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This study argues that Juvenal's 'angry' satires, particularly those of his first book, are best understood through the considerable appetite for revenge literature as evidenced in our sources for the early second century rather than as an unsympathetic persona whom Juvenal intends to undercut as an ironic narrator in the poet's effort to dramatize Stoic precepts of anger. It is argued that Juvenal's contribution to the satiric genre, modulating as it does from the sharp, angry style of Lucilius to the mellow refinement of Horace and his acerbic imitator Persius, was to apply rhetorical strategies of indignation to produce an imagining of the genre in its most virulent manifestation.

Juvenal's conception of the genre attempts to resuscitate Lucilian aggression to serve in his retroactive satire primarily against targets of Rome's recent traumatic past. In doing so, the poet jettisons the subtle niceties of Horace's satiric persona in favor of an indignant one whose critiques of historical personages extends to criticisms that excoriate the social tensions of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods, but which are sometimes of contemporary application. These include the breakdown of the patronage system, the rise of freedmen and the influence of the foreign "Other," themes that often dovetail with the frequently denunciatory tone of his contemporaries. This persona,
embodying rhetorical modes of anger, can be seen then, as forging a bond with his readers largely through unified angst against historical themes.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Juvenal’s raging satirist has prompted a wide variety of responses, but far too infrequently is his indignant persona understood in the context of the considerable appetite for revenge literature that coincided with the death of Domitian and which was fed by an attendant freedom to denigrate figures from the past. This freedom is amply demonstrated by major authors of Juvenal’s period, including Tacitus and Pliny. These authors also took this opportunity to present themselves on the literary scene with particularly scathing denunciations of Domitian and the group of informers whom Tacitus depicts as the scourge of the age¹ and who were instrumental in the infamous treason (maiestas) trials that marred the principate.

It is evident that the tone of Juvenal’s criticism must be read alongside the jaundiced historical visions of Tacitus and Pliny in particular. Juvenal’s narrative of corruption at all levels of Roman society is mirrored in these works and asks to be considered as legitimate criticism against the targets it censures. One of the main purposes of this project is to focus a critical eye on current trends in scholarship that argue for Juvenal’s intentional undercutting of his satirist’s views, particularly in his first two books of satires.

Chapter 1 considers the relatively recent attempts to apply persona theory to Juvenal’s early “angry” satires and concludes that its application introduces an artificiality that tends to sanitize the hostile aggression of the satirist and excise the importance of Juvenal’s persistent treatment of the historical themes that were vital.

¹ Tac. Ann. 1.73: Haud pigebit referre in Falanio et Rubrio, modicis equitibus Romanis, praetemptata crimina, ut quibus initiis, quanta Tiberii arte gravissimum exitium inrepserit, dein repressum sit, postremo arserit cunctaque corripuerit, noscatur.
topics for his contemporaries. The persona theory identifies “tensions” within Juvenal’s corpus to argue that the author intends to present his satirist “...as a villain [sic], a perverse wretch who plots to create a diseased social order in conformity with his vile conception of life,” and reads Juvenal's vaunted indignatio through the lens of the Stoic philosopher Seneca, whose treatise De Ira denigrates the value of anger except in a forensic context.

The danger in rehabilitating the satirist is that it sometimes has the effect of applying anachronistic moral judgements to the sentiments of the satirist since there is no safeguard against attributing our own opinions about the content of the Satires to the intentions of the poet himself. When pushed too far, persona theory can actually end up doing what it in fact it disavows. We also run the risk of neutralizing a virulent strain of homophobic and xenophobic discourse by defending Juvenal’s discourse as mere irony. As Green notes, persona theory’s bifurcation of author and satirist can have the effect of “neatly severing one’s moral judgements from any overt application to the satirist himself,” while instead applying that evaluative judgement to the speaker in the Satires. So, for example, the speaker but not the poet is to be seen objectively as a “narrow-minded, chauvinistic bigot,” an argument that simultaneously maintains that the views of the poet are unrecoverable yet not those of his speaker. By claiming to know what

---

4 Braund (1996) 121.
5 “J. we are to assure ourselves, did not possess these characteristics (or if he did, the fact is irrelevant): he simply projected a narrator who was a parodic compound of them all, and gave him his head” (Green, (1998) 129).
views Juvenal himself was not sympathetic to, *persona* theory asserts knowledge of the author’s personal intentions.

Whatever the precise relation between the satiric poets and their creations, it is clear that the genre encourages an autobiographical reading of its authors, who invite their audiences to read their satires not as mere literary artifices, but as "real" in the sense that their literary contributions have some efficacy in the real world of the author. In this way, Juvenal is not “stuck inside his poems, doomed to interact only with other literature, fictional creations, and generic types.” Chapter 1 seeks to question the assertion of Juvenal's intentionality in distancing himself and his audience from the indignant views espoused by the speaker in his *Satires*. To quote Persius, this is the very ink of the cuttlefish, since this interpretation threatens to divorce Juvenal’s angry satirist from the palpable anger evident among his contemporaries concerning similar themes.

Chapter 2 then argues that Juvenal's angry mode is, in fact, an innovation insofar as he is the first satirist to couch his moralizing criticism in terms of rhetorical *indignatio* (as the satirist himself explicitly states), though he is certainly not the first to present an angry voice. Juvenal's rhetorical style is consonant with Seneca’s allowance for a rhetorical anger and is also consistent with the orator's method of presenting an indignant *persona* that employs an artful anger as evidenced in the extant treatises on the art of oratory from the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero’s *De Oratore* and *De Inventione*, and Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria*. By sedulously imitating a recognizable method of oratorical indignation, whose main purpose is to persuade his audience, it is entirely plausible that Juvenal’s satirist, far from alienating his audience

---

6 Childree (2007) 9 here referring to the limiting effect of the *persona* theory on Propertius’ corpus.
by the ferocity of his invective, creates a sympathetic bond against universally loathed figures and social trends of the past.

The common tone of belated fury that pervades the literature of post-Domitianic Rome is the topic Chapter 3, which explores the prevalent theme of servility and silence, which our sources identify as a humiliating result of an abusive principate. The servility of the Roman world to the tyrannical whims of "bad" emperors comes in for heavy criticism in our authors of the period and this thread binds them together in a chorus of indignation that was possible only once Domitian was safely dead, and which, perhaps, harmonizes too well. This, at least is Ramage's argument, which provocatively suggests that the anti-imperial literature of the period was encouraged by Trajan and in fact functioned as backhanded propaganda since it ultimately aimed to praise the ruling emperor by denigrating his predecessors.

This view has implications for the *persona* theory's interpretation of the speaker's character in Juvenal, since it would seem to presuppose an authoritative speaker whose sentiments are to be taken seriously as a proponent of the new emperor, or at least a voice that dovetails with his interests. Ramage's thesis does not sit well with the suggestion that Juvenal intends to hint at another aspect of his undercut narrator by presenting his satirist as a coward since he specifically attacks the dead. Chapter 3 further argues that this interpretation isolates Juvenal’s satirist from the volatile climate of his historical context by again excluding him from the reality that the authors similarly directing their works to the past were unabashedly writing only after the tyrant was safely dead (*Occiso Domitiano*).\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) Pliny *Ep.* 9.13.2.
To conclude this study, the topic of Juvenal's angry xenophobia is taken up in an effort to demonstrate that the views espoused by the main narrator and the figure of Umbricius in the third satire are not idiosyncratic. They instead find broad resonance in a number of our sources that similarly exhibit an uneasy tension about the nature of Roman interaction with the "Other." Set in this context, the anxiety that Juvenalian aggression exhibits against the rise of freedmen especially, and the belief that they wielded power disproportionate to their social station in particular, becomes familiar.

This study does not seek to foreclose on personal interpretations of Juvenal's poetry, since each reader will inevitably have their own reactions to such a toxic author. It rather aims to investigate many of the historical claims that adherents to the persona theory offer, since these lay claim to objective interpretations that assert a specific and historical reception of Juvenal's invective, which in turn has the effect of muzzling the satirist and denying the damaging power of Lucilius' grinding molars. It reasserts the ancient characterization of the satiric genre as a mode of social criticism and reaffirms the dominant quality of angst that one would expect to drive the genre. Juvenal's indignant satirist is (as far as we know) the apex of that angry style, but perhaps it needed to be in order to match the palpable indignation attested to by his contemporaries. The genre is, after all, designed to critique vice, and not to be outdone Juvenal's effusive satirist demonstrates that the dispassionate critic is the exception rather than the rule.

---

8 Pers. 1.114-115.
CHAPTER 2
SANITIZING THE SATIRIST

The last fifty years have seen an extensive reinterpretation of the speakers' voices in the Roman satirists.¹ This trend has affected no satirist more profoundly than Juvenal, whose indignant poetics, primarily in his first two books,² lead modern scholars to question the motives of this most intractable and virulent author. Rather than reading Juvenal's Satires as representative of current Roman thought in his socio/political milieu, recent literary criticism has focused on internal “tensions” (i.e. inconsistencies), in order to question the validity of the speaker's self-professed indignatio. These tensions are then conceived of as intentional devices by which the author has sought to distance not only himself, but also his own and subsequent audiences from the views of

¹Anderson (1982); Winkler (1983); Braund (1988), (1996) a and b; Freudenburg (1993), (2001); Schlegel (2005); Keane (2006); Plaza (2006); Rosen (2007). I adopt Braund's term ‘speaker’ when referring to the voices in Juvenal's Satires. Braund chooses this term in order to highlight the ‘dramatic’ qualities of the voices in the Satires while I prefer to stress the insistence in our three extant satirists on writing for readers and recitation for a select group (particularly in Horace and Persius): Hor. S. 1.4.22-25; 1.4.71-74; 1.4.138-139; 1.10.16-19; 1.10.92; Pers. 1.2; 1.45-47; 1.120; 1.125-126; 3.10-14; Juv. 1.63; 1.86; 3.321-322. Plin. Ep. 6.21 may perhaps be included in this list, if we assume that his description of Vergilius Romanus' work concerns a book of satires (as Green does; (1998) 220 n. 1). Nevertheless, ‘speaker’ seems an amenable and elastic term that incorporates widely differing views on the nature of the main satirist-figure presented in Juvenal's Satires, whether we are to conceive of him as Juvenal's voice or entirely alien to his own views.

²It is widely accepted that Juvenal's first two books contain the 'angry' satires, while in his subsequent books the poet is felt to modulate to a more detached and ironic tone with the old anger occasionally showing up again (Braund (1988)). Freudenburg's contention that the 'angry' satires include book three reveals just how slippery the labeling of the angry, and therefore unsympathetic, satirist can be: "His first poem...begins in a full-blown rage, and he stays in that mode with little variation throughout his first three books" ((2001) 248). Scholars have also noted a similar trajectory, though somewhat artificial, in the career of Horace, who is believed to modulate between a younger, angry poet in his Epodes into a more mature and less tempestuous figure in his later works, despite the resurgence of his old anger: o imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe bilem, saepe | iocum vestri movere tumultus! | libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps, | non aliena mea pressi pede, Epist. 1.19.19-22. Here, Horace looks back upon his iambic work with pride in his condemnation of the current literary environment: "Horace's defense of his Epodes as an expression of iambic weakness or as a Callimachean mollification of Archilochean invective. Horace's look back at his Epodes [in the Epistles] asserts too much iambic power (Johnson (2011) 40)." Furthermore, in the Ars Poetica Horace again reserves invective for the bad painter and the "mad poet" (who is criticized as a raging bear and finally a "blood-sucking leech") at its beginning and end: tenet occiditque legendo, l non missura cutem nisi plena cruoris hirudo, Ars 475-6).
the speaker(s) in the Satires. In this view, Juvenal himself and his ancient learned audience would have naturally disassociated themselves from the indignatio of the i-speaker. The strict application of this approach to Juvenal’s oeuvre risks blunting the force of his moralizing discourse. Our perspectives need to be rebalanced.

The concept of the persona as applied to Juvenal found its most influential proponent in W. S. Anderson, who, borrowing the concept from the work of Alvin Kernan on Renaissance satirists, forged a welcome new direction in the study of Roman satire at a time when scholars were attempting to recreate intimate details of Juvenal's personal life from his satiric collection, perhaps most infamously in Hight's conclusion that Juvenal was unhappily married and divorced based on a literal interpretation of satire 6. Anderson sought to show that the speaker in the Satires dons an angry mask (persona), which consequently leads his ancient audience, familiar with Seneca's treatises De Ira and De Tranquillitate Animi, to find the speaker unsympathetic.

But while Anderson's approach disavows Hight's biographical reading, it artificially bifurcates the sentiments of Juvenal's speaker from Juvenal the author:

I would contend that Juvenal has provided ample reasons for disassociating him [Juvenal the author] from the attitudes expressed by his satirist...he

---

3 "...we might suggest that, after coming up to Rome from his country town, he [Juvenal] had an unhappy experience with the proud and selfish Roman ladies. It looks as though, while waiting for the appointment in government service which never came, he had married a lady of superior rank and pretensions, and found her intolerable. When he was sent into banishment, she would surely divorce him—so that he would lose not only his career and his money but his home and his family too..." (Hight (1961) 103).

4 The first two books of the De Ira date approximately to 41 CE between the accession of Claudius and Seneca’s exile. Book three does not have a secure date. The De Tranquillitate Animi dates to about 63 CE. On the De Ira, see Ramondetti (1996), Bortone (1977). For the De Tranquillitate Animi, see Parenti (2004).

5 Hight sought to recreate the life of Juvenal from his corpus but inevitably produced a circular argument since Juvenal’s text is virtually all we have to reconstruct his life. See Winkler (1983) 4: "...he [Hight] extracts pieces of information concerning the life of Juvenal from the author’s works, constructs his “biography,” and then returns to the works for “evidence” to support his hypothesis.”
assigns to the satirist moral ideas that we could not possibly share, not so long as we have our wits about us" (Italics added).6

The biographical approach has in this schema been replaced by the contention that we may know Juvenal's attitudes and ideas as distinct from his satiric voice, and posits an idealized view of the mind and demeanor of the poet, who is not believed to have sympathized with the views expressed through his poems.7

This view is bolstered by the supposition that the idealized poet would not have written inconsistencies into his poems if he were partial to their sentiments.8 This argument, however, presupposes an infallible author who would only be inconsistent or contradictory by choice, rather than allowing the possibility that the author may present sentiments that contain inconsistent reasoning—a trait common both to ancients and moderns alike. The theory that Juvenal has provided clues to distinguish himself from the views of his speaker also begs the question by assuming that Juvenal intends to undercut his speaker(s) without having proved that intent; Juvenal's text, if we leave aside the author's hopelessly contradictory vitae (which all point towards an autobiographical reading of the Satires) and the now lost epigraphic evidence,9 is the

6 Anderson (1982) 314. See also Braund (1988) 22: "In, his own eyes, he [the speaker] is simply an indignant man. But in our eyes, if we pick up Juvenal's hints which lie in the discrepancies between claim and practice, he is pompous, narrow-minded, untruthful and ridiculous."

7 So Anderson (1982) 9: "sometimes the persona created by the satiric poet is so distinct from the poet's biography that the two are opposites." Cp. Iddeng (2000) 110 on regarding the speaker as an untrustworthy figure distinct from the ideas and views of his creator: "[this approach] conditions an alternative access to ancient authors' minds to be able to learn something about their real views and values, although such access usually is denied." See further Ibid. (2005) where Iddeng calls for a reevaluation of the "I-speaker."

8 "any inconsistencies are Juvenal's indications that the character he has created, the speaker, is practically berserk, or at least unhinged (Braund (1988) 8).

9 The original inscription disappeared in the 19th century, but in the 18th century copies were made of an inscription from ancient Aquinum (CIL 10.5382) that bore the cognomen Juvenalis. It is generally believed that the inscription does not refer to the poet Juvenal, but to a later relative, since the Dalmatian cohort is thought not to have existed prior to 166 CE. Nevertheless, this Juvenal was certainly a relative of the
only tangible evidence on which to base any interpretation of authorial intent or biography, and we therefore have no basis for hypothesizing the intentionality of any potential inconsistencies.

   My concern is that by accepting the implications of the _persona_ theory’s application to Juvenal and transferring the speaker’s invective against the stated targets of the text onto the satirist himself, we not only excuse the satirist from his transgressions, but we all too coincidentally make Juvenal a figure palatable to modern audiences by over-reading our own scruples into Juvenal’s art. The result is that Juvenal is constructed as an author who shares our own values and who laughs with us at his ‘berserk’ creation.\textsuperscript{10}

   While not seeking to revive the biographical fallacy criticized in Highet’s work, nor devaluing the basic concept of _personae_ in Latin literature, I want to begin by testing the supposition that Juvenal intends to disassociate himself and his audience from the views of the speaker(s) in his satires. In addition to ascribing intentionality to the poet, this inference is a mere reconfiguration of the biographical fallacy, not in professing to tell us what Juvenal believed personally, but rather by defining his views in the negative

---

\textsuperscript{10} Cp. Wray (2001) 164: “But in its [the _persona_ theory’s]…application to individual texts both ancient and modern (Juvenal and Catullus were chief targets within Latin literature), it often tended to serve…as a way of rehabilitating, of naturalizing canonical authors (and especially the questionably canonical ones, like Juvenal and Catullus) by reassuring the modern reader that whatever dreadful things great writers might have said in their Great Books, what they really meant—and this could be seen once the necessary adjustments for detached irony were made—never failed to embody the cultural and ethical values of the modernist new humanism.”
and assuming to know to what views Juvenal himself was not sympathetic. Whether or not we are to understand the poems as voicing the views of the historical poet, what is relevant here is that, along with the other extant Roman satirists, Juvenal goes to great lengths to at least present the speaker as the satirist. By blurring this distinction and including real historical personages and events, he invites the audience to conflate speaker and satirist and to read the Satires as “real.”

In his foundational work exploring the function of anger in Juvenal, Anderson lists five tensions, which Kernan had noted in Renaissance satirists and applies these to Juvenal in his discussion of the various inconsistencies he identifies in the satirist’s character:

(1) he is a plain, blunt, simple artless speaker who yet makes the most skillful use of rhetoric; (2) he proclaims the truth of what he says, while he wilfully distorts facts for emphasis; (3) although he loathes vice, he displays a marked love of sensationalism; (4) despite his moral concerns, the satirist can take sadistic delight in attacking his victims; (5) sober and rational as he may claim to be, he frequently adopts the most shockingly irrational attitudes.

---

11 So Braund (2004) 22: “Juvenal indicates the limitations of this character by exposing the contradictions between his view of himself as a morally pure and superior being and the more objective view of him as a narrow-minded bigot.” That the authorial voice is self-evidently that of a narrow-minded bigot is, perhaps, an objective interpretation from the point of view of modern audiences and seems to posit moral evaluations as if universally consistent.

12 Note that Juvenal introduces his fellow satirists Lucilius and Horace by referring to their hometown (Juv. 1.19-21; 51); he does the same at the close of satire 3 for his speaker. Horace in particular strongly encourages his reader to perceive not only his own, but Lucilius’ satires as autobiographical, asserting that Lucilius confided the events of his life to his writings as to a votive tablet: *ille [Lucilius] velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim credebat libris neque, si male cesserat, usquam decurrens alio neque, si bene; quo fit ut omnis votiva pateat veluti descripta tabella vita senis*, S. 2.1.30-34.

13 Anderson (1982) 293. Some of these discursive qualifications are applicable, for example, to Greek iambographers (cp. the moralizing stance of Archilochus in 173 W or of Hipponax fr. 115) as well as to other authors of invective ranging from Aristophanes to ancient rhetoricians, whose adaptation of iambic abuse is well outlined by Rotstein (2010) and Worman (2008) 213: “They [Attic rhetoricians] claimed things about their opponents that were not only openly slanderous but often hilariously exaggerated, drawing on gossip and hearsay and deploying it strategically until it mounted incrementally to the most serious accusation: that the man in question had behaved in a manner unbefitting for an Athenian...
Juvenal’s speaker famously declares in the first satire that his indignation will inspire his verses, if his natural talent is not up to the task (si natura negat, facit indignatio versum, 1.79). In addition, the speaker (or perhaps an interlocutor) doubts whether he can summon the talent necessary to tackle such an ambitious program (unde ingenium par materiae?, 1.150-151), while making no effort to obscure the fact that he has been schooled in traditional rhetorical education (et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus, et nos consilium dedimus Sullae, privatus ut altum dormiret, 1.15-17). This perceived inconsistency is then believed to contribute to the careful construction of a speaker who is deceptive, untrustworthy, and ultimately a “villain.”

The difficulty of applying the first of Kernan’s criteria solely to such professions by Juvenal to support the claim that he intends to undercut his speaker is well illustrated when we do the same for other Roman authors. We read, for example, that Cicero denies the possession of any extraordinary talent, despite his evident high opinion of his
citizen.” Slanderous and absurd exaggeration contributes here to the accretion of negative values that seeks ultimately to destroy its target and is not felt to reflect poorly upon the source of invective.

14 Anderson (1982) 294: “Indeed, as Kernan demonstrates, the logical extension of the satirist’s inconsistencies is the presentation of the satirist as a villain [sic], a perverse wretch who plots to create a diseased social order in conformity with his vile conception of life.” Again, the inconsistencies we perceive in the poetic voice are not limited to the satiric genre and are evident, for example in Horace, who adopts standard literary postures such as the claim to be too love sick to write (Hor. Epod. 14), or the claim that he is insufficiently talented to praise when he is doing precisely that (Hor. Od. 1.6, 4.2; cp. Prop. 2.1). He furthermore makes claims that denigrate his own talent in general while highlighting it throughout his corpus (Cp. Horace’s Od. 4.3 in light of the poet’s claims to immortality in 2.20 and 3.30).

own rhetorical skill throughout his corpus. Cicero, in fact, stresses the need for self-deprecation, especially for an orator:

nam cum omnis adrogantia odiosa est, tum illa ingeni atque eloquentiae
multo molestissima. Quam ob rem nihil dico de meo ingenio; neque est
quod possim dicere, neque si esset dicerem; aut enim id mihi satis est quod
est de me opinionis, quidquid est, aut, si id parum est, ego maius id
commemorando facere non possum. (Caec. 36-37)

For not only is all arrogance despised, but the pride of talent and oratorical
skill is by far the most offensive. For this reason, I say nothing concerning
my own talent; for there is none to speak of, nor would I comment even if
there were. Either, in fact, the opinion of me, whatever it is, is enough for
me, or, if it is insufficient, I am not able to improve it by bragging about it.

Cicero’s labored denigration of his own ingenium is reflective of a broad ethos that
shuns hubristic self-aggrandizement. Similarly, we find Tacitus assuring his readers
that he will attempt to achieve what he can despite his limited talents: non tamen pigebit
vel incondita ac rudi voce memoriam prioris servitutis ac testimonium praesentium
bonorum composuisse (Ag. 3). Turning to Quintilian, we find explicit exhortations to
prospective orators that stress the necessity of feigned modesty as illustrated by Cicero

16 Cp. Cicero's statement that it would be impossible for a prosecutor to have the necessary ingenium to
express adequately the crime and depravity of Verres, an exact parallel to Juvenal's unde ingenium par
materiae?: Etenim quod est ingenium tantum, quae tanta facultas dicendi aut copia, quae istius vitam tot
vitiis flagitisque convictam, iam pridem omnium voluntate iudicioque damnatam, aliqua ex parte possit
defendere (Verr. 1.1.10-11)?

17 For the illustration of Cicero's self-deprecatory manner throughout his forensic speeches, see: Quintct.
2: verum ita se res habet, ut ego, qui neque usu satis et ingenio parum possum...; 4: Nam, quod ingenio
minus possum, subsidium mihi diligentia comparavi; S. Rosc. 1: Credo ego vos, iudices, mirari quid sit
quod, cum tot summI oratores hominesque nobilissimi sedeant, ego potissimum surrexerim, is qui neque
aetate neque ingenio neque auctoritate sim cum his qui sedeant comparandus; 5: His de causis ego huic
causae patronus exstiti, non electus unus qui maximo ingenio sed relictus ex omnibus qui minimo
periculo possemm dicere, neque uti satis firmo praesidio defensus Sex. Roscius verum uti ne omnino
desertus esset; 9: Nam commoditati ingenium, gravitati aetas, libertati tempora sunt impedimento.; Caec.
64: Si me hercule mihi, non copioso homini ad dicendum...; Mur.: 29: In qua si satis profecissem, parcius
de eius laude dicerem, nunc nihil de me dico, sed de eis qui in dicendo magni sunt aut fuerunt.; Arch.: 1:
Si quid est in me ingeni, iudices, quod sentio quam sit exiguum, aut si qua exercitatio dicendi, in qua me
non infiltror mediocrer esse versatum...; 13: Atque id eo mihi concedendum est magis quod ex his studiis
haec quoque crescit oratio et facultas quae, quantacumque <est> in me, numquam amicorum periculis
defuit. Quae si cui levior videtur, illa quidem certe quae summa sunt ex quo fonte hauriam sentio.

18 All translations are my own.
and Tacitus.¹⁹ As these passages suggest, the intentional depreciation of one’s own
talent, while simultaneously displaying it, is not a tactic exclusive to Juvenal’s corpus,
nor to the poetic genre. This nearly obligatory self-deprecation would have been
familiar to Juvenal’s readership and functions as a formulaic way of ingratiating the
author with his audience, rather than consciously signaling that the author is introducing
an undercut speaker whose rhetoric should be viewed with suspicion.

The second of the tensions cited in arguing for the undercut speaker in Juvenal is
his hyperbolic language, which is felt to be incongruent with a figure that professes to
speak the truth.²⁰ Both Anderson and Braund cite the sweeping language of the satirist,
including such terms as *nullus* and *omnis*, which tend to generalize and thus
exaggerate.²¹ For example, in satire 6, a poem ostensibly against marriage, an
interlocutor asks the speaker whether he feels there is any woman who meets his
criteria for an acceptable wife:

‘nullane de tantis gregibus tibi digna uidetur?’
sit formonsa, decens, diues, fecunda, uetustos
porticibus disponat auos, intactior omni

¹⁹ Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.15-16: *In primis igitur omnis sui uitiosa iactatio est, eloquentiae tamen in oratore
praecipue, adfertque auditibus non fastidium modo sed plerumque etiam odium;* 11.1.17-20:
*Reprehensus est in hac parte non mediocriter Cicero, quamquam is quidem rerum a se gestarum maior quam eloquentiae fuit in orationibus utique iactator. Et plerumque illud quoque non sine aliqua ratione fecit: aut enim tuebatur eos quibus erat adiutoribus usus in opprimenda coniuratione, aut respondebat
inuidiae, cui tamen non fuit par, seruatae patriae poenam passus exilium: ut illorum quae egerat in
consulatu frequens commemoratio possit uideri non gloriae magis quam defensioni data. Eloquentiam quidem, cum plenissimam diuersae partis aduocatis concederet, sibi numquam in agendo inmodice

²⁰ It is not readily apparent that the use of exaggeration is to be taken *per se* as an author's hint that he
intends to undercut his speaker. Consider the efficacy, for example, of political cartoons, which
exaggerate out of all proportion their intended target (Green (1972) 249).

²¹ Anderson (1982) 303. Cp. Braund (1996) 122 where *nulla* and *quis…non…?* are examples “typical of
indignation.” See also p. 234 where, commenting on Umbricius’ language in satire 3, *nullus, nulla* 22,
308, *maximus* 310 are evidence of “sweeping generalizations,” which are “linguistic signs of anger
familiar from the indignant speaker’s rantings.”
crinibus effusis bellum dirimente Sabina,
rara auis in terris nigroque simillima cycno,
quis feret uxorem cui constant omnia? malo,
malo Venustinam quam te, Cornelia, mater
Gracchorum, si cum magnis uirtutibus adfers
grande supercilium et numeras in dote triumphos.
tolle tuum, precor, Hannibalem uictumque Syphacem
in castris et cum tota Carthagine migra.
'parce, precor, Paean, et tu, dea, pone sagittas;
nil pueri faciunt, ipsam configite matrem'
Amphion clamat, sed Paean contrahit arcum.
exit ergo greges natorum ipsumque parentem,
dum sibi nobilior Latonae gente uidetur
atque eadem scrofa Niobe fecundior alba.
quae tanti grauitas, quae forma, ut se tibi semper
inputet? huius enim rari summique uoluptas
nulla boni, quotiens animo corrupta superbo
plus aloes quam mellis habet.
(6.161-177)

‘Is there no woman from such a great herd that seems worthy to you?’ Let
her be beautiful, seemly, rich, fertile, let her display her ancient ancestral
portraits in her colonnades, more chaste than any Sabine woman who, with
hair disheveled, halts the war, a rare bird on earth and most like a black
swan; who can stand a wife whose every aspect is perfect? I much, much
prefer Venustina22 to you, Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, if along with your
great virtues you bring stuck-up haughtiness, counting up your triumphs in
your dowry.23 Away, I pray, with your Hannibal and Syphax, defeated in his
camp, and move on out with all your Carthage. ‘Show mercy, I pray,
Healer, and you, goddess, put away your arrows; the children do not offend,
pierce the mother herself!’, Amphion cries, but the Healer draws his bow.
Niobe thereby destroyed her brood of children along with their father, since
she deemed herself more noble than the family of Latona and also more
fertile than the white sow. What reputation, what beauty is worth so much,
that she forever casts it in your teeth? There is, in fact, no pleasure in this
rare and best woman, when, so often marred by a proud mind, she holds
more bitterness than honey.

22 Likely the name of a prostitute. Cf. Courtney (1980) 282: “This name represents the woman in the
street.”

23 Contrary to the general perception of Horace as ‘mannered’, see also Epod. 8.11-12 for sexual
invective that similarly mocks the value of the unnamed woman’s vaunted ancestral lineage, though here
the iambist intends to draw a contrast between her aristocratic credentials and her unattractive
appearance, which results in an inability to stir the iambist’s desire: esto beata, funus atque imagines /
ducant triumphales tuum...magis nervi rigent, / minusve languet fascinum? / quod ut superbo provokes ab
inguine, / ore allaborandum est tibi. Cp. Hor. Sat. 1.2 for the narrator’s preference for prostitutes over
matrons—the former will satisfy desire without danger, while chasing the latter incurs several risks.
Anderson notes the generalizing *nulla* of line 161 and comments: “It makes no difference whether she is supremely virtuous and chaste or otherwise: the satirist affects abhorrence of every woman in the world.” Braund similarly states, “once we have heard that he cannot stand even the perfect wife, we know for sure that we cannot take him seriously.” While the speaker does in fact end by rejecting all prospective wives, the idea that he has rejected the perfect wife is misleading and belies the satirist’s strategy. The key to the satirist’s broad invective in this passage seems to be how he defines the perfect wife. The satirist’s rejection of the imagined woman is predicated on a conditional (*si cum magnis virtutibus*), which introduces pride as the outstanding quality of her character. The characterization of the woman as “perfect” therefore turns out to be ironic, since she is imbued with a haughty disposition (*supercilium*, 169; *animo superbo*, 180).

That the satirist does not believe that the “chaste and virtuous wife” is perfect is revealed by her unflattering identification with the haughty and arrogant Niobe in lines 172-177—a woman whose hubris cost her the lives of her children. The satirist has turned his interlocutor’s hyperbolic *nulla* into an opportunity to attack all the vice he sees in his highly selective catalogue of women, and he manages to transform the virtuous and chaste woman into an image of a spouse undesirable in Roman codes of behavior.

---


25 We may, of course, compare Semonides’ famous categorization of the different classes of women. The narrator, identifying women with various animals, contends that the wife who resembles the industrious bee is the only kind worth having (7.83-93), though he later asserts that a husband must beware the wife who seems the “best-behaved,” since her ‘going behind his back’ will make him an object of mockery: ἥτις δὲ τοι οὐκ ἐστὶν μάλιστα σωφρονεῖν δοκεῖ, αὕτη μέγιστα τυχόνως ἁμαινεῖ· κεχνητος γὰρ ἀνδρός, οἱ δὲ γείτονες χαίρουσα ὄρῳντες καὶ τόν, ὡς ἀμαρτάνει (Semon. 7.110-111).
and to himself.\textsuperscript{26} His rejection of the virtuous and chaste (perfect) wife seems designed rather to introduce the satirist’s main target in this selection, the rise of vice, in this case arrogance, even out of apparent virtues.

Further, if we are to consider Juvenal’s language of exaggeration as a cue designed to compel the ancient reader to question the satirist’s authority, a discrepancy arises when we find a similar linguistic strategy employed by other authors, since the same hyperbolic language is not confined to Juvenal but is found in many works, including Seneca’s \textit{De Ira}, the prime source used to question Juvenal’s presentation of \textit{indignatio}. If hyperbolic language is behavior “typical of indignation,” and “sweeping generalizations” are “linguistic signs of anger familiar from the indignant speaker’s rantings,”\textsuperscript{27} how are we to read Seneca’s employment of generalized and exaggerated language in his condemnation of Roman vice in terms identical to Juvenal’s own?:

\begin{quote}
Atqui si irasci sapiens turpiter factis debet et concitari contristarique ob scelera, nihil est aerumnosius sapiente: omnis illi per iracundiam maeroremque uita transibit. Quod enim momentum erit quo non inprobanda uideat? Quotiens processerit domo, per sceleratos illi auarosque et prodigos et inpudentis et ob ista felices incedendum erit; nusquam oculi eius flectentur ut non quod indignentur inueniant. (\textit{Dial.} 4.7.2.1-5)
\end{quote}

But if the wise man ought to become angry at disreputable deeds and is troubled and saddened by crimes, there is no one more wretched than him: his whole life will be spent in anger and grief. What moment will there be in which he sees something that doesn't deserve condemning? So often as

\textsuperscript{26} With the satirist’s condemnation of Cornelia “counting up the number of triumphs in her dowry,” \textit{si cum magnis uirtutibus adfers grande supercilium et numeras in dote triumphos}, compare Horace’s assertion that some women boasted of their dowry and held it over their husbands’ heads: \textit{illic matre carentibus / privignis mulier temperat innocens / nec dotata regit virum / coniumx nec nitido fidit adultero; / dos est magna parentium / virtus et metuens alterius viri / certo foedere castitas, / et peccare nefas, aut pretium est mori.} Cps. also Pliny’s praise for Trajan’s wife and sister specifically for their rejection of titles, which he attributes to their modesty: \textit{Quid enim laudabilius feminis, quam si uerum honorem non in splendore titulorum, sed in iudiciis hominum reponant magnisque nominibus pares se faciant, et dum recusant?} In addition to her modesty in refusing to highlight her status in stark contrast to Juvenal’s Cornelia, Trajan’s wife (Pompeia Plotina) embodies ancient virtues, prompting Pliny to wonder, \textit{ubi est autem similis?}, surely an exaggeration.

\textsuperscript{27} See n. 21.
he leaves his house, he will have to pass by the wicked, greedy, extravagant, and the shameless—men happy to be so! Never will his eyes turn from something to meet with his indignation.

We find similar hyperbole in book 4:

Numquam irasci desinet sapiens, si semel coeperit: omnia sceleribus ac uitiis plena sunt; plus committitum quam quod possit coercitione sanari; certatur ingenti quidem nequitiae certamine. Maior cotidie peccandi cupiditas, minor uercundia est; expulso melioris aequorisque respectu quocumque uisum est libido se inpingit, nec furtiua iam scelera sunt: praeter oculos eunt, adeoque in publicum missa nequitia est et in omnium pectoribus eualuit ut innocentia non rara sed nulla sit. Numquid enim singuli aut pauci rupere legem? undique uelut signo dato ad fas nefasque miscendum coorti sunt… (Dial. 4.9.1-2)

Never will the wise man cease from anger, if once he begins: Everywhere is full of wickedness and vice; more crime is committed than can possibly be restrained by punishment; indeed, each man vies in rivalry for wickedness. Greater each day is the passion for sin, less the shame. With consideration of what is better and more justly banished, lust forces its way wherever it likes, nor are crimes any longer concealed: they parade before our eyes, to the point where wickedness is brought into the open and has grown strong in the hearts of all so that innocence is not rare, but nonexistent. For it isn’t in fact each man or only a few who break the law, is it? From every side, just as if a signal were given, men arise who confuse right and wrong.

Seneca agrees with Juvenal’s assertion, in very specific terms, that evils are everywhere, and claims not that innocence is rare, but ‘nonexistent.’ In fact, Seneca’s language is uncannily like that of the satirist.28 The philosopher presents as a given fact that monstrous vices stalk Rome, differing only from Juvenal’s speaker in determining the appropriate response to the reality of omnipresent vice. There is an inherent inconsistency in ascribing generalizations to the satirist, which contradict his professed desire to speak the truth and are understood as undercutting his indignant stance, while

28 [scelera] praeter oculos eunt is reminiscent of Juvenal’s image of the satirist on a street corner filling his scrolls as he observes the parade of supposed moral degenerates before him: nonne libet medio ceras inplere capaces / quadruiuo, cum iam sexta ceruice feratur / hinc atque inde patens ac nuda paene cathedra / et multum referens de Maecenate supino / signator falsi, qui se lautum atque beatum / exiguis tabulis et gemma fecerit uda? (1.63-68). For similar hyperbole, cf. Dial. 2.6.7.
not applying this same rubric to Seneca, when he employs hyperbole to describe what is for him a given fact.

Juvenal's hyperbolic language is perhaps better understood within the framework of rhetorical discourse. That hyperbole was within the bounds of the rhetorician's trade, and was in fact encouraged by teachers of rhetoric, is shown both by Cicero and Quintilian (who, of course, generally turns to Cicero to illustrate his principles). Hyperbole, according to Quintilian, is indeed a liar, though its purpose is not to deceive; rather it is a tool to be employed when normal language is at a loss to express the magnitude of the matter under discussion:

Tum est hyperbole uirtus cum res ipsa de qua loquendum est naturalem modum excessit: conceditur enim amplius dicere, quia dici quantum est non potest, meliusque ultra quam citra stat oratio.\(^{30}\) (Inst. 8.6.76)

Hyperbole is of merit when the matter itself about which we must speak transgresses its natural bounds: it is then granted to speak more expansively, because the size of the matter is not able to be conveyed, and it is better that the language should go too far than that it fall short.

It is the orator's job, Quintilian argues, to amplify and exaggerate the qualities of one's opponent in whatever way is expedient. Amplification and hyperbole are ultimately key elements of eloquence:

Quid uero agit omnino eloquentia detractis amplificandi minuendique rationibus? Quarum prior desiderat illam plus quam dixeris significationem,
id est ἐμφάσιν, et supralationem veritatis et traiectionem, haec altera
extenuationem <et> deprecationem. (Inst. 9.2.3)

Truly, what can rhetoric do at all if the methods of amplification and
minimization are removed? The first of these needs more intimation than
one says, which is called 'emphasis', in addition to exaggeration of the truth
and hyperbole; the other requires lessening and diminution.

If we consider, for example, Cicero's use of hyperbole in the Pro Milone, we can see an
illustration of Quintilian's theory, as Cicero, when pressed to describe the depths of
Clodius's villainy,\textsuperscript{32} admits that he is at a loss for words (Non potest dici satis). Cicero
frequently employs hyperbolic language to impress upon his audience the gross crimes
of his opponents, while simultaneously professing to speak the truth. This strategy is
evident in numerous speeches, but particularly those in which he attacks women by
attempting to frame his charges within accepted stereotypes or by links to well-known
female tragic figures.\textsuperscript{33} So, for example, in the Pro Caelio, Clodia is a "Medea of the
Palatine," with Cicero exclaiming in the very next paragraph, "How great is the power of
truth!" (O magnam vim veritatis).\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{32} Non timeo, iudices, ne odio mearum inimiciarum inflammatus libertius haec in illum evomere videar
quam verius. Etenim si praecepuum esse debebat, tamen ita communis erat omnium ille hostis ut in
communi odio paene aequaliter versaretur odium meum. Non potest dici satis, ne cogitari quidem,
quantum in illo sceleris, quantum exi fuerit, Mil. 78-79.

\textsuperscript{33} See Corbeill (2002) 207f. for Cicero's exploitation of cultural prejudice to win over his audience.
Geffcken notes in her monograph analyzing the comic tropes of the Pro Caelio that, "Such phrases as
oppugnari autem opibus meretriciis and libidinem muliebrem, so shrewd in their vagueness, introduce
suspense, hint at scandal to be revealed, entertainment to be provided, and titillate the listeners" ((1973)
12).

\textsuperscript{34} Cael. 63. For Clodia as Media, see Cael. 18: Ac longius mihi quidem contexere hoc carmen licet:
Nam numquam era errans hanc molestiam nobis exhiberet Medea animo aegro, amore saevo saucia.
Sic enim, iudices, reperietis quod, cum ad id loci venero, ostendam, hanc Palatinam Medeam
migrationemque hanc adulescenti causam sive malorum omnium sive potius sermonum fuisse. Caelius
had named Clodia a "one-penny Clytemnestra" (quadrantaria Clytaemestra) (Inst. 8.6.53) and Cicero
plays off of this slur by mocking her with this unwelcome nickname (Cael. 62, 69). See Geffcken (1973)
15-20 for Cicero's employment of transposition by linking the cotidian Palatinam with the tragic Medeam:
"Illustrated is one of the basic principles involved in parody: transposition, that is, the degradation of
the solemn into the familiar or the exaggeration of the trivial into the grandiose" (16-17). Sussman argues
that Cicero, in his invective against Antony in the Second Philippic, modifies the traditional mode of
Cicero further illustrates the efficacy of hyperbole in the *Pro Cluentio* when he constructs his portrait of Sassia in terms designed to recall such female tragic archetypes as Phaedra and Medea. Not so coincidentally, perhaps, this hyperbole is marked by the same characteristics of *indignatio* that Juvenal's speaker will later employ in his invective against women:

O mulieris scelus incredibile et praeter hanc unam in omni vita inauditum! o libidinem effrenatam et indomitam! o audaciam singularem! nonne timuisse, si minus vim deorum hominumque famam, at illam ipsam noctem facesque illas nuptialis, non limen cubiculi, non cubile filiae, non parietes denique ipsos superiorum testis nuptiarum? Perfregit ac prostravit omnia cupiditate ac furore; vicit pudorem libido, timorem audacia, rationem amentia. (*Clu.* 15-16)

O, the amazing crime of the woman, unheard of in all the experience of life except in her alone! O, the unbridled and unconquerable lust! O, her singular recklessness! If she were not concerned about the power of the gods and her reputation among mankind, did she at least fear the wedding night itself and those bridal torches, the threshold of the bridal chamber, the marriage bed of her daughter, or even the walls themselves, a witness to the prior marriage? She, by her lust and madness, destroyed and overthrew all these hindrances. Passion conquered her shame, audacity her fear, insanity her reason.

political invective that included charges of thievery, drunkenness, and sexual deviance, to include elements of the comic stage. We have seen that Cicero incorporates elements of the comic to great effect in his invective against Clodia in the *Pro Caelio*, and he further adopts this approach by "portray[ing] Antony as a *meretrix* of comedy, but more specifically as a money-hungry, transvestite, passive homosexual prostitute" for the purpose of "entertaining and amusing his audience" ((1998) 96).

35 See *Clu.* 12-13 for Sassia's purported bewitching of her son-in-law (*nefaria libido*), where Cicero presents the seduction in terms of magical enchantment (*pellexit, capta, deleniri*): *Cum essent eae nuptiae plenae dignitatis, plenae concordiae, repente est exorta mulieris importunae nefaria libido non solum dedecore verum etiam scelere coniuncta. Nam Sassia, mater huius Habiti—mater enim a me in omni causa, tametsi in hunc hostili odio et crudelitate est, mater, inquam, appellabitur, neque umquam illa ita de suo scelere et immanitate audiet ut naturea nomen amittat; quo enim est ipsum nomen amantium indulgentiusque maternum, hoc illius matris quae multis iam annos et nunc cum maxime filium interfector cupit singulari scelus maiore odio dignum esse ducetis. Ea igitur mater Habiti, Melini illius adultercentis, generi sui, contra quam fas erat amore capta primo, neque id ipsum diu, quoquo modo poterat in illa cupiditate continebatur; deinde ita flagrare coepit amentia, sic inflammata ferri libidine ut eam non pudor, non pietas, non macula familieae, non hominum fama, non fili dolor, non filiae maeror a cupiditate revocaret. Animum adultercentis nondum consilio ac ratione firmatum pellexit eis omnibus rebus quibus illa aetas capi ac deleniri potest.*
Cicero’s exclamatory denunciation of Sassia’s madness (*amentia*) in his depiction of her as a poisoner and an out of control, lustful, angry, and hateful stepmother, who cannot even be considered a human being,\(^{36}\) apparently struck a chord with his audience and, far from resulting in damage to Cicero's credibility as a speaker, helped him to achieve victory in this case. If we turn to Juvenal, we find the same claims to truth sitting alongside similarly indignant and exaggerated passages against women. Like Cicero, the speaker staunchly defends the truth of his statements and anticipates questions of their credulity:

> fingimus haec altum satura sumente coturnum scilicet, et finem egressi legemque priorum grande Sophocleo carmen bacchamur hiatu, montibus ignotum Rutulis caeloque Latino? nos utinam uani...occurrent multae tibi Belides atque Eriphylae mane, Clytemestram nullus non uicus habebit. (6.634-656)

Am I making all this up? Surely satire dons the high buskin, and I have transgressed the boundary and the law of my predecessors? Am I ranting with gaping Sophoclean yap a lofty song as yet unknown to Rutilian hills and Latin sky? Would that it was so...the fact is that you meet many Danaids and morning brings many an Eriphyle; each street will have its Clytemnestra.

As Braund notes in her treatment of the conclusion to Juvenal's sixth satire (ll. 627-661), Juvenal illustrates the techniques of *indignatio* as listed by Cicero in his theoretical works on oratory.\(^{37}\) Yet, here again, Juvenal's professions of truth, while hyperbolically linking stepmothers and other deviant women with tragic figures, is taken as evidence

\(^{36}\) *At quae mater! Quam caecam crudelitate et scelere ferri videtis, cuius cupiditatem nulla umquam turpitudo retardavit, quae vitiis animi in deterrimas partis iura hominum convertit omnia, cuius ea stultitia est ut eam nemo hominem, ea vis ut nemo feminam, ea crudelitas ut nemo matrem appellare possit. Atque etiam nomina necessitudinum, non solum naturae nomen et iura mutavit, uxor generi, noverca fili, filiae paelex; eo iam denique adducta est uti sibi praeter formam nihil ad similitudinem hominis reservavit.* (Clu. 199-200).

\(^{37}\) *Ad Herenn. 2.48-9, De Inventione 1.100-5.*
that Juvenal intends to undercut his *persona*,\(^{38}\) while the same criterion is not applied to Cicero when he employs similar methods—methods approved and recommended both in Cicero's and Quintilian's theoretical works for their efficacy in affecting the audience's emotions.

As additional evidence for the satirist's distortion of truth and the audience's concomitant alienation from the satirist's views, it is argued that Juvenal has provided clues for the astute reader to distinguish between the satirist's truths and truth itself, as in the concluding verses of satire 2:

```
esse aliquos manes et subterranea regna,
Cocytum et Stygios ranas in gurgite nigras,
atque una transire uadum tot milia cumba
nec sueri credunt, nisi qui nondum aere lauantur.
sed tu uera puta: Curius quid sentit et ambo
Scipiadae, quid Fabricius manesque Camilli,
quid Cremerae legio et Cannis consumpta iuuentus,
tot bellorum animae, quotiens hinc talis ad illos
umbra uenit? cuperent lustrari, si qua darentur
sulphura cum taedis et si foret umida laurus. (2.149-158)
```

That there exist shades and the subterranean kingdoms, Cocytus and black frogs in the Stygian swell, and also that so many thousands cross the stream in one raft, boys do not believe, except those who do not yet bathe for a coin. But you, assume for the moment it is true: what does Curius think and both Scipios, what Fabricius and the shade of Camillus, what the legion of Cremera and the youth devoured at Cannae, so many souls of war, so often as such a shade comes to them from here? They would wish to be purified, if they were somehow given sulphur with torches and if they could get their hands on some wet laurel.

Anderson suggests that Juvenal has undercut his speaker by casting doubt on the existence of the underworld while asking his audience to imagine a scene there: "Under the circumstances, how can the reader take seriously the satirist who has frankly

---

\(^{38}\) Braund (1988) 21: "there is no comparison between the figures of literature and modern women (*Alcestim* 653, *Belides* 655, *Eriphylae* 655 and *Clytemnestram* 656). With this extravagant claim, Juvenal's indignant speaker has gone right over the top: his anger has taken him irrevocably into the realm of ridicule."
exposed the fiction even before embarking on his rhetorical flight?39 But merely inviting the reader/audience to imagine (sed tu vera puta) a fictitious landscape does not preclude a serious purpose on the part of the poet. The audience is aware that the poet asks them to suspend disbelief, and I would argue that by introducing his picture of the underworld in this way, the satirist strengthens, rather than detracts from, the effect of his satiric picture. The preamble to the satirist’s presentation of the scene in the underworld may even be seen as a subtle defense against the potential charge of naïveté rather than a clue that Juvenal has inserted this scene in order to disavow the rhetoric of the speaker, since he self-consciously exposes the scene as ‘fiction’—a point already familiar to his audience.

That the educated Roman reader would have serious reservations about the reality of the subterranea regna is illustrated, for example, in Cicero’s Pro Cluentio when he assumes his audience’s denial of a physical underworld as related in fabulae:

Nam nunc quidem quid tandem illi mali mors attulit? nisi forte ineptiis ac fabulis ducimur ut existimemus illum ad inferos impiorum supplicia perferre ac pluris illic offensisse inimicos quam hic reliquisse, a socrus, ab uxorum, a fratris, a liberum Poenis actum esse praecipitem in sceleratorum sedem atque regionem. Quae si falsa sunt, id quod omnes intellegunt, quid ei tandem alius eripuit mors praeter sensum doloris? (Cluent. 171-2)

For indeed, what harm has death brought him [Oppianicus]? Unless perhaps we are led by silly stories so that we should think that he endures the penalty of wicked men in the underworld and there meets more enemies than he left behind here—that he was driven headlong into the abode and lands of the wretched by the vengeance of his mother-in-law, his wife, brothers, and children. If these stories are false, as everyone knows, in the end what did death take from him except the feeling of pain?

The specious existence of fabled punishments in the underworld does not prevent Cicero from inviting his audience, however briefly, to envision Oppianicus hounded by

avenging shades, suffering there for his crimes; Cicero’s *Quae si falsa sunt, id quod omnes intellegunt* is an explicit recognition of the audience’s doubt concerning the veracity of these stories, the same recognition expressed by Juvenal (*nec pueri credunt, nisi qui nondum aere lauantur*). Nor does the confessed non-existence of *post mortem* punishment prevent Cicero in his fourteenth Philippic from encouraging Roman senators to envision Antony’s traitorous soldiers suffering torment in the afterlife.\(^{40}\)

Likewise, Juvenal’s *sed tu vera puta* asks the audience to imagine, and does not prevent the satirist from effectively staging his criticism in the underworld. The satirist stresses that the existence of the underworld is not the point, but that the presentation is calculated to create an opportunity to depict the striking contrast between the quintessentially heroic ghosts of Rome’s past and the effeminate upper class of the current period.\(^{41}\) The speaker does not ask the reader to take as literal his depiction of the underworld any more than Seneca does when he stages the *Apocolocyntosis* in the underworld.\(^{42}\) As so often in Juvenal’s and Seneca’s satire, literal truth is willingly sacrificed, since it was never the focus, and the satirist’s attention is rather directed towards the successful effect of the entire presentation.

\(^{40}\) *Ili igitur impii quos cecidistis etiam ad inferos poenas parricidi luent*, Phil. 14.32

\(^{41}\) Juvenal precedes his fantastic scene in the underworld with a mirror image of that scene, but staged in the arena at Rome. The upper class tunic-clad Gracchus, depicted as a gladiator fighting beasts, contrasts sharply and ironically with those whose birth is lower than his: *uicit et hoc monstrum tunicati fuscina Gracchi, / lustrauitque fuga medium gladiator harenam / et Capitolinis generosior et Marcellis / et Catuli Paulique minoribus et Fabiis et / omnibus ad podium spectantibus*, 2.143-147. The passage gives Juvenal the opportunity to parade the ancient and venerable names of Rome’s past, as he will do in the following scene in the underworld.

\(^{42}\) Tacitus states that Agrippina had brought Seneca back from exile in hopes that he would be bound to her for her kindness and because it was believed that, through his indignation at Claudius for exiling him, Seneca would aid Agrippina’s and Nero’s rise to power: *Seneca fidus in Agrippinam memoria beneficii et infensus Claudio dolore iniuriae credebatur* (Ann. 12.8). The attack on the deceased Claudius in the *Apocolocyntosis* argues that Agrippina was not entirely wrong about Seneca’s own indignation.
The strategy of appealing to the imagination of an audience—whether or not the argument follows strictly logical or rational guidelines more appropriate to proper philosophy than satire—\(^{43}\) is a common rhetorical device with which we may compare Cicero’s employment of *prosopopaea* in the *Pro Caelio*:\(^{44}\)

Sed tamen ex ipsa quaeram prius utrum me secum severe et graviter et prisce agere malit, an remisse et leniter et urbane. Si illo austero more ac modo, aliquis mihi ab inferis excitandus est ex barbatis illis, non hac barbula qua ista delectatur sed illa horrida quam in statuis antiquis atque imaginibus videmus, qui obiurget mulierem et qui pro me loquatur ne mihi ista forte suscenseat. Exsistat igitur ex hac ipsa familia aliquis ac potissimum Caecus ille; minimum enim dolorem capiet qui istam non videbit. (Cael. 33)

Nevertheless, I will ask Clodia herself whether she prefers that I deal with her in a strict and stern manner characteristic of the ancients, or whether I should relax and treat her gently and in a modern fashion. If she prefers me to deal with her in an austere manner, I must summon from the underworld someone from those bearded men, not one with a goatee, which she enjoys, but a good shaggy one, which we see on those old statues and images; someone who would reproach the woman and who may speak in my place so that she does not, perhaps, become angry with me. From her own family someone stands out who fits the bill—that famous Caecus; he will in fact be the less pained since he will not have to see her.

Cicero expends a full paragraph in self-consciously “exposing the fiction” of summoning Appius Claudius *ab inferis* before embarking on his rhetorical flight; yet the successful outcome of the trial argues for the efficacy of Cicero’s rhetorical strategy and suggests that Cicero’s audience did not interpret the fictive way Cicero introduced Appius Claudius as a tactic that undermined his authority as a speaker.

For his satiric picture of Clodia, Cicero relies not only on the audience’s preconceptions of her reputation, but also on their implicit acceptance of the contrast

\(^{43}\) Cp. Green (1998) xlviii: “Juvenal does not work out a coherent ethical critique of institutions or individuals: he simply hangs a series of moral portraits on the wall and forces us to look at them.”

\(^{44}\) See Childree (2007) 32-37 for the efficacy of *prosopopeia* in the orator's "performance of reality."
between modern morality, as represented by Clodia, and the mos maiorum embodied by her grandfather. Juvenal uses a similar strategy in the aforementioned passage from his second satire to highlight the contrast between modern mores (quotiens hinc talis ad illos umbra uenit) and the archetypical models of virtue from Rome’s past. What Cicero, Seneca, and Juvenal gain in introducing figures from the underworld into their discourse is the emotional effect of their presentation considered in its entirety.

When hyperbole is not given its rightful due in the evaluation of the speaker's indignatio, it is argued by extension that his apparent sensationalism is at odds with his professed loathing of vice. By having his speaker reveal sometimes lurid details about his satiric targets, it is suggested that Juvenal has called into question his creation's own moral character and thereby the validity of his indignant stance, which has in turn given way to prurient fantasy. Thus, for example, the depiction of the secreta orgia of satire 2 should make us wonder how the speaker, now a Pentheus, has come by his knowledge (talia secreta coluerunt orgia taeda / Cecropiam soliti Baptae lassare Cotyton, 2.91-2). Yet, if we apply this criterion to Juvenal's speaker, we should also ask how Cicero is privy to the details of Clodius’ reputed incest with his sisters, or his transvestitism during his infamous transgression of the Bona Dea’s rites, without Cicero himself being present:

P. Clodius a crocota, a mitra, a muliebribus soleis purpureisque fasceolis, a strophio, a psalterio, a flagitio, a stupro est factus repente popularis. (Har. 44.)

---


46 So Anderson (1982) 306: "Was he among the transvestites too? Did he sneak into the company of the women, as Clodius once did? Again, the reader might wonder about the manner in which the satirist constructs his picture."

47 E.g. De Haruspicum Responso 9, 39, 42, 59; Cael. 32, 36, 78.
P. Clodius, out of his saffron dress, his head dress, his effeminate slippers and purple stockings, from his breast-band, from his harp, straight from his disgrace, his illicit lust—all of a sudden a demagogue!

Cicero's depiction of Clodius in women's clothing is reminiscent of Juvenal's depiction of the dress of those who celebrate the *secreta orgia* (*caerulea indutus scutulata aut g albina rasa*), but we would not be justified in asserting that Cicero invites his audience to envision the orator participating in Clodius' violation. Similarly, when Cicero wishes to stain Clodia's or Mark Antony's reputation, it would be misleading to focus on how Cicero acquired the details of his opponents' debauchery, lust and excess. Cicero is

---

48 Note especially Cicero's lurid sexual invective against Clodia, in which he purports to offer true details of the debauchery of her household. If we accept that Juvenalian sexual invective condemns itself by its prurience, what are we to make of Ciceronian sexual invective? We may, for example, ask ourselves how Cicero knows of Clodia's *occulta* and the intimate workings of her *domus*: At quibus servis?—refert enim magno opere id ipsum—eisne quos intellegebat non communi condicione servitutis uti sed licentius liberius familiarisque cum domina vivere? Quis enim hoc non videt, iudices, aut quis ignorat, in eius modi domo in qua mater familias meretricio more vivat, in qua nihil geratur quod foras proferendum sit, in qua insitutae libidines, luxuries, omnia denique inaudita vita ac flagitia versentur, hic servos non esse servos, quibus omnia committantur, per quos gerantur, qui versentur isdem in voluptatibus, quibus *occulta* credantur, ad quos aliquantum etiam ex cotidianis sumptibus ac luxurie redundet?. Cael. 57. The *persona* theory too often assumes static values, so that, for example, Shumate states, "these tendencies [women's affinity with the foreign] involve them in mixing at lower levels of the social hierarchy than is seemly for Roman women of a certain class, in the speaker's prim view" ((2006) 28). Yet, far from disassociating himself from this "prim" view, it is precisely the stereotype surrounding female lust that Cicero trades on for the success of his picture of Clodia's alleged inappropriate relationship with her slaves (*hic servos non esse servos*).

49 *Primo volgare scortum; certa flagiti merces nec ea parva; sed cito Curio intervenit qui te a meretricio quaestu abduxit et, tamquam stolam dedisset, in matrimonio stabili et certo conlocavit. Nemo umquam puer emptus libidinis causa tam fuit in domini potestate quam tu in Curioni. Quotiens te pater eius domu sua eiecit, quotiens custodes posuit ne limen intrares? cum tu tamen nocte socia, hortante libidine, per tegulas demittere. Quae flagitia domus illa diutius ferre non potuit. Scisne me de rebus mihi notissimis dicere?* Phil. 2.44-45; *Apothecae totae nequissimis hominibus condonabantur; alia mimi rapebant, alia miae; domus erat aleatoribus referta, plena ebriorum; totos dies potabatur atque id locis pluribus; suggerebantur etiam saepe—non enim semper iste felix—damna aleatoria; conchylialiatis Cn. Pompei peristromatis servorum in cellis lectos stratos videres...Huius in sedibus pro cubiculis stabula, pro conclavibus popinae sunt, Phil. 2.67-69; At videte levitatem hominis. Cum hora diei decima fere ad Saxa rubra venisset, delituit in quadam cauponula atque ibi se occultans perpotavit ad vespertum; inde cecideri ad urbem adventus domum venit capite involuto. Ianitor, 'Quis tu?" 'A Marco tabellarius.' Confestim ad eam ducitur cuius causa venerat, eique epistulam tradidit. Quam cum illa legeret flens—erat enim scripta amatoria; caput autem litterarum sibi cum illa mima posthac nihil futurum; omnem se amorem abiecisse illim atque in hanc transfusisse—cum mulier flerot uberius, homo misericors ferre non potuit, caput aperuit, in collum invasit. O hominem nequam! Quid enim aliud dicam? (Phil. 2.77 note the comic context); At quam multos dies in ea villa turpissime es perbacchatus! Ab hora tertia bibebatur, judebatur, vomebatur, Phil. 2.104; At vero te iniquino—non enim domino—personabant omnia vocibus ebriorum, natabant pavimenta vino, madebant parietes, ingenui pueri cum meritoriis, scorta inter matres
merely following his own advice of how to incite *indignatio*, which explicitly calls for introducing and describing the shameful act (*indignum*) in vivid detail before the eyes (*ante oculos*) of his audience.  

To press this point further, when we turn to Suetonius, we might ask not only how, but why he relates the lurid details of Tiberius' *sedes arcanarum libidinum*, its secrets apparently as easily divulged as the aforementioned *secreta orgia*. Such passages have led to Suetonius' reputation as a sensationalist, despite his concern to highlight the vices and virtues of the Caesars. By the same token, we do not need to suppose that Catullus (or his *persona*) shared the same bed with Caesar and Mamurra in order to publicly slander them with an account of their sexual relations. It is evident that the poet, in offering this voyeuristic view, affects significant damage to Caesar's reputation:

Valerium Catullum, a quo sibi uersiculis de Mamurra perpetua stigmata imposita non dissimulauerat, satis facientem eadem die adhibuit cenae hospitioque patris eius, sicut consuerat, uti perseuerauit. Suet. (*Iul.* 73)

He [Caesar] was not unaware of Valerius Catullus, by whom an everlasting stain was put upon him in the verses concerning Mamurra. Caesar invited him, making amends, to dinner and, just as he had been accustomed, continued in the friendship with the poet's father.

---

50 *Inv.* 1.104.


52 *Pulchre convenit improbis cinaedis, / Mamurrae pathicoque Caesarique...morbosi pariter, gemelli utrique, / uno in lectarulo erudituli ambo, / non hic quam ille magis vorax adulter, / rivales socii puellularum, Catul. 28.*
In the case of Catullus’s two poems on Mamurra and Caesar, at least, Suetonius provides a rare insight into the efficacy of sexual invective, couched in terms typical of indignation, outside of Catullus's poems themselves. It is apparent that by presenting a lurid scene, Catullus' moral stance as indignant narrator was not sufficiently deflated to avert the personal stain (perpetua stigmata) against his intended victim; otherwise Catullus would not have had to smooth things over with the dictator, and Caesar would have had little to fear for his reputation from Catullus' unsympathetic speaker.

The conclusion that the speaker's prurience results in the disavowal of his viewpoint is again argued from the fact that he remains behind in Rome in the third satire, while his friend Umbricius departs in disgust from the city to take up residence in vacant Cumae (vacuis Cumis). The speaker in the second satire had also professed a desire to flee Rome, but it is only Umbricius who actually does so. This fact is then construed as evidence that Juvenal has left his speaker as a prurient voyeur, mired in his simultaneous revulsion and attraction to Rome's vices.

While it is true that Umbricius departs in disgust from Rome while leaving the predominant speaker behind, the speaker actually praises Umbricius' departure while expressing his sorrow:

Quamuis digressu ueteris confusus amici laudo tamen, uacuis quod sedem figere Cumis destinet atque unum ciuem donare Sibyllae.

---

53 Catul. 29: Quis hoc potest videre, quis potest pati...cinaede Romule, hoc videbis et feres? In addition to the terminology of indignation, there is the repetition of cinaede Romule, hoc videbis et feres? and numerous pointed questions, all indicative of indignatio.

54 The efficacy of Catullus’ invective is also referred to by Cremutius Cordus in his ill-fated defense of his own historical writings under Tiberius. Cordus groups together Catullus’s verses against Caesar with the invective of Bibaculus, Mark Antony, and Brutus against Octavian/Augustus. Cordus’ argument here is not that Catullus (or the others, whose writings do not survive) was perceived as an undercut speaker, but only that Caesar and Augustus were wise not to become angry, since becoming angry was seen as an admission of guilt (Ann. 4.34-35).
ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni
secessus. ego uel Prochytam praepono Suburae;
nam quid tam miserum, tam solum uidimus, ut non
deterius credas horrere incendia, lapsus
tectorum adsiduos ac mille pericula saeuae
urbis et Augusto recitantes mense poetas? (3.1-9)

Although vexed by the departure of my old friend, nevertheless I applaud
his decision to reside in vacant Cumae and offer himself as a citizen to the
Sibyl. It is the gate of Baiae and a pleasing shore of idyllic recess. I prefer
even Prochytas to the Subura; for what do we see so wretched, so lonely,
that you would not think it worse to fear fires, the continual collapse of
buildings and the countless other dangers of this cruel city—and the poets
reciting in the month of August?

Supporting the view that Juvenal has staged the departure of Umbricius in such a way
as to imply that the speaker actually prefers Rome requires downplaying his praise of
Umbricius's actions and the speaker's own arguments against the city in lines 5-9,
which foreshadow Umbricius' own. Preceding Umbricius' departure to Cumae at the
beginning of the third satire is the speaker's own rhetorical desire in the second satire to
abandon Rome and disappear to the farthest reaches of the empire rather than be
subjected to the moralizing of hypocritical Stoics moralists (Vltra Sauromatas fugere
hinc libet et glacialem / Oceanum, quotiens aliquid de moribus audent / qui Curios
simulant et Bacchanalia uiuunt, 2.1-3).55

       Much as Democrats in our own political climate threatened to move to Canada if
President George W. Bush was elected to a second term in 2004, and as Republicans
similarly proclaimed when President Obama's Affordable Care Act was upheld as
constitutional by the Supreme Court, Juvenal's speaker here seeks to outrun a world
gone mad. That the speaker did not actually leave Rome for these far off regions

55 Cp. Inst. 1. pr. 15-16: Ac ueterum quidem sapientiae professorum multos et honesta praepesisse et, ut
praeeperint, etiam uixisse facile concesserim: nostris uero temporibus sub hoc nomine maxima in
plerisque uitiis latuerunt. Non enim uirtute ac studiis ut haberentur philosophi laborabant, sed uultum et
tristitiam et dissentientem a ceteris habitum pessimis moribus praetendebant. See also 12.3.12 for the
dour and grim Stoics.
should point us to a possible literary trope for Juvenal's purpose here when his declaration is recognized as a poetic stance, designed to heighten an aversion to hypocritical philosophers. We may compare, for example, the fact that Horace remained in Rome while apparently having no real intention of searching out the islands of the blessed accompanied by the best part of the community (pars indocili melior grege), while leaving the cowardly behind (mollis et exspes / inominata perprimat cubilia). Suetonius also records a strikingly similar lampoon current during the reign of Nero, in which the author urges the citizen body to abandon Rome and move to Veii: Roma domus fiet; Veios migrate, Quirites, si non et Veios occupat ista domus.

Rather than viewing the satirist as disloyal, and therefore rejected by his fellow citizens, we should ask, rather, what is gained by staging the drama as he does. As the aforementioned examples show, there is a dramatic and poetic tension in threatening to leave the city that is held in balance while the satirist stays and his alter ego departs. Horace's poetic proposal to abandon a doomed Rome in Epode 16 has echoes in historical precedent (e.g. Livy 5.49-55; 22.53.5), "But such proposals were generally seen as betrayals of the national heritage..., certainly not as gestures of pietas, which is beyond question the frame of reference which Horace deploys for his would-be émigrés here." I suggest that the character of Umbricius, like Horace's poetic persona,

---

56 haec et quae poterunt redivis abscindere dulcis / eamus omnis exsecreta civitas, / aut pars indocili melior grege; mollis et exspes / inominata perprimat cubilia. / vos, quibus est virtus, muliebrem tollite luctum, / Etrusca praeter et volate litora. / nos manet Oceanus circumvagus: arva beata / petamus, arva divites et insulas, Hor. Epod. 16.35-42.

57 Suet. Nero, 39.

58 Watson (2003) 481. But see Johnson for the iambist's symbolic and restorative journey: "Rome has fallen into such an irreparable state of strife that she is no longer safe from herself. She is not viable now or in the future. Therefore, the iambist invites his fellow citizens to start a new and symbolic literary journey with him to a very different destination than in epode 1...Such a claim [that the poet knows how to
operates within a similar framework of *pietas*, and is employed to convey "the utter hopelessness of Rome's situation." Further, that the promulgation of flight from Rome "generally arise[s] in response to social and political crises," which, for Horace, results from the fratricidal curse upon which Rome was founded, compounded with its ongoing enactment in civil war. It is this crisis that has engendered and justified his proposal to abandon Rome and make for the *Insulae Beatae*, while Umbricius describes a kind of civil war that pits those Romans believed to embody long-standing values, against Romans who adopt and promote foreign corruption of those values, a cultural war in which Rome "is being destroyed from within by self-inflicted wounds."61

If Juvenal were to have the speaker retire with Umbricius to Cumae, the dramatic tension would be greatly reduced, with little reason to introduce the figure of Umbricius in the first place. Furthermore, it should be remembered that one of the key themes of satire 3—indeed of the entire first book—is friendship, and by staging satire 3 as he does, Juvenal is able to stress the breakup of what he presents as a legitimate friendship (*digressu ueteris confusus amici*) over the vapid and perfunctory system of *amicitia*, which he castigates throughout book one.

A perceived inconsistency between the satirist's professed moral concerns and his 'sadistic' delight in attacking his victims has prompted doubts over whether the end Rome's warring mentality] is not indicative of a reticent iambist doubting the efficacy of his craft, but one having the nerve to offer up his *carmen* as the positive force needed to reconstitute society" (2012) 157-162).

60 *Ibid*. 482.
This charge, however, risks applying anachronistic ethical values to the satirist, a logical fallacy evidenced when considering the polemical orators and authors who profess their own righteousness while debasing their opponents with withering invective, intended to entertain while simultaneously condemning their targets. If we, for example, applied this ethical criterion to Juvenal’s contemporary Pliny the Younger, believing as he does that he speaks from a righteous position, this ‘sadism’ would reveal itself when he tells us not only that contemporary Romans delighted in the deaths of informers after the death of Domitian, but that it was even pleasing to witness their punishments:

 nihil tamen gratius, nihil saeculo dignius, quam quod contigit desuper intueri delatorum supina ora retortasque ceruices. Agnoscebamus et truebamur, cum uelut piaculares publicae sollicitudinis victimae supra sanguinem noxiorum ad lenta supplicia grauioresque poenas ducerentur. Congesti sunt in nauigia raptim conquisita ac tempestatibus dediti: abirent fugerent vastatas delationibus terras, ac si quem fluctus ac procellae scopulis reseruassent, hic nuda saxa et inhospitale litus incoleret, ageret duram et anxiam uitam, relictaque post tergum totius generis humani securitate maereret…Iuvabat prospectare statim a portu spar sa navigia. (Pan. 34.3-35.1)

Nothing, nevertheless, is more pleasing, nothing more worthy of the age than the fact that we have the opportunity to gaze down from above on the upturned faces of the informers with their necks twisted back. We recognized them and were overjoyed, when, just as victims atoning for public anxiety, they were led through the blood of criminals to long punishments and severe penalties. They were immediately hunted down, gathered together into ships and given over to the whim of the weather. Let them leave and flee the lands devastated by their informing. And if the waves and storms preserve him for the crags, let him dwell on bare rocks and a hostile shore. Let him live a harsh and troubled life, and let him suffer, knowing his departure occasioned the safety of all human kind…It was a delight to behold right there on the harbor the ships scattered.

---

62 “In poetic satire, the satirist is made to discredit himself to a certain extent by confessing his diseased imagination and his pleasure in delivering painful blows to others” (Anderson (1982) 294).

63 The informers’ actions even provoked the very forces of nature to indignation. The waves are angry as they drive the informers from the shore: Memoranda facies, delatorum classis permissa omnibus ventis,
Pliny’s brutal description of the informers, paraded through the blood of criminals in the arena to the mockery of spectators, their necks wrenched back to meet the gaze of their delighted avengers, may very well strike us as rivaling the ‘sadism’ of Juvenal. We also find Suetonius including among the litany of Titus’s virtues his vengeful reprisals against delatores, again paraded through the arena and beaten to the pleasure of the crowd:

Inter aduersa temporum et delatores amendatoresque erant ex licentia ueteri. hos assidue in foro flagellis ac fustibus caesos ac nouissime traductos per amphitheatrai harenam partim subici ac uenire imperauit, partim in asperrimas insularum auehi. (Tit. 8.4-5).

Among the calamities of the times were the informers and their bribers, who enjoyed a long-standing license. He [Titus] ordered them to be continually beaten with whips and clubs and finally led through the arena of the amphitheater; some to be put up for sale as slaves and some to be exiled to the harshest islands.

Both Pliny and Suetonius depict punishments that, while perhaps to modern sensibilities sadistic, are nevertheless presented in their context as righteous revenge not only wholly appropriate but entirely welcome as joyful expiation. It would not be saying too much to assert that Pliny and Suetonius both paint a picture of their contemporaries reveling in sadistic delight at the debasement, deaths, and sale of their enemies into slavery.

One final passage from Pliny on this point reiterates a sympathetic portrait of righteous vengeance and should cause us to question whether Seneca’s authority on the ethical value of anger should apply to the revenge literature of the post-Domitianic period:

coctaque vela tempestatibus pandere iratosque fluctus sequi, quoscumque in scopulos detulissent. The passage is reminiscent of the reverse propempticon from iambic literature, e.g. the first Strasbourg epode, attributed variously to Archilochus and Hipponax. Cp. Hor. Epod. 10, on which Mankin (1995) 183 states: “The vagueness about what ‘Mevius’ has done could suggest that he is a pharmacos…that his expulsion is a matter of great urgency…that the ‘ritual’ is intended to avert the anger of the gods from Rome.” Pliny clearly describes the fate of the informers in terms of expiation (uelut piaculares publicae sollicitudinis uictimae).
Illae autem <aureae> et innumerabiles strage ac ruina publico gaudio litauerunt. Iuuabat illidere solo superbissimos uultus, instare ferro, saeuire securibus, ut si singulos ictus sanguis dolorque sequeretur. Nemo tam temperans gaudii seraeque laetitiae, quin instar ultionis uideretur cernere laceros artus truncata membra, postremo truces horrendasque imagines obiectas excoctasque flammis, ut ex illo terrore et minis in usum hominum ac voluptates ignibus mutarentur. (Pan. 52.4-52.6)

Those countless golden images [of Domitian], however, in their overthrow and ruin were offered as sacrifice for the public's delight. It was a joy to strike to the ground those most haughty faces, to attack them with the sword and to vent our rage with axes, as if blood and pain might follow each blow. No one so restrained himself from joy and exultation deferred that he did not seem to find a substitute for vengeance in the mangled and mutilated limbs, and finally the savage and frightful images cast into the flames and melted down, so that from an object of fear and threats they were changed by the flames into something useful and pleasurable for men.  

If we may conclude from such passages that Seneca's De Ira did not exercise absolute control over the reception of indignant passages in Pliny's corpus, we should be cautious in asserting that it did for similar 'sadistic' passages in Juvenal. I will return to the question of Seneca's influence on perceptions of indignation in Chapter 3, but will first conclude with Anderson’s fifth and final point for questioning Juvenal's indignant stance.

Anderson highlights "the irrationality of Juvenal's analysis of Roman decline, especially as applied to the happy eras of Trajan and Hadrian when many a Roman like

---

64 Cp. Juv. 10. 61-64 on the overthrow of Sejanus: *iam strident ignes, iam follibus atque caminis | ardet adoratum populo caput et crepat ingens | Seianus, deinde ex facie toto orbe secunda | fiunt urceoli, pelves, sartago, matellae.*

65 We should note as well that Lucilius' scathing invective still enjoyed widespread popularity in Juvenal's era, and we may similarly wonder whether Stoic views on the indignant speaker caused an informed readership to view Juvenal's model as an undercut speaker. See Quint. Inst. 10.1.93-94 where Lucilius is not only recognized as a popular satirist, but by his adherents he is believed to be the best poet in any genre: *Satura quidem tota nostra est, in qua primus insignem laudem audebat Lucilius quosdam ita deditos sibi adhuc habet amatores ut eum non eiusdem modo operis auctoribus sed omnibus poetis praeferre non dubitent.*
Pliny lived contentedly, and when the whole Roman world enjoyed marked prosperity.\(^{66}\)

To posit the ubiquitous happiness of any given Roman citizen in any era, no matter its prosperity, or to suggest that a satirist would be unable to find a sympathetic audience for social dissent in such an expansive empire, is perhaps hyperbolic.\(^{67}\) Emperors always had their detractors—even Augustus had to fear assassins—and any era will have its critics.\(^{68}\) Furthermore, it is the very influence of 'marked prosperity' on human behavior that often provides fodder for the satirist throughout his first two books, a topic of perennial interest among Roman moralists in the centuries following Rome's expansion of her empire.\(^{69}\)

Pliny's general contentment in the period of Trajan and Hadrian, as portrayed in his epistles, is largely the result of his advancement in the imperial administration during and after the treacherous period of Domitian's reign, but this is scant reason to suspect that his or any other upper class Roman's contentment precluded a satirist—whose personal biography, according to the *persona* theory, is virtually unknown to us—from finding an audience for his social critiques, largely focused as they are on the past to illustrate often timeless themes.\(^{70}\) In fact, both Juvenal and Pliny often focused on the

---


67 Consider, for example, that many Americans consider the prosperous period immediately following World War II as a kind of golden age, yet dissenting voices on social issues are not difficult to find and hardly need citation.

68 See Raaflaub and Samons II on the question of opposition to Augustus: "That there existed opposition under Augustus and that much of it was aimed no less at the new system and individual solutions introduced by Augustus than at the *princeps* himself cannot be doubted" ((1990) 417).

69 E.g. Lucil. 465-6; 467; 472 Hor. *Carm*. 2.15; Liv. 1.9; Sal. *Cat*. 11-16.

70 “To accept Pliny’s words at face value, as omniscient on his contemporary society, and reject Juvenal as a social and political critic on lack of motive is unreasonable and illogical—there was then, as there will always be, plenty of meat for a satirist to get his teeth into" (Iddeng (2000) 110). For the general applicability of Juvenal's critiques, see Highet (1961) 57-8.
period prior to the happy eras of Trajan and Hadrian. While Pliny is most appreciative of his advancement and success under Trajan, particularly in his correspondence with the emperor in book ten of his *Epistles*, he is, like Juvenal, constantly looking back, sometimes voicing strikingly similar social complaints to those found in Juvenal.71

Finally, it is most unlikely that Juvenal's first book was entirely composed during the reign of Trajan.72 We can pinpoint with relative accuracy the publication dates of the five books of *Satires*, but we are much less sure about the span of years taken to compose them. Not only is a good deal of book one most likely composed before the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian, but the five poems that comprise it almost always look back to the period before Trajan's accession—an obsession mirrored in Pliny's correspondences, Tacitus' corpus, and the revenge literature that followed the death of Domitian.

Juvenal's innovation in the satiric genre, in addition to his stated intent to historicize satire with a focus on the famous dead, also extends to the utilization of a discourse strongly influenced by rhetorical theory that stresses and promotes the adoption and efficacy of an indignant voice, precisely in order to gain the confidence and sympathy of one's audience. Extant rhetorical treatises unequivocally stress the importance of an indignant rhetorical mode, and it is precisely this mode that Juvenal explicitly advertises in his programmatic first satire through reference to his oratorical training.

71 These passages will be dealt with more fully in Chapters 3 and 4.

72 “The impression conveyed by the Book as a whole is that some of the material (especially Satires II and IV) may well have been composed in private draft during the reign of Domitian” Green (1998) xvi.
CHAPTER 3
RHETORICAL INDIGNATIO

Est enim finitimus oratori poeta, numeris astrictior paulo, verborum autem licentia liberior, multis vero orandi generibus socius, ac paene par.

Cicero, Orat. 1.16.70

The poet is, in fact, the orator's relative, a little more bounded by rhythm, but nevertheless freer in his use of language; he is the orator's counterpart in many kinds of embellishments, and very nearly identical.

It seems a natural development that Roman Satire would come to adopt explicitly, in Juvenal, the rhetorical element that Quintilian claims was always latent in the satiric genre's specified models:

Si est in insectandis uitiis praecipua, plurimum tamen uirium etiam in ceteris partibus habet. Nam et grandis et elegans et uenusta, et nescio an uilla <poesis>, post Homerum tamen...aut similior sit oratoribus aut ad oratores faciendos aptior. Plures eius auctores, Aristophanes tamen et Eupolis Cratinusque praecipui. (Inst. 10.65-66)

If it [Old Comedy] is remarkable for attacking vice, it also has considerable ability in other respects. For it is grand, elegant and graceful, and I am not sure whether any <poetry>, aside from Homer...is either more similar to oratory or more suited to producing orators. There are many authors of the genre—the best being Aristophanes, Eupolis, and Cratinus.

In addition to Lucilius, Horace and Persius specifically name Old Comedy as the font of their inspiration (Hor. Serm. 1.4.1: Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae / atque alii, quorum comoedia prisca virorum est, / siquis erat dignus describi, quod malus ac fur, / quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui / famosus, multa cum libertate notabant. / hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus, / mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque; Pers. 1.123-126: audaci quicumque adflate Cratino / iratum Eupolidem praegrandi cum sene palles, / aspice et haec, si forte aliquid decoctius audis. / inde uaporata lector mihi ferueat aure). Horace's list of Attic influences tallies precisely with Quintilian's, and Persius expressly states that his ideal readership is that of Old
The link between oratory and Attic Old Comedy is drawn even more tightly by Quintilian's insistence that it sought to correct vice, an interpretation reified by the 4th century CE grammarian Diomedes, who links Old Comedy's purpose with that of Roman Satire.

Juvenal, then, realizes the rhetorical potential of the satiric genre's archetypes, suitable as they are to an orator's education, and applies to it the oratorical theory of indignatio. His employment of rhetorical principles has been amply demonstrated, and yet the ethical quality of his indignatio has remained a contentious issue. Some scholars assert that the moral sentiments of the Satires are in earnest, while others prefer to view Juvenal's satiric enterprise not as a legitimate critique of vice in the tradition of Old Comedy, but as an ironic critique of anger itself, with the satirist's audience safely disengaged and distant from his indignatio.

Although Juvenal's adoption of the indignant style of the rhetorical schools is clear, questions still remain about the ethical quality of the satirist's indignatio. How would Juvenal's audience have responded to an indignant speaker, educated as they were to recognize the rhetorical tropes of indignatio? The thesis that Juvenal seeks to present his indignant satirist as an unsympathetic figure largely relies for its argument on a comparison between the angry tone of the early satires and Seneca's denunciation.

1 It is worth noting that Eupolis is in Persius described as iratus, though the overall purpose of the authors of Old Comedy, according to Quintilian, was to correct vice. While Eupolis is, unfortunately, not extant, it is interesting to note that the playwright was apparently best known for his angry character; Persius, a Stoic himself, does not present this fact as a hindrance to his moral message.

2 *satira dicitur carmen apud Romanos nunc quidem maledicum et ad carpenda hominum uitia archaeae comoediae charactere conpositum, quale scripserunt Lucilius et Horatius et Persius*, GLK 1.485.

3 De Decker (1913); Scott (1927); Anderson (1961); Kenney (1963); Braund (1988); Cairns (2007).


of anger in the *De Ira*. For Anderson, the very fact that Juvenal's indignant satirist vaunts his *indignatio* is enough to condemn the satirist in the eyes of "most Romans in the audience," who would perceive the deficiencies of his character "precisely because he was angry."\(^6\)

In reexamining the application of the *persona* theory to Juvenal's *Satires*, the central purpose of Chapter 1 was to question the assertion of Juvenal's intentionality in distancing himself and his audience from the indignant views espoused by the speaker in his satires. The connection between oratory and satire points to a different and more compelling option. The models of rhetorical indignation reveal the potential appeal of the satirist's presentation of *indignatio* through the applicability of the rhetorical theory of anger, such as survives, from the anonymous author of the *Ad Herennium*,\(^7\) Cicero, Seneca, and Quintilian. If such *indignatio* has a positive appeal, then using Seneca's denunciation of anger as an ethical baseline for understanding its unrepentant adoption in Juvenal's satiric praxis is called into question.

We are relatively well positioned to consider the rhetorician's application of theoretical oratorical principles between Cicero's reign as king of the courts in the first century BCE and Quintilian's staunch adherence to Ciceronian principles in the *Institutio Oratoria* at the end of the first century CE. Each of the aforementioned sources include some discussion of the (in)appropriate application of rhetorical *indignatio* in public speaking. In Cicero we have the unique opportunity to read both the theory and practice of a leading orator, since his corpus offers numerous illustrations of rhetorical

\(^6\) Anderson (1982) 326.

\(^7\) The authorship of the *Ad Herennium*, while attributed to Cicero in antiquity, is doubted and it is now generally believed that Cicero did not write it. Nevertheless, the treatise corresponds in many of its particulars, especially on the matter of the use of *indignatio*, with the *De Inventione*. 
indignatio through the deployment of an indignant speaker, both in forensic and curial contexts.

Cicero had early in his career written on rhetorical principles in his (self-admittedly) immature De Inventione, written perhaps between 91 and 87 BCE, before returning to similar topics in his De Oratore (about 55 BCE). The value of indignatio features prominently in both of these works, which stress the importance of inspiring and inciting magnum odium against one's opponent in the peroration, a position of emphasis. Cicero lists fifteen loci that are appropriate for the employment of indignatio,10 many of which are echoed in the Ad Herennium and which are, as Braund notes, evident in Juvenal's satiric method.11

8 Orat. 1.5.

9 Inv. 1.98: Conclusio est exitus et determinatio totius orationis. Haec habet partes tres: enumerationem, indignationem, questionem.

10 Inv. 1.101-105: (1) stressing the importance of the care taken by those who have the most authority (i.e. immortal gods, the senate) concerning the subject under discussion; (2) employing an amplified indignation to show who is affected by the act under discussion; (3) emphasizing the evil that would result, if everyone acted in the manner of the accused; (4) illustrating that many are awaiting the decision of the case to see what license they are afforded in similar matters; (5) indicating that in other cases, an erroneous decision was changed when the truth was learned, and the wrong decision corrected; but in the case under discussion the decision is unable to be changed; (6) showing that the deed was perpetrated intentionally and with ill-intent; (7) demonstrating the orator's indignation by denouncing the deed in strong language as wicked and tyrannical; (8) claiming that the deed under consideration is unknown even among barbarous tribes and wild beasts. The orator seeks to incite hatred and to rouse violent indignation by proving a violation of sacred relationships has occurred; (9) comparing the deed under discussion with others widely accepted as crimes; the orator then juxtaposes the current deed with those to show how much more shameful it is; (10) recounting the deed with violent denunciation and vivid narration in order to amplify the shame of the act; (11) demonstrating that a deed was committed by one who is least expected to have committed it and who should be in a position to protect against such crimes rather than perpetrate them; (12) expressing indignation in order to stress that an outrage has been committed against the defense first, and that the deed has never been committed against anyone else; (13) claiming that the perpetrator has, through arrogance and haughtiness, added insult to injury; (14) attempting to win the audience's sympathy, the orator asks them to imagine the injury resulting from a deed as their own; (15) claiming that enemies do not even deserve the treatment that the accused has meted out.

11 Braund (1988) 3-5, in fact, identifies nearly all of Cicero's loci in satire 6 alone, though they are evident throughout Juvenal's first book as well.
Juvenal's educated readers would have been familiar with Cicero's rhetorical *loci* and even a general audience would have been conditioned through their own experience in listening to trials and speeches to appreciate the appropriate response that a speaker sought to elicit from their deployment. As with many of Cicero's speeches, Juvenal's first two books are filled with instances of rhetorical indignation that correspond to the precepts of Cicero's treatises. The early satires are synonymous with the rage of *indignatio*, though Juvenal only employs the term twice within his entire corpus, once in his famous declaration that *indignatio* will serve as his muse (1.79) and once again in the fifth satire (5.120), which allows the satirist to strategically place his indignant *loci* at the emphatic opening and conclusion of the first book.

The satirist's scathing depiction of the degeneracy of *amicitia* is a key theme in the fifth satire (as well as the first book generally), and demonstrates several of the rhetorical principles outlined by Cicero. The dramatic setting of the satire is a feast hosted by the wealthy patron Virro; yet, the perspective is that of the poor client Trebius, whom Virro has invited, the satirist claims, merely to fill a vacant couch (*tertia ne vacuo cessaret culcita lecto*, 5.17). The client is made to endure the humiliation that his inferior social status ensures, as he observes the disparity between the dinner presented to the sarcastically named *rex* and his own shabby fare.

---

12 So Braund (1996) 8: "it is clear that Juvenal's speaker expects his audience's sympathy throughout, just as the orator trying to simulate and provoke indignation does, according to Cicero...The convergence of rhetorical theory and practice in this passage [6.643-61] and throughout Juvenal's satires—would have been appreciated by his audience who had received the same grounding as the poet."

13 Cp. 1.135-146 where a gluttonous patron is similarly referred to as *rex*.
Among other benefits, the appropriate payment for a *cliens* was food,\(^{14}\) but the satirist thoroughly scorns the idea that the feast here represented qualifies as fulfilling the obligations of *amicitia*. Trebius' patron, Virro, is expected to look out for the interests of his client, but he and the other *reges* in attendance have instead made Trebius an object of derision in a demeaning perversion of the *amicitia* relationship.\(^{15}\) We may similarly compare Pliny's criticism of hosts who have, by implementing social stratification at meals, turned an opportunity for communal fellowship into an occasion for denigrating lesser "ranked" clients:\(^{16}\):

> Longum est altius repetere nec refert, quemadmodum acciderit, ut homo minime familiaris cenarem apud quendam, ut sibi uidebatur, lautom et diligentem, ut mihi, sordidum simul et sumptuosum. Nam sibi et paucis opima quaedam, ceteris uilia et minuta ponebat. Vinum etiam paruolis lagunculis in tria genera discripserat...aliud sibi et nobis, aliud minoribus amicis (nam gradatim amicos habet), aliud suis nostrisque libertis. (*Ep*. 2.6.1-2.6.2)

It would take too long to relate (and it wouldn't matter anyway), how it came to be that I was dining at a certain man's house, though scarcely known to me, who considered himself urbane and thrifty, but to me, at once unrefined and extravagant. You see, he was serving to himself and an elect few the choicest food, but to others the shabbiest and most meager. He had also assigned the wine, comprised of three classes, to little bottles...some was for himself and for us, some for his lesser "friends" (since he considers his friends graded), and some for his own and our freedmen.

---

\(^{14}\) Juv. 5.12-14.

\(^{15}\) The language of patronage is complex. The difficulty of the terminology is well outlined by Saller (1982). As he demonstrates, the terms *patronus* and *cliens* are relatively rare in literature (though much more substantial in inscriptions), largely due to their restriction in "polite society." The terms *amicus* and *amicitia* are, however, much more common, and this is the terminology that Juvenal employs in the fifth satire (though he does not shy away from using forms of *cliens* several times in his first book, e.g. 1.132, 3.125, 3.188, 5.16, 5.64). The term *amicitia* encompasses a wide variety of exchange-relationships, including one between equals, but as in the case of the fifth satire, "Where the term *amicus* occurs with respect to a friendship between men known to be of unequal status, we can assume a patronage relationship" (15).

\(^{16}\) See Saller (1982) 12, for Pliny's implicit acceptance of the "hierarchical classification of friends," though he "disapproved of some of the manifestations of arrogance encouraged by such classification."
When pressed by a fellow guest whether he approves of such classifications, Pliny responds:

'Eadem omnibus pono; ad cenam enim, non ad notam invito cunctisque rebus exaequo, quos mensa et toro aequaui.' 'Etiamne libertos?' 'Etiam; convictores enim tunc, non libertos puto.' (Ep. 2.6.3-2.6.4)

'I serve the same portions to all; for I, in fact, don't invite guests to dinner in order to insult them by ranking them according to class, and I treat those whom I have invited as equals in table and couch the same in all respects.' 'Even freedmen?' 'Them, too. For then I consider them companions, not freedmen.'

Pliny's letter indicates that Juvenal's presentation of a degraded amicitia relationship is not pure literary fantasy, and Pliny's sentiment is reflected by Juvenal's authorial voice when he breaks into the narrative to directly address the abusing host:

nemo petit, modicis quae mittebantur amicis
a Seneca, quae Piso bonus, quae Cotta solebat largiri; namque et titulis et fascibus olim maior habebatur donandi gloria. solum poscimus ut cenes ciuiliter... (5.108-112)

No one's asking for the things sent to his common "friends" by Seneca, things which good Piso and Cotta used to bestow; for it used to be the case that the renown from giving was considered a greater thing than titles and rods of office. We ask this one thing: that you dine without pretension...

Juvenal here foreshadows the lack of patronage from the elite that is the theme of his seventh satire; the narrator does not here expect Virro to actually be a good (bonus) patron, but he can at least dine as an equal with his guests. The satirist's vignette of the amicitia relationship reveals an uncomfortable tension when the protector becomes the abuser, and thus illustrates Cicero's eleventh locus, in which the orator recommends amplifying a given act that was committed by the person who least of all should have committed it, and who should, in fact, be in a position to protect against abuse.
Trebius must not only stomach his paltry station at the feast, but he must also witness the display of Virro's meat carvers, who serve the purpose of rubbing Trebius' nose in the fact that he will have no share in the meal of the voracious regetes. It is this luxurious display that triggers indignatio:\footnote{17}

\begin{quote}
structorem interea, ne qua indignatio desit, saltantem species et chironomunta\footnote{18} uolanti cultello, donec peragat dictata magistri omnia; nec minimo sane discrimine refert quo gestu lepores et quo gallina secetur. (5.120-124)
\end{quote}

Meanwhile, just so your indignation is not absent, you'll watch the carver whirling and gesticulating with his flying blade, until he completes all the lessons of his instructor; of course, it is a matter of the greatest importance how one carves up the hares and fowl.

The ironic sane acerbically highlights the insult added to Trebius' humiliation, and serves to illustrate the satirist's employment of Cicero's thirteenth locus, which suggests demonstrating that insult has been added to injury (\textit{tertius decimus locus est si cum iniuria contumelia iuncta demonstratur, per quem locum in superbiam et arrogantiam odium concitatur}, Inv. 105). Yet, Trebius' humiliation is not complete without the realization that he has been invited to the feast not to dine with equals, since, as the satirist acidly remarks, it is money alone that makes men amici,\footnote{19} but to provide the evening's entertainment as an unwitting buffoon, just as a monkey performs for an

\footnote{17} Aristotle defines anger, in part, as requiring a real or imagined slight, accompanied by the pleasurable desire for revenge (\textit{Rh.} 1378a.30-32). But as Konstan has noted, the perception of a slight is a complex social event and involves "an appraisal of social roles" and "a judgement of intentions" (Konstan (2006) 43-45), and so accords with Cicero's eleventh locus in which the orator is encouraged to demonstrate that an act was committed intentionally.

\footnote{18} See Anderson (1982) 448, for Juvenal's use of Greek terms as a weapon of indignatio: "The Greek words, therefore, act as the sign and object of his indignation, now used to describe appropriately the conditions of Roman vice, now employed in the rhetorical purpose of \textit{amplificatio.}" As Braund (1996) 296 notes, \textit{chironomunta} conveys scorn.

\footnote{19} Juv. 5.132-134.
apple; there is, after all, nothing so funny as watching a hungry man squirm (nam quae comoedia, mimus quis melior plorante gula?, 5.157-158).

The satirist anticipates Trebius’ explanation of such meager reward for his services—Virro simply needs to save money (forsitan inpensae Virronem parcere credas, 5.156). It is not a matter of money, the satirist insists, but rather Virro’s intentional denigration of his lowly clients that serves the explicit purpose of insulting and mocking them (hoc agit, ut doleas). Just as the meat carver's display added insult to injury and served to illustrate Cicero's thirteenth locus, the satirist's explicit claim that Virro purposely cheats his clients should remind his audience of Cicero's sixth locus, in which the orator is instructed to amplify an insulting deed intentionally committed, in order to inspire indignatio in his auditores (sextus locus est, per quem consulto et de industria factum demonstratur et illud adiungitur, voluntario maleficio veniam dari non oportere, imprudentiae concedi nonnumquam convenire, Inv. 1.102.

Juvenal further adopts descriptio as a technique of amplifying indignatio, an effect that the orator employs to invite the audience into a vivid account of an action and which is carefully crafted to provoke indignatio through simulation of an actual event:

20 5.53-55.

21 Cf. Umbricius’s complaint at 3.147-151: quid quod materiam praebet causasque iocorum / omnibus hic idem, si foeda et scissa lacerna, / si toga sordidula est et rupta calceus alter / pelle patet, uel si consuto uolnere crassum / atque recens linum ostendit non una cicatrix?

22 See Arist. Rh. 1378b.14-15 for the three categories of 'slights' that are an essential component of anger: καταφρόνησις τε καὶ ἐπηρεασμὸς καὶ ὕβρις (disdain, spitefulness, insult). All three apply to the treatment of Trebius, but particularly the second, in which a spiteful man intentionally blocks the wishes of another, not for his own benefit, but solely to prevent the wishes of the other: καὶ ὁ ἐπηρεάζων φαίνεται ὀλιγωρεῖν. ἔστι γὰρ ὁ ἐπηρεασμὸς ἐμποδισμὸς ταῖς βουλήσεσιν μὴ ἦνα τι αὐτῷ ἀλλ’ ἦνα μὴ ἐκεῖνω (1378b.17-20).

23 Cp. Rhet. Her. 2.30.49, where the intentionality of a cruel act is one of ten loci communes for the employment of amplificatio.
Decimus locus est, per quem omnia, quae in negotio gerundo acta sunt quaeseque rem consequi solent, exputamus acriter et criminose et diligenter, ut agi res et geri negotium videatur rerum consequentium enumeratione. (Rhet. Her. 2.49)

The tenth commonplace occurs when we keenly, vehemently, and thoroughly examine everything which has occurred in conducting the matter at hand and which typically accompanies the situation, so that the deed seems to be done and carried out by the recounting of the attendant situation.

We may similarly compare Cicero, who expressly requires the orator to develop this

_ locus with palpable _indignatio:__

Decimus locus est, per quem omnia, quae in negotio gerundo acta sunt quaeseque post negotium consecuta sunt, cum unius cuiusque indignatione et criminatione colligimus et rem verbis quam maxime ante oculos eius, apud quem dicitur, ponimus, ut id, quod indignum est, proinde illi videatur indignum, ac si ipse interfuerit ac praesens viderit. (Inv. 1.104)

The tenth commonplace is one by which we assemble all the things that have occurred in carrying out the deed at hand and which followed after the deed, when with indignation and the vehement denunciation of each action we arrange and place the matter by our language as much as possible before the very eyes of the judge before whom we are pleading, so that a shameful deed may accordingly seem so to him, just as if he were present and witnessed the deed himself.

The orator is advised to indignantly depict what is shameful (indignum) in an effort to bring before the very eyes of his audience (ante oculos) stimuli specifically designed to incite anger and hatred. This very tactic is evident throughout Juvenal's first two books, as he begins his collection with the famous image of his satirist cataloging the vice and social corruption of Rome (nonne libet medio ceras inplere capaces quadriuio..., 1.63-64). The satirist parades before the audience's eyes a corrupt forger

---

24 Rhet. Her. 3.13.23: _Amplificatio est oratio quae aut in iracundiam inducit, aut ad misericordiam trahit auditoris animum...Amplificatio dividitur in cohortationem et conquestionem. Cohortatio est oratio quae aliquod peccatum amplificans auditorem ad iracundiam adducit._
of wills, carried along in his litter, and a *potens matrona*, who has become a modern day *Lucusta*, skilled in the arts of poison.

In the first and fourth satires the satirist likewise utilizes *descriptio* to defame Crispinus, the Egyptian upstart, who has roused the satirist's ire through his rise to prominence under Domitian. In both instances it is the detail of the action that provokes *indignatio*. We are invited to envision the foreigner showing off his gold ring, an indication of his status as an equestrian, while hitching up his Tyrian purple cape over his shoulder. We again meet Crispinus in satire 4 (*ecce iterum Crispinus*), where the satirist brings before the eyes a Vestal virgin's corruption. The image of the Vestal still wearing her sacred band during Crispinus' intercourse with her is the key to provoking *indignatio* in the short vignette, as it symbolizes a foreigner's corruption of a sacred and ancient Roman office.

In the fifth satire *descriptio* again excites *indignatio* in addition to the various *loci communes* illustrated above. One dish after another parades past Trebius on their way to the *rex* and his *amici*. A large section of the satire is taken up with this catalogue of inequality, but one image in particular continues the thread of satire 4. Virro, now termed *dominus* in a variation on his characterization as *rex*, is served lobster in terms that highlight Trebius' exclusion:

---

25 See Brown (1983) for the litter as a satiric symbol designed to provoke *indignatio*.

26 Turnus, a post-Neronian satirist, refers to Lucusta in a passage recorded in the scholia on Juv. 1.71. The passage seems to indicate that Juvenal was not the only satirist whose program had a penchant for looking back: *ex quo Caesareas suboles † horrida Lucusta / occidit cura sui verna nota † Neronis*.

27 1.26-30: *cum pars Niliacae plebis, cum uerna Canopi Crispinus Tyrias umero reuocante lacernas unentilet aestiuum digitis sudantibus aurum nec sufferre queat maioris pondera gemmae, difficile est saturam non scribere*. For Tyrian purple as a rich garment, whose use was sometimes restricted, see Courtney (1980) 90.

28 *corruptor et idem incestus, cum quo nuper vittata iacebat sanguine adhuc vivo terram subitura sacerdos*, 4.8-10.
aspice quam longo distinguat pectore lancem
quae fertur domino squilla, et quibus undique saepta
asparagis qua despiciat conuiuia cauda, dum uenit excelsi manibus sublata
ministri. (5.80-83)

Just look how the lobster distinguishes the tray with its long breast, as it is
borne to the Master, and with what asparagus it is everywhere guarded,
with a tail that looks down upon the guests, while it is carried in on high by
the hands of the lofty servant.

The language of exclusion (saepta, despiciat, excelsi, sublata) echoes that of the fourth
satire, in which Domitian has secluded himself in his Alban estate, leaving the
marginalized senators to loiter on his front step, watching as a monstrous turbot hastens
on its way inside to the dominus. After the fisherman caught the turbot, he hastens to
Domitian's Alban estate (who would be so mad as to sell or buy it when imperial
informers are watching?) before making his way through the throng of senators and
gaining easy access to Domitian's door:

obstitit intranti miratrix turba parumper.
ut cessit, facili patuerunt cardine ualuae;
exclusi spectant admissa obsonia patres.
itur ad Atriden. (4.62-65)

---

29 The language of domination is a continual presence throughout Juvenal's early satires and serves to
illustrate just how easily the patronus/cliens relationship could shift to that of dominus/servus. Domitian
sits atop the pyramidal amicitia relationship and is mockingly referred to alternately as Atriden and
dominus. Domitian in his arrogance had adopted the inflated title "lord and god" (dominus et deus)—
making himself an easy target for satire (Suet. 13.1-2; Cass. 67.13.4). Augustus and his successors had
rejected this title precisely because it uncomfortably introduced the notion of a master/slave relationship.

30 Juv. 4.46-48: quis enim proponere talem / aut emere auderet, cum plena et litora multo / delatore
forent?

31 The satirist hyperbolically depicts the omnipresent informers scouring even the shores and seaweed for
such treasures as the fisherman's turbot, asserting ownership over the fish by claiming it as an escapee
from the emperor's personal fishpond (4.46-56). The mockery of Domitian's greed—however
exaggerated—finds correspondence in Pliny, who contrasts Domitian's need to own everything he sets
his eyes upon with Trajan's munificence: Sed cum rebus tuis ut participes perfuamur, quae habemus
ipsi, quam propria quam nostra sunt! Non enim exturbatis prioribus dominis omne stagnum, omnem
lacum, omnem etiam saltum immensa possessione circumuenis, nec unius oculis flumina montes maria
deserviunt. Est quod Caesar non suum uideat, tandemque imperium principis quam patrimonium maius
est, Pan. 50.
A marveling crowd for a short time blocked his path. When it yielded, the double doors opened on easy hinges; shut out are the senators, watching as the meal is granted entrance. It makes its way to King Atrides.

While the confiscated turbot is allowed an easy entrance (facile cardine) to "King Agamemnon" (Atriden), the senators are locked out (exclusi), permitted merely to look on (spectant) at this leviathan of a turbot as Trebius had gazed after Virro's lobster (aspice). Through *descriptio*, Juvenal's audience is transported into these two scenes, as if taking place before their eyes, and we watch Trebius and the senators gaze after the luxurious fare of their respective "masters." Just as Juvenal's *descriptio* vividly portrayed Domitian secluded in his Alban complex and consuming the magnificent turbot in isolation, aloof from the throng of senators lingering on his doorstep, so too Virro's *cena* serves to differentiate by defining the social stratification of *reges* and *clientes*.

Juvenal's satire, then, employs the orator's technique of *descriptio* as only one means of implementing an indignant voice. But the orator could also borrow from satire to cement his indignant *persona*. It was precisely his desire to appeal to his audience's

---

32 Pliny similarly describes Domitian's exclusion (exclusa) of the *turba legationum*, who have been relegated to the palace steps in contrast to Trajan's sober and responsible rule (*Pan*. 79). He further highlights Domitian's isolation as a particular fault and indicates that Juvenal's corresponding details here align with contemporary criticism of Domitian's exclusivity and would likely have found a broadly sympathetic audience (*Pan*. 49). For Pliny, the act of dining alone marks the tyrant and we find this practice similarly criticized throughout satiric literature, particularly at Pers. 3.98-102 and Juv. 1.140-144, where the glutton's death brings delight to his angry "friends" (*ducitur iratis plaudendum funus amicis*). See further Suet. *Dom*. 3 for the famous story of Domitian's affinity for secluding himself for hours at a time, stabbing flies. This prompted Vibius Crispus to quip, when asked if Domitian was alone, that there was not even a fly (*ne muscam quidem*) in the room with him. Juvenal's language of exclusion also recalls the theme of the *paraklausithyron* in (especially) Augustan elegy in which the locked-out lover is denied entrance to his lover's door no matter what his complaints (e.g. Catul. 67; Hor. *Od*. 1.25, 3.10, Tib. 1.2, Prop. 1.16). Juvenal's depiction of the "easy hinges" (*facil...cardine*) seems an echo of Horace (*Parcius iunctas quattuor fenestras / iactibus crebris iuvenes protervi / nec tibi somnos adimunt amatque / ianua limen, / quae prius multum facilis movebat / cardines. audis minus et minus iam*).

33 Juv. 4.144-45.
sense of *indignatio* that had compelled Cicero in his denunciation of Antony to characterize himself as *iratus* and link himself with Lucilius, the hero of outspoken satire, in the *Philippics*,\(^{34}\) one of the final examples from the Republican period of that frankness of speech so often prized by the satirists. Cicero's deployment of the quintessential satirist is here an attempt to appropriate for his own purpose Lucilius' identity as the paradigm of *simplicitas* and aggression in attacking Antony.

Further, it is this very Lucilian *simplicitas* whose loss under the principate is embarrassingly highlighted by Juvenal's satirist after a century of silence, when an apparent interlocutor asks the satirist how he can possibly employ the old fashioned Lucilian candor in light of the horrors that the principate has introduced:

> unde illa priorum scribendi quocumque animo flagrante liberet simplicitas? "cuius non audeo dicere nomen? quid refert dictis ignoscat Mucius an non?"
pone Tigillinum, taeda lucebis in illa qua stantes ardent qui fixo gutture fumant, et latum media sulcum deducit harena.' (1.151-157)

Where is that honesty of your predecessors, who wrote whatever their blazing spirit desired? "Whose name do I dare not utter?" What do I care whether Mucius pardons my words or not?" Write, "Tigillinus," and you will blaze on that torch, burning, like those who with throat fixed stand smoking, and you will trace a broad line through the middle of the arena.

While Cicero's *simplicitas* did in fact lead to a similar fate (execution at the hands of Antony) and should give us pause before hastening to emphasize the literary artificiality of the satirist's picture,\(^{35}\) what is relevant here is that Cicero enacts long-held theoretical

---

\(^{34}\) *Phil.* 13.15: *odimus, irati pugnamus, extorqueri manibus arma non possunt.* Cicero here adapts Lucilius, whom he quotes in full at *Tusc.* 4.48: *odi hominem, iratus pugno...usque adeo studio atque odio illius ecferor ira.*

\(^{35}\) Cp. Juvenal's more specific reference to the culpability of *simplicitas* in the death of Cicero, which is imagined as a direct result of his eloquence: *ingenio manus est et ceruix caesa, nec umquam sanguine causidici maduerunt rostra pusilli. 'o fortunatam natam me consule Romam:' Antoni gladios potuit*
principles stressing the tactical deployment of rhetorical indignation. Both rhetorician and satirist reach back to the font of Lucilian aggression to establish their authority as outraged speakers and appropriately adopt the mood of *indignatio* in an effort to tap into a communal and sympathetic anger.

It is hardly likely, therefore, that rhetoric’s use of *indignatio* would be overlooked or brushed aside as a casual matter that pits the vaunted outrage against the speaker himself. A century after Cicero's death, Seneca in his *De Ira* clearly demonstrates that the ethical quality of anger was part of an ongoing and by no means settled discussion among Roman rhetoricians and philosophers. As Anderson notes, Seneca is largely concerned in this treatise with angry acts, rather than words, but the rhetorician’s employment of *indignatio* also indicates that words are not so easily distinguished from acts.

While Aristotle believed ὀργή (*ira*) to be a potentially positive force, even a necessity, and allowed for its use when a matter needed to be treated with vigorous

---

*contemnere si sic omnia dixisset. ridenda poemata malo quam te, conspicuae diuina Philippica famae, uolueris a prima quae proxima, 10.120-126.* Juvenal's satirist asserts that the dangers of outspokenness, here represented by the tortures inflicted by Tigillinus, are not confined to the reigns of one emperor, and that these dangers cast a long shadow, even during the apparently "happy" reign of Trajan. The history of the principate made abundantly clear that the relatively mild rule of a Vespasian or Titus, whom Suetonius records with the highest accolades (*Tit. 1*), could backslide into the harsh autocracy of a Domitian.


37 For speech act theory, in which language is seen as 'performative', see Austin (1962). Cp. Eagleton (2008) 103: "Literature may appear to be describing the world...but its real function is performative: it uses language within certain conventions in order to bring about certain effects in the reader. It achieves something in the saying."

38 See Arist. *NE* 1126a 4-6 for the philosopher's insistence that feeling and expressing anger against those guilty of instigating that righteous anger is a necessity. To neglect the expression of anger is, in Aristotle’s view, a fault. See also *Rh.* 1380a1-a5 for the injunction that the orator must incite anger in his audience to produce a positive outcome: δήλον δ’ ὅτι δεόταν κατασκευάζειν τῷ λόγῳ τοιούτους οἱ οὐντες ὀργίλως ἔχουσιν, καὶ τοὺς ἡμαντίους τούτοις ἐνέχοις ὄντας ἐφ’ οὐς ὀργίζονται, καὶ τοιούτους οὐος ὀργίζονται. Cp. *Rh.* 1419b: δήλων ὄντων καὶ οἷα καὶ ἡλίκα, εἰς τὰ τάθη ἁγείν τόν ἄκροστην. ταῦτα δ’ ἐστιν
passion (*ad omne, quodcumque calore aliquo gerendum est*), Seneca argues against its employment in any situation, unless artificial. That is, he allows for the rhetorical presentation of *indignatio* as a valid means of persuasion, but the orator must ensure that his production is an artfully contrived anger that does not affect his inner *tranquillitas* and does not permit this most dangerous emotion to penetrate and overthrow his mind:

"Orator' inquit 'iratus aliquando melior est.' Immo imitatus iratum; nam et histriones in pronuntiando non irati populum mouent, sed iratum bene agentes; et apud iudices itaque et in contione et ubicunque alieni animi ad nostrum arbitrium agendi sunt, modo iram, modo metum, modo misericordiam, ut alii incutiamus, ipsi simulabimus, et saepe id quod ueri affectus non effecissent effecit imitatio affectuum. 40 (*Dial. 4.17.1*)

'The orator', he says [Seneca's imagined interlocutor] is sometimes better when enraged.' Not so, but he is rather better when imitating the angry man; for actors rouse their audience in reciting their lines not when angry, but when acting the angry man well; just so, among judges and in the assembly and wherever our audience must be brought around to our opinion, we ourselves must sometimes simulate anger, sometimes dread, and at other times pity, in order to instill these emotions in others. Often, the imitation of passion has accomplished that which true passion has not.

We are here presented with the somewhat duplicitous motivation of the ideal Stoic orator, manipulating and driving to anger the masses, who are apparently ignorant of, or

---

39 Sen. *Dial*. 5.3.5-5.3.6.
40 See also 4.14.1: *Numquam itaque iracundia admittenda est, aliquando simulanda, si segnes audientium animi concitandi sunt, sicut tarde consurgentis ad cursum equos stimuli facibusque subditis excitamus. Aliquando incitendus est iis metus apud quos ratio non proficit.*
at least uninterested in, achieving the Stoic ideal of disavowing anger; we might otherwise expect them to be on their guard against submitting to this very emotion, which the Stoic orator denies for himself. Seneca's orator seeks to create a sympathetic bond with his audience by appearing *iratus*, and thereby inspiring the vice of true *ira*, without himself yielding to the dangers of the angry impulse.\(^{41}\)

From an oratorical standpoint, Antonius (d. 87 BCE), the famous rhetorician and character in Cicero's *De Oratore*, argues against the artificial application of *indignatio*, in one of many points of departure from Stoic doctrine. Antonius declares that the orator must necessarily embody any emotion, specifically anger, that he wishes to convey:

Neque fieri potest ut doleat is, qui audit, ut oderit, ut invideat, ut pertimescat aliquid, ut ad fletum misericordiamque deducatur, nisi omnes illi motus, quos orator adhibere volet iudici, in ipso oratore impressi esse atque inusti videbuntur...de me autem causa nulla est cur apud homines prudentissimos atque amicissimos mentiar: non me hercule umquam apud iudices [aut] dolorem aut misericordiam aut invidiam aut odium dicendo excitare volui quin ipse in commovendis iudicibus eis ipsis sensibus, ad quos illos adducere vellem, per moverer; neque est enim facile perficere ut irascatur ei, cui tu velis, iudex, si tu ipse id lente ferre videare; neque ut oderit eum, quem tu velis, nisi te ipsum flagrantem odio ante viderit...nulla mens est tam ad comprehendendam vim oratoris parata, quae possit incendi, nisi ipse inflammatus ad eam et ardens accesserit. (Orat. 189-190)

It is impossible for your audience to feel indignation, hatred, scorn, or to fear something, so that they are led to tears or pity, unless all of those emotions, which the orator desires to provoke in the judge, are imprinted in the orator himself and seem indelibly branded...As for me, however, there is no reason why I should deceive my most dear and wise friends: at no point have I, by Hercules, ever sought to rouse in pleading before jurors either indignation, pity, hostility, or hatred without myself, in stirring the judges, being thoroughly moved by those emotions to which I wished to lead them; it is not an easy thing to bring about a judge's anger at your intended target, if you yourself seem to treat the matter lightly; nor is it easy to get him to hate the

\(^{41}\) Aristotle also treats the definition and causes of anger in order to facilitate the manipulation of the orator's audience by using anger to form a bond against a given target: δήλον δ' ὅτι δεότα ἐν κατασκευάζειν τῷ λόγῳ τοιούτως οἴοι ὄντες ὀργίλως ἔχουσιν, καὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους τούτοις ἐνόχους ὄντας ἐφ' οἷς ὀργίζονται, καὶ τοιούτοις οἰοῖς ὀργίζονται, *Rhet.* 1380a.1-5.
man whom you wish him to hate, unless he sees you yourself burning with hatred first...no one's mind, which has the potential to be inflamed, is so prepared to grasp the force of an orator, unless the orator is himself inflamed and ablaze with passion.

In Antonius' view, the orator not only rejects the mere imitation of the emotions he is trying to inspire, but is actually stirred by them more than his audience.\textsuperscript{42} The conception of anger as inspiration is what leads Sallust, for example, to attribute the excellence (\textit{luculentam}) of Cicero's First Catilinarian to anger (\textit{ira}), a speech that was "useful to the state."\textsuperscript{43} Antonius explicitly recommends embodying emotions that Seneca specifically denounces and refuses to deceive his own educated friends by a mere simulation of indignation (\textit{dolor}) or hatred (\textit{odium})—friends certainly familiar with the Stoic disavowal of anger. We may similarly expect that at least a part of Juvenal's audience was familiar with Stoic doctrine—a key lynchpin in Anderson's argument that they viewed the satirist unsympathetically due to his angry presentation. If Antonius, or orators who pleaded in his style, presented their oratory as indignant and angry speakers, fully bent on inciting hatred, while yet maintaining the goodwill and sympathy of educated friends familiar with Stoic doctrine on anger, what evidence do we have that Juvenal's audience would have denounced the satirist's indignation, presented in a clearly rhetorical style?

Further, although Antonius expresses an appreciation for the fact that of the philosophical schools, Stoicism alone addresses the importance of eloquence, he

\textsuperscript{42} Orat. 2.191-192.

\textsuperscript{43} Sal. Cat. 31.6-31.7: \textit{tum M. Tullius consul, sive praesentiam eius timens sive ira conmotus, orationem habuit luculentam atque utilem rei publicae, quam postea scriptam edidit.}
ultimately dismisses the Stoic as an ideal orator precisely because he is alienated from the reality of most Romans:44

Hic nos igitur Stoicus iste nihil adiuvat, quoniam, quem ad modum inveniam quid dicam, non docet; atque idem etiam impedit, quod et multa reperit, quae negat ullo modo posse dissolvi, et genus sermonis adfert non liquidum, non fusum ac profluens, sed exile, aridum, concisum ac minutum, quod si qui probabit, ita probabit, ut orаторi tamen aptum non esse fateatur; haec enim nostra oratio multitudinis est auribus accommodanda, ad oblectandos animos, ad impellendos, ad ea probanda, quae non aurificis statera, sed populari quadam trutina examinantur. (Orat. 2.159)

That Stoic [Diogenes] is therefore of no use to us, since he does not teach how I may discover what to say in pleading; in fact, he even impedes my oratory, because he discovers many things which he says there is no way to resolve, and offers a kind of speech that lacks clarity, fluidity, and abundance; is feeble, dry, hampered, and concerned with minute knowledge; if someone approves this style, that is fine so long as he admits that it is nevertheless not suited to the orator. In fact, this oratory of ours must be suited to the ears of the majority, to entertaining their minds, to urging them on, and approving those things that are weighed not on a goldsmith’s scale, but on what are essentially the people’s scales.

Antonius criticizes the Stoic oratorical style by illustrating its inability to save Rutilius Rufus, one of its own members, from condemnation, when, Antonius argues, a more embellished style would have won the case. Rutilius had himself condemned the employment of emotional pleading, despite its efficacy, and Antonius points out the disjuncture between philosophy and effective oratory, asserting that the Stoic manner is not only ineffective but actually hinders the case. Antonius goes as far as to deride the Stoics as a kind of police force over oratorical style:

Nunc talis vir amissus est, dum causa ita dicitur, ut si in illa commenticia Platonis civitate res ageretur. Nemo ingemuit, nemo in clamavit patronorum, nihil cuiquam doluit, nemo est questus, nemo rem publicam imploravit,

44 Cp. Iddeng (2000) 118 on Juvenal’s employment of rhetorical indignatio: “Even if we follow Anderson, assuming that Seneca did not appreciate a speaker playing on anger or indignation, what would we expect a satirist to do who wants to make his case; to follow prudent advice from a temperate philosopher [Seneca] or a vigorous pointer from an experienced rhetor [Cicero]?"
nemo supplicavit; quid multa? pedem nemo in illo iudicio supplosit, credo, ne Stoicis renuntiareetur. (Orat. 1.230-231)

Now such a man [Rutilius] has been lost, the reason being that his case was pled just as if the matter were debated in Plato's imaginary state. None of his defenders cried out in anguish, no one shouted, no one expressed indignation at anything, no one protested, or invoked the state, and no one humbly sought petition; put simply, no one stamped their foot in that trial, I think, because they feared to be reported to the Stoics!

A little bit of emotion, a little bit of foot stomping, could have saved Rutilius, Antonius argues, but the orator feared being reported to the Stoics for using such emotional tactics.

The question over how Juvenal’s audience would have reacted to the satirist is best framed within the debate between the orator and the Stoic over the value of indignatio. From which perspective would the audience view the “angry Juvenal,” philosophical or oratorical? Even Seneca is, in fact, conscious throughout the De Ira of Antonius' criticism that Stoic views on anger are not predominant among his contemporaries. It is questionable whether Juvenal or his audience would have particularly subscribed to Seneca's disapproval of anger any more than they would have agreed that the proper response to the tyrant is to commit suicide,45 or that one should meet his father's murder or his mother's rape not with anger, but with a cool detachment that seeks vengeance dispassionately, and solely because justice demands it.46 These views, while perhaps ideal, were an unlikely reality for most Romans. Seneca is quite explicit that it is only the very few who can attain the ideal state of Stoic tranquility that

45 A viewpoint specifically repudiated by Tacitus: sciant, quibus moris est inlicita mirari, posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse, obsequiumque ac modestiam, si industria ac vigor adsint, eo laudis excedere, quo plerique per abrupta, sed in nullum rei publicae usum < nisi > ambitiosa morte inclaruerunt, Ag. 42.4.

46 Dial. 1.12.1-3.
he recommends. Therefore, it is likely that the majority would react from the more pragmatic, experiential perspective, to the persuasive style of indignatio as present in rhetoric.

Closer to Juvenal's era, Quintilian takes a different view from Seneca and is more in line with Antonius' view that the orator should embody ira and indignatio in their efforts to rouse an audience's emotions. Quintilian insists that in order to truly convince a judge the orator must yield to and participate in the required emotion he seeks to arouse in his audience:

Summa enim, quantum ego quidem sentio, circa mouendos adfectus in hoc posita est, ut moueamur ipsi. Nam et luctus et irae et indignationis aliquando etiam ridicula fuerit imitatio, si uerba uultumque tantum, non etiam animum accommodarimus. Quid enim aliud est causae ut lugentes uitate in recenti dolore disertissime quaedam exclamare uideantur, et ira nonnumquam indoctis quoque eloquentiam faciat, quam quod illis inest uis mentis et ueritas ipsa morum? (Inst. 6.2.26)

The heart of this issue of rousing the emotions, as far as I am concerned, lies in this—that we are moved ourselves. In fact, the imitation of grief, anger, and indignation sometimes will appear absurd, if we will have fit our words and visage alone, and not our mind [to the required emotion]. What other reason is there that mourners in fresh grief seem capable of the most learned sentiments, and anger sometimes makes even the unlearned eloquent, than the vitality of their mind and the frankness of their manner?

Whereas for Seneca, any acquiescence to anger beyond mere simulation is dangerous for the orator, since anger is ultimately uncontrollable, the emotions Quintilian specifically recommends for the orator's use when necessary are ira and indignatio,

---

47 Dial. 4.10.6.

48 See also 11.3.61-62: sed cum sint alii ueri adfectus, alii ficti et imitati, ueri naturaliter erumpunt, ut dolentium irascentium indignantium, sed carent arte ideoque sunt disciplina et ratione formandi. Contra qui effinguntur imitatione, arte habent; sed hi carent natura, ideoque in iis primum est bene adfici et concipere imagines rerum et tamquam ueris moueri.

precisely those emotions Juvenal uses to incite his audience. The argument certainly implies that an audience, far from being repulsed by these emotions, is more likely to be persuaded by them. Quintilian further suggests that anger can inspire rhetorical skill (eloquentia), just as Juvenal's satirist claims indignatio as the moving force behind his satire (si natura negat, facit indignatio versum).\(^{50}\) The Satires, then, are deeply imbued with the recognized rhetorical principles of Rome's leading theoreticians, principles that the poet employs as an arsenal at the service of his indignatio.\(^{51}\)

In his persuasive treatment of the influence of Quintilian's rhetorical theory on Juvenal's satiric enterprise, Anderson wisely leaves unresolved the question of Juvenal's direct tutelage under the rhetorician, but cogently argues for the general influence of the sentiments contained in the Institutio Oratoria, which must have codified widely held rhetorical principles.\(^{52}\) By classifying Juvenal's early satires as vituperatio, a sub-category of the rhetorical technique of the genus demonstrativum, rather than as suasoriae, Anderson draws a convincing link between the tenets of ancient rhetoricians and Juvenal's unique satiric approach.

Juvenal's first two books have more in common with Cicero's In Pisonem, Quintilian's default text for illustrating the principles of vituperatio, than they do with the style of Sermones that Horace applied to the ever-mutable satiric genre. Horace's subtle "chats" disarm its readers as it charmingly works to privately correct vice, prompting Persius to imagine Horace "playing around the heart" after sneaking into his

\(^{50}\) Juv. 1.79.

\(^{51}\) Crassus in the De Oratore also praises the craft of the orator for its ability to take vengeance: Quid autem tam necessarium, quam tenere semper arma, quibus vel tectus ipse esse possis vel provocare integer vel te ulcisci lacesitus? (Orat. 1.32).

\(^{52}\) "Juvenal and Quintilian" in Anderson (1982) 396-486.

Juvenal, by contrast, reinventing the genre for his time, gives a nod to Horace's satiric program53 but ultimately rejects the format of the *Sermones*, opting instead for a self-admittedly rhetorical style far from subtle, with all the exaggeration and self-professed *indignatio* of Cicero's *Philippics*.

Within this wider context of rhetorically influenced satire, we may return to the ethical question of the satirist's adoption of *indignatio* with which we began. Anderson suggests that Juvenal's audience distanced themselves from his palpable indignation based on the fact that the satirist admits his *indignatio* in his employment of denunciatory invective, an emotion contrary to Stoic ethics, which stresses disengagement from one's passions. Yet, Anderson also refers to the Stoic imperative that the orator must contain his own emotions and simultaneously "provoke sympathetic anger" from his audience.54 But if most Romans in Juvenal's audience viewed the satirist unsympathetically precisely because he was angry, would they not also view the orator's professed anger unsympathetically? This would require an audience to react in opposite ways to what are essentially the same stimuli. What evidence do we have to suggest that they viewed the orator with a sympathetic anger, if "most" shun the emotion altogether? Even assuming that Seneca was not read by the learned of Juvenal's time, as Quintilian suggests,55 or that his philosophical views were not

53 *haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna?*, Juv. 1.51.
55 Quintilian's criticism of Seneca stems primarily from the faults of his style rather than his moral philosophy, which, Quintilian states, appealed to the young, but which prevented the approval of the
undercut by his reputation as a hypocrite,\textsuperscript{56} Seneca's views in the \textit{De Ira} were unlikely to have been a watershed event, as Stoic views on anger were well known prior to its publication;\textsuperscript{57} yet, this fact did not prevent Cicero or the anonymous author of the \textit{Ad Herennium} from teaching the provocation of hatred (\textit{odium}) in an indignant style against a specific target in order to elicit a sympathetic anger.

It is, therefore, more plausible that Juvenal presents a perspective that is not in keeping with the ideal tranquil state of the Stoic than that he wished to entertain his philosophical readers with a flamboyant depiction of an unsympathetic \textit{indignatio}. There does not seem to be a direct correlation between the \textit{De Ira} and Juvenal's early satires beyond the demonstration that Seneca proffers the Stoic position on the value of anger, while Juvenal presents an indignant voice. Even more to the point, as we have seen, the existence of Stoic views on anger prior to and contemporaneous with Cicero does not prevent the orator from identifying himself as \textit{iratus} and allying his views with Lucilius, the paradigm of hostile aggression, in an effort to win the sympathies of his audience.

Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that Juvenal himself sought to impart Stoic ethics in his first two books, especially when we consider that he makes Stoicism one of the targets of his satire as does Horace, his fellow satirist, who ends his

\begin{footnote}{learned: Velles eum suo ingenio dixisse, alieno iudicio: nam si aligua contempsisset, si ſparum ſ non concupisset, si non omnia sua amasset, si rerum pondera minutissimis sententii non fregisset, consensu potius eruditorum quam puerox rum amore comprobaretur, 10.1.130-131.}
\end{footnote}

\textsuperscript{56} Cass. 61.10.1-6: ὃτι ὁ Σενέκας αἰτίαν ἔσχε, καὶ ἐνεκλήθη ἄλλα τα καὶ ὃτι ὁ Ἀγριππίνη συνεγίγνετο· οὐ γάρ ἀπέχρησεν αὐτῷ τὴν ἤολιαν μοιχεύσα, οὐδὲ βελτιῶν ἐκ τῆς φυγῆς ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ Ἀγριππίνη τοιαύτῃ τε οὐσία καὶ τοιούτων υἱῶν ἔχουσί ἐπηλπισίαζεν. οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τούτῳ ἄλλα καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις πάντα τὰ ἐγαντίωτα σι ἐφίλοσοφείς τοῖς ἡλέγχθη.

\textsuperscript{57} E.g. Cic. \textit{Tusc.} Bks. 4-5.
first three satires with critiques of Stoics.\textsuperscript{58} Rather, just as Cicero tactfully criticizes the rigidity of Cato's Stoicism for its departure from reality in the Pro Murena,\textsuperscript{59} there is similarly a marked dissonance between the Stoic views on anger expressed in the De Ira and the prevalent hatred that marks the literary sources of Juvenal's social environment in the post-Domitianic period.

Anderson's discussion of the De Ira amply demonstrates that the ethical value of anger was a subject of continual contestation and that there were likely some readers, partial to Stoic doctrine, who may have been alienated from the fierce indignatio of the satirist.\textsuperscript{60} Similarly, Quintilian states approximately sixty-five years following the publication of the De Ira, and contemporaneously with Juvenal (though deceased before Juvenal begins to publish), that there were many orators who used an abusive style (12.10.73-4), a fact which, while not to Quintilian's taste, should be taken to mean that there were vigorous disagreements about the ethical value of an abusive approach rather than that these speakers intended to undercut their public personae as a result of their educated audience's familiarity with Stoic philosophy. Anderson's discussion clearly elucidates the main tenets of Seneca's De Ira and successfully demonstrates the Stoic aversion to anger. Yet, a clear link between the De Ira and Juvenal's intent to dramatize its principles in his early satires through an undercut speaker remains elusive.

\textsuperscript{58} Juv. 2.1-15; 19-21. While Horace and Persius are more prone to self-criticism, Juvenal notoriously provides little "autobiographical" material. Satirists, then, are generally not averse to highlighting their own foibles (perhaps as a method of winning their audience's sympathy), but this fact does not prevent Horace from criticizing the rigidity of the Stoics' positions nor Juvenal from criticizing their hypocritical moralizing.

\textsuperscript{59} Accessit istuc doctrina non moderata nec mitis sed, ut mihi videtur, paulo asperior et durior quam aut veritas aut natura patitur, Mur. 60-61.

\textsuperscript{60} "Anger in Juvenal and Seneca" in Essays on Roman Satire, 1982.
By confining the interpretation of Juvenal's indignant satirist to the application of Stoic views on anger, we denigrate the interpretive value of the consistent resonance of the satirist's technique throughout each of the extant theoretical works on the orator's craft from Cicero, the anonymous author of the *Ad Herennium*, and Quintilian. All of these authors stress the importance of hyperbolic and denunciatory invective, specifically intended to inspire the *indignatio* of their audience in an effort to drive them to the speaker's conclusions. Rather than viewing all professions of *indignatio* through the framework of Stoic views of anger, Antonius in the *De Oratore* specifically rejects the efficacy of Stoic values when it comes to producing effective oratory. Stoic ethics do not prevent Antonius or Cicero from presenting themselves as indignant speakers, ablaze with anger. It seems contrary to the facts of Cicero's success that his audience was unsympathetic to the speaker when he specifically characterizes himself as *iratus*. Furthermore, according to Antonius, this anger must not be the artificial mask that Seneca would later specifically demand of his ideal orator. Antonius' orator functions as a conduit possessed of the given emotion that he seeks to inspire in his audience.

The interpretation of Juvenal's satirist as an intentionally undercut speaker as a natural result of his *indignatio* not only downplays the consistent demand for this emotion in the rhetorical treatises discussed in this chapter, but it also inadequately treats the persistent and palpable anger that is a key theme throughout Juvenal's contemporaries by marginalizing the contextualization of Juvenal's appearance on the literary scene within the coincidence of post-Domitianic revenge literature. The fact that Juvenal, more than any other extant Roman satirist, puts historical themes at the front and center of his first book and makes a point of drawing on historical topics for his
moral *exempla* should invite comparisons between the attitudes of his satires and the historical accounts of his contemporaries. Satire is undoubtedly not history, and yet, there are consistent affinities between the satirist's themes of a shared servility and silence that also mark the pages of his contemporaries. These themes provide a thread by which we may trace a common anger and its attendant desire for vengeance (albeit deferred), often expressed in similarly indignant tones, as Chapter 4 contends.
CHAPTER 4
SERVILITY AND SILENCE

Dedimus profecto grande patientiae documentum; et sicut vetus aetas vidit quid ultimum in libertate esset, ita nos quid in servitute, adempto per inquisitiones etiam loquendi audiendique commercio. memoriam quoque ipsum cum voce perdidissemus, si tam in nostra potestate esset oblivisci quam tacere.

Tacitus, Ag. 2.3

We assuredly provided an exceptional example of our submissiveness; and just as the former age has seen the extreme of freedom, so we have experienced the depths of servitude, deprived as we were of our right to speech and conversation through oppressive investigations.¹ We would have also lost memory itself along with our voice, if it were as easy to forget as to keep quiet.

Juvenal published his first book of Satires in the context of the post-Domitianic period, an era seething with a palpable—if deferred—indignation. This potent anger, attested in sources from a variety of genres,² is most evident in the denigration of Domitian, the last emperor of the Flavian dynasty, and his attendants. For Tacitus, the ascension of Nerva and Trajan endowed the principate with freedom,³ two seemingly incompatible concepts, while for Pliny, the new era presented an opportunity for bringing notice to oneself as a prosecutor of guilty informers (delatores) who had survived Domitian and had passed into the reigns of Nerva and Trajan unscathed.⁴

¹ For humorous exaggeration of the informers’ ubiquity, cp. Juv. 4.45-52: destinat hoc monstrum cumbae linique magister pontifici summo. quis enim proponere talem aut emere auderet, cum plena et litora multo delatore forent? dispersi protinus algae inquisitores agerent cum remige nudo, non dubitarii fugitium dicere piscem depastumque diu uiuaria Caesaris, inde elapsum ueterem ad dominum debere reuerti.

² Dio states (68.1.3) that reprisals in the chaos following Domitian’s death had reached such a pitch that Nerva was forced to intercede. Pliny’s Panegyricus and collection of epistles waste no opportunity to decry the state of affairs under Domitian.

³ Nunc demum redit animus; et quamquam primo statim beatissimi saeculi ortu Nerva Caesar res olim dissociabilis miscuerit, principatum ac libertatem, Ag. 3.1.

⁴ Occiso Domitiano statui mecum ac deliberavi, esse magnam pulchramque materiam insectandi nocentes, miserios vindicandi, se proferendi, Ep. 9.13. Cp. Ep. 4.22 for Pliny’s account of Mauricus’ witty insult against Veiento, an informer under Domitian, who was seated next to the emperor Nerva at dinner. The emperor had wondered aloud what would have happened to Catullus Messalinus, another of Domitian’s delatores, had he been alive. At this, Mauricus sharply remarked that he would be “dining with
It is likely the relative safety of the new era that allowed Juvenal to introduce his satirist so boldly, whereas Persius’ muffled (*muttire*) criticism of Nero forty years earlier seems to reflect the stress under which he created his short collection of *Satires*.\(^5\)

Juvenal, like Pliny and Tacitus, took advantage of this new era in which, as Tacitus proclaimed, one may think what he wishes and say what he thinks (*ubi sentire quae velis et quae sentias dicere licet, Hist. 1.1.20*). When we consider the historical context in which Juvenal chose to present his indignant satirist, in combination with the evidence for the positive reception of a rhetorically indignant style in the oratorical theorists, we may legitimately ask whether the speaker’s professed *indignatio* is more likely to be read as a unifying rather than distancing force.\(^6\)

The concomitant themes of servility and silence resonate throughout early second century literature and provide a major link between Juvenal’s *indignatio* and that of his contemporaries. Here we find as central themes the servitude of the Roman world, subject to the rule of the principate, and the attendant loss of *libertas*. For Juvenal,

---

\(^5\) Pers. 1.191-121: *me muttire nefas? nec clam? nec cum scrobe? nusquam? hic tamen infodiam. uidi, uidi ipse, libelle: auriculas asini quis non habet?* The scholiast and *Vita* assert that Persius had written *Mida rex* for which *quis non* was substituted upon publication, for fear of offending Nero; see Harvey (1981) 51; Nikitinsky (2002) 96 ad loc.

\(^6\) Cp. Freudenburg (2005) 24-5: “anger ranks as the least sociable of human emotions; and it is precisely this emotion that is most commonly associated with satire.” While acerbic satire certainly has the ability to alienate, it also has the potential to unify. Various historical *exempla*, both ancient and modern, demonstrate that anger is employed by rhetoricians and/or public personalities to unify their audience against a stated target. E.g. Cicero’s Catilinarian orations, even if we allow that their stylistic effects were drawn from a rhetorician’s handbook and are perhaps somewhat artificial, illustrate that an *indignatio* utilizing the tropes of an artful anger, often employing acerbic humor, functions to unify Cicero’s audience against a common enemy. And, the fact that Cicero’s orations were polished after delivery does not obscure the successful presentation of immediate anger as Cicero’s apparently persuasive speeches imply. For modern examples of anger’s unifying effect, witness the angry rhetoric in current American politics and the success of radio and television personalities in the style of Rush Limbaugh or Glenn Beck, who simultaneously unify and repel; also relevant is the unifying force of the “Day of Rage” demonstrations that have swept multiple nations of the Middle East in 2011-2012.
Pliny and Tacitus, the informers’ perversion of the judicial system and the rise of powerful freedmen are inextricably linked to the decline of senatorial power and form a key element of their retroactive hostility. It is hardly self-evident then that Juvenal’s employment of indignant rhetoric to address these themes would have caused his audience to disavow his anger per se, especially when the indignatio of his more overtly political satires sounds all too familiar to be considered mere benign comedy, intent primarily on criticizing the satirist himself, as Juvenal forces his audience’s/reader’s attention back to potent themes of violence and power still very much alive in the discourses of post-Domitianic Rome. Juvenal quite possibly found readers sympathetic to his satirist’s views, derived from a common indignation, directed against the powerful individuals of the past, some of whose victims had relatives contemporaneous with the satirist. By contextualizing Juvenal within the popular revenge literature of post-Domitianic Rome, we are better situated to understand the thrust of Juvenal’s invective against the past and its implications for the present.

7 Sinclair (1995) 13: “[T]he whole subject of informers and delation allows Tacitus to hint at the uncomfortable fact that a princeps could use the patronage system so dear to the nobility to control and harm their class.”

8 Green (1998) xxviii: “What concerns me is the effect on Juvenal [from the application of the persona theory], which has been to turn the Satires into a series of contrived, semi-dramatic performances, structurally exotic and wholly removed from real life, performed by a literary quick-change artist with a bundle of formal masks behind which to hide, and a bagful of moral bromides and stock rhetorical tropes or literary allusions to suit every occasion...For Susanna Braund Juvenal’s narrator has become ‘a spineless and petty bigot’...thus subverting any moral standpoint that the Satires may originally have had.”

9 Cp. Keane (2012) 409: “as we survey Juvenal's poems it becomes glaringly apparent that they were written not simply in imitation of a satiric tradition, but in the shadow of monumental new historical works focusing on Rome and the empire in the past century.”

10 Courtney (1980) 229 for example, comments on Juvenal’s reference to the murder of Lamia in the last line of satire 4: “One [relative] at least was alive when this was written, L. Aelius Lamia Aelianus, cos. 116; he can hardly have read this passage with pleasure.”
Specifically, Pliny’s Epistles and his Panegyricus for Trajan are obsessed with the past,\textsuperscript{11} as Pliny seeks to define his role both during the apparently brutal rule of Domitian and in the aftermath of the emperor’s assassination, when many were looking back in anger and seeking the condemnation of infamous delatores, who were believed to have escaped punishment under Domitian.\textsuperscript{12} While Tacitus in his Annals expands on this complaint and focuses on the degeneracy of the principate and the subjugation of the nobility, Juvenal likewise, while reserving potent invective for Domitian in particular, takes aim in his first book at the patron-client relationship by including the themes of servility and silence not only among the upper echelons of society (satire 4) but also in its reverberation down through the pyramid of lesser patrons and clients (satires 1, 3, 5). These unified currents of discourse among writers in the early Trajanic period serve to illustrate the parallel concerns to rehabilitate voices silent for so long.

The debate over the ethical quality of Juvenal’s speaker should, therefore, explore the tenor of the historical material composed in the decades following the end of the Flavian period and in this context we may ask whether we are right to dismiss Juvenal’s invective as light comedy directed primarily against the satirist himself, with the satirist having “nothing terribly serious to say,”\textsuperscript{13} or whether, constructed in an

\textsuperscript{11} Freudenburg (2001) 216: “Pliny’s letters repeatedly turn from the day-to-day affairs of a consular senator in the early second-century Rome to the world of the Julio-Claudians and the Flavians.”

\textsuperscript{12} Once he had become emperor, Nerva executed slaves and freedmen who had turned against their masters, and he forbade the charge of treason (maiestas), by which the informers had inspired such terror. Many of the informers themselves, as Dio relates, he put to death: καὶ τοῖς μὲν τοιούτοις οὔδ᾽ ἄλλο τι ἔγκλημα ἐπιφέρειν ἐπὶ τοὺς δεσπότας ἐφῆκε, τοῖς δὲ δὴ ἄλλοις οὔτ᾽ ἀσεβείας οὔτ᾽ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ βίου καταιτιᾶσθαί τινας συνεχώρησε. πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν συκοφαντησάντων θάνατον κατεδικάσθησαν (Dio 68.1.2).

\textsuperscript{13} Freudenburg (2001) 251 contends that Juvenal’s satire is too much, too late and inevitably comes off as “clownish” since it so harshly attacks notorious figures of the past. He further argues that “making up for lost time in satire is an unlikely, if not irredeemable, notion. No one has ever used satire to do this before. The genre is not set up to work that way. Satire is a genre that must engage with the present,
exhausted political climate,\textsuperscript{14} Juvenal is engaged in a socio-political program every bit as serious and real as Tacitus, Suetonius, and Pliny.

Tacitus indicates in no uncertain terms that there were authors and audiences eager to write and read exactly the kind of bitter invective against fallen emperors and their favorites that Juvenal offers, particularly in his first book:\textsuperscript{15}

temporibusque Augusti dicendis non defuere decora ingenia, donec gliscente adulatione deterrerentur. Tiberii Gaiae et Claudii ac Neronis res florentibus ipsis ob metum falsae, postquam occiderant recentibus odiis compositae sunt. (\textit{Ann.} 1.1)

Suitable talent was not lacking for covering the period of Augustus, until they [historical authors] were prevented by a growing flattery. The historical accounts of Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius and Nero were, due to fear, false while they were living, but after their deaths, composed with a fresh hatred.

In addition to testifying to a vibrant interest in vindictive literature directed at deceased emperors like that found in Juvenal’s fourth satire, Tacitus’ statement casts doubt on the and any attempt to make it seem that it can work as a kind of retroactive payback has got to come off as just a little absurd” (237). Yet, Freudenburg had noted that Turnus' satires appear to have “looked back to the cruel follies of Nero’s court rather than to the persons and activities of the contemporary Roman scene” (214 n.7). Moreover, Seneca’s \textit{Apocolocyntosis} was only published after Claudius was safely dead and deified. In addition, as Larmour notes, Lucilius targeted the enemies of P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus only after his death in 129 BCE, the year the satirist began to compose his satires (2003, 401, n.3). The suggestion that satire retains its efficacy only if specifically criticizing the living fails to explain the continued relevance of Lucilius’ satire well into the imperial period (and Juvenal’s popularity well after his own), with Quintilian highlighting his cult following in his own day (\textit{Lucilius quosdam ita deditos sibi adhuc habet amatores ut eum non eiusdem modo operis auctoris sed omnibus poetis praefere non dubient}, \textit{Inst.} 10.1.93-4). Most importantly, the contention that Juvenalian invective too harshly attacks dead monsters to be taken seriously downplays the strong appetite for revenge literature, defined in the strongest terms, as evidenced by our sources. The acts described may be past, but revenge is ever present.

\textsuperscript{14} Juv. 4.37-8: \textit{cum iam semianimum laceraret Flavius orbem / ultimus et calvo serviret Roma Neroni...} Cp. Tac. \textit{Ag.} 44: \textit{ilud tempus, quo Domitianus non iam per intervalla ac spiramenta temporum sed continuo et velut uno icu rem publicam exhausti.}

\textsuperscript{15} Cp. Tacitus’ similar statement at \textit{Hist.} 1.1.7-13 that truth (\textit{veritas}) had suffered through the extremes of flattery and hatred in the historical works composed after Actium and the establishment of the principate. The ready reception for invective and defamation is again highlighted: \textit{simul veritas pluribus modis infracta, primum inscitia rei publicae ut alienae, mox libidine adsentand\textipa{1} aut rursus odio adversus dominantis: ita neutris cura posteritatis inter infensos vel obnoxios. sed ambitionem scritoris facile averseris, obtrectatio et livor pronis auribus accipiuntur; quippe adulationi foedum crimem servitutis, malignitati falsa species libertatis inest.} See \textit{Ag.} 1.4 for the reiteration of the claim that audiences lent a more willing ear to works of invective than to works of praise: \textit{at nunc narraturo mihi vitam defuncti hominis venia opus fuit, quam non petissem incusaturos: tam saeva et infesta virtutibus tempora.}
claim that Seneca’s treatise on anger management, written approximately seventy years prior to the Satires, exercised complete control over the putative reader’s response to Juvenal’s corpus. Juvenal’s literary contemporaries provide evidence that their audiences not only fail to adhere to Seneca’s philosophical views on anger, but even relish the works of historiography imbued with indignant anger, which formed a part of the revenge literature following the death of Domitian.

The parallels of Juvenalian invective to the sentiments and tone of authors in this historical tradition force us to confront the uncomfortable notion that the sources for the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods are also marked by the indignatio of their authors (despite Tacitus’ protestations), and are thus not as far removed from the ira of Juvenal as we would like. It is evident from this appetite that Seneca’s intellectual position was an expression of only one side of an ongoing discussion over the ethical quality of indignatio, rather than a comprehensive framework through which all professions of indignatio were evaluated.

An indignant tone is, however, not the only similarity that marks these historical and epistolary works and links them to Juvenal’s satiric effort. As we shall see, these same authors also show a concern to account for the validity of their indignatio and its attendant desire for revenge in light of the elapsed time between the dates of their compositions and the historical personages whom they target. The apparent awkwardness of accounting for this anxiety in Juvenal’s Satires is exactly what has led to the notion that Juvenal intentionally created his speaker to be viewed as an ethically undercut “coward.”

---

16 consilium mihi pauca de Augusto et extrema tradere, mox Tiberii principatum et cetera, sine ira et studio, quorum causas procul habeo, Tac. Ann. 1.1.
It has furthermore been suggested that the creative output in multiple genres following the death of Domitian was sparked by the ascension of Trajan and an attendant surge in panegyric. This theory has found forceful proponents, and has offered a plausible interpretation of post-Domitianic revenge literature by explaining the indignant tone of the works from this period primarily as flattery composed to highlight by contrast the positive qualities of the newly enthroned emperor. Viewing Juvenalian invective as panegyric has implications for the persona theory’s contention that Juvenal's speaker was intended to be viewed unsympathetically in the “angry” satires of books 1 and 2 (and, if we follow Freudenburg, book 3), since it is questionable how we might reconcile an unsympathetic coward who was perceived as a “spineless and petty bigot” with the flattering voice that Trajan was hoping would (however indirectly) sing the praises of the new golden age. If we, however, allow that Juvenal’s contemporary audience interpreted his satirist in this way, we must also assume that they applied this evaluative terminology to those passages in Tacitus and Pliny that express the same fear and loathing of the lurking totalitarian monster, evidenced by their own long silence.

17 Principle among them Ramage (1989).
18 Braund (1993) 67-68: “Contrary to first appearances, Roman satire on political subjects affirms rather than challenges the status quo and buttresses the present regime, which is often if not usually defined by reference to previous regimes...the satire which at first sight may appear to be so revolutionary and anarchic and which likes to lay claim to a certain freedom of speech can itself, in its denigration of earlier emperors, be viewed as a disguised form of flattery and affirmation of the present regime.” I find it difficult to reconcile the interpretation of an ‘unhinged’ or ‘berserk’ satirist with the suggestion that Juvenal’s satirist operated as an advocate for Trajan’s propaganda, especially as “The denigration of Domitian in Satire 4 is not accompanied by any positive allusion to his successors, as one would expect if the analogy with Pliny's Panegyricus is to be sustained (Wilson (2003) 530). Wilson similarly questions the supposition that Juvenal's Satires could simultaneously function as Trajanic propaganda while maintaining the interpretations offered by persona theory: “Would an emperor find it useful to have his policies promoted through a mouthpiece like the speaker of Satire 1 or Satire 6? The persona Juvenal presents is of a man who barely has his temper under control, who is irrationally angry, ruled by indignatio, xenophobic, misogynist, verbally aggressive, alienated and discontented, and who feels dispossessed of his birthright as a Roman. This extremism is a recipe for a public relations disaster” (530).
In other words, such a negative appraisal of Juvenal’s satirist, while it conveniently sanitizes Juvenal for us, forces a major rift into the literary environment of the period.

One method of tracing the theme of servility and silence common to the authors of the post-Domitianic period is through the indignation generated by the issues of *delatio* and the social mobility of freedmen, some of whom had advanced to the highest threshold of power. Pliny keeps his readers’ attention focused on the past in a variety of ways, including a continual reference to and denigration of the notorious informers active under Domitian and even earlier. He explicitly claims that hatred, rage, and the attendant desire for revenge against those believed to have played some role in Domitian’s despotism were common after his assassination in 96 CE, and that many seized this opportunity to vent their anger on personal enemies and those whom Domitian’s reign of terror had elevated.

When writing to Quadratus of his proposal to prosecute Publicius Certus, an informer instrumental in the prosecution of Herennius Senecio and Helvidius Priscus in 93, Pliny relates the general animosity of the times:

Ac primis quidem diebus redditae libertatis pro se quisque inimicos suos, dumtaxat minores, incondito turbidoque clamore postulaverat simul et oppresserat. Ego et modestius et constantius arbitratus immanissimum reum non communi temporum invidia, sed proprio crimine urgere, cum iam satis primus ille impetus defremuisset et languidior in dies ira ad iustitiam redisset. (*Ep.* 9.13.4-5)

Indeed, in the first days of the restored freedom, each man had prosecuted and condemned his own enemies (provided they weren’t too high up the ladder), in the general confusion and chaos of the times. I thought it more prudent and secure to pursue this most inhuman criminal [Publicius Certus] not in the universal hatred of the times, but with a specific charge, when that first impulse had abated enough, and slowly, day by day, anger had returned to justice.
While Pliny pursues his target in the senate and enshrines his vilification in the *Epistles*, 
Juvenal incorporates a similar ethic into his own poetic program, devoting his early 
satiric efforts to the defamation of the unpunished guilty. This tactic is particularly 
evident in the peroration to satire 4, where the speaker implicitly claims for himself the 
role of punisher and signals that retribution against Domitian's memory for his crimes 
against *inlustresque animas* is precisely the motivation for his lampoon:

\[
\text{atque utinam his potius nugis tota illa dedisset} \\
\text{tempora saevitiae, claras quibus abstulit urbi} \\
\text{inlustresque animas inpune et vindice nullo.} \\
\text{sed perit postquam cerdonibus esse timendus} \\
\text{coeperat: hoc nocuit Lamiarum caede madenti. (4.152-154)}
\]

It is too bad that he [Domitian] did not dedicate himself to these trifles [what to do with an enormous turbot] in those years of cruelty, when he robbed the city of celebrated and famous men, unpunished and with no avenger. Yet, he got his desserts, after the artisans began to fear him: it was this that finished him, dripping as he was with the gore of the Lamiae.¹⁹

Juvenal's *vindice nullo*, though in a different medium than Pliny's *Epistles*, directly parallels Pliny's stated objective of avenging the pitiable (*miseros vindicandi*) and similarly reflects Pliny's impulse to characterize his own speeches against Publicius Certus as the vengeance of Helvidius (*Helvidi ultione, Ep. 9.13.1*).

Pliny's attack was at least partially successful. Though the emperor Nerva did not pursue a motion against Certus, he was, according to Pliny, prevented from taking up the consulship as a direct result of his implicit denunciation before the senate. He furthermore lost his post as prefect of the treasury (*aerarium Saturni*), a position to which Pliny then advanced. Pliny reports that Certus died shortly thereafter, hounded

¹⁹ See Suet. *Dom.* 10.2 for the death of Aelius Lamia, an ex-consul whom Domitian put to death for trivial remarks uttered long before.
by a vision of Pliny with sword drawn at the ready,\footnote{Accidit fortuitum, sed non tamquam fortuitum, quod editis libris Certus intra paucissimos dies implicitus morbo decessit. Audivi referentes hanc imaginem menti eius hanc oculis oberrasse, tamquam videret me sibi cum ferro imminere. Verane haec, adfirmare non ausim; interest tamen exempli, ut vera videantur, Ep. 9.13.24-25.} as by a vengeful but belated Fury. Pliny's self-characterization recalls the terminology that satirists employ to describe their own purpose. Horace, Persius, and Juvenal all position themselves within the satiric lineage through reference to Lucilius as the authoritative founder of the genre. Juvenal does so by announcing his intent to follow in the footsteps of this paragon of satiric attack,\footnote{Cur tamen hoc potius libeat decurrere campo, / per quem magnus equos Auruncae flexit alumnus, / si vacat ac placidi rationem admittitis, edam, Juv. 1.19-21.} while similarly depicting Lucilius confronting the guilty with sword drawn.\footnote{Ense uelut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens / infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens est / criminibus, tacita sudant praeordia culpa, Juv. 1.165-167. For satire as sword, cf. Hor. S. 2.1.39-41, in which the satirist, sword sheathed, takes a more defensive posture unless provoked. The threat, nonetheless, is clear. While Persius does not employ the same imagery of the sword, the vengeful nature of Lucilian satire is evident: secuit Lucilius Vrbem, / te Lupe, te Muci, et genuinum fregit in illis, 1.114-115.} By specifically highlighting the vengeful nature of Lucilian satire and announcing his intent to follow in this tradition, Juvenal parallels Pliny's \textit{persona} of sword-wielding avenger.

Pliny continues the key theme of denouncing \textit{delatores} throughout his \textit{Epistles} by an ongoing denigration of his \textit{bête noir}, the informer Regulus. Regulus is portrayed as a man living with the fear that he will ultimately pay for his crimes (\textit{Ep.} 1.5) and who, Pliny gloats, did well to die, though not soon enough (\textit{Ep.} 6.2). Pliny mocks the prosecutor as a leftover from a tyrannical age, though he seems generally to have ceased from \textit{accusatio} after Nero.\footnote{Sherwin-White (1985) 94.} Yet, Pliny specifically makes the death of Domitian the backdrop for his criticism of Regulus, who roused Pliny's anger precisely because he had taken part in the prosecution of Rusticus in 93 CE and had then given readings
of these speeches that had helped to secure Rusticus’ death as proof of his rhetorical virtuosity.24

In terms strikingly similar to Juvenal's, Pliny decries a city that produces and supports social climbers who succeed through corruption—men like Regulus:

\[
\text{Ἀλλὰ τί διατείνομαι}^{25}\text{ in ea civitate, in qua iam pridem non minora praemia, immo maiora nequitia et improbitas quam pudor et uirtus habent? Adspice Regulum, qui ex paupere et tenui ad tantas opes per flagitia processit. (Ep. 2.20.12-13)}
\]

But why stress myself [over Regulus’ unscrupulous legacy hunting] when I live in a state in which criminality and dishonesty have for a long time now attained no fewer rewards—actually, even more—than modesty and virtue? Just look at Regulus, who went from being a pauper and a nobody to such immense wealth through his outrages!

To his condemnation of Regulus as parasitic informer, Pliny here includes another aspect indicative of Juvenalian satire, the charge of fraudulent captator.26 Pliny’s scathing indictment of Regulus, if put into hexameters, would be a near match to that of Juvenal’s speaker in the first satire:

\[
\text{nonne libet medio ceras inplere capaces quadriuo, cum iam sexta ceruice feratur hinc atque inde patens ac nuda paene cathedra et multum referens de Maecenate supino signator falsi, qui se lautum atque beatum exiguis tabulis et gemma fecerit uda? aude aliquid breuibus Gyaris et carcere dignum, si uis esse aliquid. probitas laudatur et alget; criminibus debent hortos, praetoria, mensas, argentum uetus et stantem extra pocula caprum. (1.63-68; 73-76)}
\]

---

24 Ep. 1.5.1-2: Coepit vereri ne sibi irascerer, nec fallebatur: irascebar. Rustici Aruleni periculum fovert, exsultaverat morte

25 Dem. De Cor. 142.

26 The criticism of legacy hunters is, in fact, a theme throughout the Roman satirists; e.g. Hor. S. 2.5; Juv. 5.98, 10.202, 12.111-114.
Is it not fitting to fill spacious notebooks in the middle of the crossroads, when a witness to a fraudulent will, who has made himself luxurious and rich by a few documents and a moist signet ring, is borne aloft already by six necks, visible on all sides and very much recalling the effete Maecenas in his virtually open litter? Dare to commit some crime worthy of tiny Gyaros and prison, if you wish to be somebody. Honesty is praised—and freezes; They owe to their crimes their gardens, mansions, dining tables, antique silver, and cups engraved with goats.

Juvenal’s *signator falsi* bears an unmistakable resemblance to Regulus, who unscrupulously inserts himself into the wills of vulnerable individuals (*quod est improbissimum genus falsi*). The advancement of those men deemed to be socially and morally inferior is an overarching theme not only throughout Juvenal's *Satires* (*quales ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum extollit quotiens uoluit Fortuna iocari*, 3.39-40) but other authors of the period as well; Pliny's specific complaint that Regulus accedes to power *ex paupere* is a reflection of that critique.

Pliny's attack against the informer Regulus for his ill-gained riches (soon to have sixty million sesterces! *ut ipse mihi dixerit, cum consuleret quam cito sestertium sescentiens impleturus esset, Ep. 2.20.13*), is not limited to *delatores*, but extends to the rise of influential Greek freedmen who are similarly blamed for the senate’s servility and enforced silence. Pliny's resentful assault against these social climbers has a clear affinity with the statements not only of Tacitus but of Juvenal’s speakers in his early satires. The force of Juvenal's attack against the Egyptian Crispinus, a powerful upstart under Domitian, is matched by Pliny's *indignatio* against Pallas, Claudius' Greek freedman, whom he refers to as “filth” and “scum” (*caenum, sordes, Ep. 7.29.3*),

---

27 1.26-9; 4.1-33; 108-9.

28 *Ep. 7.29; 8.6.*
precisely because, like Regulus, he is viewed as unworthily advancing to the pinnacle of power.\textsuperscript{29}

Pliny is nowhere more indignant than in his attack on the memory of Pallas and his outrage at the servility of the senate in awarding financial and even praetorian honors to this Greek “slave.”\textsuperscript{30} Pliny devotes two letters to the denigration of the freedman’s memory and ironically concludes his first letter with the assertion that Pallas does not deserve his anger (\textit{Sed quid indignor?}) before launching into a more extensive and resentful second letter against the powerful freedman:

\begin{quote}
\textit{quis adeo demens, ut per suum, per publicum dedecus procedere uelit in ea ciuitate, in qua hic esset usus florentissimae dignitatis, ut primus in senatu laudare Pallantem posset? Mitto quod Pallanti seruo praetoria ornamenta offeruntur (quippe offeruntur a seruis), mitto quod censent non exhortandum modo uerum etiam compellendum ad usum aureorum anulorum; erat enim contra maiestatem senatus, si ferreis praetorius uteretur. (Ep. 8.6)}
\end{quote}

Who is so insane, that he desires advancement at the cost of his own and the public’s disgrace, in this city in which this is the prerogative of the most distinguished rank—to be first in the senate to praise Pallas? I’ll ignore the fact that praetorian insignia were offered to a slave (seeing that they were offered by slaves), and I’ll also leave unmentioned the fact that the senate determined not only to encourage but even to compel him to wear a golden ring; it was, of course, contrary to the dignity of the senate that a praetorian should wear the slave’s iron ring!

Pliny here employs techniques of \textit{indignatio} similar to Juvenal’s assaults on freedmen, including sharp rhetorical questions, \textit{praeteritio}, and exaggeration. Juvenal’s critique matches that of Pliny in specific detail; both seek to incite the \textit{indignatio} of the reader.

\textsuperscript{29} Cp. Tac. \textit{Ann.} 12.53; Suet. \textit{Cl.} 25.

\textsuperscript{30} Pliny indicates his derision by ignoring his freedmen status and hyperbolically referring to him as if he currently held slave status.
through a focus on the golden ring\textsuperscript{31} that has been granted to freedmen of eminent social position:

\begin{quote}
cum pars Niliacae plebis, cum uerna Canopi
Crispinus Tyrias umero reuocante lacernas
uentilet aestiuum digitis sudantibus aurum
[nec sufferre queat maioris pondera gemmae],
difficile est saturam non scribere. nam quis iniquae
tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus, ut teneat se. (1.26-30)
\end{quote}

When Crispinus, part of the Nile’s rabble and a native slave of Canopus, brandishes his golden ring in the summer heat, with fingers sweating, his shoulder drawing back his purple cloak, and is unable to bear the weight of a larger gem, it is difficult not to write satire. For who is so tolerant of this prejudiced city, so iron-willed, that he is able to restrain himself...

Juvenal, employing the rhetorical techniques of \textit{descriptio} and vividness (\textit{enargeia}), detailed by Quintilian,\textsuperscript{32} presents Crispinus before the reader’s mind, showing off his golden ring and flaunting his Tyrian purple cloak,\textsuperscript{33} while Pliny (a student of Quintilian) likewise invites his audience to view Pallas’ actions cinematically, as he presumes to accept or reject the senate’s honors.\textsuperscript{34}

We see the technique of \textit{descriptio} subtly employed to similar effect in Juvenal’s depiction of the sacrilegious violation of a Vestal at 4.8-10, where the poet once again

\textsuperscript{31} Juvenal’s reference is perhaps to the golden ring of the equestrian class, though \textit{gemma} may complicate this interpretation (Courtney (1980)). Braund (1996), following Nisbet (1988), recommends deleting line 29 and allows that the golden ring signifies equestrian status. A decree of the senate in 23 CE, “forbade the wearing of golden rings to all persons save those who had the equestrian census” (Sherwin-White (1985)).

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Inst}. 4.2.123; 8.3.61-70; 9.27 (quoting Cicero). For Juvenal’s use of \textit{enargeia} to inspire \textit{indignatio}, see esp. 1.63-72, with its use of the present \textit{occurrit} to convey immediacy.

\textsuperscript{33} Courtney (1980) 91.

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Ep}. 8.6.11-12: \textit{Imaginare Pallantem uelut intercedentem senatus consulto moderantemque honores suos et sestertium centies quinquagies ut nimium recusantem, cum praetoria ornamenta tamquam minus recepisset; imaginare Caesarem liberti precibus uel potius imperio coram senatu obtemperantem (imperat enim libertus patrono, quem in senatu rogat); imaginare senatum usquequaque testantem merito liberterque se hanc summam inter reliquos honores Pallanti coepisse decernere et perseveraturum fuisse, nisi obsequeretur principis voluntati, cui non esset fas in ulla re repugnare.
summons Crispinus onto his satirical stage (*Ecce iterum Crispinus, et est mihi saepe uocandus ad partes*). Juvenal not only forces his audience to consider the violation of the virgin, a major crime in itself against the gods, but with a single detail he highlights the outrage by depicting the Vestal in her sacred band during intercourse (*corruptor et idem incestus, cum quo nuper uittata iacebat sanguine adhuc uiuo terram subitura sacerdos?*). The poet’s vignette seeks to elicit a visceral reaction from his reader by highlighting the theme of foreigner as violator and corruptor. The effect of this technique, as in Pliny’s vivid narrative, is to inspire and enhance the *indignatio* of one’s audience—a task Pliny assumes is successful at the close of the letter:

> Non dubito similiter adfici te. Scio quam sit tibi uiuus et ingenuus animus: ideo facilius est ut me, quamquam indignationem quibusdam in locis fortasse ultra epistulae modum extulerim, parum doluisse quam nimis credas. (*Ep.* 8.6.17)

I have no doubt you [Montanus] are similarly affected. I know how sturdy and honest your mind is: and so, I am sure that, although I may have expressed my indignation in certain places beyond the bounds of a letter, you may believe that I am insufficiently rather than excessively bitter.

The culmination of Pliny’s complaint is the fact that the senate ordered a bronze plaque set up in the most frequented part of the forum, so that Pallas’ actions become a model of virtue to be emulated. His resentment is shared by Tacitus, who records, with his familiar sarcasm, an account of the senate’s bestowal of honors upon Pallas.

> adseveravit Claudius contentum honore Pallantem intra priorem paupertatem subsistere. et fixum est <aere> publico senatus consultum quo libertinus sestertii ter milies possessor antiquae parsimoniae laudibus cumulabatur. (*Ann.* 12.53)

---

35 This concern is similarly at the heart of Umbricius’ smear against Greek freedmen who seek to dominate the households in which they serve: *hic alta Sicyone, ast hic Amydone relict, hic Andro, ille Samo, hic Trailibus aut Alabandis, Esquiliias dictumque petunt a uimine collem, uiscera magnum domuum dominique futuri...praeterea sanctum nihil †aut† ab inguine tutum, non matrona laris, non filia virgo, nec ipse sponsus leuis adhuc, non filius ante pudicus. horum si nihil est, auiam resupinat amici (3.69-112).
Claudius declared that Pallas would be content with the honor and would remain in his previous poverty. And so, fixed in official bronze was the senate’s decree by which a freedman worth three hundred million sesterces was heaped with praise for his old-time frugality.

Tacitus adds his indignation to the chorus of those who decry the diminished value of traditional honors, which have been cheapened by their bestowal upon men whom our authors deem unworthy. In one of the rare instances where Tacitus breaks into his narrative in an impassioned apostrophe to a potentially disbelieving audience, he proclaims that during the events he describes, the social world had become so corrupt that accolades, which the senate once bestowed upon honorable men, were accorded to murderers. *Insignia*, like those offered to Pallas and Narcissus, Tacitus satirically suggests, had become signs of a national calamity rather than emblems of honorable deeds.

> quicumque casus temporum illorum nobis vel aliis auctoribus noscent, praesumptum habeant, quoties fugas et caedes iussit princeps, toties grates deis actas, quaeque rerum secundarum olim, tum publicae cladis insignia fuisse. neque tamen silebimus si quod senatus consultum adulatione novum aut patientia postremum fuit. (*Ann.*14.64)

Whoever inquires into the calamities of those times [the Neronian period] either in my account or in those of other authors, let them assume that, so often as the princeps ordered slaughter or exile, so often was thanks given to the gods, and that things which had formerly been a sign of prosperity then became signs of public disaster. Nevertheless, I will not be silent if a senatorial decree offered something new in adulation, or finally in passivity.

Worse still, freedmen such as Narcissus and Pallas snub the honor offered to them by the senate, thus provoking the ire of Pliny and Tacitus. Upon the execution of Messalina, for example, Tacitus records that Narcissus, one of Claudius' freedmen, is presented with quaestorian honors, "a most worthless thing to one who in his pride paraded himself above Pallas and Callistus" (*decreta Narcisso quaestoria insignia,*
likewise denounces Pallas' refusal of the senate's gift of fifteen million sesterces, a fact that ultimately heightens the insult, placing as it does the value of money above the honor of the decorations bestowed by the state:

Pliny likewise denounces Pallas' refusal of the senate's gift of fifteen million sesterces, a fact that ultimately heightens the insult, placing as it does the value of money above the honor of the decorations bestowed by the state:

Spreuit, quod solum potuit tantis opibus publice oblatis adrogantius facere, quam si accepisset...Imagine Pallantem uelut intercedentem senatus consulto moderantemque honores suos et sestertium centies quinquagies ut nimium recusantem, cum praetoria ornamenta tamquam minus recepisset. (Ep. 8.6.9-11)

Pallas did reject the fifteen million sesterces decreed to him by the senate, the only act which he could have done to show greater contempt than if he had accepted the money...Just imagine Pallas intervening with his own veto against the senate's decree and moderating the honors accorded to him, refusing fifteen million sesterces as too excessive while yet accepting praetorian honors as if they meant less!

A necessary framework for understanding Pliny's anger at the senate's decree honoring Pallas is the importance that he attaches throughout his Epistles to monuments and literature for their didactic purpose and their ability to confer immortality. In composing for publication a work in memory of a youth, Pliny highlights a direct connection between the arts, whether painting, sculpture, or literature, primarily because they all function to bestow immortality upon their author. So, for example, he praises Titinius Capito as an individual worthy of emulation for erecting a statue to the memory of Lucius Silanus, thereby bestowing immortality upon himself as well as Silanus. The efficacy of this function is called into question as monuments to “slaves”

---

36. *difficile, sed tamen, ut sculptorem, ut pictorem, qui filii uestri imaginem faceret, admoneritis, quid exprimere quid emendare deberet, ita me quoque formate regite, qui non fragilem et caducam, sed immortalem, ut uos putatis, effigiem conor efficere*, Ep. 3.10.6.

37. Executed by Nero in 65.

mock and denigrate the overall value of such memorializing. That Romans of the best families should look to successful foreigners as models of emulation represents for Pliny and Juvenal an encroachment upon social values (Inueniebantur tamen honesto loco nati, qui peterent cuperentque quod dari liberto promitti seruis uidebant, "People of noble birth, nevertheless, were found seeking and desiring to attain what they saw given over to a freedman and promised to slaves," Ep. 8.6.16). So too, the Juvenalian satirist disparages an Egyptian who "dared" to erect a statue of himself among the triumphales in the forum of Augustus, thereby inserting himself among the monuments to the most renowned figures of Roman history. Juvenal’s suggestion that it is appropriate "not only to piss" at the Egyptian’s monument, is a vivid, if obscene, enactment of Pliny’s complaint.

Pliny’s uncle likewise finds, in his discussion of the chalk used to mark slaves for sale, a pretext for a seemingly spontaneous and indignant diatribe against Greek slaves and freedmen who have risen to power and enriched themselves, as the delatores have done, through the ruin and slaughter of Roman citizens. The Elder Pliny proceeds from more distant examples (Chrysogonus under Sulla) to include Pallas and others of his own times:

sanguine Quiritium et proscriptionum licentia ditatos. hoc est insigne venaliciis gregibus obprobriumque insolentis fortunae. quos et nos adeo potiri rerum vidimus, ut praetoria quoque ornamenta decerni a senatu iubente Agrippina Claudi Caesaris videremus tantumque non cum laureatis fascibus remitti illo, unde cretatis pedibus advenissent. (Nat. 35.201)

[Those Greek freedmen] enriched themselves by the blood of Roman citizens and the license of proscriptions. This is the status of this herd of slaves for sale—and the disgrace of an arrogant fortune; those whom even

---

39 deinque forum iurisque peritus Apollo / atque triumphales, inter quas ausus habere / nescio quis titulos Aegyptius atque Arabarches, / cuius ad effigiem non tantum meiere fas est, Juv. 1.128-131.
we have seen acquire such a degree of power that we witnessed even praetorian honors decreed for them by the senate (at Agrippina’s behest, the wife of Claudius Caesar) and they all but returned with laurel-wreathed rods of power to the lands from which they came, when their legs were chalked white.

In Juvenal, we are invited to imagine Fortune entertaining herself by elevating these men as a sarcastic joke, and for Pliny, the social advancement of freedmen and slaves is attributed to arrogant Fortune (insulae fortunae). Pliny considers the level of power attained by these men to be a mark of Rome's shame (opprobrium) and Juvenal directly parallels Pliny's sentiments when his satirist imagines various social classes at Rome waiting in line behind a freedman for their share of the sportula:

'da praetori, da deinde tribuno.'
sed libertinus prior est. 'prior' inquit 'ego adsum.
cur timeam dubitemue locum defendere, quamuis natus ad Euphraten, molles quod in aure fenestrae arguerint, licet ipse negem? sed quinque tabernae quadringenta parant. quid confert purpura maior optandum, si Laurenti custodit in agro conductas Corinus ouis, ego possideo plus Pallante et Licinis?' expectent ergo tribuni, uincant diuitiae, sacro ne cedat honori nuper in hanc urbem pedibus qui uenerat albis (1.101-111)

‘Give to the praetor, then give to the tribune.’ But the freedman comes first. ‘I was here first,’ he says. ‘Why should I be afraid or hesitate to defend my place in line, although I was born on the shores of the Euphrates, a fact which the effete window-shaped holes in my ears gives away—even if I deny it. But my five taverns net me four hundred thousand sesterces. What greater hope can the purple stripe offer, if Corwinus tends leased sheep in Laurentine fields, while I possess more than Pallas and Licinus?’

So, let the tribunes wait, let riches rule, so that he who had recently come into this city with legs chalked white does not have to yield to sacred offices.

The satirist here employs the standard rhetorical practice of prosopopeia to personify a libertinus who illustrates precisely those criticisms found in the authors of the period.

---

40 The minimum financial qualification for attaining the status of an eques.
Juvenal’s reference to Pallas here is passing but relies for its impact on a literary nexus that spans the post-Claudian period into his own.

One of the main themes of the first book of the *Satires* (and of a plethora of Roman authors) is that a dishonorable hunt for riches and advancement has led to general moral and social ruin. The argument has been advanced that Juvenal has intentionally sought to undercut his main speaker’s professed motivations to moral indignation since “This claim does not sit easily with his evident envy of rich and successful people.” \(^{41}\) So too, Shumate, interpreting Juvenal's speakers through the lens of the *persona* theory, contends:

...immigrants are the worst class transgressors and the greatest beneficiaries of the social mobility that so distresses the speaker. They have the ambition and the energy to 'make it' in the urban jungle, throwing the traditional social and economic order into confusion and leaving passive and resentful natives like the speaker behind as they pass him on the social ladder... \(^{42}\)

The assault against foreign social climbers is, as we have seen, not confined to Juvenal's *Satires* and to problematize Juvenal's presentation of such social dynamics as a particular untoward “resentment” is misleading, since it becomes a vibrant point of contention in other authors. To single out Juvenal's indictment of the advancement of freedmen and ex-slaves and to posit that the author wishes to characterize the speakers as "jealous" does not sufficiently account for the widespread impulse to

---

\(^{41}\) Braund (1996) 120. Umbricius’ complaints in satire 3 are similarly downplayed by the suggestion that Juvenal has sought to embody in his character mere jealousy of the socially successful Greeks whom he targets. Umbricius’ name in this schema, though not entirely fictional (Plin. *Nat.* 10.19.4; Tac. *Hist.* 1.27; Just. *D.* 1.6.2p.r.11) is interpreted as ""Mr. Shady" in a less than favourable sense: he is a manifestation of the petty greed and jealousy which haunts the city of Rome" (Braund (1996) 234).

criticize these social trends. The criticism of Juvenal’s speakers against those whom they perceive to be foreign intruders into their social world is not for their "ambition and energy," as if a virtue in the Hesiodic sense, but their duplicitous nature\textsuperscript{43} (non sumus ergo pares: melior, qui semper et omni / nocte dieque potest aliena sumere vultum / a facie..., 3.104-106), a quality that Sallust, for example, includes as a fault in the character of Catiline, the paradigm of social corruption in the Roman mind,\textsuperscript{44} in addition to being an undesirable quality often associated with foreigners. Umbricius' argument against the deceitful nature of the Greeks falls in line with Tacitus' presentation of foreigners as duplicitous and untrustworthy groups\textsuperscript{45} and calls into question the suggestion that Juvenal seeks to present Umbricius as merely jealous of the \textit{nouveaux riches} and successful Greeks.\textsuperscript{46}

Furthermore, Pallas, among other freedmen, is universally condemned by both Pliny the Elder and Younger, as well as Juvenal and Tacitus, precisely for his dishonorable acquisition of riches and ascension to power and influence. Yet, it has not been suggested that Pliny the Elder betrays his ‘jealousy’ at the enriched freedmen, whom, in an inversion reminiscent of Juvenal, he indignantly depicts returning to their native land garbed in the highest accouterments of Roman office. Nor is it likely that his

\textsuperscript{43} “There is...ample evidence for Juvenal's contention...that affluence springs from dishonesty. It is, therefore, misleading to speak of the satirist's "irrational rage," as does Anderson (1982, 301)" (Tennant (2001) 177).

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Cat.} 5.4: Animus audax, subdolus, varius, cuius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator Cp. Umbricius' further description of the Greeks: 3.73-74: ingenium uelox, audacia perdita, sermo promptus et Isaeo torrentior.

\textsuperscript{45} E.g. \textit{Hist.} 4.37 and 4.57. "When the negative side of barbarian alterity is foregrounded, furthermore, plain-speaking is replaced by perfidy, directed as often at each other as at the Romans" (Shumate (2006) 97).

\textsuperscript{46} Braund (1988) 13.
nephew intentionally seeks to undercut his epistolary persona by displaying his envy towards Regulus and Pallas. The assumption that such a high level of irony was objectively\textsuperscript{47} Juvenal’s intent can therefore be met with considerable skepticism.

Juvenal, Pliny and Tacitus are, then, unified in their outrage at the rise of freedmen, the domination of delatores, and the resulting sycophancy of the ruling class. Tacitus is, if anything, even more unrelenting than Pliny in his retroactive pursuit of infamous delatores,\textsuperscript{48} and few passages cause us to question Tacitus' intent to write sine ira et studio as those concerning the phenomenon of delatio. Accordingly, Whitton has persuasively argued for a common link between Pliny's and Tacitus' retroactive programs—and Juvenal must be added to the mix:

Like Pliny in the Panegyricus, Tacitus emphatically separates the implied side of right, the authorial outrage which the right-minded reader is invited to share, from the side of wrong, the wicked delators who precipitate the cataclysmic social collapse of Flavian Rome, a collapse in which even the most canonical human antithesis of friend-enemy is overturned.\textsuperscript{49}

By emphatically placing this issue at the front and center of his Histories, Tacitus highlights its role in Rome’s social disintegration during the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods:

\textsuperscript{47} Braund (2004) 22: “Juvenal indicates the limitations of this character [the persona in Books One and Two] by exposing the contradictions between his view of himself as a morally pure and superior being and the more objective view of him as a narrow-minded bigot.” Cp. Winkler (1983) 218: “The conclusions to be drawn about the persona...show us a narrow-minded and cynical bigot who blindly condemns what he does not like.”

\textsuperscript{48} Whitton (2012) 355 argues that Pliny links Tacitus to his own epistolary program through parallel paths of literary vengeance: “Indignation blends with self-defense as the survivor stakes his moral ground: Tacitus condemns the delators, if anything more obsessively than Pliny, thereby asserting the gulf that divides him from them.”

\textsuperscript{49} Whitton (2012) 355.
nobilitas, opes, omissi gestique honores pro crimine et ob virtutes certissimum exitium. Nec minus praemia delatorum invisa quam scelera, cum alii sacerdotia et consulatus ut spolia adepti, procurationes alii et interiorem potentiam, agerent verterent cuncta odio et terrore. corrupti in dominos servi, in patronos liberti; et quibus deerat inimicus per amicos oppressi. (Hist. 1.2.3)

High birth, wealth, offices refused or accepted—these gave reason for charges, and virtue was the surest road to ruin. The rewards of the informers were no less hated than their crimes, when some attained priesthoods and consulships as spoils, others procuratorships and private power; they created chaos and turned the world upside down with hatred and terror. Slaves were corrupted against masters, freedmen against their patrons; those without enemies had friends to ruin them.

Tacitus traces the abuse of the *lex maiestatis*—which had previously been applied to Roman armies guilty of sedition but had come to be applicable to a wide range of “offenses”—to the reign of Augustus, though he asserts that it was fully revitalized under Tiberius, by whose will *delatio* became an all-consuming disaster (*quanta Tiberii arte gravissimum exitium inrepererit, dein repressum sit, postremo arserit cunctaque corripuerit*, Ann. 1.73).

As with Pliny and Juvenal, Tacitus puts the focus on the unscrupulous method by which these men rose *ex paupere* to wealth by threatening the nobility. One of the first to take advantage of the abuse of the newly revised law was Caepio Crispinus,

---

50 *Ann. 1.72.* It is worth noting that both Augustus and Tiberius are said to allow the revival of the *lex maiestatis* as a result of slander and satiric verses written against their person. Suetonius too stresses the domination of *delatores* under Tiberius and the rewards decreed for them: *decreta accusatoribus praeципua praemia, nonnumquam et testibus. nemini delatorum fides abrogata. omne crimen pro capitali receptum, etiam paucorum simpliciumque verborum*, Tib. 61.3.

51 Tiberius defended the practice of rewarding *delatores*, men “born for the destruction of the state,” upon successful conviction of their opponents: *sic delatores, genus hominum publico exitio repertum et <ne> poenis quidem umquam satis coercitum, per praemia eliciebantur, Ann. 4.30.* Cp. *Ann. 11.5* for the license that Tiberius’ rule afforded to *delatores*: *Continuus inde et saevus accusandis reis Suillus multique audaciae eius aemuli; nam cuncta legum et magistratum munia in se trahens princeps materiam praedandi patefecerat.*

52 In lieu of a professional public prosecutor, it was up to individual citizens to bring charges. If successful, the plaintive would receive remuneration from the estate of the defendant.
who introduced this kind of living, which afterwards became popular through the wretchedness of the times and men’s recklessness. For, being indigent, a nobody, and rash, he took advantage of the cruelty of the princeps, and soon threatened each noble; he acquired power under one man, but universal hatred among all others. He offered an example, which was followed by men who went from poverty to wealth, men to be feared from men despised, ruining others before finally bringing it upon themselves.

Tacitus' picture of the informers turning the world upside down (*agerent verterent cuncta odio et terrore*) and inspiring the hatred of their contemporaries accords well with the overall tone of Juvenal's first two books, as in his vivid image of the scavenging *delatores*, snatching after the remaining scraps (*quod superest*) from the carcass of an "eaten away nobility".  

*veniat...magni delator amici et cito rapturus de nobilitate comesa quod superest, quem Massa timet, quem munere palpat Carus et a trepido Thymele summissa Latino. (1.32-36)*

The informer against his powerful friend comes along, about to snatch quickly from an eaten away nobility whatever remains; he whom Massa fears, whom Carus sooths with a gift and Thyme, offered by a frightened Latinus.

For Juvenal and Tacitus the corruption of the *delatores* is involved in the broader societal compact of *amicitia* between patron and client. By identifying the *delator*

53 Cp. Tac. *Ann.* 2.27 for the image of *delatores* devouring the state: *Sub idem tempus e familia Scriboniorum Libo Drusus defertur moliri res novas. eius negotii initium, ordinem, finem curatius disseram, quia tum primum reperta sunt quae per tot annos rem publicam ecedere.*

54 Baebius Massa and Mettius Carus were notorious informers under Domitian. Of Massa, Tacitus comments at *Hist.* 4.50: [*Baebius Massa| iam tunc optimo cique exitiosus et inter causas malorum quae mox tulimus saepius rediturus.* It is most likely that Tacitus treated Massa in detail in the now lost final book of the *Histories.* See Freudenburg (2001) 218.
specifically as an informer against his patron (magni amici), Juvenal here reifies Tacitus’
account of the perversion of the amicitia relationship that has caused severe disruption
in the social fabric at Rome.

The influence of delatio on the corruption of the amicitia relationship is further
stressed in Juvenal and Tacitus’ parallel accounts of the accusations against Marcius
Barea Soranus, whom the Stoic philosopher P. Egnatius Celer, a client and instructor of
Soranus, condemned with his testimony in 66 CE.55 In the passage above, Juvenal had
neither specifically named the informer nor his amicus,56 but in the third satire he
continues the condemnation of traitorous informers by employing Umbricius to voice an
identical complaint with a specific historical exemplum:

Stoicus occidit Baream delator amicum
disciplumque senex ripa nutritus in illa
ad quam Gorgonei delapsa est pinna caballi. (3.116-18)

The informer, an old Stoic, born on that shore towards which the wing of the
Gorgonian nag glided down, killed his friend and pupil Barea.57

By using Celer’s denunciation of his own patron and student as an example of Greek
treachery, Umbricius strengthens his argument against Rome as “a Greek city” (non
possum ferre, Quirites, Graecam Urbem) with an allusion that takes advantage of the
hostility against Celer, bitterly detailed in both the Histories and Annals of Tacitus:58

55 The fact that Juvenal refers to Celer as a delator when he was technically a testis
against his patron indicates the satirist’s typical interest in pointing the moral, rather than

56 Cf. Courtney (1980) 92: “None of the identifications proposed for this character can be
right, and Juvenal probably had no specific person in mind but simply thought in general
terms of those who practised delatio under Domitian.”

57 Soranus had been accused of plotting revolution during his proconsulate in Asia during the reign of
Nero.

58 The relevant passages are Hist. 4.10; Ann. 16.21, 16.23-33.
Tum invectus est Musonius Rufus in P. Celerem, a quo Baream Soranum falsa testimonio circumventum arguebat. ea cognitione renovari odia accusationum videbantur. sed vilis et nocens reus protegi non poterat: quippe Sorani sancta memoria; Celer professus sapientiam, dein testis in Baream, proditor corruptorque amicitiae cuius se magistrum ferebat. (Hist. 4.10.1-5)

Then Musonius Rufus attacked Publius Celer, accusing him of unjustly prosecuting Barea Soranus with false testimony. The hatred of the informers seemed to be revived by this inquiry. But a defendant so contemptible and guilty was unable to be protected since the memory of Soranus was holy; Celer preached philosophy; then became a witness against Barea, and so a traitor and corruptor of the friendship he pretended to teach.

Both Juvenal and Tacitus use Nero’s attempt to “destroy virtue herself” by the ruin of Thrasea Paetus and Barea Soranus as an opportunity to critique corrupted amicitia.

Juvenal's first book is tightly bound by the theme of amicitia corrupted, ubiquitously present in different settings and from various social perspectives. In satire 3, we are introduced to Umbricius, from whose viewpoint dissembling Greeks have wormed their way into positions of power and dislocated native-born Romans like himself from their service as clientes. Juvenal links the authorial voice of the first satire to Umbricius' complaint not only through verbal repetition (summmoveant...summmoveor), but also in the introduction to the third satire through an explicit sympathy with Umbricius' perspective:

---

59 Ann. 16.21: Trucidatis tot insignibus viris ad postremum Nero virtutem ipsam excindere concupivit interfecto Thrasea Paeto et Barea Sorano.

60 3.84-85: usque adeo nihil est quod nostra infantia caelum / hausit Auentini baca nutrita Sabina?

61 Juvenal employs varieties of this compound three times (1.37, 3.124, 14.186). The two instances in book one are linked by the exclusion of the client in a critique of the amicitia relationship. The te whom the authorial voice addresses in satire 1 prepares for the transition to the client's voice embodied in Umbricius.

62 3.1-20. The satirist's voice (Umbricius makes clear at 3.321-2 that the authorial voice is here that of a satirist's) foreshadows many of Umbricius' criticisms.
nam quis iniquae
tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus, ut teneat se,
cum te summoueant qui testamenta merentur
noctibus, in caelum quos euehit optima summi
nunc uia processus, uetulae uesica beatae? (1.30-31; 37-39)

For who is so tolerant of such an unjust city, so iron-hearted, that he is able
to restrain himself, when those who earn their inheritance in the night
displace you, those whom the best road to advancement—the snatch of
some rich old woman—now raises to the heights?

nam cum facilem stillauit in aurem
exiguum de naturae patriaeque ueneno,
limine summouer, perierunt tempora longi
seruitii; nusquam minor est iactura clientis. (3.122-125)

In fact, when he [a Greek cliens] has let drop into the patron’s willing ear a
bit of that poison, so natural to him and his race, I am barred from the
threshold, and all those long years of servitude are for naught; never has
the abandonment of a client been of less concern.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Juvenal uses the image of entry permitted or denied to
highlight the key theme of exclusion, whether it is the lowly cliens shut out from dining
on equal terms with his patron and forced to salivate over dishes passing him by63 on
their way to “king” Virro (rex),64 or the aristocratic senators excluded from the threshold
of Domitian’s palace, similarly left to gape after the giant turbot as it passes through the
double doors with its easy hinge (facile cardine)65 on its way to the “king”:

obstitit intranti miratrix turba parumper.
ut cessit, facili patuerunt cardine ualuae;
exclusi spectant admissa obsonia patres.
itor ad Atriden. (4.63-65)

63 Juv. 5. 80-83: Aspice quam longo distinguat pectore lancem / quae fertur domino squilla, et quibus
undique saepta / asparagis, qua despiciat convivia cauda, / dum venit excelsi manibus sublata ministri.

64 Juv. 5.14.

65 See ch. 3, note 32 for Juvenal's possibly parody of the paraklausithyron motif.
For a little while, a marveling crowd blocked the fish’s path. When the
crowd yielded, the double doors opened with a willing hinge. Shut out, the
senate eyes the dish, ushered in. It makes its way to King Agamemnon.

In Juvenal’s first and third satires, we see the client displaced (*summoveor,*
*summoveant*) from the threshold of the powerful just as the senators are excluded
(*exclusi*). Juvenal, then, presents the decay of *amicitia* from the lowest to the highest
echelons of society, consistently drawing upon *exempla* and themes that form an
integral part of Tacitus’ and Pliny’s *corpora* in a sustained responsion designed to
provoke the *indignatio* and *odium* of their contemporaries.

These authors of distinct genres (epistolography, history, and satire) are linked by
the desire to cast themselves as avengers after the fact, and there is no reason to
suppose that Pliny’s or Tacitus’ readership sympathized with these authors of
retroactive denunciation in their *studia,* but denied this same retrojection to Juvenal’s
*Satires.* It is entirely plausible that those feeling the palpable anger described by Pliny
would have laughed (albeit bitterly) along with the satirist at his mockery—however
exaggerated—of overthrown “monsters” and their henchmen, rather than perceive him
as an undercut speaker for voicing the same *indignatio* that Pliny and Tacitus suggest
they themselves, along with their contemporaries, experienced.

Without a sufficient literary context and with a stubborn refusal to see Juvenal’s
present in light of his recent past, recent scholarly contributions questioning the efficacy
and purpose of a collection that so blatantly turns its attention to the past have puzzled
over the notion of a satirist venting upon the deceased as a hardly plausible and serious

---

66 At the conclusion to Juvenal’s fourth satire, the council is dismissed and Domitian is left to devour his
gigantic turbot alone.

67 Green (1972) 249: “Of course Juvenal exaggerates; so does every political cartoonist.”
didactic enterprise. The schema of the persona theory, when superimposed upon Juvenal's thematic statement at the conclusion to his first satire has interpreted evasion as merely another facet of his undercut narrator. The fact that Juvenal, more than any other satirist, grants historical themes pride of place in his collection through this declaration becomes in this view a belabored and circuitous mechanism designed to reveal the speaker's cowardice:

>'pone Tigillinum, taeda lucebis in illa
qua stantes ardent qui fixo gutture fumant,
et latum media sulcum deducit harena...'
experiar quid concedatur in illos
quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina. (Juv. 1.155-171)

"Write 'Tigillinus', and you will burn as a torch where those men stand smoldering with their throats fastened, and [you] will trace a broad furrow through the arena..." I will attempt what I may against those whose ashes are covered by the Flaminian and Latin roads.

It is telling that Juvenal's claim to be prevented from writing contemporaneous satire is illustrated by the example of Nero's henchman Tigillinus, who was executed by Vespasian thirty years prior to the publication of Juvenal's first book. When the satirist writes, “Tigillinus,” as he says he must not do if he is to preserve his life, he touches upon themes still vibrant and topical among his contemporaries, if we are to judge by the works of Tacitus and Pliny, whose gloomy and gruesome picture fits well with the world of Juvenal's Satires. The satirist chooses to frame his profession in satire 1 to write of the deceased with an example that Tacitus tells us was particularly distasteful to the Romans. Nero's persecution of the Christians through, among other horrific tortures, immolation, was too shocking even for a people who loathed the burgeoning religion and who were obsessed with the violence of the gladiatorial arena.68

---

68 Tac. Ann. 15.43-44.
from such a gruesome *exemplum* fits Juvenal's *modus operandi* of painting stomach-churning images to elicit visceral reactions from his audience.

The very fact that Juvenal chooses Tigillinus as his potential executioner to illustrate the dangers of writing down contemporaries implies that he seeks to import his reader into the past precisely because he envisions historical *exempla* as ever present. One even gets the sense that Juvenal may not *want* to specifically write about his contemporaries and deploys his redirection at the conclusion of the first satire as a device whereby he can more easily focus his attention on the past. It is difficult to believe, for instance, that the scathing and vindictive nature of satire 4 against the emperor Domitian was only grudgingly taken up because the satirist was unable to write against his contemporaries. In this light, satire 1 reads very much like an explanation or excuse to direct his attention where his contemporaries wanted it: squarely on the Julio-Claudians and Flavians. The effect of Juvenal’s professed intent to only attack the dead is that he is free to employ historical *exempla* to reflect upon the values and behaviors of his era while at the same time cashing in on the trend of attacking figures from the past as did his contemporaries.

There is undeniably, then, a certain reality to the danger of attacking one's contemporaries that argues against viewing Juvenal's stance as an entirely artificial and literary one. Furthermore, judging authors concerned with the repercussions of criticizing contemporaries as 'cowards' is not necessarily an assumption shared by Juvenal's peers, as they similarly treat the issue of their own enforced silence and the limits of what they themselves were able to get away with under tyranny. Juvenal's suggestion that writing against one's contemporaries is a dangerous business that has
and still may have very real consequences for the critic is enumerated by Tacitus in several instances where an author's works—particularly those of a satiric quality—drew the unwanted attention of the princeps or informers who sought their prosecution. Phaedrus, for example, writes that his chosen genre of fabulae was designed precisely to convey a moral through obfuscation when it was dangerous to name names, and he still fell afoul of Sejanus under Tiberius for suspected allusions to the praetorian prefect. In addition, Tacitus records that Tigillinus' son-in-law Cossutianus Capito denounced the praetor Antistius after he composed slanderous poems against Nero in 62 CE and recited them at a dinner party. Fabricius Veiento (who would himself be an informer under Domitian and a target of Juvenal's satire) was similarly exiled by Nero after he was prosecuted for composing libelous verses against senators and priests.

Even setting these specific exempla aside, every extant satirist following Lucilius exhibits anxiety over the increased dangers of attacking powerful contemporaries. This fact is, of course, in itself a comment and criticism upon present realities.

Juvenal's turn to the past, therefore, might better be seen as a way of using real personages, the critiques of whom are still applicable in Juvenal's era (and later). Pliny,

---

69 Phaed. Pr. 3.40-47. Cp. Ann. 4.34 for Sejanus' actions against Cremutius Cordus, who had published a collection of annals in which he praised Marcus Brutus and referred to Gaius Cassius as the "last of the Romans."

70 Tac. Ann. 14.48-50. Veiento's satiric verses took the form of a mock will (codicilli). Cp. Ann. 16.19 for Petronius' real satiric indictment of Nero's debauchery in his actual will (again codicilli). The fact that Petronius was already condemned and even in the midst of opening his veins seems to have offered a rare opportunity for attacking his contemporaries.

71 Juvenal's programmatic statement upsets the expectations of a genre that was at least theoretically designed to critique the vices of specific individual contemporaries. This was the function, after all, of Old Comedy, upon which the genre had been founded. The disparity between the license afforded to Aristophanes and Juvenal is glaring, and while the Republican Lucilius appears to have been more successful as a detractor of his contemporaries, Juvenal is under no illusions that his freedom is on par with the outspoken critic.
in fact, states that it is appropriate for Roman authors not to use the names of contemporaries when imitating the license of Old Comedy, the genre from which satire traces its lineage.\textsuperscript{72} It is evident that Juvenal usually employs historical individuals to illustrate the themes he has chosen for his satire, rather than making them the focal point. As Highet noted, virtually all of Juvenal’s themes, even when explicitly citing historical events or persons, are universal in nature and not limited to a particular period.\textsuperscript{73} Juvenal here makes the contemporary coterminous with the figures he parades throughout the \textit{Satires}, unaware that he was living at the beginning of an epoch about which Gibbon would famously declare: "the period in the history of the world, during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous."

Juvenal had borne witness to a succession of collapsed regimes and perhaps had little confidence that history would not repeat itself as it so often had; there is little reason, then, to wonder at the severe pessimism in his early satires.

Reading Juvenal's "angry" satires through Seneca's Stoic disavowal of vengeance and the ensuing narrative of an intentionally undercut coward ultimately does not account for the complexity of Juvenal's historically situated critique and produces a reading in which the satirist's insistence on placing historical themes at the front and center of his collection becomes a curious appendage. Rather, a consideration of the specific context in which Juvenal introduces his satirist is essential to approaching his

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Nunc primum se in uetere comoedia, sed non tamquam inciperet ostendit. Non illi uis, non granditas, non subtillitas, non amaritudo, non dulcedo, non lepos defuit: ornauit uirtutes, insectatus est uitia; fictis nominibus decenter, ueris usus est apte} (Ep. 6.21). Pliny refers here to Verginius Rufus’ first attempt at Old Comedy. Important here is Pliny’s statement that Old Comedy is designed to attack vice, but that there is a concern to employ fictitious names when necessary, though real names can be used appropriately. This is precisely the method of the satirists and the aims of the two genres are so similar that it is reasonable to apply Pliny's ethic to contemporary satire.

\textsuperscript{73} Highet (1961) 56-58.
indignant, moralizing creation, in whom the satirist personifies the spirit of vengeance so prominently highlighted by his contemporaries. This is where Juvenal's satiric efficacy lies. Juvenal's critical voice must be viewed in the light of Pliny's epistolary persona, who declares that only with the death of Domitian does the opportunity at last arise to make oneself known:

\[\text{Occiso Domitiano statui mecum ac deliberaui, esse magnam pulchramque materiam insectandi nocentes, miseris uindicandi, se proferendi. (Ep. 9.13)}\]

With Domitian dead, I determined and resolved that this was a great and fine opportunity to attack the guilty, avenge the pitiable, and to put oneself forward.

It is furthermore difficult not to believe that Juvenal is attempting, at least in part, to make satire work within a vindictive literary trend that Trajan permitted (and perhaps promoted):74

\[\text{Praeterea hoc primum erga optimum imperatorem piorum ciuium officium est, insequi dissimiles; neque enim satis amarit bonos principes, qui malos satis non odierit. Adice quod imperatoris nostri non aliiud amplius ac diffusius meritum est, quam quod insectari malos principes tutum est. An excidit dolori nostro modo uindicatus Nero? Permitteret, credo, famam uitamque eius carpi qui mortem ulciscebatur, nec ut in se dicta interpretaretur, quae de simillimo diceretur. Quare erga te, Caesar, muneribus [omnibus] tuis omnibus comparo, multis antepono, quod licet nobis et in praeteritum de malis imperatoribus cotidie uindicari et futuros sub exemplo praemonere, nullum locum nullum esse tempus, quo funestorum principum manes a posterorum exsecrationibus conquiescant. (Pan. 53)}\]

In fact, it is first and foremost the duty of loyal citizens, as regards the best of all emperors, to attack those unlike him; for it is not possible to have a sufficient appreciation of good emperors if one does not sufficiently hate bad

---
74 See Ramage (1989) who makes the leap from Trajan’s permitting of vindictive literature against previous emperors to the overt promotion of this enterprise in a variety of genres. Cp. Wilson (2003) for a critique of the revisionist historical perspective that sees Tacitus, Pliny, and Juvenal engaged in an overt and concerted propaganda: “The principal weakness of this way of reading the literature is that it completely ignores the issue of genre, by reducing all literary forms to one, that is, panegyric...Only by means of massive oversimplification and by ignoring the authors' own definitions of their aims can these other genres be treated as if they are really organs of semi-official government communication” (529-530).
ones. Add to this the fact that there is no other merit of our emperor more generous nor widespread than the fact that it is safe to denounce evil emperors. Or is it forgotten amongst our sorrow how Nero was but recently avenged? Would it have been permitted, do you think, for his reputation and life to be criticized by the one who avenged his death [Domitian]; would he not interpret words as applicable to himself which were said about one similar to him? Therefore, in regards to you, Caesar, I compare to all of your acts of generosity, indeed, I rank it above many of them, the fact that it is permitted for us both to avenge ourselves daily on the wicked emperors of the past and to thereby warn future ones in advance by this example, that there will be neither time nor place for the shades of ruinous rulers to rest from the curses of posterity.

Pliny illustrates many key themes that have been considered thus far: the enforced silence under Domitian, who would not tolerate criticism of his predecessors; the virtual requirement of morally righteous citizens (piorum civium officium est) to hate (oderit) the wicked emperors of the past (and one would assume this was not felt without some indignation); the emphasis on memory as a crucial component of the vengeful works in condemning emperors who failed to serve as an ideal paradigm of behavior. Juvenal's approach is to attack those famous dead whose tombs lined the Flaminian and Latin roads (precisely where Domitian's remains rested) and by doing so Juvenal illustrates Pliny's conception of how revenge literature functions: attacking evil rulers puts current and future rulers on notice that "there will be neither time nor place for the shades of ruinous rulers to rest from the curses of posterity."

What is particularly noteworthy about the above passages from Pliny, in addition to its testimony that the floodgates of criticism against former emperors had been thrown open, is the casual assumption that the only appropriate time to attack Domitian was after his death. The prerequisite for stepping out onto the public stage and seeking

---

75 Domitian executed the imperial freedman Epaphroditus in 95 for assisting Nero in his suicide.
vengeance is clear: *Occiso Domitiano*. A vivid enactment of Pliny's praise of belated vengeance is offered by his description of the mutilation of Domitian's statues after his fall:

\[
\text{Iuvabat illidere solo superbissimos vultus, instare ferro, saevire securibus, ut si singulos ictus sanguis dolorque sequeretur. Nemo tam temperans gaudii seraque laetitiae, quin instar ultionis cernere laceros artus truncata membra, postremo truces horrendaque imagines obiectas excoctasque flammis. (Pan. 52)}
\]

Those countless golden images [of Domitian], however, in their overthrow and ruin were offered as sacrifice for the public's delight. It was a joy to strike to the ground those most haughty faces, to attack them with the sword and to vent our rage with axes, as if blood and pain might follow each blow. No one so restrained himself from joy and exultation deferred that he did not seem to find a substitute for vengeance in the mangled and mutilated limbs, and finally the savage and frightful images cast into the flames and melted down.

Chapter 1 considered this passage in connection with the joy Pliny expresses of taking a long overdue revenge upon the fallen emperor, and how this belies the interpretation of Juvenal's similarly vengeful satirist as exhibiting an unsympathetic anger. Here I would like to consider this passage in light of the suggestion that Juvenal intends to color his satirist as a coward. It would be difficult to find another image that better demonstrates the impotence and futility of anger as the mutilation of statues, whose destruction functioned "as a substitute for vengeance." Nonetheless, Pliny is not embarrassed in his portrayal of such a powerless display of anger as the dismembering

---

76 Cp. Freudenburg (2001) who mocks Pliny's decision to "take action" only after Domitian's death: "The race was on to "make oneself known" (se proferendi), to invent yourself as a subject after the fall, to define yourself as part of the solution rather than as part of the problem. And the way you did this, Pliny indicates, was to mark off a clear distance between yourself and the enemy: to "attack the guilty" and to "avenge the injured." His speeches directed against Publicius Certus, the praetorian senator who prosecuted Helvidius in the autumn of 93, are part of this project. And we may note with some slight discomfort that they are written not "in defense of" Helvidius, but "to vindicate" him (de Heluidi ultione). Pliny, when it really mattered, three years before when he could have "defended" the man, said nothing. But now that Domitian has died, when it really matters to him, he has plenty to say. It is payback time. Time to start writing those speeches that have welled up inside him for the past fifteen years or more, the ones he found so very difficult to not write. It all sounds terribly familiar" (232).
of statues that serves as a proxy for the lifeless Domitian. We may ask of Pliny and those desecrating Domitian’s statues, as Freudenburg does, “where were you when it mattered,” but this seems anachronistic since the question does not appear to be how our authors framed their experience in the event of Domitian’s death and its aftermath. There was plenty of finger-pointing at the guilty (particularly informers) who were felt to have unscrupulously enriched themselves, yet, in neither of these passages does Pliny display a self-conscious concern that his peers may perceive him or those striking the inanimate statues as cowards, as it is understood that they were all similarly bound by the same silence.

What about Tacitus? While he poignantly laments the loss of freedom under the rule of tyrants, and he levels a blistering critique against the behavior of the senate under various emperors, he does not seem to have offered a plausible alternative course of action, but instead praises those who function with honor within the existing social structure under the principate. He directly addresses the issue of the culpability of the silenced under Domitian in his Agricola, where he in fact condemns the ostentatious and ultimately futile deaths of senatorial "freedom-fighters".

78 See especially Ag. 3.2 for the loss of freedom for fifteen years. Tacitus here commiserates with the survivors of Domitian, but his tone is not one of condemnation for their cowardice, but of relief at the tyrant’s death: subit quippe etiam ipsius inertiae dulcedo, et invisa primo desidia postremo amatur. quid, si per quindecim annos, grande mortalis aevi spatium, multi fortuitis casibus, promptissimus quique saevitia principis interciderunt, pauci et, ut ita dixerim, non modo aliorum sed etiam nostri superstites sumus, exemptis e media vita tot annis, quibus iuvenes ad senectutem, senes prope ad ipsos exactae aetatis terminos per silentium venimus?
79 See Tac. Hist. 1.1. Tacitus, while strongly criticizing the principate, seems to admit its necessity when he asserts that its introduction served the interests of peace.
80 "Tacitus admits that the Stoic martyrs won praise but adds that they achieved no good by it. The reference is to Thrasea Paetus and, above all, to Helvidius Priscus" (Ogilvie and Richmond (1967) 297).
sciant, quibus moris est inlicita mirari, posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse, obsequiumque ac modestiam, si industria ac vigor adsint, eo laudis excedere, quo plerique per abrupta, sed in nullum rei publicae usum <nis> ambitiosa morte inclaruerunt. (Ag. 42.5)

Let them know, those whose manner it is to marvel at illegality, that it is possible even under wicked emperors for great men to exist, and that compliance and respect for order, if a sense of purpose and energy are not lacking, excel to the height of praise, where most through perilous courses (though of no use to the State) have gained their fame by an ostentatious death.

Tacitus' exhortation comes in the context of his defense of Agricola's military performance in Britannia and his decision to turn down the governorship of another province due to his dangerous popularity, which had earned the despot's envy. Tacitus does not conceal that his father-in-law's career had been advanced by Domitian to a point,81 nor is Tacitus shy in admitting that his own career had been furthered by the emperor.82 A certain amount of silence has its rewards.

Juvenal's proclamation that he will use the famous dead to illustrate his satires exploits this anxiety, evident particularly in works of the imperial period, over the issue of the freedom to criticize contemporaries. In this way, Juvenal transforms satire into an opportunity to concentrate on the deceased in competition with a variety of genres (e.g. historical works, Pliny's *Epistles* and *Panegyricus*) and finds his own outlet in the revenge taking industry. By reading Juvenal's early satiric effort against this backdrop, it becomes evident that he seeks to historicize satire by marshaling more than any other satirist historical *exempla* to serve his moralizing didactic, rather than present his main

81 See Ogilvie and Richmond, who similarly argue that Tacitus' sentiments here “should not be seen as an embarrassed defence of Agricola's and Tacitus' personal collaboration with the régime of Domitian. It is in line with all Tacitus' political thinking about the futility of ostentatious independence under the principate. The contrast with the immediately following account of Agricola's death must be deliberate and reflect Tacitus' view that Agricola no less than more controversial heroes of the time displayed *virtus*” (296-297).

82 As had Nerva's and Trajan's. See Tac. *Hist*. 1.1.
narrator as an undercut coward. Juvenal’s *Satires* demand to be read in concert with the monumental literature being constructed and debated around them. To confine Juvenal to his text alone and to find there internal “tensions” to explain an undercut narrator excludes the historical context in which Juvenal himself chose to immerse us.
CHAPTER 5
THE CONTAGION WITHIN: THE OTHER IN JUVENALIAN CONCEPTIONS OF
ROMAN IDENTITY

Immigrants and faggots, they make no sense to me / they come to our
country / and think they'll do as they please / like start some mini-Iran or
spread some fuckin' disease / they talk so many goddamn ways / it's all
Greek to me... -Axl Rose, "One in a Million"

Anyone approaching Juvenalian satire may feel the need to begin with an apology
for handling this satirist at all,¹ due primarily to Juvenal's characteristically brash
presentation of xenophobic and misogynistic invective. His seething persona raises
questions about his place among the Classics,² as the ferocity of his onslaught against
foreign intrusion into his conservative and hierarchical world rubs us the wrong way and
leaves us seeking an alternative interpretation for his untempered angst.³

Yet, the satirist's xenophobic discourse is couched in terms and viewpoints familiar
to, and apparently reified by, Juvenal's cultural milieu. Consistently linked in our
primary sources throughout the Republican and Imperial periods as a unified out-group
is the trio of foreigner, female, and 'homosexuals'.⁴ The indictments of Juvenal's
speaker(s) against these groups often find broad resonance throughout our sources,
and are not therefore so easily dismissed as the idiosyncratic ranting of a madman,

¹ Freudenburg (2005) 24: "The history of much scholarship on satire, whether ancient, early modern, or
that of our own day, reads like a strained effort to land one's loutish, but fun-loving, brother-in-law a
decent job."

² Mason (1962) "Is Juvenal a Classic?"

³ Freudenburg (2005) 25: "Sometimes we find ourselves in perfect agreement with everything that the
satirist says, so we are free to weigh in with a heartfelt laugh. And yet, often, we find it difficult to second
the satirist in his every (vengeful, leering, xenophobic, ironically smug) judgment. Even when we happen
to agree with the gist of what he says, we commonly object to the way he says it."

⁴ Shumate (2006) 21: "these poems [satires 1, 2, 3, and 6] 'star' the three groups—foreigners, women,
and (in modern terms) 'homosexuals'—that the speaker shakes up and blends into the composite Other,
the national enemy who threatens to overwhelm the dwindling ranks of 'real' Roman men." See also ibid.
99: "many of the deficiencies attributed to the barbarians in their function as negative exempla are the
deficiencies assigned to women in Greek and Roman tradition."
entirely alien to the prejudices of Juvenal’s audience, and consequently best viewed as
the moralizing of an unsympathetic speaker. Even scholars who subscribe to the
persona theorists’ supposition that Juvenal sought primarily to critique the views of his
own speaker⁶ concur that those views are, in fact, representative of contemporaneous
xenophobic discourse:

It is true that Juvenal the poet assigned his speaker an
especially reductive form of an apparently current discourse
in order to make it a target of satiric scrutiny (Shumate,
2006: 33-34).⁶

While Juvenal’s narrative incorporates contemporary and deep-seated negative
conceptions of the Foreign, the "Other" can at times have positive attributes that
function as a foil against which Juvenal draws his critique of Rome’s upper classes.
Foreign groups are sometimes figured as idyllic examples of a Roman past utterly lost.

The exploitation of this facet of the "Other" is not limited to Juvenal, but is a
common tool employed by several Greek and Roman authors when moralizing to their
own readers. This rhetoric can in turn take the form of an attack against foreigners and
their influence, but is directed ultimately against those Romans who have permitted that
influence to permeate Roman political and moral life. This discourse that is at once a
critique of Rome herself, with the "Other" constructed as an innocent group corrupted
only upon contact with the Roman, can itself transform and become, at the whim of the

---

⁵ "I follow what has become the critical consensus, which insists that a clear distinction must be made
between the poet and the dramatic characters that he [Juvenal] creates to speak in his poems...His
credibility as a moral authority is called into question as he repeatedly exposes himself as irrational,
dogmatic, hypocritical, and profoundly lacking in self-knowledge. The target of the satire, then, is this
speaker’s reactionary discourse and its moral blind spots as much as the behaviours and trends that he

⁶ See also Isaac (2004) 42: “Satire must...be taken seriously as a form of commentary on the opinions of
the speaker and hence, of the current views of many of his readers.” Cp. Henderson (1999) 205: "We
know that, whatever else, Satire satirizes the satirist and satirizes the genre of Satire, turns on itself and
on the consciousness of its voice and its readers. Its mark and mask is self-mockery."
author, an attack that exposes the "Other" as a corrupting agent responsible for Rome's further plunge into decadence and departure from an idealized mos maiorum.

One of the major consequences of the contact with and assimilation of particularly Eastern territories is an enervating effeminacy believed to produce a decline in military order, ultimately viewed as the primary determining factor in Rome's superiority that justifies her empire. Consistently present in historical and literary narratives concerning Roman power is the notion that Rome's success is the very reason for her decline, as her armies become conduits of contagion, bringing home with them the cultural virus of her subjugated nations. This contagion becomes a focal point for moralizing authors, including Juvenal, since Rome's military might, the key to her success, is called into question by luxurious and therefore effeminate influences.

This theme of contamination is one of the consistent threads throughout Juvenal's corpus (and not only in the so-called "angry" satires of books one and two), since the corruption of the upper classes is directly correlated to their adoption of foreign attitudes, luxuries, and practices, prompting Umbricius, for example, to decry in

---

7 Rome's unlikely rise to dominance is later crystallized in Vegetius' succinct explanation that Rome overcame the numbers of the Gauls, the height of the Germans, the strength of the Spaniards, the wealth of the Africans, and the art and intelligence of the Greeks through sheer military discipline: Nulla enim alia re uidemus populum Romanum orbem subegisse terrarum nisi armorum exercitio, disciplina castrorum usuque militiae. Quid enim adversus Gallorum multitudinem pulchritudinem Romana ualuisset? Quid adversus Germanorum proceritatem breuitas potuisset audere? Hispanos quidem non tantum numero sed et viribus corporum nostris praestississe manifestum est; Afrorum dolis et artibus semper impares fuimus; Graecorum artibus prudentiaque nos uinci nemo dubitauit. Sed adversus omnia profuit tironem sollicitter eligere, ius, ut ita dixerim, armorum docere, cotidiano exercitio roborare, quaecumque uenire in acie atque proelii possunt, omnia in campestri meditatione praenoscere, seuerae in desides uindicare, Ep. 1.1.

8 E.g. Livy 39.6, Juv. 6. 286-295, Hor. Ep. 16. 1-16.

9 The historians of Rome's rise to dominance, though differing in the specific date, are unanimous in their determination that Rome had incontrovertibly slipped into moral decline as a consequence of its expansion and its resulting contact with foreign peoples. Livy (39.6) traces this corruption to 187 and the return of Manlius Vulso's army from Asia, while Sallust (Cat. 10) identifies 146 as its starting point, with the destruction of Carthage and Corinth. Polybius (32.11) traces the decline to the period after the battle of Pydna in 168, though he finds its origins as early as 200. Lucan, as an author of historical epic,
language characteristic of *indignatio* that Rome, through a kind of betrayal, is no longer identifiably Roman: *Quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris et quos praecipue fugiam, properabo fateri, nec pudor obstabit. non possum ferre, Quirites, Graecam Vrbem* ("The race that is now most welcome to our wealthy citizens—those whom I am especially happy to escape, I'll tell you straight out, nor will any modesty prevent me—I am not able to endure, Romans, a Greek city," Juv. 3.58-61). Umbricius' objections find a broad parallel among sources for the early imperial period, including Tacitus and both Pliny the Elder and Younger. The logic of this unified discourse is that foreign upstarts, even ex-slaves, have (to the shame of the upper classes) not only risen in social status, but have in some cases, as with the rise of Pallas, Claudius' Greek freedman, acquired such extraordinary authority that it supersedes the senate's and even the emperor's.

Juvenal's vindictive treatment of influential foreign elements and those deemed to be foreign upstarts is a pointed and acrimonious manifestation of ingrained strains of xenophobia. The focus upon the undercut speaker, developed through the identification of 'tensions' in a strict application of *persona* theory, posits the inability of Juvenal's speakers to be successful at Rome as a result of the author's conscious attempt to depict their mere jealousy of foreign upstarts. Such a conclusion, however, again seems at odds with Juvenal's contemporaries who share the same anxieties, expressed in a similarly indignant manner, and raises some doubt whether Juvenal intended his audience to understand his speakers in this way.

One of the most common functions of the "Other" in Roman literature is to serve as an idealized and didactic example against which to highlight the degeneracy of identifies the appropriation of foreign luxury and dress and a concomitant departure from a traditional stern Roman morality as an underlying cause of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey (Luc. 1.158-170).
Roman morality. The moral innocence of the barbarian is exploited as a teachable moment, an idealized mirror constructed to reflect Rome's pre-imperial and unpolluted past before the invasion of the very luxury that Rome itself now peddles to the provinces.\textsuperscript{10} Rome has become so diseased that it spreads its contagion to others. Tacitus expresses his own ambiguous anxiety over Rome's imperial agenda through a description of its corrupting influence upon foreign groups in Britain as they become acculturated:

\begin{quote}
...qui modo linguam Romanam abnuebant, eloquentiam concupiscenter.
inde etiam habitus nostri honor et frequens toga; paulatimque discessum ad
delenimenta vitiorum, porticus et balinea et conviviorum elegantiam. idque
apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset. (Ag. 21.3)
\end{quote}

Those who at one time rejected the Roman language ardently took up rhetoric. From there, they adopted the honor accorded to our dress, and the toga came into fashion; little by little they slid into the seduction of vice—colonnades, baths, and the refinements of dinner parties.\textsuperscript{11} This was called "culture" among the ignorant, though it was a part of their slavery.

Tacitus' ambivalence toward Rome's imperial mission is on display here, when, in the context of a panegyric to his father-in-law Agricola, he offers a critique of the very civilizing influence that Agricola helped to introduce to the provinces. Roman contact has here engendered a decline into vice as the foreigner adopts the trappings of the dominant "civilized" culture.

\textsuperscript{10} See esp. Caes. \textit{Gal.} 1.1.3 for the belief that the corruption of the "Other" derives specifically from a group's proximity to Roman culture: \textit{fortissimi sunt Belgae, propterea quod a cultu atque humanitate provinciae longissime absunt minimeque ad eos mercatores saepe commenat atque ea, quae ad effeminandos animos pertinent}. Cp. the Scythians' character and morals, favorably contrasted with the Romans' at Hor. \textit{Carm.} 3.24.9-13: \textit{campestres melius Scythae, / quorum plaustra vagas rite trahunt
domos, / vivunt et rigidi Getae, / inmetata quibus iugera liberas / fruges et Cererem ferunt...illic matre
carentibus / privignis mulier temperat innocens / nec dotata regit virum / coniunx nec nitido fidit adultero; /
dos est magna parentium / virtus et metuens alterius viri / certo foedere castitas, / et peccare nefas, aut
pretium est mori.}

\textsuperscript{11} Cp. Sal. \textit{Cat.} 7.4-5 for similar moralizing that idealizes the military prowess of Rome's youth in contradistinction to the current decadence of elaborate dinner parties: \textit{iam primum iuventus, simul ac belli patiens erat, in castris per laborum usum militiae discebat, magisque in decoris armis et militibus equis quam in scortis atque conviviis lubidinem habebant.}
Tacitus' theme of the innocent "Other" tragically corrupted by a decadent and dominant culture finds an almost verbatim treatment in the first century Greek geographer Strabo. Strabo reflects upon the unease that accompanies the expansion of a multicultural world and the inevitable exchange that "contaminates" an idyllic people:

We [Greeks] believe that they [the Scythians] are honest people, least of all, mischievous, and far more frugal and self-reliant than we are. And yet, our way of life has extended a change for the worse to nearly all peoples, introducing luxuriousness and desires, false artifice, and all manner of greed. Many of these sorts of evils have befallen the barbarians and others, including nomadic peoples. For in fact, taking up seafaring, they have degenerated, becoming pirates, and the murderers of strangers; because of their interaction with many peoples, they take part in their extravagance and petty trade. These things may seem to point towards a people's cultivation, but in fact they destroy customs and introduce craftiness in place of the frankness I just now mentioned.

Strabo here refers to contemporary Greeks, who had themselves been affected by cultural contact with Rome. An immigrant himself to Rome in 44 BCE, Strabo echoes Roman historians in his conception and explanation of the debasement of foreign groups. Like Tacitus in the above passage from the Agricola, where the trappings of Roman luxury were called "culture" (humanitas) but were in Tacitus' view implements of

---

12 Cp. Tac. Germ. 22.4.1: *gens non astuta nec callida aperit adhuc secreta pectoris licentia loci.*

13 Isaac (2006) 242: "Strabo here speaks of Greeks, but...emphatically describes them as the Greeks of his own age, when they had been living under Roman rule for more than half a century."
their servility, Strabo distinguishes between the adoption of foreign practices as an illusion of civilization (ἡμερότητα) and the reality of corruption. Strabo is consonant with Tacitus in other key respects, such as in the characterization of the export of luxuries and sensuality as cultural diseases. The spread of this contagion is believed to be exacerbated by the speed of transport through seafaring, a form of contamination similarly censured by Seneca, Horace (Strabo’s contemporary), and Juvenal specifically for its efficacy in corrupting morals.¹⁴

This moral decay destined to contaminate far-off provinces of the empire is one of the main themes adopted by Juvenal in the second satire that comically defeats the satirist’s opening proclamation that he longs to flee to the furthest reaches of the empire whenever he witnesses the hypocritical moralizing of Stoic philosophers.¹⁵ The satirist will be unable to travel far enough since all foreign territory is subject to contamination through Rome’s expansive push that draws with it the corruption now on display in the heart of the empire. This cultural infection is expressed by a contrast similar to Tacitus and Strabo’s between the honorable “Other” and the effeminate and amoral practices of Rome:

arma quidem ultra
litora Iuuernae promouimus et modo captas
Orcadas ac minima contentos nocte Britannos,
sed quae nunc populi fiunt uictoris in urbe
non faciunt illi quos uicimus. (2.159-163)


¹⁵ Juv. 2.1-3: Vltra Sauromatas fugere hinc libet et glacialem / Oceanum, quotiens aliquid de moribus audent / qui Curios simulant et Bacchanalia uiuunt.
Indeed, we have advanced our arms beyond the shores of Juverna, the recently captured Orkneys and the Britons, content with the shortest nights; but those whom we have conquered do not do the things that the populace now does in the city of the victor.

Juvenal takes a typical rhetorical tack here, as he does earlier in the satire with Laronia’s contention that not even women behave as the hypocritical moralists do, by seeking, through Cicero’s eighth *locus* (stressing the extraordinary nature of an offense, unknown even among barbarians and beasts) to rouse the indignation of his audience. The poet accomplishes this emotional response by stating that the sexual practices to be found at Rome are unknown even among the barbarous tribes whom Rome has conquered. So too, by deriding Otho’s masculinity earlier in the satire through a depiction of the stark contrast between his effeminate pre-battle manicure and the virile bravery of barbarian queens in war, the satirist employs foreign examples to heighten the effect of his critique through this rhetorical stratagem designed to provoke mocking indignation.

After drawing the picture of Rome’s feminization throughout the satire, Juvenal concludes with contagion. Rome is here the exporter of vice, confirmed by the vignette

---

16 Juv. 2.47-50.

17 *Inv.* 1.103: *octavus locus est, per quem demonstramus non vulgare neque factitatum esse ne ab audacissimis quidem hominibus id maleficium, de quo agatur; atque id a feris quoque hominibus et a barbaris gentibus et inmanibus bestiis esse remotum.*

18 See Courtney (1980) 148 *ad loc*. The poet seems to allude to Tacitus directly here, though Agricola had planned but never executed an invasion of Ireland (*Juverna*). See Tac. *Ag.* 10.4 for the discovery and subjugation of the Orcades.

19 Juv. 2.104-109: *nimirum summi ducis est occidere Galbam / et curare cutem, summi constantia ciuis / Bebriaci campis solium adfectare Palati / et pressum in faciem digitis extendere panem, / quod nec in Assyrio pharetrata Sameramis orbe / maesta nec Actiaca fecit Cleopatra carina.* Juvenal’s critique falls in line with the popular opinion of Otho’s effeminacy, recorded in Tacitus (*Hist.* 1.30), Suetonius (*Oth.* 2.2; 6.3) and Plutarch (*Plut. Oth.* 4.3; 8.2-3; 9.4-5).
of a hostage\textsuperscript{20} retained at Rome who, upon returning home, takes with him the
degenerative practices he has learned in the heart of the empire:

et tamen unus
Armenius Zalaces cunctis narratur ephebis
mollior ardentii sese indulsisse tribuno.
aspice quid faciant commercia: uenerat obses,
hic fiunt homines. nam si mora longior urbem
induerit\textsuperscript{21} pueris, non umquam derit amator.
mittentur bracae, cultelli, frena, flagellum:
sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores. (2.163-170)

Yet, one Armenian, Zalaces, who was more effeminate than all the youths,
is said to have enjoyed himself with a salacious tribune. Look at what
international dealings accomplish: as a hostage he came—here at Rome
they become "men of the world!" For, if a longer stay will have allowed such
boys to don the culture of this city, they will never lack a lover. They
disavow their trousers, little daggers, harnesses, and whips: this is how they
bring back Roman morals to Artaxata.

Juvenal plays with the notion of Rome as the exemplar of virile sexuality in his facetious
suggestion that Rome sets the standard for masculinity by transforming foreigners into
“real men” (\textit{hic fiunt homines}). Tacitus offers a parallel instance of innocent-foreigner-
turned-corrupt in his account of the Parthians’ rejection of Vonones, whom King
Phraates had sent to Rome to be raised as a hostage under Augustus.\textsuperscript{22} Upon the
death of Phraates, Parthian legates had been sent to Rome to retrieve Vonones and

\textsuperscript{20} The practice of taking a hostage (\textit{obses}) from foreign groups was a common practice and served as a
bond of faith. See Courtney (1980) \textit{ad loc.}, Braund (1996) 166. For the corruption of hostages at Rome,
cp. Suet. \textit{Cal.} 36.1: \textit{quosdam obsides dilexisse furtur commercia mutui stupri.}

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{induerit} Nisbet; \textit{indulsit} codd. See Braund (1996) 166-167.

\textsuperscript{22} Cp. Tac. \textit{Ann.} 15.1 for the Parthian’s similar objection to the hostage Tigranes, whom Nero placed on
the throne of Armenia, because he had become accustomed to servitude under the Romans.
install him as their new sovereign, only to later reject him because it was felt that he had been indoctrinated with Roman culture and had learned subservience.\textsuperscript{23}

mox subiit pudor degeneravisse Parthos: petitum alio ex orbe regem, hostium artibus infectum; iam inter provincias Romanas solium Arsacidarum haberi darique...accendebat dedignantis et ipse diversus a maiorum institutis, raro venatu, segni equorum cura; quotiens per urbes incederet, lecticae gestamine fastuque erga patrias epulas. inridebantur et Graeci comites ac vilissima utensilium anulo clausa. (\textit{Ann.} 2.2.5-15)

But shame soon convinced them [the Parthians] that they had fallen from the standards of their ancestors; that a king had been sought from another part of the world who was tainted by the evil of the enemy; that the throne of the Parthians was held and given as a Roman province...The man himself fueled his countrymen's scorn, removed as he was from the customs of his ancestors, by scarcely hunting and slothfully obsessing over his horses. Whenever he went through the towns, he went by litter and arrogantly avoided Parthian banquets.

Vonones' preference for a litter as his mode of transport taps into the theme of the litter as a symbol of luxury and excess that drew wide condemnation from Greek and Roman moralists,\textsuperscript{24} and furthermore injects into Tacitus' narrative the innuendo of effeminacy. Vonones is cast in the light of a foreigner not only corrupted by luxury, but also emasculated by his sojourn in Rome through his association with the litter, whose use is commonly linked with effeminates like Maecenas, who became a byword for

\textsuperscript{23} Cp. Tac. \textit{Ann.} 11.16-17 for the Cherusci's similar rejection of Italicus, the sole survivor of their royalty, who was raised at Rome and provided by Claudius as their king. The Germans feared the encroachment of Roman cultural and political influence since Italicus had been raised at Rome: \textit{frustra Arminium praescribi: cuius si filius hostili in solo adultus in regnum venisset, posse extimesci, infectum alimonio servitio cultu, omnibus externis} See Isaac (2004) 318-319: “Vonones, through his prolonged stay in Rome, had become tainted by strange customs. He was as unacceptable to the Parthians as a Roman emperor with Parthian habits and customs would have been. The qualities which Tacitus describes as being usual in Parthia are not those he usually attributes to Greeks and orientals: they are those of a nomad king. The subjects of the nomad king regarded Rome in the same light in which Romans regarded Syrians.”

\textsuperscript{24} E.g. \textit{Din.} 1.36; Cic. \textit{Verr.} 4.51,53; Sen. \textit{Cons. Marc.} 16.2; \textit{Ben.} 1.9.3; \textit{Brev. Vit.} 12.6-7; Catul. 10.14-34 where it is assumed that Catullus had returned from the East.
effeminacy.25 The criticism of Vonones' Otherness includes the adoption of a Greek retinue in addition to his use of a litter, both themes that become in Juvenal symbols of his *indignatio* throughout his first three books.26 The disparagement of Vonones that Tacitus places in the mouths of the Parthians all highlight the masculine accomplishments of their previous rulers, and provides a stark contrast to the feminized Vonones:

ubi illam gloriam trucidantium Crassum, exturbantium Antonium, si mancipium Caesaris, tot per annos servitutem perpessum, Parthis imperitet? (*Ann. 2.2.8-10*)

Where was the glory of those who slaughtered Crassus and drove out Antonius, if a slave of Caesar, who had tolerated subservience for so many years, ruled over the Parthians?

Vonones' effete practices during his short-lived reign link him with Juvenal's Armenian hostage through the perception that Rome has become an exporter of decadence and is the fount of moral pollution, whose source, as contact with the "Other" increases, in turn becomes muddied and confused as the cycle of corruptor and corrupted becomes indistinguishable.

While Juvenal's second satire highlighted Rome's role in the corruption of the "Other," his third scrambles the distinction between Roman and foreigner, as Umbricius claims that Rome was itself corrupted by external contact, before transforming into a source and emissary of degenerate *mores*:

iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes et linguam et mores et cum tibicine chordas obliquas nec non gentilia tympana secum uexit et ad circum iussas prostare puellas.


26 Juv. 1.32-33; 63-68; 3.69-83, 86-93; 6.90-91; 9.50-53.
For some time now the Syrian Orontes has been polluting the Tiber, drawing its language, morals, and pipers with slanting strings along in its current, followed by their national drum and girls bidden to offer themselves for sale at the circus. Go to them, you who enjoy your foreign whores in their painted headdress. That rustic of yours, Quirinus, dons his little Greek slipper and carries off his wrestling medal with his mud-smeared neck. From lofty Sicyon they come—leaving Amydon, Andros, Samos, Tralles or Alabanda—all to seek the Esquiline and Viminal hills, to be the heart and masters of the Great Houses.

Umbricius' metaphor of the Tiber's pollution, resulting from Rome's victories in the East and her rise to prominence, finds a direct parallel in Livy, for whom female lute and harp players were similarly a remarkable and visible sign of corruption imported to Rome. A long-standing tradition emphasized the negative effects of migration, as well as the contamination that resulted from the contact of Roman armies with their subjugated enemies. Rome's victories abroad and its increasingly cosmopolitan status introduced a growing number of foreign peoples to the city, where, Tacitus derisively asserts, "all that is shameful and abominable in the world flows together and is celebrated."27 Tacitus here refers specifically to Jewish customs and religious practices, which Seneca the Younger also condemns with equal fervor through a similar expression of the anxiety surrounding Jewish contamination: *Cum interim usque eo sceleratissimae*

---

27 *repressaque in praesens exitialbilis superstitionem erumperebat, non modo per ludaeam, originem eius mali, sed per urbem etiam quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluent celebraturque,* Ann. 15.44.14-17. Cp. Florus' assertion that it was the conquest of Syria and the inheritance of Pergamon upon the death of king Attalus III in 133 BCE that ruined Roman morals in a whirlpool of vice "as if in a common sewer": *Syria prima nos victa corrupit, mox Asiatica Pergameni regis hereditas. illae opes atque divitiae adflixere saeculi mores, mersamque vitiis suis quasi sentina rem publicam pessum dedere* (1.47.23-27).
gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes iam terras recepta sit; victi victoribus leges
dederunt ("For the present, the customs of this most wicked people have prevailed, so that they are received now throughout every land; the conquered have given laws to their conquerors").

Such a negative appraisal of the cultural influences inundating Rome would not be out of place in Umbricius' speech, though it is rather the “Juvenal,” or main narrator of satire 3 who highlights the encroachment of Jewish beggars into a grove sacred to the native but displaced Roman Camenae, in one of many instances in which the narrator foreshadows the themes of Umbricius' soliloquy throughout the rest of the satire.

Seneca offers a less jaundiced view of Rome as the magnet of the Mediterranean though his purpose in the following passage is to console his mother as he faces exile. The philosopher assures his mother that moving from one's native city is natural and has resulted in Rome's patchwork population:

maxima pars istius turbae patria caret. Ex municipiis et coloniis suis, ex toto
denique orbe terrarum confluxerunt: alios adduxit ambitio, alios necessitas officii publici, alios inposita legatio, alios luxuria opportunum et opulentum

28 Seneca quoted in August. C.D. 6.11. As Isaac notes, Seneca's aversion to Jewish religion is a direct response to the idea, directly expressed by Cicero (De haruspicum responsis 19), that Roman superiority is based on its piety and religion. The invasion of the Jewish religion and its various sects threatens that superiority by threatening Rome's relationships with its own gods.

29 Juv. 3.12-16: hic, ubi nocturnae Numa constituebat amicae (nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur ludaeis, quorum cophinus fenumque supellex; omnis enim populo mercedem pendere iussa est arbor et eiectis mendicat silua Camenis). Cp. Juv. 6.544 for Juvenal's further ridicule of Jewish beggars, whose activities also include fortune telling. See also ibid. 6.526-529 for the juxtaposition of the temple of Isis, which rises in the Campus Martius by the saepta, here refered to as the ancient sheepfold. As the Jews have invaded the forest of the Camenae, foreign cults have invaded Rome. See Schäfer (1998) 185 for the distinction Juvenal makes between Greeks and Jews in the contempt he shows to both groups: "Juvenal accuses only the Jews—not any other ethnic group, and certainly not the Greeks—of proselytism. And it is precisely the combination of proselytism and exclusiveness that alarms him. One can hardly think of a more serious attack on the customs of Rome's ancestors than the Jewish insistence that one has to abandon the "laws of Rome" (Romanas contemnere leges) in order to follow the "Jewish law" (Judaicum ius). That the one had to be substituted for the other, could not be integrated into the other, was completely alien to a Roman; that this strange superstition could become successful in the very heart of the Roman empire was intolerable because it undermined the agreement upon which the Roman society was based and functioned."
uitiis locum quaerens, alios liberalium studiorum cupiditas, alios spectacula; quosdam traxit amicitia, quosdam industria laxam ostendendae uirtuti nancta materiam; quidam uenalem formam attulerunt, quidam uenalem eloquentiam. Nullum non hominum genus concucurrit in urbem et uirtutibus et uitiis magna pretia ponentem. Iube istos omnes ad nomen citari et ‘unde domo’ quisque sit quaere: uidebis maiorem partem esse quae relictis sedibus suis uenerit in maximam quidem ac pulcherrimam urbem, non tamen suam. (Sen. Dial. 12.6.2-4)

Most of the crowd [in Rome] is deprived of their native land. From the municipalities and their own colonies, and finally from the entire world they have converged on Rome: some ambition draws, some the necessity of public office, some the duties of an embassy; others seek by luxury a favorable and opulent place to sate their vices, while still others are drawn by their love of liberal pursuits or the games. Certain men the obligations of friendship have drawn, while certain others have found ample opportunity for displaying their skill by their industry. Some of them put their bodies up for sale, while some sell their eloquence. There is no group of men that has not rushed into the city that affords great rewards for both virtue and vice. Call all of them by name and ask them where they came from: you will see that a greater part of the inhabitants are those who left their own homes in search of the greatest and most beautiful city, albeit not their own.

Seneca understands shifting populations within a Stoic framework as a reflection of a broader, natural wandering of the constellations and planets, viewed as a reflection of the divine mind,30 but there were some (and, as we saw above in connection with the customs of the Jews, Seneca is not exempt here) for whom the influx of these populations and their customs had a destabilizing effect on the traditional social fabric of Roman society. Livy, for example, has the commander Cn. Manlius say that men are like plants that prosper better in their own soil. Transferred to foreign territory, they degenerate and take on the attributes of the soil that feeds them.31 We have seen how

---

30 Dial. 12.6.7.

31 Macedones, qui Alexandriam in Aegypto, qui Seleuciam ac Babyloniam, quique alias sparsas per orbem terrarum colonias habent, in Syros Parthos Aegyptios degenerarunt; Massilia, inter Gallos sita, traxit aliquantum ab accolis animorum; Tarentinis quid ex Spartana dura illa et horrida disciplina mansit? <est> generosius, in sua quidquid sede gignitur; insitum alienae terrae in id, quo altit, natura vertente se, degenerat, 38.17.11-13. Cp. Juvenal, who warns of the spread of moral corruption as a bruised grape
Tacitus, Strabo, and Juvenal applied this principle to Rome's corruption of the "Other" but the narrative that Manlius' army introduced foreign luxury upon its return to Rome from Asia in 187 BCE illustrates that the opposite is also true. As Livy tells it, along with the victorious army came degenerative habits that corrupted social life, and Livy singles out dining practices, which saw the introduction of lavish entertainments. This luxury was compounded as well by the adoption of culinary extravagance, so that cooks, whom Romans had once considered the "most worthless slaves" increased in stature and whose purview, previously quotidian, became an art.\textsuperscript{32}

Juvenal echoes Livy's disapproval of the extravagant preparation that became part of Roman banquets, sarcastically remarking upon the extravagance of upper class dining practices and all the accouterments of the meal. The lavish preparation of the food here becomes a goad to indignation, as the client Trebius is made to observe the lavish preparation of dishes that he will not share:\textsuperscript{33}

\begin{quote}
structorem interea, ne qua indignatio desit, saltantem spectes et chironomunta volanti cultello, donec peragat dictata magistri omnia; nec minimo sane discrimine refert quo gestu lepores et quo gallina secetur.
\end{quote}

Meanwhile, just to see you indignant, you will watch the meat carver leaping and gyrating with his flying knife, until he completes all the instructions of his teacher; of course, it is of the utmost concern with what motion one carves up the hares or a chicken!

\textsuperscript{32} Liv. 39.6.8-9.

\textsuperscript{33} Cp. Petr. 36.7-8 for the highly trained carvers who go through similar gyrations as they serve up the nouveau riche Trimalchio's courses to his guests: non minus et Trimalchio eiusmodi methodio laetus 'Carpe' inquit. processit statim scissor et ad symphoniam gesticulatus ita laceravit obsonium, ut putares essedarium hydraule cantante pugnare. ingerebat nihil minus Trimalchio lentissima voce: "Carpe, Carpe'. ego suspicatus ad aliquam urbanitatem totiens iteratam vocem pertinere, non erubui eum qui supra me accumbebant hoc ipsum interrogare. at ille, qui saepius eiusmodi ludos spectaverat, 'vides illum' inquit 'qui obsonium carpit: Carpus vocatur. ita quotiescumque dicit "Carpe", eodem verbo et vocat et imperat'.

spoils the bunch: edit hanc contagio labem / et dabit in plures, sicut grex totus in agris / unius scabie cadit et porrigine porci / uuaque conspecta liuorem ducit ab uua, 2.78-81.
While historians fault the armies for bringing cultural contagion back to Rome, where it takes root and spreads (as it is only a foreshadowing of the contamination to come),\textsuperscript{34} this charge of being a conduit of contagion is in turn mirrored by Umbricius' disparagement of upper class Romans themselves for their fixation on Greek culture and its detrimental effects, particularly upon the patron-client relationship. We are presented with the picture, most especially in Juvenal's first and third satires, of native Romans vying with shifty and disingenuous Greeks for limited influence with their patrons. It is this supplanting of the homegrown Roman by the duplicitous "Other" that causes Umbricius to resentfully exclaim: \textit{usque adeo nihil est quod nostra infantia caelum / hausit Auentini baca nutrita Sabina?} ("Does it matter not at all that as an infant I took in the sky of the Aventine and was raised on the Sabine olive?" Juv. 3.84-85).\textsuperscript{35}

We again find Juvenal framing Greece as the cause of corruption in a Rome enervated by a long peace:

\begin{quote}
\textit{nunc patimur longae pacis mala, saeuior armis luxuria incubuit uictumque ulciscitur orbem. nullum crimen abest facinusque libidinis ex quo paupertas Romana perit. hinc\textsuperscript{36} fluxit ad istos\textsuperscript{37} et Sybaris colles, hinc et Rhodos et Miletos atque coronatum et petulans madidumque Tarentum. prima peregrinos obscena pecunia mores intulit, et turpi fregerunt saecula luxu diuitiae molles. (6.292-300)}
\end{quote}

Now we are suffering the evils of a long peace: luxury, crueler than arms has settled upon us and takes revenge for a conquered world. No crime is lacking nor deed of lust ever since Roman poverty's extinction. From that

\textsuperscript{34} Livy 39.6.9.

\textsuperscript{35} Cp. Umbricius' vivid description of Greek clients "pouring their poison" into the "indulgent ear" of their patron: \textit{qui gentis uitio numquam partitur amicum, / solus habet. nam cum facilem stillauit in aurem / exiguum de naturae patriaegue ueneno, / limine summoueor, perierunt tempora longi / seruitii; nusquam minor est iactura clientis}, Juv. 3.121-125.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{huc}, Hendry.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{et Isthmos}, Hendry.
time Sybaris, Rhodes, Miletus, and Tarentum, garlanded, drunk and
haughty, have poured in upon our hills. It was polluted money that first
introduced foreign morals, and by base extravagance riches, which make
men effeminate, destroyed the generations.

Juvenal’s striking phrase *victumque ulciscitur orbem* is a sharper take on Horace’s
*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis / intulit agresti Latio*,\(^{38}\) ironically suggesting
that Greek effeminate practices have conquered Rome from the inside out, succeeding
where arms failed. For Horace, the culturally “rough” victor, educated by a refined
Greek literature, has in Juvenal been replaced by a victor feminized by an influx of
wealth, whose former “rough” moral qualities are precisely what distinguished and
preserved it from the decadence of subjugated nations.

There are strong parallels to the satirist's presentation of views hostile to invasive
Greek morality in Pliny's praise of Junius Mauricus for the suppression of Greek-style
games in Gallia Narbonensis, which were felt to have a corrupting influence. Pliny
comments upon Mauricus' conduct during deliberations over whether he in fact had the
authority to suppress the games:

> Cum sententiae perrogarentur, dixit Iunius Mauricus, quo uiro nihil firmius
nihil uerius, non esse restituendum Viennensibus agona; adiecit 'Vellem
etiam Romae tolli posset.' (*Ep*. 4.22.3-4)

When [the magistrates] opinions were solicited, Junius Mauricus, more
steadfast and true than anyone, said that the games should not be restored
at Vienna; he even added: "I wish they could be banned at Rome as well!"

Sherwin-White notes that the offending element in the games at Vienna was "The
novelty...in the character of the festival, modeled like Domitian's *Quinquatvia* on the
Greek type of athletic and musical contest, instead of the Italian gladiatorial and beast

\(^{38}\) *Ep*. 2.1.156-157.
show" and that "it was the homosexual element that was feared." Mauricus' example serves as an opportunity for Pliny to express a general moralizing point that parallels the assignment of blame in Tacitus, Pliny the Elder, and Juvenal:

Placuit agona tolli, qui mores Viennensium infecerat, ut noster hic omnium. Nam Viennensium uitia intra ipsos residunt, nostra late uagantur, utque in corporibus sic in imperio grauissimus est morbus, qui a capite diffunditur. (Ep. 4.22.7)

It was good to see the games banned, which had polluted the morals of the people of Vienna, as the games here at Rome ruin the morals of all. In fact, the vices of Vienna stay among the inhabitants themselves, while ours travel far and wide; as in the body politic, so in the government, the most noxious disease is the one that derives from the head.

Pliny's assertion that Rome, as the heart of empire, pumps its polluted blood into its provinces as the "head" to its "limbs" illustrates the conceptualization of Greek culture, and thereby deviant sexuality, as a disease, a theme subtly hinted at in his Panegyric to Trajan, when Pliny praises the emperor's adherence to old-time military discipline.

Trajan's military prowess, Pliny asserts, hearkens back to the legendary families of Fabricius, Scipio, and Camillus, before military arms became a spectacle rather than a reality, and before military exercises were directed by a petty Greek (Graeculus magister) instead of Roman heroes (veteranorum aliquis cui decus muralis aut civica).  

---


40 Pan. 13.5. Juvenal uses two of the three exempla from Pliny's list of heroes to draw precisely the same contrast between idealized Romans embodying manly virtues and their degenerate modern counterparts: Curius quid sentit et ambo Scipiadae, quid Fabricius manesque Camilli, quid Cremerae legio et Cannis consumpta iuuentus, tot bellorum animae, quotiens hinc talis ad illos umbra uenit?, 2.153-157. With Pliny's picture of decline represented by a Roman army trained by a Graeculus, compare Tacitus' account of the embassy of Nero's Greek freedman Polyclitus to Britain in order to at once settle a dispute between the Roman legate and procurator there and by a demonstration of authority to bring rebellious native tribes to heel. Tacitus contemptuously depicts Roman soldiers in terror at Polyclitus' approach, but the natives themselves, "for whom the desire for freedom was not yet extinct, as they had not yet encountered the power of freedmen," mock the Roman general and army for their obedience to "slaves" (apud quos flagrante etiam tum libertate nondum cognita libertinorum potentia erat; mirabanturque, quod dux et exercitus tanti belli confector servitius oboedirent, Ann. 14.39).
Pliny’s disparaging diminutive resounds in Umbricius’ lampoon of the hungry Greek (Graeculus esuriens), who shifts from one guise to another in his attempt to win his patron’s favor, and thus his livelihood: *quemuis hominem secum attulit ad nos: grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes, augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus, omnia nouit Graeculus esuriens: in caelum iusseris ibit*, Juv. 3.75-78 (“He brings to us whatever man he needs to be—grammarians, rhetoricians, geometricians, painters, athletic trainers, augurs, tightrope walkers, doctors, magicians—in short, our little hungry Greek knows everything: if you say jump, he says “how high?”"). The Graeculus’ palette, in Umbricius’ terms, extends beyond securing food from his patron (the appropriate relationship between patron and client) to include a voracious appetite both for arrogating power to himself within the houses of the nobles (*uiscera magnarum domuum dominique futuri*, 3.70), and for seducing both males and females within the family. Umbricius’ fear that Greeks seek to attain power from within the houses of the nobles finds its confirmation in Tacitus and Suetonius’ account of the unbridled authority of Claudius and Nero’s Greek freedmen who are similarly accused of sexually corrupting the members of the imperial house. The Greek is in Juvenal a master of disguise and dissimulation, prompting Umbricius to assert that there is no one better at playing female roles onstage and to wonder whether the actor isn’t really a woman,

---

41 Cp. the satirist’s use of the diminutive Graecula in *Satire* 6, in his mockery of a Roman female’s attempts to ape Greek ways: *nam quid rancidius quam quod se non putat ualla formosam nisi quae de Tusca Graecula facta est, de Sulmonensi mera Cecropis?*, Juv. 6.185-187.

42 *primo fige loco, quod tu discumbere iussus / mercedem solidam ueterum capis officiorum. / fructus amicitiae magnae cibus*, Juv. 5.12-14.

43 *praeterea sanctum nihil †aut† ab inguine tutum, / non matrona laris, non filia uirgo, nec ipse / sponsus leuis adhuc, non filius ante pudicus*, 3.109-111.

44 For the excessive power and influence wielded by Claudius’ freedmen Narcissus, Pallas, and Callistus as well as freedmen under Nero, see *Hist.* 1.7, 22; *Ann.* 11.29, 35, 38; 12.53, 60; 13.2, 14; 14.39, 55. See *Ann.* 12.25, 65; 14.2 for the assertion that Pallas and Agrippina were sexually involved.
thereby joining in one scene foreigner, female, and sexual deviant. Pliny's smear, then, that Roman military exercises are now in the hands of a Graeculus plays off of assumptions about Greek sexuality and the insinuation of Pliny's complaint conveys, if not outright overtones of effeminacy, certainly that of unmanly leadership.

Pliny's picture of Roman military prowess in decline is a direct reflection of Vegetius' belief, cited above, that Roman military superiority is the key to her unparalleled dominance. The thought of a Graeculus responsible for training Roman troops represents for Pliny a direct threat to that dominance, and thus to the wellbeing of the empire itself. Pliny's fear resonates in Juvenal's vignette of the pleader Creticus, who tries his case garbed in Coan silk, an effeminate and foreign garment, which, for the main speaker of Juvenal's Satires, becomes a channel of contagion through its transparent, and therefore sexually degenerate, quality:

dedit hanc contagio labem
et dabit in plures, sicut grex totus in agris
unius scabie cadit et porrigine porci
uuaque conspecta liuorem ducit ab uua. (2.78-81)

An infection has spread this disgrace and will spread it upon many more, just as an entire herd dies in the fields on account of the mange and scurf of a single pig and a bunch of grapes takes on the rotten hue from another.

The only group not figured in this contamination are those idealized rustics not influenced by the City, viewed as the hub of contamination, and whom the satirist

45 an melior cum Thaida sustinet aut cum / uxor eum comoedus agit uel Dorida nullo / cultam palliolo?
muller nempe ipsa uidetur, / non persona, loqui: uacua et plana omnia dicas / infra uentriculum et tenui
distantia rima. / nec tamen Antiochus nec ent mirabilis illic / aut Stratocles aut cum molli Demetrius
Haemo: / natio comoeda est, 3.93-100.

46 The seriousness of exchanging Roman dress for foreign is illustrated by Suetonius' account of Tiberius during his self-imposed exile in Rhodes, laying aside his native garb in favor of the Greek cloak (pallium) and slippers (crepidae). The perception that he had "gone native" is apparently what causes the citizens of Naumasia (whom Tiberius had previously governed) to depose his statues and busts and led some to call for his execution (Tib. 13).
imports into Creticus' audience specifically to draw this contrast (en habitum quo te leges ac iura ferentem / vulneribus crudis populus modo victor et illud / montanum positis audiret vulgus aratris, "Look at the dress in which you, carrying on about rights and laws, are viewed by the people, fresh off of victory and with bloody wounds, and the rustic throng, who have paused from work at the plow, 2.72-75). Pliny had reached back to those legendary figures of Roman tradition to find a suitable parallel for Trajan's military stature, and it is this quintessential Roman military tradition that Juvenal draws upon here. Just as the idealized “Other” had served in Tacitus and Pliny to highlight by contrast the decadence of what Roman culture had become, this brief vignette of the rustic embodiment of Romanitas stands in stark contrast to the license of the urban aristocrats whom Juvenal parades throughout the satire in various guises of effeminacy.

As the oft-maligned customs of the foreigner become crystallized in the princeps Nero, the ultimate source (caput) and paradigm of social behavior, it is precisely the corrupted/corrupting influence of the “Other” that elicits in the Annals of Tacitus an outcry over the perception that traditional mores have been overthrown through the adoption of Greek institutions. In the context of the importation of Greek-style games in the Neronia of 60 CE, Tacitus, quoting the views of conservative moralists, presents the same criticisms as Mauricus and Pliny against Nero's—and the general populace's—adoption of Greek culture, making the same connections between foreigner and degenerative sexuality:

spectaculorum quidem antiquitas servaretur, quotiens praetores ederent, nulla cuiquam civium necessitate certandi. ceterum abolitos paulatim patrios mores funditus everti per accitam lasciviam, ut quod usquam corrupti et corrumpere queat in urbe visatur, degeneretque studiis externis iuventus, gymnasia et otia et turpis amores exercendo, princepe et senatu auctoribus, qui non modo licentiam vitiis permissaret, sed vim adhibeant <ut> proceres
Certainly, let the tradition of the performances be preserved, when the praetors put on the shows, when there was no compulsion for any citizen to compete. But ancestral morals, which have gradually eroded, are now utterly overturned through imported debauchery, so that whatever from anywhere may corrupt or be corrupted might be seen in the city, and that the youth, by foreign pursuits, would shame their ancestors through the adoption of the gymnasia, sloth, and disgraceful lusts, with the princeps and senate as examples. They, it was said, not only allowed license for vice, but even forced Roman leaders, under the pretense of giving an oration or reciting poetry, to defile themselves on the stage.

Tacitus follows this account of social erosion by quoting a reductio ad absurdum (quid superesse nisi ut corpora quoque nudent et caestus adsumant easque pugnas pro militia et armis meditentur?, "What remains except to strip down and, instead of practicing real military endeavors, take up the boxing gloves?, 14.20.17-21) worthy of Juvenal, whose speaker mockingly advises Creticus that he might as well plead stark naked (nudus agas: minus est insania turpis, Juv. 2.71) rather than wear his transparent Coan silks.47

Few themes provoke Tacitus' indignation during his retroactive assault on the Neronian period as his description of Nero's marriage to a Greek, paralleled in detail by Juvenal's revulsion at a similar wedding of the aristocratic Gracchus. According to Tacitus, Nero, ever the Hellenophile, was to set out for the East, in particular Egypt, but changed his mind and instead imported the East to Rome. During a banquet hosted by

47 The satirist likewise has more sympathy for the pathic Peribomius—arguing that he is at least honest about his "disease" (morbum) unlike the hypocritical moralists whom the satirist castigates in the opening salvo of the satire: uerius ergo et magis ingenue Peribomius; hunc ego fatis inuto, qui uultu morbum incessuque fatetur. horum simplicitas miserabilis, his furor ipse dat ueniam, 2.15-19. Here again it should be noted that frankness (simplicitas) is valued, as it is in the narratives of Strabo's and Tacitus' uncontaminated 'barbarian', over the duplicity that is the central theme of the second satire and continues to be a main thread throughout the Satires.
Tigillinus, wild beasts, birds and sea animals were imported to Rome from foreign lands and, Tacitus assures us, every form of depravity ensued:

ipse per licita atque inlicita foedatus nihil flagitii reliquerat quo corruptior ageret, nisi paucos post dies uni ex illo contaminatorum grege (nomen Pythagorae fuit) in modum sollemnium coniugiorum denupsisset. inditum imperatori flammeum, missi auspices, dos et genialis torus et faces nuptiales, cuncta denique spectata quae etiam in femina nox operit. (Ann. 15.37.15-21)

Nero himself, polluted with licit and illicit lusts had left no disgrace untried by which he might live more depraved, except that he added after a few days, becoming the wife of one from that crowd of perverts (whose name was Pythagoras), as if a proper wedding. A bridal veil was placed upon the Commander, witnesses sent for; the dowry and bridal couch, nuptial torches—all things were on view, which night obscures, even in the case of a female.

Nero is elsewhere disparaged by Suetonius' lurid account of his marriage to the eunuch Sporus, whom the emperor married with "all the usual ceremonies," in addition to the marriage he contracted with his Greek freedman Doryphorus.  

Juvenal parallels Tacitus' picture of a corrupted nobility through a similarly indignant portrayal of the wedding of the aristocratic Gracchus:

quadringenta dedit Gracchus sestertia dotem cornicini, siue hic recto cantauerat aere; signatae tabulae, dictum 'feliciter,' ingens cena sedet, gremio iacuit noua nupta mariti. o proceres, censore opus est an haruspice nobis?...segmenta et longos habitus et flammea sumit arcano qui sacra ferens nutantia loro sudaut clipeis ancilibus. (2.117-126)

Gracchus gave four hundred thousand sesterces as a dowry to a trumpeter—or maybe he played on a “straight horn”! The wedding papers are attested, best wishes given, a huge assembly is seated for dinner; the new bride lies in the lap of his husband. Oh nobles, is it a censor or a

48 puerum Sporum exectis testibus etiam in muliebrem naturam transfigurare conatus cum dote et flammeo per sollemni<n> nuptiarum celeberrimo officio deductum ad se pro uxor pro habuit...Suam quidem pudicitiam usque adeo prostituit, ut contaminatis paene omnibus membribus nouissime quasi genus lusus excogitaret, quo ferae pelle contectus emitteretur e caeaui iuorumque ac feminarum ad stipitem deligatorum inguina iuaderet et, cum affatim desaeuisset, conferceretur a Doryphoro liberto; cui etiam, sicut ipsi Sporus, ita ipse denupsit, Suet. Nero 28.1-29.1.
soothsayer that we need? ...He wears the decorations, the long dress and bride's veil, he who, bearing the sacred shields nodding from the mystic thong, sweated in the Salian dance.

As Pliny's Graeculus was a sign of a decline in Roman military standards, so too Juvenal highlights the pervasive effect of foreign, and therefore effeminate, behavior on Roman social institutions, by juxtaposing the image of Gracchus in his traditional and sacred militaristic role with the depiction of the aristocrat resting in the lap of his husband. Rather than positing that Juvenal's audience viewed the speaker's objections to the marriage of Gracchus as those of a "narrow-minded bigot," it may be more productive in light of Tacitus' almost verbatim objections to understand their indignation as stemming from a perception that foreign influence had so permeated Roman culture that those very men who were to serve as paradigms of conduct for Roman (and by extension, the empire's) behavior participated in these ceremonies.

While the "Other" can serve, at one time and at an author's pleasure, as a moral sounding board to critique the vice of an author's own country—saying more about the author and his own concerns than about the historical reality of a given group—or as

---

49 Cp. Juv. 2.155-158 where the heroes of the past similarly wish for lustrations after contact with their morally polluted progeny: quid Cremerae legio et Cannis consumpta iuuentus, / tot bellorum animae, quotiens hinc talis ad illos / umbra uenit? cuperent lustrari, si qua darentur / sulpura cum taedis et si foret umida laurus.


51 Cp. Braund (1996) 155: "mention of a Salian priest carries associations with ancient religious custom, military activity and the Roman elite—all travestied by Gracchus' conduct." See also Tennant (2001) 188f. for Juvenal's criticism of the aristocracy for their failure to fulfill their roles as paradigms of behavior: "Juvenal makes the homosexual "marriage" of Gracchus even more scandalous by setting it against the backdrop of rituals redolent of ancient ideals of sanctity and virtus."

52 Shumate (2006) 84: "any idealizing gesture, in spite of its apparent expansiveness, is really about 'us', so to speak, involving as it does the colonizer's appropriation of native peoples to mediate his own cultural anxieties."
agents of corruption themselves, they can also, with a shift of the rhetorical prism,\textsuperscript{53} be cited as untrustworthy duplicitous figures. The duplicitous nature of the foreigner is one of the main critiques that Umbricius levels against his Greek competitors as they employ flattery and deceit to contend for their patron's attention. Umbricius avers that he is unwilling to imitate these practices just so he can survive in Rome. He therefore rhetorically leaves the city to those who "turn black into white" (\emph{maneant qui nigrum in candida vertunt}, 3.130), and prefers to maintain the honesty (\emph{simplicitas}) that Strabo so prized in his description of the Scythians and Tacitus in his characterization of the Germans.

Umbricius' argument against the deceitful nature of the Greeks largely falls in line with Tacitus' presentation of the "Other,"\textsuperscript{54} and calls into question the suggestion that Juvenal seeks to present Umbricius as merely jealous of the \emph{nouveaux riches} and successful Greeks.\textsuperscript{55} A key theme of the first book of the \emph{Satires} (and of several Roman authors in a variety of genres) is that an unprincipled hunt for riches and advancement has led to general moral and social ruin, and to trivialize Juvenal's presentation of this social dynamic is misleading and downplays the fact that Umbricius' resentment stems not from the success of others but the duplicitous manner in which that success was obtained.

\textsuperscript{53} "According to Tacitus, the same Germans who with a turn of the rhetorical prism can exemplify good domestic and sexual order spend most of their time in idleness, sleeping, eating, and drinking...their frequent prolonged drinking bouts often lead to violent quarrels, and in their passion for gambling they throw away their property and even their freedom" (Shumate (2006) 97).

\textsuperscript{54} E.g. \emph{Hist.} 4.37 and 4.57.

Juvenal's hyperbolic and often fierce attacks on foreign customs and peoples are directly tied to the survival of a conservative Roman identity. The acerbic manner in which he directs these attacks is not ipso facto sufficient reason to conclude that the moralizing content of the satires is not in earnest (as was certainly not the interpretation of early Christian moralists, who demonstrated familiarity with the moralizing tradition of Roman satire). The assault against foreign social climbers is, in fact, not confined to Juvenal's Satires, and becomes a vibrant point of contention in other authors. To single out Juvenal's indictment of the advancement of freedmen and to posit that the author wishes to characterize the speakers as "jealous" does not sufficiently account for the impulse in contemporaneous authors to criticize these same social trends.

---

56 Cp. Green (1998) 128 who similarly highlights the interpretational difficulties facing the persona theory: "what would J. create his 'spineless bigot' for? To mock satirists along with the gluttons and mean patrons they attack? But this would undermine any thought of satirical seriousness; and J. can hardly (if Braund is right) have made his purpose clear, since no one before her ever tumbled to the idea, which certainly wasn't what saw to all that multiplication of J's MSS in the Middle Ages."
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

This study has been largely concerned with offering a critique of a certain application of the *persona* theory, particularly in regards to Juvenal, by challenging the grounds upon which the satirist's moralizing purpose is called into question. The implications of this theory present a central problem of efficacy in the interpretation of Juvenal's early satires, since it presents the satirist as intent on eviscerating any didactic stance he has made, leaving us with an unsatisfactory conclusion that excises Juvenal's persistent treatment of themes consistent with contemporaneous authors who were similarly engaged in blackening the reputation of the famous dead. Chapter 3 argued that any evaluation of Juvenal's satiric project must be firmly rooted in this, his most immediate, context. The assertion that the satirist intentionally exposes himself as the primary target of his invective further downplays the genre's role as a vehicle for social criticism in the vein of Attic Old Comedy as attested by the fourth century grammarian Diomedes and the satirists themselves.¹

The danger of applying extreme interpretations of the *persona* theory to Juvenal—that the satirist's hostile aggression is primarily directed against himself—is that it runs the risk of glossing over the virulent strains of homophobia, misogyny, and xenophobia present in the satirist's (and often his contemporaries') narrative. Hyperbolic language, as we have seen in the discussion of rhetorical indignation, is not

¹ *satira dicitur carmen apud Romanos nunc quidem maledicum et ad carpenda hominum uitia archaeae comoediae charactere conpositum, quale scripsissent Lucilius et Horatius et Persius. et olim carmen quod ex variis poematibus constabat satira vocabatur, quale scripsissent Pacuvius et Ennius*, GLK 1.485. By Diomedes' time, it was apparent that satire was assumed to have a moralizing and slanderous bent (*nunc quidem maledicum*). *Nunc* implies that this slanderous element was not always the case and he seems to draw this contrast with Ennius and Pacuvius. Cp. Green (1998) 128 for the criticism that the *persona* theory eviscerates the attested purpose of the genre.
enough to conclude that Juvenal’s moral criticism is mock didactic. Wild exaggeration is, for example, how the political cartoonist hits his target, and yet few would argue that the artist marks his exaggeration as an indication that his satire is to boomerang back as a critique against himself. Such persistent and sophisticated invective as we find in Juvenal is hardly mollified, if we excuse the satirist’s transgressions by the suggestion that he is “just kidding.” Nor, as Chapter 1 argues, are the satirist’s indignant professions and perceived inconsistencies enough to argue for an intentional undercutting of his sentiments. If we begin, as the persona theory does, with the assumption of an arbitrarily idealized poet who would never present inconsistent views unless he intended to do so, and who condemns the viewpoints expressed in his own poems whenever he departs from that idealization, we inevitably produce a skewed and problematic picture.

It is unclear where this picture leaves us, the readers, in interpreting Juvenal’s efficacy—that is, if we are not to take Juvenal’s indignant moralizing as a serious effort, and we explain away his pivot to the past in his programmatic statement as yet another component of Juvenal’s undercutting characterization of his speaker—what does the satire do? This is an especially poignant question when Juvenal’s acerbic tone seems unlikely, even when being summarily dismissed, to evoke laughter or even a wry smile. The reevaluation of indignation’s function in Juvenal’s satiric praxis offered here substantiates that anger may have in fact had a cohesive, rather than alienating influence on at least a segment of Juvenal’s readership and may very well have reflected tensions within Roman society.\(^2\) Perhaps a better question is, what does the

\(^2\) See Green (1998) xl: “The trouble with literary commonplaces, especially when they are sedulously imitated from one generation to the next, is that we tend to write them off as mere stage-properties. But
entire literary revenge movement, of which Juvenal must have been a part, and which was so prominent after Domitian, accomplish? Juvenal's program is, in addition to the satiric tradition's role as corrector of vice, very much in line with that of Tacitus and Pliny, and very much about a fight for a certain view of the immediate past. This is partially why he sets up his first book to look back in anger and why he, of all the satirists, is concerned primarily with employing historical exempla to illustrate his satire.

Juvenal's angry persona is precisely the element that causes the most consternation in the evaluation of the satirist's censorial effort. Yet, when we place Juvenal within the satiric lineage, it becomes apparent that Horace's moderate satirist is the odd man out, the exception rather than the rule.\(^3\) The characteristic anger of Lucilius that had "cut Rome to the quick" is in Horace replaced by a jovial criticism that is cognizant of universal vice but which "touches every fault" in his reader as the satirist gains their confidence and "plays around their hearts":

\[\text{omne uafer uitium ridenti Flaccus amico tangit et admissus circum praecordia ludit, callidus excusso populum suspendere naso. (Pers. 116-118)}\]

While his friend is laughing, sly Horace touches each of his vices and, gaining entrance to his confidences, plays around his innermost feelings, skilled at hanging the people from his cleaned-out nose.

the two or three centuries before Juvenal's lifetime had radically transformed Roman civilization and mores; a vast and sudden influx of wealth had corrupted former standards of behaviour and promoted reckless ambition; the Republic, however venal and inefficient, had been replaced by a despotism, however benevolent and enlightened; the average Roman citizen had lost effective political power; foreign upstarts had obtained a stranglehold on some of the most influential positions in the Empire; such members of the old aristocracy as had survived the Civil Wars and subsequent Imperial purges were, very often, taking refuge in hell-raising or philosophical quietism. Juvenal, as they say, had a case.\(^3\)

\(^3\) In a genre designed for criticizing vice, it would be surprising if we did not find such harsh acerbic wit as a key component in Lucilius, Persius, and Juvenal. Horace's moderate satirist becomes something of an anomaly when we consider that he reinvented a genre whose premise naturally tended toward denunciation and hostile criticism. Horace in general seems to have reserved his bile for his Epodes (although here his harshness is to some degree offset by his often fictitious targets). Juvenal's satiric manner, in fact, tends to have more in common with Horace's invective mode in the Epodes (in fact the only work of Horace's which features the term indignatio, the driving force of Juvenal's satire).
Horace, then, as Persius understood him, forges a communal ethic by including his reader in his laughter and ultimately invites him into his circle of friends while slyly breaching his defenses in order to correct his faults. While Horace’s *de te fabula* is not a mark for branding and condemnation, but is rather a recognition of common faults, both Juvenal and Persius adhere more closely to an understanding of Lucilius’ aggressive *modus operandi* that values blame over conversion:

> secuit Lucilius urbern, te Lupe, te Muci, et genuinum fregit in illis. (Pers. 1.114-115)

Lucilius shredded the city—you, Lupus, you Mucius—and broke his molar on them.

> ense uelut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens est criminibus, tacita sudant praecordia culpa. inde ira et lacrimae. (Juv. 1.165-168)

So often as raging Lucilius roars, as if with sword drawn at the ready, the listener, whose mind is fearful and chilled by his crimes, grows red with shame, his inner heart sweating with silent guilt. Hence his anger and tears.

While Horace had sought to temper vice through the subtle disarming of his friend’s defenses, there is nothing subtle about the aggression of the Lucilian model that Persius and Juvenal themselves adopt. It is not that Horace does not take Lucilius as his model in many respects, but, as he had disavowed the Archilochean and Hipponactean invective that led to destruction (*Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben, Ep.*

---


5 The playful nature of Horatian satire, that seeks to educate by gentle prodding rather than branding, is evident in his discussion of his satiric praxis: *quamquam ridentem dicere verum quid vetat? ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima. sed tamen amoto quaeramus seria ludo, S*. 1.1.24-27.

6 As is clear from Horace’s simultaneous critique and praise of Lucilius in *S*. 1.4 and 1.10.
Although Persius is intimately familiar with Horace's satires and often aligns himself with their intellectual concepts, he does not follow his congenial tone, rather positioning himself as an angry and alienated outsider to the literary scene and to society in general. Horace too positions himself as an outsider to the mainstream poetic scene, preferring instead a close circle of readers whose opinion he values. For Persius, the poetic scene is so vapid that he only expects a few readers at best, *vel duo vel nemo* (1.3).

Persius' diatribes may be said to operate in a similar manner to Horace's in the sense that it appeals to a circle of like-minded readers, but there is a distinct sense of an "us versus them" mentality that scorns the object of Persius' satire and which becomes the sole mode in Juvenal's first two books of satires. Although Persius follows Horace's satiric model closely in that there is room for self-reflection and an admittance that he is at times caught up in the vice he excoriates, he for example has no

---

7 Horace signals his alliance with Alcaeus, who also chose in his imitation of Archilochus to moderate the aggression that defamed his would-be father-in-law Lycambes and "wove a noose for his bride": *temperat Alcaeus, sed rebus et ordine dispar, nec socius quaerit, quem versibus oblinat atris, nec sponsae laqueum famoso carmine nectit*, Ep. 1.19.29-31.

8 *Ipse semipaganus / ad sacra vatum carmen adfero nostrum*, Pr. 6-7.

9 Persius tells us who his ideal readers are, and they are unsurprisingly those who prize Greek Old Comedy, the grandfather of Latin satire, to the low entertainment on display at Rome: *audaci quicumque atflate Cratino iratum Eupolidem praegrandi cum sene palles, aspice et haec, si forte aliquid decoctius audis. inde uaporata lector mihi ferueat aure*, 1.123-126.

10 See Pers. 3 for the satirist's self-criticism of his indulgence in drink and the consequent inhibition of his writing. Cp. Hor. S. 1.3.19-20 for the satirist's allowance that he is not blameless, though even here Horace preserves his stance of moral superiority by claiming his faults are less than those whom he castigates: *nunc aliquis dicat mihi 'quid tu? nullane habes vitia?' immo alia et fortasse minora*. See also
sympathy for and sarcastically mocks those whose prayers the satirist believes only reveal their selfish motives.\textsuperscript{11}

Juvenal's contribution to the satiric genre, modulating as it does from the sharp, angry style of Lucilius\textsuperscript{12} to the mellow refinement of Horace and his acerbic imitator Persius, was to apply rhetorical strategies of indignation to produce an imagining of the genre in its most virulent manifestation that does away with the subtle niceties of Horace's approach and forges a bond largely through unified angst against historical figures. This is the efficacy of Juvenal's historical satire. Tacitus and Pliny had lamented the painful servility and silence that predominated during Domitan's reign, in which the Roman world endured fifteen years that ripped away the lives of young and old alike without ever uttering a word.\textsuperscript{13}

This is the context in which Juvenal announces his satirist, whose appearance on the literary scene begins with an echo of that silence: \textit{semper ego auditor tantum?} Being a mere listener was precisely what Juvenal and his fellow Romans had been doing for so many years. With the death of Domitian and a new atmosphere that

\textsuperscript{11} See Pers. 5 for the greedy requests of suppliants' prayers that stir Persius' mocking critique. For Braund, Persius' satiric voice is intentionally revealed and objectively identified as that of a 'prig': "This "holier-than thou" tone adopted by Persius' \textit{persona} characterises him as an intolerant prig, who modulates from friendly advice into delivering a sermon to the world, (2004) 63." Yet, it is unclear why a Stoic viewpoint such as Persius offers would preclude a serious criticism of prayers that reveal the suppliant's vice, a task the genre is designed to accomplish. Highet similarly criticized Anderson's application of the \textit{persona} theory and its tendency to allow for the grafting of personal viewpoints about the content of the satire onto the intentions of the satirist: "Although Mr. Anderson makes this point several times [that the 'tensions' in Juvenal's \textit{Satires} make it incorrect to sympathize entirely with his prejudices], in general terms, it seems to mean only that Mr. Anderson himself dislikes and rejects some of the moral preachments in Juvenal's earlier satiric poems" (1974) 330.

\textsuperscript{12} The aggressive nature of Lucilian satire is amply attested. Quintilian notes a sharp wit and acerbic tone as characteristic qualities of his satire: \textit{Nam et eruditio in eo mira et libertas atque inde acerbitas et abunde salis, Inst.} 10.1.94.

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Ag.} 3.2-3.
permitted the defamation of the deceased, Juvenal injects his venomous voice into the mix, taking advantage of contemporary literary appetites that allowed for the punishment, no matter how belated, if not of the person, then of the memory of the guilty.
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