) – a satisfactorily plausible allegation since Domitian had tried others on similar charges, though in fact no other source supports any connection between a Crispinus and those cases.¹⁶ 'No-one wicked is happy, least of all a seducer, and an impious one at that', moralizes the speaker (8-9), adopting a tone of suitably grave sententiousness. Yet he also slyly acknowledges Crispinus' insignificance, in such a way as to undercut the vigorous denunciation. He is a 'character' (*persona*, 15),¹⁷ whom the satirist brings on stage to play 'a part' (2), as he has done in the past (*iterum*, 1). He merely fulfils a function: to demonstrate the speaker's capacity for ostentatious invective in a genre in which hatred of a predecessor's regime was a badge of the

¹⁵ Mart. 7.99, 8.48; cf. *Sat.* 1.27 (*Tyrias lacernas*); for a survey of different theories of the identity of Juvenal's Crispinus, see Ferguson (1987: 72-3).

¹⁶ See Courtney ad loc., who concludes rather generously that gossip must have linked Crispinus to the Domitianic trials against Vestals (Plin., *Ep.* 4.11, Suet. *Dom.* 8).

¹⁷ OLD s.v. *persona* 2(a).

speaker's sincerity. 'What does it matter' that Crispinus has made a lot of money, Juvenal asks sarcastically (*quid refert*, 5)? The question tempts a truthful answer.

We might expect the excited speaker to escalate, and progress with outrage to some greater scandal, but instead Juvenal says explicitly that he will begin discussing facts that are 'more trivial' (11).¹⁸ The *monstrum* suddenly shrinks; Juvenal is consciously manipulating size and perspective. All the more ironically, then, the satirist confesses that Crispinus' unspeakable badness can be expressed only by exaggeration:

*quid agas, cum dira et foedior omni
crimine persona est? mullum sex milibus emit,
aequantem sane paribus sestertia libris
ut perhibent qui de magnis maiora locuntur* (4.14-7).

What can you do, when a character is more frightful and foul
than every one of his crimes? He bought a mullet for 6 000 sesterces!
Its cost was certainly matched by its weight
(as people say who make big things seem even bigger).

Now that Juvenal is, he admits, talking about small matters (*levioribus*), he is keen to demonstrate the art of overstatement and his ability to make everything seem as big as possible. Crispinus, who formerly hawked fish at Egyptian markets in a big voice (*magna...voce*, 32), is now the 'scoundrel of the big Palace' (*magni scurra Palati*, 31). He

¹⁸ 4.11: *sed nunc de factis levioribus*.

could send the big fish to his ‘big’ girlfriend (*magnae...amicae*, 20); the litter in which she rides is an entire ‘cave’, with windows that are ‘wide’ (*latis specularibus antro*, 21). The speaker is like a child with a magnifying glass, delighting in his ability to increase the size of anything he chooses. His rhetoric is a blur of quantities and amounts, on a scale that is constantly and quickly shifting: a fisherman could be bought for ‘less’ (*minoris*, 25) than the fish, which is ‘how much’ (*tanti*, 26) land in the provinces costs, though you could buy ‘more’ (*maiores*, 27) in Apulia. Crispinus squanders ‘so many’ (*tot*, 29) sesterces, but this fish is a ‘tiny’ (*exiguam*, 30) portion, a side dish to a ‘moderate’ (*modicae*, 30) dinner. Of course, the greatest increase will come when Crispinus is inflated to the size of the emperor, since (as the explicit comparison makes clear, 28-9), Crispinus is himself a miniaturized version of Domitian. This play with proportions seems independent of what it describes: exaggeration is an art in itself.

Expending so much rhetorical energy on Crispinus establishes the speaker’s credentials from the first as a piously hateful detractor of the predecessor’s regime, and yet the very insignificance of this whipping boy makes the grandiose abuse seem hollow. Moreover, the world this character inhabits seems transparently unreal. At the climax of the invective, Juvenal exclaims that this Crispinus has now become the *princeps equitum* (32), as if his assuming the post were the summit of indignity. Is this a poetic way of referring to the *magister equitum*, or perhaps a humorously miniaturized version of Domitian’s role (the ‘emperor of the *equites*’)? In any case, no such post exists.¹⁹ The title joins a long list of fake or misnamed government positions in the poem, a cumulative vagueness that suggests that the satire (like panegyric) occupies a rhetorical Rome recognizably of its own construction.

¹⁹ See Courtney ad loc. on this problem (it ‘is not an official title and probably has no special significance’).

So, the censor is referred to by an otherwise unprecedented periphrasis, *iudex morum* (12), the *pontifex maximus* is called instead the *pontifex summus* (46), and, for *imperator*, Juvenal uses *induperator* (29), an Ennian archaism unseen in extant Latin verse since Lucretius.²⁰ Later, the satirist ironically creates a cast of possible positions: the fisherman is ‘master of boat and line’ (*cumbae linq̄ue magister*, 45), the shores teem with ‘investigators of seaweed’ (*algael inquisitores*, 48-9), the urban prefect is scornfully called the *vilicus urbi* (‘city slavemaster’, 77), and a new position of official potter is suggested (135). Of course, the detachment from reality is nowhere clearer than in the description of Domitian’s inner circle of advisors being summoned for an urgent meeting about how to cook a giant turbot. But once the underlying panegyric trope of the emperor’s power over nature is recognized, the very fantasy of this scene becomes a parody of the fantastic elements of panegyric itself.

2. The Emperor over Nature

At lines 65-69 the fisherman who caught the huge turbot approaches the Emperor and, in his address, slips naturally into a tried and tested topos:

tum Picens “accipe” dixit
“privatis maiora focis. genialis agatur
iste dies. propera stomachum laxare sagina
et tua servatum consume in saecula rhombum.
ipse capi voluit”. (4.65-9)

²⁰ TLL s.v. *induperator*.

Then the man from Picenum said: “Receive this,
 too big for private citizens’ homes. Let this day be
 a holiday. Hurry up and expand your stomach with this
 stuffing. Consume the turbot which was saved for your
 era! It itself wanted to be caught”.

Although we do not hear Domitian’s reaction, Juvenal follows the speech with a cynical comment suggesting that such speeches are wont to be accepted by the emperor. As he puts it, ‘there is nothing “power equal to the gods” could not believe about itself when it is being praised’ (*nihil est quod credere de se/ non possit cum laudatur dis aequa potestas*, 70-1). This last phrase (*dis aequa potestas*) is reeled off ironically as a kind of panegyric cliché, though it almost exactly matches a phrase Pliny uses about Trajan in the *Panegyricus*.²¹ It serves to characterize the speech as an example of a wider, contemporary panegyric strategy in which the emperor is hailed as a god, or the representative of a god, or manifesting powers equal to a god. Thus, according to the fisherman, it is not only humans who recognize the divinity of their *dominus et deus*: even fish ‘wish to be caught’, a miraculous inversion of their native instincts.²² As has long been recognized, this rather unlikely idea finds parallels in a variety of other texts. Wild animals offering themselves up for capture or curbing their native tendencies were frequently cited in the period as visible manifestations of the emperor’s divine nature (his *numen*). Leopards endure the yoke, tigers bear the whip, bison draw carts, lions caress hares – not witches’ powers or rhetorical

²¹ *Paneg.* 4.4: *aequata dis immortalibus potestas*. It is hard to capture the rhetorical force of the word order in Latin – one assumes (on the basis of *illi* in line 69) that the Emperor himself will be the subject, until, in the very last word of the sentence, Juvenal replaces him with personified ‘power’ (*potestas*).

²² On Domitian’s title, *dominus et deus* (‘master and god’) see Scott (1975: 102-112).

adynata, but presented literally in a poem of Martial as praise of Domitian.²³ Another of Martial's texts (4.30) is particularly close to the fisherman's speech in Juvenal's satire. Here, Martial posits a supernatural relationship between Domitian and the fish in his Imperial fishpond (*piscina*). Just as the fish in the fourth satire is said to have been preserved specifically for Domitian's reign (line 68), the fish in Martial's poems are claimed as sacred fish (*sacrae pisces*), and an attempt by a mortal to poach them from the pond is an act of sacrilege. These fish 'recognize their master', and swim up to him to lick his hand – a hand, Martial says, 'than which nothing on the earth is greater'.²⁴

It is worth quoting another, even closer parallel to Juvenal's passage, taken from Oppian's didactic fish poem, the *Halieutica*. Although Oppian's text belongs to the latter part of the second century,²⁵ Oppian is clearly manipulating the same panegyric motif:

νήα μὲν εὐγόμεφωτον, εὐζυγον, ἔξοχα κούφην,
 αἰζηοὶ κώπησιν ἐπειγομένης ἐλόωσι,
 νῶτον ἀλὸς θείνοντες· ὁ δ' ἐν πρύμνησιν ἄριστος
 ἰθυντήρ ἀλίαστον ἄγει καὶ ἀμεμφέα νήα
 χῶρον ἐς εὐρύαλόν τε καὶ εὐδία πορφύροντα·

²³ Mart. 1.104. As Martial puts it in the last lines, 'this mildness is not obtained by art; rather, the lions know whom they serve' (*haec clementia non paratur arte/ sed norunt cui serviant leones*). Cf. e.g. Mart. *De Spect.* 17 on an elephant apparently supplicating the emperor in the arena: *nostrum sentit et ille deum* ('it too knows our god'); *De Spect.* 30 on a doe falling before Caesar as a suppliant (*supplex*). The fundamental study of animals' recognition of the emperor's power is Otto Weinreich's 'Die Tiere und das Numen des Kaisers', where many other examples are to be found (1928: 74-170).

²⁴ 4.30.4-5: *qui [sc. pisces] norunt dominum manumque lambunt/ illam, qua nihil est in orbe maius*. Some readers may have seen a sly recollection of Tiberius' own 'little fish', as he is said to have called them: boys on Capri who were trained to slip between his thighs, lick and bite him while he was in the swimming pool (Suet. *Tib.* 44).

²⁵ The *communis opinio* supports a date between 176 and 180 A.D. Oppian's passage here addresses Marcus Aurelius and his son, Commodus.

ἔνθα δὲ δαιτυμόνων νεπόδων ἀπερείσια φύλα
 φέρεται, οὓς θεράποντες ἀεὶ κομέουσιν, ἐδωδῆ
 πολλῇ παίνοντες, ἐτοιμότατον χορὸν ἄγρης (65)
 σοὶ τε, μάκαρ, καὶ παιδὶ μεγαυχεῖ, πώεα θήρης.
 αὐτίκα γὰρ χειρὸς μὲν εὐπλοκὸν εἰς ἄλλα πέμπεις
 ὀρμῆν, ὃ δὲ ῥίμφα γένυν κατεδέξατο χαλκοῦ
 ἰχθὺς ἀντιάσας, τάχα δ' ἔλκεται ἐκ βασιλῆος
 οὐκ ἀέκων, σέο δ' ἦτορ ἰαίνεται, ὄρχαμε γαίης (*Hal.* 1.58-70)

The young men drive a ship well-riveted, well-benched,
 exceedingly light, with racing oars striking the back of the sea.
 An excellent steersman guides the ship, unabating and
 unwavering, into the broad expanse of gently swelling waves.
 There, boundless tribes of feasting fish are fed. Servants constantly
 attend to them, fattening them up with an abundance of food: a
 very ready chorus for the catch, blessed one, a herd for the hunt,
 for you and your glorious son. For as soon as you send the well-wound
 fishing-line into the sea, a fish meets and receives the jaw
 of the bronze hook. Swiftly and willingly, it is dragged forth by the
 emperor, and your heart delights, leader of earth.

There is a tendency when analyzing satire to ‘straighten out’ the objects of the parody in order to throw the satirist’s own techniques into higher relief. By emphasizing the clever job the satirist has done on the target texts, these texts’ own ironies tend to disappear. It should

be noted, then, that Martial's panegyric epigrams are notable for their shots of wit,²⁶ and certainly the ironies multiply thick and fast in this passage of Oppian. We open to Odyssean vistas, with sailors in well-benched ships sailing over the broad back of the sea and a valiant steersman at the helm – before we realize that we are not on the wine-dark sea, but rather in an imperial fishpond, serviced by staff.²⁷ 'I do not go fishing with fleets', said Thyestes with apparent hyperbole, conjuring up the proclivities of tyrants – Oppian brings this image to life.²⁸ The fish that the emperor will catch are fattened up specifically for this purpose by attendants at the pond (indeed, the fish dine on an abundant supply of someone else's food, like suitors), and they literally catch themselves, in stark contrast to the danger and exertion of the actual open-sea fishermen described in the section immediately preceding this one. The Homeric set-up for the emperor's effortless expedition is all an act – there is even a chorus (line 65). With this ironic juxtaposition of the grandiosely epic and the banal, Oppian comes close in tone to Juvenal himself.

To return to Juvenal's passage, the context of the fisherman's speech also gives it an ironic edge. But the irony here is brutal: the fisherman urges Domitian to accept a gift which a network of imperial spies has compelled him to make in the first place (48-52), and, as Juvenal says, the fisherman gives the gift *ne pereat* (56), an ominously open-ended phrase that could mean 'so that it would not go to waste' or 'so that he would not die'. The fish is 'too big for private citizens' hearths', a jibe at Domitian's gross elevation of himself above

²⁶ See the Watsons (2003: 11-12) on Martial's propensity for 'encomium...harnessed to wit'; also Lorenz (2002).

²⁷ ἐν τῷ βιβαλίῳ ('in the wild-life reserve') comments the scholiast, and this seems to be the necessary implication of lines 63-6. The enjambment of φέρεται in lines 63-4 underlines the bathetic shift from open sea to tended fishpond. On the strong Homeric coloring in the vocabulary of this passage, see Bartley (2003: 38-41).

²⁸ Sen. *Thy.* 459: *non classibus piscamur*. Nero (Suet. *Ner.* 30) is said to have gone fishing with a net interwoven with golden, scarlet and purple threads.

ordinary *cives*, something for which Pliny pillories Domitian in his *Panegyricus*, and perhaps also a reminder of the presentation of Domitian amongst his panegyrists as physically larger than other people.²⁹ There is humor also in the image of this humble fisherman adopting a well-known panegyric conceit as soon as he begins to speak to the Emperor, as if the topos is so stale that it comes ‘naturally’, and to anyone in the Empire. He will use the fish he has caught to ‘catch’ the emperor with his fatuous flattery.³⁰ Yet he is not a practiced speaker, and the bluntness of his speech betrays his nervousness.³¹ The use of the strange circumlocution *laxare stomachum* is palpably double-edged: both ‘stretch your stomach’ and ‘relax your anger’, a desperate and literal *captatio benevolentiae*.³²

The intellectual background to the panegyric motif of the fish’s willingness to be caught lies in the idea that inversions of natural order can signify not impiety or violation, but, in a positive sense, the extent of human, and specifically the emperor’s, control over the natural world. Although the recording of unnatural occurrences as prodigies had always had a role in Roman political life, and the freer medium of verse panegyric also had, at least since the period of the Hellenistic ruler cult, imagined the ruler exercising command over the powers of nature,³³ the open celebration of the emperor’s supernatural status is particular to the

²⁹ See the Watsons (2003) on Mart. 4.30.4-5.

³⁰ Cf. Gowers (1993: 208): ‘Both emperor and fish are willing to be hooked’. On the semantic flexibility of the words ‘catch’ and ‘capture’, which are also used to mean ‘to secure by flattery’, see *OLD* s.v. *capere* (17), *captare* (9).

³¹ Note the profusion of (contradictory?) commands: accept! (*accipe*); let today be a holiday (*genialis agatur dies*); hurry! (*propera*); relax (*laxare*); eat! (*consume*).

³² Winkler (1995: 69) suggests that the phrase could also have uncomfortable scatological associations: the verb is reminiscent of descriptions of laxatives; cf. *laxandis intestinis* (Pliny, *NH* 8.129); *laxamentum ventris* (Macrob. *Sat.* 7.11).

³³ Relevantly, command over the proverbially uncontrollable sea is claimed for leaders in extant verse panegyric. So, cf. Theocr. 17.91-2: ‘the entire sea and the earth and the roaring rivers are ruled by Ptolemy’; *Paneg. Mess.* 124-5: on the day Messala was made consul, ‘the winding rivers did not pursue

Flavian period. Indeed, earlier Imperial thinkers, particularly under Nero, had warned precisely against vaulting human achievement or control above that of nature.

So, Seneca's letters consistently promote the idea that life ought to be lived according to nature; 'do you think it more just', he asks Lucilius, 'for you to obey nature, or for nature to obey you?'³⁴ Nature, for her part, is 'unyielding, cannot be conquered, demands her due'.³⁵

According to Pliny the Elder, nature has a providential relationship with man; at its best, the human race, in both artistic and imperial achievements, can seek only to equal, but not to exceed, the supreme *artifex*, Nature. Those who pervert the natural order earn Pliny's condemnation. Describing man's invasion into the *viscera* of the earth by mining, for example, Pliny grimly describes men as 'conquerors gazing at the ruins of nature'.³⁶ This invocation for men to live in accordance with nature is part of a universalizing vision that extends to and includes the Emperor himself. As Seneca elaborates in his *De Clementia*, addressed to Nero, it was Nature who conceived of the idea of a king (he adduces as proof the natural superiority of the king – we would say queen – bee over the worker bee), but rulers should equally be constrained by the 'law of Nature' (*naturae legem*), and look to nature for precedents of beneficent rule.³⁷

The Flavian verse panegyrists' image of nature's defeat as an index of aesthetic and imperial achievement is in pointed opposition to the world-view of these Neronian thinkers. In the *Liber Spectaculorum*, Martial celebrates the arena, long the setting for staging various

their usual courses, and even the violent sea stood still, its waves at rest'. By contrast, Cicero in his prose panegyrics is notably reluctant to ascribe divine attributes to leaders: Levene (1997).

³⁴ *Ep.* 93.2: *utrum...aequius iudicas te naturae an tibi paene naturam.*

³⁵ *Ep.* 119.2: [sc. *natura*] *contumax est, non potest vinci, suum poscit.* On living with accordance to nature, see *Ep.* 25.4, 16.7-8, 107.7-12, 119.2-16.

³⁶ *HN* 33.73: *spectant victores ruinam naturae.* On Pliny's conceptualization of nature, see Beagon (1992).

³⁷ See *De Clem.* 1.19.1-6. On Seneca's views of nature, see Rosenmeyer (2000).

miracula, as a space over which, thanks to Roman ingenuity, the laws of nature no longer hold jurisdiction. In epigram 24, Martial uses imagery of natural upheaval to describe the artificial flooding of the arena during naval battles, thus underscoring Roman mastery of what were previously cosmic cataclysms: ‘don’t be deceived’, he says: ‘this was once earth’ (*hic modo terra fuit*, 4). Once the water is drained, you will say, equally, ‘this was once a sea’ (*hic modo pontus fuit*, 6).³⁸ Most illustrative is a poem of Statius (*Silvae* 2.2) celebrating the construction of Pollius Felix’s seaside villa at Surrentum. Nature in that poem is said to ‘give space’ (*dat Natura locum*, 15) for Felix’s home, and a constructed colonnade ‘subdues the harsh rocks with its long spine’ (*longoque domat saxa aspera dorso*, 31). Felix has completely reshaped the landscape, leveling mountains and filling in sea with land, the kind of natural perversion with which earlier moralists had characterized the hubris of tyrants: ‘where you now see lofty woods, here there was not even land’.³⁹ As if impertinently answering Seneca’s warning that Nature cannot be conquered, Statius says in this poem that ‘Nature has favored these places; here, she has been conquered and has ceded to her inhabitant’.⁴⁰ At its heart, such statements embody a different view of nature: no longer divine and all-powerful, *Natura* is merely another aspect of the Empire to be brought under Roman control. As Newmyer (1984) also argues, this Flavian vision of nature submitting to human control enables, and is developed together with, the contemporaneous image of the Emperor himself surpassing Nature in his power and authority. Thus, Statius in the *Silvae*

³⁸ Hinds (2007: 153).

³⁹ *Silv.* 2.2.55-6: *ubi nunc nemora ardua cernis, / hic nec terra fuit*. On the perverse decadence of filling in the sea to acquire land, see Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.33-4. It was always associated with Xerxes. Cf. [Sen]. *Anth. Lat.* 495 [SB], cited by Coleman (2006: 195): *quale fuit regnum, mundo nova ponere iura / "hoc terrae fiat, hoc mare", dixit, erat* ('Such was Xerxes' kingdom, to impose new laws on the earth. / "Let this be land, this, sea", he said, and it was').

⁴⁰ 52-3: *his favit Natura locis, hic victa colenti / cessit*. On the theme of Nature’s domination in the poem, see Newlands (2007: 154-198), Giesecke (2007: 106-9).

hails Domitian as a leader ‘better and more powerful than nature’,⁴¹ and in the *Thebaid* as a ruler ‘wielding power over land and sea’.⁴²

Manolaraki (2008) has recently demonstrated the importance of images of the sea in Pliny’s *Panegyricus*. One of Trajan’s hobbies is sailing, and Pliny approvingly contrasts Trajan’s manly captaining of boats to Domitian, who, as a seasick passenger, was carried passively on the ocean or down the Danube or Rhine (*Paneg.* 81.4-82.5). Trajan sends Domitian’s *delatores* off on boats to be shipwrecked on a stormy sea (34.5-35.1), then later prays for a calm sea for his retiring pretorian prefect (86.3-5). Domitian’s rule is itself described as an unpredictable and stormy sea (66.2-3), which suggests that we are to understand Trajan’s rule as the calm after the storm. The cumulative effect of these references to the sea is, Manolaraki suggests, to “naturalize” Trajan, ‘associating him with both the purity of primal seascapes and their successful control by experienced mariners’ (2008: 391). The images of Trajan navigating and mastering the sea also underscore a particular theological conception of the emperor, which is made explicit at the speech’s end: Trajan is the earthly representative of Jupiter, the ‘parent of the world’, who, ‘if he gazes down on the earth’, controls all ‘with a nod of his head’.⁴³ In the fourth *Satire*, too, the emperor and his courtiers are “naturalized”. But rather than thereby expressing the emperor’s divine control of the elements, there is in Juvenal a nightmarish fluidity between humans and the natural world, and between humans and animals – between the fish the courtiers are carving and the empire

⁴¹ *Silv.* 4.3.135: *natura melior potentiorque*.

⁴² *Theb.* 1.31: *undarum terraeque potens*. Juvenal echoes such epithets for Domitian in *Satire* four, calling the emperor ‘the ruler of seas and lands and peoples’ (*maria ac terras populosque regenti*, 83).

⁴³ *Paneg.* 80.5: *...ille mundi parens temperat nutu, si quando oculos demisit in terras*.

they are ruling.⁴⁴ Having alluded to the panegyric topos of the emperor's divine control over nature, Juvenal juxtaposes this with a vision of natural chaos, in which human and animal have become frighteningly interchangeable.

3. Natural Reversal and Fish Savagery

Juvenal goes to some length in *Satire* four to establish the season in which the fisherman conveys the prodigious turbot from the Black Sea to Domitian's villa in Alba Longa. Yet this description of the natural world is full of striking and unnatural details:

Iam letifero cedente pruinis

Autumno, iam quatarnam sperantibus aegris,

stridebat deformis hiems praedamque recentem

servabat; tamen hic properat, velut urgeat Auster (4.56-9).

Now death-dealing Autumn is ceding to frosts, now the sick are hoping for three-day fevers. Horrid winter was whistling, and was keeping the catch fresh; yet the fisherman hurries along, as if the South Wind was urging him on.

The satirist has already described this fish as bigger than those that are discharged into the Sea of Azov when spring comes and the ice melts in the sun (42-4). Yet now the poet winds

⁴⁴ On the theme of *mundus inversus* in the poem, Winkler (1995) is fundamental, and I am greatly indebted to his observations in the following section.

the year back to winter, which is literally ‘deformed’ – a cliché, but given new life in a poem full of unnatural monstrosities.⁴⁵ Moreover, although, as the commentators note, these lines primarily recalls the similar description of winter in Seneca’s *Apocolocyntosis*,⁴⁶ in both Juvenal and Seneca the ‘now...now’ (*iam...iam*) topos is an inverted allusion to poems such as Catullus 46 that herald the arrival of spring, not winter.⁴⁷ Such poems usually express excitement and hope for the new spring, yet people in Juvenal’s world are excited to see the coming of winter, since it holds the promise of fevers that recur only every three days. The seasons here seem very human – they are ‘death-dealing’ (56), ‘whistling’ (58), ‘guarding’ (59), ‘urging’ (59). Indeed, once we arrive at the *concilium*, we will see their attributes mirrored precisely among Domitian’s inner council: in place of death-dealing autumn (*letifero*, 56), inside the palace we find the death-dealing Catullus (*mortifero*, 113; autumnal Doppelgänger of spring Catullus?). In place of the whistling winter (*stridebat*, 58) we find the informer Pompeius, who could slit throats with a whisper (*susurro*, 110), and instead of fever (*quatarnam*, 57), Domitian’s entire rule is a ‘disease’ (*peste*, 84). Rather than exercising control over the natural world, the court directly replicates the paradoxical, sickening environment surrounding it. The behavior of the fisherman is equally paradoxical, but reflects instead the pressures of being under constant surveillance. The cold winter wind is refrigerating the fish and keeping it fresh, and yet (*tamen*, 59) he hurries. Making this gift is a matter of personal safety. In the court of Domitian, even *talking* about the seasons is

⁴⁵ Winter is frequently described as *infirmis* or *deformis* in Latin literature: see Nisbet & Hubbard (1978: 164). At least according to Servius (ad *Georg.* 3.354), winter is *deformis* by transferred epithet, since the blanketing of snow robs the earth of its proper form.

⁴⁶ *Apocol.* 2.1-6. Cf. *iam* (1)...*iam* (3)...*deformis Hiems* (4).

⁴⁷ Catul. 46: *iam* (1)...*iam* (2)...*iam* (7)...*iam* (8). For anaphora of *iam/ἴδη* as a structural device in poetic descriptions of spring, cf. the epigrams on the arrival of spring in the *Palatine Anthology* (e.g. 10.5, 16), Hor. *Carm.* 1.4; 4.12; Colum.10.196-214.

potentially dangerous. Given the brutality of the tyrant's ear, an *amicus Caesaris* puts 'his life on the line every time he tries to talk about the rains, the heat, the showery spring'.⁴⁸

One survivor is the ancient Crispus (his name is an anagram for *priscus*, 'ancient'), who has lasted eighty years by not speaking his mind at all. Appropriately enough, his life is measured not in years, but in seasons.⁴⁹ Juvenal describes his survival technique as 'never swimming against the rapid flow' (*numquam derexit bracchia contra torrentem*, 89-90), alluding, as Courtney points out, to a Roman proverbial expression (adversity is 'when the stream flows against you').⁵⁰ But the swimming metaphor also assimilates Crispus with the fish that feature so prominently in this poem; compare, for example, Crispus' political inertia with those immobile fish in the ice carried downwards inexorably by 'the Pontic sea's rapid flow' (*torrentis...Ponti*, 43). Crispus' fish characterization is not an isolated case. Throughout the fourth satire, the natural reversal we observed in Juvenal's references to the seasons is mirrored in the way human characters in court are confused with the objects of their excessive desire – fish. Thus, there is a continuity of language between the fish and Domitian's courtiers: the huge turbot is a *monstrum* (45), just as Crispinus (2) and Catullus (115) are described as *monstra*.⁵¹ Indeed, the description of Domitian's courtier as a *grande et conspicuum...monstrum* (115) is an ironic echo of an earlier courtier's grandiose claim that whatever is *conspicuum pulchrumque* in the sea belongs to Domitian (54).⁵² Another man in

⁴⁸ 4.87-8: *de pluviis aut aestibus aut nimbo/ vere locuturi fatum pendebat amici*.

⁴⁹ 4.92-3: 'He saw many winters and his eightieth summer solstice (*multas hiemes atque octogensima vidit/ solstitia*).

⁵⁰ Cf. Otto s.v. *flumen* (7).

⁵¹ Deroux (1983).

⁵² 4.54-5: *quidquid conspicuum pulchrumque est aequore toto/ res fisci est, ubicumque natat* (54-5). It was a legal axiom that the products of the sea were *commune* (see Braund ad loc., citing *Dig.47.10.13.7*), so the joke lies in applying a superficial legal sheen to the purely panegyric topos of the emperor controlling the

court, Montanus, is distinguished by his preternatural ability to determine from taste and sight the native sea-beds and shores of oysters and sea urchins (140-3), an odd communion with sea-life from a man whose very name (*montanus* = ‘the mountain man’) alludes to the natural world. The notorious Crispinus himself, who was described as the ‘plebs of the Nile’ in *Satire one* (*pars Niliacae plebis*, 1.26), and had earlier worked as a seller of fish, appears here wrapped in papyrus, a personification of his old product.⁵³ Crispinus has now worked his way high enough up the social ladder to buy an exorbitantly expensive mullet, but his social success is still measured in scales.⁵⁴

The most grotesque animalization is reserved, though, for Domitian himself. As we have seen, Juvenal echoes Pliny’s vision of Domitian as a bloodthirsty beast in his *Panegyricus*. Elsewhere he resembles a fish. He is offered the turbot by the fisherman as *sagina* (67), ‘the small fry on which larger fish feed’ (Braund 1996: 250). When flattered, Domitian’s ‘crest rises’ (*surgebant cristae*, 70): Sweet (1981: 288-9) notes the parallel with the image of the turbot’s erect dorsal fins at line 128. The turbot, on the other hand, is humanized, described as a ‘runaway’ from the *vivaria* that must be returned to its ‘master’ (50-2), and as a ‘foreigner’ (127), whose capture portends Domitian’s future imperial conquests. Indeed, it is clear that, throughout the entire poem, we should see the huge fish as a metaphor for Domitian’s human subjects. As he debates with his council how to contain, or (his own suggestion, 130) to cut up, this huge turbot, Domitian’s brutal treatment of the Roman world should be at the front of our minds. A particular verbal play ensures the immanent

sea. The speakers here are Armillatus (unknown) and Palfurius (M. Palfurius Sura), known as an orator (Suet. *Dom.* 13.1) and, if we can trust the scholiast, a poet (Wessner 1931: 57).

⁵³ So, Freudenburg (2001: 261). Cf. 4.24: *succinctus patria quondam... papyro*. Papyrus was apparently used as a wrapper of old fish: see Catul. 95.8, Mart.3.2, and Gowers (1993: 205). For Crispinus’ earlier career, see 4.32-3.

⁵⁴ Cf. 4.24-5: *Crispine... hoc pretio squamas?* (Crispinus, did you pay this much for scales?)

identification between turbot and Rome. The word Juvenal uses for turbot is the Greek loan word ‘*rhombus*’, but the same fish is known in Latin (no doubt from its rounded shape) as an *orbis* (Thompson 1947: 223).⁵⁵ The verbal play is particularly prominent in lines 132-3: rather than cut up the turbot, Montanus recommends that a deep bowl be fashioned to contain its *spatiosum orbem* (‘round expanse’/ ‘expansive turbot’/ ‘expansive world’) by means of a *tenui muro* (‘thin wall’). Pliny describes Domitian attempting in vain to enclose himself in his palace by means of ‘barriers and walls’ (*parietibus et muris*, 49.1), but, inevitably, vengeance forces its way through the palace’s ‘narrow openings’ (*apertas fores*). He found protection neither in ‘his divinity, nor his clandestine haunts, nor his vicious retreats’ (an extraordinary phrase).⁵⁶ In the ‘thin’ wall with which the courtiers attempt to contain the giant fish, Juvenal creates a vivid symbol for the fragility and tenuousness of Domitian’s rule.⁵⁷

Moreover, although the fish which Juvenal depicts in his *Satire*, the red mullet (*mullus*, τριγλή) and the turbot, are both synonymous with costliness and luxury, other associations make these fish more fitting objects for the attentions of the court than has been emphasized in previous readings of the poem.⁵⁸ Crispinus pays a kingly sum for a *mullus*, yet, just as his

⁵⁵ Winkler (1995: 76) also points this out. As Gareth Williams suggests to me, the word *rhombus* may itself recall Rome. Cf. Athen. 330b: ‘**Ρ**ωμαῖοι δὲ καλοῦσι τὴν ψήτταν ῥόμβον· καὶ ἔστι τὸ ὄνομα Ἑλληνικόν (‘the **R**omans call the turbot a ‘**r**hombos’, though the word is Greek’). The difference in vowel quantity is no necessary barrier to the verbal play (Ahl 1985: 56).

⁵⁶ *Paneg.* 49.1: *illi divinitas sua...arcana illa cubilia saevique secessus.*

⁵⁷ I owe this observation to Alessandro Schiesaro.

⁵⁸ Fish appear frequently in Roman satire for their association with decadence – see Jones (1990: 47-9), Connors (2005: 124-5, 127-9) – and in stories about tyrants (e.g. Herod. 3.40-4, Suet. *Tib.* 60, *Vit.* 13). As exotic fish were sourced from ever more distant corners of the Roman world, treatises on fish – surprisingly numerous in the Imperial period, as Corcoran (1964) shows – also implicitly became discussions of Rome’s expanding reach, as is especially clear from Atheneaus’ topographically arranged fish catalogue (Wilkins 2008). But only in *Satire* four are fish a predominant symbol for Rome’s tyrants because of their own proverbial viciousness (see below).

own reputation as a wealthy dandy is undercut by the bloody consequences of his sexual misdemeanors, the *mullus*' reputation as a delicacy is undercut by some similarly unpleasant characteristics.⁵⁹ Aelian calls the red mullet the 'most gluttonous of the animals of the sea' (θαλαππίων ζώων...λιχνότατον, *N.A.* 2.41), and Oppian likens it to a pig, 'always mixed up in filth to please its belly' (φυρομένοισιν ἀεὶ περὶ γαστέρος ὀρμήν, 3.440). Like Crispinus, who occupies main stage in the first part of the poem but proves to be a mere bit player once Domitian arrives (108-9), just another crony in the emperor's crooked court, this fish is literally a bottom-feeder: it feeds on the silt at the bottom of the ocean, the lowest form of food available to fish, according to Oppian (*Hal.* 3.432-3). Most damningly, just as Crispinus' debauchery with a Vestal Virgin leads to her being buried alive (*Sat.* 4.8-10), so the mullet, notoriously, is attracted to the smell of death: 'it takes exceeding pleasure in the rotting bodies of men, whenever the sea, which causes men to mourn, takes a victim'.⁶⁰ The turbot's famously prodigious size makes it an equally appropriate fish for Domitian; the image of the emperor mauling the world presents Domitian as monstrously large.⁶¹ The connection between the turbot's size and fierceness and the Roman Empire's size and fierceness is drawn elsewhere: when Lucian and his comrades find themselves inside a whale, they are confronted with various races of fish people including the 'turbot-footed-

⁵⁹ For the *mullus* as a delicacy in Imperial Rome, see the passages collected by Andrews (1948). The fish changes color as it dies, offering morbid pleasure to decadent gourmands (Plin. *HN* 9.66, Sen. *QN* 3.18).

⁶⁰ Opp. *Hal.* 3.435-6: σώμασι δ' ἐκπάγλως ἐπιτέρπεται ἀνδρομέοισι/ πυθομένοις, εὐτ' ἄν τιν' ἔλη στονόεσσα θάλασσα. Similarly, Aelian (*N.A.* 2.41): 'a red mullet would eat the corpse of man or fish' (φάγοι δ' ἄν τρίγλη καὶ ἀνθρώπου νεκροῦ καὶ ἰχθύος). The poet again associates Crispinus morbidly with death later in the poem: he enters the conference smelling of more perfume than 'two funerals' (109).

⁶¹ For the turbot's size, see Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.95, [Ov.], *Hal.* 125. Keller (1913: vol.2, 367) also cites a fragment of Plato Comicus (frag. 114 *PCG* 7, p.480) describing two men who 'live for pleasure, not thinking at all' (οἱ ζῆτε τερπνῶς οὐδὲν ἐνθυμούμενοι), one of whom is apparently nicknamed the turbot (ψῆττα).

folk' (Ψηττόποδες), likely a parody of the Romans, a 'warlike race' who exact tribute from everyone else living in the whale.⁶²

Indeed, the world of fish may provide a better parallel for Domitian's court than it first appears. As Hesiod said, 'The son of Cronus gave this law to men: that fish and beasts and winged birds eat each other, since there is no justice amongst them'.⁶³ In Plutarch's *De Sollertia Animalium*, which stages a debate about whether sea or land animals are *phronimotera*, the character Aristotimus argues that fish 'are completely lacking in grace and affection, and have no share in sweetness. Well did Homer say that "the green-blue sea bore you", referring to a man who seems savage and unsociable, since the sea brings forth nothing well-disposed or gentle' (*De Sollertia Animalium* 970B).⁶⁴ So, while writers about fish, such as Oppian, humanize their subjects, fish society functions as a mirror of human society's worst aspects. 'Among fish', says Oppian, 'there is neither justice, nor shame, nor affection, for all that swim are bitter enemies of each other'.⁶⁵ The author of the pseudo-Ovidian *Halieutica* gives the motif of fishes' savagery some characteristically Ovidian bite. In this poem, fish are presented as belligerent citizens – if the text is correct,⁶⁶ one fish is actually called a citizen, *cive*, 18 – destined constantly to fight each other, with *arma* distributed by the universe itself (*mundus*, 2).

⁶² *VH* 1.36.

⁶³ *Op.* 277-8: τόνδε γὰρ ἀνθρώποισι νόμον διέταξε Κρονίων./ ἰχθύσι μὲν καὶ θηροῖ καὶ οἰωνοῖς πετεηνοῖς/ ἔσθθιν ἀλλήλους, ἐπεὶ οὐ Δίκη ἐστὶ μετ' αὐτοῖς.

⁶⁴ καὶ καλῶς Ὅμηρος εἶπε ἔγλανκῆ δέ σ' ἔτικτε θάλασσα, πρὸς τὸν ἀνήμερον εἶναι δοκοῦντα καὶ ἄμικτον, ὡς μηδὲν τῆς θαλάσσης εὐνοϊκὸν μηδὲ πρᾶον φεροῦσης. Pliny calls the sea 'the most savage part of nature' (*saevissimam rerum naturae partem*, *HN* 36.2).

⁶⁵ *Hal.* 2.43-5: Ἰχθύσι δ' οὔτε δίκη μεταριθμὸς οὔτε τις αἰδῶς, οὐ φιλότης· πάντες γὰρ ἀνάρσοι ἀλλήλοισι δυσμενέες πλώουσιν

⁶⁶ *cive* is Heinsius' conjecture for the manuscripts' nonsensical *q.* or *quem*; see Richmond ad loc.

In Juvenal's vision, Domitian's court bears a close resemblance to that savage society of the fish. As soon as the fisherman catches the huge turbot, we see 'even the shore teeming with informers' (47-8). If the fisherman were to sell the fish or keep it to himself rather than make of it an imperial donation, Juvenal says that 'investigators of seaweed would be scattered about instantly and would commence legal action with an oarsman, with the shirt still off his back'.⁶⁷ They would unjustly contrive a false accusation: that the fish belongs to the imperial *vivarium* and must be returned at once. The *delatores* spawn and reproduce, eating up and chewing out competitors and victims. There as here, justice finds no home. Oppian's judgment could apply to Rome, or sea, or both: 'The stronger always feeds on the weaker. One swims against the other, bringing doom. One furnishes a meal for another'.⁶⁸

4. The Perils of Panegyric Speech

Four lines survive from Statius' panegyric epic, the *De Bello Germanico*, cited on *Sat.* 4.94 in Giorgio Valla's "Probus" commentary:

lumina: Nestorei mitis prudentia Crispi
et Fabius Veiento (potentem signat utrumque
purpura, ter memores implerunt nomine fastos)
et prope Caesareae confinis Acilius aulae.

⁶⁷ 4.48-9: *dispersi protinus algae/ inquisitores agerent cum remige nudo*. The point of *algae inquisitores* is not only, as Courtney says, the proverbial worthlessness of seaweed; rather, as Juvenal implies, these official inquiries themselves proliferate along the seashore like seaweed.

⁶⁸ Opp. *Hal.* 2.45-7: ὁ δὲ κρατερώτερος αἰεὶ/ δαίνυτ' ἀφαιροτέρους, ἄλλω δ' ἐπνήχεται ἄλλος/ πότμον ἄγων, ἕτερος δ' ἐτέρω πόρσυνεν ἔδωδ' ἴν.

...leading lights (?): [next came] the gentle wisdom of Nestor-like Crispus, and Fabius Veiento – the purple marks both out as men of power. Three times they filled the consuls' list, which does not forget. After them came Acilius, closely connected to the circle of Caesar.

Stattius offers a Homeric catalogue of Domitian's advisors, who shuffle past in a kind of procession (*prope*, 4). Juvenal's *concilium* scene in *Satire* 4, though no doubt influenced by previous *concilia deorum* in satire (Lucilius' attacks on Lentulus Lupus, for example, or Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*), is primarily a parody of this section of Stattius' panegyric. All three of Stattius' figures reappear in the fourth *Satire*, again in a kind of procession, though now with little pretense to stateliness or dignity (for *prope...Acilius* in line 4, cf. Juvenal's sped-up, urgent *proximus...properabat Acilius*, 94). Scholarship on Stattius has demonstrated the undercurrents of irony and political observation that pervade his work, and we should be wary of assuming the naïveté of this particular work. Nonetheless, Juvenal uses his parody of Stattius' *concilium* scene to dramatize the conditions under which orators and poets produce panegyric under the Empire. His picture of political figures forced to produce flattering speeches in an antagonistic, competitive, hostile environment, compelled by necessity to fictionalize and falsify what is before their eyes, must have offered a savage demystification of the motivations behind Stattius' original poem. The parody extends to those writers producing panegyrics under Trajan, for although Pliny claimed that endless rhetorical competitions in flattery belonged to the Domitianic past (*Paneg.* 54.5), his own endless panegyric suggests that change in this aspect was, indeed, merely rhetorical.

Before the advisers are summoned to a meeting, the fisherman, as we have seen, makes his approach to Domitian, and claims that ‘the fish wanted to be caught’ (69). Commenting on this speech, the satirist says:

*quid apertius? Et tamen illi
surgebant cristae. nihil est quod credere de se
non possit cum laudatur dis aequa potestas.
sed derat pisci patinae mensura. (69-72)*

What could be more open? And yet the emperor’s crest rose.

There is nothing “power equal to the gods” could not
believe about itself when it is being praised.

But the plate did not measure up to the fish.

As Ahl points out, Domitian’s apparent belief that the fish itself wanted to be caught proves that he is a fool. But ‘the fact that we are not persuaded by the absurd statement does not diminish its persuasiveness. It persuades the person it was designed to persuade’ (1984: 198). Yet, although it may be true that, as Ahl says, ‘the master persuader wields immense power’, Juvenal’s characterization of the fisherman hardly paints him as a master persuader. The parody in these lines extends not merely to the gullible emperor, but also to the panegyrist himself, since the hyperbolic claims he espouses are absurd and self-evidently false. Panegyric thrives on amplification, euphemism, exaggeration; a cynical observer like Juvenal could undercut the whole enterprise. The problem, Juvenal suggests, is one of *mensura*,

‘measure, proportion’ (72). Quintilian had warned aspiring orators that a sense of proportion (*mensura*) had to be retained when employing hyperbole, even despite the fact that hyperbole often moves beyond the believable. Without *mensura*, it can lapse into bad taste and even become laughable.⁶⁹ Juvenal will play on this extended sense of *mensura* again in his eleventh *Satire*, in a passage in which fish and rhetoric also reappear in thematic combination. Whether you are arguing a big case, Juvenal says, or merely buying fish, you must ‘know your own measure’ (*noscenda est mensura sui*, 11.35). The fisherman’s absurd image of the fish wanting to be caught, and the implication of Domitian’s divinity, represents hyperbole beyond the limits of *mensura*. The picture that Juvenal gives us in line 72, of a monstrously large fish too big for its plate, replicates the sense of absurd excess and grotesque lack of fit in the flatterers’ vision of the all-too-human emperor as a god.

‘What could be more open?’ (*Quid apertius?*) Juvenal’s laconic comment on the fisherman’s speech highlights one of the contradictions in the panegyrist’s task. On one hand, the panegyrist must avoid openness, since the employment of transparent artifice or blatant falsehood would sabotage the chances of his praise being persuasive. On the other hand, the panegyrist must try to seem ‘open’, since his praise must appear to be sincere and uncompelled. The ambiguities of ‘openness’ are similarly evident in Seneca’s discussion of flattery in the preface to the fourth book of his *Natural Questions*.⁷⁰ Flattery, as Seneca presents it, is a dangerous dance, fraught with paradoxes: when rejected, it pleases; when it is apprehended, the flatterer profits; where you are flattered, you are attacked.⁷¹ Indeed, even discussing flattery is apparently a dangerous dance: having discoursed for some time on the

⁶⁹ 8.73-76

⁷⁰ *Q.N.* 4A.pr. 3-19.

⁷¹ At 3.

subject, Seneca warns his interlocutor, Lucilius, that he may be ‘either flattering or testing’ Lucilius even now.⁷² Seneca uses ‘openness’ to refer to a variety of different kinds of speech. At one point, he asserts aphoristically: ‘the more open flattery is, the more shameful it is’ (*quo apertior est adulatio, quo improbior*). Coming as it does after a discussion of Demetrius the Cynic’s counsel to flatterers to bend the truth if it is profitable to do so, ‘open’ here suggests, negatively, ‘transparent, strategic’; perhaps even ‘patently false’.⁷³ On the face of it, this is the meaning of *apertus* in Juvenal’s quip. But ‘open’, as Seneca uses it at another point, can also mean artless or naïve in a positive sense, an impression the fisherman may well have achieved, deliberately or not.⁷⁴ Moreover, the master-flatterer Plancus allegedly counseled a different sort of openness, advising that ‘flattery never be concealed or dissembled’ (a charge on which Juvenal’s fisherman is also not guilty).⁷⁵ Presumably, for an audience already on guard against flattery, speakers who are particularly open about it can seem disarming, wittily self-aware, and, ironically, believable. Fitzgerald (2007: 115) compares modern advertisements that deliberately mirror readers’ notion of a dishonest advertisement (‘Buy me – I’ll change your life!’). Such advertisements ‘invite us to congratulate ourselves for belonging to the circle of the non-duped’ – and therefore persuade.

⁷² 4.pr.19: *aut captare aut experiri*; see Williams (2008: 220-5).

⁷³ Cf. e.g. Demetrius’ demonstration of his technique at 4.pr.8: ‘I will not tell a lie when I say that no man is more generous than you, since whatever you have discarded, you could seem to all to have given to the world as a gift’ (*hominem quidem non esse ullum liberaliorem non mentiar, cum possis videri omnibus donasse omnibus quicquid dereliquisti*).

⁷⁴ At 4.pr.3: ‘One man uses flattery surreptitiously and sparingly; another, openly, directly, feigning rusticity, as though it were the result of artlessness, not design’ (*Alius adulatione clam utetur, parce; alius ex aperto, palam, rusticitate simulate, quasi simplicitas illa, non ars sit*).

⁷⁵ 4.pr.3: *non esse occulte nec ex dissimulato blandiendum*. Plancus’ motto (4.pr.5): ‘If it’s understated, the wooing’s wasted’ (*perit...procari, si latet*). Yet another, more positive, sense of *apertus* comes later in Seneca’s discussion: he says that Lucilius had hoped that, although he had flattered, he had spoken the truth, and therefore his audience could listen ‘with open ears’ (*speraveras posse apertis auribus recipi, quamvis blanda diceres, quia vera dicebas*, 12).

Elsewhere, Juvenal emphasizes the sense of competition in the courtiers' speeches, which forces their flattering claims to escalate. The ex-consul Fabricius Veiento (also in Statius), and the blind courtier Catullus Messalinus vie to upstage each other at 113-129. Both are farcically incompetent. Of Catullus, Juvenal says:

*nemo magis rhombum stupuit; nam plurima dixit
in laevum conversus, at illi dextra iacebat
belua. sic pugnas Cilicis laudabat et ictus
et pegma et pueros inde ad velaria raptos* (4.119-122).

Nobody was more amazed at the turbot; for he said a great deal,
turned toward the left – but the beast was lying on his right.
That's also how he praised the Cilician's fights and attacks
and the stage-platform, and boys whisked up to the awnings.

That *nam* (119) is a damning indictment on a culture of display oratory – Catullus proves that he admires the gift more than anyone else *because* he gave such a long speech about it (*plurima dixit*, 119). Of course, precisely because Catullus is blind, he must therefore resort to fiction, and Juvenal's picture of him mistakenly looking in the wrong direction is a cruel demonstration of his detachment from reality. 'That's also how' (*sic*, 3) he praised gladiatorial fights⁷⁶ and theatrical shows, Juvenal says; does the poor blind man look the wrong way even in the amphitheater? The ironic fact that Catullus chooses these spectacles

⁷⁶ Presumably the 'Cilician' is a gladiator of recent fame; see Courtney ad loc.

as the theme of his praise underlines the extent to which his own self-evidently fictional speeches offer a kind of theater. Juvenal then says that Catullus was ‘worthy of being a beggar’, blowing ‘flattering kisses’ (*blanda...basia*, 118) at passing wagons, an Imperial-age travesty of the famous romantic kisses of that other Catullus. This is not merely a reflection of the conventional curse that someone become a beggar, but also a comment on Catullus’ speech: he is the murderous yes-man whose flattery is so transparent, so shamelessly *apertus*, that it can be characterized as outright ‘begging’.

In his keenness to compete with this performance, *prudens* Veiento (113) loses his cool. He will not be beaten (*non cedit*, 123).⁷⁷ In order to upstage Catullus, he raves as a *fanaticus* (123), like one has been incited by the fury of the war-goddess Bellona (*oestra/ percussus Bellona*, 123-4). His speech is passionate, prophetic, oracular – yet given to pointing out things obvious to everyone in the room. Casting his eyes over the huge fish, ‘you have a huge omen’, he utters portentously (*ingens/ omen habes*, 124-5). It is an omen ‘of a big and famous triumph’ (*magni clarique triumphi*, 125). This is the failsafe technique of the panegyrist, not the prophet, to tell the emperor that something is ‘big’ (especially something that everyone can already see is big; cf. *ut perhibent qui de magnis maiora locuntur*, 17). ‘You will capture some king’ (*regem aliquem capies*, 126) he says, with, at least, an oracular lack of specificity; ‘or Arviragus will fall off his British chariot-pole’ (*aut de temone*

⁷⁷ On the competitive element, cf. Luisi (1990: 187), who views the council as a whole as an ironic reflection of the competitions of poetry and rhetoric held by Domitian at his Alban residence (*Stat. Silv.* 3.5.28; *Mart.* 4.1.5-6). It was at such a competition in 90 that Domitian awarded Statius first prize, presumably for the very poem Juvenal is here parodying, the *De Bello Germanico*; cf. *Silv.* 4.2.64-7. Pliny presents his *Panegyricus* as an *exemplum* for other speakers keen to ‘win the same glory’ (*eandem gloriam niti*, *Ep.* 3.18.2), which suggests, if not necessarily formal contests, then nonetheless a strongly felt sense of competition among those delivering panegyrics to the emperor.

Britanno/ excidet Arviragus, 127).⁷⁸ Finally, presumably motioning for all to look at the fish, he tells the crowd that ‘the beast is a foreigner’ (*peregina est belua*, 127), and, in an interpretation of the fish’s spines no less fanciful than the encomium of the blind man, asks whether they can all ‘see those stakes running up its back?’ (*cernis/ erectas in terga sudes*, 127-8).⁷⁹ Rather than genuine prophecy, Juvenal’s parting comment scornfully assumes that Veiento was attempting to orate an encomium all along, and, in his zealous raving, omitted the first steps: ‘Fabricius missed one thing – to recount the turbot’s birthplace and age’ (*hoc defuit unum/ Fabricio, patriam ut rhombi memoraret et annos*, 129).

As well as mocking the incompetence of these flatterers, Juvenal also undercuts their rhetorical efforts by emphasizing the disjunction between what they say and the conditions under which they say it. Before any of the courtiers speak, we are told that these are men Domitian ‘hates’ (*oderat*, 73), encouraging us to look for antagonism behind the civility of the emperor asking for these men’s recommendations, and left to question how he receives their fatuous flattery. At the conclusion of the *concilium*, Juvenal retrospectively provides further information about the circumstances of the meeting in order to expose even further the compulsion under which they spoke. Far from willingly attending to their emperor, they had been ‘dragged there’ ‘astonished’, ‘compelled to hurry’ (*traxerat attonitos et festinare coactos*, 4.145), as if (or ‘on the pretext that’, *tamquam*, 148)⁸⁰ they were going to receive news of the campaigns in Germany, or an anxious letter had brought bad news from a distant

⁷⁸ Veiento chooses a name that no other ancient writer mentions (and no-one else, safely, may have heard?) It is explained by the scholiast as ‘*Britannorum rex Arbila*’. As Braund (1996: 263) points out, the name appears later in Geoffrey of Monmouth (4.16) as a son of Cymbeline (and so also in Shakespeare’s play of the same name).

⁷⁹ Cf. Bower (1958: 9-10), removing some confusion on the meaning of *in terga*, though it seems a bit charitable to say that ‘any picture of a turbot will immediately make clear what Veiento means’.

⁸⁰ A common use of *tamquam* in Juvenal and Tacitus is to ‘suggest alleged reasons for an action’ (Braund 1996: 181).

region. No doubt either or both of these reasons were the motivations for the nobles being assembled at the *concilium* in Statius' *De Bello Germanico*, but Juvenal has deflated this poem's (presumed) picture of valued courtiers and their 'great' – or 'big' – leader (*magnus dux*, 145). Now they come for a fish. The compulsion Juvenal describes also retrospectively explains why, in his account of the meeting, when courtiers discuss an unmoving fish with their seated emperor, everyone is in such a hurry.⁸¹ His advisors themselves bear on their faces the 'pallor of a wretched and great' – or, like everything, 'big' – friendship' (*miseræ magnæque...pallor amicitiae*, 74-5). Stated oxymoronically in this way, the intractable contradictions of the courtiers' position are exposed. Friendship with the emperor is fear of the emperor, and fear, according to Pliny, is the mother of oratorical invention, not oratorical truth.⁸² None of these people is a master persuader; they are in a discursive and pragmatic bind.

By contrast, Juvenal's picture of a 'good' senator in their midst, Q. Vibius Crispus, bristles with irony as an ode less to the man himself (whose integrity was, in fact, questioned by other ancient sources) than to the man he was not and could not possibly have been.⁸³ Crispus is praised as one whose 'morals are just like his eloquence, a gentle character' (*mores qualis facundia, mite ingenium*, 82). *Mores qualis facundia* – a kind of correspondence that recalls a time before eloquence became a shield, rather than an indicator, of one's character. He would

⁸¹ So, e.g., the first person to arrive is the jurist Plotius Pegasus (a joke on his winged-horse name?) He 'snatches up his cloak and hurries' to the palace, and arrives while Domitian's slave is still shouting for people to 'run, for He is already seated' (*primus clamante Liburno/ "currite, iam sedit" rapta properabat Liburno/ Pegasus*, 4.75-77). Cf. hurrying at 4.59, 67, 94, 96, 134.

⁸² *Paneg.* 2.1; 72.5-7. In Epictetus, *Disc.* 4.1.47, there is a prosopopoeia of a 'friend of Caesar', who implores the philosopher not to mock his miserable existence, beset by anxieties and lack of sleep. Epictetus (in Arrian's words) ends by commenting 'I can swear to you that no one is so devoid of insight and feeling, as not to lament his misfortunes, the more one becomes his friend'.

⁸³ See Williams (2010) on the representation of Crispus in Juvenal and Tacitus, emphasizing his 'exemplary status' in both texts to underline 'limitations on speech'.

have been a useful check on Domitian's tyranny, Juvenal says, except that it was too dangerous for him to play the Seneca role and check the tyrant's excesses. In any case, as Juvenal puts it, Crispus was not 'the kind of citizen who could freely offer the words he is thinking' (*nec civis erat qui libera posset/ verba animi proferre*, 90-1) – or, on another reading, he could not offer the 'free words', incompatible with Rome's 'slavery' (*serviret*, 38) under Domitian. His silence makes him a survivor. But this means that the *facundia* praised at line 82 turns out to consist of not speaking his mind at all, making his character all too 'gentle'. Juvenal's lines specifically deflate Statius' picture of Crispus in the *De Bello Germanico*, turning Statius' praise into a diagnosis of Crispus' political ineffectiveness. Statius says that Crispus has 'gentle wisdom' (*mitis prudentia*), and gives him the Homeric epithet *Nestoreus*, 'Nestor-like'. But the gulf between this tacit Imperial survivor and the sweet-voiced speaker of the Pyliaans, that archetype of the outspoken good counselor, is damningly vast. 'Gentle' (*mitis*) wisdom may be admirable, but it is Crispus' yielding and tractable character – his *mite ingenium* (82) – that ensures he can have no impact in guiding the emperor's own ethics.

It is the impotence of elites such as Crispus that Juvenal emphasizes at the end of the poem, in recounting the circumstances of Domitian's eventual demise:

*atque utinam his potius nugis tota illa dedisset
tempora saevitiae, claras quibus abstulit urbi
inlustres animas impune et vindice nullo.
sed periit postquam cerdonibus esse timendus
coeperat: hoc nocuit Lamiarum caede madenti.* (4.150-4).

If only, instead, he had devoted to trifles all those periods of brutality, when he stole away from the city famous and glorious souls, with nobody to exact punishment and revenge. But he died when he began to be feared by the *cerdones*: this is what killed him, though drenched in the blood of men like Lamia.

Juvenal contrasts the nerveless *nobiles* eliminated by Domitian, specifically L. Aelius Plautius Lamia Aelianus, whose family is elsewhere in Juvenal cited as an archetype of the aristocratic family,⁸⁴ with the rebelling *cerdones*. As the commentators explain, *cerdo* is a word used ‘almost exclusively by satirists to represent lowly status’ (Braund 1996: 269). Juvenal’s vision of Domitian’s demise distorts history to a significant degree: his assassination, though physically carried out by freedmen, was the result of a plot within the court, not the anger of the plebs.⁸⁵ Indeed, Suetonius says that, contrary to the indignation of the soldiery and the joy of the senate, the people bore the news of Domitian’s death with indifference.⁸⁶ But by pointedly excluding the elites from this final vision of political change, Juvenal emphasizes the ultimate impotence and ineffectiveness of the rhetorical culture he has targeted throughout the poem. All that flattery and pretense has come to nothing, since Domitian died with the elites’ blood on his hands; and the mild wisdom of those silent survivors has done less for Rome under tyranny than the indignation of unhappy workers.

⁸⁴ 6.385. On the generalizing plural *Lamiae*, see Courtney ad loc.

⁸⁵ Cf. Jones: ‘All the ancient sources stress that this was a palace plot’ (1992: 195). On the conspiracy, see Suet. *Dom.* 14, Dio 67.15.

⁸⁶ Suet. *Dom.* 23.

Juvenal, in this satire on panegyric, has spent the poem puncturing a discourse that turns emperors into gods, and, in its concluding lines, the flatterers' 'god' has been literally punctured by rebelling *ignobiles*. The single teasing glimpse the satirist gives us of himself in this poem replays in miniature these elements, of an ignoble, mocking rebellion against counterfeit gods. At lines 94-101, describing the courtier Acilius, Juvenal says:

*proximus eiusdem properabat Acilius aevi
cum iuvene indigno quem mors tam saeva maneret
et domini gladiis tam festinata; sed olim
prodigio par est in nobilitate senectus,
unde fit ut malim fraterculus esse gigantis.
profuit ergo nihil misero quod comminus ursos
figebat Numidas Albana nudus harena
venator.* (4.94-101)

Next to him hurried Acilius, a man of the same age, with his son, who was undeserving of the death which awaited him, so savage and so hastened by the swords of the *Dominus*. But for a long time, old age has been like a miracle amongst the nobility. That's why I'd prefer to be the small brother of a giant. It did the wretched boy no good that, as a naked beast-hunter in the Alban arena, he speared Numidian bears at close range.

The humiliating end of Acilius' son proves the powerlessness of the elites under the tyranny of Domitian, so the mocking Juvenal aspires, instead, to be a *'fraterculus gigantis'*, the 'small brother of a giant' (98). The phrase suggests a warped sense of perspective, a disorienting shift between tiny and huge, which perfectly suits the satirist of panegyric. But what does the phrase mean? In a note, not on this passage, but on a different verse of Juvenal's (8.44), the scholiasts say:

*'humiles' ignobiles, unde et terrae filii esse dicuntur,
ut supra 'unde fit ut malim fraterculus esse gigantis
[tum φ], id est terrae filius ac per hoc ignobilis.*

'Lowly': not a member of the nobility [*ignobiles*]. They are also called 'sons of the Earth', as above: 'That's why I'd prefer to be the small brother of a giant [or 'giants']. He means 'son of the earth', and thus not a member of the nobility.⁸⁷

None of the layers of scholia to Juvenal is usually accounted very trustworthy,⁸⁸ but scholars do trust them here. Mayor, Duff, Courtney and Braund all agree that the key phrase is a rhetorical periphrasis for the proverbial Latin idiom *terrae filius*. Indeed, this idiom is well attested in Latin literature to refer to someone who has been 'born from the Earth', and who

⁸⁷ Wessner (1931: 250).

⁸⁸ See Townend (1972: 376) for the standard view ('an unusual degree of ignorance and sheer stupidity').

therefore has no traceable ancestry. A nobody, in other words.⁸⁹ Giants, meanwhile, were literally ‘born from the Earth’, since, in a tradition which goes back at least to Hesiod, Gaia/Gē (Earth) is said to have given birth to the giants.⁹⁰ In Greek, the giants are commonly called γηγενεῖς (‘the Earth-born’) and this Greek phrase becomes *fili Terrae* at least once in extant Latin.⁹¹ But there is no other passage in which a reference to the giants is intended to call to mind the expression *terrae filius*, and, indeed, it is quite an interpretative leap to take the giants, proverbially massive in bulk and might, as a byword for a safely inconspicuous nobody.⁹² The explanation, we may also add, illuminates Juvenal’s reference to the giant, but not the wish to be a giant’s ‘small brother’ (*fraterculus*). In fact, the precise implications of the rare word *fraterculus* are not especially clear, and little help is offered by the other extant examples; Plautus (*Cist.* 451) and Cicero (*Verr.* 3.155) use the word as a colloquial term of endearment rather than literally to denote a brother.⁹³

Yet the image of giants, in a poem about the Imperial court, calls to mind the use to which giants were put in iconography and literature in Imperial Rome. The giants were enemies of

⁸⁹ Josephson (1956) discusses the extant instances of the phrase.

⁹⁰ *Theog.* 184-6.

⁹¹ Naevius, *Pun.* 46W: *Titani/ bicorpores Gigantes magnique Atlantes,/ Runcus et Purpureus, filii Terras.*

⁹² Such is the objection of Friedlaender: ‘*gigas* im Sinne von *terrae filius* ist weder nachweisbar, noch irgendwie glaublich’ (1895: 606). He instead thinks (without demonstrable proof) that the reference is to a now-unknown fairy tale synonymous for being in position of fear (at 249). If being the little-brother of a giant means being in fear, why would Juvenal say that he would ‘prefer’ this? Zacher (1897: 555) has a different objection: instances of the expression *terrae filius* tend to occur in the generalizing plural, but here, both *fraterculus* and *gigans* are singular (the MS variation *gigantum* suggests that the passage was even misremembered in this way). Zacher’s own view, that Juvenal is here referring to a specific ‘giant’, the star charioteer Porphyrio (*Mart.* 13.78), is rather harder to accept. The only substantial modern discussion is by Edgeworth (1999), who also rejects the scholiast’s *terrae filius* explanation. Instead, Edgeworth appeals to a common experience of younger brothers (he assumes without argument that this is the meaning of the diminutive *fraterculus*), an experience ‘not shared by sisters or by oldest brothers’ – their older brothers beat them up. If beatings by an older brother are bad, then beatings by a giant would be worse. Thus, ‘to be a noble at Rome is such a bad fate that receiving regular beatings at the hands of a giant would be preferable’ (1999: 181). This makes a certain amount of sense, but I am not sure that it is quite the ‘clever or piquant meaning’ that Edgeworth says we should look for in the line.

⁹³ Cf. *TLL* s.v. *fraterculus*.

Heaven (*in aethera...hostes*, Claud. *Carm. Min.* 52.5), and specifically of Jupiter – representations of Jupiter battling individual giants, especially Typhoeus, occur frequently in both art and literature.⁹⁴ Indeed, the allusion to this myth in this poem has quite specific point, since Domitian was ubiquitously identified with Jupiter during the period of his reign. Domitian restored the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at considerable expense and established public games in Jupiter’s honour. Poets praising Domitian hailed him as ‘our Jove’⁹⁵ and ‘Ausonian Jupiter’⁹⁶, and images of Jupiter, or Domitian with Jupiter’s aegis and thunderbolt, appear frequently on coinage and gems from his reign.⁹⁷ In his *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius had cast Epicurus on the side of the giants, shaking the foundations of the heavens with reason.⁹⁸ Juvenal has a similar position in mind for himself, but his target is now a rhetorical discourse that addresses the emperor as a god and puts humans in the heavens.

The ill-fated young son of Acilius abased himself to such an extent that he had appeared in the ‘Alban arena’ (*Albana harena*, 100), the brutal double of an equally brutal court (called the ‘Alban fortress’, *Albanem... arcem*, at line 145). Rather than the sublime cosmic battles of the giants, Acilius’ son was forced to engage in degrading beast-hunts in the amphitheater, which ‘did him no good’ (99). Acilius tried as hard as he could to please Domitian/Jupiter and was executed anyway. Not for Juvenal this vain courting of Olympian favor. Juvenal may make himself and his own personal identity invisible in his *Satires*, but here, in this very

⁹⁴ Gantz (1993: 445-454); on the gigantomachy in Latin poetry, see esp. Hardie (1986) 85-156. Only Ferguson (1979: 167) among the modern commentators mentions this aspect of the image.

⁹⁵ Mart. 14.1.2: *nostrum...Iovem*. Cf. 9.28.10 (*sui...Iovis*); 6.10 (*nostrum Tonantis*) 7.56 (*noster Tonans*). On Domitian’s identification with Jupiter, see Scott (1975: 133-40). Of course, the identification of Domitian with the violent Jupiter is not without its ambivalences: Chinn (2008).

⁹⁶ Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.17: *Iuppiter Ausonius*.

⁹⁷ Scott (1975: 140). Trajan was also identified with Jupiter in his iconography: see Roche (2003b).

⁹⁸ On paradoxical ‘positive’ images of the giants’ assault on heaven, see Volk (2001: 106-113).

public and political *Satire*, which offers a forceful critique against a powerful contemporary rhetorical discourse, he does not present himself as a ‘nobody’. Rather, fleetingly and allusively, he pictures himself in a position of opposition, with a phrase that embodies in miniature the poem’s themes. As the ‘little brother of a giant’, he suggests a role for himself with suitably cosmic implications, redolent of the *Satire*’s imagery of natural order upended and reversed. His poem on panegyric discourse, which itself mockingly reproduces the genre’s tendencies towards fictionalization and magnification, finds its icon in this mythological paradigm. The gigantomachic satirist critiquing panegyric is a small, mocking fighter, in a big – very big – campaign.⁹⁹

Juvenal’s eyes continue to be trained on the public sphere as we move from the Trajanic to the Hadrianic books of the *Satires*, but the characteristic concerns change. In line with Hadrian himself, Juvenal shows an increasing interest in philosophy and religion, and the new cosmopolitanism of the emperor – for the first time, the capital of the Empire was wherever the itinerant Hadrian happened to be – encourages the satirist to inquire more broadly about what constitutes Rome and Roman values. In the fourth chapter, we examine two poems in which Juvenal critically assesses the place of philosophers in forming and

⁹⁹ The scholia on our line (4.98), rather than endorsing the interpretation of *terrae filius*, seek to explain the phrase by a different means, but it is unclear to what extent the mythological story to which they refer would have been well-known to Juvenal’s audience. The ‘little brother of a giant’, they say, is the ape (Wessner 1931: 62). The late “Cornutus” scholiast explains this reference with a garbled story, which nonetheless draws on authentic elements: after the giants’ defeat in the gigantomachy, the earth, angry over the destruction of her children, gave birth to apes, in order to continue the giants’ opposition to Jupiter (Höhler 1896: 429-30). This inverts the ending of a tale told in Lycophron (*Alex.* 9.712): Jupiter put a race of apes on Pithekoussai, under which the giant Typhon is buried, in order to mock the giants for their defeat (this version also in Servius Auctus, ad *Aen.* 9.712; Ovid, *Met.* 14.91-4, differently, relates Jupiter’s transformation of Pithekoussai’s human inhabitants into apes for their habit of deceit). If the myth was well-known, the ape would be a very appropriate avatar for the satirist, given both the apes’ opposition to Jupiter and their long-held associations with mockery in the ancient world (see e.g. Connors 2004).

changing those values. Cynic philosophy was enjoying an unprecedented prominence in Rome of the early second century, and in *Satire 10*, Juvenal adopts an uncompromisingly extreme Cynic voice, advocating a coherent but alienating Cynic argument designed to expose the corrosive impact of Cynic philosophy on Roman ideals. In *Satire 14*, he turns back to the domestic, to the Roman house, but with an eye still trained on philosophers in the public sphere. By arguing for the overwhelming influence of the father in determining the morals of his children, and picturing education entirely in the Roman home, Juvenal works to limit the role of outside influences, including philosophers, on the ethics of Roman youth.

4. Cynic Philosophy and Ethical Education in *Satires* Ten and Fourteen

pauca licet portes argenti vascula puri
nocte iter ingressus, gladium contumque timebis
et mota ad lunam trepidabis harundinis umbra:
cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator. (10.19-21).

You could be carrying only a few vessels of plain silver.

Night falls. You set out. *You* will be terrified of swords and sticks,
 and tremble at the moon if a reed's shadow stirs.

The empty-handed traveler will sing in a robber's face.

We are back, for a moment, in the anxious world of the third *Satire*. Juvenal confronts the listener with fears that mirror those of Umbricius in his earlier poem: he too described travelling at night (in his case, returning home), accompanied only by the moon and the light from a single candle. He described himself falling foul of roving gangs of drunken toughs, who keep clear of the rich, but are ready to strip the downtrodden and undefended poor of what little they have (3.278-301). Familiar with Juvenal's first book, we are identified with his earlier protagonist: 'you', Juvenal says, fear even the shadow – the *umbra* – of a reed moving in the breeze. But then, rather than contrasting the vulnerability of the poor with the security of the rich, the speaker of *Satire* 10 instead approvingly cites someone even poorer, an 'empty-handed traveller' (*vacuus viator*), a character-type familiar not from Umbricius' Rome but from the sermons of ancient philosophers who held up poverty as an ethical ideal.

The type was associated particularly with the itinerant Cynics, whose sage, Diogenes, famously shunned housing to live in a tub, and renounced clothing, wealth and respectability as barriers to living a virtuous life in accordance with nature.¹ The absurdity of singing at a mugger could equally be interpreted as an act of shamelessness (*ἀναίδεια*), the kind of transgressive public behavior through which the Cynics demonstrated their beliefs. This vision of poverty as a sort of freedom is very far from Umbricius' sarcastic reference to the *libertas pauperis* – which was, he says, whenever a poor man escapes a fight with teeth left in his mouth (3.299-301). By recalling the earlier *Satire*, Juvenal brings into sharp relief a surprising shift in perspective.

The speaker of *Satire* 10, it is immediately evident, is different. 'In all the lands that stretch from Cadiz to the Ganges and the Dawn', he begins, 'there are few people able to distinguish true goods from their complete opposite, and remove the mist of delusion (*erroris nebula*)'.² He addresses the world, not Rome, with a philosophic view from above. 'Roman and Greek and foreign' (*Romanus Graiusque et barbarus*, 138) is his rubric: the posture is cosmopolitan, lacking allegiance to any one *polis*, which the Cynic cited as integral to his personal freedom.³ As he strongly implies, he himself is one of the 'few', with the ability to 'distinguish' between false goods and true, a key trait of the philosopher in Persius' description.⁴ The 'mist of delusion' suggests a Latin rendering of the Greek τῦφος ('smoke',

¹ See Desmond (2006).

² 10.1-4: *omnibus in terris, quae sunt a Gadibus usque/ Auroram et Gangem, pauci dinoscere possunt/ vera bona atque illis multum diversa, remota/ erroris nebula.*

³ This is the so-called 'negative' interpretation of Cynic cosmopolitanism (Dudley 1937: 34-6). John Moles (1996) has made the most prominent argument for a more 'positive' doctrine of cosmopolitanism amongst the Cynics, an aspiration fully to be a 'citizen of the cosmos'. In this vision, the whole world is a potential home, and all people – if they realize their error and abandon false goods – constitute a potential kinship.

⁴ *Sat.* 5.105: *veris speciem dinoscere calles?* ('do you have the skill to distinguish appearance from truth?')

‘vapour’), which is ‘almost a technical term’ amongst the Cynics (Dudley 1937: 56) for the misguided beliefs that prevent one from perceiving truth.⁵ The opening lines thus suggest that the speaker’s orientation is Cynic, and as the poem develops, the speaker will cast a piercing Cynic eye on Roman customs, ambitions, and history. Indeed, while a variety of philosophical backgrounds have been postulated for the ideas in the poem, perceiving the specificity of this Cynic voice is key both to its argument and to its critique of second-century intellectual culture.⁶ Moreover, more than merely seeming different from Juvenal’s other voices in the *Satires*, the Cynic voice of *Satire* 10 is consciously alienating. If the sermon of the Cynic speaker is carefully considered, its implications are so disturbing and discordant with Roman ideals that the poem seems to be provoking readers’ shock and disagreement. By embodying an extreme vision of a Cynic, Juvenal makes an implicit attack against a philosophy that, in the early second-century, though strongly ethnically coded as non-Roman,⁷ was enjoying unprecedented popularity and influence throughout the Empire.

Although it traced its origins to Diogenes (and through Antisthenes, to Socrates), the second century A.D. was the golden age of ancient Cynicism. The influence of Cynicism in the period is perceptible at every level of society. Whereas philosophers had suffered expulsion from Rome under Domitian and Vespasian, under Trajan, Dio Chrysostom would (claim to)

⁵ On the history of ancient philosophers’ use of the word, see Decleva Caizzi (1980).

⁶ Hight (1949) and Ferguson (1979: 254) presume an Epicurean orientation (surely incorrectly), but most scholars would see the poem as demonstrating Stoic influence, channeled through Roman rhetoric (Val. Max. 7.2. ext.1 is frequently cited as a specific source): see Courtney (1980: 446-452) and Campana (2004: 38-44). Of course, it would be misleading to deny any similarities with Stoic thought, largely because the most influential Imperial Stoic thinkers, including Seneca and Epictetus, drew influence from Cynic ethics. Yet it is important to see that the tenth *Satire*’s emphases are characteristically Cynic, not Stoic, and, the speaker frequently maintains Cynic positions from which Stoics distanced themselves: the perils of political life and the value of detachment, the praise of individual toughness and the rejection of intellectualism, the deprecation of historical figures Stoics regarded as moral and political *exempla*, the lack of any broader argument from cosmology or a general teleological principle.

⁷ See Griffin (1996).

deliver discourses on Diogenes and Cynic notions of kingship to the Emperor himself.⁸ Epictetus espoused an especially lofty vision of the Cynic as ideal philosopher, enshrining the ethics of Cynicism while purifying it of its more anti-social aspects (and disdaining its current popular incarnation).⁹ Although our knowledge of his life is overly indebted to the satirical account of Lucian, the charismatic Cynic preacher Peregrinus, with his flair for provocative spectacle, enjoyed celebrity throughout the Empire, and Lucian also offers a laudatory account of the far milder Cynic teacher Demonax.¹⁰ Co-existing uneasily with the loftiest forms of Cynicism was a more populist brand of the philosophy, which seems, at least from the unerringly hostile ancient sources, to have been a genuine social movement among the poor and dispossessed of the Empire. Dio represents crowds of Cynics ‘at street-corners, in alley-ways, and at temple-gates’, stringing together jokes and abuse and lowering people’s opinion of philosophers in general.¹¹ Lucian tells us that ‘every city’ is full of Cynics, who ‘enlist in the army of the Dog’, but imitate all dogs’ worst characteristics, barking, thieving and fawning over people who give them things rather than following the principles of the Cynic progenitors Diogenes, Antisthenes or Crates.¹² Moreover, despite the breadth of its influence across social levels, Cynic philosophy is consistently ethnically coded as non-Roman. We do not know of a single Roman Cynic philosopher,¹³ and the emphasis on

⁸ On the banishments of philosophers, see Toynbee (1944), Harris (1977); on Dio’s Kingship Orations (*Or.* 1-4), see Moles (1990). Whitmarsh (2001: 325-7) argues that the claim to have performed the orations before the emperor is a fiction.

⁹ *Disc.* 3.22.

¹⁰ *Pereg., Demon.*; Clay (1992). Although Lucian is scornful of Cynic charlatans in the *Fugitivi*, his own satires demonstrate an indebtedness to the spirit and form of the Cynic Menippus: Relihan (1996).

¹¹ *Or.* 32.9.

¹² Lucian, *Fug.* 16; cf. *Mart.* 4.53. Appian similarly tells us that many of the poverty-stricken of his day attempted to better their circumstances by turning to (presumably Cynic) philosophy: *Mithr.* 5.28.

¹³ Crescens, the mid-second century Cynic and opponent of Justin Martyr, is a possible exception. Goulet-Cazé (1996: 389-413) offers a helpful catalogue of known Cynics and their sources.

cosmopolitanism and the ‘kingship’ of the individual, and the rejection of public life, offered a means of individualistic response to the ubiquity of Roman power.

Paradoxically then, Roman verse satire – the genre that is ‘wholly ours’ – has among its influences the diatribe form first credited to the Cynic Bion of Borysthenes. The argument for the influence of the diatribe was made in its most strident form by Terzaghi (1944), for whom the moralizing strain in Roman verse satire can be attributed entirely to contact with popular Cynic sermonizing.¹⁴ But the influence of the form should not obscure the real rifts Romans felt between Cynic philosophers and their own ideals. In the *De Finibus*, Cicero argues that the ‘wise man’ (the *sapiens*) should wish to become involved in politics and government. Of the Cynic rejection of public life, he says that, although some Stoics suggest that the *sapiens* could follow their lead in some circumstances, others Stoics reject Cynic disengagement entirely.¹⁵ That Cicero’s own views lean towards the latter is suggested by a further passage in the *De Officiis*, where he condemns the Cynics for their opposition to social custom, and argues that the ‘entire Cynic philosophy should be cast out; for they are enemies of a sense of shame, without which nothing can morally upright, nothing honorable’.¹⁶ Tellingly, in Horace’s *Satires*, despite indebtedness to the Cynic diatribe form, when an actual Cynic appears, he is used to epitomize an extreme asceticism – a *sordidus victus* (‘destitute way of life’) that is contrasted negatively with Horace’s less threatening ideal of the *tenuis victus*, the

¹⁴ English-speaking classicists have generally been more skeptical about the extent to which ‘diatribe’ was recognized as a literary form in antiquity. The concept is most prominent today in New Testament studies, where it remains of central importance: see Stewart-Sykes (2001: 58-68), with a critical review of past work.

¹⁵ *De Fin.* 3.68.

¹⁶ *De Off.* 1.148: *Cynicorum vero ratio tota est eicienda; est enim inimica verecundiae, sine qua nihil rectum esse potest, nihil honestum.* Generally on Rome’s antipathy towards Cynicism, see Dudley (1937: 118-121), Griffin (1996).

‘modest way of life’.¹⁷ In the second century, as Francis (1995) has argued, when various kinds of asceticism were in the ascendant, the type of extreme and provocative asceticism epitomized by the Cynics was stigmatized by Romans as dangerous and a threat to existing values. On one hand, a ‘positive’ model of asceticism was developed by Stoics, and practiced by Marcus Aurelius, ‘precisely to allow individuals to better perform their traditional social roles and functions’ (Francis 1995: 182). But a far more threatening model of second-century asceticism is observable in Lucian’s attack on Peregrinus, and later Celsus’ on the Christians. Both these authors warn of the capacity for charismatic ascetic groups to dissolve conventional societal bonds. If the influence of the Cynic diatribe was perceived as part of the essential make-up of the genre that is “wholly ours”, there is all the more reason for Juvenal to distance himself from the movement’s current exponents.

The philosophic turn in the Hadrianic books of Juvenal’s *Satires* is part of his close and critical engagement with the intellectual culture under Hadrian, when the scholarly and philosophical activities previously the province of a Roman aristocrat’s *otium* became increasingly integral to public life.¹⁸ Hadrian immersed himself in Greek literary and scholarly culture, not without some resistance from the Greek intellectual elite, and the philosopher’s beard he adopted became, by the Antonine period, a frequent aspect of aristocratic self-presentation, especially in the East.¹⁹ While Persius’ *Satires* are steeped in

¹⁷ Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.53-66. The individual described is one Avidienus, whose nickname ‘the Dog’ (line 56) confirms the Cynic reference. In *Epistle* 1.17.13-32, Horace similarly mocks the Cynics’ physical self-abasement and rejection of social *mores*: see Moles (1985). Fiske (1920: 277-306) argued that, in Horace’s rejection of Lucilius’ frank speech, he aimed to dissociate himself specifically from Cynic *παρρησία*.

¹⁸ The *persona* of the later Juvenal has been described since Anderson as ‘Democritean’, on a misunderstanding of *Satire* 10’s Cynic postures; see below. On the increasing prominence of philosophic themes in books 4 and 5, see Braund (1997c), Keane (2007).

¹⁹ Zanker (1995: 217-233), although cf. Vout (2006), on the variety of possible associations of Hadrian’s beard. For the unprecedentedly high profile of scholarly debate in Hadrian’s court, see Wallace-Hadrill

knowledge of Stoic philosophy, and make philosophical argument an essential part of their form, Juvenal's later *Satires* probe the cultural authority of philosophy in Roman life, and ultimately articulate a subordinate position for philosophers in inculcating ethical values. He does this in *Satire 10* by highlighting the alien aspects of a philosophic sect at the height of its influence. Juvenal appropriates a Cynic voice and launches a series of attacks on Roman custom, history and ideals, bringing to life the kind of sordid, uncompromising extremist demonized in the popular Roman imagination. Rather than instruct, the *Satire* aims to unnerve and disturb. Through Juvenal's ventriloquism of the threatening Cynic, alien to Roman custom, readers are provoked to realize the corrosiveness of Cynic thinking to the values Roman culture holds dear.

I then turn to *Satire 14*, a poem typically regarded as stitching together, in unequal proportion, two separate themes. An introductory section decries the negative moral influence that parents – specifically fathers – have on their children, then the bulk of the poem indicts contemporary Rome on the charge of *avaritia*, 'greed'. As I argue here, the poem's sections are unified by a consistent interest in childhood education, and the section on greed in fact constitutes a surprisingly humane critique of education aimed pragmatically at economic advancement rather than ethical training. The link between the two poems is made both explicitly and implicitly. *Satire 10*'s Cynic voice is briefly requoted in *Satire 14*: having himself assumed the role of educator, Juvenal cites the final two lines of *Satire 10* in an anecdote about the Cynic sage Diogenes (14.315-6), and the teacherly voice of *Satire 14* thereby recuperates the couplet from its original astringent philosophical context. But, more pervasively, by focusing throughout the poem on the pedagogical relationship between father

(1983: 73-96); on Greek writers' resistance to Hadrian's ambitions in the intellectual world, see Uden (2010: 125-9).

and child, Juvenal limits the role of outside teachers, and particularly philosophers, in cultivating ethical values. Parents must be cautioned against inculcating bad morals. But they present such a danger precisely *because* Juvenal assigns the father an all-consuming influence over his child's moral development, and no amount of 'bearded teachers' (12), he says, can shift the ethical perspective of a child once it has been formed. If *Satire 10* polemicized against philosophy by embodying its most alien and threatening aspects, *Satire 14* deliberately excludes a meaningful place for philosophers in Rome, by domesticating ethical instruction within the Roman home.

1. Debasing the Coinage

According to the story told in Diogenes Laertius (6.20), the Cynics' first sage, Diogenes, was the son of a banker. At some point Diogenes' father (or Diogenes himself, according to a variant) was convicted of fraud, and father and son were sent into exile. The specific charge was that he had 'debased the coinage' (παρὰχαραττεῖν τὸ νόμισμα). The precise implications of this phrase are debated; he may have attempted to fabricate money by using a counterfeited stamp, or perhaps he altered the impression (χαρακτήρ) on some of the money to put it out of circulation.²⁰ In yet another version of the story, Diogenes' workers were trying to persuade him to participate in the fraud, and Diogenes visited the Delphic Oracle for guidance about whether to accede to their plan. To his surprise, the Oracle positively encouraged him to 'debase the coinage', punning on the word τὸ νόμισμα, which also means 'custom' or 'institution'. On converting to philosophy, this became his motto, and that of Cynics after him. As Diogenes Laertius puts it, 'Diogenes really did debase the currency,

²⁰ See Bywater & Milne (1940) for the possible interpretations of the phrase.

granting no such authority to custom as he did to nature, and saying that he lived the same type (χαρακτήρα) of life as Heracles, preferring nothing to freedom'.²¹ At a basic level, Diogenes' notorious acts of public indecency are in fulfillment of this injunction, as is his irreverence and audacious free speech (παρρησία) towards powerful public figures such as Alexander and Demosthenes. At its loftiest, in the Emperor Julian's oration to the Cynics, 'debase the currency' is elevated to the status of the Oracle's most famous injunction, 'know thyself' (γνῶθι σεαυτόν), and Apollo himself is recast as the true founder of Cynic philosophy. No great learning is necessary to become a Cynic, Julian says, but merely taking to heart Apollo's two divine commands.²²

Throughout the course of the tenth *Satire*, Juvenal moves through the major categories of goods for which people pray – power (56-113), eloquence (114-132), military glory (133-187), long life (188-288) and beauty (289-345) – and exposes these prayers as foolish by proving that these ambitions can, if achieved, only have a destructive effect on one's life. In Bellandi's words, the poem 'consists primarily, alas, of the pitiless emptying-out [*svuotamento*] of everything that seems to common-sense to be a good'.²³ The sheer extremity and grimness of Juvenal's argument has evaded few commentators. For Eichholz (1956), the tone is one of 'harsh mockery', with 'little room for pathos or for any but the most cynical brand of humour' (at 65).²⁴ Fishelov (1990) describes the process of reading the poem as one of repeated disillusion: Juvenal raises a new potentially attractive ambition, only

²¹ 6.71: ὄντως νόμισμα παραχαράττων, μηδὲν οὔτω τοῖς κατὰ νόμον ὡς τοῖς κατὰ φύσιν διδοῦς τὸν αὐτὸν χαρακτήρα τοῦ βίου λέγων διεξάγειν ὄνπερ καὶ Ἡρακλῆς, μηδὲν ἐλευθερίας προκρίνων.

²² Jul. *Or.* 7 (188A).

²³ 'Essa consta principalmente, purtroppo, dello svuotamento impietoso di tutto ciò che al senso comune sembra un bene' (Bellandi 1980: 67).

²⁴ Cf. Lawall (1958), who argues for a strong strain of (Heraclitean) pathos throughout the poem.

to dash the reader's hopes by detailing its 'tragic, or better grotesque' consequences (at 375). Courtney attributes the poem's extremity to Juvenal's rhetorical style, and argues that it ultimately compromises the coherence of the poem's argument.²⁵ Here I argue that Juvenal's grim picture of conventional ambitions does not have its origins in Roman rhetoric, but rather represents a philosophic process of Cynic debasement, *παρὰχάραξις*, writ large. This debasement is exemplified in the attacks on hallowed figures of Roman and Greek antiquity, in the unremittingly negative picture of Roman public life and political institutions, and in patterns of imagery throughout the poem that evoke the idea of 'debasement' in various ways. Juvenal's extremity here is not so much the extremity of the declaimer, pushing concepts to the limit in the quest for rhetorical effect, but rather the shamelessness of the Cynic, who assaults conventional thinking in order to provoke others into embracing his rhetorical position. We are robbed of the illusions and ideals that shape Roman thought, by a recognizably Cynic process of *παρὰχάραξις*. Moreover, far from being merely 'rhetorical', at times this fully Cynic extremity goes quite beyond Juvenal's usual rhetorical outbursts, and these dissonances between the Cynic preacher and Juvenal's statements elsewhere are the critical fault lines of the poem. The speaker of the poem presents a powerful Cynic argument, but it is not Juvenal's argument necessarily, and if we lose sight of that distinction, we lose much of the significance of the satire.

The poem's process of *παρὰχάραξις* is most evident in its vicious attacks on lauded figures from Roman history – figures Juvenal had previously praised, or who are key to traditional accounts of Roman virtue. The speaker's Cynic shamelessness is exemplified already in the

²⁵ 'The rhetorical nature of Juvenal's style makes him push the argument to its most extreme and striking form, whereas a more philosophical consideration would have to admit that some misguided objects of prayer are not actually disastrous, though they may not contribute to the central essence of happiness' (1980: 453).

opening's scandalizing attack on figureheads for the Stoic opposition to Nero. These early imperial figures were frequently idealized in this period in the popular genre of *exitus* literature for their principled opposition to tyranny;²⁶ here, instead, each is contemptuously adduced to play the stock role of the avaricious *dives*:

*Sed pluris nimia congesta pecunia cura
strangulat et cuncta exuperans patrimonia census
quanto delphinis ballaena Britannica maior.
Temporibus diris igitur iussuque Neronis 15
Longinum et magnos Senecae praedivitis hortos
claudit et egregias Lateranorum obsidet aedes
tota cohors: rarus venit in cenacula miles. (10.12-18).*

But money, piled up with excessive anxiety,
strangles more people, as does property that exceeds all inheritances
as much as the British whale out-sizes dolphins.

That's why, in grim times, at the order of Nero, an entire cohort
closed in on Longinus and the estate of Seneca, exceedingly rich,
and besieged the splendid property of the Laterani.

Only the occasional soldier enters a city apartment.²⁷

²⁶ On the genre of *exitus illustrorum virorum*, see Marx (1937); Sailor (2009: 11-24).

²⁷ *Cenacula* denotes the upper rooms of an *insula*: Courtney ad loc.

Plautius Lateranus has already appeared as an example of aristocratic profligacy in the eighth *Satire* (8.147-162). The caricature of the philosopher Seneca as a money-grubbing hypocrite was disseminated by his enemies and is therefore not without precedent,²⁸ though elsewhere in Juvenal's *Satires* he appears as a generous patron (5.109) and as Nero's tutor (8.212). The celebrated jurist and conservative senator Gaius Cassius Longinus also aroused the hostility of Nero for his hereditary fortune.²⁹ So, while the Cynic speaker does not simply invent a link between these figures and the dangers of wealth, no Roman reader could fail to see the more pertinent philosophical and political link between these three figures as icons of Nero's Stoic opposition. According to Tacitus, Lateranus was a key figure in the Pisonian conspiracy, the one who would physically hold Nero down while the conspirators struck, and Tacitus attributes to him a Stoic death, 'full of resolute silence, and refusing to acknowledge the involvement of the tribune'.³⁰ Longinus, exiled after the Pisonian conspiracy, bears the same name as his ancestor, who struck down the tyrant Julius Caesar on the Ides of March in 44 B.C. Longinus is said to have kept in an honored place a bust of his famous namesake inscribed with the phrase 'for the leader of the cause'.³¹ Of course, Seneca too was ordered to commit suicide in the wake of the Pisonian conspiracy; his appearance here as the Stoic antitype of the *dives* is all the more paradoxical given the close intertextual connection between this very poem and Seneca's own works of philosophy.³² All three were led to their deaths not, of course, by their riches but by their principled engagement in politics in 'grim

²⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 14.52.

²⁹ *Ann.* 16.7: ...*nullo crimine, nisi quod Cassius opibus vetustis et gravitate morum*. On Longinus, see D'Ippolito (1969).

³⁰ *Ann.* 15.60: *plenus constantis silentii nec tribuno obiciens eandem conscientiam*. Lateranus' role in the Pisonian conspiracy: *Ann.* 15.53.

³¹ *Ann.* 16.7: *duci partium*.

³² Schneider (1930) catalogues specific allusions. Dick (1969) proposes a general 'Senecan framework' for the poem.

times' (*temporibus diris*, 10.15, a direct echo of Juvenal's earlier description of the reign of Domitian, 4.80). Their scurrilous misrepresentation here is a bracing introduction to the poem's program of debasement of hallowed Roman *exempla*.

By conspicuously ignoring the philosophical motivations of these figures, the speaker also implicitly draws the lines between Stoic and Cynic; for, whereas the Stoic advocated conscientious and moral engagement in contemporary politics, the Cynic response was withdrawal – to live one's life 'outside of business and law-suits and rivalries and wars and factions'.³³ The Cynic line taken in the poem regarding political life is extreme. 'How often do you start a project so favorably', the speaker taunts, 'that afterwards you don't regret the attempt – or its accomplishment?'³⁴ *No* undertaking is worthwhile, if we believe this sermon. Moreover, people in public life, we are told, are universally murderous in their motivations towards one another. 'Even people who don't *want* to kill anyone want to be *able* to do so': *et qui nolunt occidere quemquam/ posse volunt* (96-7). The witticism is so concentrated that all the truth has been boiled out of it. If we trust the poem's views on public life, political success is inevitably attended by personal disaster:

Quid Crassos, quid Pompeios evertit et illum,

ad sua qui domitos deduxit flagra Quirites?

summus nempe locus nulla non arte petitus

110

magnaue numinibus vota exaudita malignis.

³³ Dio 6.31: πραγμάτων δὲ καὶ δικῶν καὶ φιλονεικιῶν καὶ πολέμων καὶ στάσεων ἐκτὸς ἦν. Generally on the characteristic social orientation of Stoic and Cynic, cf. Francis (1995: 66): 'Whereas Stoic values came directly from society itself and were based on accepted social expectations, Cynic values were based on explicitly denying and overturning the values and expectations of society'.

³⁴ 10.5-6: *quid tam dextro pede concipis ut te/ conatus non paeniteat votique peracti?*

ad generum Cereris sine caede ac sanguine pauci
descendunt reges et sicca morte tyranni (108-113).

What caused the downfall of men like Crassus and Pompey,
 and the one who tamed Rome's citizens and led them under his lash?
 Surely it was the top spot, sought with every skill,
 and lofty prayers, granted by gods who bear us ill.
 Few kings and tyrants go to meet Ceres' son-in-law
 without blood and slaughter, and with a dry death.

Success itself destroys: 'a long and distinguished list of honors drowns people'.³⁵ *Nempe* ('surely') at line 110 seems like a provocation: we are dared to accept the speaker's condemnation of political engagement as self-evident truth. The description of these historical figures smacks of a Cynic's audaciously frank speech. Pompey and Caesar (surely the *illum* of 108-9), despite their ideological opposition, are characterized as 'kings and tyrants' (103). Caesar, whose sole rule established the Imperial system of government under which Juvenal still lives, turned Roman citizens into slaves: they are *domiti* (110), 'tamed', a word that recalls Rome's recent tyrant Domitian, and the title that punned on his name, *dominus et deus* ('master and god'). The contemptuous implication in the generalizing plural *Crassos et Pompeios* is that the power-brokers of the First Triumvirate have been reduplicated again and again in subsequent Roman history. The sentiment was hardly unknown – as Matthew Roller has demonstrated, the notion that aristocrats had become

³⁵ 10.57-8: *mergit longa atque insignis honorum/ pagina*.

slaves of a sort to the authority of the emperor represented a widespread anxiety under the Empire.³⁶ But the argument is also thoroughly Cynic in its implications, since the Cynics emphatically promoted the notion of individual ‘kingship’ in opposition to the slavish service of any political regime.³⁷

Whereas political success constitutes its own trap, the orators Cicero and Demosthenes incurred destruction through their own celebrated eloquence, says the Cynic speaker, in a vigorous bout of debasement (10.118-126):

*Eloquio sed uterque perit orator, utrumque
 largus et exundans leto dedit ingenii fons.
 ingenio manus est et cervix caesa, nec umquam 120
 sanguine caesidici maduerant rostra pusilli.
 “o fortunatam natam me consule Romam”:
 Antoni gladios potuit contemnere si sic
 omnia dixisset. ridenda poemata malo
 quam te, conspicuae divina Philippica famae, 125
 volveris a prima quae proxima.*

But both orators [*sc.* Cicero and Demosthenes] perished through their eloquence:
 a copious and overflowing fountain of talent delivered both to death.

Talent had its hands and neck severed: the Rostra

³⁶ See Roller (2001: 213-288) on the master-slave relationship as a metaphor for understanding the situation of elite Romans under the Emperor.

³⁷ See e.g. Dio 4 *passim*; Epict. 3.22.49, 94; Luc. *Vit. Auct.* 7.

was never drenched in the blood of any smalltime attorney.

“O Rome, so blessed to have been born while I was consul!”

He could have scorned Antony’s swords if everything

he had said was like this. I prefer his laughable poems

to you, the divine *Philippic* of shining fame,

the speech that you find after the first on the roll.

The passage begins with what seems like flattery of Cicero, praising his ‘fountain of talent’, but the sentiment is immediately undermined when the imagery of an ‘overflowing fountain’ is grotesquely literalized in the scene of the Rostra drenched with blood, the *largus fons* of no *pusillus causicus*. The placement of ‘hands and neck’ (*manus* and *cervix*) as the grammatical subject of line 120 is striking: the reduction of men to particular body-parts is not an infrequent satirical technique in Juvenal and other Latin satirists,³⁸ but has wicked point here, since, when Cicero’s dismembered head and hands were nailed to the Rostra, the man was literally reduced to his body parts.³⁹ Juvenal then at 122 cites Cicero’s infamous line from his epic poem *De Consulatu Suo* (‘On his own Consulship’), which was frequently

³⁸ See Schmitz (2000: 150-161), who catalogues instances in Juvenal of ‘die satirische Reduktion eines Menschen auf das entscheidende Detail’. In this poem, in which we are constantly encouraged to realize the ease with which death can come to us, and in which life is envisaged through its barest physical components, there is disproportionate mention of necks. No one neck suffices for the *corona* in line 40; the frightened crowd witnessing the downfall of Sejanus fear being dragged away by their necks (88); Priam would have been carried out on his sons’ necks if he had not outlived them (260), but as it was, he wished to die, like a useless ox offering its neck to its master’s knife (269); on Pompey’s death, ‘Fortune severed the head she had saved’ (286); if you submit to the persuasions of a wealthy temptress, you will ‘offer your pretty white neck to the sword’ (345).

³⁹ The story is told at Sen. *Contr.* 17.1; App. *B.C.* 4.20; Plut. *Cic.* 48.2; Cass. Dio 47.8.3-4; see Butler (2002) on the story’s cultural implications.

excerpted and mocked by Cicero's detractors for its cumbersome assonance and its vanity.⁴⁰ The line is such a familiar object of ridicule that Juvenal's citation here is almost a quote of a quote, a reference as much to the popular mockery of Cicero's poetry as to the line itself. The speaker then trumps this timeworn line of attack by claiming impertinently that he actually prefers this 'laughable' poetry to the second *Philippic*, the most excoriating and vehement of Cicero's orations against Antony, and a work held in far greater esteem than Cicero's verse.⁴¹

The most vicious criticism comes, however, in Juvenal's sardonic remark that Cicero could have 'scorned Antony's swords' if everything he had said was like that line of poetry. Eichholz calls it a 'brutal remark' (1956: 66), rightly, though he does not explain quite why, and other interpretations have softened its blow. According to several commentators, the phrase 'scorned Antony's swords' means, in fact, avoiding them altogether, which Cicero could have done had he been solely a poet, or a merely mediocre orator.⁴² But the point of courageously 'scorning' the enemy's swords is very specific, since it refers to, and, indeed, claims to rebut a defiant challenge of Cicero to Antony in the second *Philippic*: 'I scorned Catiline's swords, and I will not be afraid of yours'.⁴³ In grammatical terms, the apodosis of the unreal conditional clause '*Antoni gladios potuit contemnere*' should mean that Cicero did

⁴⁰ The line is mocked at [Sall] *In Cic.* 5, and defended at [Cic] *In Sall.* 7. Quintilian uses the verse as a negative example of excessive assonance (9.4.41, followed by Diomedes 456-6 K) and excessive boastfulness (11.1.24). For an overview of the line's afterlife, see Allen (1956). Whatever its actual merits and influence, Cicero's poetry had a deplorable reputation in the Empire; see Sen. *Contr.* 3.pr.8, Plut. *Cic.* 2.2. Tacitus remarked that Caesar's and Brutus' poetry was written with no greater skill than Cicero, but with more luck, since fewer know that they had written it (*Dial.* 21).

⁴¹ On Cicero's reputation in the Imperial age, see Winterbottom (1982), Kaster (1998).

⁴² Duff (1898) summarizes: 'If Cicero had confined himself to poetry, he would have been safe'; Winkler (1989b: 86): 'If his oratory had been as bad as his poetry, Cicero would not have come to a sticky end'.

⁴³ *Phil.* 2.118: *contempsit Catilinae gladios, non pertimescam tuos.*

not, in fact, scorn Antony's swords,⁴⁴ and this is precisely the scurrilous claim of a tradition of Ciceronian detractors, beginning with Asinius Pollio in his oration *Pro Lamia*. According to Pollio's (partisan) account, once Cicero found out that Antony had had him proscribed, far from 'scorning Antony's swords', Cicero offered to retract everything he had said in the *Philippics*, and, in cowardly fear for his life, offered to write speeches in praise of his enemy.⁴⁵ Although few in antiquity shared Pollio's fierce animosity towards Cicero, Pollio was commemorated as a pivotal figure in the history of declamation, and it was in the stock themes of declamation that the claims of Cicero's cowardice lived on. Seneca the Elder preserves two *suasoriae*, with a variety of notable responses, inspired by Pollio - 'Cicero deliberates whether to beg Antony for his life' and 'Cicero deliberates whether to burn his speeches in return for Antony's promise of safety' - and Quintilian attests that both of these retained currency as *suasoria* topics in his time.⁴⁶ The point, therefore, is this: if Cicero had always been as proud as he was in his poetry, then he could have scorned Antony's swords - but he did not. Just as the Cynic speaker of the poem had adopted the slurs of Seneca's enemies that he was a money-grubbing hypocrite (10.16-7), so here he adopts the slur of Cicero's enemies that he was a coward.⁴⁷ When he goes on to criticize Demosthenes, he similarly repeats the slurs of an invective tradition about Demosthenes' low birth (10.130-2)

⁴⁴ The indicative is regularly used with modal verbs instead of the potential subjunctive in the apodosis of an unreal conditional clause: Woodcock, sec. 200.

⁴⁵ Sen. *Suas.* 6.15.

⁴⁶ *Suas.* 6 (*Deliberat Cicero, an Antonium deprecetur*), 7 (*Deliberat Cicero, an scripta sua comburat promittente Antonio incolumitatem, si fecisset*). For their currency in Quintilian's time, see *Inst.* 3.8.46. On these declamation topics, see Kaster (1998), Wilson (2008); on ancient versions of Cicero's death, see Roller (1997).

⁴⁷ Asinius Pollio was a partisan of Antony (Vell. 2.86.3, Sen. *de Clem.* 1.10.1). On Antony and the proscriptions, Velleius Paterculus (2.64.4) claims that, once Cicero was dead, Antony had had his fill of blood. It should be observed that Juvenal's attack on Cicero is much more abusive than Seneca's own more reasoned, ambivalent portrait of Cicero in his *De Brevitate Vitae* 5, in which Cicero's withdrawal from politics (presumably in 56: see Williams 2003 ad loc.) is represented as compromising his Stoic principles.

– though, of course, it is completely irrelevant to the argument that Demosthenes perished as a result of his eloquence.

According to a story told about Diogenes, the Cynic sage once encountered Demosthenes having lunch in a bar, and when a crowd of people wished to see the famous orator, Diogenes stuck out his middle finger at Demosthenes and exclaimed: “That’s him - the demagogue of Athens!”⁴⁸ In the eighth *Satire*, Juvenal had described Cicero, in a manner more consonant with his image in other sources in the Imperial era, as the man whom ‘free Rome dubbed the *pater patriae*’.⁴⁹ Here instead, in true Diogenes-style, the Cynic speaker gives Cicero the middle finger. Still, there is something startling in these targets, given Juvenal’s indebtedness to them in his satiric project at large. As Winkler (1989b: 88) puts it, ‘Juvenal’s satires are contemporary Philippics against the rising flood of vice and hypocrisy’, and Juvenal’s techniques owe much to Cicero’s impassioned invectives. Demosthenes is an equally important stylistic model. The tone of indignation and recrimination that Imperial-era stylistic theorists labeled βαρύτης, for which Demosthenes’ *Epistles* in particular were a primary model, was a central building-block of Imperial declamation and has left a clear mark on Juvenal’s satires, especially in his earlier guise as the indignant satirist.⁵⁰ Even more fundamentally, the *Philippics* of both Cicero and Demosthenes are protests against tyranny or the threat of tyranny, a project with which Juvenal might be expected to have had some

⁴⁸ *DL* 6.34-5.

⁴⁹ 8.244: *Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit*. Winkler (1989b: 86-7) convincingly argues that the style of Juvenal’s lines about Cicero in the eighth *Satire* mimic the overwrought assonance and alliteration typical of Cicero’s own self-aggrandizing verse. Of course, this ‘subtle undermining’ of Cicero’s greatness in the eighth *Satire* is quite different from the abuse in the tenth.

⁵⁰ See Rutherford (1998): you produce βαρύτης ‘when you impersonate a certain tone of indignation and injured pride, sometimes reproaching the jury, protesting that you deserve the opposite treatment to what you have received, sometimes accusing yourself in irony (or ‘figured language’)...’ (at 28); ‘Indignant and self-reproaching speeches of this sort, often dramatizing quasi- or wholly fictional episodes from the end of Demosthenes’ life, were extremely popular with declaimers and their audiences during this period’ (at 82).

sympathy. In these odd, self-defeating attacks we are made to feel the dissonance between the Cynic speaker of *Satire* 10 and the positions assumed elsewhere by Juvenal in his *Satires*.⁵¹ The Cynic program of debasement finds expression, also, in the poem's constant imagery of brokenness, fragility, and collapse. One of the poem's most memorable vignettes describes the statue of Sejanus being torn down, amid other chaotic and indiscriminate destruction: ropes draw down the statue (58) while axes strike the wheels of chariots (59) and the legs of innocent horses are broken (60). Fires blaze, in readiness for a literal debasement: the head of Sejanus, 'second most-loved in the whole world', will be melted down and fashioned into 'little jugs, basins, saucepans, piss-pots'.⁵² His fall from power is figured as physical collapse (*ruina*, 107). The corruption of intangible ideals is also expressed in Juvenal's scene of damaged war spoils on the battlefield (133-7): 'a breastplate fastened to branchless [or 'dismembered'] tree-trunks, and a cheek-piece hanging from a shattered helmet, and a chariot pole broken [or 'mutilated'] from its yoke, and the stern ornament of a defeated ship...'⁵³ These inanimate objects are, Juvenal ironically says, 'believed to be goods more than human'.⁵⁴ Of the ancestral busts missing shoulders and ears at the beginning of the eighth *Satire*, Braund writes that 'the broken state of the statues does not reflect worthlessness but real excellence; if anything, the dilapidation depicts the decline of their families' (1988: 105).

⁵¹ Contrast too the difference in Juvenal's depictions of Marius. In *Sat.* 8 Juvenal describes his laudable ascent from wage-earning ploughman to 'the sole protector of frightened Rome' (*solus trepidantem protegit Urbem*, 250). In *Sat.* 10, by contrast, Juvenal makes Marius synonymous with the wretchedness of old age, a man who suffers 'exile, imprisonment, Minturnine marshes, and begging for bread in defeated Carthage' (276-7: more extremist slander, as Courtney observes ad loc., since Juvenal ignores the fact that 'he returned to Rome victorious, held a seventh consulship, and died in his bed').

⁵² 10.63-4: *deinde ex facie toto orbe secundal fiunt urceoli, pelves, sartago, matellae*. Cf. Pliny (*Paneg.* 52.5) has a similar picture of people melting down the statues of Domitian. Lavagnini (1948: 88) points out similar images at DL 5.77 and Plut. *Prae.ger.rei.* 820F, and suggests a common source of the image in diatribes on the vanity of political glory.

⁵³ 10.133-5: *Bellorum exuviae, truncis adfixa tropaeis/ lorica et fracta de casside buccula pendens/ et curtum temone iugum victaeque triremis/ aplustre...*

⁵⁴ 10.137: *humanis maiora bonis creduntur*.

for virtue. Who embraces virtue for its own sake, if
 incentives are removed? Yet, a nation has at times been destroyed
 by the glory of a few, the lust for praise and an inscription
 that will cling to the stones, the guardians of his ashes,
 the stones which the evil strength of a sterile fig tree can
 cleave apart, since even tombs themselves can die.

When Cicero, using Republican Roman heroes as moral *exempla*, asserted that the only thing worth seeking in life is ‘that which is worthy of praise and fame’ (*quod laudabile esset et praeclarum*), he was giving voice to a near-ubiquitous Roman ideal of judging actions according to the estimation of one’s fellow and future Romans.⁵⁵ Juvenal’s Cynic speaker debases the very notion of fame into something not merely trivial but physical, and therefore not transcendent – merely an inscription on gravestones. Yet these are also stunningly poetic lines – some of the most inventive in all Juvenal – and their form is at odds with their content. The impression one gets when reading this sentence is of images constantly proliferating. The main clause is stated first (*patriam...cupido*), but then the sentence branches out into a series of new clauses; the subject moves from *cupido* to *tituli*, which begets its own participial clause, then the subject moves from *cupido* to *saxis*, which begets an appositional phrase and a relative clause with a new subject, the *ficus*, even after which there is a further causal clause. The form of the sentence, with its insistent tendency to renew itself, seems to tell against the lines’ sentiment of finality and closure. There is a superabundance of imaginative detail: the very inscriptions ‘cling’ tenuously to the

⁵⁵ *Par. Stoic.* 1.12, quoted by Griffin (1996: 196).

gravestones, which, personified, are ‘guards’ of no more than ashes. Yet even these inanimate stones are subject to death, cracked apart by a fig tree whose strength is itself ‘bad’, and even *it* is ‘sterile’ and therefore can hope for no posthumous issue or fame. As always in *Satire 10*, the very grimness of the worldview taunts us to disagree. Mayor’s note on this line adds the incidental detail: ‘at this time (Sept. 1871) a wild fig-tree may be seen growing out of the walls of the senate-house court, Cambridge’. Mayor took this fortuitous opportunity to point out a small continuity between Juvenal’s world and his own, thereby (intuitively?) protesting the notion that the memory of things past stops dead in the grave. If this were true, our own reading of Juvenal would be both useless and impossible; luckily, then, the poem works to provoke our critical disagreement, and not our passive assent.

2. The Laugh of Democritus and the Cynic Ideal

In lines 28-53 of *Satire 10*, as Juvenal is setting out to demonstrate the vanity of worldly ambitions, he refers his listeners explicitly to a popular philosophical precedent. Do you approve of Heraclitus, he asks, who is said to have cried at every human enterprise, and Democritus, who met every situation with his ‘stern, critical laughter’ (*rigidi censura cachinni*, 31)? He says that Democritus’ laughter is ‘easy for anyone’, but the speaker clearly sympathizes with his approach, and he imagines Democritus transported to Rome, responding with his trademark laughter to contemporary Roman life. Seneca had already introduced this pair in his *De tranquillitate animi*, and had expressed a preference for Democritus’ serene detachment (the theme of Democritus’ now-lost treatise *περὶ εὐθυμίας*)

over Heraclitus' excessive empathy with life's petty miseries.⁵⁶ 'We should make light of everything', says Seneca, 'and endure everything with a ready conscience'.⁵⁷ Anderson (1962) influentially derived programmatic significance from this introduction of Democritus, suggesting that his mocking detachment is a model the satirist himself follows in his later *Satires*.

It should, though, be emphasized that the choice of Democritus as a philosophical model underlines the specifically Cynic orientation of the speaking voice in *Satire* 10. Zeph Stewart (1958) has demonstrated that it was the Cynics who, in the Imperial period, adopted the laughing philosopher as a figurehead, and it is largely to them that we owe the survival of Democritus' ethical fragments in the gnomologies. Democritus himself delivers a lengthy, orthodox Cynic diatribe in the fictional Imperial-era epistles of Hippocrates, a sequence of which relate the legendary visit of Hippocrates to Democritus. Hippocrates traveled to Abdera intending to cure the philosopher of his mad, ceaseless laughter, only to be convinced by him that laughter is the only appropriate response to the vanity of human affairs.⁵⁸ The Democritus of these letters lives in a disheveled state at an isolated location, denouncing involvement in the pursuit of wealth, military glory, marriage and all the other things commonly acknowledged as goods. When Hippocrates objects that nature did not beget men for inactivity, Democritus describes the infinite fickleness and foolishness that mark human

⁵⁶ 2.10.5; see Anderson (1982: 341-4). For a survey of this pairing in antiquity and beyond, see Lutz (1954). Several sources attempt to reconcile the popular image of Democritus as the laughing philosopher with his other after-life as influential early proponent of atomic theory. Thus, he finds everything laughable because he knows that human existence in its entirety consists merely in the drift of atoms: Luc. *Vit. Auct.* 13; [Hippocr.] *Ep.* 17.7 (Smith 1990: 85).

⁵⁷ *Tr. an.* 15.2: *elevanda ergo omnia et facili animo ferenda*. Cf. *De Ira* 2.10.5. Lucian introduces the pair in several works, and his satirical approach also obviously inclines towards the Democritean model (*De Sacr.* 15, *Peregr.* 7, 45; *Vit. Auct.* 13-4).

⁵⁸ Text and translation in Smith (1990: 54-97). On the encounter between Democritus and Hippocrates in the Imperial imagination, see Temkin (1991: 51-76).

ambition, for which laughter is the only truly appropriate response.⁵⁹ Although Juvenal may not have known these particular epistles (though, equally, he may have), it is clearly a Cynic vision of Democritus that Juvenal presents at 10.28-53. Juvenal's emphasis is not on Democritus' contented εὐθυμία, but rather on Democritus' scornful dismissal of the usual incidents of human society: 'he would laugh at the anxieties of the mob, and also at their joys, and sometimes at their tears'.⁶⁰ Moreover, Juvenal's passage ends with an archetypal Cynic display of ἀναιδεία ('shamelessness'), as Democritus counters the common man's enslavement to the tyranny of fortune by giving Fortuna the middle finger – an obscene gesture that was somewhat of a trademark for the Cynic σοφός Diogenes.⁶¹

The targets of Democritus' mockery in this scene are also consistent with Cynic ideas, since, far from inveighing against vice, Democritus seems here instead to be laughing at Roman custom, empty νόμος, the archetypal target of Cynic scorn. Juvenal imagines Democritus witnessing the procession at the opening of the annual *Ludi Romani*, and, seeing the procession through Democritus' eyes, presents a farcical and defamiliarizing account of this familiar Roman institution. According to Roman ritual, the magistrate in charge of the games

⁵⁹ *Ep.* 17.5-8. Reflecting the Cynic lens through which Democritus was viewed in the period, Plutarch also understood Democritus to have recommended withdrawal from public affairs, and makes the same objection: εὐθυμία is too costly a good if its price is inactivity (ἀπραξία): *Tran. An.* 465C.

⁶⁰ 10.51-2: *ridebat curas nec non et gaudia volgi, / interdum et lacrimas*. Cf. the picture of Democritus at [Hippocr.] *Ep.* 10.1: 'he laughs at everyone, whether he sees them dejected and sad, and whether he sees them happy' (ὁ δὲ γελᾷ, τοὺς μὲν κατηφεῖς τε καὶ σκυθρωπούς, τοὺς δὲ χαίροντας ὁρῶν). Montaigne also said he preferred Democritus' approach to Heraclitus, not because 'it is pleasanter to laugh', but because 'it expresses more contempt and is more condemnatory of us... I do not think we can ever be despised as much as we deserve' (trans. Cohen, 1958: 132-3). The sentiment seems classically Cynic; indeed, later the same paragraph, Montaigne cites Diogenes as his *exemplum*.

⁶¹ 10.52-3: *Fortunae ipse minaci / mandaret laqueum mediumque ostenderet unguem* ('he bid threatening Fortune to go hang herself, and gave her the middle finger'). Cf. DL 6.34, 35; Epict. 3.2.11.

leads the procession dressed in the garb of a general at a triumph, thereby making the *pompa*, as Mommsen (1858: 81) put it, a ‘Triumphalprocession ohne Triumph’.⁶² Thus, Juvenal asks:

*Quid se vidisset praetorem curribus altis
 extantem et medii sublimem pulvere Circi
 in tunica Iovis et pictae Sarrana ferentem
 ex umeris aulaea togae magnaеque coronae
 tantum orbem, quanto cervix non sufficit ulla? 40
 quippe tenet sudans hanc publicus, et sibi †consul†
 ne placeat, curru servus portatur eodem.
 da nunc et volucrem, sceptro quae surgit eburno,
 illinc cornices, hinc praecedentia longi
 agminis officia et niveos ad frena Quirites,
 defossa in loculos quos sportula fecit amicos. (10.36-46).*

What if he [Democritus] had seen the praetor standing
 on his high chariot, conspicuous amid the Circus’ dust,
 in the tunic of Jupiter, bearing the Tyrian folds of
 a decorated toga from his shoulders, and the circle of a huge crown,
 so big that no single neck is sufficient to carry it?
 Indeed, so that the †consul†⁶³ doesn’t become too pleased with himself,

⁶² Juvenal himself calls it, in a second brief description, ‘similar to a triumph’ (*similisque triumpho*, 11.194).

a sweating public slave, carried along in the same chariot,
 holds it for him. Add the bird that surges from the ivory scepter;
 the horn section on one side; the escort on the other,
 leading the way in a long battle-line:
 citizens in their clean white togas at the bit,
 men whom a dole buried deep into cashboxes made into friends.

Democritus had already once been transplanted to the Roman Circus, in Horace's *Epistle to Augustus*. Horace had used Democritus to mock the taste for spectacle amongst jaded audiences; whether the people are entranced by a 'panther crossed with a camel, a hybrid species, or whether by a white elephant', Horace says that Democritus, 'if he were alive on earth', would mock the Roman people themselves, who provide the true spectacle.⁶⁴ But the differences between Horace and Juvenal are striking. In Horace, the ancient Greek philosopher was imagined witnessing at close hand the contemporary fascination with outlandish freaks of nature. While there was hardly a lack of such outlandish spectacles in the Empire – as, for example, Martial's epigrams on the amphitheater attest – in Juvenal's poem, Democritus instead witnesses a spectacle that would have been all too familiar, even banal, to the audience. The *Ludi Romani* had been held annually in Rome since 367 B.C., and the scene that Juvenal exhibits for Democritus' mockery is an apparently unembellished vision of the *pompa* opening the event, a *de rigueur* ceremony that, for contemporary audiences, can

⁶³ All modern editors athetize *consul* (49), since one needs a word to refer back to the *praetor*. But the discontinuity may highlight the artifice of this procession, in which the praetor masquerades precisely as a triumphing "consul".

⁶⁴ *Ep.* 2.1.194-198. The 'panther crossed with a camel' (*confusa...panthera camelo*) is the giraffe (*camelopardalis*). Horace's periphrasis makes an exotic animal seem even more outlandish.

have turned few heads in amazement. ‘I know what a tiresome thing the procession is at the Circus’, commiserates Seneca the Elder.⁶⁵ Keeping Horace’s use of Democritus in mind, the outlandish spectacles of Juvenal’s satiric predecessors have been replaced with a traditional Roman custom, which, in turn, is made to seem, through farcical description, like a kind of outlandish spectacle of its own. No white elephants here; instead, the Roman military icon of the eagle (*aquila*), surely an everyday sight in ancient Rome, is described, grotesquely, as a kind of theatrical trick, ‘a bird that surges forth from the ivory sceptre’ (line 43). Horace depicted squadrons of cavalry and troops of infantry flooding the theatres before shows begin, keeping the ‘curtains closed for four or more hours’,⁶⁶ these ‘curtains’ (*auleae*) in Juvenal become merely the folds of the praetor’s garment, as he leads a single chariot in the *pompa*. The overstatement and exaggeration in Juvenal’s description of the scene ironically heighten the gap between an actual triumph and the banality of its ritualized imitation. So, for example, although it was a well-attested ritual aspect of the triumph for the slave in the triumphing general’s chariot to carry the crown as a reminder to the general not to fall prey to hubris, here, a public slave strains, sweating, to carry the crown because it is so large (one neck is not sufficient to bear the weight, 40). Although no part of the world has been subdued by this mock general, his crown is described as an entire *orbem* (‘circle’/ ‘world’), an oversized prop that serves only to highlight the artificiality of his glory.⁶⁷

Another implicit juxtaposition in this passage is between the Cynic preacher’s ironic vision of the Circus and Juvenal’s earlier indictment of elite involvement in theatrical display. When

⁶⁵ *Contr.* 1.pr.24: *scio, quam odiosa res mihi sit circensibus pompa.*

⁶⁶ *Ep.* 2.1.189: *quattuor aut pluris aulaea premuntur in horas.*

⁶⁷ The slave’s role as crown-bearer in the triumph: Plin.*HN* 33.4.11; Zon. 7.21. On the theatrical aspects of Juvenal’s picture of the *pompa*, see also Schmitz (2000: 27-8), Keane (2003: 269-273).

we read lines 36 and following for the first time, it is hardly possible to resist the expectation that Juvenal is here, as before, presenting an excoriating image of an aristocrat behaving badly. Yet the opposite is true. When Juvenal enjambes *extantem* in line 37, the word deflates the expectation that the praetor, ‘on his lofty chariot’ (*curribus altis*), is shamefully taking part in some chariot race, or careering through the city like the boy Automedon of *Satire* one (60-1) or the ‘consul muleteer’ Lateranus of *Satire* eight (146-162). He is just standing. When, at the end of line 37, the praetor is depicted amidst the dust of the Circus, we expect perhaps that he is taking part in some degrading farce or gladiatorial combat, like the wayward aristocrats Juvenal inveighs against in the eighth *Satire* (183-230), only to learn in the following line that he is dressed ‘*in tunica Iovis*’, adorned in the proper ritual dress for the *pompa*. Put simply, the praetor earns Democritus’ mockery not through any crime or scandal, but merely, or precisely, by participating in Roman ritual. The Cynic preacher inveighs here not against vice, but against νόμος (‘custom’), which is itself made to seem like an outlandish spectacle. The defamiliarizing account and ironic theatricalization of the ritual *pompa* empties it of its meaning, and exposes it as mere farce, mere display, mere τῦφος.

If the speaker of *Satire* 10 aims to disabuse us of our ideas about Roman ambitions and Roman custom, what is left? This question is answered in the unforgiving final section of the poem, in which the speaker’s credentials as a ‘hard Cynic’ are more firmly established than ever. True to tendencies throughout the poem, ideals are here replaced with physical realities, and we are left with nothing but our own bodies. It is worth reading the final section in its entirety, since its philosophical coherence has not been commonly stressed.

Nil ergo optabunt homines? si consilium vis,

*permittes ipsis expendere numinibus quid
 conveniat nobis rebusque sit utile nostris;
 nam pro iucundis aptissima quaeque dabunt di.
 carior est illis homo quam sibi. nos animorum 350
 impulsu caeco vanaque cupidine ducti
 coniugium petimus partumque uxoris, at illis
 notum qui pueri qualisque futura sit uxor.
 ut tamen et poscas aliquid voveasque sacellis
 exta et candiduli divina tomacula porci, 355
 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 360
 Herculis aerumnas credat saevosque Dolores
 et venere et cenis et pluma Sardanapalli.
 monstro quod ipse tibi possis dare; semita certe
 tranquillae per virtutem patet unica vitae.
 nullum numen habes, si sit prudentia: nos te, 365
 nos facimus, Fortuna, deam caeloque locamus. (10.346-66).*

So, then, is there nothing for people to wish for? If you want advice,
 you'll allow the gods themselves to weigh out
 what is best for us and what will help our circumstances;

for whatever the gods give will be most appropriate, rather than pleasant.
 People are dearer to the gods than they are to themselves.
 Led on by our blind instinct and our vain desire,
 we seek out marriage and children from a wife,
 but only the gods know what kind of wife and kids we'll have.
 Yet, to give you something to ask for, and so you can dedicate to the shrines
 the innards and sacred sausages of a gleaming white pig,
 you should ask for a sound mind in a sound body.
 Demand a brave spirit without any fear of death,
 that reckons life's last lap amongst nature's gifts,⁶⁸
 that can endure any toil, that has no knowledge of anger,
 that desires nothing, and thinks that the labors and brutal exertions
 of Hercules superior to the sex and banquets and feather-beds of Sardanapallus.
 I'm showing you what you can give to yourself.
 No doubt, the only entrance to the tranquil life lies open through virtue.
 If we had any sense, you'd have no power: Fortune, it's we
 who make you a goddess and lodge you in the sky.

The argument is, first, that we should leave the determination of what is good for us to the gods, who care for us more than we do ourselves. Then, if we must pray for something, we should pray for 'a sound mind in a sound body'. The deprecatory treatment of religious ritual in introducing this prayer (lines 354-5) has evaded few readers. The reason for the sarcastic

⁶⁸ In accordance with Wiessen (1969), I take *spatium vitae extremum* ('life's last lap') to be a poetic periphrasis for 'death', and thus the line is an amplification of the previous one: far from fearing death, we should ideally treat it as a boon.

tones of these lines comes in line 363 – a sound mind in a sound body is not something we need to pray for at all, but, rather, ‘this is something you can give yourself’. The model for this ideal is Heracles, famous for his ‘virtue’ (ἀρετή) and his endurance of ‘labors’ (πόννοι). It is through this fundamental self-reliance (αὐτάρκεια) that we can surmount the trials cast our way by Fortune, thus stripping her of her power. For some commentators, the stress laid on *virtus* marks the passage out as Stoic;⁶⁹ others have seen Epicurean inspiration in the ideal of the *tranquilla vita*;⁷⁰ still others think that the philosophical sheen here is too vague or superficial to be tied to any specific position.⁷¹ But, as elsewhere in the poem, to miss the passage’s philosophical specificity would be to miss the very point of the satire.

The conclusion of the tenth *Satire* offers, point by point, a powerful summation of the Cynic creed. The notion that we should leave the decision of what is best for us to the gods is a Cynic commonplace: in the pseudo-Lucianic dialogue ‘The Cynic’, God is described as a ‘good host’, who puts before us all the kind of meal most appropriate for each of us. While the greedy try to eat every dish on the table, we should be content with the meal allotted to us, because that is the one best suited for us.⁷² Cynic moralizing against luxury is frequently

⁶⁹ So Courtney (1980: 450-1).

⁷⁰ So Ferguson (1979: 276) and Fishelov (1990: 381). The continued prominence of Epicureanism in the second century is unquestionable (Gordon 1996). But the superficial similarities are misleading. Epicureanism may have taken a dim view of involvement in politics and regarded the trappings of glory and fame as superfluous to a happy life, but the Epicurean ideal of a ‘body without exertion, mind without disturbance’ (*corpus sine dolore, animus sine perturbatione*, Sen. *Ep.* 7.66.45) is utterly opposed to the praise of physical toils and labors in the concluding section of the poem, and the claim that the gods care more for us than we do ourselves (351) reads almost as a direct rebuttal of the Epicureans’ belief in the indifference of the gods towards human existence. It is more likely that Juvenal uses the phrase *tranquilla vita*, as Seneca did *tranquillitas animi*, to evoke the idea of Democritean εὐθυμία. Epicurus is said to have called the Cynics ‘enemies of Greece’ (DL 9.8) and the two sects were particularly antagonistic towards each other (Dudley 1937: 106-8).

⁷¹ So, Hooley (2007: 124): ‘The strength of the satire is in these factors of style and presentation; there is no philosophical coherence in it...even that oft-quoted aphorism [*mens sana in corpore sano*] is an ironic shadow’.

⁷² [Luc]. *Cyn.* 7.

grounded in the idea that all of our needs are already met by the gods.⁷³ Since the gods supply us with what we need of their own accord, there is little need of prayer: thus, Lucian tells us that the Cynic philosopher Demonax never sacrificed to Athena because he did not need anything else from her.⁷⁴ Moreover, most people's prayers are, as Diogenes used to say, fundamentally misguided, based on a false understanding of what they need to live a happy life.⁷⁵ By shucking off ambitions and desires for false goods, the Cynic can vanquish 'anger and grief and desire and fear, and the fiercest beast of all, hollow and effeminate pleasure'.⁷⁶

Because we have been softened by such pleasure and luxuries by the customs of civilized society, fully realizing a virtuous life in accordance with nature requires embracing a life of physical toughness – hence the Cynic praise of 'labours' (πόννοι). In Dio's eighth oration, Diogenes is imagined attending the Isthmian Games. When asked by a bystander his reason for attending, he claims that he has come to compete – not in effeminate athletic contests, but in a struggle with πόννοι, the noble person's 'greatest competitors' (ἀνταγωνιστὰς μεγίστους), with whom one must do battle day and night, earning not sprigs of parsley but happiness and virtue (εὐδαιμονίας καὶ ἀρετῆς) as a lifelong prize.⁷⁷ This emphatically physical struggle with labors is, as Juvenal well puts it, the 'only path' (*semita...unica*) to virtue amongst the Cynics; all other apparent goods are to be rejected. The Cynics'

⁷³ DL 6.44; Dio 6.25.

⁷⁴ Luc. *Demon.* 11.

⁷⁵ DL 6.42: ἐνεκάλει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις περὶ τῆς εὐχῆς, αἰτεῖσθαι λέγων αὐτοὺς ἀγαθὰ τὰ αὐτοῖς δοκοῦντα καὶ οὐ τὰ κατ' ἀληθείαν ('He would reproach people about their prayer, saying that they requested things which seemed them to be goods, but, in truth, were not'). On Juvenal's particular example at lines 352-3, cf. DL 6.63: Diogenes asks parents why they sacrifice to have a son without hesitating to enquire what kind of son it would be.

⁷⁶ Dio 9.12: ὀργὴν τε καὶ λύπην καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ φόβον καὶ τὸ πάντων ἀμαχώτατον θηρίον, ὕπουλον καὶ μαλθακόν, ἡδονήν.

⁷⁷ Dio, *Or.* 8.11-16.

uncompromising stance on this issue set them apart from the Stoics, who were willing to endorse other goods under the heading of ‘indifferents’.⁷⁸ Since no god was better known for his physical labors, Heracles became, from the very beginning of the Cynic tradition, the pre-eminent Cynic model, and remained so throughout antiquity.⁷⁹ The use of Heracles as a model at the end of the poem is fully in accord with Cynic ideals, and the Assyrian king Sardanapallus also appears with frequency as a Cynic antitype.⁸⁰

But most evocative of Cynic ideas is, precisely, the poem’s best-known phrase, *mens sana in corpore sano*, (‘a sound mind in a sound body’, 356). For all its notoriety, the line has seemed to some readers ill-fitted to its context. Reeve (1970) argued that this most famous line was an interpolation, a view that has earned credence in disproportion to its likelihood.⁸¹ Although early interpolation in the vulgate text cannot be discounted, it is significant that the fifth century poet Dracontius quotes the line verbatim in his *De Laudibus Dei* amongst other verbal and thematic Juvenalian reminiscences whose authenticity is unquestioned.⁸² More pertinently, though, the line need not be impugned on the grounds of sense, since it sums up

⁷⁸ According to the Stoic Zeno, things like wealth and good birth were ‘preferables’ (προήγμενα); the outright rejection of these in the tenth satire as any sort of good is fully in accord with the more rigorous Cynic position.

⁷⁹ Antisthenes used Heracles to demonstrate that ‘labor is a good’ (ὁ πόνος ἀγαθόν, DL 6.2), and he was frequently invoked thenceforth by Cynics (and Stoics, who also adopted him in a somewhat more intellectualized form as a model of virtue): Desmond (2008: 14). Lucian describes the Cynic philosopher Peregrinus immolating himself on a burning pyre at the Olympian Games of 161 in order to imitate Heracles’ fiery death and to demonstrate that death is not to be feared (*Pereg.* 4, 25).

⁸⁰ Dudley (1937: 155).

⁸¹ So Reeve (1970: 136), laconically: ‘[Juvenal’s] message is manifestly thus: “the only thing worth praying for is virtue – and that lies in your own hands”. Substitute ‘health’ for ‘virtue’ and he can be charged not only with a dereliction of a moralist’s duty but also with propagating palpable falsehood’. This argument is hailed as ‘one of the most brilliant episodes in recent interpolationist criticism’ by Tarrant (1987: 297) and the line officially acquires brackets in the text of Campana (2004: 71).

⁸² Drac. *De Laud. Dei* 3.745; cf. 3.626. Dracontius quotes another Juvenalian line in full in that work (3.87 = *Juv. Sat.* 8.83), and his hexametric attack on vice in book 3 owes much to Juvenal in both imagery and argument.

the Cynic argument with both philosophical specificity and epigrammatic point. For the Cynics, a healthy mind and body were not in any way goods additional to a life of virtue, but indivisibly part of, and indeed proof of, a life of virtue. Cynic philosophy presents itself, in opposition with (for example) Stoicism and Platonism, as a fully embodied way of life rather than an intellectual mode of thought. Epictetus captures this best in his encomium to the perfect Cynic: he says that the ideal Cynic ought not merely exhibit the qualities of his soul to potential converts, but should prove the excellence of his way of life by the strong and healthy state of his body, so that he can boast that ‘both I and my body are a witness to this truth’.⁸³ This ‘sound body’ is, indeed, something you can give yourself, according to the Cynics, who place unique importance on physical training (ἄσκησις). Diogenes Laertius reports that ‘Diogenes would say that training was of two kinds – mental and bodily...One kind is incomplete without the other, good health and strength being no less amongst the things we ought to have, as much for the soul as for the body’.⁸⁴ Hence, the tradition of anecdotes about the Cynic philosopher Crates, for example, pursuing a vigorous regime of physical exercise even when old and a hunchback.⁸⁵ These anecdotes emphasize self-reliance above all. Whether or not we endorse the idea (and moderns may in fact be *more* likely to believe it), for the Cynic, health is not something to be won by prayers from the gods, but something to be achieved oneself through a dual focus on bodily and mental training (ἄσκησις).

⁸³ Epictet. 3.22.88: ἰδοὺ καὶ τούτου μάρτυς εἰμι ἐγὼ καὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐμόν.

⁸⁴ DL 6.69: Διττήν δ’ ἔλεγεν εἶναι τὴν ἄσκησιν, τὴν μὲν ψυχικὴν, τὴν δὲ σωματικὴν...εἶναι δ’ ἀτελῆ τὴν ἐτέραν χωρὶς τῆς ἐτέρας, οὐδὲν ἦπτον εὐεξίας καὶ ἰσχύος ἐν τοῖς προσήκουσι γενομένης, ὡς περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ περὶ τὸ σῶμα.

⁸⁵ DL 6.91-2: Crates, mocked for his appearance while exercising, reassures himself that he will not fall prey to the diseases of the idle; [Crates] *Ep.* 20 (Malherbe 1977: 71): children mocking Crates at the palaestra are later inspired to adopt an exercise regime and thank him for being the ‘cause of their health’.

Yet, if the strong Cynic precedent for the ideas in the conclusion suggests that it should not be dismissed as ironic or self-defeating, there *is* something intuitively unsatisfactory about the end to this poem. The vast majority of the tenth *Satire* has been engaged in the process of ‘emptying out’ beliefs about perceived goods in Roman society (military glory, public reputation, eloquence) and staining the image of hallowed exempla. What is there, then, at the conclusion to fill the void? There is no praise of a life in accordance with nature; no promise of freedom of social pressures and restraints by adopting the Cynic lifestyle; there is only the ability to endure the inevitable sorrows and hardships of modern life, and, in a poem fixated on drawing lessons from the death of famous men, the advice to view death as a good. The ideas are Cynic indeed, but this conclusion to the preacher’s sermon brings to life precisely the kind of uncompromising extremity that Romans always found uncomfortable about Cynic philosophy. Implied in the prayer for a ‘sound mind in a sound body’ is that we have been stripped of everything else: the *imagines* lining the halls have been shattered, and we have been disillusioned of all the customary ambitions. We are left only with our bodies, in an extreme kind of self-reliance, forcibly transformed into a so-called “hard” Cynic like Diogenes. No matter how honorable this is to the Cynics, to conventional Roman thinking, this is the *sordidus victus*.

The poem’s conclusion is both the most powerful, and the most provocative and uncomfortable, summation of the Cynic creed. The satirist makes clear just how little we will have left to us if we embrace the philosophers’ worldview. If Dio Chrysostom and Epictetus had won an influential Roman readership with their lofty, idealized, amenable, ‘soft’ image of the Cynic sage, offering advice on kingship and virtue to Romans extending even to the emperor himself, *Satire* 10 exposes the philosophy’s hardest edges. The speaker’s scorn for

everything (and everyone) that Romans consider good epitomizes the corrosiveness of Cynicism, the damaging severity of its most fundamental ideas. Not a sermon but a polemic, *Satire 10* is a timely intervention in the cultural politics of the early second century.

3. *Satire Fourteen: The Domestication of Ethical Teaching*

The fourteenth *Satire* is typically described as a poem of two themes that do not entirely cohere. The first part (1-106) deals with the pernicious influence parents have on children. The remainder deals with the particular vice of greed, and, by the end (after line 255), ‘the theme of parental influence does completely fade away’ (Courtney ad loc.).⁸⁶ The poem should be re-described as a satire on education at Rome, albeit one pulling in two different directions. On one hand, Juvenal attacks those who link education solely with economic gain, and mercilessly parodies the pragmatism of fathers who teach their children nothing but the desire for profit. On the other hand, despite his criticism of the content of fathers’ teaching, his constant reference to fathers as the most proper and effective educators of their children serves to domesticate ethical teaching. ‘Few people’ are endowed with the ability to distinguish true goods from false, said the speaker at the opening of *Satire 10*, and the poem went on to show just how threateningly alien that exclusive philosophical insight could be. *Satire 14*, by contrast, emphasizes the formative place of the Roman home, and the Roman father, in the inculcation of ethical values, thereby implicitly restricting the ambit of influence for philosophers in affecting Roman values. What then of Juvenal’s own ‘teaching’? Rather than the theme of education fading away at the end, Juvenal has by that

⁸⁶ A more detailed analysis of the structure is given by O’Neil (1960). Stein (1970) suggests that Juvenal uses the headings of parental indulgence and *avaritia* to unify, within a single poem, all his typical satiric complaints. For Bellandi (1984), the theme of *avaritia* provides unity precisely because Juvenal presents it as the source of all other vices.

point himself assumed the role of educator. He commends his *Satires* as an edificatory spectacle of other's flaws, echoing the argument, precisely, of Horace's father in *Satire* 1.4. Again, Juvenal limits the role of external teachers of virtue, in this case by offering his own book as its own self-contained (and unimpeachably Roman) ethical curriculum.

In the opening of the poem, Juvenal decries the bad examples set in the home, but in language that points not merely to parental 'influence', but to education. The Roman household is a schoolroom – indeed, it is the only schoolroom the poem ever mentions. Parents themselves 'demonstrate' (*monstrant*) and 'hand down' (*tradunt*) vices to their children, the satirist says (3). One boy has 'learned' (*didicit*, 9) to gourmandize, with his wastrel father 'demonstrating' (*monstrante*, 10) his technique. Rutilus, who takes sadistic pleasure in whipping slaves, does not 'give instruction in' gentleness of spirit (*praecipit*, 16), but rather 'teaches' cruelty (*docet*, 18). With deflationary irony, these whippings are presented in terms that evoke a philosopher's sermon: 'does Rutilus', muses Juvenal, 'impart the idea that the souls and bodies of slaves are composed of the same physical matter and atoms as our own?'⁸⁷ Other children's imitations of their parents' vices are satirically presented as perversions of class exercises. For Larga's daughter, naming her mother's many lovers offers training not only in adultery, but in counting: 'she will never be able to name them so quickly, or list them off at such a pace, that she doesn't need to draw breath thirteen times'.⁸⁸ Now, while her mother dictates to her, she fills up her kid-sized wax tablets (*ceras...pusillas*) not with practiced *gnomai*, but with letters to her own lover (29-30).⁸⁹

⁸⁷ 14.16-7: *praecipit utque animas servorum et corpora nostra/ materia constare putet paribusque elementis?*

⁸⁸ 14. 26-8: *quae numquam maternos dicere moechos/ tam cito nec tanto poterit contexere cursu/ ut non ter deciens respiret?*

⁸⁹ On the place of *gnomai* in education see Morgan (2007).

These are *exempla domestica* (32), in place of the historical *exempla* counseled as part of Roman children's ethical training. Parents assume complete importance in determining children's values. In the fascinating vignette describing a Jewish household (96-106), the children 'learn and observe and reverence Judaic law' (101) for no more profound reason than that they 'happened to get' a Jewish father (*sortiti*, 96). For this religious lifestyle, deviating from Roman norms, 'the father [or Father?] is the cause' (*pater in causa*, 105).⁹⁰

In the main section of the poem, Juvenal criticizes in particular fathers who educate their sons only in the pursuit of material gain. As Morgan (1998) has shown, in the *gnomai* that ancient pupils were instructed to memorize at the earliest stages of their education, the overwhelming and predominant theme is wealth. In the anthologies, the acquisition of wealth is consistently presented as 'the greatest good and the business, along with virtue, of life' (at 125); and yet Morgan notes that few texts 'refer explicitly to the role of education in improving one's material expectations' (130).⁹¹ *Satire* 14 is one text that does critique the link between education and the desire for wealth, to which children are habituated by educators. At lines 120-5, Juvenal shows a man transmitting his love of wealth to his children in precisely the characteristic language of Roman education (*exempla...incumbere ...inbuit... ediscere...docet*), training them in the ABCs – the *elementa* – of vice. The cluster of pedagogical vocabulary ironically underlines the intellectual poverty of the lesson:

⁹⁰ The other vignettes of specific households in the opening section continue to draw a conceptual connection, albeit more obliquely, between fathers, education, and the Roman home. One father terrorizes his household, brandishing a (teacher's?) rod (*virga*, 63), because his house is dirty - but its true stains are moral ones (59-69). Juvenal says that his porch (cf. the Stoic *Porticus*?) is spattered with mud, but even a single little slave could 'correct the error' (*emendat*, 67). Juvenal depicts another father, Caetronius, not in his house but rather obsessively *building* houses (86-95), and his son acquires this same decadent penchant for construction.

⁹¹ But cf. Quintilian's condemnation of the student who is motivated by 'sordid profit' (*sordidum lucrum*), and eagerly calculates the economic return to be expected from his studies (1.12.17). For the memorization of *gnomai*, see Quint. 1.1.35-6.

a comfortable pension on retirement.⁹³ Alternatively, he tells his son to become a merchant, and not to object to importing any sort of foreign merchandise, then marking up the price (198-205). As a travesty of the educational principle that children should memorize edifying verses by famous poets, this father bids his child memorize a verse transparently of his own invention: *unde habeas quaerit nemo, sed oportet habere* ('whence you obtain it, no-one inquires; but obtain it, you ought').⁹⁴ Other fathers actively discourage their sons' generosity and charity to preserve funds for themselves. 'You're teaching them to rob and swindle and gain wealth by all crooked means', the poet accuses.⁹⁵ With black humor, Juvenal depicts an act of murder by a son who has learned his lessons about economic efficiency only too well: 'all the things you think should be obtained on land and sea, a quicker road will give to him: serious crime requires minimal effort'.⁹⁶ Yet another father has 'taught' (*praecepit*, 227) his son the love of money, and 'raised' greedy children (*producit*, 228), and now he will pay the penalty for an education absent of ethical content: 'the disciple lion will roar loudly and do away with its trembling master (or 'teacher', *magistrum*) in its cage'.⁹⁷

⁹³ 196: *dirue Maurorum attegias, castella Brigantum*. With the imperative *dirue* Juvenal conjures an entire scene: while the child drowsily laments his interrupted sleep, the father barks out commands, as if his son's future is already before his eyes. The references are to revolts suppressed by Hadrian by 123 A.D. (Courtney ad loc.): 'he is a little out of date (as fathers so often are)' (Green 1998: 210).

⁹⁴ A true heir to Trimalchio in his pride and his mythological mistakes, the father boasts that this doggerel is 'worthy of the gods, and of the poet Jupiter himself' (*dis atque ipso Iove digna poeta*, 206). Aside from the crassness of the sentiment, *oportet* is strongly prosaic (Axelson 1945: 13-4). On students' memorization of poetic lines, see Quint. 1.1.36.

⁹⁵ 14.237-8: *et spoliare doces et circumscribere et omni crimine divitias acquirere*.

⁹⁶ 14.222-4: *nam quae terraque marique/ adquirenda putas brevior via conferet illi;/ nullus enim magni sceleris labor*.

⁹⁷ 14.246-7: *trepidumque magistrum/ in cavea magno fremitu leo tollet alumnus*. The simile recalls Statius' simile of Achilles as a tame lion, which roars at its 'frightened teacher' once it rediscovers its native urges (*Achil.* 1.858-863). But note the shift in educational philosophy: in the *Achilleid*, Thetis' education about Achilles' disguise on Scyros could not alter Achilles' noble nature, and he soon shirked it off, as he did women's clothing. By contrast, in Juvenal's conception, the lion's vicious instincts are themselves the result of corrupt education. Children are good by nature (cf. 14.47), but they can be habituated to vicious instincts all-too-easily by unethical instruction.

Juvenal offers, then, a very dim assessment of contemporary Roman fathers' education of their children. Yet key to the *Satire's* function within its intellectual milieu is that the satirist persists nonetheless with his image of the father as educator. Quintilian too decried the damage parents do to children's morals. Every inch the satirist himself in this section, he paints a damning picture of children at home receiving an education in *luxuria*: 'first they can distinguish purple, the next moment they cry for vermilion – and they haven't even said their first words yet! We train their palate before we train them to speak'.⁹⁸ But Quintilian concludes that children should therefore be sent to school at a very young age: it is beneficial both for education and ethics, says Quintilian, for a child to be taught and socialized in the 'daylight of a most reputable school', and not in the 'shadowy solitude' of private tutoring in the home.⁹⁹ Juvenal himself in an earlier satire says that parents impose 'savage standards' on teachers' knowledge of literature (*saevas...leges*, 7.229), but bids them also to demand that teachers 'mold children's tender morals as if with their thumb, as when they fashion a face from wax'.¹⁰⁰ In *Satire* 14, however, this task of molding children's morality is attributed not to schools or teachers, but entirely to the father, and the father himself is consistently referred to as the 'teacher'.¹⁰¹ Despite critiquing parental education, the satirist continues to situate ethical training entirely within the Roman home.

⁹⁸ 1.2.6-8: *nondum prima verba exprimit, iam coccum intelligit, iam conchyliam poscit. Ante palatum eorum quam os instituimus.*

⁹⁹ 1.2.9: *lumen tamen illud conventus honestissimi tenebris ac solitudini praetulisset.* It is true that the school was also viewed as a place of potential moral corruption, although Quintilian argues that any dangers are outweighed by its benefits (1.2.1-31)

¹⁰⁰ 7.237-8: *exigite ut mores teneros ceu pollice ducat, / ut si quis cera voltum facit.*

¹⁰¹ Cf. *magistro...discipulum* (212-3); *magistrum...alumnus* (246-7). Conversely, that the student should revere the teacher like a parent is an educational ideal: Quint.2.9.1; Juv. 7.209-210.

Again and again throughout the *Satire*, Juvenal makes the point that parents' instruction of their children is entirely determinative of their future ethical values, a theory of education that elevates typical Roman anxieties about the impressionability of youth to a fever pitch. No relative can 'hold any hope' that the child taught to gourmandize by his father will behave any better as an adult (6-7). Some prodigious child fashioned by Prometheus from 'better clay' (35) might be able to think for himself, but most are drawn inexorably into their father's footsteps (*vestigia*, 36, a key image; cf. 53, 222). More positively, 'the skills and morals with which you educate your child will make an enormous difference' Juvenal says, in an enjambed line itself as enormous as the meter will allow.¹⁰² Because of this lasting impact, 'one must be sparing with children (*parcendum est teneris*): the dissipation of adults has not yet filled their hearts with evil'.¹⁰³ As has long been recognized, the phrase *parcendum est teneris* is a reminiscence of Vergil in the *Georgics*, who advises restraint in the pruning of tender young plants, which he personifies as moving 'from youth to adolescence'.¹⁰⁴ Behind Vergil's lines is the metaphor in which the teacher is a farmer or gardener cultivating young plants, ubiquitous in ancient pedagogical theory.¹⁰⁵ But Juvenal uses nature instead to justify assigning such lasting and formative effect to parents' influence on their children. 'This is nature's command', he pronounces (*sic natura iubet*, 31): 'since they enter minds by way of

¹⁰² 14.73-4: *plurimum enim intererit quibus artibus et quibus hunc tu/ moribus instituas*. The hammering repetitions and sixth-foot monosyllables express the warning with particular emphasis.

¹⁰³ 14.215-6: *parcendum est teneris: nondum implevere medullas/ maturae mala nequitiae*.

¹⁰⁴ 2.362-5: *ac dum prima novis adolescit frondibus aetas,/ parcendum teneris...ipsa acies nondum falcis temptanda* ('as it matures from youth to adolescence, one must be sparing with its tender shoots...one must not yet try it with the knife's edge').

¹⁰⁵ 'Nature is like the land, the teacher is the farmer, and his instructions and precepts on the subjects are the seed' is the version given in the *De Liberis Educendis* (2b) ascribed to Plutarch, and Quintilian similarly imagines the child as fertile ground, which will only produce its best fruit if cultivated by a skilled teacher (2.19.2). Certain other details in Juvenal's poem might be explained by the pervasive influence of this educational metaphor. So, the father who teaches his child an ethics of humble contentment in Juvenal's idealized picture of Italy's rustic past also teaches him about responsible cultivation (179-188), whereas the satirist devotes lines 141-151 to indicting a corrupt modern for his immoral acquisition and willful destruction of arable land.

big authorities, domestic *exempla* of faults corrupt us with greater speed'.¹⁰⁶ Crucially, since parents do wield such power over their children's ethical orientation, 'you could bring in a thousand bearded teachers' (*barbatos licet admoveas mille inde magistros*, 12), and they could not steer children from the moral course set for them by their parents. Here is the domestication of ethical teaching: though Juvenal criticizes parents for setting a bad example, his argument accords them the determinative role in molding ethics, to the exclusion of influences outside the Roman home.

If the logic is strictly pursued, then Juvenal's own *Satires* can offer little hope of shifting the ethical orientation of their adult listeners. Yet the satirist himself does adopt the role of teacher in the poem; and, in a sense, of father. As Corn (1992: 318) has observed, when Juvenal begins the final section of his poem (256-331) with the word *monstro* ('I demonstrate...'), he has assumed the pedagogical role on which he has commented throughout the *Satire*.¹⁰⁷ By putting before his listener's eyes the foolishness of contemporaries risking their life for material gain, he claims to offer a better show than the theater:

*monstro voluptatem egregiam, cui nulla theatra,
 nulla aequare queas praetoris pulpita lauti,
 si spectes quanto capitis discrimine constant
 incrementa domus, aerata multus in arca*

¹⁰⁶ 14.31-3: *velocius et citius nos/ corrumpunt vitiorum exempla domestica, magnis/ cum subeant animos auctoribus*. *Nos* in line 31 suggests an identification with the children, as does *magnis* – parents are 'big authorities' both because of their lasting impact and because parents are, from a child's perspective, big.

¹⁰⁷ For *monstrare* used throughout the poem for teaching, cf. 10, 37, 103. On the role of images of education in Roman satirists' conceptualizations of their genre, see Keane (2006: 105-136).

*fiscus et ad vigilem ponendi Castora nummi,
 ex quo Mars Ultor galeam quoque perdidit et res
 non potuit servare suas. ergo omnia Florae
 et Cereris licet et Cybeles aulaea relinquant:
 tanto maiores humana negotia ludi. (14.256-264).*

I demonstrate to you the supreme pleasure. No theater,
 no lavish praetor's stage is any match for it.
 Just watch how people risk their life to see their house
 get bigger, the riches increase in their bronze coffers,
 the cash they have to bank at the temple of Castor
 (ever since Mars Ultor dropped his helmet and couldn't
 protect his own assets anymore).¹⁰⁸ So you can abandon
 all the stage-curtains of Flora and Ceres and Cybele.
 The real world makes for better entertainment.

The theatrical imagery may lead us to think of Democritus at the amphitheater in *Satire* 10. But whereas he laughed his scornful Cynic laugh at the spectacle of Roman custom, Juvenal advises listeners to observe other's greed and foolishness as spectacle (and also indirectly tells them not to spend so much time at the theater). For Keane, Juvenal has here become the type both of the bad teacher and the bad father, 'recognizing and encouraging his reader's

¹⁰⁸ Funds were frequently deposited for safeguarding at temples, but it seems that the Temple of Mars Ultor was no longer secure; as Courtney notes ad loc., *galeam perdere* seems to be proverbial (cf. Plaut. *Rud.* 801).

appetite for shocking subject matter, much as fathers force avarice on their unwilling sons' (2007: 39). No doubt the *Satires* are sensationalistic. Indeed, as Juvenal proceeds in the following lines (265-302) to conjure before his listeners' eyes (cf. *aspice*, 275) the vivid and fantastic perils of a greedy trader – forced to travel to ever-more distant locales (277-80), susceptible to attacks from sea monsters and mermen (283), endangered by thundering ocean storms (292-5), flung overboard and clinging for dear life by his belt, or his teeth (295-7) – it is clear he is competing with the stage for dramatic spectacle. But he could not, at least, be charged with teaching greed, which is the kind of bad teacher he particularly scorns. Moreover, the advice to watch other's vices is not far removed from that *locus classicus* of Roman satirical theory, the speech of Horace's father to his son in *Satire* 1.4.109-120, advising him to watch the follies of other men's sons and draw lessons from their failures. Finally, this recommendation to *watch* spectacles is also clearly a recommendation to *read* his *Satires*, which put on stage all manner of human idiocy, and with no lack of ethical advice. Indeed, Juvenal's *Satires* supplement education more generally. A committed reading of Juvenal's *Satires* is a stiff primer in the *enkyklios paideia*, since the poems' discursive style and constant periphrastic references to mythology and Roman history test the aptitude of their readers. Another critic of contemporary education (and satirist, of sorts), Vipstanus Messalla in Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, complained that, by contrast with the comprehensive education of the Republican orators, today's students spend insufficient time on the *prima elementa*: 'not enough effort is expended on learning authors, reading through the ancients, becoming familiar with facts or personalities or periods'.¹⁰⁹ Juvenal makes up the difference.

¹⁰⁹ *Dial.* 30.1: *nec in auctoribus cognoscendis nec in evolvenda antiquitate nec in notitiam vel rerum vel hominum vel temporum satis operae insumitur.*

Crucially, by referring us to life's spectacle for ethical instruction, the satirist implies that we do not need ethical instruction from the *pauci* who claimed particular expertise in the field, the philosophers and preachers of Hadrianic Rome. In *Satire* 13, Juvenal said that 'great are the precepts given to sacred books by philosophy, the conqueror of fortune' – *victrix fortunae sapientia*, a reminiscence of *Satire* 10's closing couplet – 'but we do also consider those people happy, who have learned to endure life's troubles and cast off its yoke with life itself as their teacher'.¹¹⁰ *Vita magistra* – a powerful democratization. Then, later: 'accept, by contrast, some powerful consolations, from someone who hasn't read the Cynics or the dogmas of the Stoics – who differ from Cynics only in their outfits – and hasn't admired Epicurus, content with the plants of his little garden'.¹¹¹ Juvenal cultivates a studiously non-philosophical persona not by omitting reference to philosophy, but by trivializing the specificity of different schools and promoting above all the value of experience. Barely distinguishable from one another, these philosophies seem no longer threatening; indeed, no longer necessary.

So too in *Satire* 14, Juvenal does not ignore philosophy, but he does diminish its claims and importance. In another instance of ethical teaching in a home (of sorts), Juvenal even adduces the Cynic sage Diogenes. By contrast to extravagant homes' vulnerability to destruction by fire, 'the naked Cynic's tubs do not catch alight'.¹¹² Not a great philosopher or thinker but a 'great inhabitant' (*magnum habitatorem*, 312), he and his tub teach Alexander the Great the happiness of the man who desires nothing (*quanto felicior hic qui nil cuperet*, 312-3).

¹¹⁰ 13.19-23: *magna quidem sacris quae dat praecepta libellis/ victrix fortunae sapientia, ducimus autem/ hos quoque felices, qui ferre incommoda vitae/ nec iactare iugum vita didicere magistra.*

¹¹¹ 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.*

¹¹² 14.308-9: *dolia nudi/ non ardent Cynici.*

Juvenal ends his Cynic vignette in *Satire 14* by repeating (with near if not complete exactness) the final two lines of *Satire 10*, reaffirming the Cynic orientation of the earlier poem.¹¹³ Yet this picture of Cynicism seems less threatening, and its presentation less polemical. Alexander realizes that, in Diogenes' voluntary poverty and self-reliance, there is happiness – an emotion distant from the austere, Herculean *tranquillitas animi* preached at the end of *Satire 10*.

This poem also ends with reference to philosophy, in terms that both endorse, and yet also severely qualify, its cultural authority. The satirist is asked how much wealth is enough, but since the greedy imaginary interlocutor is displeased with every answer, the amount Juvenal advises begins to spiral out of control. The interlocutor cannot be content with the sum required for equestrian status (400 000 sesterces), or even with two or three times that much; or indeed with the 'wealth of Croesus and the kingdoms of Persia' (328), or, in the poem's mordant conclusion, with the amount Claudius gave his freedman Narcissus to kill his wife (329-331). But figures from philosophy form his 'baseline':

in quantum sitis atque fames et frigora poscunt,
quantum, Epicure, tibi parvis suffecit in hortis,
quantum Socratici ceperunt ante penates; 320
numquam aliud natura, aliud sapientia dicit.
acribus exemplis videor te cludere? misce
ergo aliquid nostris de moribus, effice summam
bis septem ordinibus quam lex dignatur Othonis (14.318-324)

¹¹³ Not insignificantly, in *Satire 14*, Juvenal changes the ending of the second line, so that it now leads directly into a section on moderation: *nos facimus, Fortuna, deam. mensura tamen quae.*

Enough is as much as thirst and hunger and cold demand,
 as much as sufficed for you, Epicurus, in your small garden,
 as much as Socrates' house used to keep inside it.

Nature and philosophy never differ in their instructions.

Do I seem to be restricting you with harsh examples? Then mix in
 something from our own ways: make it the sum

Otho ordained to sit in the theater's fourteen rows.

The simple living of Epicurus and Socrates is an ideal. Yet the structure of this passage also inserts these philosophical reference points into a social and economic scale that, for a Roman readership, casts this 'simple living' in a less than attractive light. Umbricius in *Satire* 3 is outraged at having fallen under the basic wealth requirement of an *eques* and therefore having been excluded from the first fourteen rows of the theater (153-163). The ideal natural existence of Epicurus and Socrates comes well below this economic standard on the scale, and indeed far closer to poverty than respectability. In view of Juvenal's wider probing of the cultural authority of philosophy, the imagined objection of 322-3 articulates what Juvenal projects as a standard Roman response. The naked Cynic and his tub, the figures happy with as much as 'thirst and hunger and cold' demand: these might be noble *exempla*, but they are also harsh and restrictive *exempla* (*acribus exemplis te cludere*). Moreover, and most crucially, these *exempla* are not 'ours', and opposed to 'our' – that is, Roman – *mores* (*nostris moribus*, 323). Juvenal's apothegm that 'nature and philosophy never differ in their instructions' (321) is also a trivialization. To live in accordance with nature was an ethical

ideal for all philosophical sects of the Empire, and yet equally for the naïve rustic at lines 185-7, who tells his son that nobody who enjoys wearing gumboots and animal-skin coats ever desired to do wrong.

Juvenal cites Epicurus and Socrates in his own ethical lesson, yet it is clear that living naturally is not something you need learn from them. Nature's law is that parents must train their children in the home. Although Juvenal spends much time in *Satire 14* illustrating how *badly* parents already do this, he does not therefore, like Quintilian, advocate for the importance of teachers and schools in molding ethics. Rather, the premises of the satirist's argument – his constant insistence on the father as educator, to the exclusion of a thousand other 'bearded teachers' – assume that the proper place for the ethical education of Romans is the Roman home, and that the proper teacher is the father himself. Roman *mores* are a cultural continuity, a patrilineal inheritance. If *Satire 10* deliberately provokes discomfort about the prominence of Cynic philosophy and its potential corrosiveness to Roman traditions, *Satire 14* polemically domesticates ethical teaching, diminishing the importance of philosophers who, in Hadrianic Rome, claimed to be the few who could distinguish truth from its complete opposite.

5. *Satire* Twelve: Repetition and Sacrifice in Hadrianic Rome

Despite Juvenal's notorious rhetorical volume, his sharpest satiric weapons remain silence, inference, and suggestion. His power lies in provocation as much as explicit attack. As the satirist's techniques develop over his five books, the role of the listener shifts accordingly, but it remains pivotal. If listeners were implicitly asked to complete the charges leveled in *Satire* 1, then, in the famously disjointed twelfth *Satire*, listeners are implicitly challenged to put together an argument fragmented into seemingly inapposite parts. The true force of this *Satire* emerges only from consideration of each component section, and by tracing the movement of key ideas across passages on ostensibly different themes.¹ As I argue here, for the reader attentive to Juvenal's cues, emerging from the twelfth *Satire* is a potent religious critique, which links its two predominant motifs – sacrifice and legacy-hunting – in order to satirize mercantile conceptions of the relationship between human and divine. Sacrifice ultimately is indicted as a kind of legacy-hunting of the gods, in which humans use gifts to extort divine benefits. This satiric vision of sacrifice complements similar critiques by Persius and, later in the second century, Lucian. Moreover, once set in a contemporary Hadrianic context, Juvenal's descriptions of sacrifice evoke and parody a wider ideology of

¹ The advice of Weisinger (1972: 227) to readers unfamiliar with the later Juvenal emphasizes precisely this need to appreciate each poem's subtle thematic interconnectedness: 'Whatever moral message the satire might carry can be determined only by transcending the level of the particular and discovering some pattern into which the majority of details can be placed. Juvenal, especially in the later books, is seldom simplistic enough that any gnomic statement, however straightforward it might seem, can be taken out of the context of the poem and exhibited as the poet's unequivocal advice to his audience'. Larmour (2007: 172-3) similarly stresses the need for readers to pay close attention to subtle patterns in the text: 'Narrative incoherence is a feature of Juvenalian satire, as well as the Juvenalian *urbs*, for it depends for its effects on the rhetoric of exemplarity and the cumulative weight of verbal lightning-strikes more than on a storyline. The reader is thus forced to look for connections just as much on the metaphoric as on the metonymic level of signification and this too evokes the complex cognitive corridors and the episodes, monuments and landmarks of toponymy and psychogeography'.

cultural and religious renewal, under an Emperor who consciously presented himself as (another) new Augustus.

Satire 12 divides naturally into four distinct sections. In the first (1-16), Juvenal, addressing a certain unknown Corvinus, describes a sacrifice he will perform in thanksgiving for the safe return from sea of another unidentifiable friend, Catullus. In the second section (17-82), Juvenal delivers a long narrative of the storm from which Catullus has escaped. The tonal shift is pronounced: compared with the humble, pastoral atmosphere of the opening sacrifice, the storm narrative explicitly draws on epic motifs.² The third section (83-92) links back to the first, narrating the more humble offering Juvenal pledges to his *Lares* in return for his friend's deliverance from sea. Despite the apparent piousness of these offerings, Juvenal's concern for Catullus, as others have well established, seems rather less than sincere, since he makes light of the sailors' perils, mocks their cowardice in the face of death, and obliquely satirizes their *luxuria* by detailing the merchandise they jettison overboard.³ Finally, on the abrupt pretext that Corvinus might assume that Juvenal is a legacy-hunter attempting to win Catullus' favor, the poet launches in the fourth section (93-130) into a condemnation of legacy-hunters, and particularly the horrific and impious sacrifices they conduct for the benefit of wealthy and ailing old men. This switch to the frequent Roman satiric theme in the final section, and the resultant structural imbalance, has been viewed as the poem's major interpretive crux. Some commentators have responded to the lack of fit by reading parts of the poem as separate discourses under distinct headings;⁴ others have posited themes that

² On the system of generic oppositions in the *Satire*, see Littlewood (2007).

³ Ferguson (1979: 294), Smith (1989). Cf. Adamietz (1983), who suggests that Catullus' willing surrender of his worldly goods in the storm commends him as a Cynic/Stoic sage. Pryor (1969) first suggested that Corvinus' name (carrion crow) subtly foreshadows the later theme of legacy-hunting.

⁴ Cf. the critical comments of Ehlers (1996: 69) on the artificiality of this approach.

unify its sections.⁵ Helmbold (1956) counseled jettison: faced with ‘the combined horrors of wild fire at sea and false Latinity’, he would cast overboard some sixteen lines, including the entire digression on elephants, ‘at no great loss’ (at 21). Larmour (2005) engages instead in creative rearrangement, interpreting an image at the center of the satire (of a beaver’s self-castration) as an ‘ideological ground zero’ (139), in which the various themes elaborated in the surrounding sections appear in distilled form. Although his reading differs from the one advanced here, his instinct to reorder the poem’s puzzle pieces responds astutely to what I suggest is the text’s own provocation. The structural distinctness of each section, and their perplexing interconnection, compel the reader to explore the poem’s satiric argument in light of various juxtapositions and combinations.

My own reading interprets the *Satire* as a religious critique, and one engaged with the particulars of contemporary Hadrianic political ideology.⁶ Sacrifice is central to *Satire* 12, not merely as an overarching theme, but as an image constantly reiterated, restlessly seen in new perspectives and played out by new actors, and rendered ironic by its own self-defeating circularity. The two major sacrifices described by Juvenal (1-16, 83-92) present a vision of divine control that is undermined by the intervening narrative of the storm, in which the gods thanked for Catullus’ safety in fact play no helpful role. Moreover, the sailors’ reactions to their peril are described in terms consistently reminiscent of sacrifice, as if they were caught in an ongoing cycle without any resolution or benefit. The twelfth *Satire* is also notable for

⁵ Smith (1989) suggests greed as a unifying theme, implied by Catullus’ luxurious merchandise then embodied in the legacy-hunters. Ramage (1979) suggests friendship as the central concern – the true friendship of Juvenal for Catullus, opposed to the false friendship of the legacy-hunters. Hightet (1954: 136) anticipated both lines of enquiry: ‘The Twelfth Satire, then, is another poem on the theme of greed, interwoven very cunningly with the theme of friendship false and true’.

⁶ I have been anticipated in this focus by Ronnick (1993), whose excellent article on sacrifice in the poem is vitiated only by being less than four pages long. For religious themes and parody elsewhere in Juvenal, see above all Gérard (1976: 353-442).

its lengthy and strikingly sympathetic descriptions of animals (a calf at 5-9, beaver at 33-6, and elephants at 102-110), which deliberately undermine the sacrificial principle of substitution, by highlighting flaws and inadequacies in the humans for whom they are being killed. At the poem's end, in his damning portrait of the figures who would sacrifice even their own daughters to win the favor of wealthy old men, Juvenal consciously fuses two figures – the crazed fanatic of the philosophical tradition condemning sacrificial ritual, and the amoral legacy-hunter of the satiric tradition. Juvenal's unbalanced poem, of pious sacrifices and venal legacy-hunters, culminates in a metaphor combining the two, envisioning sacrifice as a form of legacy-hunting, conducted by Romans to extort benefits from the gods. I end the chapter by looking briefly at *Satire* 13, demonstrating that the religious themes of *Satire* 12 are picked up again in the first poem of the fifth book. In that poem, Juvenal shifts the focus of his religious critique by bringing to life two unpleasant and often-lambasted theological extremes: the atheist bent on his own self-interest, and the superstitious man plagued by fear of the gods.

1. Horatian Ritual and the “New Augustus”

*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* 5
*Tarpeio servata Iovi frontemque coruscat,
 quippe ferox vitulus templis maturus et arae*

spargendusque mero, quem iam pudet ubera matris

ducere, qui vexat nascenti robora cornu.

si res ampla domi similisque adfectibus esset,

10

pinguior Hispulla traheretur taurus et ipsa

mole piger, nec finitima nutritus in herba,

laeta sed ostendens Clitumni pascua sanguis;

et grandi cervix iret ferienda ministro...

Corvinus, today is sweeter to me than the *Natalis*:

the day the festal turf awaits the animals vowed

to the gods. We lead a white lamb for Juno Regina.

An equal fleece will be given to Minerva, who fights with Moorish Medusa.

But the lusty victim reserved for Tarpeian Jupiter shakes

and pulls the rope to its full extent, and flashes its forehead –

truly a headstrong calf, the right age for the temple and the altar

and for sprinkling with ritual wine. Now it's ashamed to suck

at its mother's teats; it attacks tree trunks with its growing horns.

If my household wealth could match the depth of my emotions,

a bull would be brought, fatter than Hispulla and slowed by

his own weight. He would not be raised on neighboring pastures:

instead, his blood would attest the fertile meadows of Clitumnus,

and he would lift his neck to be struck by the lofty ministrant.

Religion has already been a subtle but binding theme in the fourth book. In *Satire* 10, Juvenal, in Cynic guise, attacked the misguided prayers of the mob. In *Satire* 11, he contrasted rustic simplicity and idealized images of early Rome with contemporary indulgence, and religious piety formed part of his nostalgic vision of Rome's past. The final poem of the book begins with the poet conducting a sacrificial ritual that interweaves individual piety with the institutions of the Roman state, delivering private prayers reminiscent of *publica vota*, and giving dramatic life to a Hadrianic ideology of religious renovation. The location and the precise reason for the ritual are at first deliberately unspecified. Rather, Juvenal's sodded turf altar, his *caespes*, is a timeless, abstract symbol of rustic piety, and the 'sweetness' (*dulcior*, 1) of the opportunity to fulfill his vows suggests a humble devotion to the gods.⁷ For Smith (1989), the setting is akin to Horace's Sabine farm, an embodiment of pastoral self-sufficiency, and Juvenal adopts 'a kind of "Horatian" persona espousing the simple life...The doings of the outside world are kept at a distance, looked on with scepticism' (at 288-9).⁸ The Horatian milieu is buttressed by specific allusions to the *Odes*. Mayor cites as a parallel *Odes* 4.11, in which Horace celebrates Maecenas' birthday with wine, garlands, and the sacrifice of a lamb, an occasion 'justly observed as a holiday, and almost holier to me than my own birthday' (17-8). Juvenal's description of the *vitulus* in lines 5-9 also echoes the offering announced by Horace in *Odes* 4.2.54-60: whereas others will celebrate Augustus' achievements with a grandiose offering of ten bulls and ten cows, Horace will express his appreciation with the humble offering of a single young, snowy-white calf, which, as in Juvenal, has just left its mother behind, and which 'imitates with its

⁷ Turf altars are characteristic of early Rome, but 'the custom was maintained if no permanent altar was available (and private citizens would not normally possess one)' (Nisbet & Hubbard 1970: 242).

⁸ On the Horatian character of the scene, see also Adamietz (1983: 238-9); Littlewood (2007: 391-3).

brow the curved flames of the moon in its third rising'.⁹ The brows of both calves bear a weather sign: the fiery brightness in Horace of the moon's horns on its third rising of the month – a favorable sign for sailors¹⁰ – is replaced in Juvenal by a lightning-like flash (*coruscat*, 6), an ill omen for the *Satire's* storm ahead. Finally, Juvenal moves beyond the pastoral space in lines 10-15, imagining a fuller offering from 'not neighboring' climes (*nec finitima*): a fat bull that will offer its neck to be struck by the ministrant, just as heifers 'offer their necks to be struck' in Ovid's harmonious vision of celebrations for the new calendar year.¹¹ But all this happens in a contrafactual conditional clause, and the satirist thereby reiterates his pose of Horatian pastoral self-sufficiency.¹²

Despite this affected humbleness, the offering Juvenal makes on his *caespes* is not to a rustic deity such as Faunus, Venus or Bacchus. Rather, he sacrifices to the Capitoline Triad (Juno Regina, Minerva and Jupiter Optimus Maximus), the 'national cult of Rome par excellence' (Fears 1981: 106), and the object of particular attention in Hadrian's religious policy, which reasserted the centrality of the Captoline Triad in the cultural integration of the provinces, and portrayed the emperor himself as Jupiter's divinely elected representative.¹³ The sacrifice rehearses motifs from state religious iconography: the three gods are often found on

⁹ 4.2.57: *fronte curvatos imitatus ignis/ tertium lunae referentis ortum.*

¹⁰ Aratus, *Phaen.* 783-4 (= *De Signis* 51-2).

¹¹ *Fast.* 1.83: *colla...praebent ferienda iuveni.*

¹² The mention of Hispulla (11) seems an incongruent element in the landscape, but the precise reference is inscrutable. If Juvenal were truly, as Highet (1954: 292) suggests, comparing his fattened sacrificial bull to Calpurnia Hispulla, the recipient of two of Pliny's letters (*Ep.* 4.19 and 8.11) and a 'paragon of pioussness' (*pietatis exemplum*), it would be both a humorously jarring reference to the recent past and an ironic foreshadowing of the human sacrifices later in the poem.

¹³ See Fears (1981: 85-9). Hadrian's policy was, as Fears says, the culmination of a conscious policy, initiated under Nero and developed by Domitian and Trajan, aimed at grounding the authority of the principate not on a single dynasty but on Olympian mandate, and centered particularly on the syncretistic figure of Zeus, who could readily be assimilated with local cults. On Hadrian's title of Olympius on coinage and his iconographic association with Zeus, see Metcalf (1974); more broadly on Hadrian's religious policies, Beaujeu (1955: 112-278); Kuhlmann (2001); Galimberti (2007: 123-153).

Hadrianic coinage, which, in contrast to the preponderance of military motifs on Trajanic coins, favor religious themes.¹⁴ Hadrian himself, we are told in the *Historia Augusta*, ‘attended to Roman religious rituals with extreme diligence, and despised foreign cults’, and he performed the functions of the *pontifex maximus* rather than merely assuming the title as previous emperors had done.¹⁵

Hadrian’s interest in Roman religious traditions is seen, amongst other things, in his establishment of a festival institutionalizing the worship of *Roma Aeterna* herself, and indeed Juvenal appears to reference this innovation in the very first line of *Satire 12. Natali...die* is typically translated ‘my own birthday’; but given the religious context and the political implications of public sacrifice to the Capitoline triad, it also arguably recalls the *Natalis Urbis*, the festival instituted by Hadrian in 121 to celebrate Rome’s ‘birthday’.¹⁶

Celebrations were held on April 21, long canonized as the founding date of Rome (in 753 B.C.) and previously celebrated as the date of the *Parilia*. Thus Hadrian could also, in a sense, lay claim to the quintessentially Roman, rustic festival of *Parilia*, and founding his own festival is less innovation than renewal – renewal, specifically, of an institution closely tied to the religious ideals of Rome’s first *princeps*. ‘The shepherd, drunk with wine, will celebrate his own festival, the *Parilia*’, said Tibullus at 2.5, and in that very political elegy (as

¹⁴ See Levi (1993: 62-3). While Jupiter coins are the most frequently occurring type, Minerva is depicted in several types as an armed goddess (bearing a breastplate, as she does in Juvenal’s poem, with an image of the Gorgon Medusa), and Juno Regina coins were issued to honour the empress Sabina.

¹⁵ *H.A.* 22.10: *sacra Romana diligentissime curavit, peregrina contempsit. pontificis maximi officium peregit*. On these lines see Fündling (2000: 986-994). The statement that Hadrian ‘despised foreign cults’ is odd given the emperor’s famous devotion to Greece and interest in Egyptian religion. But perhaps the biographer is reflecting, all too closely, Hadrian’s own ambitions to be perceived as a new Augustus (on which see below). As Walton (1948) points out, the sentence is modeled on Suetonius’ statement that Augustus ‘very reverently’ observed the older, established foreign cults, but ‘held all others in contempt’ (*Aug.* 93).

¹⁶ On Hadrian’s founding of the *Natalis Urbis*, see Beaujeu (1955: 129-133). Its inauguration was celebrated on a series of coins: see *BMC* no.333, 1245-6. Athenaeus describes a celebration of the festival (which he instead calls the *Romaia: Deip.* 8.361); see Beard (1987: 11).

also in Propertius and Ovid), the pastoral festival symbolizes a rustic piety not merely preserved but re-embodied in Augustan Rome.¹⁷ Juvenal thus introduces *Satire* 12 by saying that fulfilling his sacrifice to the Capitoline Triad is sweeter to him even than celebrating the *Natalis*, the new festival instituted by Hadrian on the date of the *Parilia*. Moreover, if we remember the Augustan descriptions of the *Parilia* while reading Juvenal's own pastoral scene, we see the satirist's intertextual renovation of the Augustan poets occur alongside the religious renovation of the emperor Hadrian.¹⁸

Whereas Juvenal implicitly distances himself from the Horatian satiric voice of Naevolus in the final poem of book 3, book 4 as a whole is notable for its rejuvenation of Horatian scenes and ethical perspectives. The form of *Satire* 11, an invitation to dinner to another shadowy friend, Persicus, has Horatian precedent, and its moralizing praise of rustic humbleness, moderation and Socratic self-knowledge are all strongly reminiscent of Horace's satiric voice.¹⁹ But in this poem, as in *Satire* 12, the Horatian echoes are part of a wider satiric scheme. Juvenal imagines his own home in that poem as an isolated preserve of Augustan values, anachronistically 'out of time' amidst the advancing disintegration and disorder of a luxury-obsessed modern Rome. He compares his dinner to the one given by Evander to Hercules and, later, Aeneas, on the site of future Rome (60-2), and promises as entertainment a recitation from 'the founder of the *Iliad*' or 'sublime Vergil, who puts Homer's crown in

¹⁷ 2.5.85-6: *ac madidus baccho sua festa Palilia pastor/ concinet...*; cf. Prop. 4.4.73-84, Ov. *Fast.* 4.783-806.

¹⁸ Cf. Littlewood (2007), who argues that Juvenal deliberately violates the generic integrity of his Horatian idyll through the public associations of the sacrifice: the satirist 'offers not a single, humble animal (as Horace does in *Odes* 2.17, 4.2, and 4.11), but a miniature version of the public sacrifices to the Capitoline triad' (at 412). But state religion and rustic piety are not necessarily opposed: as in Tibullus 2.5 or *Aeneid* 8, Juvenal's poem reflects a contemporary ideology in which the two are presented as part of the same continuum.

¹⁹ Adamietz (1972: 117-159); Braund (1988: 186-7); Plaza (2006: 238-243).

doubt' (180-2).²⁰ The nostalgia contrasts with the doom-laden picture of the desperate gourmands, who ransom the past along with their other possessions, melting down their 'mother's bust' (18), spending all their 'paternal bronze' (39), then willingly fleeing their 'fatherland' (52), as antitypes of Aeneas. The decadent epicure on the point of bankruptcy is like a building on the point of collapse, with sunlight already penetrating through the cracks (12-3), an image of urban deterioration akin to the falling roof-tiles and blazing apartment blocks of *Satire* three. The dishes Juvenal will serve epitomize an idealized domesticity: the asparagus will be gathered by a 'foreman's wife once her spinning is done' (69) and even the eggs are 'still with their mother hens' (72), unlike the domestic strife that typifies his guest's urban existence (185-192). Juvenal interweaves the description of his meal with vignettes from Rome's historical origins – an ekphrasis of a war-helmet (formerly a goblet) embossed with scenes of Romulus and Remus (100-107); the dining habits of the early senate (78-89); a description of Jupiter's prophecy amidst the Gallic invasion of 391 B.C. (111-119), with the assertion that 'the greatness of the temples was more evident then' (111).²¹ The gourmands, on the other hand, are associated not with origins but with decay: perfumes and roses seem 'rotten' to them (*putere*, 121, cf. *rancidula*, 135), and their vampiric appetites are aroused only when the tableware is made of dead leopards and elephants (122-7). They mourn so excessively when their chariot-racing team loses that it seems like Cannae all over again (199-201). As for their own lot, their 'old age is more to be feared than death itself' (45). Ethical contrasts are plotted along a temporal axis in *Satire* 11. The poem's Horatian echoes

²⁰ *conditor Iliados cantabitur atque Maronis/ altisoni dubiam facentia carmina palmam*. This 'competition' is a quaint equivalent to the popular love of chariot-racing described in the poem's last section (197-202). Winkler (1990) notes other Vergilian allusions in the satirist's proposed meal, saying that 'the *Aeneid* represents nothing less than a substratum underlying the whole satire'.

²¹ *templorum quoque maiestas praesentior*.

are part of a wider nostalgia; Juvenal dramatizes a private renaissance of Augustan values amid the slow rot of a cultural old age.

The Horatian emphasis in *Satires* 11 and 12 has been widely acknowledged, but this turn in Juvenal's poetics is too often presented in isolation from wider trends in contemporary Rome. The reanimation of the Horatian voice in these poems corresponds to the claims of Hadrian himself to embody a new Augustus – a poetic revival in reflection of an intended political revival. In 125, coins were issued on which Hadrian bears the stark, emphatic new title HADRIANUS AUGUSTUS (replacing the fuller former title 'IMP. CAESAR TRAIANUS HADRIANUS AUG. '); it was, Walton says, 'an explicit bid by Hadrian for recognition as the second founder of the Empire' (1957: 167).²² Many of Hadrian's policies earlier in the 120s attest to the importance of Augustan emulation in his public image. His restoration of the Augustan monuments in the Campus Martius, for example, served to create a link between the two *principes* in the topography of the city of Rome.²³ Hadrian's reinstatement of the *pomerium*, celebrated by coins hailing him as a new founder (*conditor*) of Rome, recalled Augustus' alleged pomerial extensions, even while it also signaled a policy of non-expansionism reminiscent of the later years of Augustus' reign.²⁴ Evidence survives, too, of Hadrian sealing tablets with a *signum* bearing the image of Augustus, and piously devoting a bust of the young Octavian to his household *Lares*.²⁵ In *Satire* 12, Juvenal restores Horace's festal *caespes* and renews Horatian rites. Like Hadrian, he summons Augustan shades.

²² On Hadrian's self-wrought image as a 'new Augustus', see Beaujeu (1955: 126-7); Birley (1997: 147). For the coins, see *BMC* 282-304, nos 334-512.

²³ Boatwright (1987: 72-3).

²⁴ Boatwright (1986); Birley (1997: 96-7).

²⁵ Birley (1997: 96). Evidence for the former is found in a document reproduced in Smallwood (1966: 20), the latter, in an aside of Suetonius (*Aug.* 7).

Later in the poem, Juvenal provides an account of a second offering, this time to his household *Lares*.²⁶

igitur, pueri, linguis animisque faventes
sertaque delubris et farra inponite cultris
ac mollis ornate focos glebamque virentem. 85
iam sequar et sacro, quod praestat, rite peracto
inde domum repetam, graciles ubi parva coronas
accipiunt fragili simulacra nitentia cera.
hic nostrum placabo Iouem Laribusque paternis
tura dabo atque omnis violae iactabo colores. 90
cuncta nitent, longos erexit ianua ramos
et matutinis operatur festa lucernis. (12.83-92).

So, boys, keep an auspicious silence with your mouths and minds.

Hang wreaths on the shrine, sprinkle spelt on the blades,
 and adorn the soft hearths and the green turf.

As soon as the sacred rite at hand is properly complete, I'll follow you
 and return home, where the small effigies, gleaming with
 fragile wax, receive their delicate garlands.

Here I will propitiate my own Jupiter, and offer incense to my
 ancestral Lares, and scatter violets of every color.

²⁶ On the cultural and religious background to such offerings to the *Lares*, see Orr (1978).

Everything gleams. The door has raised its long branches
and celebrates the festival with morning lanterns.

This is a complementary picture to Juvenal's public sacrifice to the Capitoline Triad, an offering made in the poet's own home to 'his own Jupiter' (*nostrum Iovem*, 89). Perhaps here, then, a genuinely 'private' ritual – yet the correspondences between public and private sacrifice illustrate precisely the process by which sacrifice becomes a cultural force throughout the Empire. The public proceedings conducted at Rome are exemplary, a model to be imitated in private and regional iterations, each to personal or local versions of syncretistic Jupiter.²⁷ Here too the ritual is resonant with Horatian echoes. On Maecenas' birthday (*Odes* 4.11), boys and girls scurry about preparing the house (9-10), the altar is adorned with greenery, and the house 'smiles' brightly with its silver (6). Mayor points to *Odes* 3.23 (*inter alia*) as a model for the picture of the poet adorning the small effigies, in which Horace depicts rustic Phidyle 'crowning the small gods with rosemary and delicate myrtle' (15-6), and appeasing the *penates* with 'dutiful spelt and sprinkling salt', a humble offering Horace says will be no less effective than expensive animal sacrifices (19-20).²⁸ But Juvenal also moves beyond this vision. The progression from the effigies 'gleaming' with wax (88) to the terse, oracular 'everything gleams' (91) is universalizing, tracing the emanation of religious influence from simple gestures to the world at large. Catullus has returned home, and once the offering is correctly completed, so Juvenal too will 'return

²⁷ On the 'exemplary' nature of Imperial sacrifice, see Gordon (1990). On 'personal' sacrifices to Jupiter in this period, see Fears (1981: 101): 'Interest in such exotic deities as Mithras, Serapis and Jupiter Dolichenus should not obscure the fact that in the Latin West, with the exception of Africa, private dedications to Jupiter vastly outnumber those to any other god'.

²⁸ 3.23.15-6: *parvos coronantem marino/ rore deos fragilique myrto*; 19-20: *mollivit aversos Penatis/ farre pio et saliente mica*.

home' (87), and parallels like these illustrate the clockwork calibration of a universe under divine control. Indeed, even the inanimate door participates in the rite. Presumably, the door has been covered with laurel branches and lanterns have been affixed to the door-posts (see Mayor's parallels), but, in Juvenal's account, the door has erected the branches itself and takes equal part in celebrating the ritual. Like the bull Juvenal imagines 'lifting its neck' to be struck by the ministrant in line 14, the piety of the participants in the religious ritual is guaranteed by a miraculous universal harmony that omits nothing. *Cuncta nitent* – 'everything gleams'.

But what *facta* have warranted these lengthy and elaborate descriptions of thanksgiving rituals, what manifestations of Jupiter's divine control? The reason for Juvenal's celebration comes in the description of the storm at sea that all but destroyed Catullus' boat and nearly killed all the sailors (15-82). The account begins abruptly with a description of the specific threat posed by lightning-bolts:

*nam praeter pelagi casus et fulminis ictus
 evasit. densae caelum abscondere tenebrae
 nube una subitusque antemnas inpulit ignis* (12.17-19)

For besides the misfortunes of the sea, he also escaped
 blows from thunderbolts. Thick shadows buried the sky in a
 single cloud, then, suddenly, fire set upon the yardarms.

As a result, the sails catch fire (22), and each sailor, astonished (or ‘thunder-struck’, *attonitus*, 21), despairs of what disasters will strike next. Readers of the *Satire* will think back to the heifer preserved for Tarpeian Jupiter, the forehead of which ‘flashed’ like lightning, an appropriate offering for Ζεὺς καταβάτης (‘Zeus of the thunderbolts’). But if we are meant to remember Jupiter’s control over thunder and lightning as the ailing sailors are assaulted by those elements, the irony is rather cruel. In *Aeneid* 5.685-699, Jupiter answers Aeneas’ prayers and sends a thunderstorm that extinguishes the ships set alight by the Trojan women, guaranteeing the safety of both the fleet and Aeneas’ fated voyage to future Rome. Silius Italicus has a rousing epic narrative of Jupiter summoning a fierce thunderstorm from atop the *Mons Tarpeia*: that storm drives back the oncoming forces of Hannibal and saves the city of Rome, after which the people joyously acclaim the triumph of Tarpeian Jupiter and wreath his shrines (12.605-752). What about *this* storm? If Juvenal’s friend Catullus has survived his ordeal, it is – or it should be – no thanks to Tarpeian Jupiter. Moreover, if the storm is a manifestation of Jupiter’s anger, it occurs to no sailor to appease his wrath, as it does, for example, to the sailors of *Epode* 10, who ‘direct prayers to Jove, who had turned his back’.²⁹

In fact, there is a fundamental theological inconcinnity in this poem, which, once realized, gradually undoes the vision of divine control in the Horatian sacrifice scenes. The boat loosed in the storm is buffeted by incompatible and, indeed, conflicting forces, natural and divine. Having described the thunderbolts, Juvenal speaks of Catullus’ *fortuna* (29) and his lot (*sortis*, 25), as if unmoored from divine control. In reference to sailors’ devotion to Isis, he likens the frightful storm to those depicted on the votive tablets dedicated to Isis in her ‘very many shrines’ (*fana... plurima*, 27-8). ‘Who doesn’t know that painters get their

²⁹ Hor. *Ep.*10.18: *preces et aversum ad Iovem*.

livelihood from Isis', he asks wryly, anticipating the theme of economic relationships between humans and the gods that will dominate the final part of the poem.³⁰ On the other hand, threatened with imminent death, Catullus resorts not to prayer but to 'negotiating with the winds' (*decidere...cum ventis*, 33-4), and Juvenal later ironically advises him to 'entrust his soul to the winds' (*ventis animam committe*, 57). Juvenal then reveals that these natural forces are subject to yet another contrary force: they subside only when 'Fate has proven stronger than the East Wind or the ocean' (*fatumque valentius Euro/ et pelago*, 63-4), and 'the joyous Parcae spin better threads with favoring fingers' (*Parcae meliora benignal/ pensa manu ducunt hilares*, 64-5). If these lines suggest that the storm and its resolution were the product of *inexorabile fatum* all along, the sailors are none the wiser. They disembark 'with their heads shaved' (*vertice raso*, 81), having performed what Petronius calls the 'last-resort ritual of the shipwrecked' (*nafragorum ultimum votum*, 103), and end up resembling devotees of Isis after all.³¹ Amid this flurry of references to divine influences, there is no mention of any of the gods for which Juvenal had conducted such elaborate rites of thanksgiving. The satirist brings to life Hadrian's spirit of religious renovation in his offerings to the Capitoline Triad, but the prayer celebrates an event in which those gods' divine control appears to play no part.

The multiplicity of references to Horace's *Odes* in the sections framing the storm sequence invite us to keep Horace in mind, and, indeed, storms at sea are a recurrent symbol in the *Odes* for traumatic experiences, both personal and national.³² Juvenal's tempest flashes with

³⁰ 12.28: *pictures quis nescit ab Iside pasci*.

³¹ Cf. Juvenal's description of the priests of Isis as the 'bald herd' (*calvus grex*) at *Sat.*6.533. Ronnick (1995) argues that the allusions to Isis should lead us to understand the sailors as followers of the Egyptian goddess, headed presumably to a temple devoted to her at Ostia.

³² See Blaiklock (1959).

reminiscences of Horace's storms, and the theological questions they insistently pose. One naturally thinks of the Ship of State (1.14), about to be buffeted by 'new waves' but already half-destroyed, with mast 'wounded', yard-arms 'groaning' and sails torn. Horace warns the ship that, 'oppressed by trouble once again, there are no gods upon whom you can call' (9-10). In literal terms, the tutelary deity on the ship's stern has broken off (as Nisbet and Hubbard explain), but if the ship's return to open waters allegorizes a reemergence of civil war, that would also constitute a forbidden impiety, a *vetitum nefas* (1.3.26). More ambiguous is *Odes* 1.34, in which Horace witnesses Jupiter, 'who is wont to split the clouds with flashing fire' (*igni corusco*, 6), instead send a bolt of lightning across the clear blue sky, which he says has compelled him to 'set sail in the reverse direction' back to traditional observance of the gods (3-5). Yet, by a troubling identification, in the last stanza of the poem, Horace affirms not the divine control of Jupiter but rather the arbitrary and destructive power of *rapax Fortuna* (14-15). The sudden and violent prodigy of the god's thunderbolt has impressed upon Horace a realization merely of the gods' capacity for sudden violence. In *Odes* 3.29, a storm at sea provides Horace with a poetic opportunity to assert his creed more positively: 'it's not my way, if the mast creaks in an African tempest, to run to wretched prayers and strike a bargain with vows, so that my Cyprian and Tyrian merchandise doesn't add to the riches of the sea' (57-61).³³ That poem counseled flight to Maecenas – geographical and ethical, from materialistic Rome to the simplicity of Horace's Sabine farm – and by addressing him as the 'descendant of Etruscan kings' in the first line, Horace also suggests a flight from Rome's onward historical flow, a return to simpler origins. This is an ethical version of the *secunda fuga* (the 'favorable' or 'second' escape) first counseled in *Epodes* 16: an invitation to repeat Aeneas' originary flight and re-found Rome, backwards.

³³ *non est meum, si mugiat Africis/ malus procellis, ad miseris preces/ decurrere et votis pacisci/ ne Cypriae Tyriaeque merces/ addant avaro divitias mari.*

The ship wrecked in Juvenal's *Satire* 12 is a Ship of State not merely in its reminiscences of Horace's *Odes*, but also because its voyage too replays incidents in the founding of Rome:

iam deficientibus Austris
spes vitae cum sole redit. tum gratus Iulo
atque novercali sedes praelata Lavino
conspicitur sublimis apex, cui candida nomen
scrofa dedit, laetis Phrygibus mirabile sumen,
et numquam visis triginta clara mamillis (12.69-74)

Now the South Winds are subsiding, and, along with the sun,
the hope of living returns. Then a high peak appears,
a place loved by Ascanius, and preferred to his step-mother's
Lavinium. A bright white sow gave the mount its name.
Her udder was a prodigy to the delighted Trojans, and she was
known for her thirty teats, never before witnessed.

Repetition, recognition, renovation: Catullus' ship traces the path of Rome's mythical and religious history, as the sailors encounter Mount Alba, named by Ascanius after the white sow with thirty piglets that appeared as a prodigy to Aeneas on the banks of the Tiber.³⁴ Even these everyday sailors seem to be replaying the myth that gave Augustus legitimacy, the

³⁴ Verg. *Aen.* 8.43-8. Adkin (2004-5: 287-290), in a sensitive analysis, detects specific parodies of Vergilian metrical tendencies in these lines.

myth of a lineage stemming from Iulus, directly linking Rome's present with its mythical past. Hadrian's coins proclaimed him a *conditor*, a new founder, and his iconography presented him as a new Augustus, but the value of that currency is debased if *anyone* can replay Rome's foundation myth. In seeing the shipwreck as part of an infinite replaying of Rome's originary voyage, Juvenal also makes Catullus' perils, which leave him 'still shaking' (15) and 'amazed at his survival' (15-6), seem especially trite and second-hand. This ocean storm moves through the scripted motions of any *poetica tempestas*, Juvenal says, with 'new dangers' merely ringing changes to a stereotyped scene.³⁵ Once the sailors disembark in safety, they will retell their 'prattling perils' (*garrula pericula*, 81-2), giving narratives of their shipwreck just like this one, reinforcing the clichés. If this broken ship is the Hadrianic Ship of State, national myth has been reduced to the repetition of sailors' tales.

Rome is a thundering echo-chamber. Some institutions derive meaning from that constant repetition of the past. The ritual of sacrifice is established and made efficacious precisely by being carried out in the proper fashion again and again. So too, the Principate as an institution is engaged in remoulding and representing elements of the ideology of past rulers, caught up in a circular process of Golden Ages and re-foundations. Of course, this satire is itself constructed as a kind of echo-chamber of Augustan, and specifically Horatian, poetry: the opening scene of sacrifice boasts as dense an allusive patterning as the epic beginning of *Satire 1*. But the storm narrative marks the point at which the productive repetition of sacrifice becomes the tautologous and cheapening repetition of self-parody. In Juvenal's vision, no-one falls outside this compulsion to repeat the past – or, no people. But *Satire 12* is

³⁵ Cf. *Sat 12.22-4: omnia fiunt/ talia, tam graviter, si quando poetica surgit/ tempestas genus ecce aliud discriminis!* ('Things like that always happen, and just as severe, whenever a poetic storm swells – then look! A new danger').

also notable for the time it spends describing animals – the *ferox vitulus* (5-9), the endangered beaver (34-6), and, in most detail in a lengthy digression, elephants (102-110) – and the themes of independence and severing ties figured in these animals pass damning judgment on their human counterparts.

2. Substitution and Servitude: Animals and Humans in *Satire Twelve*

In his theory of scapegoating rituals as a kind of ‘safety valve’ to redirect communal violence to safe outlets, Girard (1979: 99) shows how the sacrificial animal becomes a ‘receptacle of human passions’, an object of the violence community members would otherwise have directed towards each other. The ritual must personify the animal and accord it human traits for it to be perceived as an equivalent substitute for the true object of the community’s hostility.³⁶ Such personification is an equally prominent element in many Roman poets’ accounts of animal sacrifice, even where the characteristics ascribed to the animal cannot easily be matched with the apparent motivations of the sacrifice. So, for example, both Vergil in the *Georgics* and Ovid in the *Fasti* ascribe human characteristics to the animal victims of agricultural sacrifice, though not obviously to satisfy any aspect of the ritual itself; rather, some scholars have seen the poets’ blurring of the line between animal and human as an

³⁶ Cf. Feldherr (1997: 48): ‘While its animal shape obviously differentiates it from the human spectators, nevertheless these spectators’ capacity to recognize a resemblance to themselves in the victim is essential for the success of the sacrifice’. Smith & Doniger (1989) helpfully survey the role of substitution in anthropological theories of sacrifice. Keane (2006: 43-4) suggests that sacrifice and satire perform similar functions in Roman society: in both, violence – whether literal or metaphorical – separates outcasts from their community and thereby indirectly reinforces societal bonds.

attempt to question the ethics of the practice, indebted to the Pythagorean tradition, which condemned animal sacrifice (as also meat-eating) as a kind of murder.³⁷

The most illuminating parallel (in theme if not by direct textual allusion) is again provided by Horace, in his *O fons Bandusiae*, *Odes* 3.13, a description of a thanksgiving ritual for a spring that offers water to cattle. It is worth spending some time with this *Ode* before returning to Juvenal's own satirical meditation on Roman sacrifice. The balance and economy it epitomizes will be irreversibly thrown off center in *Satire* 12. Whereas in Horace's poem the personification of the animal is a key part of its ritual's process of exchange, the descriptions of the animals to be sacrificed in *Satire* 12 serve to expose the weaknesses and inadequacies in the humans who profit from their death.

O fons Bandusiae splendidior uitro,
dulci digne mero non sine floribus,
cras donaberis haedo,
cui frons turgida cornibus
primis et uenerem et proelia destinat. 5

Frustra: nam gelidos inficiet tibi
rubro sanguine riuos
lasciui suboles gregis.

Te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae
nescit tangere, tu frigus amabile 10

³⁷ On Vergil, Gale (2000: 105-12); on Ovid, Green (2008).

fessis uomere tauris

praebes et pecori uago.

Fies nobilium tu quoque fontium

me dicente cauis impositam ilicem

saxis, unde loquaces 15

lympphae desiliunt tuae.

O spring of Bandusia, gleaming more brightly than glass,
deserving of sweet unmixed wine and flowers,
tomorrow you shall be presented with
a kid.

Its brow, burgeoning with its first horns,
marks it out for love and battles -
in vain; for the scion of the lusty herd
will dye your icy cold waters with its
crimson blood.

The harsh season of the scorching Dog-star
has no power to touch you. You offer
cherished cool to the bulls and the wandering herd,
exhausted from plow work.

You too will you take your place amongst
the famous springs, when I speak of the oak-tree that stands
above your hollow rocks. From there, your whispering waters

leap down.

The physical aspect of the sacrifice in *Odes* 3.13 has tended to strike readers most profoundly. The image at its center, of the kid's blood polluting the clear water of the spring, seems to express the loss of young life in particularly stark terms. But the metaphysical process of the ritual, in which life is not lost but transferred, is charted more subtly throughout the course of the entire poem. In the first line, the water is still and like glass (1). The spring's imperviousness to time and movement is its virtue: it preserves its coolness even as the seasons shift and the countryside swelters under the force of the Dog-Star (9-12). By contrast, the frisky young goat, 'scion of the lusty herd' (8), embodies time and movement in the most physical sense, its forehead in the process of 'burgeoning' with its 'first' horns (4-5). When the ritual is complete and the kid has been sacrificed to the fountain, the spring waters are no longer still. Now it too has been embodied – its waters have a voice (*loquaces lymphae*, 15-6), and they 'leap down' from the rocks, as the lusty kid must formerly have done. If the life of poetry is its sound, the often-noted onomatopoeic alliterations of these final lines (*ilicem saxis, unde loquaces lymphae desiliunt tuae*) demonstrate how the transfer of οὐσία enacted in the ritual is realized at the level of poetic form.³⁸ The movement between the first and last lines – from the waters being 'glass-like', to their 'leaping down' over the rocks – gives an arc not only to the poem but to the ritual. *Odes* 3.13 shows us not just the death of the kid, but, from a quite impossible cosmic perspective, every stage in the animation of the spring. Moreover, the poem subtly emphasizes the equity of the reciprocal

³⁸ Jameson (1997: 57) postulates that the name Bandusia itself suggests a Greek neologism, παντουσία, 'all-being'. Nisbet & Rudd (2004: 172) suggest instead that the name is a 'south Italian corruption of the Greek *Pandosia*, 'giver of everything''.

exchange. The kid's erstwhile 'battles' are recalled in the imagery of blood (7), and 'love-affairs' are recalled in the (now-retrospective) reference to the 'lusty' herd (8).³⁹ The victim's life is not lost entirely; it is transmuted into the echoes and images that compose this very text.⁴⁰

The visible progression in *Odes* 3.13 through the stages of the sacrificial ritual, from the loss of animal life to the vibrant animation of the 'whispering waters', gives the poem an especially pronounced sense of fulfilment. Not so *Satire* 12, in which the offerings in the opening passage are followed, in the narrative of Catullus' shipwreck, by the constant recurrence of sacrificial imagery, as if the ritual transferred to its human actors no blessing or benefit but merely, recurrently, the act of sacrifice itself.⁴¹ The travails of the ship in the storm are described in ways that deliberately recall scenes of sacrifice. Just as the ministrant of the sacrifice will strike the neck of the cow in line 14, so the sailors, compelled by dire emergency, make the absurd and grotesque decision to cut down their mast (they 'haul it down with steel', *malum ferro summitteret* 54).⁴² The 'wounds' of the mast on Horace's Ship of State are here inflicted by the sailors' own hands. Juvenal lingers on the image because, I suggest, it involves a calculation typical of sacrificial logic – one gains only through voluntary loss. To adopt the interpretation by Adkin (2008: 129) of a contested phrase, in

³⁹ 'Lascivi picks up *Venerem*': Nisbet & Rudd (2004: 177).

⁴⁰ See, most perceptively, Commager (1962: 323-4). Close to my reading is that of Morgan (2009), who stresses the centrality of the sacrificial ritual to the meaning of the poem as a whole, but instead sees the kid as a substitute for Horace himself, a 'payment for Horace's extraordinary accomplishments' (at 138).

⁴¹ Ronnick (1992: 8). Larmour (2005) posits a recurring pattern of castration imagery in *Satire* 12, though many of his examples could equally be described as images of sacrifice, depending on one's view of the poem's dominant themes.

⁴² Lowering the mast (by means of cables) in order to reduce the craft's resistance to the winds is one measure taken in a storm to protect a ship (cf. Jules Verne's *Journey to the Center of the Earth*, chap. 35), and *summitto* (as Stramaglia notes ad loc.) is the *vox propria* for 'hauling down' the sails or the yard-arm (cf. Sen. *Ep.* 77.2; 95.7). Cutting down rather than merely lowering the mast is absurdly extreme.

losing the ship's mast Catullus 'gets out poor' (*se /explicit angustum*, 54-55).⁴³ Yet it is the *discriminis ultima*, Juvenal says, the 'final crisis' (55), when you need to make a ship smaller to ensure its safety (*praesidia adferimus navem factura minorem*, 56), and Juvenal wryly comments that the crew should remember in the future to pack axes as part of their cargo (61). As the ship suffers the trauma of having part of its body sacrificed, it is also increasingly humanized. It is clothed in its crew's garments, which are spread out to support its only remaining sail (on the prow, 68-9), and it arrives to the end of its journey 'crippled' (*trunca*, 79), embraced finally by the open 'arms' (76) of the Portus Augusti.

The scene at the center of the storm narrative, in which Catullus jettisons his cargo of precious luxury goods, offers a particularly mercantile variation on the sacrificial motif. When Horace in *Odes* 3.29 resolved never to 'run to prayers and make bargains with vows' to save his trader's goods from a storm at sea, he inadvertently created precisely the role Catullus plays in Juvenal's poem, a figure who attempts to 'negotiate with the winds by jettison' (33-4). The satirist luxuriates in describing these precious goods (at lines 37-49), no doubt for the picture they construct of Catullus himself, not merely as decadent but, perhaps more pointedly, as a political climber.⁴⁴ First, Juvenal says that he was carrying purple clothing 'fit for effete Maecenases' (38-9): effeminate outfits for those who wished to ingratiate themselves into the favor of a new Augustus. Likewise, he had 'platters made for Parthenius' (43-4), presumably Domitian's *a cubiculo*, famously a trusted intimate in the palace of the late tyrant, and the recipient of a series of epigrams from Martial, who tried to

⁴³ For *angustus* as 'poor' in the financial sense, cf. *OLD* s.v. *angustus* 5 (b).

⁴⁴ There is a similar scene in the book of Revelation (18.11-19), in which the author – a satirist of sorts – attacks Rome through a damning inventory of luxury goods carried in and out of the city by traders. See Royalty (1998), who charts connections in theme and imagery between Revelation and Roman satirists.

use him to secure access to Domitian for his books.⁴⁵ There are sinister overtones here: at least according to later historians, Parthenius had a leading role in Domitian's assassination, but was himself murdered in the reign of Nerva by soldiers, who cut off his genitals then choked him with them.⁴⁶ Similarly, Catullus himself shares a name with one of Domitian's most sinister intimates, the blind *delator* Catullus Messalina, best known from Juvenal's fourth *Satire* (113-122), who 'would be dining with us' if he were still alive, according to a famous quip made to Nerva.⁴⁷ One would hardly have thought it prudent for this Catullus to encourage a connection. Indeed, amongst his other goods are the paraphernalia of dinner-parties, evidently characterized by grandiose – or legendary – drunkenness, including a 'mixing bowl worthy of thirsty Pholus', the centaur who entertained Hercules (44-5). Appropriately for someone trying to bribe the elements, Catullus can also boast of a goblet once used by Phillip of Macedon, 'the wily purchaser of Olynthus' (*callidus emptor Olynthi*, 47), and an *exemplum* elsewhere for political corruption.⁴⁸ Finally, Juvenal ironically applauds Catullus' readiness to surrender all this property to save his life: 'who else, now, in what part of the world, has the boldness to prefer his life to his silver, his safety to his property?' (48-9).⁴⁹ This schematic series of exchanges (life for silver, safety for property) is

⁴⁵ The scholiast takes *Parthenio* as ablative and assumes that Parthenius is an (otherwise unknown) artisan: hence, Catullus owns 'platters made by Parthenius'. Friedlaender first suggested the identification with the historical Parthenius, and he is followed by Courtney, though Courtney's broad statement that 'to have belonged to famous people added to the value of works of art' should be qualified with reference to the particulars of Parthenius' posthumous fame. Parthenius was so trusted by Domitian that the emperor allowed him to wear a sword: Dio 67.15.1. Martial seeks access to Domitian through Parthenius in *Ep.* 5.6, 11.1, 12.11, and also mocks a would-be social climber for speaking unceasingly about him: 4.78.8. Martial also associates Parthenius with luxury clothing, which may add additional point here: 8.28, 9.49.

⁴⁶ Parthenius' involvement in planning and carrying out Domitian's assassination: Dio 67.15.1; Eutrop. 8.1. His grotesque demise: *Epit. de Caes.* 12.8.

⁴⁷ Plin. *Ep.* 4.22. 4-6. In a line unanimously bracketed by editors for its redundancy, it is said that men, 'blind with folly, live for their patrimonies' (*sed vitio caeci propter patrimonia*). Green (1998: 198) intriguingly suggests that the reference to 'blindness' may indirectly identify our Catullus.

⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.16.13-6. Phillip captured Olynthus in 348 B.C. by bribing two citizens, Lasthenes and Euthyrates: Dem. *Or.* 19; Diod. Sic. 16.53.2.

⁴⁹ *Sed quis nunc alius, qua mundi parte quis audit/ argento praeferre caput rebusque salutem?*

a travesty of the sacrificial principle of substitution, in which one life is exchanged for the welfare of others: *unum pro multis dabitur caput*, as it is formulated in the *Aeneid* (5.815).⁵⁰ Palinurus must be sacrificed if the Trojans are to make it safely through the storm to the harbor at Cumae. If Catullus and his crew are to reach their own harbor through the storm, they must sacrifice their high-end cargo.

The gruesome severing of the genitals of Parthenius, Domitian's *a cubiculo*, mirrors an image at the beginning of this passage, in which Juvenal explicitly describes Catullus' jettisoning of his possessions as a kind of self-castration. Catullus acts 'in imitation of the beaver' (*imitatus castora*, 34), which, when endangered, castrates itself to be rid of the sought-after drug allegedly secreted in its groin, 'desiring to escape through the loss of a testicle.' 'That', Juvenal asserts, 'is how well it understands its drug-bearing groin'.⁵¹ Larmour is surely right in stressing the connection traced here and throughout the poem between luxury and effeminacy.⁵² But the beaver, in cutting off part of its own body, also engages in a kind of (animal) sacrifice, seeking to gain through loss (*damno*, 35), and our Catullus imitates the beaver in more ways than one. Among the jettisoned goods are:

...*alias quarum generosi graminis ipsum*

⁵⁰ Bandera (1981); broadly on the motif of sacrificial substitution in the *Aeneid*, Hardie (1993: 19-56); Leigh (2010).

⁵¹ 12.34-6: *imitatus castora, qui se/ eunuchum ipse facit cupiens evadere damno/ testiculi: adeo medicatum intellegit inguen*. On the ancient belief in beaver's self-castration, and a wealth of other details of arcane ancient mammal lore, see Katz (1998; beavers at 77-8). This *castora* may also allude to the *Castor* noticeably absent here, Pollux's divine twin, whom a sailor might be expected to invoke in a crisis, as Littlewood (2007: 403) also notes; for the role of the Dioscuri as 'saviors of the sea', see Jaisle (1907: 6-73).

⁵² Larmour (2005: 149): 'Catullus represents how "proper" Roman masculinity has been "castrated" by the desire for wealth and *luxuria*, typified here by rich fabrics and silver plate'. The comparison he draws between *Satire* 12 and Seneca, *Ep.* 19.9, which unites the themes of effeminacy, castration and shipwreck, is particularly illuminating.

infecit natura pecus, sed et egregius fons
viribus occultis et Baeticus adiuvat aer (12.40-2)

...other clothes, made of a flock naturally dyed by
 noble grass; but also excellent water, with secret potency,
 and a Baetic climate add additional quality.

This hardly seems the time for detailing the virtues of Spanish clothing, even despite Juvenal's obvious aim in this section to damn Catullus' character by cataloguing his goods. If Catullus has all this expensive cargo because he is a merchant, as most commentators since Duff have assumed, this is the kind of hyperbolic encomium he might have delivered to gullible buyers.⁵³ Yet these lines are included here, I suggest, as yet another twisted parallel to the earlier descriptions of animal sacrifice. Juvenal here speaks of the 'flock' of the clothes (*pecus*, 41), 'certainly a remarkable phrase' (Courtney 1980: 523), but reversing an earlier metonymy, in which the live sheep to be sacrificed to Minerva was called a 'fleece' (*vellus*, 4). As in the earlier ritual scenes – or, for that matter, in *Odes* 3.13 – the sacrifice is preceded by praise of the animal's origins: so, the fat bull of lines 10-14 was 'not raised on neighboring pastures', but rather 'his blood attests the fertile meadows of Clitumnus'. The 'noble' grass and 'potency' of the water might well have imbued this flock with some of the spirit of the *ferox vitulus* ('headstrong calf', 7, almost an oxymoron). As he did with the actual sacrificial animals, Juvenal accords the clothes a brief life story, before they are jettisoned from the side of the boat, in another perversion of the sacrificial scene.

⁵³ For the hyperbolic image of sheep with ready-dyed fleece, Ferguson justly compares the flocks in Vergil's restored Golden Age, the fleece of which changes color of its own accord (*Ecl.*4.42-5).

The description of the clothes' origins amidst excellent water and a nourishing atmosphere also, of course, draws into sharp relief the sailors' own plight amidst catastrophic waves and a violent storm. Indeed, throughout the poem, the descriptions of the sacrificial *hostiae* consistently illustrate some lack or flaw in the humans for whom they are forcibly surrendering their lives, resulting in a series of egregiously imbalanced ritual exchanges. If sacrifice is a process of symbolic substitution, these particular victims get an especially raw deal. So, Smith (1989: 290) points out that 'Catullus' fearfulness...stands in amusing contrast with the fighting spirit of the deities and the animals in the opening lines (cf. *pugnanti*, 4, *petulans*, 5, *coruscat*, 6, *ferox*, 7, *vexat*, 9)'. The preternatural boldness of the 'headstrong calf' is far removed from the scrambling, panicking sailors on the shipwreck, who, as in Lucretius' picture of primitive humans, quake in fright at every lightning flash.⁵⁴

The most extensive description of animals comes in the final section of *Satire* 12, in which Juvenal has switched to an (ostensibly) unrelated theme, legacy-hunters (*captatores*). But here too, the context is animal sacrifice, and here too the description of animals serves to characterize negatively the human protagonists in the poem. In a long digression, Juvenal describes elephants, an outrageously impious sacrifice pledged by the mad legacy-hunters Pacuvius and Novius in order to win the affections not of the gods, but of the ailing and wealthy targets of their legacy-hunting. Smith (1989: 296) suggests that the satirist's tone in describing these elephants is ambiguous: while displaying 'admiration, even awe, for the nobility of these gigantic beasts', they are nonetheless 'not Roman' and associated with Rome's enemies, and thereby a natural fit for the *captatores*, who are also, in some sense,

⁵⁴ 12.20: 'each man thought that he had been struck by lightning...' (*se quisque illo [sc.igne] percussum crederet*).

Rome's enemies.⁵⁵ But Roman or not, the 'fighting spirit' Smith sees in the *ferox vitulus* is exemplified by the elephants on a grand scale:

*Existunt qui promittunt hecatomben,
 quatenus hic non sunt nec venales elephanti,
 nec Latio aut usquam sub nostro sidere talis
 belua concipitur, sed furva gente petita
 arboribus Rutulis et Turni pascitur agro,
 Caesaris armentum nulli servire paratum
 privato, siquidem Tyrio parere solebant
 Hannibali et nostris ducibus regique Rolosso
 horum maiores ac dorso ferre cohortis,
 partem aliquam belli, et euntem in proelia turrem.
 nulla igitur mora per Novium, mora nulla per Histrum
 Pacuvium, quin illud ebur ducatur ad aras... (12.101-112)*

There are those who would even promise a hecatomb,
 but not of elephants. They don't live here, and they're not for sale.
 Such a beast is not born in Latium, nor anywhere
 in our climes: it's obtained from the dark-skinned people,

⁵⁵ Smith is partly reacting against Ramage (1979), who argues that the elephants of *Satire 12* are cast in an unambiguously negative light, though it is unclear whose perspective Ramage presents when he asserts flatly that 'elephants are in themselves grotesque' (at 231). So also Littlewood (2007: 408): 'The elephants are exotic monsters reserved for the high and mighty, whether for the person of Caesar, the pursuit of war, or the genre of epic. Clearly Pacuvius would misuse them, but one may wonder whether exotic monsters have any use at all'.

then it is grazed upon Rutulian woodland and Turnus' fields.
 Being Caesar's herd, the elephants are not prepared to serve
 any private individual. For their ancestors used to obey
 Tyrian Hannibal, and our own generals, and the Molossian king,
 and they carried cohorts on their back and turrets
 advancing into battle, playing a considerable role in war.
 No delay, then, for Novius; no delay for Pacuvius
 Hister, before that ivory is offered at the altars...

Juvenal's lengthy excursus unexpectedly hymns these beasts, which, in size and significance, dwarf the modern-day homunculi around whom the rest of the *Satire* revolves. As commodities, elephants are an indulgent expense. But as sacrificial victims, these elephants have a 'life story' no human actor in the poem can match. Catullus' ship was stocked full of the tawdry paraphernalia of political ambition: clothes fit for Maecenas, mementos of Parthenius (Martial's valued conduit to the emperor's attentions), the ancient relics of Phillip of Macedon's bribery. Yet the elephants are already part of the 'inner circle', depicted as the personal herd of Caesar himself (the cognomen Caesar derives from the Punic word for 'elephant', according to one etymology).⁵⁶ The emperor's elephants were kept at Ardea, near Laurentum,⁵⁷ which Juvenal identifies as old Rutulian territory, and the elephants thereby participate no less than other characters in the poem in replaying the myths of Rome's

⁵⁶ H.A. *Ael.* 2.3; Serv ad. *Aen.* 1.286, cited by Nousek (2008: 297). Presumably, they are kept by the current emperor for amphitheatrical displays, but elephants were also an important symbol of political power in Rome (Scullard 1974: 64-100). Cf. Artem. 2.12: dreaming of an elephant signifies danger, unless the elephant is in Italy, in which case it symbolizes 'a master, an emperor, or a very powerful person' (δεσπότην σημαίνει καὶ βασιλέα καὶ ἄνδρα μέγιστον).

⁵⁷ Scullard (1974: 199-200, 279-280).

origins. But unlike Catullus and the rest of the storm-tossed crew, whose unwitting nautical misadventure is incongruously cast as a new version of Aeneas' ordinary voyage, the elephants can actually trace a line of heritage connecting those mythical origins to significant stages in Rome's history, playing a 'considerable role' in the battles against Pyrrhus and Hannibal, and then fighting as part of Rome's own forces.⁵⁸ No doubt the mention of Turnus contrasts with the reference to the ship's crew as Trojans (there is even perhaps a contrast between the 'dark-skinned' people from whom elephants are sought and the 'bright white sow' that will lead the Trojans to Alba Longa). But the difference is not simply between 'Romans' and 'enemies'⁵⁹. After all, the history recounted by Juvenal shows the elephants' allegiance shift from foreign leaders to Roman ones, before finally assuming their current prestige as 'Caesar's herd'. The difference is between those who have played a 'considerable role' in Rome's history, and those merely engaged in its hollow repetition. Who *are* these people? Catullus? Pacuvius? Barely characterized by Juvenal, not certainly identifiable with any historical figure, they nevertheless bear the names of great Roman literary figures, taking up permanent residence on giants' shoulders.

A connecting theme in the descriptions of animals in *Satire* 12 is their willingness to sever ties and assert their independence. The elephants are 'not prepared to serve any private individual' (105-6). But the legacy-hunters are: their sole goal is to please their intended targets, held in thrall to some private individual, who is, after all, no more than 'some rich

⁵⁸ See Adamietz (1983: 244) on Juvenal's ironic emphasis on the noble 'pedigree' of the elephants.

⁵⁹ As Henke also stresses (2000: 210): 'Die Tatsache, daß der Satiriker die Elefanten hier mit Turnus, Pyrrhos sowie Hannibal zusammenbringt, darf übrigens nicht dazu verführen, in der Nennung dieser Feinde Roms eine Hindeutung auf die Erbschleicher zu sehen und das Monströse, Nichtrömische dieser Tierart als Negativum herauszustreichen, da ja Juvenal ausdrücklich sagt, daß Elefanten auch den römischen Heerführern... zu dienen pfliegen'.

man wielding the reign of childless old age', as Seneca put it.⁶⁰ The elephants are 'not for sale' (102) in a world in which *everything* is for sale, where, as the poem will soon reveal, the blinding desire for money will lead the *captator* Pacuvius to sacrifice even his own daughter. The beaver severs part of itself out of a surprisingly lofty self-understanding (*adeo...intellegit*, 36), not out of the sailors' desperate panic to save their own hides. Most of all, the *ferox vitulus* at the very beginning of the *Satire* is an appropriate victim to be sacrificed precisely because it has broken away from its origins and from repeating its infantile rituals, 'now ashamed to suck at its mother's teats' (8-9).⁶¹ By contrast, the miraculous white sow that signified the location of the city of Alba Longa delighted the Trojans, Juvenal says, by having 'thirty teats'.⁶² Juvenal rewrites this pivotal omen in Rome's foundation myth as an image of dependency, from which subsequent generations have not broken free. Central to the twelfth *Satire* is the Roman cultural habit of deriving identity from repeating the past, from Hadrian's reinvention as the 'new Augustus', to the repetitions of sacrificial ritual, to Juvenal's own stylistic reinvention as a new Horace in the 'pastoral' scenes of this poem. To borrow a metaphor from the end of *Satire* 12, all Rome is engaged in a sort of cultural legacy-hunting, enthralled to its own past, dependent on the dead.

The poet finally turns to face legacy-hunters directly in the last section of *Satire* 12. In this final section, *captatores* are indeed shown to be the epitome of human dependence and

⁶⁰ *De Const.* 6.1: *diues aliquis regnum orbae senectutis exercens.*

⁶¹ *iam pudet ubera matris/ ducere.* We might compare the 'little kid' (*haedulus*) destined not for sacrifice but for the dinner-table in *Satire* 11, who is 'unaccustomed to pasture' (66), 'hasn't dared to munch the low willow-shoots' (67) and still has 'more milk than blood' in him (68). This animal's life-story is mirrored in that of Juvenal's wine-pourer, who 'sighs for his long unseen mother' (152) and 'sadly misses his little cottage and familiar goats', a product of the countryside no less than the wine he serves (159-60).

⁶² 12.72-4: *conspicitur sublimis apex, cui candida nomen/ scrofa dedit, laetis Phrygibus mirabile sumen,/ et numquam visis triginta clara mamillis* ('The high peak comes into view, to which the white sow gave the name. It was an udder miraculous to the delighted Trojans, and famous for its thirty teats, a sight unseen').

non sperat tragicæ furtiva piacula cervæ. 120

laudo meum ciuem, nec comparo testamento

mille rates; nam si Libitinam evaserit aeger,

delebit tabulas inclusus carcere nassæ

post meritum sane mirandum atque omnia soli

forsan Pacuvio breviter dabit, ille superbus 125

incedet victis rivalibus. ergo vides quam

grande operæ pretium faciat iugulata Mycenis.

If you were to assent to it, Pacuvius will vow to sacrifice big bodies, since these are most beautiful, from his herd of slaves, or place sacrificial bands upon the foreheads of his servants and maids. And if he has at home any Iphigenia of marriageable age, then he will proffer her to the altars, even without any thought of tragedy's furtive substitution of a deer.

Bravo, my fellow-citizen! A thousand ships is no match for one will – for if the ailing man has escaped death, he'll erase his documents, and, trapped in the prison of Pacuvius' fishing net, after that really amazing service, perhaps, in a few words, he'll give it all to Pacuvius.

Swollen with pride, he'll exult over his conquered rivals. So you see how very profitable it is to have cut the throat of the girl from Mycenæ.

In Pacuvius' ritual, human victims have been substituted for sacrificial animals. He selects an offering from his 'herd' of slaves (116). As if already insensate and stripped of their personhood, these offerings are 'big bodies' (116-7). He puts sacrificial fillets on their foreheads, like cattle; a sacrifice frightening in both kind and number. Even more scandalously, if he has a daughter at home, 'an Iphigenia of marrying age', he is willing to sacrifice her as well (118-9). Although the Euripidean version of that myth has Iphigenia switched for a deer at the last moment, Pacuvius, true to form, will sacrifice humans rather than animals, and the horror narrowly escaped in tragedy will be fully realized in contemporary Rome.⁶³ The abrupt juxtapositions of Juvenal's Latin accentuate the absurdly high stakes of this desperate game: in the enjambed lines 124-5, we read *omnia soli/ forsam...breviter* – 'everything to one man/ perhaps...briefly'. Indeed, despite these horrors, the ritual is perpetuated in only uncertain expectation of future gain: if (*si*, 122) the sick Gallitta survives, then perhaps (*forsam*, 125) he will make Pacuvius his sole heir, and all this only if you allow him to do so (*si concedas*, 115). *Si concedas* is an important qualification; the *captator* seeks to forge a kind of contract, in which his violent excesses are licensed by a 'victim' who will reward him accordingly.⁶⁴ It is an exchange, albeit of the most corrupt kind.

Summarizing the results of Pacuvius' gamble, and with the sacrificer's own false confidence, Juvenal in the final lines treats the ritual as already successful and complete, drawing mythological history and contemporary crime into a timeless commentary: 'you see', he says,

⁶³ A version of *Iphigenia in Tauris* was written by Pacuvius (Cic. *Lael.* 24), which may give additional point to Juvenal's use of Pacuvius' name here.

⁶⁴ On the quasi-contract between *captatores* and the wealthy, cf. Pliny's picture of the stir caused by the will of Domitius Tullus (*Ep.* 8.18). Tullus encouraged legacy-hunters during his lifetime, but then in the end honorably bequeathed his property to his family. Ironically, far from arousing praise, this last-minute switch led to the widespread opinion that Tullus was mendacious, ungrateful and fickle (*alii fictum ingratum immemorem loquuntur*).

‘how very profitable it is to have cut the throat of the girl from Mycenae’ (126-7). In fact, this translation expands Juvenal’s phrasing, which is callously perfunctory and grammatically compact. The phrase *iugulata Mycenis* continues to blur the line between animal and human victims, since the verb *iugulare* is used both of slitting animals’ throats in ritual contexts (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.199, 12.214), and as an emotive word for murdering other humans. Finally, having described this monstrous sacrifice, the satirist, as if interrupting Pacuvius’ opportunity to pray for Galitta’s health, offers his own prayer in retaliation:⁶⁵

*vivat Pacuvius quaeso vel Nestora totum,
 possideat quantum rapuit Nero, montibus aurum
 exaequet, nec amet quemquam nec ametur ab ullo.* (128-30)

I pray that Pacuvius will live as long as Nestor, and possess
 as much as Nero stole, with gold heaped high as mountains,
 and that he will love nobody, and that nobody will love him.

By invoking the horror of human sacrifice, Juvenal presents a shrilly hyperbolic image of the extremes of depravity to which legacy-hunters will sink. Yet Juvenal’s portrait of the legacy-hunters Pacuvius and Novius is also notable for its absences, since it is almost completely devoid of any of the accustomed hallmarks of legacy-hunters in other accounts of the

⁶⁵ For *quaeso* in the specific sense ‘to pray’ (most clearly in the ritual formula *precor quaesoque*, but also found without *precor*), see Hickson (1993: 49-50). Prayer and sacrifice typically occurred together: Pulleyn (1997: 7-15).

practice.⁶⁶ True, the fishing imagery employed by Juvenal – *nassa*, in line 123, is literally a wicker-trap for fish – is typical of evocations of legacy-hunting, which, as the English phrase ‘legacy-hunting’ preserves, draws its metaphors in Latin from hunting or fishing.⁶⁷ But there is no mention here of the expensive gifts with which legacy-hunters conventionally ensnare their prey; no mention of obsequious attendance at the *salutatio*, or the law-courts, or the sick-bed; no mention of humiliating self-abasement or sexual services; and no mention of false flattery, the otherwise ubiquitous weapon of *captatores*.⁶⁸ While sacrificing on behalf of one’s potential target was indeed depicted as part of the legacy-hunter’s armory, in *Satire* 12, uniquely, Pacuvius’ shamelessness as a legacy-hunter is epitomized entirely by the grotesqueness and impiety of the sacrifices he performs.⁶⁹ If this passage of the poem were truly a condemnation of legacy-hunters in the tradition of Horace, *Satires* 2.5 and the Croton episodes in Petronius, then its singular focus would render it oddly incomplete. But Juvenal’s intertwining of the themes of sacrifice and legacy-hunting suggest a different satiric target.

If the figure who would sacrifice his own daughter symbolizes the worst kind of legacy-hunter, that figure is also familiar from a different moral discourse, one that centers more directly on the cruelty and impiety of sacrificial ritual, or of extreme or perverse religiosity more generally. Empedocles, in an extant fragment, depicts a man unwittingly sacrificing his own son, who had been reincarnated as an animal, turning the ritual feast into a horrific

⁶⁶ Tracy (1980) summarizes the ancient evidence on legacy-hunting. Champlin (1991: 87-102) explores the social tensions that underlie satire’s (doubtlessly over-exaggerated) vision of legacy-hunters. According to Champlin, their prominence in satirical literature testifies to the solemn importance accorded in Roman culture to unhindered testamentary freedom, and the significance of the will as an honest reflection of social and familial bonds.

⁶⁷ Tracy (1980: 400-1).

⁶⁸ For legacy-hunter’s typical ‘services’, see Champlin (1991: 89-90; and, at 201-2, an appendix of ancient references to *captatio*).

⁶⁹ For *captatores*’ sacrifices on behalf of their intended targets, cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 710; Mart. 12.90; Pliny, *Ep.* 2.20.5; Luc. *Dial. Mort.* 345.

Thyestean banquet.⁷⁰ The anecdote is part of Empedocles' broader argument for abstention from both sacrificing and eating animal flesh, and those who followed his lead often deliberately blurred the line between human and animal in order to demonstrate their essential kinship.⁷¹ Plutarch, in his essay *Peri Deisidaimonias* ('On Superstition'), mentions Empedocles' argument, but goes further, climactically describing groups of Gauls and Scythians who consciously sacrifice their own children as part of their ritual practice (or, if they have none of their own, sacrifice the children of the poor.)⁷² These people must, Plutarch says, have 'no conception of the gods, no vision, no myth', to descend to this ultimate impiety. Rives (1995) has pointed to the use of human sacrifice more widely in the Empire to epitomize both cultural otherness and erroneous or excessive religious belief; the nations claimed by the likes of Pomponius Mela or Pliny the Elder to engage in human sacrifice are indicted on both grounds.⁷³ Human sacrifice also appears as a theme with some frequency in declamations dated to the late first or early second century, and always as an extreme test of the bond between fathers and their children. In one extant example, the declaimer is challenged to assume the role of a son arguing for his own sacrifice in order to rid the city of the plague, and then the father arguing against.⁷⁴ In another, a father sues a magistrate for wrongly sacrificing his daughter; he had intended to sacrifice a virgin, but the father had denied all along that his daughter was eligible.⁷⁵ These fantastical scenarios suit a genre

⁷⁰ Fr. 137 D-K, cited by Gale (2000: 103).

⁷¹ See Green (2004: 163-6), with the references there cited, on Ovid's aetiology of animal sacrifice (*Fast.* 1.349-456).

⁷² *Mor.* 171C-D

⁷³ See Rives (1995: 77-80) on human sacrifice in discussions of 'bad religion'; cf. Pomp. Mel. 3.18; Plin. *HN* 30.13.

⁷⁴ Calp. Flacc. 19.

⁷⁵ [Quint] *Decl. Min.* 384; cf. Calp. Flacc. 44, a similar scenario. Elsewhere, the image of human sacrifice is used for rhetorical effect: a son, sentenced to death, challenges his father to sacrifice him before the Penates

frequently criticized as ‘shirking from reality’ (*abhorrenti a veritate*);⁷⁶ yet later writers maintain that only under Hadrian was human sacrifice abolished by law throughout the Empire – another instance of Hadrian’s attempt to mould religious discourse in this period, if our sources are to be believed.⁷⁷

The most famous condemnation of excessive religion amongst the Latin poets, though, is certainly Lucretius’ depiction of Agamemnon’s sacrifice of his daughter Iphigenia (1.82-101), and the Lucretian episode is Juvenal’s most prominent intertext in his description of Pacuvius’ sacrifice. Lucretius memorably describes the moments leading up to Iphigenia’s sacrifice – the sacrificial ribbon (*infula*) being bound around her head, her father standing by the altar, the attendants with their knives ready. As in Juvenal, Lucretius’ Iphigenia is of marrying age, and her sacrifice is the cruel simulacrum of a marriage ritual (1.95-7). Finally, Lucretius says:

*sed casta inceste nubendi tempore in ipso
hostia concideret mactatu maesta parentis –
exitus ut classi felix faustusque daretur.
tantum religio potuit suadere malorum. (DRN 1.98-101).*

But a pure girl, impurely, at the very age of marriage,
would fall as an anguished sacrificial victim, slain by her father

(Calp. Flacc. 24); a priest offers to be killed *inter aras et altaria* in place of his son, who has been sentenced to death (Calp. Flacc. 26).

⁷⁶ Tac. *Dial.* 35.4.

⁷⁷ Porph. *Abst.* 2.56.3; Lact. *Div. Inst.* 1.21. For a skeptical consideration of the evidence, see Hughes (1991: 128-9). How this relates to Hadrian’s far more notorious connection to human sacrifice – the allegation that he sacrificed his *eroumenos* Antinous in Egypt – is unclear (cf. Dio 69.11.2-4).

so that fair and favorable passage be granted to the fleet.

To such a magnitude of evil can religion incite people.

For Lucretius, Agamemnon's willingness to sacrifice his own daughter, merely to receive favorable winds for his fleet, epitomizes the extremes of impiety and crime to which religion can drive people. By alluding to this figure in his picture of Pacuvius, Juvenal positions his contemporary condemnation of legacy-hunters in the context of a wider field of texts about sacrifice. Juvenal has fused two figures – the crazed fanatic of the philosophical tradition condemning sacrificial ritual, and the amoral legacy-hunter of the satiric tradition – in order to draw a parodic parallel between legacy-hunting and sacrifice. Legacy-hunters are famed for their venality, their obsequiousness, and the willing loss of their resources in the uncertain hope of future gain. They profit from death. Sacrifice was, as we have seen, impugned for its cruelty, but also, increasingly, for a kind of implicit mercantilism that underlay the ritual, its justifications and theology. By identifying the worst contemporary legacy-hunters with the most hideous of sacrifices, Juvenal sets up a two-way critique, in which both practices serve as a damning comment on each other. In particular, the identification of sacrifice with a corrupt kind of commercial activity is Juvenal's contribution to a wider satiric and theological discourse that targeted precisely the contamination of religious discourse by commercial conceptions of benefit and gain. Of course, the *captatores* Juvenal depicts presumably expect 'favor' and profit not from the gods but from the intended targets of their legacy-hunting. Their sacrifices are mere display for human eyes. Expense has become an end in itself. But the nature of Juvenal's two-way critique is such that both legacy-hunting

and sacrifice are implicated in the satire as motivated by crassly economic factors. The waste of life is squared against a crude calculation of profit and loss.

Such considerations of profit and loss were not foreign to Greek and Roman thinking about sacrifice, which had always depended on notions of reciprocity and exchange. According to the study of Greek religion by Pulleyn (1997), those sacrificing sought to establish a reciprocal relationship of χάρις, or ‘favor’, with the god, so that, by offering pleasing gifts, the god would be well-disposed towards granting requests. This notion of reciprocity underlies the prayer formula *da-quia-dedi*, ‘give because I have given’, which frequently accompanies acts of sacrifice. On the other hand, a strictly commercial notion of this human-divine exchange was consistently resisted. Pulleyn (1997: 30) himself is careful to qualify his argument in this respect: ‘I do not wish to suggest, of course, that Greek χάρις was bluntly mercantile. Presumably, one’s previous offerings made the god well-disposed to one in a way that could not be crudely quantified. It is not the case that one ox would buy divine health insurance for just one month’. But Pulleyn’s reservations here mirror ancient anxieties about the possibility for sacrificial discourse to be conceived in purely economic terms, almost exactly (his example of divine health insurance – unconsciously? – echoes Lucian in his *On the Sacrifices*, considered below). In particular, as a matter of basic piety, Greeks and Romans rejected the notion that the efficacy of one’s sacrifice was commensurate with its size and expense. ‘The incense that the poor man offers to the gods from his small plate has as much effect as that given from a huge platter’, wrote Ovid. The notion is a commonplace.⁷⁸ Significantly, those formulating the rhetoric of new faiths under the Empire were keen to escape the mercantilist strains they saw in Greco-Roman notions of human-

⁷⁸ *Pont.* 4.8.39-40: *nec quae de parva pauper dis libat acerra/ tura minus grandi quam data lance valent;* cf. *Trist.* 2.75-6. On the prevalence of the notion, see the references cited by Nisbet & Rudd (2004: 262).

divine exchange. Saint Paul's insistence that God's gift of grace is incommensurate with any human form of repayment, and Solomon's declaration in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (8.111) that men cannot repay God for his 'favor' [χάρις] since He is 'above such an exchange' [κρείττον τοιαύτης ἀμοιβῆς], simultaneously acknowledge and reject the economic overtones of Greco-Roman notions of sacrifice and prayer; or, more widely, they reject for their theology an immanent Imperial habit of thought that conceived one's position in terms of resources and exchange.⁷⁹

If sacrifice involved entering into a mutual relationship of reciprocity with the gods, in which one made offerings in expectation of benefits in return, a certain degree of mystification about one's motivations was also necessary, since transparently self-interested prayers were routinely condemned by ancient moralists.⁸⁰ Greco-Roman ideas about gift-giving more broadly provide a helpful parallel.⁸¹ Despite a common social understanding that giving a gift established a reciprocal obligation for its return, for Seneca, the *moral* virtue of a gift depends on it being made without any expectation of personal gain. His negative *exemplum* in one of the most striking passages in his treatise on gifts, the *De Beneficiis*, is, in fact, the legacy-hunter, the archetypal figure to give gifts or performs services in self-interested expectation of a return. 'Though he may do everything which a good and dutiful friend ought to do, yet, if any hope of gain be floating in his mind, he is a legacy-hunter, and casting out

⁷⁹ Harrison (2003) argues that Paul deliberately, if paradoxically, adopted the Greco-Roman reciprocal notion of χάρις to express to his readers the nature of God's unilateral grace; His χάρις 'frees Christians from dependence on civic luminaries' (at 287), unbinding them from a Roman ethics of reciprocity. For Solomon's speech in Josephus, which is without biblical precedent but demonstrates the influence of Stoic notions of God, see Jonquière (2007: 162-4).

⁸⁰ So, e.g. [Plat.] *Sec. Alcib*; Hor. *Carm.* 1.31; Pers. *Sat.* 2 (on which see below); Joseph. *Ap.* 2.197 (Jonquière 2007: 29-44); Maxim. *Or.* 5.

⁸¹ The parallel is not coincidental; Pulleyn (1997) derives the ancient understanding of sacrifice from contemporary notions of reciprocal hospitality (ξενία).

his fishing-hook'.⁸² To demystify the economic basis of the relationship between the childless man and his 'friend' is to expose that friend as a legacy-hunter, and thereby undermine the legitimacy of his gifts. No less, to expose the economic and self-interested basis of sacrifice is to undermine its legitimacy, and this is precisely Juvenal's project in fusing the two practices.⁸³

Juvenal's characterization of Pacuvius and Novius, then, is shocking because it implicitly identifies sacrifice with legacy-hunting, the paradigmatic example of a human relationship 'corrupted' by frankly economic concerns. The language with which Juvenal describes the sacrifice is mercantile. He sarcastically dubs Pacuvius' profitable sacrifice of his Iphigenia as *grande operae pretium* (127) – literally, 'a great reward for work'. Pacuvius has 'earned' the boon of Gallitta's legacy (cf. *meritum* at 124). The *captatores* are led to perform extravagant rituals in the crudely fiscal belief that grand benefactors require grand sacrifices: the elephants that Pacuvius and Gallitta offer before Gallitta's household shrines (the *Lares*) are, they believe, 'the only victim worthy of such great gods and their legacy-hunters' (*et cadat ante Lares Gallittae victima sola/ tantis digna deis et captatoribus horum*) – the phrasing here suggests, significantly, that, in performing the ritual, the sacrificers are *captatores* not of the ailing childless but directly of the divine Lares themselves.⁸⁴ Juvenal says that he will not

⁸² *De Ben.* 4.20: *faciat licet omnia, quae facere bonus amicus et memor officii debet: si animo eius observatur spes lucri, captator est et hamum iacit.*

⁸³ Presumably, on a practical level, legacy-hunters also needed to obscure the economic basis of their 'friendship' in order to be successful. So Maus (2005) observes, writing on Ben Jonson's comedy about legacy-hunting, *Volpone*: 'If Corvino's gift-giving were openly acknowledged to be a "venture", the game would be up. The gulls must disown their expectation that Volpone will reciprocate their gifts, even while everything they do depends on that expectation' (at 436). Jonson's comedy also combines the theme of legacy-hunting with underlying elements of theological critique; according to Maus (2005), the childless Volpone's opening speech, a prayer to his riches as to a 'saint' in his 'shrine', instigates a discourse about the nature of idolatry that persists throughout the play.

⁸⁴ This notion of the *captatores* targeting the Lares reverses an earlier passage of Horace, in which *captatores* are advised to worship their targets *instead of* the *Lares*. Thus, Tiresius in *Satires* 2.5 tells the

‘compare’ ten thousand ships with a will (*nec comparo*, 121), mimicking the legacy-hunters’ calculations while exposing their absurd lack of proportion. Indeed, Juvenal makes very explicit the legacy-hunters’ calculations in an earlier passage in the poem. For a father who already has heirs, he says that *captatores* would be willing to sacrifice only (in a neat inversion) a hen itself on the point of death, but for more profitable targets, *captatores* will go to correspondingly greater expense:

*libet expectare quis aegram
et claudentem oculos gallinam inpendat amico
tam sterili; verum haec nimia est inpensa, 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... (12.95-101)*

I’d gladly wait and see who
would pay even for a sick hen, closing its eyes to the world,
for a friend as barren as mine. But even that is too much expense!
No quail will ever be slain on behalf of a man with heirs. But if
the rich and childless Gallitta and Pacius begin to feel a fever,
the entire porch is adorned with vows, affixed in the ritual manner.
There are those who would even promise a hecatomb...

captator Odysseus that the sweetest fruits of his farm should be sent first to the target of his legacy-hunting: ‘May he taste them before his Lares, a rich man more worthy of veneration than the Lares themselves’ (*ante Larem gustet venerabilior Lare dives*, 14).

The notion of *emax prex*, ‘praying as if one were buying something’, was the object of attack for other Imperial satirists. That phrase occurs in the second *Satire* of Persius, and Juvenal seems to indicate from the very beginning of *Satire* 12 that we should read this text with Persius’ earlier poem in mind.⁸⁵ The second *Satire* is, in the first place, a diatribe on the misuse of prayer by the avaricious and hypocritical, but its broader target is a mindset in which relationships, both between people and with the gods, are conceived in exclusively commercial terms.⁸⁶ One man prays to be able to ‘erase’ (*expungam*) the ward who will inherit before him, as if people were merely marks on a ledger (12-3);⁸⁷ another sweats and shakes in ecstasy not through any erotic adventure but at the sight of silver plates (52-3); and a bankrupt man’s last remaining coin voices its master’s plight, sighing, ‘deceived’, ‘devoid of hope’ – the final stage of a life in which money has ousted human concerns (50-1). The philosophical failing of these characters is to infer the gods’ nature from their own, such that they can only perceive religious rituals in economic terms. ‘What is it you believe about god’, asks Persius (18), interrogating a man who likens the gods to public officials (19-20) and therefore conceives of animal sacrifice as a kind of bribery. ‘What is the price with which you buy the gods’ little ears? Lungs and greasy intestines?’⁸⁸ This kind of theology

⁸⁵ A connection between the two poems was noted by Helmbold (1956:18), though oddly he deems it ‘a confused recollection’. Both poems begin with references to birthdays (appearing to announce themselves as *genethliaka* or ‘birthday poems’), but both ultimately go on to attack those who make hypocritical use of religious institutions. The first lines of each poem are constructed similarly to signal the intertext from the outset, with the vocative of the addressee as the second word followed by a form of *dies* (‘day’), a comparative adjective, and a final word beginning with ‘1’. Pers. *Sat.*2.1: *Hunc, Macrine, diem numera meliore lapillo* (‘Mark, Macrinus, this day with a better token...’); Juv. *Sat.* 12.1: *Natali, Corvine, die mihi dulcior haec lux* (‘This day, Corvinus, is sweeter to me than my birthday...’)

⁸⁶ Cf. Malamud (1996: 47): ‘Money, exchange at its most abstract *and* its most tangible, lies behind everything in *Satire* 2...’.

⁸⁷ *Expungo* means, etymologically, to ‘prick out’, and is used of physical (indeed, sexual) violence in Plautus (*Pers.*5.2.67), but assumes the technical financial sense of canceling an obligation or debt on an account: *OLD* s.v. *expungo* (2).

⁸⁸ 29-30: *aut quidnam est qua tu mercede deorum/ emeris auriculas? pulmone et lactibus unctis?*

fashions god in our own crooked image. ‘What benefit is there to impose our own customs on the temples, and assume from our own corrupted pulp what is good for the gods?’⁸⁹ Instead, as Persius says at the conclusion, we must ourselves become the sacrifice, bringing to the temples not expensive offerings but our own sense of justice and right. The very *hardness* of the commercial mindset is replaced at the poem’s end by an edifying, if disconcerting, sense of humanity’s own fleshy, fallible softness: we are ‘pulp’ (63), says Persius, made up no less of lungs and greasy intestines, and our offering must be one of honor, ‘cooked into’ our hearts (74).⁹⁰

Like Persius, Lucian in his *On Sacrifices* (Περὶ Θυσίων) attacks the theology of sacrificial ritual through its metaphors, and the conception of the gods it implies.⁹¹ Lucian had argued in the *Zeus Cross-Examined* (Ζεὺς Ἐλεγχόμενος) that performing sacrifices to the gods is superfluous, since their actions are bound by the laws of fate no less than our own.⁹² In *On Sacrifices*, by contrast, he argues that sacrificial ritual implies a view of the gods as all too human – hungry, petty, venal and susceptible to flattery – a line of argumentation familiar from Platonic attacks on poets’ representation of the gods. But particularly it implies that divine favor can be bought, and Lucian parodically formulates a scale of ‘prices’ for blessings – one can obtain health for a calf, he says, and wealth for four oxen, a kingdom for a hecatomb, safe return from Troy to Pylos for nine bulls, and (notoriously) passage from

⁸⁹ 62-3: *quid iuvat hoc, templis nostros inmittere mores/ et bona dis ex hac scelerata ducere pulpa?*

⁹⁰ On the metaphor of humanity as food in the poem, see Flintoff (1982), Rudd (1986: 103-4), and more broadly in Persius, Gowers (1993: 183-4). Cf. Reckford (2009: 62): ‘true piety requires process, like the compounding (*compositum*) of ingredients in cooking, or like the steeping (*inconctum*) of woolstuffs through and through with an indelible dye’.

⁹¹ See Macleod (1991: 176-187).

⁹² *Jup. Conf.* 5.

Aulis to Troy by sacrificing the king's daughter.⁹³ Lucian runs through the same escalating series of sacrifices as Juvenal in *Satire* 12. He progresses from single animals, to a hecatomb, to the execrable *exemplum* of Iphigenia's sacrifice, and he even surmises that the gods must set aside some petty benefit for the price of a cock, just as for Juvenal the sacrifice of a dying hen represented the variety of sacrifice destined to draw the smallest profit. But where Juvenal was scandalizing, Lucian is banalizing, reducing Olympian beneficence to a banalistic roster of goods and services. Such a view of sacrifice implies a particularly mercenary view of the gods, who, as Lucian puts it, 'do nothing...without getting paid' (οὐδέν...ἀμισθὶ ποιοῦσιν, 2); but it also implies that sacrificial ritual operates within a calculable scheme of profit and loss, precisely the kind of economic conception ancient thinkers strenuously rejected.

The latter section of *Satire* 12 is frequently described as a condemnation of legacy-hunters, but few of the motifs familiar from other ancient discussions of legacy-hunting recur here. Instead, Juvenal in *Satire* 12 contributes an original – and damning – metaphor to the analysis of religious ritual in Imperial Rome. If, in Persius, sacrifice is likened to bribery, and in Lucian it is likened to purchasing goods and services, then in Juvenal, sacrifice is likened to legacy-hunting. This parodic link is illustrated not only in the sacrifices of Pacuvius and Novius, but in the structure of *Satire* 12 itself, which moves with superficial inconsistency between a humble Horatian sacrifice to a satiric indictment of legacy-hunting. Which second-time-reader could re-read the 'genuine' sacrifice of the opening *without* a heightened sensitivity to issues of benefit and gain, and new suspicions about any sacrificial gift? *Satire* 12 is immersed in the Augustan poetic tradition, yet it expresses a cynicism about the value

⁹³ *De Sacr.* 2.

of tradition and its hollow repetition in art and politics. It also offers a vision of sacrifice in wildly variant forms, in connection with a broader theological discourse about its ethics and economics. Its thematic complexity is mirrored in a structure that appears jaunty and disconnected; yet, in its apparent disconnection, is in fact another attempt by Juvenal to provoke the listener to draw links him or herself. The poem's critique of sacrifice and tradition only acquires more power and point the more we are made to reflect upon its various interconnections, forced therefore to reread from end to beginning, to weigh up the respective significance of its component sections, and to participate in yet one more cycle of repetition.

4. Reading across Books: Atheism and Superstition in *Satire Thirteen*

Satire 12 brings to a climax the religious elements evident throughout the fourth book. Yet, as I have described it, this shifting and apparently disjointed poem is a curiously open-ended conclusion to a poetic *libellus*. This impression of 'open-endedness' increases once one begins the fifth book, which re-introduces *Satire 12*'s religious themes. *Satire 13* has long been recognized as a parodic version of a philosophical *consolatio*, addressed to an interlocutor mourning not over the loss of a family member, but over a swindled deposit ('when money's lost, the tears are real', Juvenal quips).⁹⁴ Calvinus is 'blazing' with indignation at the thought of this petty crime going unpunished (14-5, 174-5), just as Juvenal was blazing about unpunished crime in the first *Satire*, and far from consoling his addressee, the puckish satirist seems bent on provoking him further. Challenging Calvinus to put his

⁹⁴ 13.134: *ploratur lacrimis amissa pecunia veris*. The view of *Satire 13* as a 'false consolation' was first advanced by Pryor (1962), followed by Fredericks (1971) and Morford (1973). For a closer comparison with patterns of structure and thought in extant philosophical consolations, see Braund (1997c).

comparatively trivial financial loss into a properly philosophical, global perspective, he tells his interlocutor to recall the infinite and unceasing variety of crimes to which the city is home (135-173) – poor consolation indeed.⁹⁵ While this poem, like *Satire 12*, is marked by apparent contradictions and shifts in perspective, comparison with *Satire 12* reveals that religion is once again at the forefront of the satirist's concerns.⁹⁶ The discontinuities in the poem in fact consist of contrasting theological views about the gods and their role in punishing crimes. Juvenal brings to life two unpleasant and often-lambasted theological extremes: he assumes the persona of an atheist, who denies the existence of divine justice or of the gods at all; yet he uses this persona to describe in detail the superstitious man, whose guilt and neurosis leads him to interpret any minor illness or event as the manifestation of divine wrath.⁹⁷ More than ever, Juvenal stages an ideological debate not by clearly setting out the premises of an argument, but through a tangle of impersonated voices, whose ethical claims the reader is provoked to distinguish and assess.

Plutarch, in his *Peri Deisidaimonias*, describes the two types of the atheist and the superstitious person.⁹⁸ They are two sides of the same coin. Both positions arise out a 'lack of

⁹⁵ Juvenal may be producing a satiric variant on the panegyric topos that everything in the Empire can be found in Rome; on the topos, see Swain (1996: 363-4).

⁹⁶ On the poem's apparent incoherence, see, e.g., Hooley (2007: 125-6): 'There is no particular philosophy systematically on display here...the variations on the generic theme, assuming that this is the literary game being played, are not exactly coherent either...' Courtney (1980: 533-7) proposes that the first half of the poem is ironic, the second half, serious. Keane (2007) sees the shifting argument of the satirist as evidence of the mutual influence exerted by speaker and addressee upon each other, thereby producing a 'unique kind of consolation drama' (at 33).

⁹⁷ Jones (1993: 91), somewhat similarly, notes the 'ethical puzzle' in the contrast between the picture of the 'unconscionable criminal' and the 'criminal plagued by conscience'. To my knowledge, though, only Lowell Edmunds, in an interesting early paper (1972), has recognized the centrality of religion to the poem, though with different conclusions; he extracts, from a recalcitrant text, a positive theological argument about the interdependence of personal conscience and religious belief.

⁹⁸ Laurenti & Santaniello (2007) offer the most recent edition of this essay, typically considered an early work.

learning and knowledge’ about the gods (164E). While atheists conclude from false reasoning that the gods do not exist, the superstitious misinterpret the gods’ benevolent care as despotic anger and a desire to harm (167D). The atheist will blame himself for his failures, or else condemn fortune or chance, charging that ‘all human affairs are confused and disordered and upside-down’ (168A). If faced with religious celebrations or worship at temples, the atheist is liable to ‘laugh a mad, sardonic laugh at what is being done. Perhaps, unshaken, he’ll mutter an aside to his friends that those who think these ceremonies are conducted for the gods are deluded and raving’.⁹⁹ By contrast, the superstitious person is paralyzed by fear of the gods – an inescapable terror that plagues sufferers even in their dreams (165E). He imagines himself constantly being ‘punished’ (κολάζεσθαι, 168B). He trembles with fear while offering sacrifice, yet also never ceases worshipping the gods and besieging their shrines, as frightened subjects do for tyrants (169E). E.R. Dodds (1951: 252-3) used this vision of the superstitious man as evidence for the ‘irrational anxieties and the striking manifestations of neurotic guilt-feeling’ he perceived in Imperial-era Greek thought. Plutarch even presents a neat argument to argue that superstition is, in fact, more impious and pernicious than atheism. What would you prefer? People spreading false rumors about you – that you are ‘fickle, changeable, quick to anger, eager to avenge everyday occurrences, pained over minutiae’?¹⁰⁰ Or people simply not knowing that you exist at all?

Juvenal embodies the ‘sardonic laugh’ of the atheist in *Satire* 13, rebuking Calvinus for his naïve appeals to the sanctity of sworn oaths.

⁹⁹ 169D: τὸν ἄθεον γελῶντα μὲν μανικὸν καὶ σαρδάνιον γέλωτα τούτοις ποιούμενοις καὶ που παραφθεγγόμενον ἄτρομα πρὸς τοὺς συνήθεις ὅτι τετύφονται καὶ δαιμονώσιν οἱ θεοὶς ταῦτα δοῦσθαι νομίζοντες... On the specific connection between atheism and mockery, cf. Apuleius’ picture of his accuser Aemilianus, who ‘considers it a piece of wit to mock religious matters’ (*facetiae sibi habere res divinas deridere*, *Apol.* 56).

¹⁰⁰ 170A: ἀβέβαιος, εὐμετάβολος, εὐχερῆς πρὸς ὀργήν, ἐπὶ τοῖς τυχοῦσι τιμωρητικός, μακρόλυπος.

*Nos hominum divomque fidem clamore ciemus
 quanto Faesidium laudat vocalis agentem
 sportula? dic, senior bulla dignissime, nescis
 quas habet veneres aliena pecunia? Nescis
 quem tua simplicitas risum vulgo moveat, cum
 exigis a quoquam ne perieret et putet ullis¹⁰¹
 esse aliquod numen templis araeque rubenti? (13.31-7)*

Are we to cry out and invoke the good faith of gods and men,
 as loud as Faesidius' clients praising him while he pleads a case?
 Tell me – you codger deserving of a *bullā* – don't you know
 the charms of someone else's money? Don't you know
 what laughter your idiocy commonly arouses, when
 you demand from anyone that they refrain from perjury, and
 believe that some divinity exists in any temple or reddening altar?

Calvinus' harping upon the divinity of temples and the 'reddening altar' (the sacrificial blood also suggests a personified, modest 'blush') is derided as mere childish *simplicitas*. If these are his beliefs, he should reattach his *bullā* (33), a kind of locket worn by children then devoted to the *Lares* on the assumption of the *toga virilis*. In a comparison reminiscent of the

¹⁰¹ The sense of line 36 somewhat awkwardly requires us to understand a positive indirect command joined by *et* to a negative one. Courtney's emendation of *ullis* to *altis* at the end of the line is unnecessary and robs these incensed rhetorical questions of a hyperbolic sixth-foot climax.

twelfth *Satire*, the gods are implicitly likened to patrons with craven and self-serving clients, and invoking their *fides* is comparable to clients' loud, self-serving, sycophantic flattery (31-3). The influential seventeenth century satirist John Oldham translated these lines in such a way as to bring out the uncomfortable religious implications, wryly endorsing the postures of atheism among contemporary wits. Why, the satirist asks, 'preach up a God and Hell, vain empty names./ Exploded now for idle threadbare shams./ Devis'd by Priests, and by none else believ'd./ E're since great Hobbes the world has undeceiv'd?'¹⁰² Hammond (1983: 163) suggests that Oldham's irony here is 'carefully ambiguous, and deliberately disquieting to the reader', an assessment that might be extended to the Juvenalian original. Hammond also cites the note on *Sat.* 13.31-7 by the earlier translator Barton Holyday, who assures readers, not without insight, that Juvenal 'speaks not as his own belief, but by way of Satyre, to express the Common Atheisme of those Times'.

Throughout the thirteenth *Satire*, Calvinus presents his loss in religious terms, as an offense against piety. He blazes because he has lost his 'sacred deposit' (*sacrum... depositum*, 15-6); he has been cheated in an act of fraud he describes as 'sacrilegious' (*sacrilega*, 72) and 'wicked' (*nefandae*, 174). When his ghost appears in the guilty party's dream, it is even described as a 'sacred vision, and greater than human' (*sacra et maior imago*, 221), which compels the criminal to confess. As MacMullen (1981: 32, 58-9) demonstrates, appeals to the gods to watch over financial transactions and punish transgressors played a prominent role in personal religion throughout the Empire. In sardonic response, the satirist travesties religious language in order to argue the inevitability of self-interest. 'What day', he asks, 'is so holy that it rests from exposing a thief, a betrayal, deceit, profit sought from every kind of charge,

¹⁰² Oldham, 'The Thirteenth Satyr of Juvenal, Imitated' (1682-3), excerpted in Winkler (2001: 82-97).

and cash obtained by sword or treasure-box?’¹⁰³ Juvenal creates an irreverent vision of the Golden Age (38-59), in which Jupiter appears as an ‘ordinary person’ (*privatus*, 41) and Juno as a ‘toddler’ (*virguncula*, 40). It is an act of ‘prodigious loyalty’ (*prodigiosa fides*, 62), worthy of consultation of Etruscan books and atonement with sacrifice, if a friend follows through on a financial agreement (60-3). A ‘noble and just man’ is an omen, as portentous as a swarm of bees on a shrine, or a river of milk (64-70). Juvenal describes the cool rationality of those who ‘attribute everything to the accidents of fortune’ (86) and can therefore ‘touch any altar without shaking’ (89). Others believe that the gods exist but perjure themselves anyway, since, after all, as the satirist provokingly asserts, ‘it is just so easy and straightforward to disdain the gods as witnesses’.¹⁰⁴ Yet others drag you to ‘the secret shrine’ (107) and act out a scripted invocation to Jupiter, making dramatic appeals for divine justice in order to bolster their ‘poor case’ (109). This theological song-and-dance is a ‘mime’ (110) – the satirist likens the figure demanding justice at the altars to the runaway slave character from one of Catullus’ mimes (111).

The combined weight and brazen directness of these mockeries of piety go well beyond the intricate ironic patterning of *Satire* 12. Atheism was more an insult than an accepted intellectual position in antiquity. No Epicurean, for example, would call himself an atheist, though an opponent of Epicureanism might call him one.¹⁰⁵ On the other hand, allegations of

¹⁰³ 23-4: *quae tam festa dies, ut cesset prodere furem/ perfidiam, frauds atque omni ex crimine lucrum/ quaesitum et partos gladio vel pyxide nummos?* Markland proposed to emend *festa* in line 23 to *fausta* (Willis 1996: 79), and Nisbet (1995: 25-6) suggested *furtum* for *furem*, to accord with the abstract nouns in line 24. Both emendations serve to dull slightly the boldness of Juvenal’s personification of the day itself as a sort of *accusator*, vigilant (even when it is a holiday!) at exposing crime.

¹⁰⁴ 13.75: *tam facile et pronum est superos contemnere testes*. The line becomes even more devilishly irreverent, as Pryor (1962: 173-4) observes, by its similarity to the obscene 9.43: *an facile et pronum est agere intra viscera penem*.

¹⁰⁵ For ancient accusations of atheism, see Winiarczyk (1984) and (1992).

atheism became an increasingly pointed rhetorical weapon in the second century, brandished most famously against the Christians. Later second-century apologists expend much effort defending themselves from the hated charge.¹⁰⁶ By assuming this very hard-edged atheist persona, Juvenal gives voice to an objectionable, even alarming kind of religious critique. His satiric manoeuvre is similar to that of *Satire 10*, where he adopted the voice of an extreme, ‘hard’ Cynic in order to unsettle readers into realizing the dangers of his ideas.¹⁰⁷ Moreover, the poem’s broad theme of crime and punishment allows the satirist to illustrate vividly how this atheist perspective results in the disappearance of any solid ethical ground. Despite a false impression of rationality and detachment created by the contrast with the blazing, indignant Calvinus, the atheist’s assertions are calculated to produce discomfort, outrage, and challenge.

If the reader, then, is reaching for a more moderate view to temper the satirist’s scorn for the gods, the satiric voice in the second half of the poem (174ff) at once oscillates to the opposite extreme, offering a detailed psychological profile of the superstitious person. Wreaking physical vengeance on a wrongdoer is no match, he says, for the mental torment of those people anticipating the punishment of the gods: ‘their minds, conscious of their frightful crime, keep them quaking, and lash them with a silent scourge’.¹⁰⁸ The satirist encourages this fear by recounting the story of Glaucus of Sparta, drawn from Herodotus (6.86), who questioned the Pythian Oracle about whether to return some money or not. Although Glaucus took the honorable course, he and his descendents nonetheless suffered catastrophic

¹⁰⁶ See Walsh (1991).

¹⁰⁷ See chapter four. Although the Cynics preached self-reliance and were typically skeptical towards traditional cult, atheism was as foreign to the Cynics as to any other ancient philosophical sect (see, e.g. Bosman 2008).

¹⁰⁸ 13.193-4: *diri conscia facti/ mens habet attonitos et surdo verbere caedit.*

punishment merely for his having *contemplated* fraud, and the lesson to be drawn from this seems positively to foster a religious neurosis and paranoia: *has patitur poena peccandi sola voluntas* ('these are the punishments suffered merely for wanting to do wrong').

Juvenal's lengthy description of the *perpetua anxietas* of a guilty conscience (210-235) is famous for its hellish terrors.¹⁰⁹ But 'guilty conscience' for Juvenal does not denote an internal ethical sense. It is an acute manifestation of the symptoms of excessive superstition. Criminals shake and turn pale whenever a storm appears, in the fear that each lightning bolt represents the gods' wrath and judgment (223-228). The slightest trace of pain and illness signifies for them the 'stones and missiles of the gods' (*saxa deorum/...et tela*, 231-2). The final lines of the poem, reassuring Calvinus that the gods will punish his opponent, and that his faith in their justice will be reaffirmed, doubtless contradict the disdain of the gods shown earlier by the atheist voice. But they are clearly calculated as bromide for a view of the gods merely as punishers of human transgression, answering the claims of the litigious and fueling the paranoia of the superstitious. The final sentence of Plutarch's *Peri Deisidaimonias* commends 'reverence' (εὐσέβεια) as the mean between atheism and superstition, but the fantasy of retribution at the end of *Satire* 13, transparently calculated to satisfy the addressee Calvinus, can offer its readers no satisfying resolution to the poem's jolting alternation between theological extremes:

dabit in laqueum vestigia noster

perfidus et nigri patietur carceris uncum

245

¹⁰⁹ Indeed, a version of the thirteenth *Satire* exists by Matthew Lewis, author of *The Monk*, who augments this section with a full Gothic array of ghosts and night-terrors: *The Love of Gain: A Poem. Imitated from the Thirteenth Satire of Juvenal* (1799).

aut maris Aegaei rupem scopulosque frequentes
exulibus magnis. poena gaudebis amara
nominis invisī tandemque fatebere laetus
nec surdum¹¹⁰ nec Teresian quemquam esse deorum. (13.244-9)

Our criminal will put his foot into the trap!
 He'll suffer the hook of the gloomy prison,
 or a crag in the Aegean Sea, and cliff-tops thronging with
 high-powered exiles. You'll delight in the bitter punishment
 of his hated name! In the end, you'll gleefully confess
 that none of the gods is deaf or a Tiresias.

The poem shifts jarringly between the two incompatible poles of (false) religious belief identified by Plutarch – atheism at one extreme, and superstition at the other – and the poem's conclusion fails to resolve the theological back-and-forth, casting it to the listener to find their way between the two unpleasant world-views. The *Satire* does offer some close connections, though, to religious themes in the fourth book. One indignant character ventriloquized by the atheist voice protests the lack of advantage that comes from performing religious ceremonies, then cries to the gods that 'there is no distinction between your effigies

¹¹⁰ Courtney thinks that *surdum* and *Teresian* is 'an odd combination', and emends the second of these to *Drusum* (that is, Claudius), an emendation accepted by Willis and Braund. An oblique reference to the *Apocolocyntosis* would be appealing, but the emendation is unsupportable. The combination of historical and mythological figure is no less odd, especially since Claudius is hardly a by-word for deafness in the way Tiresias is for blindness. Moreover, when unambiguous mention is made of Claudius in the *Satires*, he is called Claudius (5.147, 6.115, 14.330); Courtney adduces *Sat.*3.238 as a parallel, but *Druso* there is not certainly a reference to Claudius, and should perhaps be corrected to *surdo* in any case (so Speyer 1892). Could there not also be a cheeky revival of the atheist voice in Tiresias – Calvinus will realize that none of the gods is blind, but also that none of the gods, like Tiresias, is endowed with divine foresight?

and the statue of Vagellius', a contemptuous equivalence between the gods and some despised human patron.¹¹¹ They do not keep their side of the contract. Later, Juvenal makes explicit *Satire 12*'s theme of uneven substitution between sacrificial animals and the humans they benefit. The superstitious, he says, 'do not dare to promise a bleating sheep to a shrine, or even a crested cock to their *Lares*, for what are the ailing guilty allowed to hope for? Which sacrificial victim is not more worthy of life than they are?'¹¹²

Finally, the image of Golden Age renovation in *Satire 12* meets with cynical rejoinder in the rhetoric in *Satire 13* of the *nona aetas* ('ninth age'), an unbending descent from Rome's origins to the present day. 'The ninth age is upon us', Juvenal says, 'an era worse than the age of Iron. Nature herself has found and appointed no name from any metal for its crime'.¹¹³ Juvenal puts the end, of course, in the second century. The first poem of his first book claimed to expound a vision of vice that extended from the Flood, from the very beginning of the world (1.81-4). His fourth book focused on myths of nostalgia, cultural repetition, cyclical regeneration. The opening of the fifth measures current cultural degeneracy in a straight line, from the *Natalis Urbis* recalled at the opening of *Satire 12*, almost nine hundred years, or 'nine ages', into the second-century A.D.¹¹⁴ Sibylline Oracles predicting the dissolution of Rome into chaos after nine hundred years appeared in the reigns of Tiberius

¹¹¹ 13.118-9: *nullum discrimen habendum est/ effigies inter vestras statuamque Vagelli*. Vagellius could be as Courtney speculates, the Neronian poet Vagellius, author of a work on Phaethon, about one man's failure at playing god (the two surviving fragments hint at the theme of exceeding human bounds).

¹¹² 13.232-5: *pecudem spondere sacello/ balantem et Laribus cristam promittere galli/ non audent; quid enim sperare nocentibus aegris/ concessum? vel quae non dignior hostia vita?*

¹¹³ 12.28-30: *non aetas agitur peioraque saecula ferri/ temporibus, quorum scelere non invenit ipsa/ nomen et a nullo posuit natura metallo.*

¹¹⁴ For *saeculum* indicating a hundred years, see Varro, *De Ling Lat* 6.2.11. Contrary to the anti-chronological nostalgia of the fourth book, the fifth book is notable for its references to specific time; Juvenal tells us (13.16-7) that Calvinus is over sixty and was born in the year of 'Fonteius' consulship' (see Courtney ad loc.), and the cannibalism scandal of *Satire 15* is given a dramatic date in Iuncus' consulship (15.27).

and Nero; Juvenal issues a grim reminder of their prophecies.¹¹⁵ Here, in the *Satires*' final book, rather than history incessantly repeating itself, it has come to an end.

¹¹⁵ Dio 57.18.3; 62.18.3. For another view, see McGann (1968), who argues that Juvenal's ninth *aetas* is not literally Rome's ninth *saeculum* (due to begin in 153 A.D, twenty-five years from Juvenal's writing), but refers rather to the notion familiar in the Sibylline oracles of history unfolding in ten γενεαί, the tenth of which will include the destruction of Rome and the restoration of God's rule. The 'ninth age' expresses therefore a sense of being perilously close to the end.

APPENDIX: Martial 12.18 and the Dating of Juvenal's First Book of *Satires*

The evidence for the dating of Juvenal's first book can be briefly stated. It is generally agreed that the opening of the third book (that is, *Satire* seven) refers to the accession of Hadrian, providing a *terminus ante quem* of 117. The reference to the death of Domitian in 4.154 provides the first *terminus post quem* of 96. *Exul...Marius* (1.49) quite certainly refers to the prosecution of Marius Priscus in 100, thereby giving us a second *terminus post quem* of 100. Contemporary scholars, however, almost unanimously suggest that the first book dates a full decade later, to 110 or thereabouts. Why? A third *terminus post quem*, first claimed by Gercke (1895: 189-90) and made better known by Hight (1954: 13-4), is found in an alleged reference to Tacitus' literary works. In his indictment of male sexual hypocrisy in *Satire* 2, Juvenal lambasts the emperor Otho for preening in his mirror on the battlefield. This scandal is, he says:

res memoranda novis annalibus atque recenti

historia, speculum civilis sarcina belli.

...something worth being recorded in new annals and in

recent history – a mirror as the baggage of civil war!

Knowing Tacitus as we do, interest is naturally piqued at the fortuitous concatenation of 'annals' and 'history', and *novis* and *recenti* seem to arrange those two works in the correct chronological order. From Pliny we can determine that Tacitus was composing the *Histories*

in 106-7; the date of the *Annales* is unknown, but it seems he was still writing in 115. Hence, with this third *terminus post quem* in mind, Courtney (1980: 1) dates the book to 107, ‘at earliest’, adding that ‘in fact the poem probably belongs to a date much nearer that of book 2, A.D. 116-7’ (1980: 77). Highet (1954: 12) places the first book ‘in or near the year A.D. 110’, a view endorsed by Stramaglia (2008: 13); Friedlander (1969: 10), between 112 and 116; Braund (1996: 16), following Syme (1979: 260), even later, ‘in the second decade of the second century A.D....or, possibly, soon after Hadrian’s accession in A.D. 117’.

It is doubtful, however, that listeners would have understood a reference to Tacitus’ works from Juvenal’s lines. Neither this incident nor its damning view of Otho appear in either the *Histories* or the *Annales*. At least in Gercke’s original argument, that is precisely the point: the force of the gerundive *memoranda* is that Tacitus ‘ought to have recorded’ these unflattering attributes of the former emperor but did not. A more fundamental problem is that neither *historia* nor *annales* would likely have been recognized as the title of Tacitus’ works. Goodyear (1972: 85-7) makes a lengthy and convincing case that *Annales* lacks both MS authority and ancient corroboration as a title (he suggests *Ab Excessu divi Augusti [libri]* on the model of Livy’s *Ab Urbe Condita* and Pliny the Elder’s *A Fine Aufidii Bassi*). On the other hand, it is true that Pliny refers to Tacitus’ ‘histories’ (in the plural, *Ep.* 7.33.1), and Tertullian likewise refers both to Tacitus’ ‘histories’ (in the plural) and his ‘history’ (*Apol.* 16.1, 3). But *historia* is a genre of writing, not necessarily a title. Indeed, other ancient writers refer to *historia* and *annales* together not as titles but broadly as the two central genres of Roman historiography: Aulus Gellius devotes a whole chapter (5.18) to different accounts of the distinction between the two, and the issue is rehearsed in Servius (ad *Aen.* 1.373), who nonetheless admits that ‘the two are freely confounded’ (*haec tamen*

confunduntur licenter). In this light, Juvenal's references to *historia* and *annales* do not constitute a specific allusion to Tacitus, but are rather a sweeping reference to history-writing in general, by way of its two main Roman varieties. As Nisbet explains, the satirist's point is that 'incredible things should be recorded before too much time has elapsed'; Otto's preening is so outrageous it should be set down 'while the annals are new and the record is fresh' (Nisbet 1988: 89). Note also the wholly facetious comparison between his own scandalizing satires and the genre of history: needless to say, the detail of pathic Otho's mirror is only 'worth being recorded', and is in fact only recorded, in the pages of a satirist.

With the Tacitean *terminus* discounted, we revert to the *terminus post quem* of Marius Priscus' prosecution in 100 A.D.¹ In fact, I argue, an epigram of Martial may provide evidence that Juvenal's first book was published very close to that date. Martial mentions a *Iuvenalis* in three epigrams; given the pervasive knowledge of Martial's work in Juvenal, there is no good reason to doubt the two men's familiarity and that this *Iuvenalis* is our satirist. In the first (7.24), Martial attacks an unnamed man whose *perfida lingua* ('treacherous tongue' – the theme is intriguingly satirical) has threatened to fracture his friendship with Juvenal, which is cast in the mould of the great friendships of classical mythology. In the second (7.91), Martial sends nuts to 'eloquent' (*facunde*) Juvenal for Saturnalia – a paltry gift, since, as he says, Priapus has already bestowed his plot's best fruits on lusty women.² In the third epigram, however, from a later book dating to 101 or 102,

¹ Another *terminus post quem* has been suggested by Babel (1993). At lines 1.113-6, Juvenal wonders that there is not a temple to *Pecunia*, just as *Pax*, *Fides*, *Victoria*, *Virtus* 'are worshipped', and *Concordia* too, 'who rattles where her bird's nest is greeted' (see Courtney ad loc. for details of these deities' temples in Rome). Babel notes that all five appeared on coins during the age of Trajan, with the latest in 111; but nothing compels, or even suggests, a reference to coinage here, and these motifs were in any case hardly unique to the coinage of the Trajanic period.

² Nuts are, in fact, a specifically childish gift – punning perhaps on Juvenal's *cognomen*. For nuts as a gift given to children on holidays and special occasions, see Hopman (2003: 560) and the passages there cited.

Juvenal's character is suddenly recognizable: in epigram 12.18, he is the embattled, embittered client, shuttled to and fro throughout Rome, and his frantic life is teasingly contrasted with the repose Martial has found as a 'rustic', residing in country Bilbilis.³ Of course, such contrasts between *rus* and *urbs* are a conventional topos in Latin poetry. But Juvenal's characterization here does seem awfully familiar, and it is worth considering the idea – not entirely new⁴ – that Martial's epigram consciously reworks elements of Juvenal's first book, rather than responding merely to a body of shared topoi or to the *Realia* of the satirist's life. The picture Juvenal creates of the put-upon client is thus refracted back onto the author by his friend – which would have been particularly amusing if those details were (as recent commentators have suspected) more exaggerated than real in the first place. Martial's incorporation of a Juvenal garbed in the motifs of his satiric book, is comparable, then, to Vergil's incorporation of Gallus as an elegiac lover into the pastoral landscape of the tenth *Eclogue*, or Horace's mock-consolation to Tibullus (*Carm.* 1.33), where, as Nisbet and Hubbard point out, 'the poem derives its humour from being expressed in the elegists' own terms' (1970: 370). If this connection between Martial's epigram and Juvenal's *Satires* is accepted, the publication of Juvenal's first book must fall quite precisely between 100 and 101 or 102.

Martial begins the poem by placing Juvenal in an epigrammatic condensing of the satirist's own scenes of city life. 'While you, Juvenal', he says, 'wander restlessly in the noisy Subura,

³ On the dating of Martial's epigrams, see the fundamental analysis of Friedländer (1886: 65-7).

⁴ Rimell (2008: 194-5) makes this connection (but does not explain her reversal of the usual chronology): she says it is 'possible that it [sc. *Ep.* 12.18] also plays heavily on Juvenal's famous third satire... both Martial and Juvenal in *Satire* 3 work the same imperial irony of the urbanite who traces Aeneas' foundational journey to Rome in reverse'.

or tread constantly over mistress Diana's hill...'⁵ We think of Juvenal's account of the duties of the client, traipsing through Rome to the *salutatio* and the handout, and perhaps also of his disgruntled complaint that he would rather be stranded on the island Prochyta than be in the Subura (3.5). As the Watsons point out (2003: 145), *inquietus* means both 'restless' and 'lacking sleep'; by describing Juvenal as *inquietus* (and the Subura as *clamosa*) Martial recalls the satirist's description of the city-dweller's inability to sleep (3.232-238) amid the city's ceaseless racket.⁶ Martial then imagines Juvenal 'on the door-steps of the more powerful' (*per limina te potentiorum*, 12.18.4). The wording quotes Horace's second *Epode*, a famous earlier comparison between country and city life,⁷ but the situation nonetheless also recalls Juvenal's picture of a crowd of nobles who 'harass the doorway' (*vexant limen*, 1.100) of their patron. This general resemblance is capped with a specific verbal allusion. It is hard not to write satire, Juvenal says in the first *Satire*, when one sees the Egyptian parvenu Crispinus waving his 'summer' gold, gem-studded ring, illustrating the easy lifestyle of the newly wealthy:

...cum verna Canopi

Crispinus Tyrias umero revocante lacernas

ventilet aestivum digitis sudantibus aurum

*nec suffere queat maioris pondera gemmae*⁸ (1.27-8)

⁵ 12.18.1-3: *Dum tu forsitan inquietus erras/ clamosa, Iuvenalis, in Subura/ aut collem dominae teris Dianae*

⁶ Martial composes his own poem on the problem of urban sleeplessness in this book (12.57), which also bears strong verbal and thematic similarities to Juvenal 3.232-8 – see Colton (1991: 131-4) for detailed discussion (though he assumes the influence is only in one direction).

⁷ *Epod. 2.7-8: forumque vitat et superba civium/ potentiorum limina.*

⁸ Nisbet would bracket the last line as an interpolation, but it adds a new (and perfectly understandable) point: the gem on Crispinus' ring is so ludicrously ostentatious and oversized, that 'if the gem were any bigger, he wouldn't be able to bear the weight'. Although it is of course no defense against an earlier

...when Canopus' native slave

Crispinus, his shoulder hitching up his Tyrian cloak,
is fanning his summer gold on his sweating fingers,
and couldn't bear the weight of a bigger gem...

Crispinus enjoys the easy lifestyle that the speaker of *Satire* one claims is unjustly denied to him. Teasingly, then, in *Ep.* 12.18, Martial describes the harried lifestyle of Juvenal himself in *Ep.* 12.18 in words that recall his indignant description of Crispinus:

dum per limina te potentiorum
sudatrix toga ventilat vagumque
maior Caelius et minor fatigant (12.18.4-5)

While, on the doorsteps of those more powerful,
your sweating toga fans you, and, as you wander,
the greater and lesser Caelian hills tire you out.

Out of Juvenal's words, Martial creates the paradoxical image of the toga, flapping (and therefore 'fanning') as Juvenal rushes from place to place, while he sweats because of the heat. The unusual use of the verb '*sudo*' ('to sweat') as a transferred epithet by both authors

corruption, Dracontius has an unambiguous allusion to the line: *cuius et in digitis non sedit crassius aurum/ et licet exiguae non ferret pondera gemmae* (*De Laud. Dei* 3.62-3).

is a strong link between the two passages, but Martial trumps Juvenal's expression in boldness by coining an unprecedented feminine adjectival form of the verb.

While Juvenal is imagined trapped in the Rome of his own first book in *Ep.* 12.18, Martial depicts himself living out a fantastically leisured country existence in Bilbilis. Martial's retirement to his native town in Spain at the end of his career was described in a series of epigrams that make use of the traditional contrasts between country *otium* and urban *negotium*, though elsewhere his picture of his town is not unremittingly ideal: the epigrammatist complains equally about its rusticity, the presence of personal enemies (a larger problem in a small place), lack of amenities, and the infiltration of city obligations such as patronage even into the countryside.⁹ In *Ep.* 12.18, though, his teasing epigram to Juvenal, Bilbilis is absolutely ideal; indeed, patently unreal.¹⁰ Martial tells Juvenal that he exerts himself here 'at leisure, with sweet labor', to 'attend upon' – not clients' homes, but Platea and Boterdum, rustic hamlets both.¹¹ He sleeps in past the third hour, saying: 'now I repay myself' (*nunc repono*, 15; answering Juvenal's first line, *numquamne reponam?*). The toga is worn only by the dead in Umbricius' idealized image of the countryside in *Satire* 3.171-2; here, Martial says, *ignota est toga* – 'the toga is unknown' (17). Unlike the poor clients in *Satire* 1, who must 'buy fire and wretched vegetables' while their patron (their 'king', *rex*) dines grandiosely (1.134-5), here, a fireplace stocked with a 'proud heap' of logs and 'crowned' (*coronata*) with many a pot is readied for Martial in his villa with no effort on his part (19-21). Martial's is even a sexual fantasy: a huntsman arrives out of nowhere in line

⁹ 12pr, 12.60, 12.68. On Martial's 'retirement' epigrams, see Howell (1998).

¹⁰ The Watsons' notes on this poem (2003: 143-150) are particularly instructive on the 'unreal' elements of the image.

¹¹ 12.18.10-11: *hic pigri colimus labore dulci/ Boterdum Plateamque...*

21-2, the kind ‘you’d like to have alone in the woods’,¹² and whereas Umbricius has to endure (and partially fund) the beard-clipping ceremonies of his patrons’ *delicati* in *Satire 3* (186-9), Martial’s rustic villa is mysteriously full of ‘boys’, amongst them a ‘smooth-skinned bailiff’, who asks Martial to cut his hair, in a private, erotic version of ceremonial beard-clipping.¹³ Martial presents himself to Juvenal as living in a rustic fantasy world, and this element of fantasy is the strongest point of contact between the two writers. Corresponding to the exaggeratedly unpleasant vision of Rome Juvenal gives in his first book of *Satires*, Martial, in *Ep.*12,18, presents an exaggeratedly idealized vision of his carefree existence in native Bilbilis. The epigram is not a response to Juvenal, but specifically a response to his first book.

It is true that the links between the two poems could indicate the recitation of Juvenal’s *Satires* prior to publication. This was, of course, a usual step (and suggests that, even if a later date is retained for the first book, the composition of the Trajanic satires must date from the very beginning of his reign). Yet the intermingling of motifs from both the first and the third *Satires* in Martial’s poem suggests already the publication of the book in its current form; indeed, it may be that Martial’s teasing reproduction of Juvenal’s satiric situations is an indirect means of hailing the arrival of Juvenal’s new book and his (apparently recent) debut as a satirist. If the first book is then dated between 100 and 101 or 102, it may be objected that the date is too early in respect to the other books – after all, the latest *terminus post quem*, in *Satire 15*, is in 127. But Juvenal appears already as *facundus* (‘eloquent’) in

¹² 12.18.22: *venator sequitur, sed ille quem tu/ secreta cupias habere silva.*

¹³ 12.18.24-5: *dispensat pueris rogatque longos/ levis ponere vilicus capillos.* This is my interpretation of admittedly obscure lines. Whose hair is being cut, and by whom? Curchin (2003), alternatively, suggests that the lines describe the bailiff requesting to cut Martial’s hair. Combined with the earlier verbal allusion to Crispinus, could Martial allude to Juvenal’s much less pleasant beard shaving experience (1.24-5)?

Martial's seventh book, published in 92 – surely envisaging publication of his first literary work a full ten years later could in no way be seen as premature. This date gives Juvenal a long publishing career – as long as Horace, for instance, and with less apparent material reward – though hardly impossibly long. Moreover, and significantly for the readings in this study, the early date would confirm that Juvenal is writing his critical responses to the ideological concerns of the new Trajanic age exactly as they are developing. His first book's peers, in date as well as in theme, are, as we have seen, the *Panegyricus*, the *Dialogus*, and the orations of Dio Chrysostom, as well as the other orations and treatises of the cultural movement later dubbed the Second Sophistic.

Bibliography

- Adamietz, J. 1972. *Untersuchungen zu Juvenal*. Wiesbaden.
- . 1983. "Juvenals 12. Satire". In *Hommages à Jean Cousin*. Paris. 237-248.
- Adams, J.N. 1982. *A Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore.
- Adkin, N. 2004-5. "Juvenalia stylistica". *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 40-1: 291-303.
- . 2008. "Three Notes on Juvenal's Twelfth Satire". *Philologus* 152: 128-137.
- Ahl, F. 1984. "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome". *AJPh* 105: 174-208.
- . 1985. *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca.
- Allen, W. 1956. "O Fortunatam Natam..." *TAPA* 87: 130-146.
- Anderson, W.S. 1957. "Studies in Book 1 of Juvenal". *YCS* 15: 33-92.
- . 1962. "The Program of Juvenal's Later Books". *Classical Philology* 57: 145-60.
- . 1964. "Anger in Juvenal and Seneca". *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 19: 127-196.
- . 1982. *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton.
- Andrews, A.C. 1948. "The Roman Craze for Surmulletts". *Classical Weekly* 42: 186-8.
- Austin, R.G. 1964. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus*. Oxford.
- Axelson, B. 1945. *Unpoetische Wörter: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Lund.
- Bandera, C. 1981. "Sacrificial Levels in Virgil's Aeneid". *Arethusa* 14: 217-239.
- Baines, V. 2003. "Umbricius' *Bellum Civile*: Juvenal, *Satire* 3". *G & R* 50: 220-237.
- Baldwin, B. 1961. "Lucian as Social Satirist". *CQ* 11: 199-208.

- . 1967. "Cover-names and Dead Victims in Juvenal". *Athenaeum* 45: 304-12.
- Barchiesi, A. 1993. "Insegnare ad Augusto: Orazio, *Epistole* 2, 1 e Ovidio, *Tristia* II". *MD* 31: 149-184 [= 2001. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and other Latin Poets*. London. 79-104].
- Barchiesi, A. & Cucchiarelli, A. 2005. "Satire and the Poet: The Body as Self-Referential Symbol". In K. Freudenburg (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge. 207-223.
- Barnes, T.D. 1985. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (rev ed). Oxford.
- Bartley, A.N. 2003. *Stories from the Mountains, Stories from the Sea: The Digressions and Similes of Oppian's Halieutica and the Cynegetica*. Göttingen.
- Bartsch, S. 1994. *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Cambridge, Mass & London.
- Beagon, M. 1992. *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder*. Oxford.
- Beaujeu, J. 1955. *La religion romaine a l'apogée de l'empire. I. La politique religieuse des Antonins (96-102)*. Paris.
- Beard, M. 1987. "A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday". *PCPS* 33: 1-15.
- Bellandi, F. 1974. "Naevolus *cliens*". *Maia* 4: 279-99. = 2009. "Naevolus *cliens*" (trans. L. Holford-Strevens). In M. Plaza (ed) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Persius and Juvenal*. Oxford. 469-505.
- . 1980. *Etica diatriba e protesta sociale nelle Satire di Giovenale*. Bologna.
- . 1984. "Sulla struttura della satira 14 di Giovenale". *Prometheus* 10: 154-160.
- Blaiklock, E.M. 1959. "The Dying Storm: A Study in the Imagery of Horace". *Greece and Rome* 6: 205-210.

- Blondell, R. 2002. *The Play of Character in Plato's Dialogues*. Cambridge.
- Boatwright, M. T. 1986. "The Pomerian Extension of Augustus". *Historia* 35: 13-27.
- . 1987. *Hadrian and the City of Rome*. Princeton.
- Bosman, P.R. 2008. "Traces of Cynic Monotheism in the Early Roman Empire". *Acta Classica* 51: 1-20.
- Bowe, G. S. 2007. "In Defence of Clitophon". *CP* 102:245-267.
- Bower, E.W. 1958. "Notes on Juvenal and Statius". *CR* 8: 9-11.
- Bowersock, G.W. 2004. "Artemidorus and the Second Sophistic". In B.Borg (ed) *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin & New York. 53-64.
- Bowie, E. 1974. "Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic". In M.I.Finley (ed) *Studies in Ancient Society*. London. 166-209.
- . 1990. "Greek Poetry in the Antonine Age". In Russell, D.A. (ed) *Antonine Literature*. Oxford.
- Bracht-Branham, R. & Goulet-Cazé, M.O. (eds) 1996. *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and its Legacy*. Berkeley, London & Los Angeles.
- Bradley, K. 1973. "Tum primum revocata ea lex". *AJP* 94: 172-181.
- Braund, S. 1988. *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*. Cambridge.
- . 1993. "Paradigms of Power: Roman Emperors in Roman Satire". In K.Cameron (ed) *Humour and History*. Oxford. 56-69.
- . 1996. *Juvenal. Satires Book 1*. Cambridge.
- . 1996b. "A Woman's Voice? – Laronia's Role in Juvenal *Satire* 2". In R.Hawley & B.Levick (eds) *Women in Antiquity: New Assessment*. London & New York. 207-219.
- . 1996c. *The Roman Satirists and their Masks*. London.

- . 1997. "Personal Plurals". In J.P. Hallett & T. Van Nortwick (eds) *Compromising Traditions: The Personal Voice in Classical Scholarship*. London & New York.
- . 1997b. "Declamation and Contestation in Satire". In W.J. Dominik (ed) *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London. 147-65 = M. Plaza (ed) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Persius and Juvenal*. Oxford. 450-468.
- . 1997c. "A Passion Unconsoled? Grief and Anger in Juvenal, *Satire 13*". In S. Braund & C. Gill (eds) *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*. Cambridge. 68-87.
- . 2004. *Juvenal and Persius*. Cambridge, Mass. & London.
- . 2004b. "*Libertas* or *Licentia*? Freedom and Criticism in Roman Satire". In I. Sluiter & R. Rosen (eds) *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden. 409-28.
- Braund, S. & Cloud, D. 1981. "Juvenal, a Diptych". *LCM* 6: 195-208.
- . 1983. "Juvenal's Traducement Again (2.153-163)". *LCM* 8: 50-1.
- Brink, C.O. 1982. *Horace on Poetry. Epistles Book 2: The Letters to Augustus and Florus*. Cambridge.
- . 1989. "Quintilian's *De causis corruptae eloquentiae* and Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus*". *CQ* 39" 472-503.
- Bubel, F. 1993. "Juvenal I 112-116: ein neuer *terminus post quem*?" *RhM* 136: 95.
- Butler, H.E. 1909. *Post-Augustan Poetry from Seneca to Juvenal*. Oxford.
- Butler, S. 2002. *The Hand of Cicero*. London.
- Bywater, I. & Milne, J.G. 1940. "ΠΑΡΑΧΑΡΑΞΙΣ". *CR* 54: 10-12.
- Calboli, G. 2003. "Vipstanus Messalla in Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus*". In J.Herman & H.Rosén (eds) *Petroniana: Gedenkschrift für Hubert Petersmann*. Heidelberg. 67-82.
- Cameron, A. 1991. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley.

- Campana, P. 2004. *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae X*. Florence.
- Carroll, S.T. 1991. "An Early Church Sermon Against Gambling (CPL 60)". *Second Century* 8: 83-95.
- Cerutti, S.M. & Richardson, L. 1989. "The *Retiarius Tunicatus* of Suetonius, Juvenal, and Petronius". *AJPh* 110: 584-594.
- Champlin, E. 1991. *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 B.C. – A.D. 250*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & Oxford.
- Chinn, C. 2008. "*Libertas reverentiam remisit*: Politics and Metaphor in Statius *Silvae* 1.6". *AJPh* 129: 101-124.
- Clay, D. 1992. "Lucian of Samosata: Four Philosophical Lives (Nigrinus, Demonax, Peregrinus, Alexander Pseudomantis)". *ANRW* 2.36.5: 3406-50.
- Cloud, J.D. 1989. "Satirists and the Law". In S. Braund (ed) *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter. 49-67.
- Coffey, M. 1976. *Roman Satire*. London & New York.
- . 1979. "Turnus and Juvenal". *BICS* 26: 88-94.
- Cohen, J.M. 1958. *Michel de Montaigne: Essays*. London.
- Coleman, K. 2006. *Martial: Liber Spectaculorum*. Oxford.
- Colton, R. 1991. *Juvenal's Use of Martial's Epigrams: A Study of Literary Influence*. Amsterdam.
- Commager, S. 1962. *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. New Haven.
- Connors, C. 1998. *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon*. Cambridge.
- . 2004. "Monkey Business: Imitation, Authenticity and Identity from Pithekoussai to Plautus". *CA* 23: 179-207.

- . 2005. "Epic Allusion in Roman Satire". In K. Freudenburg, *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge. 123-145.
- Conte, G.B. 1996. *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon* (trans. E. Fantham). Berkeley, Los Angeles & London.
- Corbaud, E. 1899. *De comoedia togata*. Paris.
- Corcoran, T.H. 1964. "Fish Treatises in the Early Roman Empire". *CJ* 59: 271-4.
- Corn, A.M. 1992. "Thus Nature Ordains": Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire". *ICS* 17: 309-22.
- Courtney, E. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London.
- . 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Curchin, L.A. 2003. "Whose Hair Wants Cutting in Martial 12.18?" *RhM* 146: 222-4.
- Dalzell, A. 1955. "C. Asinius Pollio and the Early History of Public Recitation at Rome". *Hermathena* 86: 20-8.
- De Decker, J. 1913. *Juvenal declamans: étude sur la rhétorique déclamatoire dans les satires de Juvénal*. Ghent.
- Decleva Caizzi, F. 1980. "Τὺφος: Contributo alla storia di un concetto". *Sandalion* 3: 53-66.
- Deroux, C. 1983. "Domitian, the Kingfish and the Prodigies: a Reading of Juvenal's Fourth Satire". In C. Deroux (ed) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 3. Brussels. 283-298.
- Desmond, W. 2006. *The Greek Praise of Poverty: Origins of Ancient Cynicism*. Notre Dame, IN.
- . 2008. *Cynics*. Berkeley & Los Angeles.
- Dick, B.F. 1969. "Seneca and Juvenal 10". *HSCPh* 73: 237-246.
- D'Ippolito, F. 1969. *Ideologia e diritto in Gaio Cassio Longino*. Naples.
- Dodds, E.R. 1951. *Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.

- Dudley, D.R. 1937. *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the Sixth Century A.D.* London.
- Duff, J.D. 1898. *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae XIV: Fourteen Satires of Juvenal.* Cambridge.
- Dupont, F. 1997. "Recitatio and the Reorganization of the Space of Public Discourse". In T.Habinek & A. Schiesaro (eds) *The Roman Cultural Revolution.* Cambridge. 44-59.
- Edgeworth, R.J. 1999. "Passages in Juvenal Four and Ten". *Classica et Mediaevalia* 50: 179-188.
- Edmunds, L. 1972. "Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire". *RhM* 115: 59-73.
- Ehlers, W.W. 1996. "Von Bibern und Menschen. Anmerkungen zur 12. Satire Juvenals". In C. Klodt (ed) *Satura Lanx. Festschrift für W. Krenkel.* Hildesheim. 57-73.
- Eichholz, D.E. 1956. "The Art of Juvenal and his Tenth Satire". *G & R* 3: 61-9.
- Elliot, J. 2007. "The Voices of Ennius' *Annales*". In W.Fitzgerald & E.Gowers (eds) *Ennius Perennis: The Annales and Beyond.* Cambridge. 38-54.
- Fanizza, L. 1988. *Delatori e Accusatori. L'Iniziativa nei Processi di Eta Imperiale.* Rome.
- Fantham, E. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture: From Cicero to Apuleius.* Baltimore & London.
- Fears, J.R. 1981. "The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Theology". *ANRW* II.17.1: 3-141.
- Feldherr, A. 1997. "Metamorphosis and Sacrifice in Ovid's Theban Narrative". *MD* 38: 25-55.
- Ferguson, J. 1979. *Juvenal: The Satires.* New York.
- . 1987. *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal.* Brussels.
- Fishelov, D. 1990. "The Vanity of the Reader's Wishes: Rereading Juvenal's Satire 10". *AJPh* 111: 370-382.
- Fiske, G.C. 1920. *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation.* Madison, WI.
- Fitzgerald, W. 2007. *Martial: The World of the Epigram.* Chicago.

- Flintoff, E. 1982. "Food for Thought: Some Imagery in Persius Satire 2". *Hermes* 110: 341-354.
- Fowler, D. 2000. *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford.
- Francis, J.A. 1995. *Subversive Virtue: Asceticism and Authority in the Second Century Pagan World*. Philadelphia.
- Frede, M. 1997. "Euphrates of Tyre". In R. Sorabji (ed) *Aristotle and After*. London. 1-11.
- Fredericks, S.C. 1971. "Calvinus in Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire". *Arethusa* 4: 219-231.
- Freudenburg, K. 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton.
- . 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge.
- . 2005. "Making Epic Silver: The Alchemy of Imperial Satire". In M. Paschalis (ed) *Roman and Greek Imperial Epic*. Crete. 77-89.
- Friedländer, L. 1886. *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri*. Leipzig (vol 1).
- . 1895. *D. Junii Juvenalis Saturarum libri V*. Leipzig.
- . 1969. *Friedländer's Essays on Juvenal*. Ed. and trans. J.R.C.Martyn. Amsterdam.
- Fündling, J. 2006. *Kommentar zur Vita Hadriani der Historia Augusta*. Bonn.
- Gale, M.R. 2000. *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Galimberti, A. 2007. *Adriano e l'ideologia del principato*. Rome.
- Gallia, A. 2009. "Potentes and Potentia in Tacitus's *Dialogus de oratoribus*". *TAPA* 139: 169-206.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore.
- Gassino,
- Gérard, J. 1976. *Juvénal et la réalité contemporaine*. Paris.

- . 1989. “Des droits et des devoirs du poète satirique á l’âge d’argent de la latinité”. *ICS* 14: 265-284.
- Gercke, A. 1895. *Seneca-Studien*. Leipzig.
- Giesecke, A.L. 2007. *The Epic City: Urbanism, Utopia and the Garden in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Washington.
- Gill, C & Wiseman, T.P (eds) 1993. *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Exeter.
- Girard, R. 1977. *Violence and the Sacred* (trans. P. Gregory). Baltimore.
- Gleason, M. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- Goldberg, S. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Goldhill, S.D. 2002. *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*. Cambridge.
- Goodyear, F. R.D. 1972. *The Annals of Tacitus: Books 1-6*. Cambridge.
- Gordon, P. 1996. *Epicurus in Lycia: The Second-Century World of Diogenes of Oenoanda*. Ann Arbor.
- Gordon, R. 1990. “The Veil of Power: Emperors, Sacrifice and Benefactors”. In M. Beard and J. North (eds) *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*. Ithaca, NY. 201-231.
- Goulet-Cazé, M-O. 1996. “A Comprehensive Catalogue of Known Cynic Philosophers”. In R. Bracht-Branham & M.O Goulet-Cazé (eds) *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and its Legacy*. Berkeley, London & Los Angeles. 389-413.
- Gowers, E. 1992. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Oxford.
- . 2003. “Fragments of Autobiography in Horace, *Satires* 1”. *CA* 22: 55-92.
- Gowing, A.M. 2005. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge.

- Grainger, J.D. 2003. *Nerva and the Roman Succession Crisis of A.D. 96-99*. London.
- Green, P. 1998. *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires* (3rd ed). London.
- Green, S.J. 2004. *Ovid, Fasti I: A Commentary*. Leiden & Boston.
- . 2008. "Save Our Cows? Augustan Discourse and Animal Sacrifice in Ovid's *Fasti*".
G&R 55: 39-54.
- Griffin, M. 1996. "Cynicism and the Romans: Attraction and Repulsion". In R. Bracht-Branham & M.O Goulet-Cazé (eds) *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and its Legacy*. Berkeley, London & Los Angeles. 190-204.
- Griffith, J.G. 1970. "The Ending of Juvenal's First Satire and Lucilius, Book XXX". *Hermes* 98: 56-72.
- Gugel, H. 1969. *Untersuchungen zu Stil und Aufbau des Rednerdialogs des Tacitus*.
Innsbruck.
- Gunderson, E. 2000. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*.
Ann Arbor.
- Habinek, T. 2005. "Satire as Aristocratic Play". In K. Freudenburg, *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge. 177-191.
- Halliday, W.R. 1927. "Tenes". *Classical Quarterly* 21: 37-44.
- Hammond, P. 1983. *John Oldham and the Renewal of Classical Culture*. Cambridge.
- Hardie, A. 1983. *Statius and the Silvae: Poets, Patrons and Epideixis in the Greco-Roman World*. Liverpool.
- . 1997. "Philitas and the Plane Tree". *ZPE* 119: 21-36.
- Hardie, P. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
- . 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*.
Cambridge.

- . 2007. "Poets, Patrons, Rulers: The Ennian Tradition". In W. Fitzgerald & E. Gowers (eds) *Ennius Perennis: The Annales and Beyond*. Cambridge. 129-144.
- Harris, B.F. 1977. "Stoic and Cynic under Vespasian". *Prudentia* 9: 105-114.
- Harrison, J. R. 2003. *Paul's Language of Grace in its Greco-Roman Context*. Tübingen.
- Harrison, S. 2000. *Apuleius: A Latin Sophist*. Oxford.
- Hartmann, A. 1907. "Lucian und Juvenal". In *Juvenes dum sumus*. Basel. 18-26.
- Hendrickson, G.L. 1927. "Satura tota nostra est". *CP* 22: 46-60.
- Heinrich, C.F. 1839. *D. Iuvenalis Satirae* (vol.2). Bonn.
- Helmbold, W.C. 1956. "Juvenal's Twelfth Satire". *CPh* 51: 14-23.
- Henderson, J. 1995. "Pump Up the Volume: Juvenal, *Satires* 1.1-21". *PCPS* 41: 101-137.
- . 1999. *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy and other Offenses in Latin Poetry*. Oxford.
- Henke, R. 2000. "Elefanten, Tochtermörder und Erbschleicher: Juvenal, *Sat.* 12.93-130". *Hermes* 128: 202-217.
- Hickson, F.V. 1993. *Roman Prayer Language: Livy and the Aeneid of Vergil*. Stuttgart.
- Highet, G. 1949. "The Philosophy of Juvenal". *TAPA* 80: 254-270.
- . 1954. *Juvenal the Satirist: A Study*. Oxford.
- . 1983. "Mutilations in the Text of Dio Chrysostom". In R. Ball (ed) *The Classical Papers of Gilbert Highet*. New York. 74-99.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: The Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- . 2007. 'Martial's Ovid/ Ovid's Martial'. *JRS* 97: 113-154.
- Hoffer, S. E. 1999. *The Anxieties of Pliny the Younger*. Atlanta.
- Höhler, W. 1896. *Die Cornutus-Scholien zum ersten Buche des Satiren Juvenals*. Leipzig.
- Hooley, D.M. 2007. *Roman Satire*. Malden, MA.

- Hopman, M. 2003. "Satire in Green: Marked Clothing and the Technique of *Indignatio* at Juvenal 5: 141-5". *AJPh* 124: 557-574.
- Horsfall, N. 2000. *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Howell, P. 1980. *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*. London.
- . 1998. "Martial's Return to Spain". In F. Grewing (ed) *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*. Stuttgart. 173-86.
- Hughes, D.D. 1991. *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. London.
- Jaisle, K. 1907. *Die Dioskuren als Retter zur See*. Tübingen.
- Jameson, V.B. 1997. "What Words can Do: Horace, C. 3.13, "O Fons Bandusiae". *Helios* 24: 44-59.
- Jones, B.W. 1992. *The Emperor Domitian*. London and New York.
- Jones, C.P. 2003. "Epigraphica VI-VII". *ZPE* 144: 157-163.
- Jones, F. 1990. "The Persona and the Dramatis Personae in Juvenal Satire Four". *Eranos* 88: 47-59.
- . 1993. "Juvenal, *Satire* 13". *Eranos* 91: 81-92.
- . 2007. *Juvenal and the Satiric Genre*. London.
- . 2008. "Juvenal and the Hexameter". In C. Deroux (ed) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (vol.14). Brussels. 348-364.
- Jonquière, T.M. 2007. *Prayer in Josephus*. Leiden & Boston.
- Josephson, Å. 1956. "*Terrae filius*". *Eranos* 54: 246-262.
- Kaibel, R. 1914. *Die Beziehungen des Rednerdialogs von Tacitus zu Ciceros rhetorischen Schriften*. Bamberg.
- Kaster, R. 1998. "Becoming CICERO". In P.E.Knox & C. Foss (eds) *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*. Stuttgart. 250-65.

- Katz, J.T. 1998. "Hittite *tašku-* and the Indo-European Word for 'Badger'". *Historische Sprachforschung* 111: 61-82.
- Keane, C. 2002. "Satiric Memories: Autobiography and the Construction of Genre". *CJ* 97: 215-231.
- . 2003. "Theatre, Spectacle, and the Satirist in Juvenal". *Phoenix* 57: 257-275.
- . 2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. Oxford & New York.
- . 2007. "Philosophy into Satire: The Program of Juvenal's Fifth Book". *AJP* 128: 27-57.
- Keller, O. 1913. *Antike Tierwelt*. Leipzig.
- Kernan, A.B. 1959. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*. New Haven.
- Konstan, D. 1993. "Sexuality and Power in Juvenal's Second Satire". *LCM* 18: 12-14.
- Kragelund, P. 1988. "The Prefect's Dilemma and the Date of the *Octavia*". *CQ* 38: 492-508.
- Kuhlmann, P. 2002. *Religion und Erinnerung: Die Religionspolitik Kaiser Hadrians und ihre Rezeption in der antiken Literatur*. Göttingen.
- LaFleur, R. A. 1981. "Horace and *Onomasti Komodein*: The Law of Satire". *ANRW* 2.31.3.: 1790-1826.
- Larmour, D.H.J. 2003. "The Incurable Wound of Telephus: Noise, Speech and Silence in Juvenal's *Satire 1*". *Intertexts* 8: 55-76.
- . 2005. "Lightening the Load: Castration, Money and Masculinity in Juvenal's *Satire 12*". *Syll Class* 16: 139-172.
- . 2007. "Holes in the Body: Sites of Abjection in Juvenal's Rome". In Larmour, D.H.J & Spencer, D (eds) *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory*. Oxford. 168-210.
- Laurenti, R & Santaniello, C. 2007. *Plutarco. La superstizione*. Naples.
- Lavagni, B. 1947. "Motivi diatribici in Lucrezio e in Giovenale". *Athenaeum* 25: 83-88.
- Lawall, G. 1958. "Exempla and Theme in Juvenal's Tenth Satire". *TAPA* 89: 25-31.

- Leigh, M. 2010. "Boxing and Sacrifice: Apollonius, Vergil and Valerius". *HSCP* 105: 117-155.
- Levene, D. 1997. "God and Man in the Classical Latin Panegyric". *PCPS* 43: 66-103.
- . 2004. "Tacitus' *Dialogus* as Literary History". *TAPA* 134: 157-200.
- Levi, M.A. 1993. *Adriano Augusto: Studi e ricerche*. Rome.
- Liber, M. 1950. "Structure and History of the "Tefilah"". *Jewish Quarterly Review* 40: 331-357.
- Littlewood, C.A.J. 2007. "Poetry and Friendship in Juvenal's Twelfth Satire". *AJPh* 128: 389-418.
- Lorenz, S. 2002. *Erotik und Panegyrik: Martials epigrammatische Kaiser*. Tübingen.
- . 2004. "Dignae Iove irae: Ovids Deucalion und Pyrrha in Juvenals erster Satire". *Latomus* 63: 892-904.
- Luce, T.J. 1993. "Reading and Response in the *Dialogus*". In T.J.Luce & A.J.Woodman (eds) *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition*. Princeton. 11-38.
- Luisi, A. 1990. "Licet et considerare...res vera agitur (Iuv.4.34-5)". *Invigilata Lucernis* 12: 181-9.
- Lutz, C.E. 1950. "Any Resemblance...is Purely Coincidental". *CJ* 46: 115-20.
- . 1954. "Democritus and Heraclitus". *CJ* 49: 309-314.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford.
- MacLeod, M.D. 1991. *Lucian: A Selection*. Warminster.
- MacMullen, M. 1981. *Paganism in the Roman Empire*. New Haven & London.
- Malamud, M. 1996. "Out of Circulation? An Essay on Exchange in Persius' Satires". *Ramus* 25: 39-64.

- Malherbe, A.J. 1977. *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study, no. 12. Missoula, MO.
- Manolaraki, E. 2008. "Political and Rhetorical Seascapes in Pliny's *Panegyricus*". *CPh* 103: 374-94.
- Marchesi, I. 2008. *The Art of Pliny's Letters: A Poetics of Allusion in the Private Correspondence*. Cambridge.
- Markus, D. 2000. "Performing the Book: The Recital of Epic in First-Century C.E. Rome". *CA* 19: 138-179.
- Martyn, J.R.C. 1970. "A New Approach to Juvenal's First Satire". *Antichthon* 4: 53-61.
- . 1970b. "Juvenal 2.79-81 and Vergil's Plague". *CP* 55: 49-50.
- Marx, F.A. 1937. "Tacitus und die Literatur der exitus illustrium virorum". *Philologus* 92: 83-103.
- Mason, H.A. 1963. "Is Juvenal a Classic?" In J.P. Sullivan (ed) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature*. London. 93-176.
- Maus, K.E. 2005. "Idol and Gift in *Volpone*". *English Literary Renaissance* 35: 429-453.
- Mayer, R.G. 2001. *Tacitus: Dialogus de Oratoribus*. Cambridge.
- Mayor, J.E.B. 1889. *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*. London.
- McFadden, G. 1978. *Dryden the Public Writer: 1660-1685*. Princeton.
- McGann, M.J. 1968. "Juvenal's Ninth Age (13, 28ff)". *Hermes* 96: 509-514.
- Mesk, J. 1912. "Lucians Nigrinus und Juvenal I". *WS* 34: 373-82.
- . 1913. "Lucians Nigrinus und Juvenal II". *WS* 35: 1-132.
- Metcalf, W.E. 1974. "Hadrian, *IOVIS OLYMPIUS*". *Mnemosyne* 27: 59-66.
- Millar, F. 1965. "Epictetus and the Imperial Court". *JRS* 55: 141-8.
- Moles, J. 1978. "The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom". *JHS* 98: 79-100.

- . 1985. "Cynicism in Horace's *Epistles* 1". *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5: 33-60.
- . 1990. "The *Kingship Orations* of Dio Chrysostom". *Papers of the Leeds Latin Seminar* 6: 297-375.
- . 1995. "Dio Chrysostom, Greece, and Rome". In D. Innes, H. Hine & C. Pelling (eds) *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Oxford. 177-192.
- . 1996. "Cynic Cosmopolitanism". In R. Bracht-Branham & M.O Goulet-Cazé (eds) *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and its Legacy*. Berkeley, London & Los Angeles. 105-120.
- . 2005. "The Thirteenth Oration of Dio Chrysostom: Complexity and Simplicity, Rhetoric and Moralism, Literature and Life". *JHS* 125: 112-138.
- Mommsen, T. 1859. "Die Ludi Magni und Romani". *RhM* 14: 79-97 = Mommsen, T. 1879. *Römische Forschungen*. Berlin. 42-57.
- Monti, S. 1978. *Commento a Giovenale. Libro I: Satire I e II*. Naples.
- Morford, M. 1973. "Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire". *AJPh* 94: 26-36.
- . 1977. "Juvenal's Fifth Satire". *AJP* 98: 219-245.
- Morgan, L. 2000. "The Autopsy of C. Asinius Pollio". *JRS* 90: 51-69.
- . 2009. "The One and Only *Fons Bandusiae*". *CQ* 59: 132-141.
- Morgan, T. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge.
- . 2007. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge.
- Morstein-Marx, R. 2004. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Muecke, F. 1993. *Satires II. Horace*. Warminster, England.

- Nadeau, Y. 1983. "Who Traduced Juvenal?" *LCM* 8: 153-157.
- Nappa, C. 1998. "Praetextati mores: Juvenal's Second Satire". *Hermes* 126: 90-108.
- Newlands, C. 2002. *Statius' Silvae and the Poetics of Empire*. Cambridge.
- Newmyer, S. 1984. "The Triumph of Art over Nature: Martial and Statius on Flavian Aesthetics". *Helios* 11: 1-7.
- Nisbet, G. 2003. *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire: Martial's Forgotten Rivals*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. 1995. *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. & Hubbard, M. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I*. Oxford.
- . 1978. *A Commentary on Odes, Book II*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. & Rudd, N. 2004. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*. Oxford.
- Nousek, D.L. 2008. "Turning Points in Roman History: The Case of Caesar's Elephant Denarius". *Phoenix* 62: 290-307.
- O'Neil, E.N. 1960. "The Structure of Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire". *CPh* 55: 251-3.
- Orr, D.G. 1978. "Roman Domestic Religion: The Evidence of Household Shrines". *ANRW* II.16.1: 1557-1591.
- Parker, H. 1998. "Loyal Slaves and Loyal Wives: The Crisis of the Outsider-Within and Roman *exemplum* Literature". In S.R. Joshel & S. Murnaghan (eds) *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*. London & New York. 152-173.
- Patterson, A. 1984. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison, WI.
- Penwill, J.L. 2003. "What's Hecuba to Him...? Reflections on Poetry and Politics in Tacitus' Dialogue on Orators". *Ramus* 32: 122-47.

- Perry, P.S. 2007. "Critiquing the Excess of Empire: A *Synkrisis* of John of Patmos and Dio of Prusa". *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29: 473-496.
- Plaza, M. 2006. *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying*. Oxford.
- . 2009. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Persius and Juvenal*. Oxford.
- Powell, J.G.F. 1999. "Stylistic Registers in Juvenal". In J.N.Adams & R.G.Mayer (eds) *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*. Oxford. 311-334.
- . 2010. "Juvenal and the *Delatores*". In C. Kraus, J. Marincola & C. Pelling (eds) *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of AJ Woodman*. Oxford. 224-244.
- Pryor, A.D. 1962. "Juvenal's False Consolation". *AUMLA* 18: 167-180.
- . 1969. "Juvenal's *ridiculum acri fortius*: Problems of Satire 12". Unpublished paper; abstract in *BICS* 16: 170.
- Pulleyn, S. 1997. *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Purcell, N. 1995. "Literate Games: Roman Urban Society and the Game of Alea". *Past & Present* 147: 3-37.
- Ramage, E.S. 1978. "Juvenal, Satire 12: On Friendship True and False". *ICS* 3: 221-237.
- . 1989. "Juvenal and the Establishment: Denigration of Predecessors in the "Satires"". *ANRW* 2.33.1: 640-707.
- Rawson, B. 2001. "Children as Cultural Symbols: Imperial Ideology in the Second Century". In S. Dixon (ed) *Childhood, Class & Kin in the Roman World*. London. 21-42.
- Reader, W.W. (with Chvala-Smith, A.J.) 1996. *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse: The Declamations of Marcus Antonius Polemo*. Atlanta.
- Reckford, K. 2009. *Recognizing Persius*. Princeton.

- Rees, R. 2002. *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric A.D. 289-307*. Oxford.
- . 2001. "To Be and Not to Be: Pliny's Paradoxical Trajan". *BICS* 45: 149-168.
- . 2010. "The Form and Function of Narrative in Panegyric". In D.H. Berry & A. Erskine (eds) *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*. Cambridge. 105-121.
- Reeve, M. 1970. "Seven Notes". *CR* 20: 134-6.
- Relihan, J. 1996. "Menippus in Antiquity and the Renaissance". In R. Bracht-Branham & M.O Goulet-Cazé (eds) *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and its Legacy*. Berkeley, London & Los Angeles. 265-293.
- Richlin, A. 1992. "Sulpicia the Satirist". *Classical World* 86: 125-140.
- . 1993. "Not Before Homosexuality: the Materiality of the *cinaedus* and the Roman Law Against Love Between Men". *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3: 523-73.
- Richmond, J. 1994. "The *Ludus Latruncularum* and *Laus Pisonis* 190-208". *MH* 51: 164-179.
- Richmond, J.A. 1962. *Halieutica: A Poem Ascribed to Ovid*. London.
- Rimell, V. 2008. *Martial's Rome: Empire and the Ideology of Epigram*. Cambridge.
- Rives, J. 1995. "Human Sacrifice among Pagans and Christians". *JRS* 85: 65-85.
- Rivière, Y. 2002. *Les délatueurs sous l'Empire romain*. Rome.
- Roche, P. 2002. "The Public Image of Trajan's Family". *CP* 97: 41-60.
- . 2003. Review of Grainger 2003. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2003.3.33
(<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2003/2003-03-33.html>)
- . 2003b. "Mixed Messages: Trajan and the Propaganda of Personal Status". In C. Deroux (ed) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 11: 428-446.
- Roller, M.B. 1997. "Color-Blindness: Cicero's Death, Declamation and the Production of History". *CPh* 92: 109-130.

- . 2001. *Constructing Autocracy: Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome*. Princeton & Oxford.
- Ronnick, M.V. 1993. "Form and Meaning of Juvenal's Twelfth Satire". *Maia* 45: 7-10.
- . 1995. "Juvenal, *Satire* 12.81: *ubi est 'ibi'?*" *Scholia* 4: 105-7.
- Rosen, R.M. 2007. *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford.
- Rosenmeyer, P.A. 2001. "(In-)Versions of Pygmalion: The Statue Talks Back". In A.Lardinois & L.McClure (eds) *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton & Oxford.
- Rosenmeyer, T.G. 2000. "Seneca and Nature". *Arethusa* 33: 99-119.
- Royalty, R.M. 1998. *The Streets of Heaven: The Ideology of Wealth in the Apocalypse of John*. Macon, GA.
- Rudd, N. 1966. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge.
- . 1986. *Themes in Roman Satire*. Norman, OK & London.
- Rutherford, I. 1998. *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age: Idea-Theory and its Literary Context*. Oxford.
- Rutherford, R.B. 1995. *The Art of Plato: Ten Essays in Platonic Interpretation*. Harvard.
- Rutledge, S.H. 1999. "Delatores and the Tradition of Violence in Roman Oratory". *AJP* 120: 555-573.
- . 2001. *Imperial Inquisitions: Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian*. London & New York.
- Russell, D.A. 1983. *Greek Declamation*. Cambridge.
- Sacks, J (ed) 2009. *The Koren Siddur*. Jerusalem & New Milford, CT.
- Salmeri, G. 2000. "Dio, Rome and the Civic Life of Asia Minor". In S. Swain (ed) *Dio Chrysostom: Politic, Letters, and Philosophy*. Oxford. 53-92.

- Sandy, G.N. 1997. *The Greek World of Apuleius: Apuleius and the Second Sophistic*. Leiden.
- Schmitz, C. 2000. *Das Satirische in Juvenals Satiren*. Berlin & New York.
- Schmitz, T. 1997. *Bildung und Macht: Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.
- Schneider, C. 1930. *Juvenal und Seneca*. Würzburg.
- Scodel, J. 2005. ““None’s Slave”: Some Versions of Liberty in Donne’s *Satires 1* and *4*”. *Journal of English Literary History* 72: 363-385.
- Scott, K. 1975. *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians*. New York.
- Scullard, H.H. 1974. *The Elephant in the Greek and Roman World*. Ithaca, NY.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. 1966. *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*. Oxford.
- Slater, N. 1990. *Reading Petronius*. Baltimore & London.
- Slings, S.R. 1999. *Plato: Clitophon. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Small, J.P. 1982. *Cacus and Marsyas in Etrusco-Roman Legend*. Princeton.
- Smallwood, E.M. 1966. *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian*. Cambridge.
- Smith, B.K. & Doniger, W. 1989. “Sacrifice and Substitution: Ritual Mystification and Mythical Demystification”. *Numen* 36: 189-224.
- Smith, W.D. 1990. *Hippocrates: Pseudoepigraphic Writings*. Leiden.
- Smith, W.S. 1989. “Greed and Sacrifice in Juvenal’s Twelfth Satire”. *TAPA* 119: 287-298.
- Speyer, J.S. 1892. “Eine schwierige Juvenalstelle (III 238)”. *RhM* 47: 638-9.
- Starr, C.G. 1948. *From Salerno to the Alps: A History of the Fifth Army, 1943-1945*. Washington.

- . 1949. "Epictetus and the Tyrant". *Classical Philology* 44: 20-9.
- Stein, J.P. 1970. "The Unity and Scope of Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire". *CPh* 34-6.
- Stewart, Z. 1958. "Democritus and the Cynics". *HSCPh* 63: 179-191.
- Stewart-Sykes, A. 2001. *From Prophecy to Preaching: A Search for the Origins of the Christian Homily*. Leiden, Boston & Köln.
- Stramaglia, A. 2008. *Giovenale, Satire 1, 7, 12, 16: storia di un poeta*. Bologna.
- Strunk, T.E. 2010. "Offending the Powerful: Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus* and Safe Criticism". *Mnemosyne* 63: 21-267.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*. Oxford.
- Sweet, D. 1981. "Juvenal's *Satire* 4: Poetic Uses of Indirection". *Classical Antiquity* 12: 283-303.
- Syme, R. 1958. *Tacitus*. Oxford.
- . 1964. "The Historian M. Servilius Nonianus". *Hermes* 92: 408-424.
- . 1970. *Ten Studies in Tacitus*. Oxford.
- . 1979. "Juvenal, Pliny, Tacitus". *AJP* 100: 250-78 [= *Roman Papers* 3: 1135-7]
- Syson, A. 2009. "Born to Speak: *Ingenium* and *Natura* in Tacitus' *Dialogue on Orators*". *Arethusa* 42: 45-73.
- Tarrant, R. 1987. "Towards a Typology of Interpolation in Latin Poetry". *TAPA* 117: 281-298.
- Temkin, O. 1991. *Hippocrates in a World of Pagans and Christians*. Baltimore.
- Tennant, P. 2003. "Queering the Patron's Pitch: The Real Satirical Target of Juvenal's Ninth Satire". In A.F.Basson & W.J.Dominik (eds) *Literature, Art, History: Studies on*

- Classical Antiquity and Tradition in Honour of W.J.Henderson*. Frankfurt am Main & New York. 123-132.
- Terzagli, N. 1944. *Per la storia della satira*. Messina & Città di Castello.
- Thompson, D. 1947. *A Glossary of Greek Fishes*. London.
- Thraede, K. 1965. *Studien zu Sprache und Stil des Prudentius*. Göttingen.
- Townend, G.B. 1972. "The Earliest Scholiast on Juvenal". *CQ* 22: 376-387.
- Toynbee, J.M. 1944. "Dictators and Philosophers in the First Century A.D." *Greece and Rome* 13: 43-58.
- Tracy, V.A. 1980. "Aut captantur aut captant". *Latomus* 39: 399-402.
- Trapp, M. 1990. "Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second Century Greek Literature". In D.A. Russell (ed) *Antonine Literature*. Oxford. 141-73.
- . 2007. *Philosophy in the Roman Empire: Ethics, Politics and Society*. Aldershot & Burlington, VT.
- Trappes-Lomax, J.M. 2000. "Four Suggestions in Juvenal". *Mnemosyne* 53: 725-9.
- Uden, J. 2010. "The Contest of Homer and Hesiod and the Ambitions of Hadrian". *JHS* 130: 121-135.
- Ullman, B. L. 1917. "Horace on the Nature of Satire". *TAPA* 48: 111-132.
- Ussani, V.S. 2008. *Il retore e il potere. Progetto formativo e strategie del consenso nell'Institutio oratoria*. Naples.
- Verrengia, A. 2000. *Dio di Prusa*. In Atene, sull'esilio (*Or. XIII*). *Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. Naples.
- Viansino, G. 2007 [1990]. *Giovenale, Satire*. Milan.
- Volk, K. 2001. "Pious and Impious Approaches to Cosmology in Manilius". *MD* 47: 85-114.

- von Albrecht, M. 1997. *A History of Roman Literature from Livius Andronicus to Boethius* (vol. one). Leiden.
- von Premerstein, A. 1908. "Frontonis Platani". *Hermes* 43: 321-336.
- Vout, C. 2006. "What's in a Beard? Rethinking Hadrian's Hellenism". In S. Goldhill & R. Osborne, eds. *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece*. Cambridge. 96-123.
- Walker, B. 1960. *The Annals of Tacitus: A Study in the Writing of History*. Manchester.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1982. "Civilis princeps: Between Citizen and King". *JRS* 72: 32-48.
- . 1983. *Suetonius: The Scholar and his Caesars*. London.
- Walsh, J.J. 1991. "On Christian Atheism". *Vigiliae Christianae* 45: 255-277.
- Walters, J. 1998. "Making a Spectacle: Deviant Men, Invective, and Pleasure". *Arethusa* 31: 355-67 = M. Plaza (ed) 2009. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Persius and Juvenal*. Oxford. 349-360.
- Walton, F.R. 1957. "Religious Thought in the Age of Hadrian". *Numen* 4: 165-170.
- Waters, K.A. 1969. "Traianus Domitiani Continuator". *AJPh* 90: 385-405.
- Watson, L & P. 2003. *Martial: Select Epigrams*. Cambridge.
- Watt, W.S. 2002. "Notes on Juvenal". *Hermes* 130: 299-305.
- Weinreich, O. 1928. *Studien zu Martial*. Stuttgart.
- Weisinger, K. 1972. "Irony and Moderation in Juvenal XI". *CSCA* 5: 227-240.
- Wessner, P. 1931. *Scholia in Iuvenalem Vetustiora*. Leipzig.
- Wiesen, D.S. 1969. "Juvenal 10.358". *CPh* 64: 73-80.
- . 1989. "The Verbal Basis of Juvenal's Satiric Vision". *ANRW* 2.33.1: 708-733.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.

- . 2005. *The Second Sophistic. Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics*, no.35. Oxford.
- Williams, C.A. 2010. *Roman Homosexuality* (2nd ed). Oxford.
- Williams, G.D. 2003. *Seneca: De Otio, De Brevitate Vitae*. Cambridge.
- . 2006. "States of Exile, States of Mind: Paradox and Reversal in Seneca's *Consolatio ad Helviam Matrem*". In K. Volk & G.D. Williams (eds) *Seeing Seneca Whole: Perspectives on Philosophy, Poetry and Politics*. Leiden.147-174.
- . 2008. "Reading the Waters: Seneca on the Nile in *Natural Questions* 4A". *CQ* 58: 218-242.
- Williams, K. 2010. "Vibius Crispus in the Works of Juvenal and Tacitus". In J.F.Miller & A.J.Woodman (eds) *Latin Historiography and Poetry in the Early Empire: Generic Interactions*. Leiden & Boston. 171-188.
- Wilkins, J. 2008. "Athenaeus the Navigator". *JHS* 128: 132-152.
- Willis, J. 1996. "Markland's Notes on Juvenal". *Antichthon* 30: 58-84.
- Wilson, M. 2008. "Your Writings or Your Life: Cicero's *Philippics* and Declamation". In T. Stevenson & M. Wilson (eds) *Cicero's Philippics: History, Rhetoric, Ideology*. Auckland. 305-334.
- Winiarczyk, M. 1984. "Wer galt im Altertum als Atheist?" *Philologus* 128: 157-183.
- . 1992. "Wer galt im Altertum als Atheist? II" *Philologus* 1992: 306-310.
- Winkler, M.M 1983. *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal*. Hildesheim, Zurich & New York.
- . 1989. "The Function of Epic in Juvenal's Satires". In C. Deroux (ed) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (vol. 5). Brussels. 414-443.
- . 1989b. "Juvenal's Attitude toward Ciceronian Poetry and Rhetoric". *RhM* 131: 84-97.

- . 1990. "A Virgilian Echo in Juvenal's Eleventh Satire". *RhM* 133: 375-378.
- . 1995. "Alogia and Emphasis in Juvenal's Fourth Satire". *Ramus* 24: 59-81.
- . 2001. *Juvenal in English*. London & New York.
- Winsbury, R. 2009. *The Roman Book: Books, Publishing and Performance in Classical Rome*. London.
- Winterbottom, M. 1964. "Quintilian and the Vir Bonus". *JRS* 54: 90-7.
- . 1982. "Cicero and the Silver Age", in W. Ludwig (ed) *Éloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron* (Fondation Hardt 28). Geneva. 237-274.
- Zacher, K. 1897. "Iuvenalis IV 98". *Philologus* 56: 555-6.
- Zanker, P. 1995. *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*. Trans. A. Shapiro. Berkeley, Los Angeles & Oxford.
- Zetzel, J.E.G. 1980. "Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity". *Arethusa* 13: 59-77.