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ABSTRACT

Juvenal does not seek to produce a fully rationalized philosophical system in the Satires. There is thus no need to attribute apparent departures from a previous stance to a pointed hypocrisy. The dictates of the genre are confined to the discourses present in the literature of second-century Rome and those earlier works with intertextual importance. Taken in sum, the author offers his audience an interpretational framework often grounded in the worst of human emotions and authorizes these responses as authentically Roman. Juvenal writes in a highly empathetic manner of the travails of the near-elite, yet the primary concern of the author rests with those whose station affords them the ability to make morally significant choices.

The author engages in one textual performance after another, but I suggest that the authorial voice of Juvenal is extensively preserved within the hexameters. We may call shifts in aspect or tone personae, but there is no valid rational for completely divorcing the poet from the content of his poetry or for setting the various personae against one another in a contest to determine which is the genuine authorial voice: all are, and none are. Biography is certainly not present in his poetry, yet the choice of themes and modes of argument are themselves significant. I suggest that the discursive force of the claim to be writing inside the ambit of a prior author is an overt attempt to guide the reading of the intended audience. This fundamental question of what observable actions were consonant with Roman identity is explored by Juvenal through every aspect of action and
daily life. Among this plethora of criteria, the author frequently returns to the use of food, gender, and space as a prime signifiers of Romanitas and Otherness.

In each of the discourses that this study explores, the author identifies the personal agency within selection and expenditure as the moral crux. Spanning what I suggest is an essentially unitary corpus of texts, the authorial voice of Juvenal vividly models for his audience the authorized emotional responses of a mens sana (healthy mind) confronted by the spectacle of deviance.
Chapter I:  
Introduction: The Pointedness of Satire

You neither squeeze winds from your panting bellows, while the lump cooks in the forge, nor do you (hoarse from a closed-in murmur) ineptly trumpet to yourself I don’t know what serious thing nor do you seek to bust your swollen cheeks with a crack. You pursue the words of the toga, a man skilled at the sharp juxtaposition, you grind with your judicious mouth, quite learned at scraping mores as they blanch and transfixing a fault with well-born sport.

Persius, *Satura V*, 10-16.¹

At some point in the early second century,² a member of the rhetorically educated elite of Rome wrote a series of poems in the Roman genre of satire. Of this author, all that is securely known is a single name attached to the text by the grammarians: *Iuvenalis*. Even the *trinomina* given in some of the manuscripts themselves may be merely the elaboration or extrapolation of early scribes. The first-person speaker that predominates the *Satires* has proven an enduringly persuasive voice for the great majority of the audiences that have encountered these poems across their history, inducing many

¹ All translations within this study are my own.
² All dates given in this dissertation are C.E., unless specified as B.C.E.
to evaluate the rhetorical flourishes of that speaker as literal fact. A tradition of biographical scholarship continuously present at minimum from the fourth-century grammarians forward has sanctioned such readings.\(^3\) While questions of reception are of no little interest and, indeed, of no little value in the study of this author’s literary production, the fundamental question that demands resolution is the relationship of these complex poems to their world. There is certainly a place for formalistic analysis of Juvenal’s poetics as well, but the greater utility of these texts rests in the breadth of the evidence that they offer for all fields of Roman studies, both literary and material. To be certain, the *Satires* are not and were not intended to be a scientific recording of their second-century milieu, yet these depictions of Roman society, which might even be termed veristic, have repeatedly proven all-too-convincing. Despite what has repeatedly been taken as more truth than verisimilitude, the warts and deformities of Juvenal’s textualized Rome serve the goals of the author’s rhetorical arguments, rather than a disinterested representation of the world as it is. If not to engage with Roman fact, what then is the object of this satire? How precisely does the author use his verse to engage with the literary and literal culture of his Rome, and how can the crucial evidence incidentally preserved in his text be responsibly employed? The global objective of this project is to offer a theoretical framework for reading these texts that accounts for the compositional strategies of the author. Rather than fracturing the author and his text into a collection of discordant fragments based on localized fluctuations in tone or technique, I will demonstrate the essential unity and coherence of the corpus and the authorial voice.

\(^3\) The *Vita Iuvenalis* is the earliest preserved instance of this tradition of attempting to find the historical author in his text.
The multivalent, often ad hoc, perspective of the Satires has made the creation of a coherent interpretive framework problematic. The primary stumbling block on the way to this goal has been the assumption that there must be a unitary, coherent, and palatable philosophical stance behind the text. If the satirist of one satire or book should seem prima facie inconsonant with that of another, then the tendency of the scholarship has been to take one stance as defective or as a caricature meant to be ridiculed. The ostensible problem of multiple perspectives can be resolved through the adoption of a multivalent understanding of Roman social discourse, in that the Satires can be seen to respond in form to the character of their milieu. There was no fixed socio-political perspective universally accepted at the time of Juvenal, just as there is not now nor has there ever been such a consensus point of view in any complex society. The discursive world of the author was in continual dispute; every perspective and means of evaluation was contested. Consequently, the significance of every observable action and reaction was nebulous, open and indeed vulnerable to the interested interpretation of any observer. I will argue that the genre of satire generally and the Satires of Juvenal most particularly, are intentionally implicated in this contested network of meaning. Roman satire is a humorous, performative genre, which by necessity must proceed from a particular point of view and a particular moralizing stance if it is to be anything other than nihilism. The verse attacks wide swaths of Roman society and specific behaviors, but it does not attack indiscriminately and it does not attack universally.

If there exists in the five books of the Satires, as I will argue, a constellation of authorized behaviors and emotional responses encoded in the negative space of what the author does not attack, then these poems and their author may be thought to have had a

---

4 The history of the scholarship will be treated in Chapter II.
positive point and a unified ideology. It has been noted, often rightly, that the various
speakers of the poems frequently show inconsistencies and even apparent hypocrisy. The
question remains of whether such deficits would have been intended by the author to
invalidate the positions taken by his speakers. Notwithstanding the credulity or the
idiomatic biases of the many audiences of the Satires, I will argue that the author
composed from within a generic tradition and an intertextual framework that enabled his
verse to advance a coherent rhetorical position embedded within the chosen exempla and
arguments. The ideological harmonies of the compositions, however, are to be
appreciated at scales greater than that of the line or the phrase. In place of these small-
scale elements, I will suggest that the argumentative structures of the satires and even the
themes of the books reveal a coherent authorial stance.

The interrelationships of the poems are of crucial importance to the study of their
intended significance. The sixteen satires of Juvenal were published in five books, each
of which constitutes an organic unit with its own programmatic first poem. Despite this
manner of dissemination, awareness of the content of earlier books may reasonably be
thought to have colored the reception of later books for the intended audience. I would
argue that the intertext for each subsequent book includes the previous books. The
programmatic Satire I of the first book properly introduces only satires one through five,
as Satire VI serves the second book, yet it is a strained proposition to imagine that the
programmatic statements of Satire VII would have utterly effaced the lingering
expectations emplaced by the first two books. It may be that a given reader might
encounter the third book without experience of the preceding books, but this outcome

5 Book I (satires 1-5), Book II (satire 6), Book III (satires 7-9), Book IV (satires 10-12), and Book V
(satires 13-16).
should not be misconstrued as the one that was intended by the author and consequently built into the interpretive fabric of Book III.

I would suggest that it is unremarkable that Juvenal would have chosen to vary the themes of his five books of satire; it would be surprising only if he had constrained himself to harping on a single theme in a single manner. It will be argued that shifts in theme are a necessary and sufficient explanation for the long-noted shifts in tone between the various books. Further, it will be shown that similar invective content encompassing a set of coherent stances is instanced across all five books. The misogyny of Satire VI, for instance, is not repudiated by no longer being as prevalent when in subsequent satires women are no longer the primary topic at hand. It is arguably natural that the density of invective content correlates to the topic under consideration and that the casual misogynistic references embedded in other arguments are all the more significant for their lack of topicality.

In order to frame the subsequent discussions, it will be useful to briefly discuss the program of the Satires by book. The first book of the Satires, comprising poems one through five, could be characterized as an extended attack on moral deviance woven throughout the society of the Roman city. In the programmatic Satire I, the author claims that every aspect of Roman society will be the object of his satiric verse, yet the focus and the censure of these five poems rests primarily on the behaviors of the social elite. For Juvenal, there is a certain assumption of the deviance of those exterior to the elite; the author writes disgust for their actions certainly, but the essential point at issue is degeneracy among those who might be expected to cohere with a more elevated norm. The second book of the Satires, comprised by poem six alone, takes the surface form of a
dissuasion from marriage that liberally draws from every misogynistic rhetorical commonplace to paint the *genus* of woman as so heinous that not one from the throngs of Rome would become an appropriate wife.

It has been generally accepted at many points in the history of these poems that there is an essential break between the first two and the latter three books of the *Satires*. Explanations and extrapolations vary. The correctness of this assumption is of crucial importance to the significance of the texts, since such a break would demand an explanation, which would in turn have profound implications for the interpretation of the poems. The prevailing logic has been that the existence of, in effect, two Juvenals entails the rejection of one division of the corpus as in some manner not genuine, in quality, in sincerity, or otherwise.

The third book of the *Satires*, comprising poems seven through nine, attacks the many failures of the elite to fulfill their proper function within the patron-client system. *Satire VII* discusses the abdication of the proper role of the elite in the production of literature, while *Satire VIII* castigates the nobility for failing to justify their status by equaling the excellence of their ancestors, and *Satire IX* depicts the utter deformation of the normative patron-client relationship in its description of the unacceptable demands of the patron coupled with a lack of reciprocal patronage.

The fourth book of the *Satires*, comprising poems ten through twelve, considers the nature of the Good. *Satire X* deconstructs a series of illusory concepts of the Good, while *Satire XI* asserts the value of simplicity and contentment with was is at hand, and *Satire XII* underscores the value of true friendship uncontaminated by mercenary interests. As with the other books, the satires of Book IV rely on all the humorous tropes
available to the author, notwithstanding their treatment of philosophical themes. It may be argued, in any case, that the themes of this book are at their core no more philosophical than any of the other components of the question of what constitutes proper Roman behavior.

The fifth book of the *Satires*, comprising poems thirteen through the incomplete sixteen, approaches the topic of self-control from multiple angles. *Satire XIII* lampoons overreaction to relatively minor injustices, while *Satire XIV* discusses the restraint demanded of a father due to the corrupting power of his poor moral example, and *Satire XV* mocks the unregulated violence of Egyptians given over to rage. Due to its truncated state of preservation, the argument of *Satire XVI* is unclear, although the topic of the preserved section is the abusive and unjust preference afforded to soldiers. In the course of their arguments, the individual satires intersect many of the standard themes of the earlier books: injustice, greed, and moral deviance. The global theme of this book, however, is not emotional control *per se* but rather appropriate action in the face of the provocation of injury or of temptation.

Although in the course of these five books the text of the *Satires* intersects Roman society at myriad points, the author returns repeatedly and from diverse tangents to a number of major themes. These themes function as axes of comparison along which every aspect of Roman behavior may be located and thus evaluated for its normative value. Observable behavior is thus constructed as a means of distinguishing between the many competing claims to Roman identity. The performance of this delimited Roman identity is consequently figured as an exercise in moral connoisseurship, whereby the potential Roman demonstrates his right to Roman identity through the proper negotiation
of the quotidian social discourses of Roman life. The author is strongly interested in the appropriate use of wealth as a sign for status. Again, it is the demonstration of the awareness of what is appropriate and the choice to conform to that norm that segregates the true Roman from the Other. Similarly, the performance of gender is of perennial concern, which ranges from discussions of deviant sexuality to irregularities of dress and every other aspect of deportment. For the satirist, gender functions as a crucial nexus for a complex constellation of behaviors; there is, in fact, little that is not coded for gender within the *Satires*. As generally, with the discourse on gender Juvenal locates an approved course of action between sins of commission and sins of omission. The true Roman must act and must act correctly.

The author is most concerned with the aspect of choice; crucially, it is precisely the ability to choose, provided by wealth and elite status, that presents the element of moral danger in every aspect of Roman daily life. It is the element of choice that creates social behavior as a moral question. It may be assumed that the lower classes would fare no better than the elite if their fortunes allowed, but absent the financial ability to choose deviance, they are of only incidental interest to the arguments of the author. The non-elite appear within the *Satires* typically as little more than ciphers for the non-Roman, points of comparison to demarcate the boundaries of proper behavior. In other instances, they appear as a sort of substrate on which the elite fail to perform their proper function. Among the many potential discourses engaged by the author, the position of a given person within the spectrum of available Roman foodways is extensively referenced as a telling mark of insider status. A *real* Roman is revealed by the ability to withstand the threat to moral and physical integrity posed by unrestricted access to opulent foods and
other physical pleasures. The ability to regulate the desires of the body is figured as indispensible to the capacity to function appropriately within a hierarchical society. There is within the Satires an assumption of social reciprocity as a fundamental underpinning of the ideal Roman social order. In the absence of this exchange of loyalty and resources, society cannot operate and all methods of creating identity are fatally compromised. The unifying thread within the strands of these varied topoi is the public, unavoidable, and interconnected nature of the performance under scrutiny. Within the moral discourse of the Satires, failure along any of the moral criteria is read as a nearly certain demonstration of a wider constellation of moral deviance. The corrupt person thus forfeits their claim to Roman identity in toto by self-exclusion from any component aspect of that identity.

The proposed norms of the Satires thus directly engage in a contest of meaning with the bulk of Roman elite society, in that the known practices of the second century do not cohere with the asserted norms of the Satires. For instance, the proposed moderation of expenditure on construction conflicts with the social competition evidenced within the archaeological record, just as the poet’s denigration of culinary excess stands in opposition to the need to engage in social display while hosting a dinner. The Satires thus operate within a broad contested space between the furthest extremes of each behavior, since only at these extremes would consensus would have been restored. The author attempts to reassign much of the contested behavioral space to these unacceptable extremes, by linking actions that would elicit universal opprobrium with more venial vices or mere predilections. The rational of the author derives from a monolithic hypothesis of moral turpitude and rectitude; much like the argument of probability
favored within Roman forensic rhetoric whereby a defendant tarred with one vice was argued to be the sort of person capable of the greater crime, the satirist figures moral turpitude as an organic whole with many observable manifestations. Conviction of any of these forms of deviance is taken within the *Satires* as sure evidence of inward corruption. In the great preponderance of his *exempla*, the author reveals the crucial thematic focus of his verse: an overarching concern with the *mores* of the elite. The full range of social classes is implicated in the verse, yet primarily as a series of occasions for the discussion of what is figured as normative or degenerate elite behavior.

In the subsequent chapters, I will explore the author’s use of his genre to construct his own elite identity within a textualized Roman world system. It will be my goal to demonstrate how Juvenal uses the satiric tradition to create a space for his own poetics and rhetoric. My second chapter will examine the role of the authorial *persona* and other *personae* in the pursuit of the author’s rhetorical goals. I will suggest that the author authorizes for his audience a complex of emotional responses to the range of potential forms of deviance. The rhetoric and argumentation within the respective poems is in fact predicated on the cued responses of the audience. As with forensic rhetoric, if the audience can be made to have no reaction to the charges, there is no hope of persuasion. In my third chapter, I will examine various ways that satire in the Post-Augustan period can be distinguished from that of earlier periods in its operation as an evolving textual sign for Roman Identity: *Romanitas*. Despite the similarities in *mise-en-scène* that can be traced from Varro onwards, I suggest that there are crucial shifts in emphasis associated with each satiric author that form an integral part of each respective poet’s reanalysis of Roman identity. This global argument is extended in my fourth chapter through an
examination of the author’s use of foodways to distinguish members of the elite, to stigmatize and segregate potential *Romani* from potential outsiders, who are seen as corrupting the values of Roman society. It is crucial that this division is effected on a basis independent of wealth, since wealth *per se* may be an enabling factor in the corruption of Roman behavior. For Juvenal, the performance of eating is a text that can easily be read. My fifth chapter picks up from this concept of semantic dining, dealing with the use of coded space, for which the author arrays the scene, both physical and literary, to signal *Romanus* versus the Other. I suggest that the *Satires* share a semantic space with the preserved literature of their period in the scope of their concerns and in much of their stylistic preferences, within the bounds of the respective genres. Juvenal offers an array of appropriate, emotional responses to deviation from *Romanitas* as he constructs it. Running the gamut of spite, anger, and jealousy, as well as compassion and stoic equanimity, these authorized emotions serve to frame a totalizing discourse on Roman identity and *mores*. 
Chapter II: 
The Authorial Persona of the Satirist

centuriae seniorum agitant expertia frugis, 
celsi praetereunt austera poemata Ramnes. 
onne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci, 
lectorem delectando pariterque monendo;

The ranks of older men reject matters devoid of profit, 
the impatient young men skim right over austere poems. 
The poet, who mingles the useful with the sweet, carries off every vote 
by delighting his reader just as much as by advising him.

Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 341-44.

Introduction

Within the internal discourses of the *Saturae*\(^6\) of the second-century\(^7\) Roman poet 
Juvenal, the writing/performance of *satura* constitutes something akin to a speech act.\(^8\)

In opposition to the contested socio-political discourses of his era, the author arranges his 
strings of rhetorical *exempla* in such a manner as to define and enforce a system of 
meaning; a great many of the claims made within the text of the *Satires* are strongly 
stated moral evaluations that are not themselves subject to ready categorization along an

---

\(^{6}\) It will be my practice after this point to refer to the sixteen poems of Juvenal as ‘the *Satires.*’ In any 
instance where I do not specifically cite another author, I refer to these texts.

\(^{7}\) All dates given in this dissertation are C.E., unless specified as B.C.E.

\(^{8}\) J.L. Austin, *How To Do Things with Words* (Cambridge, 1962), 12: e.g. “I do (take this woman to be my 
lawful wedded wife).” I will contend that the author intends to fix his textual perspective as the sole 
legitimate point of reference from which to understand the operation of Roman society. In this aim, the 
*Satires* are thus in discourse with all competing stances and frames of reference, and, crucially, the speech 
act of assigning meaning to action and thought is figured as then indisputable.
axis of truth and falsehood, such as the claim that the native and intrinsic are essentially more congruent with the Roman conception of the divine than the imported and alien.⁹

... quanto praesentius esset
umen aquis, uiridi si margine cluderet undas
herba nec ingenuum uiolarent marmora tofum.

... How much more present in the waters would the divine be, if only grass enclosed the waves with its green border and marble did not savage our native tufa.

One need look no further than the remains of the many examples of sacred space of the imperial period to appreciate the contentious nature of this observation. The historian Suetonius (flor. early second century) attributes to the emperor Augustus (d. 14) an articulation of the counterpoint argument in the emperor’s boast that urbem ... marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset (he left a city in marble, which he had received in brick, Aug. 28). In many instances, it is possible that neither Juvenal nor his predecessors in the genre may be expressing the consensus view, or—at any rate—the view of those most able to trim sacred space with costly stone or otherwise leave traces in the archaeological record. The lack of an agreed upon measure of moral comparison opens an area of ambiguity within which the satirist is at liberty to operate. For the audience of the Satires, the socially sanctioned (correct) emotional response to this class of statement is consequently ambivalent and in perpetual contest. The authors of satire, as a special class of speaker, interject themselves into such conflicted spaces of the Roman social discourse as they engage the systems of meaning that underlie and inform

---

⁹ Cf. also 11.116, where Juvenal asserts the sanctity and efficacy of the fictilis et nullo Iuppiter auro (earthenware Jupiter violated by no gold).
these performative texts.\textsuperscript{10} I will argue that the global purpose of this literary performance was to construct the identity of the author and, by necessity, all humanity within an interpretive framework written over the universal life experience of the intended audience.\textsuperscript{11}

The genre of satire is a crucial source of evidence for Roman studies, since these texts repeatedly intersect every aspect of Roman culture and life. The nature of the interrelation between these texts and their cultural milieu is thus of the greatest importance for the question of to what degree and in what manner this evidence can be employed in service of arguments exterior to the formalistic analysis of the poems. The highly rhetorical presentation of the Roman world system embedded in these texts problematizes the use of this vital evidence and demands the formulation of an interpretive strategy based on the expectations of the intended audience as evidenced in the intertextual relationships of the genre, particularly with historiography, oratory, and epic. In the course of this and the subsequent chapters, I will articulate such an interpretive strategy for the \textit{Satires} of Juvenal and for the Roman genre of satire more broadly. As an embodiment of the genre at its most developed state, the \textit{Satires} depend on the generic expectations built up by the poetics and thematics of Lucilius, Horace, and Persius. The proper explication of Juvenal thus entails an extensive examination of his predecessors.

\textsuperscript{10} J. L. Austin (1962): 14-15 gives six criteria for the performative as he defines it. Of these, the second (A. 2, that “particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked”) is parallel to the case of the satirist as a class of self-appointing persons, who arrogate the rights of a speaker to themselves through composition within the authorized discourse of satire.

\textsuperscript{11} As will be discussed below, the biographical fallacy has been until recently all too prevalent in Juvenalian studies; I do not suggest that the \textit{Satires} relate the realities of the life of Juvenal, but rather the constellation of cultural assumptions under which his authorial identity is validated.
In the study of satire, the concept of the speech act is profoundly useful, since all authors depend less on the actual day-to-day operation of the Roman world system than upon culturally contested notions of reality. Thus, in the case of Juvenal, the actual operation of the Roman state under the emperors Trajan and Hadrian is immaterial to the caustic rhetoric of the *Satires*; the function of the poems may have been to underscore the relative beatitude of Roman society in the early second century through its retrojection of vice and dysfunction on the period of the previous dynasty, just as it emphasized the virtues of the ruling elite by marginalizing deviant behavior.\textsuperscript{12} Much as Horace opines in the passage quoted at the beginning of this chapter, I argue that there is no fundamental dissonance in the encapsulation of rhetorical content within ribald or hyperbolic modes of humor; to Juvenal and his predecessors, the recording of objective truth was of no interest whatever, while the incidental preservation of any historical narrative was merely tangential to the matter at hand—the construction of a comforting meaning from the incomprehensible complexity and apparent fungibility of Roman society.

As with other poetic forms, it is reasonable to suppose that Juvenal and his antecedents in the genre of satire held delighting their audience as a prime goal of their compositional efforts; however, it is not reasonable to exclude from their agenda a desire to persuade. In many ways, the success of the poems as humorous discourses depends entirely on the agreement of the audience as expressed through their approving laughter.\textsuperscript{13} There is in this matter no need to suppose a lack of literary sophistication on

\textsuperscript{13} When a stand-up comedian, for instance, makes hyperbolic statements about aspects of their society, most audience members possess the sophistication to separate the drift of the argument from the literal signification of the words. Awareness of the social parameters of the performance conditions the reaction of the audience, which responds to some element of the performance that it perceives as *true*. I will argue
the part of the intended audiences of these poems; there is no need to presume that they were unable to appreciate at once the artistry and humor of the poetic composition, the rhetorical skill of the piled-on *exempla*, and the global force of the author’s argument. The bounds of the genre were well able to encompass these intersecting authorial objectives.

After the manner of a veiled priest or even an imagined Thessalian witch in his ability to pronounce the terms of the compact between actors within the hierarchy of the universe, the author of Roman satire may claim the notional authority to dictate the order of the *world system* through bold fiat as a speaker of some deeper truth rooted in a more perfect past; the probability that many Romans would likely remain unpersuaded by the explicit and implicit claims of the *Satires* is as immaterial to the question of their rhetorical intent as the failure of Cicero’s *Second Philippic* to persuade the Roman citizen body to rise at one against M. Antonius. In the consideration of the rhetorical stances taken within the *Satires*, the essential axiom that must be noted is that the literary discourse on *Romanitas*\(^\text{14}\) was itself – as always – in violent contest; M. Foucault stresses the centrality of such contestation of the terms of the discourse in his *L’ordre du Discours*:

\(^{14}\) There is no known ancient Latin term for the concept of “Roman-ness.” In reference to this fluid and contested concept, it will be my practice to employ the term *Romanitas*, since this term is arguably less objectionable and clearer than the many possible circumlocutions, despite the issue of its anachronism before the time of Tertullian (Braud, *Latin Literature* (Routledge, 2002), 70). Adams, “‘Romanitas’ and the Latin Language” (*Classical Quarterly*, 2003) finds the term somewhat distasteful and cites J. Kramer, *Die Sprachbezeichnungen Latinus und Romanus im Lateinischen und Romanischen* (Berlin, 1998), 81–82. In concept, I most closely follow Woolf, *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul* (Cambridge, 1998), 241 who notes that “a symbolic center did exist in the Roman cultural system, but it was located not in any one place or region but rather in a set of manners, tastes, sensibilities and ideals, that were the common property of an aristocracy.” I will have occasion throughout this work to cite this term in the sense of the global object of contention within the *Satires*. 
In appearance, speech may well be of little account, but the prohibitions surrounding it soon reveal its links with desire and power. This should not be very surprising, for psychoanalysis has already shown us that speech is not merely the medium which manifests – or dissembles – desire; it is also the object of desire. Similarly, historians have constantly impressed upon us that speech is no mere verbalization of conflicts and systems of domination, but that it is the very object of man’s conflicts.\textsuperscript{15}

Seen in this light, the \textit{Satires} constitute an act of verbal aggression directed against a hydra-like Other, figured at once above the speaker’s frame of reference in terms of wealth and below on the axis of conformity to the strictures of the \textit{mos maiorum} – as locally defined. As he deploys a seemingly endless mélange of negative \textit{exempla} in service of his tendentious form of humor, the author seeks to validate concurrently a single, ostensibly essential, mode of being Roman, while nullifying all claims to that status exterior to his own array of strictures.

In pursuit of this rhetorical goal, the author touches upon virtually every aspect of the lived experience of the Roman urbanite – both viscerally and vicariously encountered – to string a series of vignettes into the tangents of larger arguments of meaning and definition. While few contemporary scholars would be so foolish as to propose a positivistic reading of the texts of Juvenal as direct evidence for his own life experience or the objective state of second-century Roman society, it is my contention that the range of views of the \textit{Satires} based on the \textit{persona} theory fall victim to a similarly serious error.\textsuperscript{16} While it is clear that no \textit{persona} encompasses the unadulterated authorial voice, this observation can be made as accurately, if not as obviously, for any text—ancient or


\textsuperscript{16}The essence of this theoretical position is that all speakers within satire, including the first-person narrative speaker, are \textit{personae} (theatrical masks, i.e. characters) created by the author and standing at some distance from the actual views of that historical author. Primary exponents of the application of \textit{persona} theory to verse satire include W. Anderson, S. Braund, and to a lesser degree K. Freudenberg; the majority of recent treatments of satire, however, proceed from a broad acceptance of this concept.
More than for most genres, Roman satire holds a certain indulgence for hyperbole and vivid characterization of the objects of the discussion, yet the representational liberties granted within the genre ought in no way be equated with a rationale for discounting the rhetorical content of the *Satires* as characterization rather than as content. While the vehemence of the text may easily mislead those prepared to misread the author’s chosen stances, I will contend that the *Satires* in broad outline—at the level of the *exemplum*, the *satura* and the *liber*—represent the author’s desired situation relative to the Roman world-system. A process of textual self-fashioning that is not effected through identification with the authorial *persona* is to be expected. What is to be gained is then not a definitive set of normative views on Roman life and mores in the early second century, but rather the objects under contest within the elite literary discourse of that era.

Across the gamut of available identities and modes of meaning, Juvenal is consistent in deflating all those exterior to that offered to his auditors and constructed, by exclusion, for himself as author. This rhetorical payload was, of necessity, bound to be less than universally palatable to the majority of literate members of Roman society in the time of the author. What should not be expected, however, is that the members of the

---

17 The New Historicist theorists have argued that all forms of discourse are unavoidably biased. Such an observation, however, is not tantamount to a claim that nothing can be reliably recovered from such texts. For a good discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of the ‘New Historicism’ cf. the introduction of J. N. Cox et al., *New Historicist Literary Study: Essays on Reproducing Texts, Representing History* (Princeton, 1993).

18 L. Fienburg in B. Fabian, *Satura: Ein Kompendium moderner Studien zur Satire* (Hildesheim, 1975) 341, asserts, in counterpoint to M. Mack, that despite the supposedly “detached nature of the *persona*, the result of the *persona*’s actions and statements is always an attack on what the satirist himself wants attacked and a defense of what the satirist himself wants defended. After all, the *personae* of Swift and Horace and Juvenal and Voltaire and Thackeray do express, in various ways, the same criticism of society which each of these satirists wanted to express. The content of satire is historically identifiable material – specific individuals, institutions, issues – and it is remarkable how often the effect of the *persona*’s behavior supports the satirist’s own position.” The crux of the problem remains to identify what that position might be.
contemporary audiences would have been unable to draw a range of fine distinctions along grades of difference now imperceptible. That is, there is no reason to expect that a great number of Roman women might not have been able to ally themselves with the poet even through the dissection of female vice of *Satire VI*. The identity groups that might suggest themselves to the scholar schooled in, for instance, Feminist theory might have had little or no social relevance for the members of the intended audience and even less with many subsequent audiences. The array of conservative social positions embedded within the hexameters of Juvenal is fundamentally congruent, for example, with the interested sentiment that could mark the emperor Hadrian (ruled 117–138) with the appellation “*Graeculus*” in response to his (excessive) fondness for Hellenic culture.

Social transformation is a universal and perennial element of the human experience. Conservative elements that set themselves in opposition to this transformation within a reactionary discourse are no less a constant factor in genres spanning Roman *historia* to *satura*.

**Personae and the Construction of the Authorial Voice**

In the broad sweep of Juvenalian scholarship in particular and scholarship on verse satire more broadly, a false dichotomy has been set up between a biographical reading and a reading based on the divorce (provisional or complete) of the historical

---

19 A Christian woman of the Patristic period, for example, might identify fully with the authorial persona of *Satire VI*, since she might view (pagan) Roman women as entirely exterior to her own identity and appropriate targets for an invective discourse.

20 *Historia Augusta*, Hadrianus 1.5 *imbutusque inpensius Graecis studiis, ingenio eius sic ad ea declinante, ut a nonnullis Graeculus dicetur* (steeped without restraint in Greek pursuits, with his intellect leaning toward these matters to such an extent that he was being called “Greekling” by quite a few).
author from his authorial mask, *persona*, as instanced in the texts.\(^{21}\) The first of these modes of interpretation of the *Satires* has its origins in the grammarians and the Patristic authors from the fourth century and reaches its apogee in the biographical scholarship of the mid-twentieth century.\(^{22}\) The second, which has been the prevailing view since the last quarter of the twentieth century, takes a rather more contrarian stand in opposition to the clear biographical fallacy of the majority of earlier scholarship by examining the authorial *persona* as merely one of the many characters (*personae*) within the performative satiric texts. Defined broadly within the field of satire studies, the *persona* (theatrical mask) is conceived of as a speaking character within the text that is distinct from the genuine authorial voice.\(^{23}\) The ability to vividly portray the *persona* (take on the *ethos*) of another person was a crucial skill of the Roman orator. The orator and self-styled savior of the *Res Publica* Cicero (106–43 B.C.E.) masterfully employed this technique of oratorical characterization in the published version of his oration *Pro Caelio*, where he took on the *persona* of Ap. Claudius Caecus the censor to condemn (by

---

\(^{21}\) The biographical criticism of the *Satires* can be traced from the fourth-century scholiast and through the uncertainly dated *Vita Iuvenalis* given in W. V. Clausen, *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae* (Oxford, 1992), 179. The tenth-century *Suda* entry on Juvenal is in much the same vein and likely derives from earlier *vitae*. Cf. E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (Athlone Press, 1980), 1-10, with the caveat that some biographical criticism intrudes toward the end of the section.

\(^{22}\) The patristic apologist Lactantius (c. 240–320 C.E.) refers to the *Satires* nine times. R. Ogilvie, *The Library of Lactantius* (Oxford, 1978), discusses the sources quoted by Lactantius, although Ogilvie’s inferences from patterns of quotation and comparison with manuscript families may be problematic: cf. the review of M. Winterbottom, *The Classical Review*, 30:1 (1980), 144-45. The *De Ira Dei* of Lactantius is illustrative of the reanalysis of *ira* within the Christian community that could readily interpret the *Satires* of Juvenal as anti-Roman. Hight, *Juvenal the Satirist* (New York, 1961) represents the most perfect development of biographical criticism as applied to the *Satires* of Juvenal. The essential theoretical basis for this mode of scholarship is the assumption that the historical details of the author’s life and socio-political world can be directly recovered from the texts.

\(^{23}\) It will be my practice throughout this discussion to employ the crucial terms as follows: *by authorial voice*, I indicate the genuine rhetorical stance of the historical author, which may or may not be recoverable in relation to specific sections of the texts; *by authorial persona*, I mean to designate the first-person speaker that claims to be the authorial voice. For the sake of avoiding stylistic tedium, I will also indicate the authorial *persona* thus: ‘Juvenal.’ There are multiple terminologies in play with divergent refinements of definition. Of these, “*the satirist,*” cf. W. Anderson, “Anger in Juvenal and Seneca” in Essays on Roman Satire (Princeton, 1982), and “*the speaker*” as advanced by S. Braund, *Beyond Anger* (Cambridge, 1988):1, are effective alternatives.
extreme contrast) the moral stature of a descendent of the proverbially strict proponent of traditional morality – the *mos maiorum*. Many of the *personae* within the works of Juvenal and his predecessors have never been widely identified with the authorial voice: e.g. the hustler Naevolus in Juvenal’s *Satire IX*. A more liminal case is provided by the character of Umbricius in *Satire III*, whose first-person diatribe on the disappointments of life in Rome monopolizes all but twenty lines of a 322-line poem. I will examine these cases more fully later in this discussion. The crux of the theoretical problem rests in the unidentified first-person satiric speaker, the authorial *persona* that predominates the bulk of the satires of Juvenal, Perseus, Horace, and Lucilius. What precisely is the relationship between this *persona* and the authorial voice? Is there any securely reconstructable equation between these two modes of relating to the Roman world system?

It is my contention that it is possible to reconstruct the authorial voice through a careful analysis of the rhetorical strategies deployed by the authors.\textsuperscript{24} Parallel employment of an authorial *persona*, so to speak, can be detected in the political oratory of performers from Ronald Regan to Barack Obama in their careful crafting of the presidential *persona*. While only the credulous would believe that there is no daylight between what politicians, of any era, believe and what they say, it is arguable that a disbelief in any connection between the *persona* and the person is the product of a similarly excessive skepticism. As was the case for the Roman orator, an effective modern politician must project a degree of sincerity through a notional separation from such a *persona*. Performance must not be acknowledged as performance.

\textsuperscript{24} It is a curious outcome that the author for whom there must remain the greatest degree of uncertainty, Lucilius, has the least scholarly disagreement concerning the reconstruction of his authorial voice.
As has been discussed for the *persona* of politicians, there was the danger of the author drifting into the notional space of another genre and thereby compromising his claim to the right to speak in the particular mode of satire. Despite the propinquity of their performance space, there was a conceptual chasm of difference between performance oratory and the stage in Roman thought. The actual proximity of the two spaces contributes an element of danger of compromised identity to the performance. Juvenal, via the authorial *persona*, alludes to this tension when engaging a hypothetical interlocutor from his audience:

> 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. sed clamat Pontia ‘feci,
> confiteor, puerisque meis aconita paraui,
> quae deprensa patent; facinus tamen ipsa peregi.’

So obviously, I am concocting these bits with satire putting on the high tragic boot, and I have stepped beyond the boundary and the law of earlier authors and I rave - with a great Sophoclean maw - a song unknown to the Rutulian mountains and the Latin sky? If only I were off-base. But Pontia proclaims “I did it, I confess, I prepared aconite for my boys, detected crimes are obvious; yet I myself performed the deed.”

The *grande Sophocleo ... hiatu* refers to a literal *persona* (stage mask) of an actor on the tragic stage, an image which the satirist explicitly denies. ‘Juvenal’ similarly figures the literal *persona* as a mark of shame for those with any claim on *nobilitas* by exhorting Nero to lay his at the feet of his ancestor’s statue (8.224-29). As was the case for the Roman orator, there was a constant peril of pushing the performance aspects of satiric oratory into the notional space of the stage. That space was properly inhabited by actors, not members of the elite. Furthermore, the tragic mode of composition was directly
available to Juvenal, had that been his authorial inclination or object. The tragedies of Seneca are prime examples of the sort of rhetorically heavy compositions that correspond closely with the *topoi* explored in satire and with the range of pathetic emotional representation open to the satirist. The *Octavia*, for example, explores the injustice and lust of the tyrant much as does *Satire IV* of Juvenal, while the *Hippolytus* is highly congruent with the depiction of uncontrolled female lust and violence instanced throughout *Satire VI* and elsewhere. A *persona* of the sort derived from the tragic stage, however, is a poor model for the *personae* deployed within the *Satires*, since the performance is acknowledged in the tragic genre.

The risible *senex* (old man character) of the Roman comedic stage is an even less appropriate paradigm for the authorial *persona* of the satirist, in that this figure is an inversion of the normal operation of Roman society. There is a great deal of difference between the rhetorical effect of a masked actor with dangling phallus portraying the type-character of the ill-controlled, hypocritical old man on the literal performative space of the Roman stage, and the effect of the orator – or the satirist – taking up a *persona* within a diametrically opposed performance space. The first instance is coded as non-elite and, in fact, *infamis*, as actors along with prostitutes and other marginalized persons lacked socio-political rights due to their profession. The second instance is coded as elite and participates in the same semantic field as the oratory that marked its practitioner as a participant in the literary culture of the ruling elite. This characterized *paterfamilias* of the stage merely reinforces the practical *auctoritas* of the Roman father in actual

---

25 The concept of the *carnivalesque* described by M. M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World* trans. Helene Iswolsky (Indiana, 1984), in his sense of a space of potential revolution against established hierarchies is not applicable to the Roman comedic stage, since the effect of the *ludi scaenici* (stage amusements) was not to subvert the established order but to ratify it by garnering electorally useful popularity for members of the socio-political elite, who were sponsoring the productions. Bakhtin located the energy of the *carnivalesque* in Menippean satire specifically.
practice.\textsuperscript{26} If there is in satire some aspect of the \textit{carnivalesque} as formulated by M. Bakhtin, I would argue that it does not reside in the authorial \textit{persona}. None of the preserved satirists deploys the world-turned-upside-down motif in a manner that promotes any real challenge to the structure of Roman hierarchy. Each satirist is concerned with the proper behavior of the Roman elite and is interested in exclusion, but none questions the propriety of the existence of elite status \textit{per se}. The authorial \textit{persona} is not simply the author, yet I contend that the manifest error of the biographical tradition serves as no good argument for the correctness of the \textit{persona} theory as too broadly applied to satire, and I will propose an alternative mode of reading this genre that is not along an axis formed by the false choice between the extremes of credulity and excessive skepticism. In service of this argument, it is necessary to examine the operation of other authors that intersect the thematic space or the compositional mechanics of verse satire.

Sharing a conversational usage of the dactylic hexameter similar to that of Juvenal, the text of the \textit{De Rerum Natura} of Lucretius (c. 90–c. 50 B.C.E.) certainly holds to the parameters of its genre. Although he was adapting an earlier work by Epicurus as mediated perhaps through epitomes, the author was himself a poet of some skill with the use of dactylic hexameter, but his impetus for composition did not fail at the precise point of demarcation between manner and matter. The author explicitly claims a didactic program for his work:

\begin{center}
\textit{Quod super est, vacuas auris animunque sagacem semotum a curis adhibe veram ad rationem, ne mea dona tibi studio disposta fidel, intellecta prius quam sint, contempta relinquas.}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{26} G. E. Duckworth, \textit{The Nature of Roman Comedy: a Study in Popular Entertainment} (Norman, Okla., 1994) suggests that it is the incongruity of the \textit{paterfamilias} as ridiculous buffoon, the fact that this identity is not normative, that produces the humor of the scene. Cf. also R. L. Hunter, \textit{The New Comedy of Greece and Rome} (Cambridge, 1985), for a thorough introduction to the operation of New Comedy.
As to what remains, apply your open ears and mind, wise and separated from cares, to the true philosophy, so you won’t abandon (as things contemptible) my gifts, laid out for you with faithful zeal, before they have been understood.

(Lucretius 1.50-53)

There is little within this extended poem that might cause an editor to question the basic sincerity of the author’s claimed objectives. It would be hardly more than contrarian to propose that the author desires to undermine the essential thrust of his rhetoric. On the other hand, one would hope and expect that the author did not in all cases and at all occasions mimic the pedantic persona of the Epicurean exegete instanced in his unfinished text. That authorial persona is unobjectionable for the genre and for the objectives of the particular text, yet is not – of course – a doppelgänger of the author himself. Similarly, the poet deploys the range of available topoi and refinements as per the requirements of his chosen genre, but these compositional choices in no way preclude or contravene the rhetorical content of the text. It is possible to be an accomplished poet and to pursue a rhetorical point; neither the poetics of Lucretius nor the published orations of Cicero are less literary in character for having an interest in persuasion.

I would argue that there is no essential disjunction between the role of the author as poet and as partisan. The longest extant fragment of Lucilius is a short discursus on virtus (moral excellence) given as a first-person address to an interlocutor named Albinus:

virtus, Albine, est, pretium persoluere urum
quis in uersamur, quis uiuimus rebus, potesse,
virtus est, homini scire id quod quaeque habeat res,
virtus, scire, homini rectum, utile quid sit, honestum,
quae bona, quae mala item, quid inutile, turpe, inhonestum,
virtus quaerendae finem r<e> scire modumque,
virtus diuitiis pretium persoluere posse,

1200
Moral excellence, Albinus, is the ability to pay the real price, in the matters we conduct and in those in which we live; moral excellence is knowing what each matter holds for a man; excellence is knowing what is right for a man, useful, upright, which good, and alike which bad, what useless, foul, dishonorable; excellence is knowing the limit and manner of seeking for a thing; excellence is being able to pay out the price from one’s riches; excellence is giving what is owed to honor by the matter at hand, to be an enemy and an enemy of wicked men and morals, and contrariwise a defender of good men and morals, to consider these men of great value, to wish them well, to live as their friend, and beyond this, to take thought for the needs of the fatherland first, next of our parents, third and last for our own. (Lucilius 1196-1208W)

These sentiments are rhetorical commonplaces instanced across Roman literary production, but does that mean that the author does not advocate a position, simply because it is expressed in a standard form? Lucretius articulates his program and is credited, while the successors of Lucilius are often dissected away from their authorial personae to the extent that claims are commonly made that invert the apparent meaning of the texts. It is claimed that Juvenal, for instance, makes the “angry speaker” of his first two books a figure of derision for the audience in order to incite them to reject the (offensive) content of his rhetoric, e.g. this discussion of the authorial persona in Satire VI:27

He begins by hankering after the good old days of the Golden Age (cf. Umbricius’ wistful reminiscences of the good old days, 3.312-14) – but his wistfulness is undercut by some inappropriate details (the hairy woman and acorn-belching man, 10): thus Juvenal hints that the speaker is a foolish and

27 As discussed in the introduction, the sixteen satires were published in five books: Book I (satires 1-5), Book II (satire 6), Book III (satires 7-9), Book IV (satires 10-12), and Book V (satires 13-16).
inconsistent man. His folly and inconsistency are confirmed beyond doubt when he gives himself away at 166 with *quis feret uxorem cui constant omnia*? In these words he reveals his irrational blanket hatred for women – and once we have heard that he cannot stand even the perfect wife, we know for sure that we cannot take him seriously.  

The fuller context for the comment of 6.166 is instructive for the question of whether the audience should take the rhetorical content of the passage seriously. At the terminus of a series of imprecations against female vice, Juvenal explores what might constitute the inverse of the many faults so far enumerated:

> ‘nullane de tantis gregibus tibi digna uidetur?’
> sit formonsa, decens, diues, fecunda, uetustos
> porticibus disponat auos, intactior omni
> crinibus effusis bellum dirimente Sabina,
> rara auis in terris nigroque simillima cycono,
> *quis feret uxorem cui constant omnia?* malo,
> malo Venustinam quam te, Cornelia, mater
> Graccorum, *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.

> “Does no woman from such herds seem worthy to you?”

Allowed that she is beautiful, decorous, rich, fertile, displays ancient ancestors in her porticoes, is more untouched than any Sabine woman parting the battle with locks undone, a rare bird on earth most resembling a black swan, who could endure a wife to whom all these conditions pertained? I prefer, I prefer Venustina to you, Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, if along with your great virtues you bring great arrogance and you tabulate triumphs in your dowry. I beg you, enough with your Hannibal and Syphax defeated in the camp and hit the road with your whole Carthage.

(6.161-71)

The crux of the point being articulated by the authorial *persona* is found in the *si* of line 168; the proverbial Cornelia, as a cipher for the woman meeting all of the stipulations

---

28 S. Braund, *Beyond Anger: A Study in Juvenal’s third Book of Satires* (Cambridge, 1988), 19. This text gives a full treatment of this idea of a disjunction between the first two books and the third book along the lines of *indignatio* and irony.
enumerated in lines 162-65 and further equated with the virtuous *Sabina* of Roman political myth and the exceedingly anomalous *niger cyenus*, would be rejected in favor of an antithetical *Venustina*, *if* that technically perfect woman brought intolerable *supercilium* along with her virtues.29 This critical qualification is driven home in the following lines (6.172-77) by the myth of Niobe as an *exemplum* of the role of feminine arrogance in the destruction of mankind, or at least of her husband and children. Finally, Niobe thinks herself *nobilior* (more noteworthy) than the offspring of Latona (Apollo and Artemis) and even *fecundior* (more fertile) than the fabled white sow of the Aeneas myth. Arrogance is the point at issue for the passage, and the rhetorical needs of that object drive the sequence of images and pronouncements.

Taken in isolation, the rhetorical question *quis ferret uxorem cui constant omnia* of line 6.166 might be read as a textual signal for the audience to evaluate the authorial *persona* as a “foolish and inconsistent” narrator, one whose statements ought to be rejected as little more than the thoughtless ranting of an idiot. The authorial *persona*, however, does not reject the *virtutes* of the perfect woman as would a foolish ranter; it is the concomitant arrogance that is rejected. Further, the extremity of the emotional response (total rejection) that is authorized by the authorial *persona* in 6.166 serves to rhetorically underscore the severity of arrogance so egregious that it can overbalance the virtues of the otherwise perfect wife. The authorial *persona* concludes with a juxtaposition of the relative merits of virtues and vices in the choice of a wife:

```
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. quis deditus autem
```

---

29 *Venustina* (charming little girl) is an unknown figure, who is often taken as a trade name for a woman of ill repute. Cf. Courtney (1980): 282.
usque adeo est, ut non illam quam laudibus effert
horreat inque diem septenis oderit horis?

What bearing is of such value, what beauty, that it tabulates its
worth for you constantly? Indeed, there is no pleasure from this
rare and exalted good, whenever she’s corrupted with an arrogant
mind she has more (bitter) aloe about her than (sweet) honey. But
what man is so given over that he does not shiver at the woman,
whom he exalts with praises, and hate her for most of the day?

(6.178-83)

The characteristics of *gravitas* and *forma* are not denigrated; they are set in opposition to
the tedium of constantly having to endure having these virtues thrown in one’s face.
Similarly, the authorial *persona* qualifies the potential *voluptas* of the rare and exalted
good with the possibility that the woman might be *corrupta* by an arrogant mind. The
thrust of the entire passage is encapsulated in the balanced counterpoint of *plus aloes quam mellis* of line 6.181. Thus the depiction of feminine arrogance is typically
hyperbolic within the bounds of the style of Juvenal, yet the thread of the argument is
clear and is framed as reasonable. S. Braund usefully suggests that the *Satires* of Juvenal
should be regarded as “a series of dramatic monologues delivered from the first person,”
a formulation which correctly locates the text in a performative space with expectations
and constraints tangential to those of quotidian speech. 30 In the course of this exploration
of the inverse of feminine flaws, the authorial *persona* is not constrained to only the
venial vices but is free to explore the defects of the spirit as well. Similar dramatic
hyperbole is present in the series of options given in place of marriage in the opening
segment of *Satire VI*:

*certe sanus eras. uxorем, Postume, ducis?*
*dic qua Tisiphone, quibus exagitere colubris.*
*ferre potes dominam saluis tot restibus ullam,*
cum pateant altae caligantesque fenestrae,

cum tibi uicinum se praebeat Aemilius pons?
aut si de multis nullus placet exitus, illud
nonne putas melius, quod tecum pusio dormit?

Certainly you were sane. Postumus, are you marrying a wife?
Tell me by what Fury, by what snakes you are compelled.
Are you able to endure any wife-master with so many undamaged ropes, when high and vertiginous windows lie open, when the Aemilian bridge offers itself to you just next door?
Or if from this multitude no death suits you, don’t you think it better that a boy-lover sleep with you?

(6.28-34)

Again, a reading at too fine a scale would lead to the rejection of the equation of (male) insanity and marriage. The suggestion of suicide as preferable to marriage would be egregious, but the authorial persona makes the rope, the high window, the bridge, and pederasty preferable not to marriage but to subjugation to a domina. Boy-lovers may be arguably better due to their not litigating through the night, demanding gifts, and complaining about insufficient sexual performance (6.35-37), yet the broader sweep of the argument is given by the passages that bracket this section.

Outside of the parameters of the performative space of satire, the authorial persona employed by Juvenal would be all too susceptible to damning criticism at many points of his agglomerative argument; however, this satiric persona is not meant to constitute a figure of utter derision, whose positions must be discarded in the manner that those of the authorial persona in Swift’s A Modest Proposal are certainly intended to be rejected. That persona in toto is clearly marked as antithetical to the author and the audience; no sensible reader would conclude that Swift was genuinely exhorting his

---

31 In the context of the oblique reference to Catullus and Propertius in 6.7-8, this passage is an explicit rejection of the self-fashioning as elegiac lover as subservient to a domina. The thematic linkages between satire and elegy in the creation of the authorial persona will be explored in the subsequent chapter. S. Braund, “Juvenal—Misogynist or Misogamist?” The Journal of Roman Studies 82 (1992), 71-86 rightly distinguishes (incidental) misogyny from (rhetorical) misogamy in Satire VI.
audience to eat Catholic infants. Taken as a paradigm for the interpretation of Juvenal, however, this contrarian interpretive model would lead to the assumption that the author was an advocate for moral turpitude, gluttony, and ostentatious materialism, since his authorial persona attacks each of these excesses repeatedly and violently. While the use of this rhetorical figure is certainly possible within Roman satire, the results of its identification with the Satires of Juvenal is a nonsensical inversion of meaning. I propose an inclusive model for the use of the authorial persona in Juvenal and his predecessors, where it is possible for the drift of the discussion to represent the rhetorical stance of the author, while the authorial persona is itself frequently open to humorous deflation as one of many sources of humor within the flow of poetic figures and rhetorical topoi.

In her discussion of the significance of Satire VI, S. Braund suggests based on what she argues to be inconsistencies in logic and presentation that the “misogamist” authorial persona “is also a misogynist” that was “created for the audience's entertainment,” where “the fun lies in (‘Juvenal’s’) use of the ammunition of traditional Roman morality not to support but to subvert the morality encoded in the legislation on marriage.” Allowing that the authorial persona is flawed, what does this status have to do with the misogynistic content of the satire and the Satires? Although the global theme of Satire VI is on female vice as it relates to marriage, ‘Juvenal’ by no means confines his misogynistic statements to Book II of the Satires. In the context of a discursus on

32 Braund, “Juvenal—Misogynist or Mysogamist?” 85. The point would then be that the author employs his authorial persona to mock misogynists by depicting their spokesman as incompetent and overcome by ira (rage)—a moral flaw as figured in Seneca’s De Ira.
vengeance, for example, the authorial persona of Book V takes a passing shot at women that is entirely harmonious with the thematics of Satire VI.\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{...quippe minuti semper et infirmi est animi exiguique uoluptas...}
\textit{ultio. continuo sic collige, quod uindicta nemo magis gaudet quam femina. ...}

\textit{... for certain, taking pleasure in vengeance is always a sign of a small, sick, and narrow mind. Thus realize at once, because no one rejoices more than a woman avenged.}

(13.189-92)

Being used in passing to argue other points, statements of the sort cited above must themselves serve as axiomatic once uttered. In the context of an exhortation to the study of the arts, Galen makes an aside with similar relevance for the operating assumptions of his literary culture:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ης την μοχθηρίαν ἐμφανίσαι βουληθέντες οἱ παλαιοὶ γράφοντες καὶ πλάττοντες αὐτὴν οὐ μόνον ἐν εἰδι γυναικὸς ἡρκέσθησαν (καίτοι <καὶ> τοῦθ' ἰκανὸν ἢν ἄνοιας σύμβολον) ἄλλα καὶ πηδάλιον ἔδοσαν ἐν χερῶν ἔχειν αὐτὴ καὶ τοῖν ποδοῖν ὑπέθεσαν βάσιν σφαιρικήν, ἐστέρησαν δὲ καὶ τοῖν ὑφάλμῳν, ἐνδεικνύμενοι διὰ τούτων ἄπαντων τὸ τῆς τύχης ἅστατον.}
\end{quote}

(Tyche). Having desired to make apparent her depravity, the ancients painting and sculpting her not only in the image of a woman, they were satisfied (and yet even this was a sufficient symbol of mindlessness) but they even allowed her to hold a rudder in her hands and placed a spherical pedestal beneath her feet, and they deprived her of her eyes, declaring through all these things the instability of Tyche.

(Galen \textit{Adhortatio ad artes addiscendas} 2.3)

\textsuperscript{33} For further examples of misogynistic content in Book V, cf. also 14.25-30, which details how a young girl learns the practice of adultery from observing and assisting her mother’s adulteries, and ends with the inversion of their roles: \textit{ceras nunc hac dictante pusillas / implet et ad moechum dat eisdem ferre cinaedis} (now she fills her little notebooks with her mother dictating / and hands them over to the same queers to deliver them to her adulterer). The thematics of this passage are a close match to 6.231-41, where the daughter learns vile behavior from her mother, and repeats the \textit{topos} of O17-20 in Satire VI, where the corrupting relationships of cinaedi and women are discussed.
Speaking of the dangers that will face a boy if he should chance to have the beauty for which his mother prays, in *Book IV* ‘Juvenal’ assails both the profligacy and sexual insatiability of (married) women:\(^{34}\)

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{sed tuus Endymion dilectae fiet adulter} \\
\text{matronae. mox cum dederi Seruilia nummos} \\
\text{fiet et illius quam non amat, exuet ommem} \\
\text{corporis ornatum; quid enim ulla negauerit udis} \\
\text{inguinibus, siue est haec Oppia siue Catulla?}
\end{aligned}
\]

But your Endymion will become the adulterer of a matron he loves, next (when Servilia has given him her coins) he’ll become the adulterer of a woman he doesn’t love, he’ll strip off all the decoration of her body; for what would any woman deny to her wet privates, whether she is an Oppia or a Catulla?  

\((10.318-22)\)

In tone and in language this passage would pass without remark in *Satire VI*, and the authorial persona elaborates on this theme for another twenty-three lines, discussing the uncontrolled and destructive lust of the mythical Phaedra and the historical Messalina (10.324-45). In the course of a biting characterization of a male sexual deviant, the authorial persona of *Book III* again takes a brutal passing shot at the sexuality and religious probity of Roman women:\(^{35}\)

\[
\begin{aligned}
... (\text{nam quo non prostat femina templo?}) \\
... (\text{for at what temple does a woman not whore herself?})
\end{aligned}
\]

\((9.24)\)

---

\(^{34}\) For further examples of misogynistic content in *Book IV*, cf. also 10.236-39, which discusses the ability of a prostitute to persuade an old man to change his will in her favor with a mouth, *quod steterat multis in carcere fornicis annis* (which stood for sale for many years in the cell of the arch), and 11.162-68 for the corrupting effects of Spanish dancers on men and their nuptae (brides) at dinner, and 11.185-89 for a wife returning home disheveled after a night of illicit sex.

\(^{35}\) For further examples of misogynistic content in *Book III*, cf. also 8.128-30, which employs the stereotype that a governor’s wife would steal from the provincials like a harpy, and 8.158-62, which depicts a barmaid at a popina (low-class food bar): *et cum venali Cyane succincta logona* (along with Cyane with her skirt hitched up and her mercenary bottle). For *succincta* as a reference to prostitution, cf. K. Olsen, “*Matrona and Whore: Clothing and Definition in Roman Antiquity*” in *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World* eds. C. Faraone and L. McClure (Wisconsin, 2006), 194 and note 26.
In context the aside does little but add color to the scene. It is reasonable to assume that many such casual evaluations of women or other components of Roman society are all the more liable to represent the authorial voice as they do not directly bear on the argument at hand.36 The essential point is that, while the manner and technique of the author change across books, the rhetorical stance is quite consistent. The ‘Juvenal’ of the last three books is no stranger to the ‘Juvenal’ of the first two books. Perhaps no speaker’s persona should be expected to be consistent at all times and on all topics.

As was discussed above, the authorial use of the personae of the Roman stage does not serve as an accurate paradigm for the operation of personae in satire. A far closer parallel to the interconnection of the satirist and his personae than that of the dramatist and the stage actor is offered by the orator as author and performer. Who would doubt that the orator intends to persuade – that he has a point beyond the fulfillment of the strictures of the genre? Does Cicero desire to be thought a great orator and a great writer? Certainly, and he desires with equal fervor to be thought to number among the boni. At every point of his composition, however, he also desires to persuade. Does he expect to fully persuade every possible member of every possible audience, to carry every point? Certainly not, but it is reasonable to suppose that he hopes to persuade his intended audience of both propositions, and, crucially, he expects to successfully argue the central theme of his oration.

From the analogy of the orator, it is reasonable to infer that the authors of satire as well would have had the anticipation of substantial agreement on the part of their

36 For another example of similar unmotivated misogyny, cf. the discussion of forms of moral depravity at Tacitus Ann. 3.53, where ‘Tiberius’ closes off his list by citing illa feminarum propria, quis lapidum causa pecuniae nostrae ad externas aut hostilis gentis transferuntur (that particular flaw of women, due to whom our funds are handed over to foreign or hostile races for the sake of gems).
intended audiences with the underlying arguments of their poetic discourses. What then
is the object of this satiric rhetoric? Horace frames the object and matter of his satire as a
discussion of what is really important to humankind:

... ergo
sermo oritur, non de villis domibusve alienis,
 nec male necne Lepos saltet; sed, quod magis ad nos
 pertinet et nescire malum est, agiiamus, utrumne
divitiis homines an sint virtute beati,
quidve ad amicitias, usus rectumne, trahat nos
et quae sit natura boni summumque quid eius.

… Therefore
a conversation arises, not about someone’s villas and townhouses,
and certainly not whether or not Lepos dances poorly; but I
grapple with what pertains more to us and is an evil not to know,
i.e. whether or not men are happy due to riches or virtue,
or what drags us to friendships – utility or righteousness,
And what is the nature of the Good and what is its essence.

(2.6.70-76)

The author figures important speech not as what concerns the property of others or their
skills, but as things that are nescire malum (an evil not to know). Horace enumerates
binary oppositions between divitiae (riches) and virtus (virtue), between usus (utility) and
rectum (righteousness), then finally summarizes his proposed subject matter as natura
boni summumque (the nature and essence of the Good). It is incorrect to dismiss the
importance of these themes within satire due to a scruple about their being rhetorical
commonplaces; that they are common literary topoi is the direct result of their importance
to society. Even controversiae (rhetorical exercises) having a prima facie ridiculous
premise, e.g. pirates and legal chastity, pertain not to the particulars of the premise, but
rather to questions of justice in liminal cases where the literal application of a legal
statute would produce a doubtful judgment:

37 Sermo is also the technical term for explanatory passages in rhetorical manuals such as the
Declamationes Minores traditionally attributed to Quintilian.
SACERDOS CASTA E CASTIS, PVRA E PVRIS SIT. Quaedam virgo a piratis capta venit; empta a lenone et prostituta est. venientes ad se exorabat stipem. militem, qui ad se venerat, cum exorare non posset, colluctantem et vim inferentem occidit. accusata et absoluta remissa ad suos est; petit sacerdotium.

LET A PRIESTESS BE A CHASTE AND PURE WOMAN FROM CHASTE AND PURE (PARENTS). A certain virgin happens to be captured by pirates; she was bought by a pimp and made a prostitute. She successfully begged those coming to her for the fee (without providing the service). When she was unable to persuade a soldier, who had come to her, she killed him while he struggled with her and attempted rape. After being accused (of murder), absolved, and sent back to her family, she seeks a priesthood.

(Seneca the Elder, Controversiae 1.2)

The probability of this scenario is clearly slight and just as clearly irrelevant to the function of the exercise. What then follows in the text is a number of possible rhetorical strategies that might be employed to argue the case. The exempla of Juvenal in particular would challenge the credulity of a literal-minded audience, if they were intended to convey fact rather than, like the premises of controversiae, the framework of a potential declamation. These premises are specifically cited as exempla by the authorial persona:

\[
\text{quid si numquam adeo foedis adeoque pudendis} \\
\text{utimur exemplis, ut non peiora supersint?}
\]

What if I adduce exempla never yet so foul and so shameful that things still worse do not still remain?

(8.183-84)

As is the case for the passage claiming that the satirist does not exceed the law of earlier authors cited above (6.634-40), ’Juvenal’ here asserts that his exempla do not exceed the bounds of probability and that, by extension, his dependent arguments are creditable. The rhetorical tropes and topoi of the satiric author are the scaffolding upon which he constructs arguments on liminal behaviors and beliefs; the exempla provide the entrée into a discussion of the gamut of contested areas of Roman society. Like the orator, the

---

38 Cf. Juvenal 4.45-52 for the prospect of prosecution for failing to surrender an exceptional turbot to the emperor as a fugitium.
satirist might not expect to carry every point, but by the art of arrangement and elaboration, the satirist may succeed in persuading his audience of his literary acumen, his right to a place within the elite, and his global point.

There then remains the question of the degree of alienation between the literal reading of a text and its rhetorical function. The statements of the authorial persona in Catullus 16 have been used to argue that there was an awareness among the ancient literary audience that a significant distance might exist between the authorial persona and the genuine authorial voice:

\[
\begin{align*}
Aureli pathice et cinaede Furi, \\
qui me ex uersiculis meis putastis, \\
quod sunt molliculi, parum pudicum. \\
nam castum esse decet pium poetam ipsum, uersiculos nihil necesse est; \\
qui tum denique habent salem ac leporem, \\
si sunt molliculi ac parum pudici, \\
et quod pruriat incitare possunt, \\
\end{align*}
\]

O Aurelius you fag and Furius you queer, who think that I am hardly chaste based on my little verses, because they are pansy little things. Indeed, it is appropriate that the pious poet be chaste himself, it is not at all necessary that his little verses be; which then finally have wit and charm, if they are pansy little things and hardly chaste, and able to arouse what sexually itches,

\[16.2-9\]

Leaving aside the issues of the poetic goals of the poem, the assertion of the authorial persona of Catullus that a disjunction exists between the poet and his verses is itself open to question. Inquiry into the precise biographical details of whether a Lesbia existed, who she might have been, or what the specifics of her relationship to the author were

---

39 Freudenberg, The Walking Muse (1993): 4 in his discussion of the separation of the author and his mask, cites this poem (along with Ovid Tristia 2.354 and Martial 1.4.8) as evidence that “the Roman poets themselves were fully inured to this way of thinking about their work” and that the author attacks Aurelius and Furius “for daring to draw from his poems conclusions about his own life.”
tends toward the biographical fallacy, yet the willful act of composition within a certain genre was surely meaningful to Romans of the first century B.C.E. ‘Catullus’ might twice threaten to sodomize (16.1 and 16.14) his interlocutors for what the authorial persona figures as a foolish equation of a poet and his poetics, but the question remains of how valid such a critique might be considered. Why would it be foolish for any member of Catullus’ audience to read something about the poet’s self-fashioning from his choice of manner and matter?

Perhaps a more productive way of approaching the rhetoric of this poem would be to consider the position attributed to the characters Aurelius and Furius as a straw man set up for the authorial persona to demolish. ‘Catullus’ claims that his antagonists question his status as a male due to the basia of poems 5 and 7, or perhaps 48:

\[uos, quod milia multa basiorum legistis, male me marem putatis?\]

You, because have read my many thousands of kisses, thinks that I am hardly masculine?

(Catullus 16.12-13)

Whether the antagonism is sincere or in jest, the argument is sound only so far as the source of the evaluation of the author’s character rests in particular pseudo-biographical details within his poems. What if the criteria in question were the rhetorical stances and the choice of genre? Literary composition is a discursive act that thrusts the author’s identity into a complex and contested social discourse. It is not reasonable to think that Catullus was unaware of this possibility when he chose his genre. Ovid may similarly assert that distant mores a carmine nostro (my morals stand at a distance from my poem), but the author was impelled by some rhetorical imperative to articulate this claim rather

than to rely on the general acceptance of a notional divorce of the author from of his authorial persona (Tristia 2.354).\textsuperscript{41} Again, this statement is one aspect of a discourse, not a definitive, final word on the matter. Such attempts to shape the discourse on authorial identity are evidence of its contested nature, not of a clear and widely understood lack of correlation between text and author. I would argue that the satirists, particularly after Lucilius had established the genre and thus the point of reference for their personae, were actively forming their identities through their manipulation of their chosen genre.

In the context of this contested association of the poet and his poetics, what is to be made then of the invective content of the satirists and especially of Lucilius and Juvenal? Is invective content the sole domain of a speaker given over to \textit{ira} and thus not to be credited? What is required is not the image of the sputtering maniac driven by \textit{ira}, but the comic poet behind the poetry. For ‘Horace,’ such a model is, in fact, ready to hand in the Greek Old Comedy that the poet explicitly cites as a paradigm for understanding the invective of Lucilius:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae atque alii, quorum comedia 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, facetus, emunctae naris, durus conponere versus.}
\end{quote}

The poets Eupolis and Cratinus and Aristophanes and others, the men to whom the Old Comedy belongs, if anyone was worthy of description, because he was wicked and a thief, because he was an adulterer or a cutthroat or someone infamous, stigmatized them with great liberty.

\textsuperscript{41}Seneca makes the positive case that speech and thoughts should cohere, from which it can be extrapolated that the normative expectation of the audience is for the speech of a subject to have a solid connection to the inner character: quod sentimus loquamur, quod loquimur sentiamus; concordet sermo cum vita (we should say what we think, and we should think what we say; speech should be in accord with life) Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium 75.4.
From this all Lucilius hangs, he followed these very men, with just the feet and the meters altered, an eloquent man, with a discerning nose, hard in his composition of verses. 

(Sat. I.4.1-8)

It is crucial to note that the poet reads the attacks of *personae* within these compositions as representative of the views of the authors themselves and directly correlated to the actions of the objects of their attacks. The characterization of Lamachus in the *Acharnians* is driven by the strictures of the comedic genre, but the charge that he was a warmonger is directed at the actual man by the actual author. The fifth-century-B.C.E. Athenian audience had no difficulty in comprehending the correlation between the rhetorical object of the dramatic composition and the actual objects of that rhetoric. In the *Apology*, Plato has his character Socrates claim that he has been unfairly slandered by his portrayal in the *Clouds*.\(^42\) That Aristophanes could have been prosecuted for slander against Athens by Cleon for the content of the *Babylonians* is also indicative of a general assumption of a direct, if disproportional, link between the *personae* of a poem and authorial voice.\(^43\)

In the Roman context, there are multiple references to emperors taking this understanding of comic poetics to the extreme of detecting offence where there was perhaps none intended. A casual reference in a tragedy might not have been intended as a cutting attack on Tiberius, but even the emperor’s overreaction demonstrates that there was a broad acceptance that literary content was related to the socio-political stance of the author (Tac. *Ann.* 6.29.3). S. Bartsch makes the critical point that offence need not even by intended for it to be taken, and that the attribution of agency was firmly centered

\(^{42}\) *Apology* 18b to 19d, and particularly 19c. Plato is, no doubt, self-serving in his attribution of the charges against Socrates at least in part to a play, yet the attempt to so place the origins of negative views of his mentor in the portrayal of Aristophanes would be pointless if it were entirely implausible.

\(^{43}\) Schol. *Ar. Ach.* 378.
on the author, not the *persona*. As part of a broader critique of his despotic tendencies, the historian Suetonius reports that the emperor Domitian suppressed invective texts and their authors:

\[
\text{suscepta correctione morum licentiam theatram promiscue in equite spectandi inhibuit; scripta famosa uulgoque edita, quibus primores uiri ac feminae notabantur, aboleuit non sine auctorum ignominia;}
\]

Having taken up the regulation of morals, he prohibited the freedom of watching theater without distinction among the knights; famous writings that had been published, in which leading men and women were besmirched, he obliterated and not without the degradation of their authors.

*(Dom. 8)*

It is crucial to note that the author here figures the act of literary composition, along with manner of theatrical seating, as aspects of Roman *mores* apt to regulation by an intrusive emperor. Choice of object and manner in composition was thus seen as a significant socio-political act with impact on its targets and agency on the part of its authors. The nearly contemporary historian Tacitus locates a charge of treason in the voice of a sycophantic accuser addressing the emperor Nero on the failure of the Senate to defend his majesty:

\[
nimium mitis ad eam diem patres, qui Thraseam desciscentem, qui generum eius Helvidium Priscum in isdem furoribus, simul Paconium Agrippinum, paterni in principes odii heredem, et Curtium Montanum detestanda carmina factitantem eludere impune sinerent.
\]

Excessively lenient to this day was the senate, which allowed the seditious Thrasea, his son-in-law Helvidius Priscus in the same insanities, along with Paconius Agrippinus (heir of his father’s hatred toward the emperors), and Curtius Montanus who constantly made detestable poems, to get off without punishment.

*(Ann. 16.28)*

These purportedly *detestanda carmina*, no doubt, were literary in nature and not merely the versification of the authorial voice of Montanus. Such a trial before the Senate

---

could only employ arguments, whether properly applied or not, that were congruent with the understanding of the members of that social stratum—the same subset of the Roman population that contained the authors and the primary consumers of Roman literary production. Similarly, Tacitus discusses the downfall of the praetor Antistius for composing *probrosa carmina*:

\[ P. Mario L. Afinio consulibus Antistius praetor, quem in tribunatu plebis licenter egisse memoravi probrosa adversus principem carmina factitavit vulgavitque celebri convivio, dum apud Ostorium Scapulam epulatur. \]

When P. Marius and L. Afinius were consuls, the praetor Antistius, whom I have cited as behaving riotously while he was tribune of the plebs, wrote up abusive poems against the emperor and made them known at a thronged dinner party, while he was dining with Ostorius Scapula

\[(Ann. 14.48)\]

Antistius performed his poems before an audience, presumably without the expectation of prosecution. That Tacitus was of the opinion that he should have expected repercussions is evident in the reminder that Antistius had behaved *in tribunae plebis licentia*. The composition of abusive poems should have come with the expectation that the offense would be attributed to the author.

At a minimum, the assumptions of Tacitus demonstrate a strong association of the author’s choice of theme and object with the authorial voice in the time of Juvenal, who notes this same expectation in his paradigmatic *Satire I*:

\[ securus licet Aenean Rutulumque ferocem committas, nulli grauis est percussus Achilles aut multum quaesitus Hylas urnamque secutus: \]

\[45\] As the alternative perspective of those pitying the accused, Tacitus reports that there was a belief that enimvero Montanum probae iuventae neque famosi carminis, quia protulerit ingenium, extorrem agi (indeed Montanus, a person whose youth was upright and whose poetry was not infamous, was being driven out as an exile because he had shown talent; *Ann.* 16.29). What is revealed about the literary expectation of Tacitus, however, is of significance here, not the nature or even the historicity of the referenced poems. A *carmen* could be *famosum*; it could be *detestandum*, and the content and nature of the poem would be attributed to the authorial voice.

\[46\] Tacitus cites a similar case of *probrosa (carmina)* resulting in prosecution in *Ann.* 14.50.
It is permissible for you to pit Aeneas and the fierce Rutulian against one another in no danger; wounded Achilles or much sought after Hylas, who chased his pitcher, is no big deal to anyone: (but) whenever blazing Lucilius, as if with a drawn sword, grewled against someone, his hearer blushed whose mind was cold due to the charges, the crimes, his heart sweats with silent guilt. From that comes rage and tears. Therefore, turn these matters over in your mind before the trumpets: a man with his helmet already on regrets the battle too late. I will try out what is allowed against those whose ashes are covered by the Flaminian and Latin ways.

(1.162-71)

As a prelude to this caution about composing verse against the living, ‘Juvenal’ had previously questioned unde illa priorum / scribendi quodcumque animo flagrante liberet / simplicitas (whence comes that simplicity of writing whatever was pleasing when the mind burned that the ancestors had possessed; 1.151-53). No doubt the antiquity of those with graves paved over by those early roads is exaggerated for comic effect, but if the authorial persona could be conceptualized at a significant remove from the authorial voice, why did the author not choose to engage examples of vices from his own time? There is a fundamental shift between the practices of Lucilius and Juvenal, which I attribute to a freedom of speech deriving from the high social status of Lucilius and his political allies. Libel was treated as a major crime in the Twelve Tables, as noted by Cicero:

\[\text{ Augustine de Civ. Dei 2.9 quotes Cicero from the de Republica. Festus 196.12 writes ‘occentassit’ antiqui dicebant quod nunc convicium fecerit invehebatur (the ancient called ‘shall have sung against’ what now is expressed (as) ‘shall have made an insult’). Cf. also Cornutus ad Pers. 1.137.} \]
Our Twelve Tables, (Cicero) says, on the other hand, although they punish very few matters capitally, thought this punishment (appropriate) in these instances: if someone sang or wrote a poem, which produced dishonor or disgrace for someone else.

That the *carmen* is figured as producing *infamia* or *flagitium* supports my contention that the performance of *carmina* within the invective genre of satire would have been conceptualized as an action with the potential to perform its rhetorical objective. To equate, for instance, gluttony with *infamia* is conceptually to make it *infamia* in the manner of a speech act. Aulus Gellius (c. 125-180) discusses the imprisonment of the poet Naevius (c. third century B.C.E.) for comments in one of his comedies:

*..cum ob assiduam maledicentiam et probra in principes civitatis de Graecorum poetarum more dicta in vincula Roma a triumviris connectus esset.*

Just as concerning Naevius we have heard that he wrote two comedies while in prison, the *Hariolus* and the *Leon*, when on account of constant malediction and abuses spoken against the leaders of the state in the manner of the Greek poets he was thrown into chains at Rome by the three-man commission.

(AG 3.3.15)

Here the *probra dicta* recall the *probrosa carmina* of Tacitus, while the description of Naevius’ manner as that of the Greek poets recalls the statement of Horace concerning Lucilius. Horace also makes reference to this law, and thus to the conceptual linkage between the poet and his poetics:

*Fescennina per hunc inventa licentia morem versibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit,*

---

48 Asconius (Cic. Verr. 1.29) reports that the offending verse was: *fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules* (by fate the Metelli become consuls) as explanation of Cicero’s jest: *nam hoc Verrem dicere aiebant, te non fato, ut ceteros ex vestra familia, sed opera sua consulem factum* (for people say that Verres says that you became consul not by fate, like the others from your family, but through your own effort).
While this law did not entirely eliminate invective content from Roman poetics, as evidenced by Lucilius, the passage of such a law and its continuity as a topic of literary discussion is indicative of the general acceptance of its underlying poetic theory. Based on this reiterated theme explored above, I suggest that the notional linkage between author and poetics was broadly consistent across the period encompassing Lucilius to Juvenal, despite discursive attempts like that of Catullus 16.

Returning to the equation of the methods of the Old Comedy and Lucilius, it can be conceded that Horace, as always, has his own motivations for making such a literary claim and offers, finally, only one of many potential generic frameworks for reading Lucilius; it may well be that considerations of this kind, that it was the matter of satire that defined the genre, are what prompted Horace to attribute the foundation of the formal genre of satire to Lucilius rather than to Ennius. That the early development of the genre
by Lucilius may have had more to do with the poetics of the Roman stage, and thus more with New Comedy than with Old, is of lesser importance within the discourse of Horace than the literary claim by that author superimposed on the text of Lucilius. It remains open to the ancient reader to resist the interpretational framework that Horace seeks to impose on his predecessor, but to the degree that they are accepted, the readings of Horace become, in effect, the last word on Lucilius until some other reanalysis takes their place. That these readings may have well been provisional even within the text of Horace himself does not contravene the point that the younger author is attempting to control the intertextual relationship between his satires and those of his predecessor. This is a question of authorial self-fashioning, and it is integral to the greater question of the linkage between the poet and his characters.

The dramatic and rhetorical practices of the authors within the tradition of Old Comedy proposed by Horace is of use at this point in the argument, where expectations of the Athenian audience can serve as a provisional model for its Roman counterpart. Within the framework of Old Comedy, it is reasonable to suppose that the character Dicaiopolis from Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* is a stand-in for the authorial *persona*; as was often the case for the Chorus, the comic protagonists are frequently employed to voice the premise and arguments of the play. There is much that would be risible in this figure if he were a literal man on the street, and his persuasiveness would doubtless be compromised if he were so evaluated by the audience. Within the rhetorical space opened up by the expectations of the genre, however, a comical caricature was enabled to

---

seriously advance a rhetorical argument from within a comedic genre. The character advocates peace, and this advocacy has its origins in the authorial voice.

While there might be little of such insight to be gained from an overly close reading of, for example, Dicaiopolis’ lecherous interest in young girls from Megara (729-835), I suggest that, as the Athenian audience was able to make distinctions between the manner and the matter of Old Comedy, the Roman audience was capable of a similar discrimination between the rhetorical vehicle and the rhetorical object within the performance space of satire. In sum, it was not necessary for the authorial persona within the satiric genre to conform to the normative social expectations of an actual Roman in order for the audience to decode the rhetorical content of the verse and credit the broad form of the author’s socio-political stance from the pronouncements of the persona. It is not here my purpose to argue that the authorial personae deployed by Lucilius, Horace, Perseus, and Juvenal are equivalent to the true authorial voices of those authors or, much less, equivalent to the consensus view of the majority of the Roman populace. The texts of these authors do, however, demarcate the contours of the Roman socio-political discourses prevalent at the time of their compositions. Further, I suggest that the satirists preserve a set of rhetorical poses broadly representative of the literary Zeitgeist of their respective times, a perspective that was in each instance elite in nature.

Within a space of meaning created for satire by his predecessors, the Satires of Juvenal function as comedic vehicles for rhetorical exercises allied to suasoriae. As was the case for the persona of the orator, ‘Juvenal’ and the other textual representations of the authors’ personae operated in a space to the side of quotidian speech.\(^{50}\) The authorial

---

\(^{50}\) I would argue that the diction of the Satires is in itself exclusionary in its separation from even the sermo cotidianus and especially the Vulgar Latin, which it frequently touches for comic effect, and that this
persona of satire was free to engage in conversation with literary exemplars of any stripe whatever without risk of contamination, just as the character Socrates in the works of Plato is made to hold discourses with persons of all sorts, none of whom he validates by simply engaging in conversation. This compositional model clarifies the interaction of the authorial persona of Juvenal with the character Naevolus in Satire IX. This Naevolus lives by serving the pleasures of his pathic benefactor, a social role that is clearly marked as debasing within the Satires. ‘Juvenal’ depicts his interlocutor as an unhappy individual discontent with his life:

\[\textit{Scire uelim quare totiens mihi, Naeuole, tristis occurs fronte obducta ceu Marsya uictus. quid tibi cum uultu, qualem deprensus habebat Rauola dum Rhodopes uda terit inguina barba?}\]

I should like to know, Naevolus, just why you meet me so often sad with your forehead contracted like conquered Marsyas. What business do you have with an expression of the sort that Ravola had, caught while he abraded Rhodope’s privates with his wet beard?

(T.1-4)

Tied to a tree, the satyr Marsyas was said to have been skinned alive by a Scythian or the god himself after losing a musical contest with Apollo. This image of torture is picked up again in the assertion that the face betrays the inner life and that it is possible to detect \textit{animi tormenta latentis aegro / corpore} (the torments of a mind hidden in a sick body, 9.18-20). Naevolus is described as suffering the symptoms of a man grieved and exhausted by compulsory sexual performance, having acquired sudden \textit{rugae} (wrinkles), a \textit{vultus gravis} (grim face), hair like a \textit{horrida silva} (bristly forrest), \textit{macies} (emaciation),

\[\text{compositional choice is congruent with the pejorative rhetoric aimed at women, foreigners, slaves (the Other, i.e. those without the elite literary/oratorical cursus); the diction choice is a signifier of proper Romanitas.}\]

31) Multiple depictions of this sculptural pendant (thematic group) are known from the ancient world, with the result that the image of torture would have likely been all the more immediate for the audience. Cf. Ovid \textit{Met.} 6.382-400. For the use of such groups of sculpture in Roman decoration, cf. E. Bartman, “\textit{Decor et duplicatio}: pendants in Roman sculptural display,” \textit{AJA} 92 (1988): 211-225.
and febris (fever) of a long-established sickness (9.8-17). Naevolus is a paradigm for the unhappy state of the deviant and is clearly excluded from the normative Romanitas of ‘Juvenal,’ yet his critique of deviancy is congruent with the rhetoric of the satirist.

Despite the compromised identity of Naevolus, the satirist, like Plato’s Socrates, is nevertheless able to cross-examine this witness in a manner that is utterly damning to the witness and reinforces the pro-social role of the satirist as moral arbiter. It matters little to the rhetorical objectives of the author that the persona Naevolus is self-satirizing. There is no small degree of irony in the invective speech of a client, who performs (active) sexual services for husband and wife alike and who once played the passive role as well, against his deviant patron, but this irony does not preclude that persona from being an effective conduit of the authorial voice (9.25-26; 9.46-47). The character Naevolus is made to savage representatives of the topoi of greed and pathic sexuality, objects of frequent derision by the authorial persona: quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis auarus (yet what prodigy of evil is beyond a stingy pathic, 9.38).

Highhanded violence (9.93-101), female perversion (9.22-25), supposititious fatherhood (9.82-89), and many more of the favorite targets of ‘Juvenal’ are put in play by the persona Naevolus, and the combined rhetorical stance constructed through these attacks is congruent with that present in the other fifteen satires. The miserable Naevolus is an excellent proof-text for the undesirability of the life he leads and the rectitude of the authorial voice that underlies his critique of elite mores. That serious moralizing content was notionally able to be located even in the literal persona of a comic actor is shown in Plautus by the rejoinder placed in the mouth of the fisherman Gripus to the moralizing of

---

52 This depiction of Naevolus is congruent with the depiction of the legacy hunters who earn their inheritances by night in Juvenal 1.37-44.
the old man Daemones. The author uses the *persona* of the fisherman to poke fun at his audience for their purported preference for the theory more than the practice of wise behavior:

*Spectavi ego pridem comicos ad istunc modum sapienter dicta dicere atque eis plaudier, cum illos sapientis mores monstrabant poplo: sed cum inde suam quisque ibant divorsi domum, nullus erat illo pacto ut illi iussserant.*

I have seen comic actors speak wise sayings along this line before and be applauded for them, when they pointed out to the populace the *mores* of a wise man: but when each man went to his own home separated, there was not one man in that agreement as they had commanded. *(Rudens 1249-53)*

The comic interplay of the author and his audience as instanced in this passage is no doubt complex and multivalent, yet the global point is clear; as was the case for the Old Comedy at Athens, the genre permitted the embedding and engagement of serious moral discourses even in the stigmatized comedic *personae* of stage actors. Juvenal employs a similar *topos* by placing an argument for his right to engage in authorized speech in the voice of the *infamis* (despicable) Varillus as he rejects the right of a pathetic moralist to castigate his *mores*:

*...quo deterior te? lorpipedem rectus derideat, Aethiopem albus. quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes? quis caelum terris non miscet et mare caelo si fur displiceat Verri, homicida Miloni, Clodius accuset moechos, Catilina Cethegum, in tabulam Sullae si dicant discipuli tres?*

... In what way am I worse then you?
A built man should mock a cripple, a white man an Ethiopian.
Who would endure the Gracchi complaining about sedition?
Who would not confuse sky with earth and ocean with sky,  
if a thief annoyed Verres, a murderer annoyed Milo,
Clodius accused adulterers, Catalina accused Cethegus, if his three disciples spoke against the proscription(s) of Sulla?

(2.22-28)

The poignant irony of having the hypocritical moralists rebuked by a man with the legal status of an actor or prostitute is prominent in this passage, but there is a more significant idea in play. ‘Varillus’ argues that only a speaker, who lacks the flaws that he castigates, has the right to make moral pronouncements. This passage can thus be seen as an articulation of the argument for the moral excellence of the authorial persona, since the speaker who castigates vice while practicing it would be morally equivalent to the pathic moralists of Satire II. To the extent that satire was conceptualized as a more elevated genre than comedy, the author of satire is even more free to make use of any of his personae, no matter how compromised, to advance his rhetorical objectives.

The Construction of Satura as an Authorizing Discourse

Juvenal proscribes the vast bulk of potential actions and modes of being as fundamentally un-Roman and demanding of a negative emotional response along an axis connecting indignation and moral abhorrence. In his Sermones, Horace offers a relatively dispassionate modus vivendi based on a connoisseurship of what is good in life. Juvenal, on the other hand, rejects such a disengaged view of the res Romana in a response to a hypothetical interlocutor, who might propose some other more worthy subject for his poetics:

53 This moral assumption of the nullifying effect of hypocrisy on the right to speak may be a universal feature of human social discourse: e.g. the pot calling the kettle black. Cf. 8.34-35 and the parable of the splinter and the beam, Matthew 7:3-5. Note that whether the speaker is correct in the critique is not in question, but rather the right of the speaker to critique. This topos is similarly engaged in 11.56-62, where the authorial persona claims that his guest will determine for himself whether the life of Juvenal coheres to the rhetoric of ‘Juvenal’. The plainness and simplicity of the proposed meal are comically hyperbolic, but the point is secure: the right of the speaker to make pronouncements depends at minimum on the pose of moral rectitude.
Why should I relate how much rage burns my dry heart, 45
when this defrauder of his ward presses the populace with his
herds of hangers-on, a man even condemned with a meaningless
judgment? What is infamy when your coins are safe? 45
Marius the exile drinks from mid-afternoon and enjoys himself
(though) the gods be enraged, but you, victorious province, cry.
Shouldn’t I think such matters appropriate for the Venusian lamp? 50
Shouldn’t I deal with these matters? But what (should I write) more?
Herculeses or Diomedeses or the lowing of the Labyrinth and the sea struck by a boy and the flying inventor.

This *ira* is not personal – the authorial *persona* is not enraged by slights or personal
greed, envy, or depraved desire, but by the perversion of justice and the flouting of the *mos maiorum*. The satirist maintains his rational capacity as he continues to adduce arguments in support of his rejection of a corrupted Rome, and demonstrates his moral connoisseurship, his ethical good taste, by marking Roman behavior with authorized emotional responses. Robert Kaster notes one aspect of such a science of good social taste in learned aversions.  

---

54 The sentiment of the passage is similar to that of protest slogans against the Bush administration: e.g. “If you are not angry, then you are not paying attention.” ‘Juvenal’ exhorts a new governor to set the *ireae frenae modumque* (reins and limit of anger) and *avaritiae* (of greed) 8.87-90. The crucial distinction between the *ira* of the satirist and that of the governor is that the former is authorized to respond emotionally to the aspects of the Roman world system, but not to take direct action against iniquity. In the case of the governor, the proper employment of the coercive power of the state is dependent on the self-control and the disinterested impartiality of the man in office.

This is the *fastidium* of aversive connoisseurship: it typically entails a judgment, represented as “refined,” made on objects—predominately items of daily intimate use (food, clothing, furnishings), or products of the literary culture, or people—when consuming those objects has significance for the consumer’s status, affirming that status (when the aversion is registered) or questioning it (when it is not).

Kaster further proposes a that the alternation between *invidia* (righteous indignation) and *pudor* (sense of shame) underlies the Roman social discourse on morality. In this view, the normative reaction to the observance of deviance is the communication of *invidia* followed by the induction of *pudor* on the part of the deviant, leading to conformity. I suggest that this is the precise model operative in the *Satires*. As a pro-social agent of community norms, ‘Juvenal’ is thus not comparable to the angry man of Seneca’s *De Ira* or any other exemplar of the rhetorical exercises or commonplaces against anger; the intended audience would have had no reason to equate the authorial *persona* of the genre of satire with a literal representation of the author as suffering from the emotional disease of *ira*. Martial (c. 38–104) illustrates the crucial perspective that the audience would have brought to the experience of satire:

*Nil recitas et uis, Mamerce, poeta uideri: quidquid uis esto, dummodo nil recites.*

You recite nothing, Mamercus, and you wish to be thought a poet be whatever you want, as long as you recite nothing.

(2.88)

To be a *poeta* is to recite. The reception of satire by its intended audience cannot be separated from the literal spectacle or the imagined sight of the author performing before his audience. That author wore no mask or other device of the stage, and if that author

---

56 R. Kaster, (2005), 92-103 especially. Kaster notes the root meaning of ‘see’ within *invidia* and suggests that it implies “a performance observed and judged” (96). Further *invidia* may be induced in an audience against some other, with the effect that “the emotion and the performances that it inspires thus produce a type of social glue, reinforcing certain kinds of judgments and unifying a group against a renegade” (97).
cannot be imagined as enacting his performance in fundamentally disparate ways, then it is necessary to reconsider the apparent discontinuity in the authorial persona between the five books of the Satires.

It has been accepted for some time that there is some category of discontinuity between the first two books of Juvenal’s Satires and the remaining three books. While theories based on biographical criticism spanning the advancing age or otherwise retreating skill of the poet can be discarded out of hand, it is necessary to give serious consideration to viewpoints derived from the persona theory as developed by Anderson and Braund. Braund describes the “angry speaker” (authorial persona) of Books I and II as self-satirizing through constant “gross exaggeration and gross prurience,” and asserts that in the view of the intended audience the angry speaker “deserves condemnation for his uncontrolled anger,” and states that with this “final, conclusive revelation, Juvenal makes his angry speaker irredeemable”: 57

\[... \text{facit ira nocentes} \]
\[\text{hunc sexum et rabie iecur incendente feruntur} \]
\[\text{prescipites, ut saxa iugis abrumpit, quibus mons} \]
\[\text{subtrahitur clivoque latus pendente recedit:} \]

\[650\]

…wrath makes this sex
harmful and they are borne headlong with madness burning their liver, like rocks ripped away from slopes, from which the mountain has withdrawn and the slope recedes from the hanging escarpment. \[650\]

(6.647-50)

As we have seen above in the discussion of the character Naevolus, the satiric author was able to deploy serious rhetorical arguments even through severely compromised persona. The degree to which the authorial persona of the first two books was marked as morally compromised or even a distinct and self-contained entity is open to question.

57 Braund Beyond Anger 18, 22. The author makes these assertions in service of the argument that there is a fundamental shift between the first two books and Book III in particular.
The condemnation of this passage of *Satire VI* is directed at women driven to commit outrages by their impious, insane, and immoderate rage, *ira*, and is not comparable to the male speaker who expresses justified and moderated *indignatio* at their actions.\(^{58}\)

According to Braund, *Satire VII* represents a “break” with satires one through six where Juvenal relinquishes the *indignatio* of the “angry persona” in favor of the irony of a “much more rational and intelligent” persona.\(^{59}\) It is to be expected, however, that the same poet performed both *personae* before similar audiences. If the author is not expected to have stood before his audience in a trembling, flushed paroxysm of rage as he recited his poetry, it is not reasonable to assume that the authorial *persona* was intended to be interpreted as such. The controlled cadences of the hexameter would not have equated well with the sputtering speech of a man overcome with rage. The choice of interpretational strategy to employ with the *Satires* is not restricted to these two polar anomalies; contrary to Seneca’s rhetoric, the choice is not between the angry maniac and the equally aberrant Stoic sage.

I suggest that, while there is a discernable variation between the first two and the latter three books of the *Satires*, the difference in object and argument is a necessary and sufficient explanation for this variation in tone. To use an analogy, ‘Juvenal’ does not go at once from carnivore to vegetarian at the first line of *Satire VII*; he keeps his dietary options open. The authorial *persona* still indulges all of his ‘bad’ habits, just with a bit of situationally appropriate moderation. For example, the interlocutor Naevolus of *Satire IX*, who demands *an facile et pronum est agere intra uiscera penem / legitimum atque*

---

\(^{58}\) I will concede that the semantic fields of *ira* and *indignatio* overlap to a degree, but not that they are coterminous or consistently marked as undesirable in the *Satires*. Even were they fully synonymous, the renaming of the feminine *ira* with *rabie* firmly signals that this *ira* belongs to the deleterious variety.

illic hesternae occurrere cenae? (whether it is easy and natural to ram my right-proper penis inside your guts / and there run into yesterday’s dinner), surely satisfies any criteria for “gross prurience” (9.43-4). The girl of Satire XIV who must stop for breath, while reciting her mother’s adulterers ter deciens (thrice ten times), must exceed the bounds of irony (14.28). No less does the concession that nanum cuiusdam Atlanta uocamus, / Aethiopem Cycnum, prauam extortamque puellam / Europe (we call someone’s dwarf ‘Atlas,’ an Ethiopian ‘Swan’, or a deformed and twisted girl ‘Europa’) fail to reach the pitch of invective, when it illustrates and expands the rhetorical question: quis enim

generosum dixerit hunc qui / indignus genere et praeclaro nomine tantum / insignis (for who will call a man well-born, who is unworthy of his family and famous only on account of a distinguished name) in Satire VIII (8.32-8). Nor would any of these images be likely to rouse less indignatio in Juvenal’s audience than the pathic Sophists of Satire II or the cruelly stingy patron of Satire V.\textsuperscript{60} Even if it is insisted that the authorial persona of the first two books is intentionally compromised by its indulgence in anger, it must surely be conceded that ‘Juvenal’ is far less compromised than Naevolus, and thus all the more reliable as a guide to the genuine social stances of the authorial voice. That one mode of satiric discourse predominates in particular books and not in others is perhaps less significant than might appear. When attention is paid to the topoi treated in the five respective books, it becomes clear that the manner of each satire and each book is appropriate for the topics under consideration. The vehement indignatio of Satire VI, for

\textsuperscript{60} Additional instances of “gross prurience” and invective, as opposed to irony, beyond Satire VI include: the old man’s penis that “however much it is stroked the whole night, will lie down” (10.206), the man who ejaculates at a dinner party in response to the “sights and sounds” of the dancing girls and their “shaking buttocks” (11.162-70), the gourmand so ravenous that he breaks up a statue of his own mother to buy delicacies (11.17-8), the frontal assault on the emperor Nero for murdering so many relatives (8.211-30), and the man “taking a piss” while the court awaits his convenience (16.46). Many more instances could be cited, especially from Satire IX and Satire XI.
instance, would be merely ridiculous if it had been applied to the literary discussions of *Satire VII*.

Is it probable that a poet known for parodies of rage-filled extremists would entirely reinvent his authorial *persona* to the extent that the authorial *persona* of Books I and II would be effectively repudiated? No. I argue that the performance space open to the satirist in the time of Juvenal was sufficiently wide to allow the treatment of all possible topics within the satiric discourse, without positioning any of those iterations of the authorial *persona* as mutually exclusive of any other. It is the consistent assumption and frequent assertion of the authorial *persona* that a normal person (i.e. a proper Roman) would and should react to the presence of deviant actions with an appropriate and measured emotional response, a moral revulsion that can be termed *indignatio* and even *ira*. The corresponding responsive action is another question. The author does not advocate a disproportionate response in either emotion or action, but he does authorize a response. The authorial *persona* addresses a Calvinus, who has been defrauded of a sum of money:

*quid sentire putas homines, Caluine, recenti de scelere et fidei uiolatae crimine? sed nec tam tenuis census tibi contigit, ut mediocris iacturae te mergat onus, nec rara uidemus quae pateris: casus multis hic cognitus ac iam tritus et e medio fortunae ductus aceruo. ponamus nimios gemitus. flagrantior aequo non debet dolor esse uiri nec vlnere maior.*

What do you expect that men think, Calvinus, about the recent misdeed and the crime of a violated trust? But you do not have an inheritance so meager that the burden of a moderate loss would overwhelm you, nor are the things we see you suffer uncommon: this disaster is known to many and already a cliché drawn from the middle of the heap of Fortuna. Let’s put aside excessive groans. A man should not have pain
blazing more than what is fair or greater than the injury.

(13.5-12)

While ‘Juvenal’ concedes that the loss is mediocris (middling) and that what Calvinus suffers is not rara (uncommon), neither observation functions as a blanket rejection of an emotional response. ‘Juvenal’ does not preclude all groans, only those that are nimios (excessive); the satirist does not—as Seneca does—assert that the good man should not respond emotionally to an injury. The poet does not preclude dolor, he proscribes indulgence in a dolor that is flagrantior aequo (blazing more that what is fair) or volnere maior (greater than the injury). Both uses of the comparative cohere to the sense of excess introduced by nimios and thus implicitly sanction responses in line with a provocation.

Since this conception of moderation is the operative position throughout the books of the Satires, it is no more reasonable to locate this conception of moral rectitude within a dispensable persona than it would be to assert that the condemnation of imperial malfeasance of ‘Tacitus’ in the Annales represents a critique of bloviating former politicians rather than the genuine rhetorical stance of the author encapsulated within a collection of literary devices. It might be objected that Tacitus the author in his secret heart must have deviated from his authorial persona. Perhaps Tacitus harbored authoritarian tendencies and lacked only the opportunity to realize himself as another Tiberius. Who can know? It is not relevant. That author cumulatively presents himself as he wished to be seen by his audience, within the bounds of his chosen genre. Juvenal also constructs his authorial voice over the course of each of his books in the broad form of the arguments deployed by his personae. In so doing, the author authorizes a range of emotional responses to flaws within the Roman social fabric.
What is not authorized within the *Satires* is indulgence in *indignatio* that arises from petty, personal inducements and insecurities that might, for instance, lead an emperor into a reign of terror. Quite to the contrary, the authorial *persona* models an authorized set of emotional responses to the textualized interpretation of Roman society deployed by the author as a premise with which to argue his construction of *Romanitas*. The satirist is not a Stoic sage; there would have been no expectation that any Roman would by necessity conform to the outline of that extreme and hypothetical figure. 61 William Harris demonstrates convincingly that the “notion that anger should be *completely* avoided had emphatically not, in the late Republic, won the assent of all Romans,” and that Cicero took opposing stances on this point depending on the genre to hand. 62 Were they to have been encountered on the streets of Rome, it is not the satirist that would have been read as an outlier on the emotional spectrum but rather the unemotional sage from either Seneca’s text or from the broader philosophical tradition on the pathologization of emotion. While it may be conceded that rage has a distorting effect on the ability of a person to function as a member of a civil society, what should be also conceded is that a person who would not be angered by the murder of their father or rape of their mother is little more than a hypothetical philosophical construct or an emotionless sociopath.

---

61 Anderson, “Anger in Juvenal and Seneca” 326-27 discusses the *De Ira* of Seneca as a paradigm for decoding the angry speaker of Juvenal’s *Satires*, noting that for Seneca “if a good Roman suffers an injury unjustly, even one of those fantastic crimes chosen as examples by the *adversarius* (murder of father, rape of mother), he should not indulge his anger, but rationally set about the punishment or the ending of the crime.”

62 W. Harris, *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2001), 210-11 cites multiple passages in which Cicero validates the incitement of anger by a rhetor and admits to feeling it himself. While not an uncommon object of literary discussion, the position that anger was to be completely avoided in practice and in composition constituted the minority stance within the discourse. The intentional provocation of anger within one’s audience was normative and crucial to success in forensic rhetoric, and I suggest that it was equally within the normative range of satire. The compositions of Horace are not to be taken as paradigmatic of the genre.
While Lucretius consistently follows the tenets of Epicurean philosophy, ‘Juvenal’ does not dogmatically model his conception of the proper Roman response to deviancy on the doctrines of the Stoics; he eclectically deploys the philosophical ideas of the various schools as they suit his argument. The philosophical writings of Seneca are therefore not a useful model for the interpretation of the Satires. 63 Throughout the Satires, Juvenal employs the authorial persona to extensively model the authorized response to the elevation of the ‘unworthy’: the corrupt, the foreign, and the deviant. 64 The author was also concerned with the retention of noble status by those who failed to rival the excellence of their ancestors:

quod si praecipitem rapit ambitio atque libido,
    si frangis uirgas sociorum in sanguine, si te
delectant hebetes lasso lectore secures,
incipit ipsorum contra te stare parentum
nobilitas claramque facem praefere pudendis.

Because, if ambition and emotion rip (you) away headlong,
if you shatter the rods in the blood of our allies, if worn-out
axes delight you, when the lictor is exhausted,
the notability of your very ancestors begins to stand against
you, and to set a conspicuous face before your shameful deeds.

(8.135-39)

The degenerate scion of a noble ancestor is figured as such a great disappointment and is marked for such shame precisely because of the powerful cultural expectation that excellence ought to be passed down through a family line. The historian Livy (59

63 The dramatic production of Seneca intersected exemplars of the ira of the philosophical tradition. His versions of Medea and Phaedra, for example, are impelled by pathologized emotions to take immoral actions. The authorial persona of the Satires is at no point utterly carried away by the rush of his emotion into taking or inciting immoral action. Quite the contrary, the satirist is angered by the actions of those who choose not to control their emotions. For the characterization of this madness in Seneca, cf. C. Gill, Passion as Madness in Roman Poetry in S. H. Braund and C. Gill eds. The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature (Cambridge, 1997), 213-241.
64 Cf. Juvenal 3.29-57 for a discussion of the inability of the just man to thrive in Rome, and 13.91-105 for the willingness of the impious to perjure themselves on the altars of the gods for profit. 1.99-114 for the arrogance of the eastern freedman, who refuses to yield place even the officials of the Roman state or the ancient aristocracy, and 7.88-92 for the granting of political office by an actor.
B.C.E.–17 C.E.) reveals the operation of the inverse aspect of this discourse in his
discussion of Seppius Loesius, the chief Capuan magistrate at the time of the city’s
capture by Hannibal in the second Punic War:

medix tuticus, qui summus magistratus apud Campanos est, eo anno Seppius
Loesius erat, loco obscuro tenuique fortuna ortus. matrem eius quondam pro
pupillo eo procurantem familiare ostentum cum respondisset haruspex summum
quod esset imperium Capuae peruenturum ad eum puerum, nihil ad eam spem
adgnoscentem dixisse ferunt: ‘ne tu perditas res Campanorum narras, ubi
summus honos ad filium meum perueniet.’

In that year, the Medix Tuticus, who is the highest magistrate among the Capuans,
was Seppius Loesius, who arose from obscure status and meager fortune. One
particular time, his mother (expiating a familial prodigy on behalf of her infant
son), when the haruspex had responded that the highest office which is at Capua
would come to that boy, being aware of no factor pertinent to that expectation, is
said to have replied: “You indeed depict the public affairs of the Campanians as
ruined, when the highest honor will come to my son.”

(Livy 26.6)

The rhetorical payload is clear: even the proverbial bias of a mother could not counter the
established principle that those from obscure social status should not attain to high public
office within a well-functioning state. The political theory underlying the use of this
episode by Livy is well-situated within the broader discourse on status and political
power prevalent within the Satires of Juvenal as well. I would suggest that the difference
between these two iterations of this theme is to be attributed to the dictates of their
respective genres and to idiosyncratic taste rather than to an essential gulf separating their
rhetorical stances.

The author of the Satires is in dialogue with the totality of Roman socio-political
discourse. Despite the presence of a multitude of voices and elaborately characterized
personae, the author of the Satires has placed an overwhelming emphasis on the
authorized views of the satirist as represented in the macro-scale structures of the poems.
Doubtless the fine detail of word choice and poetic artistry contributed in a significant way to the effect of the satiric performance, yet these effects would have blended into the background at the speed of normal recitation. In the context of performance, the intended audience would not have had the luxury of the minute comparison of separated passages and slight phrases. What would remain would be the global tone of the discussion and the thrust of the argument as advanced by every voice in the verse. The speaker of *Satire VI*, for instance, was not simply a proto-Christian preacher orating a sermon on female wickedness, although there have been many audiences prepared by their viewpoints and expectations to read the text in this manner. There is literary sophistication. There is argumentative subtlety. There are all the aspects of humorous distortion. Given these caveats, however, *Satire VI* remains a profoundly misogynistic text, *by our standards*. While the critique of moral hypocrisy of *Satire II* is perhaps unobjectionable, the incidental treatment of alternative sexuality would certainly qualify as homophobic, *by our standards*. In the spaces around the arguments, the author reveals a complex set of discourses that given utterance in polite society would draw condemnation as hate speech, *by our standards*. Our biases notwithstanding, the constellation of emotional responses authorized through these texts fall within the spectrum of the predominant political morality embedded in the literary discourses of the second century. Even at the extremes of his performance space, ‘Juvenal’ does not represent an outlier or a serious aberration from the normative moral discourse of the near-elite of his era. An author might, as Seneca did, take on the *persona* of the high-minded moralist in a serious genre, yet I suggest that Seneca’s disengaged *persona* stood at a much greater remove from the
unedited sentiments of the educated inhabitants of Rome than did the highly partisan authorial persona of Juvenal.

**Conclusions**

Roman satire was first and foremost a humorous genre. One does not have to go to the ends of the earth to explain the frequent irony, deflation, hyperbole, and every other device of humor present in the *Satires*. The author intends to be humorous, whether he is successful or no. It may be conjectured that Juvenal writes himself as he wished to be perceived by his intended audience. It is to be expected that his audience would have possessed the literary sophistication to simultaneously appreciate both the humorous manner of satire and its rhetorical payload. If one of the author’s personae is compromised or self-satirizing, that mere fact does not vitiate every statement located in the voice of that character. The authorial persona is central to the success of the poems as humor and is thus larded with every comic device that the author might deploy. Again, this practice does not nullify the rhetorical pronouncements located in the voice of ‘Juvenal.’ Satire, as is the case with all literary genres, has as its first objective the promotion of the author’s goals, including the assertion of the authorial identity. What is required for the interpretation of the *Satires* is an appreciation of the literary sophistication of the audience.

While the responses of members of the audiences should be expected to have been as inconsistent as their prior experience as members of the Roman socio-political order of their respective times and places, there is an implied audience for the *Satires* that the author expected to cohere with the rhetorical stances and moral axioms that underlie
the modes of argumentation deployed within the texts. That specific audience certainly
represented a small minority of the inhabitants of the city Rome and an even smaller
minority of those living within the boundaries of the Roman empire. While it is thus
clear that the Satires cannot be used to argue for a unitary, consensus view of the Roman
population, these texts are tightly correlated with the discourses animating all aspects of
Roman society. What can be recovered, however, is the terms of the discourse around
which all of the debate was focused. It is in all probability not possible, for instance, to
determine how common gladiatorial exercise was for Roman women, but it is clear that
there was a nexus of argument centered on the intersection of second-century conceptions
of gender and social class. Certain actions are construed as socially significant within the
author’s rhetoric, in that they are constructed as a system of signs that may be employed
to demarcate social status. In claiming to teach his audience to read Roman society, the
author claims for himself a position of privileged speech from which to assign a system
of meaning. It is in this capacity that the author is able to engage with another audience
just to the side of his intended audience. I suggest that this liminal audience, like the
fabled undecided voter in a presidential election, was perhaps a less interested collection
of Romans and consequently more liable to persuasion along the many contested axes of
the discourses.

What then is the textual function of satire as practiced by Juvenal? Text can
function as a barrier or a filter to sensual (complete) perception of the world.65 The
ability to persuade is dependent on this quality. For the purposes of my approach, text is

65 D. Abram, The Spell of the Sensuous (New York, 1996), 257 envisions the Greek development of a
written phonetic system including vowels as the last step in the creation of textual representation as a
“largely self-referential system closed off from the larger world that once engendered it”; under this view,
intellectual/textual and sensual intercourse with the world-as-it-is became for the first time discrete
processes.
envisioned as an imperfect medium of representation and perception that relied on the sensual and textual experience of the lector/auditor for the completeness of its signification. Juvenal constructs a totalizing discourse on the character of *Romanitas* and the Other that interposes itself like a filter between the audience and their perception of the world-as-it-is. The text contains a rhetoric opposed to social mobility and evolution; meritocracy is the ultimate danger to the existing elite, no matter how freshly minted as *Romani* they may actually be. Identity politics are here in contest to the greatest degree, as the nature of *Romanitas*—the category to which all other sources of identity are subordinate within the *Satires*—is at issue. The rhetorical objective of these poems is to engage with the contested discourses that established meaning within Roman literary production and daily life.

I suggest that what Juvenal the author offers his auditors – for the price of their acquiescence to his textual version of *Romanitas* – is a certain derisive dissipation of their social anxiety, a certain validation of their unease in the face of social change, potential or actual. By exaggerating the severity and the universality of the utter extremes of non-Roman behavior, the author demarcates a broad central space of inclusion open to any member of his intended audience willing to join with the satirist in amputating the ‘sick’ extremities of the body politic through derision. To the extent that there was any meritocratic element in the Roman social structure, that potential for change represented a threat to those just beyond the reach of the top rung of society, when the continuous competition for status was viewed as a zero-sum game. Collectively, the *Saturae* present a totalizing discourse on the act of being Roman within the near-elite of the city Rome.66

---

66 By the phrase “near-elite,” I mean to bracket all those with Roman citizenship and the rhetorical education of the elite, who lacked the wealth or connections to fully participate in the *cursus honorum* as a
In place of a final victory in a contest of wealth or power that cannot be securely attained, the author offers the consolation that social struggle through excessive display of wealth is itself debasing and therefore to be shunned. What is proposed in place of a contestation of status through wealth or office is a demonstration of the right to *Romanitas* through an authorized connoisseurship of the totality of Roman life.

---

means of constructing identity. For such persons, the suddenly wealthy or influential non-Roman constituted a category violation that threatened to negate their own claim to *Romanitas*. 
Chapter III:  
Manner is Matter

cur tamen hoc potius libeat decurrere campo,  
per quem magnus equos Auruncae flexit alumnus,  
si vacat ac placidi rationem admittitis, edam.

Just why, all the same, it is rather more pleasing to rush down  
along this plain, through which the great nursling of Aurunca turned his horses,  
if you – calm and at leisure – direct your reason, I will divulge.

Juvenal, *Satura* I 19-21.67

Introduction

Echoing the style of a Horatian *recusatio* declaiming the ability to sustain the epic  
muse, Juvenal invokes Lucilius (c. 180 to 102 B.C.E.)—the putative first father of satire  
from Aurunca. The choice of Lucilius enables Juvenal to construct his identity within a  
specific sector of the genre.68 More than that, it points the reader to a critical aspect of  
the *persona* that he will construct, an explicitly literary one, that responds to the  
significant trends in the literary world of second-century Rome.69 In fulfillment of this  
promise, Juvenal consumes much of the programmatic first poem of the first book of his

---

67 As stated in the last chapter, after the early experiments of Lucilius with other meters, I count as *satura*  
proper only Latin dactylic hexameter poetry. Menippean satire and satirical prose forms, although closely  
allied in content and often in style, were not considered to belong to the same genre. Cf. Diomedes in Keil,  
*Grammatici Latini I* (B.G. Teubner, 1857), 485-86; Quintilian 10.1.95.

68 The deliberate use of Latin to effect “Roman imperial self-definition” as a “decisive non-Greek” is  
usefully discussed by E. Dench, *Romulus ’Asylum* (Oxford, 2005), 315. Here I extend this concept of  
meaning-through-rejection in the case of Lucilian satire as a decisively non-Greek genre.

69 To note that the authorial voice of Juvenal’s *Satires* is wrapped in a collection of *personae*, along the  
lines laid out by Anderson, *Essays on Roman Satire* (Princeton, 1982), is not particularly helpful, except as  
a corrective for the biographical fallacy. As discussed in Chapter II, it is to be doubted that any piece of  
literature exists that does not also constitute a projection of the author’s desired rhetorical position or  
identity rather than the *true authorial voice*. Satire is certainly performative, but the axioms that underlie  
that performance remain instructive.
Satires asserting the rationale underlying the choice of this one genre (or as he would have it, the compulsion); the rhetorical stance of the authorial voice should not, however, be allowed to seduce the reader into a simplistic, factual approach to the text. A literal reading was never the intention of authors steeped in the tradition of poetic discourse. *Satira I* is a catalogue of vignettes marked as obnoxious to the authorial persona, yet it is the thematic expectations of the genre that show through most clearly. The why of Juvenal’s Book One is given in the form of this series of appeals to standard rhetorical topoi, but the import is arguably embodied in the manner more than the matter.

Due to the range and scope of the author’s discourse, Juvenal’s texts have often been quarried as if they were an interesting historical miscellany or repository of essential axioms of Roman social thought. The crucial step, however, of ascertaining the rhetorical bounds, within which satire generally, and Juvenalian satire more precisely, functions, is seldom considered before its disiecta membra are made to serve the temporary needs of arguments exterior to their composition. The core deficit in much of the published analysis of the Satires lies in the assumption that there is a coherent, underlying equation between the written world and the Roman world of the second century. As will be more fully explored in this and in later chapters, the author does not provide a detailed verbal image of the texture of Roman practice or space, but he does reveal what should demand the attention of the viewer. The attempt to read the satires from any positivistic stance thus creates an incoherent, doubled vision; the reader’s expectations overburden the text. Similarly, an approach that seeks to explicate Juvenal’s poetry independently of the broader trends in contemporary literature, depending instead upon a construction of normative contemporary values, no matter how covertly, is
unlikely to be compelling. I am not here advocating a moral relativism that is oblivious to the objectionable content of the poems, but rather I posit that the insidious content of the Satires demands an extra level of self-vigilance to mitigate the tendency to allow criticism to lapse into a merely aesthetic response.

To subject the author, however, to vituperation or exculpation is functionally equivalent from a theoretical standpoint. Either option arrogates the right of the critic to function as a censor contrasting the Satires with putative absolute rule of propriety. Much as was the theory behind the reading strategy Aristarchos employed on the Homeric poems, it is arguable that for some questions the best ruler for the Satires is to be found nearby. Such a statement, however, should not be construed as an endorsement of the quest for an uncorrupted text that led the successive Alexandrian scholars to athetize around a twentieth of the Homeric poems at one time or another. Despite its content and apparent incoherence, the author of the Satires needs no such apologist or redactor. The text requires no deprecation of its biases and lapses in logic; it is these very “flaws” that make these poems most valuable. The source of what meaning there is within the text is to be primarily sought not line by line but, as in the manner of an oration, on the level of the poem and of the book. Great questions cannot hang solely

---

70 There is a great deal of what now falls under the rubric of “hate speech” within the Satires; it is precisely this visceral unpalatability (or delightfulness) of the rhetorical content of the poems that has occasioned the great mass of uncritical or overcritical approaches to the text. Cf. Richlin, The Garden of Priapus (Oxford, 1992), 212 for a balanced analysis of aggressive use of language in Latin literature. She questions whether humor can exist in the absence of hierarchy, and posits that “if such humor existed, it would have to lie only in jokes and comic situations that had no (or no consistent, that is, stereotyped) victims.”

71 Proponents of new historicist theory caution against “faith in objectivity” on the part of the critic: Cox and Reynolds, New Historical Literary Study: Essays of Reproducing Texts, Representing History (Princeton, 1993), 4. At its worst, literary study can become little more than a simple anachronism and cultural chauvinism, no matter how covertly modern bias is deployed.

72 The Homeric critic Aristarchos of Samothrace is said to have posited that the best guide to Homer was Homer: Ὀμηρον ἦ το correcting σαμοθρηκιαν. Whatever the source of this pithy maxim, the methods of the analogists have definite problems on the linguistic front as well as in the interpretation of meaning.

on minor points of word choice or syntax, since the Satires were not intended for a form of dissection most resembling a close reading of Torah in the Talmud. Satire demands a refined level of literary sophistication from its audience in the interest of avoiding the trite readings of the patristic period to which, ironically, it owes the still-prevalent legacy of misreading no less than it owes the mere survival of its manuscripts.75

Genre as Meaning

As the final known iteration of the classical genre, the Saturae of Juvenal constitute the most developed ancient reading of the system of signs within which the individual satirists construct their texts and authorial personae. Satura then—by the time of Juvenal—constitutes a discourse between the satirist and his predecessors within the genre, but there are also significant conjunctions between what has often been seen as the serious authorial modes of satire and the more “trivial” (although no less elite) textuality of the elegiac genre as typified by Propertius (c. 50’s to 2 B.C.E.). Much like the operation within satire of “para-serious techniques” in service of the larger arguments, Propertius deployed irony, distancing, self-undermining and grotesquity as a “means of exposing and exploring the complexities and contradictions which the poets perceived in themselves and in their literary and political ambiance.”76 The textual world within

74 While the text of Juvenal is considered to be more secure than many other ancient authors, there remains a degree of uncertainty concerning many readings. This quantum of uncertainty, effectively a background noise in the text, strengthens my assertion that the authorial voice is best sought at the level of the exemplum, the satura and the liber. For a full discussion of the manuscripts and transmission of Juvenal, cf. E. Courtney (1980), 55-58, and S. Braund, Juvenal Satires Book I (Cambridge, 1996), 38-42.
75 G. Hight, Juvenal the Satirist (Oxford, 1961), 183 hypothesizes that “Christian propagandists” first revived the Satires in the second and third centuries. Whether Hight is correct or no, it is likely that the text owes its survival to its utility to Christian apologists and scholars as a ready source of vivid material all too easily read as if it were written from an anti-Roman (outsider) perspective.
76 F. Cairns, Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist (Cambridge, 2006), 362 notes that these literary topoi, practiced by Callimachos and Theocritos as well, “were aimed at more than providing amusement.”
which *satura* in its developed generic form operates is all but concentric with that of
elegy—*prima facie* a perverse outcome indeed; the most significant distinction between
the genres rests in the stance of the authorial voice in relation to the stock characters of
that constructed world. 77 In either genre, the authorial *persona* is positioned outside the
segment of the elite that holds overt positions of power and wealth. The elegiac *persona*
rejects the standard—now corrupted—modes of elite Roman identity and systems of
value *per se* in favor of self-identifying as another, perhaps an alternate genus of the
Roman. 78 In the programmatic first poem of his *Monobiblos*, Propertius speaks of *Amor*
deflecting him from more normative Roman behavior: 79

\[
\textit{tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus}
\]
\[
\textit{et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus,}
\]
\[
\textit{donec me docuit castas odisse puellas}
\]
\[
\textit{improbus, et nullo vivere consilio.}
\]

Then to my hurt disdain cast down the eyes of the girl
and Love forced round my head with his feet braced,
until he trained me to despise chaste girls,
Wicked Boy!, and live by no plan whatever.

(1.1.3-6)

The image of *Amor* having to brace his feet (*impositis pedibus*) to exert enough force to
turn the poet’s head is striking, even as it is facetious in its depiction of the unwillingness

77 Although their texts operate within a single notional space, Juvenal explicitly positions his discursus on
women as antithetical to that of Propertius and Catullus in his contrast of the virtuous golden-age woman
with the elegiac mistress: *haut similis tibi, Cynthia, nec tibi / turbavit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos*
(hardly similar to you, Cynthia, nor to you whose gleaming eyes the dead sparrow disturbed, 6.7-8).

78 The dichotomy in the manner of implementation of this *topos* is well illustrated by Propertius 1.5, where
the love-addled (or depraved, as Juvenal would have it) young nobleman is cautioned not to subject himself
to *grauce seruitium nostrae cogere puellae* (1.5.19)—a *dominam* as Juvenal puts it (*Sat.* 6.30; cf. Prop.
1.1.21; 1.3.17; 1.16.17; 1.17.15). P. warns of “*tota toxica Thessalia*” (1.5.4); J. matches this with *Thessala
uendit / philtra, quibus valeat mentem uexare mariti* (6.610-11). P. speaks of the *pallorem* (1.5.21) induced
by this relationship, as does J. of the gigolos at 1.43. P. discounts the utility of nobility: *nec tibi nobilitas
poterit succurrere amanti: / nescit Amor priscis cedere imaginibus* (1.5.23-24), as does J.: *tota licet ueteres
exornent undique cerae / atra, nobilitas sola est atque unica uirtus* (8.19-20).

79 E. Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture: From Cicero to Apuleius* (Johns Hopkins, 1996), 104 views the
elegiac depiction of love affairs as a “symbol, sometimes indirect, and sometimes overt of resistance to
society’s demands.” S. J. Heyworth, *Cynthia* (Oxford, 2007), 5 states that Propertius “creates an image
of himself as lacking the traditional values of Roman morality, a chaste marriage and a prudent life.”
with which *castae puellae* and a *consilium* for life are surrendered. The elegiac *persona* rests somewhere to the side of the Roman ideal, displaced. By contrast, the satiric *persona* distances all other potential claimants from that identity in process of a rhetorical move to lay exclusive claim to the status *Romanus*, pushing nonconforming persons into a conceptual displacement similar to that owned by the elegiac *persona*. It is not my position that the satirist rejects the traditional markers of elite status and rank; rather, what is rejected is the notion that those markers are reliably covariant with a *modus vivendi* that the author is prepared to acknowledge as Roman. ‘Juvenal’ rejects the notion that the consulship in itself guarantees that the officeholder fulfills the parameters of *Romanitas*, just as he denies that the *imagines* of office-holding ancestors can confer nobility:  

40 \[ \text{tota licet ueteres exornent undique cerae atriae, nobilitas sola est atque unica virtus.} \]
\[ \text{Paulus uel Cossus uel Drusus moribus esto, hos ante effigies maiorum pone tuorum, praecedant ipsas illi te consule virgas.} \]

Although all your atria display ancient wax portraits on every side, virtue is the one and only nobility.

Go on and be a Paulus or Cossus or Drusus in your morals.

---

80 The use of the concept of the “Other” for the purposes of my argument is largely consistent with the “Autre” of Jacques Lacan, *Écrits*, trans. Bruce Fink (W. W. Norton, 2006), 357-59. I identify the embedded conceptualization of the *mos maiorum* as an iteration of the Law of the Father; the satirist attempts to segregate all experience within the Symbolic Order as construed by himself. Within the *Satires*, this identity of *Romanus* is posited as normatively Roman and is assumed to be the only appropriate location for the nexus of wealth and power in the Roman state.

81 There is no known ancient Latin term for the concept of “Roman-ness.” In reference to this fluid and contested concept, it will be my practice to employ the term *Romanitas*, since this term is arguably less objectionable and clearer than the many possible circumlocutions, despite the issue of its anachronism before the time of Tertullian: Braund, *Latin Literature* (Routledge, 2002), 70. Adams, “‘Romanitas’ and the Latin Language” (Classical Quarterly, 2003), 184-205 finds the term somewhat distasteful and references J. Kramer, *Die Sprachbezeichnungen Latinus und Romanus im Lateinischen und Romanischen* (Berlin, 1998), 81–82. In concept, I most closely follow Woolf, *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul* (Cambridge, 1998), 241, who notes that “a symbolic center did exist in the Roman cultural system, but it was located not in any one place or region but rather in a set of manners, tastes, sensibilities and ideals, that were the common property of an aristocracy.” I suggest that the actual operative utility of a *Romanitas* potentially open to such volitional Romanization is in starkest contrast with the constructed *Romanitas* within the *Satires*.  
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esteem these more than the images of your ancestors, let 
these go before the very rods of office, when you are consul.

(8.19-23)

The question of elite status as a mediating factor and a function of composition 
thus looms large in either case. In the course of this discussion the Satires of Juvenal will 
be used as a lens through which the genre can be apprehended in the process of stripping 
away the layers of intermediate intertext in an effort to arrive at the semantic content of 
Lucilius’ genre as a sign and the manner in which this sign is able to anchor the rhetorical 
content of his successors within the wider space of available intertexts. Taken from this 
perspective, the use of the genre in itself constitutes an essential component of the 
rhetorical payload of the work and acts to construct the identity of the authorial voice. In 
service of arguing for the validity of this thesis, this chapter will take up in turn the 
questions of what was understood by the genre of satura, how the four primary surviving 
authors articulated generic expectations in the context of the internal rhetoric of their text, 
and what the correspondence was between the city Roma as constructed through the text 
with that of lived experience for the respective authors.82

At the time of Juvenal’s composition of his sixteen known satires, the genre 
extended backward in excess of two centuries and was constituted minimally within the 
text of C. Lucilius (c. 180-102 B.C.E.), Q. Horatius Flaccus (65-8 B.C.E.), and to a 
certain extent A. Persius Flaccus (34-62 C.E.).83 Quintilian (c. 35 to mid-90s C.E.) 
proudly claims that, in opposition to the many literary and artistic forms adopted from 

82 As remnants of a much more continuous and diverse tradition, these four authors would call into question 
the degree of representativeness of their satires relative to that tradition; however, I suggest that, as 
products of and contributors to the stream of Roman literature, the satirists may be closely compared with a 
great many contemporary texts along multiple axes. The satirist Turnus (late 1st c. C.E.) is one such no 
longer extant part of the tradition. Cf. Coffey, Roman Satire (Bristol Classical Press, 1989), 1-10 for an 
overview of the genre.
83 It will be argued that satire is intertextually dependent on multiple regions of classical literary production 
to construct its meaning, most interestingly, elegy.
Greek originals immediately preceding it in his discourse, “*satura quidem tota nostra est*” ( satire at least is all ours, *Inst.* 10.1.95).\(^8^4\) The validity of Quintilian’s statement from a totalizing viewpoint will be tested later in this discussion, yet at this point it can be easily conceded that *Satura* was explicitly marked as Roman for its intended audience by the late first century, if not earlier; there can be little doubt that the force of the satirist’s attempts to delimit social mores via the assertion of a norm (ostensibly arising from the *mos maiorum*) would have been amplified by the frame of a genre that was *a priori* Roman. Its precise etymological origins obscured even to the imperial Romans, the appellation *satura* most likely arose from the Latin adjective *satur-*a-*um* ‘full, copiously varied.’ Of the four likely etymologies offered by the grammarian Diomedes (c. late fourth or early fifth century), the derivation from the same semantic field as the phrase *lex per saturam*, a disparaging name for a bill with many titles conveying the idea of something cobbled together from discordant elements, recommends itself more forcefully, in that some similar critical phrase could have been applied to the emergent genre in the second century B.C.E. and have subsequently been truncated to simply *satura*.\(^8^5\) In addition, the tone and content of the genre of *Satura* is closely allied with the subset of Roman society involved in the production and utilization of the law.\(^8^6\)

In either case, however, the core concept of the genre as a jumbled admixture fits somewhat less well with Juvenal than with Lucilius. The willful deviation of Horace

---

\(^{8^4}\) S. Braund, *Roman Verse Satire* (Oxford, 1992), 8-9 gives two potential interpretations of Quintilian’s remark: that Roman satire was original without Greek model or was simply best. Her conclusion is that “Quintilian is indeed claiming originality – and, it simply follows, superiority – for the Romans in the genre of Roman satire.”

\(^{8^5}\) In service of a broader thesis that attempts to uniquely link the genre to Roman discourses on food, Gowers, *The Loaded Table* (Oxford, 1993), 110 argues that the derivation from *lanx satura*, a full dish of “harvest fruits,” is most probably the correct one. The other two possibilities cited by Diomedes (*GL I* 485) are from *satsivi* (satyrs) and *faricimen* (a stuffing).

\(^{8^6}\) For an elite educated in rhetoric and literature, the idiom could have easily spread from one to the other in a natural progression.
from his model (or perhaps anti-model) Lucilius, the stunningly elliptical phrasing of Persius laced with Stoic doctrine, and the equally purposeful reiteration of the primal form by Juvenal are significant in a Saussurean mode, in that the genre of satire itself is employed as a signifier pointing to an external signified. These issues will be treated at length in their place within the discussion. It remains to be examined to what extent the disparate contents of the satires and satirists can be understood to draw together their disparate images and assertions into a unified rhetoric. In service of pursuing this question, it is necessary to commence with the form of the genre and then proceed to its content and, perhaps, its import.

The various modes of satiric expression are to be found in meters other than the canonical dactylic hexameter, e.g. invective might as easily be encased in iambics and lay claim thereby to a Greek heritage irrespective of Quintilian. In his earliest moves toward the creation of what came to be recognized as his genre, Lucilius experimented with the meters of the stage as with the Saturnian, but the stable, final form of his composition—the format taken up by his Latin followers—used the Greek epic meter pioneered fairly recently in Latin by Q. Ennius (c. 239-169 B.C.E.) in his Annales. The move away from the meters of the stage is highly significant, in that this choice positions the genre to the side of the affected “ordinary speech” of the stage and, still more crucially, the epic-

---

87 The linguistic concepts of signifier (signifiant) and signified (signifié) explicated by Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale* (Payot, 1916), were extended into the fields of anthropology by Claude Levi-Strauss, among others, and are applied in this discussion to denote an entity able to convey an intended meaning. Lacan’s critique introducing an unconscious element to the signification of meaning is important for the operation of genres and aspects of literary composition as signifiers.

88 Cf. Diomedes GL I, 485. Ennius also wrote poems termed *saturaе*, yet he is not taken as the inventor of the genre by Horace (Sat. 1.10.48) or by Juvenal (1.19-21, 1.165-67); Quintilian states: *satura quidem tota nostra est, in qua primus insignem laudem adeptus Lucilius quosdam ita deditos sibi adhuc habet amatores ut eum non eiusdem modo operis auctoribus sed omnibus poetis praefere non dubitent* (satire at least is all ours, in which Lucilius first acquired outstanding praise and still has certain admirers so dedicated to him that they do not hesitate to prefer him not just to authors of this genre but even to all poets, 10.1.93).
tinged hexameter is able to distance *satura* from the theatrical and partially metrical field of oratory. The elegiac satires of Books 22-25 of Lucilius were another abandoned experiment toward the formulation of a canonical satiric genre, one set in stark opposition to the rhetorical content of elegy, even as it drew meaning from this antagonism. As Latin literary practice evolved, the connotational force of the Latin dactylic hexameter broadened and intertwined synergistically with other generic uses of the meter. Didactic/philosophical works exemplified by the Epicurean *De Rerum Natura* of T. Lucretius Carus (*floruit* mid-first century B.C.E.) and the Stoic *Astronomica* of M. Manilius (*floruit* early first century) consecutively drew and granted force to the *persona* of the satirist as sage and expositor of higher knowledge. There is much that might be said of the parallel antithesis between the pastoral fantasies of Horace and Vergil and the sophisticated and threatening urban space of satire. Quite similarly, the epic as cast by Lucan has much resonance with the rampant Stoicism of Persius and the violently vivid imagery of Juvenal, who is allowed to concurrently parody the golden age and mythic themes generally in no small part by the intertextual space opened by the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. *Satura* thus arrogates to itself an ever-expanding faculty of encompassing the superlative range of Latin, and indeed Greek, literary production within the bounds of the

---

89 The appropriate use of metrical *clausulae* (prose rhythm) was one of the prime axes of evaluation for Roman oratory. Cf. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge, 1963), 135-64.

90 An opposing stance is articulated by Freudenburg, *The Walking Muse* (Princeton, 1993), 27, who views the inconsistency in the satiric *persona* as an intentional authorial move to undercut the rhetorical content of the poems: “despite the many similarities shared between the Satires and Greek popular philosophy, there is a second side to the satiric *persona*, a degree of overt incompetence which both destroys his credibility as a moralizer and seriously questions any direct analogy with Bion, Socrates, or any other true moral philosopher. The diatribe satires are, in fact, parodies of diatribe after the manner of Callimachos, Menippus, Varro and certainly others. Yet another third influence is suggested by the very nature of the satirist’s incompetence, which is multi-faceted, highly conventionalized, drawn along lines well known to Horace from the stage of popular comedy.” By contrast, I do not view humor and wisdom literature as mutually exclusive categories: cf. Plato, *Ion* etc.

91 Pastoral usage of hexameter as in the *Georgics* of Vergil could be taken as a move undercutting the superficial anti-urbanity of the genre, but that is another question.
venerable and widely utilized dactylic hexameter. Although it has been asserted that the
dissonance between “form and content must have been striking to the Roman ear,” I
would suggest that the use of this richly connotative meter then becomes a signifier of
auctoritas and in concert with the moralizing content of the verse creates satura as a sign
for Romanitas. In service of this rhetorical move, Juvenal places the literary discourse
itself in contest; as cited in the previous chapter, Foucault referenced the discipline of
history as the source of the recognition “that speech is no mere verbalization of conflicts
and systems of domination, but that it is the very object of man’s conflicts.” Due to the
breadth of its subject matter and the directness of its engagement with the Roman world,
satura as genre is arguably the most perfect representation of this way of conceptualizing
speech.

Development and Reanalysis of the Sign

With such a view of Satura as signifier of Romanitas as the first step in the
stylobate of the argument it is then appropriate to turn to an examination of the use of that
authorial mode within the text of the four primary authors commencing with Lucilius, the
most prolific if least preserved. Lucilius stands to the side of his later disciples (or self-
asserted anti-disciples as in the case of Horace) in that he was in terms of his social
station a member of the governing elite; his brother was a senator and his great-nephew
was Gn. Pompeius (self-styled Magnus).

It would be well at this point to introduce a refinement in the category of elite by
setting up a demarcation based not on wealth per se (although there was a definite

---

correlation) but rather based on political/military power. For the purposes of this argument, I do not confine elite status to the nobles or even to those who participate in the cursus honorum, but rather include all those equites (knights) whose advanced literary and rhetorical training fitted them for political service.  

This category was inscribed within a much larger subset of the Roman population that participated in a more broadly defined elite status as created and articulated through education and through the social norms and ethical principles associated with that rank. There was a tactile rift between those who engaged with the political combat of the cursus honorum and those who did not by choice (as in the case of Lucilius) or by inability (as pertains to Horace, Persius, and Juvenal). The rhetorical needs of the imperator or indeed the princeps were certainly not those of the satirist, even in the case of Lucilius, whose proximity to those in power makes his recusatio of political ambition far more convincing than those of his literary followers.

The reading of Lucilius is problematized, but not insurmountably, by the selective preservation in the grammarians of mostly small fragments of his voluminous works. Despite the obvious fallacies implicit in any totalizing statement of Lucilius’ program, certain progress can be made with due caution and the assistance of two mitigating factors: the density of satiric expression making the excerpts comprehensible as elements of larger topoi seen in the better preserved later authors, and the large number of fragments, which does much to statistically counter the skewing effects of the process of

---

94 M. Gelzer, The Roman Nobility (Oxford, 1969), 28 notes that “there was no ancient definition of nobility” (nobilitas), but that in practice the term was of a restricted sense based on notability of a family and was essentially coterminous with the possession of consular ancestors or the attainment of the consulship as a novus homo.

95 The family of Lucilius held senatorial status, although he retained the rank of an eques. E. Gruen, Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome (1992), 69 notes that the concept of nobilitas is present in Plautus and that Lucilius is among a group of authors to reference the concept in the late second century B.C.E.
selection. As has been touched upon above, a primary topos of satura is the critique of elements of the elite by the satirist; this theme can be clearly detected in the fragment of Lucilius preserved in Nonius Marcellus (c. early fourth century) for the sake of its demonstration of the use of “facul” in place of “faciliter”:

\[
\begin{align*}
... & \text{peccare impune rati sunt} \\
& \text{posse et nobilitate facul propellere iniquos}
\end{align*}
\]

…They thought that they were able to sin scott-free and with their nobility easily drive off their inferior adversaries. (270-71W)

Nobilitas, from the standpoint of etymology, is the property of being able to be known (famous), and is essentially coterminous with membership in the senatorial elite, and more specifically the families that had attained and were expected to repeatedly attain the consulship. The use of this term as an instrumental ablative by which this subset of the broader elite are enabled to “pecare impune” and subsequently “propellere iniquos” stands as a powerful critique of the power set and concurrently creates an identity for the authorial voice set to the side of that elite.

As a member of the grand set, Lucilius thus lays claim to a greater social/moral acumen (a sort of moral maius imperium as it were) and imbues the nascent genre of satura with the facility of employing this mode against the power set. This arrogation of the right to critique the mores (the visible manifestation of interior character) of those exercising political (and indeed socio-economic power more generally) is the lynchpin of the genre, the source of its rhetorical force and no less the landmine around which the later practitioners of the genre must tread without appearing to tread. Under the evolving rule of the first princeps, Horace obscures any serious political content under a light
jocularity and a concern for the world in miniature of the courtier. In Persius, critique of literary taste and the dislocation of social commentary onto the Far (in terms of space and time) substitutes for the open condemnation of Lucilius. Even the apparent return of Juvenal to the violent Lucilian mode must be conceded as largely apparent rather than actual. This theme of the abuse of holders of elite status will be revisited as each author is examined in turn.

Another major theme of the genre is the rejection of the Other and protection of the status of Romanus generally and elite status specifically. Lucilius, although himself a Latin born not at Roma but at Suessa Aurunca, nevertheless sets the boundaries of the elite status (true Romanitas) just beyond himself in a fragment quoted by M. Terrentius Varro (116-27 BCE) for the sake of the diphthong “ae” written “e”:

*Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat.*

May Caecilius not become praetor less-than-urbanus.

(232W)

The candidate in question is likely C. Caecilius Metellus Caprarius, son of Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, later advancing even to the office of censor. The Metelli were inimical to Lucilius, who here, despite their advancing power within the highest offices of the state, casts them as non-Roman by slurring the position of praetor urbanus into its

---

96 It is often asserted that Augustus affected the literature of his principate through direct or indirect patronage, yet it is problematic to move up from the particulars of a passage of text to generalizations concerning the political milieu. D. S. Potter, *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian* (1999), 26 correctly notes that “with forms of literature that respond to each other every bit as much as they do to ‘real life’ situations, the tension between text… (and context) is particularly severe.” N. Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* (1966), 88 views Horace’s move away from the polemical style of Lucilius as a limitation in range due to his political circumstances as a “pardoned Republican and a man of no social consequence (who) could not afford to give indiscriminate offence.” D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Profile of Horace* (Harvard, 1982), 34 similarly reads *Sat.* 2.1.17-20 as a potentially offensive comment that had to be “‘cleared’ with Maecenas, and, whether through him or directly, through Caesar.” I suspect that such allusions to the potential retaliations of the powerful may be as much derived from discourses internal to the poetics as to Roman libel laws.
antithesis: *praetor rusticus*. The opposition between the urban/Roman authorial voice of the satirist and the identity of Caecilius is further underscored by the use of the vulgar (non-elite, non-literary) mispronunciation of the “ae” diphthong as “e” within both *pretor* and *Cecilius*. The ambiguity of intended agreement of the adjective *rusticus* with either *Cecilius* or *pretor* further serves to distance Caecilius from true elite status within the frame of the satire. As was noted above in the case of the critique of *mores*, the theme of exclusion of the non-urban (foreign) from the truly Roman recurs throughout the history of the genre. Just as Caecilius would subvert the nature of his office into a perversion of itself due to his non-Roman essence, the Other (especially when promoted into the ranks of the elite via wealth disjoined from correct elite *mores*) represents an existential threat to the system of meaning advanced by the author.

The next author in sequence presents a number of significant divergences from the progenitor of the genre and particularly from its last major practitioner; the use of the genre by Horace is rhetorically clever in its striking antithesis of the expected modes of Lucilius, and thus falls firmly within the ambit of the genre as much as if he had merely aped his (anti-)model. The willful inversion of the established sign-system of Lucilius and concomitant critique of that author dispersed throughout the *Sermones* of Horace does not, however, by any means invalidate the semantic meaning constructed via the usage of the genre. On the contrary, it is the intertextual engagement of the *Sermones* with the text of Lucilius that gives force to the otherwise flaccid and rhetorically tepid lines of Horace. From within the perspective of the poet writing under the reign of the

---

97 R. Syme, *Sallust* (University of California, 1964), 165 references the Caecilii Metelli as significant power-brokers of the late 2nd c. B.C.E., who collected “six consulates in fifteen years.”

98 Much the same process can be seen in the later intentional adoption of the pronunciation Clodius in place of the elite form Claudius in service of the demagogic aims of P. Clodius Pulcher (c. 92-52 BCE).
all-but-king Augustus, the vitriolic and coarse satires of his model can be made to take on the appearance of the hyper-masculine, which is to say the brute and unrefined; the times—or at least the princeps—called for a reanalyzed Romanitas compatible with an identity no longer constructed via the free (and often devastating) competition of the late Republic. ‘Horace’ claims something not unlike the elusive Truth within his purview as author with a paradoxical witticism:

praeterea, ne sic, ut qui iocularia, ridens percurram; quamquam ridentem dicere verum quid vetat? ...

Anyway, not just so may I run past with a laugh, like people who jest; although, what forbids (me) to speak the Truth while laughing? …

(Sat. 1.1.23-5)

It may be argued here that the contrast intended is between laughter as object of a discourse and mere pleasant incidental; the rhetorical stance assumed by the author is that of the familiar moral pundit of the genre. Familiar themes of moderation and contentment with the lot assigned by Fortune take on a particular urgency in the context of the new regime; ‘Horace’ questions the utility of wealth beyond the ability to consume it:

...vel dic, quid refert intra naturae finis viventi, iugera centum an mille aret?

…Or tell (me), what difference does it make to a man living within the bounds of Nature whether he plows a hundred or a thousand acres?

(Sat. 1.1.49-51)

There is then an essential modus vivendi implicit within Nature that demands conformity from the wise man, and it is knowledge of this modus that ‘Horace’ claims within his
text. By contrast, the man focused on the *cursus honorum*, the wealth crucial to its pursuit, and indeed a *bona pars hominum decepta cupidine falso (pecuniae)* (deceived by a vain lust for wealth) might in the author’s imagination object that *nil satis est... quia tanti quantum habeas sis* (nothing is enough, because you are of as much value as how much you possess), against which assertion a host of *exempla* are subsequently advanced (1.1.61-62). In this programmatic poem of Horace’s first book of satires is to be found, in addition to the point and counterpoint to Lucilius, the image of the sated party guest as an optimal paradigm for the wise man at the end of life, as Horace has it:

*inde fit raro, qui se vixisse beatum
dicat et exacto contentus tempore vita
cedat uti conviva satur, reperire queamus.*

Thereupon it comes about infrequently that we are able to find someone who affirms that he has lived a happy man and withdraws from life like a sated partygoer.

*(Sat. 1.1.117-19)*

There is in this passage of Horace a definitive echo of a parallel image deployed by a prime poetic model for the Horatian verse, Lucretius, who wrote:

*cur non ut plenus vitae conviva recedis,
aequo animoque capis securam, stulte, quietam?*

Why do you not, idiot, withdraw like a partygoer full of life and seize carefree tranquility with a balanced mind?

*(3.938-9)*

There is certainly a thread of Epicurean detachment from the cares of the socio-political struggle but recently a foregone conclusion for any member of the power elite determined to maintain or advance the status of his family.

The articulation of this most un-Roman withdrawal from the counters of traditional elite status is ultimately reconcilable with the purportedly old *Romanitas* of the
princeps, just as ‘Horace’ (in the persona of his own father) draws a firm dichotomy between the elaborate teachings of the philosophers and the simplicity of the mos maiorum:

... “sapiens, vitatu quidque petitu
sit melius, causas reddet tibi: mi satis est, si
traditum ab antiquis morem servare tuamque,
dum costodis eges, vitam famamque tueri
incolumen possum.” ...

... A sage would give your rationales for what is better avoided or sought: as far as I am concerned it is enough if I am able to preserve the custom handed down by (our) ancestors and to safeguard your life and reputation unharmed, while you need a guardian. …

(Sat. 1.4.115-19)

With such seemingly bland references to municipal (old-time Roman) simplicity, the poet locates his moralizing discourse firmly within the space of the eternal mos maiorum, be that the memory of the oldest living senator or the revisionist whim of the princeps; the essential – and covert – innovation lies (much like the Augustan program within which it functioned) in the rhetorical move of draping with the mantle of antiquity the social realities and policies of the day.99

It is not merely the act of using the genre of Lucilius that must be subjected to scrutiny, rather the act of composition becomes for Horace an object of the discourse as well and mediates the role of the genre as signifier of the status Romanus. As if responding to a critique of a prior overly harsh appraisal of inventor of the genre, Horace lays claim to a place inferior only to Lucilius:

hoc erat, experto frustra Varrone Aticino
atque quibusdam alis, melius quod scribere possem,
inventore minor; neque ego illi detrahere ausim

haerentem capiti cum multa laude coronam.

It was this, which I am able to write better than Varro of Atax (who attempted it in vain) and certain others, (still) less than the inventor; nor would I dare to drag off the garland clinging to his crown with great honor.

(Sat. 1.10.46-49)

However much Lucilius is to be praised for his creation of the genre, Horace raises the question of whether the rerum dura (hardness of his subjects) or his own natura (inborn intellect) denied Lucilius hexameters better than the mere equation to pedibus senis (feet six-at-a-time, 1.10.57-60), and Horace quickly notes the striking disjunction of Lucilian poetics with contemporary sensibilities (as constructed by himself) in the assertion that:

si foret hoc nostrum fato delapsus in aevum,
deteret sibi multa, recideret omne quod ultra
perfectum trahetur, et in verso faciendo
saepe caput scaberet, vivos et roderet unguis.

If he, by fate, had fallen into our age, he would erase much for himself, he would hack off all that got dragged beyond completeness, and in composing verse he would often scratch his head and gnaw his live nails.

(Sat. 1.10.68-71)

Having thus explicitly claimed a change in theme, Horace proceeds to underscore the constraints on the Augustan poet as literary aesthete and poem as aesthetic object in contrast to the verse of Lucilius constrained only by the bare frame of the meter and set in motion only by the rerum dura of its content. It is from within the frame of this binary that Horace pontificates neque te ut mirretur turba labores / contentus paucis lectoribus (and neither should you labor so that the mob might wonder at you, (be) content in a few readers, 1.10.73-74).

In terms of the internal rhetoric of composition, the Sermones are then posited as aesthetic exercises rather than literary vehicles for the encapsulation of invective against
deviant segments of the elite. Within the world of the poems, the satires of Horace function as a sort of litmus test for the sensibilities of the audience, even as they disclaim the intention to replicate the role of Lucilius who sale mulo / urbem defricuit (abraded the city with much salt, 1.10.3-4). It is thus ostensibly with cultured refinement and aesthetic discernment, rather than through the selection of acerbic content, that Horace delineates the grand set and invites his audience to self-identify within it by simple assent to his formulation of Romanitas.

It should in no way be taken from the preceding discussion that the authorial voice is attempting to deconstruct the framework of the restored Respublica of Augustus; quite the contrary, Horace revels in the social distance between himself within the grand set and the few remaining occupants of the power set as seen in the shameless name-dropping of Satire 1.5: the journey to Brundisium. Virgil and other literary figures are cast in the same narrative as animae qualis neque candidiores terra tuit (souls of a sort than which the earth has born none more resplendent, 1.5.41-2). Even the allies of M. Antonius come into some praise in the general bonhomie, yet the gestalt presented to the audience of this text is that of everyone in their place and content in their Fortune, rather than standing in stark (and unsustainably anti-Roman) opposition to the cursus honorum. The Sermones of Horace do not ultimately deconstruct the genre initiated by Lucilius, they subvert it in service of the concordia ordinum as practiced by Augustus – as Tacitus neatly phrased the bargain: Pax et Priniceps.\(^{100}\) From the perspective of the concept of the “authorized discourse” discussed by Pierre Bourdieu it could well be possible to read the personal recusationes of the cursus honorum in the Sermones as an authorization for

\(^{100}\) Annales 3.28. In recognition of the economy and aptness of the formulation, Syme entitled the relevant chapter of his Roman Revolution.
the appropriate others of what Horace himself forswears; such a move would be in keeping with the Augustan settlement whereby the cooperative elements of the elite continued to be granted the titles and insignia of the Republican *cursus* in the absence of actual competition (and its resultant strife). The *Sermones* can be read then as performance of the desired rhetorical payload; universal *tranquilitas* begins within the individual soul.

With the passing of the socio-political climate of the early Julio-Claudian period, there were arguably concomitant literary moves away from the aesthetic over-concern of the Augustan “Golden Age” of Latin poetry as exemplified in *Horatius* and *Vergilius*, toward a new aesthetic definable in negative terms as the Post-Augustan period or, perhaps no worse conceptually, the Silver Age of Latin Literature. The estimations and received opinion on these texts have undergone a series of sea-changes, one of which is arguably now underway. For many decades of modern scholarship the authors of the Post-Augustan period have been afforded the treatment of Hellenistic sculpture, i.e. works of this period were considered to be artless recapitulations of prior work at best, and to generally lack that genius and refinement that set a Praxiteles or a Skopas (a Vergil or a Horace) apart from the common herd. In opposition to such established slurs it is possible to advance the possibility that the fundamental question in play is not one of skill but of taste; Varro of Atax and certainly many others tried and failed, at least in the estimation of their peers or that of the early Christians, but the deviation of Persius or Juvenal from the aesthetics of Horace is more to be attributed to a difference in intention

---

101 The discussion of modes of discourse in relation to *doxa* in Bourdieu, *Esquisse d’une théorie de la pratique* (1972), is helpful as a means of approaching this issue.

than to any failure in execution.

Persius then ought to be carefully dissected with an eye toward the socio-political forces contributing to the literary choices of that author. Read with an awareness of Nero’s predilections for literary performance, there should be little surprise in the surviving satirist having a significant concern for the aesthetics of appreciating a performance. The leap might prima facie appear a trivial refinement of the Horatian stance, yet the effect is much like moving through the looking glass in that the object under consideration is taken to one level of refinement beyond Persius’ models. It is no longer the behavior or the object per se but the intellectual engagement with the object that is in question. In respect to the function of Satura and its broader form of wit, Antony Corbeill posits that political humor “both creates and enforces a community’s norms,” an observation that can as appropriately be extended to the rhetorical space of a critique of mores as well.103 The issue becomes what constitutes the community (audience) for the satirist’s humor. Corbeill, after an examination of the rhetoric of the late Republic, concludes that the direct vitriolic political humor of the Republic was emasculated under Caesar the dictator.104 To extend the examination of this thesis, the last noisy flourish of the Second Philippic may be opposed with the image of its author’s hands and head on the Rostra. A major textual mode had thus dropped out of Roman usage along with the fierce competition that had occasioned its evolution.

As may be discerned in Persius (and less so in Juvenal), there is a move toward a more restricted audience than that of Horace – the more literary portion of the elite,

103 Corbeill, Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic (Princeton, 1996), 9. As discussed above, elite humor was political humor in Rome.
104 Corbeill (1996): 215 states that “the power of political humor to defend the traditions of the state has been repressed” by Caesar.
demarcated like the emperor himself by a highly refined literary sensibility. Even in the late Republic, Cicero affirmed the intersection of the performance space of the orator and the poet:

\[
est enim finitimus oratori poeta, numeris astrictior paulo, verborum autem licentia liberior, multis vero ornandi generibus socius ac paene par; in hoc quidem certe prope idem, nullis ut terminis circumscribat aut definit ius suum, quo minus ei liceat eadem illa facultate et copia vagari qua velit.\]

Indeed the poet is the kinsman of the orator, a little more constrained, with regard to meters, but more unfettered in his freedom of words; truly, he is a companion admirable in many ways and nearly a match; indeed, in this decidedly almost identical, that he neither circumscribes himself with any limits nor would a law delimit his works, which likewise would allow him less freedom to wander where he would with ease and liberty.

\[(De Or. 1.15.70)\]

The fortunes and persons of clients no longer ran the gamut with the reputations of the orators, yet the satirists textually engaged with their audiences as if persuasion was the ultimate goal. The standard elite training in oratory found a natural expression in the strictures of the genre of *satura*, and the satires of Persius and even more so Juvenal moved toward the realm of epideictic oratory. Amy Richlin states that satire was the “most sophisticated manifestation of a frame of thought deeply rooted in Roman society” which is present across literary genres. As Bartsch points out, in an era of forced “doublespeak, poetry is in fact not only an alternative but a substitute for the defunct free-spoken oratory of the Republic.” Just as in oratory, however, there must be a certain concern for the pragmatics of the time and the mode in which the rhetorical theses of the author are articulated. K. Hopkins posits a subdivision of the imperial elite into a “power set” and a “grand set,” noting that some members of the grand set “retreated into

---

philosophy which either elevated the ideal of Liberty or scorned the slavishness of political ambition.”¹⁰⁷ Taking this analysis as the starting point, I suggest that such a retreat from political oratory into philosophical thematics is observable in Persius and that those who would satisfy the strictures of Juvenal’s delimited Romanitas would belong to the grand set as well, as will be discussed more fully below.

Lucilius has the free invective of the Late Republic as opposed to the mellifluous trifles of Horace in the era of civil war. Persius contrasts these exemplars by noting that “secuit Lucilius urbem... et genuinum fregit in illis” (Lucilius cut into the city... and he shattered a molar on those guys), whereas, concerning Horace, the satirist opines omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico / tangit et admissus circum praecordia ludit (that scoundrel Flaccus touched every vice—for the benefit of his laughing friend—and sported about (once he was) let into (one’s) heart, 1.114-17). By contrast, Persius claims himself to be apprehensive lest the “limina frigescant” (the thresholds grow cold) and the “canina littera” (the canine letter) sound forth after all:

‘sed quid opus teneras mordaci radere vero auriculas? uide sis ne maiorum tibi forte limina frigescant: sonat hic de nare canina littera.’ …

‘But what use indeed is there to grind (their) tender little ears with a file? Watch out how you are, lest the thresholds of the great grow chilly toward you: (and) here sound from the nose the canine letter.’…

(Persius 1.107-110)

The great insight that will so incense his hearers is not however mores as might be expected but rather the rhetorical question: auriculas asini quis non habet? (who does not have ass’s ears? 1.121). It is likely that the diminutive form auriculas is an aspersion on

members of the hypothetical audience that are overly sensitive to criticism. His studies of Stoic teachings under the philosopher Cornutus coupled with his independent wealth certainly freed Persius from any mercenary need to please the emperor or a patron, yet the necessity of avoiding offence remained. The consequences of an injudicious poem are represented by the thresholds of the great (\textit{maiorum / ... limina}), which grow cold. The limen becomes a barrier to the excluded poet, as the dog guarding the entryway becomes hostile. The image is one of exclusion from the interior spaces reserved for friends. Poetic speech is thus granted a significance great enough that it could be a grounds for the dissolution of \textit{amicitia}. In the literary climate of the reign of Nero and the backdrop of works on the order of the \textit{Satyrica} of Petronius, the analysis of aesthetic acumen by the satirist becomes imminently probable.

\textbf{The Genre of Juvenal}

Into this milieu the rhetorically charged invective of Juvenal projects itself, drawing from the shocking imagery and violence of Lucan and the Menippian farce of the \textit{Satyrica}, no less than the explicit model of Lucilius no longer used as counterpoint but as averred exemplar. Horace could certainly neither critique the social order of the principate, nor – significantly – the \textit{Respublica} which preceded the \textit{princeps}, as \textit{Octavianus} claimed his name \textit{Augustus} by virtue of having restored the same; in the rhetoric of the \textit{princeps} there was no essential constitutional distinction between those

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item It was a known practice to keep guard dogs in the entryways (\textit{fauces}) of elite Roman homes. There are mosaics depicting dogs in the \textit{fauces} of several Pompeian houses, including the famous \textquote{CAVE CANEM} mosaic in the \textquote{House of the Tragic Poet} (VI.8.5). This motif is also explored in Petronius as a painting (\textit{Satyrica} 29).
\item The Cynic author Menippus (c. 3rd BCE) of Gadara was a seminal figure in the development of genre-bending farce, which served as a foundation for the work of Petronius, but more significantly was a crucial figure in the work of the Greek comic essayist Lucian of Samosata (b. c. 120 C.E.).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Rudd notes the crucial disparity in the thematics of satire in Horace and
Juvenal as being the interest of the latter in crime and in behaviors that might attain to the
level of “perverted and monstrous” within moralizing discourse. The constraints of his
time are also perceived in the few satura of Persius, where the gaze is fixed into the
otherness of the interior life or the far past of classical Athens. The Satires of Juvenal
ecompass the modes of both these models certainly, yet they also fully engage with the
mos maiorum and a Romanitas congruent with that of the idealized Respublica of
historiographic tradition rather than that of the new (and rather effete and too Greek)
intelligensia. Not utterly without justification is Gibbon’s claim that “if a man were
called to fix the period in the history of the world, during which the human race was most
happy and prosperous, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the
death of Domitian to the ascension of Commodus,” yet Juvenal, who lived squarely
within this timeframe, engaged in the harshest possible critique of Roman mores of all
the surviving satirists. The key to unraveling the difficulty is the set of historical
frames employed by the author to distance the vitriolic critique from the contemporary
social order of the adoptive emperors.

Change of dynasty punctuated by the assassination of the last of the Flavians is
the signal for a circumscribed literary freedom much on the order of that exercised by
Tacitus in the Annales against the object of the Julio-Claudians; Juvenal is free to wield

---

110 N. Rudd (1966): 260-62 objects to the tendency in scholarship from Dryden forward to see the concern
of Horace in his Sermones as foibles and nugae with the observation that the objects of his satire are
essentially the same vices as those treated by Juvenal.
111 Examples of this category of the perverted and monstrous (from within the satiric discourse) would
include the homosexual prostitution of Naevolus in Satire IX and the rage-motivated cannibalism of Satire
XV. Pace Rudd, I must argue that, while not entirely without teeth, the poetics of Horace differ
categorically from Juvenal’s treatment of “monstrous” and ingrown vices. The alteration in subject and in
tone constitutes a pointed shift in meaning.
112 E. Gibbon, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (1776), (Book 1, Ch. 3).
the genre in its full Lucilian mode, so long as he does so “*in illos / quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina*” (against those whose ashes are covered by the Flaminian and Latin ways, 1.170-71). As M. Skinner observes, “under the pretext of attacking dissipation, for example, Latin authors regularly castigate political and economic oppression,” to which may be objected the possibility that the temporal displacement of the critique may be more easily read as praise of the current regime in the strongest terms via the contrast, which only grows greater with the brutality of the invective.\(^{113}\) The crucial reflection on the motivation of many writers of the late Republic and early empire such as Tacitus, Cicero, and even Seneca, is made by C. Edwards: that the writers of non-Roman extraction, marginal Romans, have the greatest need to assert their own version of *Romanitas*, as their status as *Romani* is most open to question.\(^{114}\) Juvenal can be seen to fall securely within such a category of author and authorial practice. Syme notes that due to roughly contemporary composition as well as comparability of “style, tone, and content,” the works of Juvenal and Tacitus could be considered “parallel and coeval phenomena.”\(^{115}\) Citing the stress of these authors on the *mos maiorum*, as well as their detestation of vice and foreigners, Syme asserts that the “national Roman spirit speaks with a fervor and a fury never known” in previous iterations of the Roman state. While Syme wonders whether the strident protestations of this time might indicate a certain insecurity, I suggest that these concerns of style and focus proceed from the concerns and taste of a social milieu far removed from the provisionality of the Augustan principate.

The stridency of Juvenal’s verse is the source of no little offence to the

---

\(^{113}\) M. Skinner, “The Dynamics of Catullan Obscenity” (Syllecta Classica, 1991) 5.
contemporary sensibilities, and there have been those who would rescue Juvenal from the charge of misogyny or any of a host of other politically incorrect (but all-too-Roman) intellectual vices, although at the cost of inverting the meaning of entire books of the *Satires*. \(^{116}\) The consensus opinio would appear to be turning against such unrealistic and ahistorical moral fastidiousness (arguably a form of bowdlerization actually). Braund’s opposition between (socially unacceptable) *ira* and (appropriate) *indignatio* is broken down by Amy Richlin, who defines Juvenal’s “attitude (as) actively hostile and threatening” from a global perspective. \(^{117}\) The epigrams of M. Valerius Martialis (c. 38 to 104 C.E.), who mentions Juvenal approvingly in two of his poems, serves as another counter to this impulse to explain away the difficult content of the *Satires*. \(^{118}\) The angry satirist is doubtless a construct of the literary genre and I would suggest serves as a signifier of moral authority. Much as can be argued in the case of works such as the *Ars Poetica* of Horace, the act of claiming a greater critical acumen is tantamount to an assertion in the strongest terms of the identity of the authorial voice; the one who can give the rule of poetry is himself a *poeta* certainly, just as the one who has greatest knowledge of the *mos maiorum* is definitively *Romanus*. This linkage between the social act of writing satire and moral rectitude underlies the phrase: *inprobrior saturam scribente cinaedo* (more wicked than a queer writing satire, 4.106). \(^{119}\) Here again, M.

\(^{116}\) Cf. S. Braund, *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal’s Third Book of Satires* (Cambridge, 1988); it is not here my purpose to tear down the *persona* theory as applied to satire by Anderson (1982) and Braund (1988), yet it would be well to note that the genre itself provides a prime vitiation of the argument that contemporary views on anger control (as represented by the *De Ira* of Seneca - the notorious hypocrite) are intended to contradict the direct and quite Roman *topos* of corruption arising from the female/foreign/Other.

\(^{117}\) A. Richlin (1992): 197.

\(^{118}\) 7.91; 12.18.

\(^{119}\) The performative nature of the writing of satire is apparent in this assertion, in that the *cinaedus* is excluded from the category of those with the standing to speak as a satirist; any possible utterances by such a speaker are thus by definition void—in the formulation of ‘Juvenal.’ J. L. Austin (1962): 23-24 illustrates this point with the christening of a ship: “one could say that I ‘went through the form of’ naming the vessel...
Foucault can be of assistance in the comprehension of this disjunction of the speech act of writing satire and the habitual actions that are construed as wickedness within the discourse:

We know perfectly well that we are not free to say just anything, that we cannot simply speak of anything, when we like or where we like; not just anyone, finally, may speak of just anything. We have three types of prohibition, covering objects, ritual with its surrounding circumstances, the privileged or exclusive right to speak of a particular subject; these prohibitions interrelate, reinforce and compliment each other, forming a complex web, continually subject to modification.  

What Foucault here posits for the cultural discourses of the twentieth century holds broadly true for those of the second as well; the ability to effectively assert truth was closely enmeshed with the success of the poet in creating an appropriate identity. The right to compose within the genre had to be arrogated by the poet and contested through the creation of a persona in line with the expectations of earlier texts as read through the framework supplied by the satirist.

In her seminal work *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, M. Gleason posits that rather than representing a biological essential, “masculine identity was an achieved state, radically undetermined by anatomical sex” for the Romans of the period of the Second Sophistic; it was a pure construct, which could be invoked through oratorical excellence. Under sway of such a Zeitgeist, a rhetorical stance could be deployed in satire that called into the question the Identity of those who possessed the outer trappings of elite male status: socio-political power and wealth. Thus Juvenal attempts to fracture the linkage between outer appearance and unseen virtus.

but that my ‘action’ was ‘void’ or ‘without effect’, because I was not the proper person, had not the ‘capacity’, to perform it: but one might also and alternatively say that, where there is not even a pretense of capacity or a colourable claim to it, then there is no accepted conventional procedure; it is a mockery, like marriage with a monkey.”

When he attacks the power elite of the Flavian age for sumptuary excess and poor self-control, Juvenal denies the right of that elite to their positions by undermining their moral authority, since the capacity of the elite for “self-control legitimated the control they exercised over others.” Concurrently, in the binary moral world of the Satires, Juvenal is enabled to assert – to construct – his own identity as a true male and Roman by deconstructing that of the Other. In the context of the rhetoric of the Optimus Princeps and no less his virtue-laden successor, Juvenal’s vitriolic attacks on the corruption of a prior age serve to reinforce the identity of the principes and are congruent with the role of the emperor as censor; the harsher the damnation of the corrupt the more nearly his satura approaches panegyric.

Satire Defined against Other Genres

There are multiple positive claims by Juvenal as to what the motivation and content of his verse might be. Equally or perhaps more instructive, however, is the possibility that the negative space, or void, left by the depictions of other modes of literary production is a fair approximation of the notional space occupied by satire in the rhetoric of the poet. I will argue that the poet reveals the positive aspects of his concept of the genre satire through his critiques of other genres. Further, the poet reveals the

122 C. Edwards (1993): 25. Further, the “elite justified their privileged position by pointing to their superior morals.”
123 M. Ulpius Trajanus, the Optimus Princeps (senatus consulto) as styled on a myriad of coins and inscriptions, as well as his successor Hadrianus were the principes under whom Juvenal wrote the five known books of his Satires. There was a significant shift in the iconographic usage of their coinage away from the militaristic (e.g. victoria, trophies, and captives) types of Trajan toward several series emphasizing the role of the princeps as itinerant caretaker of the imperium (e.g. restitutor and adventus types) under Hadrian. The shift is stark and arguably indicative of a great shift in the imperial identity away from unsustainable military adventurism and toward an emphasis on steady government; this new system of values is congruent with the philosophical stance of Satire X and others and may be implicated with the Second Sophistic and the literary/cultural predilections of an emperor mocked as a little too cultured: Graeculus.
intertextuality of the genre with epic and history by his incorporation of those genres and their internal topics. The oratorical nature of the *Satires* has been much remarked upon, and there is in these poems a complicated interaction with the grammarians and their texts that, I suspect, is tied to the role of these texts in the orator’s training. The author utilizes the manipulation of this genre-keyed knowledge as a *topos* to mark use beyond the limits of appropriate control.

In the course of a scathing depiction of the type of the boorish wife at dinner, Juvenal employs a depiction of vile inability to regulate intake and output of wine to prefigure a reading paradigm for female incapacity to properly moderate the ingestion and regurgitation of oratorical knowledge. The wife comes late to the *cena* with an exercise-induced flush and “*totum / oenophorum sitiens*” (thirsting for an entire crate), and after another quart is drawn “*ante cibum rabidam facturus orexim*” (before the meal to make her hunger fierce), the wine comes back up and “*loto terram ferit intestino*” (strikes the ground from her well-washed guts, 6.425-32). This entire process is encapsulated in a well-balanced simile: “*tamquam alta in dolia longus / deciderit serpens, bibit et vomit*” (like when a long snake falls into a deep wine vat, it drinks and vomits.) With this imagery, the audience is prepared to interpret the pontificating wife of the succeeding passage:

\[\text{illa tamen grauior, quae cum discumbere coepit} \\
\text{laudat Vergilium, periturae ignoscit Elissae,} \\
\text{committit uates et comparat, inde Maronem} \\
\text{atque alia parte in trutina suspendit Homerum.} \\
\text{cedunt grammatici, uincuntur rhetores, omnis} \\
\text{turba tacet, nec causidicus nec praeco loquetur,} \\
\text{altera nec mulier. }...\]

Still, there’s a woman still more baneful, who, when she first

---

Cf. Quintilian Book X on the education of the orator.
reclines at dinner, praises Vergil, pardons Dido, soon to die, throws together and compares poets, on one hand Vergil and in the other part of the scales she balances Homer. The grammarians yield, the rhetoricians are conquered, the whole crowd is quiet, not even a trial lawyer or an auctioneer will speak, not even another woman.

Part of the point of this criticism is that the woman is extraordinarily loud and loquacious, as indicated by her ability to put a *causidicus*, a *praeco*, and even another *mulier* to silence, all proverbial for their eloquence, no doubt.¹²⁵ The description of the content of her discursus and the significant members of her audience is even more instructive, however.

The woman more baneful than the vomiting drunk is the one that vomits a stream of literary criticism from the moment that she reclines at dinner. This character holds forth along the lines expected of a *grammaticus* or a *rhetor* giving primary training to future members of the elite.¹²⁶ The crucial judgment is succinctly phrased: “*quae docta nimis cupit et facunda videri*” (a woman who yearns excessively to seem learned and eloquent). The overly-learned woman’s “*Palaemonis artem*” (rhetorical manual of Palaemon, 6.452) is neatly matched by the “*artem Theodori*” (rhetorical manual of Theodorus, 7.177) of the *rhetor*, just as her “*ratione loquendi*” (rule of speaking, 6.453) is balanced by the “*verborum regula*” (rule of words, 7.230) imposed on the *grammaticus*. This woman is termed an *antiquaria* (antiquarian, 6.454), who exhibits *ignotos... versus* (obscure verses) and *nec curanda viris* (matters of no concern to real

¹²⁵ The woman is thus more obnoxious than all those she is able to silence. A similar conflation of poetics and the vocation of the *praeco* is drawn in the opening lines of Satire VII (7.1-12), where the author gives the last of the indignities borne by the failed poet as auctioning Alcithoe Pacci, Thebas et Terea Fausti (the Alcithoe of Paccus or the Thebes and Tereus of Faustus). In the context of the other bric-a-brac, these works are apparently of little value.

¹²⁶ Cf. 7.150-90 for the concerns of the *rhetor* and 7.229-36 for the province of the *grammaticus*.
Here the provinces of the *rhetor* and the *grammaticus* when reified as ends in themselves become trivial pursuits – interests unfit for elite men. Thus, in opposition to this excessive display of erudition for its own sake, the genre satire is figured as neither antiquarianism nor literary criticism; it does not explicitly seek to preserve and exhibit knowledge for the mere sake of epideictic display, despite the operation of its literary references as proofs of the author’s education-mediated claim to elite status.

In meaningful contrast with elegy and epic in particular, satire is not figured in the *Satires* as a poetic pursuit undertaken for personal renown. Juvenal describes a poet’s motivation to hold a poetic recital as uncontrolled compulsion: “*dulcedine famae / succensus*” (inflamed by the sweetness of reputation, 7.39-40). At the end of a series of inducements to walk away from the life of the poet, the author claims that an addictive behavior has the poet in its grip: “*tenet insanabile multos / scribendi cacoethes et aegro in corde senescit*” (the incurable malignant habit of writing grows old even in a sick heart, 7.51-2). The doubled contraposition of *insanabile* and *aegro* with *cacoethes* and *corde* strongly figure this desire as a disease of the inner man, a derangement of the mind. Courtney notes the conjunction of the medical terms *insanabile* and *aegro* with *cacoethes* (malignant tumor) as used in Celsus 5.28.2, yet the humorous point of the juxtaposition appears to rest in the Greek signification of the term κοκκοθῆςες (bad disposition); there is a flaw in the ἔθος of the poet who writes for the sake of *fama*. Both of these points are prefigured by the reference to the Odysseus myth invoked when the poet opines that

---

127 If *haec* is read for *nec* as Postgate suggests and E. Courtney (1980) *ad loc. cit.* concurs, the sense is essentially equivalent: the *antiquaria* is overly concerned with displaying a knowledge of matters that are exterior to what a proper Roman should care about. It might be objected that the concerns of the proper Roman woman would fall outside of matters *curanda viris*, yet the point remains: the *antiquaria* is speaking out of order and out of place.
“litus sterili versamus aratro” (we turn over the shore with a sterile plow, 7.49). I would argue that the point of the discussion of poetic patronage in Satire VII is more that members of the elite are failing to perform their function of patronage and are thus failing in their performance of proper Romanitas.

As noted above, there is a curious relationship between satire and elegy internal to the authorial persona; in terms of the rhetoric of authorship, however, there exists a wide division between the two. The exchange of meaning between epic and satire extends beyond the frequent forays into mock-epic mode. These genres, as well as many others less directly, are characterized as more art than substance in the Satires due to the desire of their authors for fame as poets. Much like the admonition of Quintilian that “ubicumque ars ostendatur, veritas abesse videatur” (wherever the art is revealed, truth seems to be absent, 9.3.102), for the authorial persona of the Satires, the apparent artistic nature of these poetic forms undercuts any potential claim to objective truth. A similar comment of the effect of disturbance of the artistic illusion was made by the surrealist René Magritte in the famous series La trahison des images with its inscription: Ceci n’est pas une pipe.

In the context of this opposition of artistry and persuasion set up in the Satires, it is in the interest of the author to attempt to mitigate the perception of his poems as artistic production in the first instance. In service of his claim for the primacy of the moralistic content of the Satires over their poetic attributes, it is significant that Juvenal disavows the necessity for great poetic skill for the author of satire:

---

128 E. Courtney (1980): 356 notes that the adjective sterilis is picked up again in 7.203 with the vanae sterilisque cathedrae of the poet. This repetition of the idea of purposelessness, amplified with vanae, is congruent with the depiction of the poet as madman.
129 While discussing how best to persuade in the Ars Amatoria, Ovid produces a claim along similar lines with si latet ars, prodest adfert depressa pudorem / atque adimit merito tempus in omne fidem. (if art lies hidden, it is effective. Once detected is brings embarrassment / and it expels belief for all time, 2.313-14).
... stulta est clementia, cum tot ubique
vatibus occuras, periturae parere chartae.

When you bump into so many bards everywhere, sparing paper that is about to perish in any case is a foolish mercy.

Irrespective of his actual skill, the author deprecates the required poetic acumen in service of the desired rhetorical point: it is the matter of the poem that is essential to the satirist, not its poetics.\textsuperscript{130} It is this point that Horace is making in the fourth satire of his first book, where the authorial \textit{persona} replies to the response of corrupt persons to satire - \textit{omnes hi metuunt versus, odere poetas} (all these men fear the verses and hate the poet, 1.4.33) - with the counterclaim that the author is no such thing as a poet:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
primum ego me illorum, dederim quibus esse poetis,
excerpam numero: neque enim concludere versum
dixeris esse satis neque, siqui scribat uti nos
sermoni propriosa, putes hunc esse poetam.
ingeniun cui sit, cui mens divinior atque os
magna sonaturum, des nominis huius honorem.
idcirco quidam comoedia necne poema
esse, quaesivere, quod acer spiritus ac vis
nec verbis nec rebus inest, nisi quod pede certo
differat sermoni, sermo merus.
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

First off, I will pluck myself out of the number of those to whom I would grant to be poets: for you will neither say that finishing a verse is enough, if someone chanced to write things too congruent with common speech as I do, you should think this man a poet. A man who has inborn talent, whose mind is more celestial and whose mouth shall intone great matters, to him you should give the honor of this title. That is why, some have questioned whether Comedy constitutes poetry, because sharp inspiration and force is present neither in its words nor in its themes, other than the fact that it differs from common speech in its defined meter, it is unadulterated common speech.

(Sat. 1.4.39-48)

\textsuperscript{130} Lucilius makes comparable misdirections concerning the literariness of his compositional practice by terming his poems \textit{schedium} – something unfinished or roughly thrown together (1131W). Further deflationary techniques are detectable in the use of \textit{ludus} (sport) and \textit{sermones} (conversations) to characterize his poetics (1039W). Horace picks up this terminology in his \textit{Sermones} at 2.6.71, 2.2.2, 1.4.41-42, and perhaps again as a pun at 1.3.65, 2.3.4, and 2.5.98.
The poet employs the authorial *persona* here to make a disingenuous claim: that he is not a poet. The incongruity of this claim to the local context, however, is resolved through examination of the full argument within which this rhetorical gambit is embedded. First the claim is advanced that the language of the verse of Horace and Lucilius is fundamentally different in character from that on Ennius or some other poet, irrespective of the arrangement undertaken for the sake of metrics (1.4.53-62). The *persona* next disclaims a desire for poetic fame as a motivation for the composition of Horace’s verse (1.4.70-78). Bias (*studium*) and spitefulness (*lividus, vitium*) are next discounted (1.4.78-103). The ground has thus been prepared for the advancement of the rhetorical payload of the satire: that the content of the verse is nothing more than the sum of unbiased *exempla* passed down by the author’s father, by which one might lead a happy life:

```
... liberius si
dixerō quid, si forte iocosius, hoc mihi iuris
cum venia dabis: insuevit pater optimus hoc me,
    ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque notando.
```

... If I chance to say something somewhat too freely, or in too jocular a manner, you will grant me this much right with pardon: the best of fathers made me accustomed to this practice, that, by marking them with *exempla*, I would flee each of the vices.

(Sat. 1.4.103-6)

Thus the authorial *persona* disclaims (suspect) agency and (distorting) interest in the rhetorical content of the verse. The objective value of any of these claims - or the extended panegyric of the moral utility of Horatian satire that closes off the poem - is of no immediate consequence to the functional intent of the argument. The author is

---

131 The authorial *persona* of Horace *Satire* 1.4 undercuts the disavowal of the poetic identity of Horace with the critique of Lucilius as *garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem. / scribendi recte* (garrulous and too lazy to endure the labor of writing / writing correctly; 1.4.12-13). This critique is explicated at 1.10.1-17. In the act of such a critique, the authorial *persona* arrogates for itself the coordinate virtues. The poetic identity is explicitly reclaimed in the final lines of the satire (1.4.141-43).
enabled to engage in rhetorical self-fashioning through dissimulation of poetic skill.

In a manner congruent with the deflationary and diversionary tactics thus employed by Horace to obfuscate the tendentious mechanics of his verse while fixing the content at the forefront, the authorial persona of Juvenal is made to rhetorically ask:

“nonne libet medio ceras inplere capaces / quadrivio” (won’t it be delightful to fill up my capacious notebooks in the middle of the intersection, 1.63-4). This chaotic locale for composition stands in tacit opposition to the idyllic retreats of Helicon or elsewhere figured as the proper loci of poetics. At the end of a list of annoying personages that one might meet in the crossroads, Juvenal claims that “si natura negat” (if nature forbids it)

“facit indignatio versum / qualecumque potest” (indignation will make the verse – whatever sort it can, 1.79-80). The attribution of motivation to indignatio sets satire in opposition to the desire for fama associated with other poetic forms, as discussed above.

Again, this image is a rhetorical topos designed to underscore the content rather than the compositional skill. The unspoken argument is a form of truth claim similar to that employed in forensic oratory when an orator deprecated his own skill as a means of emphasizing the truth value of his case. Quintilian makes this point well:

Sed ut praecipua in hoc dicentis auctoritas, si omnis in subeundo negotio suspicio sordium aut odiorum aut ambitioinis afuerit, ita quaedam in his quoque commendatio tacita, si nos infirmos, inparatos, inpares agentium contra ingeniis dixerimus. Est enim naturalis favor pro laborantibus, et iudex religiosus libentissime patronum audit quem iustitiae suae minime timet. Inde illa veterum circa occultandam eloquentiam simulatio...

---

132 The character Socrates makes exactly this claim in the opening lines of the Apology, saying that he will soon prove his accusers’ claim that he is a wondrous orator false, εἰ μὴ ἄρα δεινὸν καλοῦσιν οὕτωι λέγειν τὸν τάληθη λέγοντα: εἰ μὲν γὰρ τούτο λέγοντα, ὀμολογήσει ἀν ἔχουσιν ὑπὲρ τούτου χαίρει ῥήτορ (unless they call a man speaking the truth “wondrous:” if they are saying this, then I would agree that I am an orator – not like they are though, 17b). Plato then contrasts κεκαλλιεπησμένους γε λόγους (words spoken in fine phrases) and κεκοσμησμένους (carefully arranged) unfavorably in truth value with εἰκῇ λεγόμενα τῶς ἐπιτυχούσιν ὀνόμασιν (things spoken at random with chance words, 17c). Cf. also Lysias 152.1, Rhet. Her. 1.7.5.
But, just as the believability of the one speaking in this matter is outstanding, if every suspicion of baseness or enmity or of bribery in the undertaken business is absent, even so there exists a silent approbation in these matters, if we have said that we are weak, unprepared, or unequal to the intellects of those working against us. There exists a natural partisanship for those who are struggling, and an upright judge most willingly listens to an advocate whom he least fears as a danger to his justice. From consideration of this fact comes the pretension of the ancients about hiding their eloquence, …

(4.1.8-9)

In sum, the satirical author makes truth claims for his genre based on a series of dichotomies. The authorial persona of Horace sets up the argument that his verse is impelled by traditional virtues instilled by his father through moral exempla, not by bias, spite, or by delusions of poetic grandeur; in Juvenal’s rhetoric, the composition of satire is driven by an emotional attachment to Romanitas rather than the desire for fama, and is supported by truth in place of poetic skill.

Conclusions

The unique density of satiric expression especially as instantiated in Juvenal would make the multiplication of examples an endless exercise, yet the rhetorical force of the genre becomes apparent, when the usage of satire as signifier and sign by the four authors is taken in sum. I suggest that the genre of Satura functioned as a sign for the abstraction Romanitas and claimed to function as an authorized discourse delimiting the category Romanus; it is a genre within which the semantic fields of these interlocked terms are continually contested by the authorial voice as embodied in the global argument and the textual representation of the external reality. From this perspective it is possible to view satire as a primary tool in the battles of the culture war over identity in the period of the late Respublica and early principate, a tool that enabled the author to lay claim to a
superior cultural *auctoritas* in the very act of using that arrogated moral authority to pontificate on the nature of the *mos maiorum* and on what was essential to the Roman and the Other. Juvenal is quite overt in his claims to being in some fashion an *arbitor Romanitatis*.

Despite the claims of Quintilian, the genre draws upon many sources, not least the avowed Old Comedy in Lucilius and Juvenal particularly, but no less on oratory and epic, as well as the wit of Menippus and Terrentius Varro, nor should the range of its influence be limited to the practitioners of the Latin hexameter satire; the works of Lucian are to be set up as another point of comparison through which the difficulties of the Latin genre may be better unraveled. Like Lucian, Juvenal is highly implicated in the literary expectations of the period of revitalization in Greek rhetorical/literary production often referenced as the *Second Sophistic*, within which the oratorical strains of his verse are imminently comprehensible. That the author would hardly admit any such interdependence is all to the point. Rhetorically, the genre can be posited by an author like Quintilian as the one truly Roman literary product, but this proposed *ex nihilo* birth does not persuade. The crux of the matter is that rhetoric need not persuade all potential audiences to be meaningful present in a text. Further, rhetoric need not be in any meaningful way *true* to perform its function. The satirist uses the semantic force of his genre to arrogate to himself the authority to pronounce gnomic assertions with the force of one whose knowledge is beyond the pale. In the construction of *satura* as signifier and sign, those from Lucilius forward built a framework of meaning and expectation that

---

133 As evidence of this claim, I advance from the 2008 presidential campaign the case of a man with more houses than he cares to admit slandering as an “elitist” a man with one house. What is vital to the question of satire’s function is the existence and articulation of these truth claims, not whether they were objectively true.
ultimately enables Juvenal to take on the persona of the Roman sophist, an epideictic moral pundit who constructs his world and himself via his performance of Romanitas.

There is, in the Satires, a pervasive, manufactured sense of identity compromised by the advancement of the unworthy. Crucially, however, there is nowhere on the part of the author an utter alienation from Roman identity per se; the implicit concept of Romanitas is not itself subjected to scorn. From an anthropological perspective it can be noted that the author retains at all points an emic perspective on the Roman world.134 If he is free in his exclusion of major subsets of the Roman citizen body from his construct of Roman identity, there is no implied contradiction with the implicit assumption that there exists in Juvenal’s text an included subset that fully qualifies as Romani.135 The concept of an emic perspective is usefully applied to Juvenal in that Pike’s theory recognized that an observer from such a perspective would be able to make intrinsic cultural distinctions not apparent from an etic perspective. When applied in the context of literary composition, the crucial caveat to this important insight is that, whatever the author’s ability to make distinctions based on factors apparent to himself in his capacity as cultural insider, there is no reasonable expectation that those distinctions have been communicated without bias in his text, especially when that text is approached by readers with an etic perspective. Further, it should be noted that, while the objects of the literary discourse intersecting satire may have been agreed upon, each of these factors was open

134 The linguistic anthropologist K. Pike, Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior (Mouton, 1967), coined the neologisms emic (insider perspective) and etic (outsider perspective) as a means of signifying the two perspectives that might be taken vis-à-vis a culture.
135 While it would seem obvious that Juvenal wrote from an emic perspective, text continues to be produced that is grounded on an assumption otherwise. One rather more explicit example is provided in the opinion of S. Robinson, Juvenal: Sixteen Satires upon the Ancient Harlot (Manchester, 1983), 66 that Juvenal might represent “the man who continues to chose truthfulness, and does so despite his knowledge that humanity, as his society represents it, is contemptible, a monstrous aberration with which he – neither Stoic nor Epicurean, Imperialist nor Republican – can not and will not identify.” Admittedly, this is an extreme example, yet more subtle forms of this same fallacy can easily creep into more scholarly analyses.
to contest by those with competing claims to insider status. Sections of sustained wrath and bile in the *Satires* were easily able to engender the assumption in the fourth century that Juvenal’s verse flowed from a hostile etic perspective, by those preconditioned to desire for their own purposes a vituperative external viewpoint on the Roman Other.

Simplistic readings much like those that appealed to the patristic fathers and to their successors in the Renaissance and the recent past remain available, as do other readings that react to the former, yet the mode of reading outlined above allows these complex poems to be understood as oratorical performances with an object, rather than limiting them to being interpreted as simple rants or as mockery of narrow-minded men. *Saturn* is then – by the time of Juvenal – a proof-text of belonging to the grand set of the elite; it is an alternate, textual *cursus* whereby the satirist concurrently creates and enforces a system of semantic boundaries between the authorial self and the Other. It may be argued that this same system of meaning is available to the intended audience as a validation of their biases and a ready catharsis for their frustrations in the milieu of an increasingly meritocratic *Imperium Romanum*. In the context of a society where categories of identity were, for some, uncomfortably fungible, the satirist, like the evangelist, offered a manner of constructing identity divorced from material circumstance. It is all to the point that in the late fourth c. C.E. Ammianus Marcellinus could critique the dissipated elites of his own time along Juvenalian lines:

> *Quidam detestantes ut venena doctrinas, Juvenalem et Marium Maximum curatiore studio legunt, nulla volumina praeter haec in profundo otio contractantes, quam ob causam non iudicioli est nostri.*

136 Whatever the prevalence of meritocratic forces in second-century Rome, the prospect of social mobility irrespective of native Roman status was particularly salient for Juvenal as a social discourse.
Certain people, despising learning as if it were poison, read Juvenal and Marius Maximus with excessive care, handling no volumes other than these in their extensive leisure time, for what reason it is not mine to say.

(28.4.14)

While the larger context of the critique is that many of the elite held inappropriately narrow literary tastes, Ammianus here makes the excessive enjoyment of the Satires themselves into the sort of acerbic critique that could easily pass for one of the exempla of Juvenal. What the satirist created as a discourse on Romanitas becomes itself yet another negotiable element in the performance of Roman Identity.

With this rupture between internal and external discourses, the larger question remains of whether or to what degree Juvenal’s poems are representative of normative Roman social discourse in the second century. Juvenal may well represent the concerns of a conservative segment of the Roman population as he watches the meteoric rise of an exotic freedman, but he certainly does not represent the perspective of that freedman. Many of the author’s rhetorical stances would be still less palatable from any vantage point outside of the lived experience of the elite based in Rome itself. Although these Romans might be transposed in space wherever duty or trade might take them, Juvenal writes their world always from a center in Rome. Within the actual operation of this world system, “there were so many types of Romans to become that becoming Roman did not mean assimilating to an ideal type, but rather acquiring a position in the complex of structured differences in which Roman power resided.”137 The operation of the limited Roman meritocracy was a central discourse in the early empire, and it is to be expected that the perspective taken from a reading often had much to do with the personal interest of the viewer. The first approximation of an answer may be that these perorations on

---

vice - and occasionally virtue - are to be construed as minimally representative of the
polite discourse of the Roman elite, but that they encapsulate the terms of that discourse
quite exactly, if not its tenor.
Chapter IV:
Performative Eating: the Semiotics of Food in Juvenal

To be wise, at any rate, those in disagreement that food is able to make the quite temperate into the rather incontinent, the quite disciplined into the rather undisciplined, the quite confident into the rather fearful, and to make the cultivated and mild into the wrathful and murderous, let them come to me in order to learn what it is necessary for them to eat and drink. And they will indeed be greatly benefited as far as their moral philosophy, and from this they will enhance their powers of reason, having attained to excellence as men wiser and having better memory. In addition to the foods and drinks, I will also teach them about the winds, and the combinations of the atmosphere and also the places, which ones to prefer and which ones to avoid.

Galenus, *Quod Animi Mores Corporis Temperamenta Sequantur*, 808

Introduction

The myriad uses of food form an inescapable, quotidian discourse. Among the Roman elite of the second century, the performative and visceral aspects of this physical necessity were in the main enacted publicly, and these aspects were firmly caught in the

---

138 The title in Greek is: ΟΤΙ ΤΑΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΣΩΜΑΤΟΣ ΚΡΑΣΕΣΙΝ ΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΨΥΧΗΣ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΙΣ ΕΠΟΝΤΑΙ (That the properties of the soul follow the mixtures of the body). Galen of Pergamon (c. 129-199?) was court physician for Marcus Aurelius. As exemplified by this passage, there existed in the second century a discourse on the operation of food and drink on the moral constitution.
mesh of the literary culture of the Roman city. Within an intertext including
historiographic narratives, forensic rhetoric, and philosophical texts, the intended
audience of the *Satires* was prepared to read the moral value of their fellow Romans
through their gastronomic proclivities. By virtue of the economic restrictions imbedded
in the selection, presentation, costume, and scene of the act of eating, the social elite set
the terms of this discourse in practice and in text, with exclusion from full participation
serving as the default position for non-elites. Within this social discourse as instanced in
the *Satires*, however, access to insider status could not depend solely on current liquidity;
for the satirist, such a coarse filter would have been useless against the constant upward
flux of *nouveau riche* non-Romans.\textsuperscript{139} Within the text of Juvenal, it is the nexus of
cultural pedigree and the refinement instilled through immersion in literary culture that
functions to ratify a person’s right to wealth, status, and ultimately, *Romanitas*. Those
without the means to participate are neatly elided—within the discourse. Of those
potential Romans that remain, the principle that Horace asserts as the ideal balance
(*aureum medium*) serves as litmus test of underlying moral rectitude, not simply a mark
of cultural refinement. Wealth confers the aspect of choice that makes the uses of food
socially perilous, even physically hazardous; the act of eating becomes, under the gaze of
the satirist, a morality play and a potentially defiling contest against the gross body.\textsuperscript{140}
Within the constructed Rome of the *Satires*, Juvenal makes the use of food a signifier for
the range of moral and cultural flaws threatening the *Romanitas* of his intended audience.
Irrespective of the *persona* chosen to voice the arguments, the author maintains a

\textsuperscript{139} Roman identity, like other forms of constructed meaning, was a negotiated commodity. In the strictest
sense, even the *Claudi* were non-Roman. As in all other discourses in Juvenal, the question is not one of
fact but rather the one of assumptions and values embedded in the text.

\textsuperscript{140} M. Bakhtin outlines the gross body in *Rabelais and His World*, tr. Helen Iswolsky (Cambridge, MA
1968); the discussion of this tool of literary criticism in A. Richlin *The Garden of Priapus* (1992): 70-72 is
particularly useful.
consistent interpretive logic of Roman foodways—the complex of all practices and discourses centered on eating and drinking. Although the tone and rhetorical aim of the individual satires and *exempla* vary, I will argue that the instances where the author elects to deploy this *topos* in service of his contentions are coherent with a larger normative paradigm. In order to elucidate this recurrent *topos*, I will examine four aspects of the written foodways of Juvenal in this chapter: the equation of foodways and (ethnic) identity, the social manipulation of food at the *cena*, the ramifications of individual consumption, and the use of food as a signifier of the natural order.

**Foodways and Achieved Identity**

The use of food as a prime signifier of social status is not merely a prerogative of the elite, it is figured within the *Satires* as a diagnostic mark of the hidden and deleterious inner condition. In the summation of his *exempla* concerning food from the five books of the *Satires*, the author reveals a coherent theory of the proper relationship of the true Roman to the use of food, and this authorized relationship is revealed to conform to the social expectations of the patron-client system. The relationship of foodways to the construction of identity is particularly stark in *Satire* III, where Juvenal uses the *persona* of Umbricius to play devil’s advocate on the proposition of abandoning Rome to the mounting influx of non-Romans that are not being kept in their place:

\[
\text{horum ego non fugiam conchylia? me prior ille}
\text{signabit fultusque toro meliore recumbet,}
\text{advectus Romam quo pruna et cottana vento.}
\text{usque adeo nihil est quod nostra infantia caelum}
\text{hausit Avantini baca nutrita Sabina.}^{141}
\]

141 The sentences ending with 3.83 and 3.85 are typically punctuated as rhetorical questions following that of 3.81, yet the tenor of the speaker ‘Umbricius’ is more consonant with definitive statements of the superior social rank of the Greeks whose purple official clothes he intends to avoid.
Shouldn’t I flee their badges of office? That man will impress his seal before me and recline, propped up on his elbow, at a better couch—him, carried into Rome on the same wind as plums and figs. That is how much nothing it is that my infancy drank in the sky of the Aventine, fed on Sabine olives.

Much as in the case of the discourse on Roman decline that locates the rise of wealth and consequent importation of the vices of the world—luxuria—as a prime threat to the Roman state, Juvenal here figures the social-climbing foreigners as an import product: disposable and fundamentally alien. The air of the Aventine is no less a food for the infant Roman that the locally grown olives; these forms of nourishment grant Umbricius an essential and inalienable claim to Romanitas. Umbricius’ claims to being truly Roman are impeccable, yet the social outcome runs counter to his expectations. The speaker here asserts a fundamental disconnect between essential and achieved identity—or rather between essential identity and achieved status. In the course of an extended demonstration of the erosion of sub-elite citizenship into a species of social disenfranchisement, Juvenal (within the frame of Umbricius’ rant) makes the exposure of the sub-elite man to physical and verbal abuse from a drunken brawler the occasion for the linkage of diet and social standing. The author imagines a scene arising from the chance encounter of a poor client walking home from a dinner with a drunken thug:

\[
\text{stat contra starique iubet. parere necesse est; nam quid agas, cum te furiosus cogat et idem fortior? } \text{“unde venis” exlamat, “cuius aceto,}
\]

142 Cf. the discussion of 6.292-300 in Chapter V for the development of this theme in Juvenal par excellence, 1.140 below for the stance of the authorial persona on the “defilements of luxury” (luxuriae sordes), 4.137 below for the corruption of the Neronian court, 11.22 for the proposal that luxuria is relative to available wealth but that injudicious spending makes old age more to be dreaded than death 11.45. Cf. also Sallust Coniuratio Catalinae 12 for a paradigmatic treatment of the topos of luxury.

143 As in the claims of Galen at the beginning of this chapter, there was a general acceptance of the theory that the climate (airs) of particular regions resulted in people with commensurate physical and moral characteristics.
cuius conche tunes? quis tecum seclile porrum
sutor et elixi vervecis labra comedit?
nil mihi respondes? aut dic aut accipe calcem.
ede ubi consistas: in qua te quaero proseucha?"

He stands against you and commands you to stand. You must obey; because what can you do when a madman forces you and is stronger than you? “Where are you coming from,” he shouts, “on whose sour wine and beans do you swell up? What cobbler ate chopped leeks and boiled ram’s lips with you? No reply for me? Talk or get the boot! Tell where you hole up: in what synagogue do I look for you?”

(3.290-96)

Not only is the sub-elite man not afforded the bodily integrity due to a Roman citizen, but he is explicitly stripped of that status through aspersions on the quality and type of his food. In effect, the hostile interlocutor calls into question the entire complex of social status markers by associating his victim with a single damning culinary habit. It will be crucial to note that this rhetorical practice is consistent with the logic that underpins the probabilistic arguments of the satirist on the mores of his objectified characters.

Finally, the thug accuses the so-called pauper of being Jewish—definitively Other.

The bizarreness, alterity of Jewish food practices had already been alluded to in the opening segment of the poem with reference to the cophinus fenunque supplex (box and hay being their furniture) with which food was kept warm across the Sabbath when it was

144 ‘Juvenal’ similarly marks the beans (conche) as an inferior (lower-class) food at 14.131, where it classed with other leftovers that a miser cannot bear to throw away. Cf. Robert E. Colton, Some Rare Words Used by Martial and Juvenal (The Classical Journal, Vol. 67, No. 1 (1971)) 55-57, for instances of this and other shared usages of rare words in Martial and Juvenal.

145 In the absence of forensic science, many of the arguments employed at a Roman trial would rest on probability and associations: i.e. defendant X is guilty of Y, because the is the sort of person who would do Y, since it is said that he has done Z.

146 Although it is retrojected into the time of the emperor Tiberius, the discussion of an act of expulsion by Tacitus at Ann. 2.85 is illustrative of the prevailing literary discourse on Jewishness and other species of Otherness in the second century, since the author offers no corrective viewpoint to mitigate the tenor of what he reports. Four-thousand freedmen ea superstitione infecta (infected by this superstition) were to be transported to Sardinia to combat brigandage, but if they died in the attempt, vile damnum (cheap loss). The rest were to leave Italy by a fixed day, unless profanos ritus exuisse (they stripped off their profane rituals).
forbidden to cook (i.e. work). The Otherness of the Jews and other non-Romans is thus figured in their foodways, as an element of a broader conception of apparent otherness within the *Satires*.

As in the case of the verbal assignment of a sub-elite *civis Romanus* to the category of the Other, economic violence can compel a Roman to interact with food in a mode counter to the prevailing discourse. In *Satire* VII, the author speaks in the authorial *persona* about the failure of meritocracy within the professions at *Roma*. Juvenal states that the way to know the real rewards offered by the career of the *causidicus* (trial lawyer) would be to compare one hundred of their fortunes with that of an individual charioteer. The utter failure of Roman society to properly compensate intellectual work is figured in the types of food pawned off as payment to the unfortunate *causidicus*:

\[
\text{quod vocis pretium? siccus petasunculus et vas}
\]
\[
\text{pelamydum aut veteres, Maurorum epimenia, bulbi}
\]
\[
\text{aut vinum Tiberi depectum, quinque lagonae,}
\]
\[
\text{si quater egisti. si contigit aureus unus,}
\]
\[
\text{inde cadunt partes ex foedere pragmaticorum.}
\]

What payoff is there for the voice? A dry little pig joint and a pot of sardines or old onions – a month’s ration for the Moors or five jeroboams of wine – brought down the Tiber, if you toiled four times. If an *aureus* comes your way, the shares of the lawyers drop out, according to contract.

---

147 3.13-14. Again, the Jewish shantytown at the sanctuary of Egeria is figured as another pollution of the sacred space, much like that of the marbles that violate (*violarent*) the native tufa (*ingenuum tofum*) 3.18-20. The Roman social order, the *mos maiorum*, faces two threats within the written world of the *Satires*, the external threat of the Other and the internal threat of corruption of the native character of *Roma* itself. The latter is the true danger in that it enables the former while corrupting *Romanitas* itself.

148 Victoria Baines suggests that the mock epic nature of this passage is consonant with a larger effort on the part of the *persona* Umbricius to compare himself to the epic hero Aeneas during his flight from the burning Troy: *Umbricius’ Bellum Ciuile: Juvenal, Satire 3* (Greece & Rome, Second Series, Vol. 50, No. 2 (Oct., 2003), 220-237. There exists, in my view, no contradiction between the detection of epic, self-agrandizing rhetoric on the part of ‘Umbricius’ and the intrusion of social discourses exterior to the heroic simile. It is precisely his inflated sense of self-worth that compels the character to abandon Rome in the face of these mundane insults.

149 Cf. 7.112-14. … *ueram deprendere messem / si libet, hinc centum patrimonia causidicum, / parte alia solum russati pone Lacertae.* (If you want to find out their real harvest, put the fortunes of one hundred *causidici* on this side, and in the other part place just that of Lacerta (Lizard) of the red faction.)
Certainly, the unappealing *siccus patasunculus* and *vas pelamydum* are of no benefit to the social aspirations of our hard-working *causidicus*, but the greater threat to his claim on *Romanitas* is the need to rely on inferior foods as instanced by the *veteres bulbi* which are explicitly figured as *Maurorum epimenia*. The term *epimenia* is a transliteration of the Greek term ἐπιμενία, a compositional choice that strongly colors the term with alternity and further heightens the otherness of attributing this food to the *Mauri*. The *causidicus* is stripped of his Roman status by being given what one might properly give workers for hire from North Africa.

In direct opposition to the meanness of the compensation allotted to *causidici* and other intellectual workers, the elite are written as having no scruple against expenditure of whatever magnitude on their houses—and *essential* amenities. The issue of concern to the authorial *persona*, however, is not the magnitude of the expenditure *per se*; it is the distorted balance of conflicting priorities that is ultimately damning for the elite:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \textit{parte alia longis numidiarum fulta columnis} \\
& \textit{surgat et algentem rapiat cenatio solem.} \\
& \textit{quanticumque domus, veniet qui fercula docte} \\
& \textit{conponit, veniet qui pulmentaria condit.} \\
& \textit{hos inter sumptus sestertia Quintiliano,} \\
& \textit{ut multum, duo sufficient: res nulla minoris} \\
& \textit{constabit patri quam filius. …}
\end{align*}
\]

In another part of the house, propped up on tall columns of Numidian marble, would rise the dining room – so it could also catch the winter sun. However expensive the house, someone to skillfully arrange the plates will come, and someone to perfect the spices. Amid these expenses, two thousand *sesterces* will suffice for Quintilian, as if it were a lot: nothing costs a father less than a son. …
Luxuria had been established as a prime object of moral ire long before Juvenal, yet luxuria per se is hardly the point of this passage. True, the representative dives (rich man) spares no expense in the quest for self-gratification and the performance of status through expenditure, yet this excess is the mere painted backdrop for the morality play under production by the satirist. The profligate expenditure of the elite on decorative refinements and ephemeral consumption underscores the greed with which they withhold the patronage owed to their clients within the near-elite. Again, the rich abundantly fund those who work with their hands, while starving those who work with their minds. The indictment is aimed against the willful disordering of Roman society by the diversion of (legitimate) patronage into (illegitimate) consumption supporting the lower classes – practitioners of the banausic trades.

The debasing potential inherent in association with the lower classes and the Other generally is encompassed in a telling passage from Satire VIII that links the foodways and mores of the lower classes (non-Romans) to foreign debasement along an axis of corruption:

interea, dum lanatas robunque iuvencum
more Numae caedit, Iovis ante altaria iurat
solar Amopam et facies olida ad praesepia pictas.
[155]
sed cum pervigiles placet instaurarre popinas,
obsius adsiduo Syrophoenix udus amomo
currit, Idymaeae Syrophoenix incola portae,
hospitis affectu dominum regemque salutat,
et cum venali Cyane succincta lagona.

[150] Cf. 6.292-93 on saeuior armis / luxuria (luxury more savage than arms), discussed extensively in Chapter V.
[151] ‘Juvenal’ often critiques the excessive enactment of social distinction at the cena, as he does when he claims that he would not trust the word of a person who would willingly endure mistreatment iniquas / Caesar ad menses (at the unequal tables of Caesar, 5.3-5).
[152] This fundamental imbalance is illustrated repeatedly by the author in respect to the distribution of food and other benefits: cf. 7.74-78 for the indictment of the patron who quod donet habet (has what he can give) to a mistress and enough to feed a tame lion, but spares nothing for a poet.
Meanwhile, while he slaughters wool-bearers and a ruddy ox according to the rite of Numa, before the altars of Jupiter he swears only by Epona and icons painted on the stinky walls of a stable. But when its time to start up his all-night snack-bars, a Syrian Jew (wet with persistent cologne) runs right to him, a Syrian Jew – inhabitant of the Idymaean gate – hails him as “master” and “king” with the affection of a host, as does Cyane with hitched up skirt and jug for sale. (8.155-62)

It is the juxtaposition of the elite sacrificial rituals – validated as incontestably Roman by attribution more Numa – with the debasements of the popinae that signify perversion of the supposed nobilitas of the consul, that signify his separation from the Romanitas that should be intrinsic to his nature. The linguistic color of the passage is pronounced and assiduously pursued. The consul frequents the popinae, lower-class eating establishments, no doubt, and debasing ipso facto, but the word itself is a dialectal borrowing from Sabellic (Osco-Umbrian) and is thus marked as lower-class/non-Roman.153 A fragment of Lucilius is telling: infamem ... turpemque odisse popinam (to despise the debased and vile popina). The commentary of Nonius on this fragment further locates the social valence of the word by noting that those called popinones (from the popinae) could as well be termed luxuriosi who handed themselves over to the popinae.154

By placing himself in the popina, the consul brings the foreign into juxtaposition to himself. Thus the Syrian (eastern) Phoenician – as opposed to the more familiar Phoenicians from Carthago – is obvius. The Syrophoenix is drenched in ἀμυμος and

---

154 Nonius 161. (on Lucilius 11W) “Popinones” uel hi quos nos dicimus tabernarios, a popinis, vel luxuriosi qui se popinis dedunt. (“Popina-men,” or the men whom we call “taverna-men,” from food-bars, otherwise known as lovers of luxury who have surrendered themselves to the food-bars.)
lives at a Roman gate re-designated by the author as Idymaean. Juvenal here conflates the *Punci, Iudaei, and the Idymaei* with the effect of amplifying the distrust and hatred of his intended reader for the *Syrophoenix* as representative of the (Eastern) Other. He is too familiar with the holder of sacred Roman office, as is Cyane with her *venali λάγυνος*. The semantics of the Roman social discourse in the *Satires* are based on exclusions and binary categories. The promiscuous intermingling of categories is, in effect, the end of secure creation of meaning through behavior; it is the end of a clear Roman identity. The constellation of un-Roman *mores* centered on the *popina* represents a cardinal threat to the *Romanitas* of the audience. The consul is *luxuriosus* rather than *Romanus*; in the constructed Rome of the author, the categories in consideration are connected by the Boolean operation OR. The staged vehemence of the satirist serves as an indication that the issue is under contest; the authorial *persona* attacks the threat of social contamination implicit in the culture of the *popina*. The lack of a rigid separation between the strata of Roman society engendered a consequent threat to the status of the near-elite, whose social boundaries were uncomfortably permeable from the perspective of the author.

---

155 In the juxtaposition of (*Syro*)phoenix and *amomo* there is also the likelihood that Juvenal is making a humorous reference to Ovid, *Met.* 15.393-94: *Assyrii phoenica vocant; non fruge neque herbis, / sed turris lacrimis et suco vivit amomi.* (The Assyrians call it the phoenix; it does not live on fruit or plants but on the tears of frankincense and the juice of the balsam.) The Syrian Phoenician lives on perfume as well.

156 *Cyane* was the eponymous nymph of a spring near Syracuse: *Ov.* *Fast.* 4.469. It may be that the *venali lagona* is a sexual reference.

157 The binary rhetoric of Juvenal should clearly not be taken as representative of the choices or beliefs of contemporary *Romani*. The food of McDonald’s is generally considered unhealthy and has a distinctly proletarian valence (at least as a dating venue), yet only the fringes of society resort to it (or its like) constantly or never.

158 *Tacitus* (*Ann.* 6.4) provides another point of comparison for the second-century perspective on the culture of the public house: *Haterius invisor fuit quia somno aut libidinosis vigiliis marcidas et ob segnitiam quamvis crudelam principem non metuens inlustribus viris perniciem inter ganeam ac stupra meditabatur* (Haterius was all the more hateful because he was rotten with sloth and with lustful all-nighters and, although not dreading a cruel emperor on account of his idleness, in the midst of the public house and sexual crimes, he was plotting ruin for illustrious men). The opposition between Haterius, located in the public house (*ganeam*), and the illustrious elite men (*inlustribus viris*) is stark.
There is then the question of the appropriate response demanded in the face of this textual Rome. At the conclusion of a massive series of circumstantial *cum* clauses in *Satire I*, Juvenal gives the response of his authorial *persona*—the satirist claims that *indignatio* (the sense of being used contrary to what is worthy, *dignus*) will fashion verse. The interlocutor of *Satire III*, Umbricius, gives another potential response by voting with his feet. Certainly the author is not advocating the abandonment of Rome to the mounting tide of foreigners. On the contrary, in *Satire III* Juvenal once more asserts the perversion of the proper social order through the displacement of native Romans by upstart immigrants, not least within the context of the patron-client system and its ritual manifestations in the *salutatio* and the *cena*. Where the social cohesion of Rome is imperiled by the lack of appropriate respect for the legitimate expectations of Roman *clientes*, the author does not so much call for another succession of the plebs as for the elite to fulfill their appointed roles within the social hierarchy. Umbricius objects that *praestare tributaclientes/cogimuret cultis augere peculia servis* (we clients are compelled to pay out tribute and to augment the savings of sophisticated slaves); it is the world turned upside down. This should not be misconstrued as an assertion that Juvenal was concerned with the intermediate or lower orders of Roman society *per se*; quite the contrary, he was concerned with the behavior of the *patrones* toward their *clientes*. It is repeatedly claimed by the speaker Umbricius within the poem that no action available to himself could possibly remedy the situation; the explicit premise of this argument is that the onus to preserve the correct Roman social order rests entirely on the elite. Note also that in 3.81-85 Umbricius complains that the foreigner seals a document *me prior*, not

---

159 1.79-80 *si natura negat, facit indignatio versusum / qualemcumque potest...* (If my own nature refuses, indignation makes the verse / whatever kind it can.)
simply that a non-Roman serves as a witness.\textsuperscript{160} He objects that the foreign social climber reclines \textit{toro meliore} at the \textit{cena}, not merely that he is at the \textit{cena}. And finally, although the exasperated Umbricius is willing to abandon \textit{Roma in toto}, he remains willing to receive the hospitality of Juvenal in Aquinum, and walk there from Cumae as well to listen to the \textit{Satires} – so long as Juvenal is not embarrassed of them.\textsuperscript{161} What can be seen in this final exchange is the proper relationship between Romans of disparate social standing; Umbricius asks to be invited home by the author – his superior – and offers to listen to his verse in proper form. The message of shared hospitality is shared identity.\textsuperscript{162}

\textbf{The Social Manipulation of Food at the Cena}

Throughout the period of the principate, the \textit{cena} functioned as a central locus for the performance of social status for the Roman elite and near-elites.\textsuperscript{163} The host might practice a highly choreographed enactment of the relative statuses of his guests or opt for an equally constructed play of egalitarianism through his marvelous condescension. Wild expenditure and conspicuous parsimony were equally products and authors of the

\textsuperscript{160} Note also that U. could expect to be asked to seal a document as a witness; he is not as much the \textit{pauper} as his rhetoric suggests. Further, in 3.46-47, U. asserts that \textit{me nemo ministro / fur erit; atque ideo nulli comes exeo tamquam} (no one is going to be a thief with my assistance; and that is exactly why I never set out on a governor’s staff). Persons of no standing did not go out as \textit{comites} to governors.\textsuperscript{161} 3.318-22.

\textsuperscript{161} One should not expect the satirist to acknowledge along with Orwell that “all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others” \textit{Animal Farm} (Chapter X). The common status of \textit{cives Romanus} carries no expectation of absolute equality in the \textit{Satires}, only the expectation of proper respect for the duties of each class.

\textsuperscript{162} M. Foucault, \textit{Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison} (New York, 1979) provides an effective paradigm for the operation of social surveillance at the \textit{cena}. Like the panoptikon, the triclinium was a space of total surveillance, where every action might be registered. In the hands of Juvenal, the genre of satire functions in much this way to make all of Roman life carcerial.
discourses surrounding this social practice. John D’Arms frames the nexus of foodways and social relationships thus:¹⁶⁴

Far from being frivolous or trivial, the food habits of any society are fundamental aspects of culture, and so are socially expressive: they can be guides to social proximity and social distance; to ritual fraternity and to status; to political superiority and subordination. This becomes clear at once, when it is recognized that biological “needs,” in dietary terms, have little to do with what in fact we consume, or the order, the occasions, the social rituals which come to cluster around our consumption of it.

To this formulation, I would add that the discourses that are enmeshed with these practices are not only illustrative, but of vital importance in themselves. Juvenal repeatedly assails the outliers on the fringe of the more profligate end of the dipole of Roman foodways. Whatever the social status of the author may have been, and a precise answer on that question is neither attainable nor meaningful, the implied, ideal Rome that functions as the unstated foil for the written Rome of the *Satires* is portrayed as under assault by the deviation of the elite from the established paradigm of the *mos maiorum*. A discourse on the nature of this paradigm is under contest within the *Satires*, not reality in past, present, or future; it is a discourse on the proper structure of Roman society as instanced in foodways:

*uestibulis abeunt ueteres lassique clientes*
*uotaque deponunt, quamquam longissima cenae*
*spes homini; caulis miseris atque ignis emendus.*
*optima siluarum interea pelagique vorabit*
*rex horum uacuisque toris tantum ipse iacebit.*
*nam de tot pulchris et latis orbibus et tam*
*antiquis una comedunt patrimonia mensa.*

The old and tired clients depart the courtyards and lay aside their prayers, even if a man has the most protracted hope for dinner; cabbage and fire must be bought by the wretches. Meanwhile, their “King” will devour the best of woods and sea,

and he will do it lying just himself on empty couches.  
For from so many beautiful, wide tables—and such old ones  
— they eat up their patrimonies from just one.  

(1.132-38)

In this excerpt from the programmatic Satire I of the first book, the author asserts an ideal formulation of clientela and the cena by drawing everything outside its boundaries in lurid hyperbole.  It is clientes that depart old and tired from the elaborate entryway of their patron, despite having held out hope for a dinner as long as possible.  Much like the complaint from Satire VII that an author might better offer his compositions to the husband of Venus than to expect true patronage from any source other than the princeps, the import of this passage is contained in the contention that the elite have abdicated their traditional role as the patrons of their clientes and amici to their so-called amici.¹⁶⁵

In one word—rex—is encompassed the entirety of the social disorder that drives the creation of Juvenal’s satura; where there is a rex, there can be no cives Romani.

While their patronus devours whatever is best of the woods and the sea, the clientes eke out bare survival.  This is not simply the deployment of a stale topos to emphasize greed; it is this excessive social divide that justifies the appellation rex.  Like an eastern king, the patronus is isolated from his subjects and possesses more than he is able to use, no matter his dedication to gluttony: in sum, everything.¹⁶⁶ Within the literature of the second century, the formal sharing of food was constructed as a primal social interaction, so much so that Suetonius justifies an assertion of Domitian’s savagery thus:

_Erat autem non solum magnae, sed etiam callidae inopinataeque saeuitiae._
 _auctorem summarum pridie quam cruci figeret in cubiculum uocauit, assidere in_  

¹⁶⁵ 7.20-26 and 7.1 _et spes et ratio studiorum in Caesare tantum_ (both the hope and reason of studies are in Caesar alone)  
¹⁶⁶ The constellation of vices surrounding gluttony were all linked through a supposed lack of self-control and frequently included cruelty (_crudelitas_).
toro iuxta coegit, securum hilaremque dimisit, partibus etiam de cena dignatus est.

Yet he was a man of not just huge, but also clever and unexpected savagery. On the day before he affixed his accountant to a cross, he called him into his bedroom, he compelled him to sit down right beside himself on the couch, he sent him away carefree and jolly, and even held him worthy for shares from his dinner. (Dom. 11.1)

The detail of sharing his food with the doomed accountant is reserved for the final rhetorical flourish of a series of images amplified by asyndeton to emphasize the extra mile of gratuitous callousness that substantiates the charge of saevitia against the emperor. Like a corrupt princeps or a rex, the dives avarus has no effective checks on his callous disregard for the wellbeing of his clientes. That they must scrape for a meager dinner while he tests the limits of his gluttony alone is a species of saevitia in the written Rome.

In the triclinium of the dives avarus, the practice of the cena is stripped of its social function. The aboriginal purpose of having so many fine antique tables is lost, since no cena is hosted from them and no amici are able to view them. The reciprocal performative semantics of the patronus and his clientes are nullified. Only the question of their resulting identity is offered by the satirist. Even the baneful Trimalchio, written as an atrociously gauche, nouveau riche freedman by the author of the Satirica, takes pains to perform the role of host as he understands it; certainly no one left entirely unfed from his infamous cena – if they ever succeeded in leaving. Trimalchio may be a boor, yet he is perhaps less culpable in his deviation from the tacit norm than the dives avarus.

---

167 F. Lissarrague, *The Aesthetic of the Greek Banquet: Images of Wine and Ritual* (Princeton, 1990), basing his arguments primarily on pictorial evidence gleaned from Attic pottery, hypothesizes an ostensible social equality constructed by the Greeks of the Classical period centered on an experience of communal consumption of wine focused within a socially delimited “space of the krater.” This practice stands in sharp contrast with the explicit hierarchical practices of the Roman cena.
of Juvenal, as the object of Petronius’ lampoon is twitted for the predictable poor taste of the impostor, while that of Juvenal is subjected to a harsher invective based on a failure to meet the requirements of his station. The violence of the assault on the figure of the *dives aurus* in the *Satires* has the flavor of rhetoric designed to appeal to an interested party, in contrast to Petronius’ ridicule of an inept buffoon by and for the audience of those who were more in the position of hosting such parties than attending them as social inferiors.\(^{168}\)

In the Juvenal passage, the entire *cena* is devoured by one *gula, poena tamen praesens*. It is this solitary *cena* that strips meaning from the social construct and thus Roman identity from the so-called *amici*. The latitude taken by the author in the use of the term *amicus* is significant to his argument.\(^{169}\) The exclusion of these *amici* from a potential share in the *cena* is the source of their *ira*—but why *ira*? If they were the social equals of the glutton, they would have whatever whole boars they might desire. They are *irati* because as *clientes* they have a culturally sanctioned expectation of participation in the dinners of their patron. The consistent viewpoint and sympathy of the author is fixed in the company of these near-elite *Romani*. It is the distortion in the social fabric leading to alienation of near-elite *Romani* that is of recurrent concern to the author, in respect to foodways and other aspects of Roman life. This emphasis may indicate that the intended audience for the poems bracketed the juncture between the elite and the near-elite. The

\(^{168}\) The author of the *Satirica* has the tone of a *bon vivant* critiquing the manner of scratching on a door at the Versailles of Louis XIV.

\(^{169}\) The meaning of exclusion from the house of an *amicus* in term of the *mos maiorum* is given in the voice of the *princeps* Tiberius in *Annales* 6.29: *sed Caesar missis ad senatum litteris disseruit moremuisse maioribus, quoties dirimerent amicitias, interdicere domo eumque finem gratiae ponere* (but Caesar, in a letter sent to the Senate, asserted that it was the custom for the Old-Time Romans, whenever they broke off friendship, to ban someone from their house and put an end to their beneficence.) In the terms given through the *persona* Tiberius, the men excluded from the *cena* are not *amici*. 
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performance of Roman identity at the distorted *cenae* in the *Satires* is figured as a clear and present danger to the *Romanitas* of all involved.

**Conspicuous(ly Un-Roman) Consumption**

Within the ethos of the *Satires*, the refined Roman should have no taste for the pigswill of the *popina* and its associated debasements, but he should just as assiduously avoid a level of sophistication that verged on luxuriousness. The court of Nero was paradigmatic for failing to recognize when that line had been crossed: witness the description of Petronius (*Arbiter*), where – after praise of his effectiveness as governor of Bithynia and later as consul – Tacitus states:

> dein revolutus ad vitia, seu vitiorum imitatione, inter paucos familiarium Neroni adsumptus est, elegantiae arbiter, dum nihil amoenum et molle adfluentia putat, nisi quod Petronius adprobavisset.

Next, having reverted to his vices, or at least through the imitation of vices, he was taken up into the select few of Nero’s confidants as the arbiter of elegance – to the extent that (Nero) considered nothing pleasant and smooth in surfeit, unless what Petronius had approved. (*Annales*, 16.18.2)

The acid pen of Tacitus strips legitimacy from a position of respect and honor within the corrupt court of Nero; the historian rejects the discourse (marked as Neronian) of valuation for the skills of the aesthete and gastronome, a discourse much out of favor in the sanctioned social discourse of the imperial city under the Trajanic administration. The approved social space of the *Annales* is consonant with that of the *Satires*—broadly. A discourse valuing excess is consistently contested within the *Satires*, as when the role of *elegantiae arbiter* is taken up in the court of Domitian by a veteran of the Neronian palace in the face of an emerging culinary crisis:
uitic digna uiro sententia. nouerat ille
luxuriam inperii ueterem noctesque Neronis
iam medias alienque famem, cum pulmo Falerno
arderet. nulli maior fuit usus edendi
tempestate mea: Circeis nata forent an
Lucrinum ad stagnum Rutupinoue edita fundo
ostrea callebat primo deprendere morsu,
et semel aspecti litus dicebat echini.

An opinion worthy of the man won out. He had known
the old luxuria and past-midnights of Nero
and the second hunger, when his chest burned
with Falernian wine. No one in my time had a greater
aptitude for eating: he could proclaim whether oysters
arose from Circeii, at the Lucrine lake or were produced
from the Rutupine depths – at the first bite,
and could state the shore of a sea urchin – seen once.

(4.136-143)

The satirist plays up the ridiculousness of holding a council of state to determine the fate
of an unusually large turbot by substituting the cursus honorum of a gastronome for the
expected cursus of a senior statesman. This advisor had experience contending with
luxuria; he had endured uigilia in service of his imperator – so far into the night that the
fullness of one Neronian cena proved insufficient in the face of constant contention with
Falernan wine. He was, in short, a man without peer in the usus edendi. That it is not an
amateur that gives culinary advice to the caluus Nero is demonstrated beyond contention
by the gustatory acumen of naming the origin of oysters at a single bite and of a sea
urchin at a single glance.¹⁷⁰ In parallel to the logic of the famous passage of the Aeneid
on the artes (skills) of the Roman versus those of the subjugated nations, Juvenal
indelibly marks the gastronome as un-Roman via his excessive knowledge of an ars that

¹⁷⁰ Suetonius notes that Domitian caluitio ita offendebatur, ut in contumeliam suam traheret, si cui alii ioco
uel iurgio objectaretur (D. was so constantly offended by baldness, that he twisted it into contempt for
himself, if it was brought up in jest or insult against someone else) Dom. 18.
had little to do with the performance of *Romanitas*.\textsuperscript{171} The theme of knowing and enacting the appropriate balance between refinement and luxuriousness is central to the satiric discourse on foodways.

In his problematic comparison of excess and simplicity in *Satire XI*, the satirist frames a larger argument on the interconnection of self-control and self-knowledge. Quickly following the reference of the gnomic statement \(\gamma\nu\omega\theta\iota\ \sigma\epsilon\alpha\omega\rho\tau\omicron\nu\), the authorial *persona* is used to enunciate a theory of moral rectitude grounded in an awareness of one’s own proper place within the social fabric:

\[
\text{noscenda est mensura sui spectandaque rebus in summis minimisque, etiam cum piscis emetur, ne mullum cupias, cum sit tibi gobio tantum in loculis. quis enim te deficiente crumina et crescente gula manet exitus, aere paterno ac rebus mersis in uentrem fenoris atque argenti grauis et pecorum agrorumque capacem?}
\]

One’s own measure must be known and kept in sight in the greatest and least matters, even when a fish is being purchased, lest you lust for a mullet, when you just have a gobi in your strongboxes. For what outcome remains when your wallet is failing, while your gullet grows, when the paternal wealth and business affairs are sunk into a gut, even able to accommodate the interest the heavy silver, the herds, and the fields as well? (11.35-41)

The authorial *persona* makes the claim that the proper measure (*mensura*) demands vigilant attention in the greatest and least matters (*summis minimisque*), a statement that is consonant with the operating assumption of the *Satires* that small-scale deviance is indicative of more extensive corruption. The argument of the slippery slope is very much in play within the text. The concern of the author that degenerate change threatens in every action is embodied in the opposition of the phrases *deficiente crumina* (failing

purse) and crescente gula (growing gullet). The social instability threatened by this imbalance in means and appetite elicits the conservative impulses of the satiric genre. Although the hyperbolic phobia of change may be a transparent topos in places, Juvenal nevertheless grounds many of his core arguments on the supposition that what is established is morally preferable to social innovation (res novae). Further, as in this passage, the author posits repeatedly that there exists no limit to the potential for decadence, once the set boundaries of the mos maiorum have been crossed.  

In what might at first appear to be the uncharacteristic choice to illustrate the positive aspects of Romanitas merely as a lampoon of ostentatiously frugal displays of personal dining, Juvenal devotes the entirety of Satire XI to the contrasting of corrupting excesses set in opposition to an idealized cena and a level of consumption that would be uncontrovertibly consonant with Roman virtus. That this idealized cena is a comedic caricature of a smugly pious meal is all to the point, as the global argument of the poem concerns precisely the awareness of how much is enough. It should not be expected that the author, here or anywhere, constrain himself to mere reporting when in pursuit of his rhetorical goals. As with every other form of consumption within the Satires, the use of food is figured as a potential danger to the personal integrity of the Roman. If not retained within the bounds of personal resources and of nature, even the most basic aspects of life have the capacity to nullify crucial claims to Roman identity.

172 ‘Juvenal’ characterized the effect of the father who has promoted his son’s greed in a metaphor of an out-of-control chariot: “(the father) gives him license and drops all the reigns from the chariot, who (if you called him back) does not know how to stop and is snatched away—you held in contempt and the turning posts left behind (dat libertatem et totas effundit habenas / curriculo, quem si reuoces, subsistere nescit / et te contempto rapitur metisque relictis 14.230-32). Cf. also the discussion below of the profligacy of Crispinus in Satire IV (4.15-22).
Disturbance of the Natural Order

The use of food is thus inherently perilous, like sexuality or political power, in that it has the potential to transform the socio-political landscape. For the elite, ready money may provide no check on their habits of consumption or foodie tendencies, yet the body has its own immutable limitations. The argument being put in play by the author is that the natural order itself functions to curtail imbalance. The conclusion of the passage concerning the dives avarus from Satire I cited above is illustrative of this point:

nullus iam parasitus erit. sed quis ferat istas luxuriae sordes? quanta est gula quae sibi totos ponit apros, animal propter convivia natum! poena tamen praezens, cum tu deponis amictus turgidus et crudem pavonem in balnea portas. hinc subitae mortes atque intestata senectus. it nova nec tristis per cunctas fabula cenas; ducitur iratis plaudendum funus amicis.

Soon there will be no parasite. But who could bear your pollutions of luxury? What a gut that lays out for itself entire roast boars, an animal born just for parties! Yet the punishment is already here, when you put aside your clothes and—stuffed to the gills—drag an undigested peacock into the bath. Instant deaths and intestate old age come from that. A fresh and not sad tale makes the rounds of all the dinners; a funeral to be applauded by pissed off friends is conducted.

Poena tamen praezens indeed. The written Roman body may be able to endure wounds and sleepless nights on watch, but an undigested peacock can be deadly. Subitae mortes are the result of such egregious transgression of the natural order, largely coterminous with the mos maiorum as written by Juvenal. Like the boar born for the sake of dinner

J. D. Morgan, “Juvenal 1.142-44.” The Classical Quarterly 38.1 (1988): 264-65 argues against the stroke favored by Courtney (1980) ad loc. cit. and rather attributes the sudden death of the gourmand to a heart attack induced by a combination of the heat, alcohol, and elevated heart rate due to digestion and notes that “two millinia after decadent Romans accidentally found a novel way of killing themselves, it was rediscovered by decadent Americans” in the form of the “hot tub.”
parties (*propter convivia natum*), the Roman social status is stripped of its proper meaning when it is separated from appropriate performance in a communal space. The opposition of line 144 defines the ultimate peril of the failure to conform to established *mores*: instant death of the body (*subitae mortes*) coupled with the interruption of his family line, nullification of his identity (*intestata senectus*). With no one to carry on the name and no loyal friends to perpetuate his memory, the *dives avarus* faces the prospect of complete dissolution. The *dives avarus* is thus a failed Roman in every particular.

This topos of greedy excess and sudden death in the baths echoes the scenario of a passage from *Satire III* of Persius, but more importantly, it echoes the concern that the inability to control the appetites may lead to the loss of identity and the consequent replacement of *real* Romans by the throngs on newcomers:

*turgidus hic epulis atque albo uentre lauat, guttura sulfureas lente exhalante mefites. sed tremor inter uina subit calidumque trientem excuit e manibus, dentes crepuere retecti, uncta cadunt laxis tunc pulmentaria labris. hinc tuba, candelae, tandemque beatulus alto conpositus lecto crassisque lutatus amomis in portam rigidas calces extendit. at illum hesterni capite induto subi Quirites.*

Stretched tight from feasts and with a white belly, he bathes, as his gullet exhales sulfurous fumes. But a spasm comes amid the wine bottles and strikes the warm toddy from his hands, his bared teeth grind, then condiments drop from his slack lips, next the trumpets, the candles, and finally the lucky little guy arranged on a tall bier – bathed in rich balsam ointments stretches his stiff heels toward the door. But yesterday’s Romans with covered heads bear him up.
The adjective *turgidus* is employed in both passages to indicate the strain of excess on the body of the gourmand. At line 319 of his *Annales*, Ennius uses the verbal form of the same root to describe the swelling of the Cyclops’ stomach with human flesh: *Cyclopis uenter uelut olim turserat alte carnibus humanis distentus* (just like the gut of the Cyclops had once swelled and deeply distended with human flesh). When applied to the body, the connotation is that of deformation or sickness. The use of this charged term is designed to underscore the charge that this behavior is bestial, not in accord with *Romanitas*. In either moral *exemplum*, the body cannot support the deviant *mores* of the elite Roman, who is then carried out in funeral procession by those who are not his peers. The warning is especially sharp and overt in Persius, who equates the death of the corrupted Roman to his replacement by *hesterni Quirites*. The same theme of social extinction runs through the passage of Juvenal discussed above. In either case, it is the abdication of their place in the *natural* order of the *mos maiorum* that is in itself death, the ultimate alienation from their desired Identity.

In *Book V* of his *Satires*, Juvenal again considers the crucial role of foodways in creating the distinctions on which meaning is based. The Identity of the eater is nullified, where the perversion of the natural relations among human beings is figured in the most unnatural food conceivable to the satirist. Through the authorial *persona*, the author relates with dramatized moral disgust a tale of a *uolgi scelus et cunctis grauiora coturnis* (crime of the mob and things more grievous than all the tragedies) in *Satire XV*, where rivalry between cities in upper Egypt leads to a rage-driven cannibalism:

---

174 In his *Sermones* 1.10.36-37, Horace applies the same adjective to a an inferior poet: *turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque / diffingit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo* (While a bloated Alpine [poet] garrets Memon and while / he fouls the head of the Rhine with mud, I play with these things). The adjective is not common; Horace and Persius uses it only once, while Juvenal otherwise uses it only at 2.141 to describe a female dealer in arcane drugs.
labitur hinc quidam nimia formidine cursum
praecipitans capiturque. ast illum in plurima sectum
frusta et particulas, ut multis mortuos unus
sufficeret, totum corrosis ossibus edit
victrix turba, nec ardentis decoxit aeno
aut veribus, longum usque adeo tardumque putavit
expectere focos, contenta cadavere crudo.

Next, due to excessive terror, someone slipped their run
headlong and was captured. And indeed the victorious mob
ate the man entire—cut up from the gnawed bones into many bits
and chunks—so that one dead guy was enough for so many,
nor did they cook him up in bronze or on
spits, they thought that waiting for ovens was so very long
and even delayed, that the mob was content with a raw cadaver.

(15.77-83)

The authorial persona does not specify which town attacked the other on the occasion in
question; that fact would be irrelevant to his thesis. Within the written world of the
satirist, the *ira* of long-established rivalry coupled with a bitterly-fought mêlée is enough
to override whatever social constraints non-Romans might have. The many individuals
within the crowd are depersonalized and collected under the appellation *victrix turba*
(victorious mob). Each of the civilized modes of cooking that might serve as some
vestige of human foodways or as an ameliorating factor in their perversion of their own
humanity is disclaimed by the accusing satirist; the crown has not bothered to cook their
victim in a bronze cauldron or on spits (*nec ardentis decoxit aeno / aut ueribus*) and have
even gnawed his bones (*corrosis ossibus*) like animal as they ate every scrap, content
with a raw corpse (*contenta cadauere crudo*).

Through these literary conceits, the author strips the enraged Egyptians of their
humanity, and their savage cannibalism is figured as contrary to *Natura*—monstrous:

*nec poenam sceleri inuenies nec digna parabis
supplicia his populis, in quorum mente pares sunt
et similis ira atque fames. mollissima corda*
You will neither find a penalty nor prepare punishments appropriate for these peoples, in whose mind wrath and hunger are equivalent and similar. Nature, who gave (us) tears, confesses that she gave the human race the most gentle heart; this is the best part of our awareness.

In this passage is the explicit equation of *Natura* and a social characteristic (*mollissima corda*) particular to the human race (*humano generi*). In the dismissal of the basic humanity of alien peoples by the authorial *persona* is detectable the logic that would later be articulated as the “white man’s burden” in the period of European colonialism. The fellow-feeling that ultimately underlies the *cosmopolis* of the Stoics is here claimed by the satirist as the *sine qua non* of humanity. As in the other passages discussed above, the author here relies on the acceptance of the assumption that observable foodways reliably correlate to unobservable character as a symptom does to its disease.

The potential distortion of Roman foodways is thus figured as a symptom of a graver disease of the social order.\(^{175}\) The author repeatedly accesses this rhetorical equation to mark the targets of his invective as diseased. One of the more graphic images supplied in the *Satires* is that of the client Naevolus working his trade against the natural passage of food through the body of his patron:

\[
an \text{ facile et pronum est agere intra viscera penem legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae?}
\]

Or then is it free and easy to thrust my regulation-sized cock inside your guts, and even to assail yesterday’s dinner there?

\(^{175}\) Suetonius makes similar use of unnatural foods in his depiction of the emperor Gaius as a prodigy of immorality; the author follows a section concerning the emperor’s sexual deviance with an indictment of his fiscal irresponsibility, including his invention of *portentosissima genera ciborum atque cenarum* (the most ill-omened types of foods and dinners, *Gaius* 37.)
While the author, in the persona of Naevolus, decries the parsimony of the mollis auarus, who does not wish to pay out for his disease (morbo donare, 9.49), that distortion of Juvenal’s construct of elite masculinity is figured in the inversion of the progression of food through the elite body. The confusion of orifices and what is normally found therein is given by A. Richlin as an instance of a larger complex of category-errors linked to the use of food in the invective of Catullus. In the passage above, the mis-categorization of excrement as “yesterday’s dinner” (hesternae … cenae) when it is encountered by Naevolus’ penis is an indication of the pervasive deviance under discussion. The dissonance of the language and the action described is underscored by the rhetorical question of whether it is easy to invert the natural progression of the alimentary canal with one’s penis. By locating this invective in the persona of Naevolus, the author insinuates that the patron does not know the proper use of his money any more than he knows the sanctioned use of his rectum. The broad outline of this theme was explored in Satire III in a section of the complaints of Umbricius, where the impeded progress of food through the body is again a metaphor for the distorted natural order of Roman society:

plurimus hic aeger moritur uigilando (sed ipsum languorem peperit cibus imperfectus et haeren ardenti stomacho); nam quae meritoria somnum admittunt? magnis opibus dormitur in Urbe. inde caput morbi. ...

Many ill people die here due to sleeplessness (but food that is undigested and sticking to their burning stomachs initiated

176 Amy Richlin, Systems of Food Imagery in Catullus (The Classical World, Vol. 8, No. 5, Aesthetic Patterning in Catullus: Textual Structures, Systems of Imagery and Book Arrangements, 1988 355-363) 360, gives an effective breakdown of the misuse of food within the invective of Catullus. The extremes of foodways-related invective reached by the authorial persona of Juvenal arguably all fall well within the gamut established by ‘Catullus’ or those applicable to ‘Martial.’
Disorder within the social fabric is here manifested directly in the bodies of the sub-elite as disease. Those with the resources are able to sidestep whatever detriments life in the City may present, but their *clientes* are prostrate to the vicissitudes of *Fortuna*—the indigestion-inducing rumble of carts or a stray roof tile on the head. Lack of control over their environment is condensed into lack of control over the body; in a disordered Rome, nourishment itself kills, just as the diseased social order destroys identity.\(^{177}\) In each of the arguments deployed by the author, it is the disordered distribution or use of wealth that enables this distortion of the natural order of society and of the body. That these arguments are advanced in the context of a threat to abandon Rome or a complaint about the tight-fistedness of a pathic patron in no way vitiates their rhetorical force as assertions of a putative norm, since it is of no utility—even for a deviant—to found arguments except on some aspect of shared belief and practice. Even a *causidicus* pleading a losing case before the jury should be expected to have employed arguments founded on a more universal paradigm of the manner of proof. While embedded in the *persona* of an Umbricius or a Naevolus, it is the argument of the satirist that Roman society fails to function properly due to the selfish tendencies of the elite. In their abdication of their proper role as patrons and paragons, the satirist argues that the wealthy constitute an existential threat to the system of social meaning encoded in the use of food.

\(^{177}\) E. Gowers (1993): 120-21 reads this confusion of categories illustrated in foodways as linked with the “generic form” of satire, and she asserts that “the kind of food that is prominent in satire tends to blur the distinction between men and animals, or between food and the inedible: bulging stuffed entrails in the place of real guts, dubious stews with human-looking limbs in them, rotten or excremental messes, which are exhibited to us as disgusting or morally objectionable symptoms of the society to which they belong.”
Contamination and Poison

The employment of foods in the performance of elite status can be articulated along an axis of expense or of access, but it may also be interrogated by the speaker along an axis of purity. The ingestion of foods may also constitute an opportunity for the subversion of eating into an act of contamination or of complete nullification, that is, murder. In either instance, the identities of both the agent and the sufferer of the intentional transgression are altered. Within the frame established for moral contagion, the author locates a corollary discourse on the ultimate subversion of authorized foodways—the use of poison.\(^{178}\) As with contamination, poisoning is a willful moral act that demands circumspection on the part of those wishing to retain their identity, and the use of poison has moral ramifications beyond simply those associated with murder. The use of poison is a means to illegitimate wealth and to the social capital intrinsic to those resources. As such, poison functions within the *Satires* as a sign for elemental danger to the ideal social order that is the unexpressed opposite of the satirist’s illustrated collection of vice. The author is interested in ironic juxtapositions that amplify the dissonance of the objects of his comparison. When a matron wishes to be rid of an inconvenient husband, fine Calenan wine is the vehicle for the needful toad poison:

\[
\text{occurrit matrona potens, quae molle Calenum}
\]
\[
\text{porrectura uiro miscet sitiente rubetam}
\]
\[
\text{instituitque rudes melior Lucusta propinquas}
\]
\[
\text{per famam et populum nigros efferre maritos.}
\]
\[
\text{aude aliquid breuibus Gyaris et carcere dignum,}
\]
\[
\text{si uis esse aliquid. probitas laudatur et alget;}
\]

A powerful matron runs into you, a woman who mixed toad into the...
smooth Calenan wine she was about to offer her thirsty husband, and she—a better Locusta—instigated her uneducated neighbors to parade blackened husbands through the notoriety and the populace. Dare something worthy of tiny Gyara and the prison, if you want to be anything. Uprightness is praised and freezes.

(1.69-74)

The infamous poisoner Locusta is accused by Tacitus of serving as a tool of a corrupted imperial succession in the hands of Agrippina and of Nero. The historian emphasizes the criminal enormity of tampering with the succession in the potential ramifications of a person such as Nero attaining that station. Juvenal employs this context to excoriate the character of his *matrona potens*. Locusta imperiled the stability of the imperial succession, with all the dangers particular to that situation. The poisoning matron, however, is argued to pose an even graver threat to society because she teaches her neighbors to do the same. This matron represents an instance of the mange-ridden pig that has gotten into the herd and threatens to make the sickness universal. Her actions are done in public, and in complete disregard for her reputation (*famam*). The satirist figures the aversive power of a negative repute as the social glue that prevents the complete collapse of Roman society. This matron teaches her audience to be immune to invective and thus to be outside of any social control.

The authorial *persona* returns to this theme of the murderous wife and her toad-derived poison at the end of *Satire VI*, where the satirist makes the broad assertion that female poisoners of mythical ferocity are to be found in every neighborhood:

---

179 Tacitus Ann. 12.66 and 13.15. In the first instance of an imperial need for poison, Locusta is called an “artisan of such things” (*artifex talium*) and said to have already been “convicted on a charge of poisoning” (*veneficii damnata*), when a “poison was prepared by the genius of this woman” (*eius mulieris ingenio paratum virus*). In the second citation, she is employed like a tool when there is a need to do away with Britannicus. Nero “commands that poison be made ready” (*pararique venenum iubet*) and the tribune of the Praetorian cohort, who has charge of the prisoner Locusta, sees that it is done by the woman “famous for many crimes” (*multa scelerum fama*).

180 Suetonius represents poison as a tool of corrupt statecraft by the emperor as well, cf. Gaius 49.
occurrent multae tibi Belides atque Eriphylae mane, Clytemestram nullus non uicus habebit. hoc tantum refert, quod Tyndaris illa bipennem insulsam et fatuam dextra laeuaque tenebat; at nunc res agitur tenui pulmone rubetae, sed tamen et ferro, si praegustarit Atrides Pontica ter uicti cautas medicamina regis.

A lot of Danaids and Eriphyles run into you in the morning, there will be no neighborhood without a Clytemnestra. Just this one thing makes a difference, the fact that the daughter of Tyndareus held a tasteless and insipid double-bitted ax in her right and her left; but now business gets done with the subtle lung of a toad, but still even with steel, if her wary Atrides has eaten the Pontic medicines of the thrice conquered king ahead of time.

(6.655-61)

‘Juvenal’ asserts that there is only one distinction (hoc tantum refert) between the classes of mythical and modern murderesses: subtlety. This passage portrays the war of the sexes in hyperbolic terms as move and countermove, with poison and antidote. If the operation becomes too troublesome, however, there is always the option of recourse to open murder. The author’s use of the terms ‘tasteless’ (insulsam) and ‘insipid’ (fatuam), borrowed from the discourse on literary composition, to describe the axes of the mythical Clytemnestra focalizes the discussion with the subtle contemporary murderess and marks her as a member of the literary elite rather than as a simple thug. Her poisoning is poetic. The description of her target as Agamemnon (Atrides) coupled with his further association with Mithradates (ter uicti ... regis) also locates the concerns of the satirist within the upper classes.  

181 In the context of a discussion of the danger posed to fathers by their impatient sons in Satire XIV, ‘Juvenal’ again cites Mithradates as an exemplar of wariness and asserts that “One must have the drug, which both a father and a king must eat before a meal” (medicamen habendum est, / sorbere ante cibum quod debeat et pater et rex 14.252-55). Perversion of their fathers’ food allows these sons to circumvent the proper sequence of social roles to become sui iuris.
This concern is made explicit by the authorial persona of Satire X, where the safety of poverty is contrasted with the all-too-often justified worries that accompany wealth. The desire for wealth is figured as an overriding concern of many, to the extent that its possession makes the holder a target:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{prima fere uota et cunctis notissima templis} \\
\text{diuitiae, crescent ut opes, ut maxima toto} \\
\text{nostra sit arca foro. sed nulla aconita bibuntur} \\
\text{fictilibus; tunc illa time cum pocula sumes} \\
\text{gemmae et lato Setinum ardebit in auro.}
\end{align*}
\]

Pretty much the first vows (and the most familiar) in our temples are for wealth, that our resources would grow, that our strongbox would be the biggest in the entire Forum. Yet no aconite gets drunk from clay cups; fear that when you lift jeweled cups and the Setian wine gleams in the broad gold.

\((10.23-27)\)

As with the passage above from Satire VI, the threat of poison within food and drink is figured as a concern of the elite.\(^{182}\) The satirist constructs poison as a tool of elite social competition. In Satire IX, however, the persona Naevolus indicates that this tool could be employed against obstacles to the murderer’s status, who fell outside of the elite. At the culmination of a list of the ways that a vengeful pathic might take murderous revenge for the betrayal of his secret, ‘Naevolus’ illustrates the ease of securing poison through the metaphor of the grain dole:

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots \text{numquam cara est annona ueneni.} \\
\ldots \text{The harvest-price of poison is never expensive.}
\end{align*}
\]

\((9.100)\)

---

\(^{182}\) The association of aconite with the assassination of wealthy relatives for the inheritance is used by the satirist in Satire I as well, concerning the man “who therefore gave aconite to three uncles” (qui dedit ergo \textit{tribus patruis aconita} 1.158). Cf. also the reported use of aconite by the emperor Nero against his relatives, similarly in the interest of personal gain (8.219).
While the extended connotation of *annona* is typically given as the ‘price’ of some commodity or the ‘grain price’ specifically, the literal meaning of *annona* is the ‘yearly grain harvest.’ The relative abundance or scarcity of that harvest would determine the market price, and thus the *annona* is figuratively the price of that commodity.

In this passage, the author employs several layers of word-play to emphasize the corrupting effects of poison on his written society. First, ‘Naevolus’ alludes to the organic nature of available poisons, by figuring *venenum* as a crop produced in bulk. Like other forms of organic produce, poisons belong to the category of the edible and thus constitute a form of food.¹⁸³ Second, *venenum* is marked as apposite to the lower classes, since the *annona* is of most immediate concern to those social strata. Third, poison is treated as a staple crop of the Roman empire, rather than as a scarce luxury like truffles or mullet; it is prodigiously common, so much so that it, unlike grain, is never in short supply.¹⁸⁴ Fourth, through its association with the semantic space of *annona*, *venenum* is colored with a political complexity as a source of illegitimate power and as a grave threat to public order. The *annona* was famously a bone of contention in the Republican period as a means to political power, and it is cited by Tacitus as a tool through which Octavian Caesar made himself the first Augustus.¹⁸⁵ As with a demagogic politician, the poisoner seizes what is not hers and imperils social order through an attack on the operation of hierarchical wealth.

¹⁸³ A. Richlin (1988): 362 gives a useful tabular paradigm for the use and abuse of foodstuffs. She posits that for the literary discourse a broad central area of normative foodways was constructed that trailed off into the dysfunctional misuse of foods on either extreme: gourmandise and excess on one side and hunger and poison on the other.
¹⁸⁴ In *Satire XIII*, the author collocates the “seller of poison” (*mercatoremque ueneni* 13.154) with a number of serious but common crimes.
¹⁸⁵ *Ann. 1.2 ubi militem donis, populum annona, cunctos dulcedine otii pellexit*, (when he seduced the soldiery with donatives, the populace with the *annona*, and everyone with the sweetness of leisure). Tiberius had to quell the restive populace by fixing the price of grain, *Ann. 2.87.*
As vile as the assassination through poison is depicted by the satirist, there is a form of poisoning (*ueneficium*) still more to be feared. The employment of drugs, whether deadly or debilitating, is the art of witchcraft—*ueneficium* as well. ‘Juvenal’ makes light of Agrippina’s use of a poisoned mushroom against Claudius in comparison to the devastation produced by Caesonia’s employment of the *hippomanes* potion against the emperor Gaius (6.615-25). The satirist proposes that outright murder by poison is better than the induction of madness by *una uenefica* (one witch). This juxtaposition is set up by the discussion of the use of witchcraft against husbands:

\[
\text{hic magicos adfert cantus, hic Thessala vendit philtra, quibus valeat mentem uexare mariti et solea pulsare natis. ...}
\]

One bears incantations, another sells Thassalian potions, with which she is able to muddle the mind of her husband and beat his ass with a shoe. …

(6.610-12)

The husband is thus deprived of his proper Identity through a chemically induced derangement that nullifies his ability to defend his bodily integrity. The husband is reduced to a state like that depicted at 10.232-39, where the satirist asserts that *omni / membrorum damno maior dementia* (dementia greater than any loss of limbs) robs the old man of the ability to recognize the *nomina seruorum* (names of the slaves), the *uoltum... amici* (face of a friend) with whom he dined the night before, or even the right of the sons *quos genuit, quos eduxit* (which he bore and raised) to their inheritance. In short, dementia nullifies his ability to function as a Roman, just as does *veneficium*.

As has been discussed above, Juvenal deploys contamination and poisoning repeatedly as an existential threat to the stability and proper function of normative Roman society. With the exception of an undigested peacock, no other depraved use of food in
the *Satires* is represented as so instantly fatal to the continuity of the *status quo*. More than an omnipresent danger to the good Roman, or at any rate the wealthy Roman, poison threatens to nullify the system of meaning on which *Romanitas* is founded, as does the peril of physical contamination by the morally polluted. If the complex of familial wealth and inheritance is unable to be secured, then the social order ceases to function in Juvenal’s textual Rome.

**A Moral Topography of Dining**

Beyond the use or abuse of food within Roman social discourses of dining and patronage, the author of the *Satires* repeatedly deploys particular foods as a shorthand for the indisputably alien element penetrating the walls of the City. As carriers of moral contagion from the external world, these commodities are made to represent a sublimated fear of the permeability of social boundaries. All of the concerns delineated above remain salient in these exploitations of foodways to demarcate space. One of the favorite targets of the satirist’s invective is the courtier Crispinus, who is said to have purchased a fish for six-thousand *sestertii* (4.15). The authorial *persona* offers up the use of the fish as a gift in the hopes of securing an inheritance, but then dismisses this already base objective with one the satirist proposes to be even more damning:

```
nil tale expectes: emit sibi. multa uidemus
quae miser et frugi non fecit Apicius. hoc tu
succinctus patria quondam, Crispine, papyro?
hoc pretio squamae? potuit fortasse minoris
piscator quam piscis emi; prouincia tanti
uendit agros, sed maiores Apulia uendit.
```

Don’t expect anything like that: he bought it for himself. We see many things, which the grave and miserly Apicius didn’t do. You, Crispinus —once garbed in your ancestral papyrus—did this?
This price for scales? Just as likely, the fisherman could have been bought for less than the fish; for that much, the Province sells off fields, but Apulia sells things bigger than that.

The gourmand Apicius, notorious for his expenditure on delicacies, is used as a foil to display the degree to which Crispinus has transgressed any normative bounds with his purchase, so much so that Apicius could ironically be termed grave and miserly (*miser et frugi*). That such a transgression has been dared by a person who was once categorically alien dressed in ancestral papyrus (*patria papyro*) again is intended to argue that this genre of expenditure is characteristic of anything except *Romanitas*. That such a transaction is even possible is figured as an indication of the distortion of the Roman socio-economic system, especially by the recently arrived and unassimilated. Fields, which represent the honest acquisition of income through farming, are said to be of less value than a single meal for the foreign gourmand. This depiction of social inversion frames the discourse for the passage that follows, where the satirist completes his hierarchy of culinary excess by imagining what the emperor’s habits must have been at the time of such a prodigy of profligacy:

*qualis tunc epulas ipsum gluttisse putamus induperatorem, cum tot sestertia, partem exiguum et modicae sumptam de margine cenae, purpureus magni ructarit scurra Palati, iam princeps equitum, magna qui uoce solebat uendere municipes fracta de merce siluros?*

What sort of banquets do we suppose the emperor himself gluttonized, when the purple dandy with a great palate burped up so many *sestertii*, and that a tiny fraction taken from the edge of a moderate dinner. Now he is first of the knights, a man who in a loud voice used to sell his fellow-citizens river-fish from broken cargo.
It is the juxtaposition of the final two lines that has been in preparation throughout the entire passage. The debased Egyptian trafficker in second-rate merchandise has somehow become the most important of the knights (*princeps equitum*). A man who once hawked inferior fish, which the satirist characterizes as the fellow-citizens (*munificipes*) of Crispinus, now is the consumer of the most exalted grade of fish available. The extremity of the contrast between the foreign Crispinus and his utterly Roman status as *princeps equitum* is underscored by the use of the Latinized Greek loan-word σιλουρος to denote his fellow-countrymen. Inferior imported foods are here made the explicit symbols of the immigrant himself, yet unlike those goods, Crispinus and the class of foreign social climbers that he represents are cast as nothing more than debased imports that have somehow gone for vastly more than their market value. The fellow-citizen river-fish (*munificipes ... siluros*) represent the baseline of value that should, in the argument of ‘Juvenal,’ still apply to Crispinus himself as an imported commodity of intrinsically limited worth.

The expectations of social inversion laid out in the previous passage are rapidly exploited in the description of the movement of an Adriatic turbot into the imperial presence. While Senators are excluded from an audience, a prodigious fish usurps the lines of protocol and becomes an object of the courtiers’ competition in flattery of the imperial person:

    *exclusi spectant admissa obsonia patres.*
    *itur ad Atriden. tum Picens 'accipe' dixit*
    *'priuatis maiora focis. genialis agatur iste dies. propera stomachum laxare sagina et tua seruatum consume in saecula rhombum,*

---

186 The author similarly links the nationality of foods to the local inhabitants by figuring Cretan foods as *munificipes* of Jupiter at 14.271. This instance of a verbal shorthand is indicative of a pattern of thought whereby the moral value of commodities was linked to their cultural origins.
ipse capi uoluit.’... 

The shut-out Conscript Fathers watch the admitted main course. An approach is made to Atreides. Then Picens said, “Accept things too great for common hearths. May today be celebrated as your birthday. Rush to stretch your stomach with over-indulgence and consume a turbot saved until your own reign, he wanted to get caught.” …

(4.64-69)

The novelty of employing the Latinized Greek loan-word οὐσίων (what is eaten with bread) is in profound opposition to the formal and somewhat archaic term for the Senators immediately following it: patres. The food, thus tagged as alien, is allowed into the inner chambers of the emperor, while those with intrinsic right to that space are excluded in its favor. The emperor is marked as himself compromised with foreignness by his acceptance of the οὐσίων and by the speaker’s use of the Greek pseudonym Atriden. Hubris and over-indulgence are thus collocated in the gustatory corruption of the imperial court, which is further segregated from normative Roman life by the assertion that the fish is too large for private hearths (priuatis maiora focis). There may be in this aside and the use Atriden in the previous line an allusion to criticism of Domitian over use of the imperial title Dominus et Deus, which imposed a categorical boundary between the ruler and the ruled and encroaches on the semantic field of rex.187 The emperor is exhorted to stretch out (laxare) his stomach with indulgence (sagina) rather than to stretch out his lines of troops. The play on the alternate use of the verb laxare is likely intended to again deflate the mock-epic tone of the council of state convened to respond to the crisis of the prodigious fish rather than some imminent war, as would more befit an emperor.

As instanced in this parody of the imperial court, the dereliction of the proper duties of a member of the elite in the face of some impetus toward a diseased relationship with food is a recurrent theme in the *Satires*. It is posited that such a moral flaw is inconsonant with the demands imposed by the complex of virtues required of a member of the Roman elite:

*indulge ueniam pueris: Lateranus ad illos thermarum calices inscriptaque lintea uadit maturus bello Armeniae Syriaeque tuendis annibus bello et Rheno atque Histro. [praestare Neronem securum ualet haec aetas.] mitte Ostia, Caesar, mitte, sed in magna legatum quaere popina: inuenies aliquo cum percussore iacentem, permixtum nautis et furibus ac fugitiuis, inter carnifices et fabros sandapilarum et resupinati cessantia tympana galli. aequa ibi libertas, communia pocula, lectus non alius cuquam, nec mensa remotor ulii.*

Grant pardon to youths: Lateranus rushed to the cups of the baths and the inscribed curtains a man ready for the war of Armenia and Syria and for the rivers that have to be guarded (both the Rhine and the lower Danube). [This age was strong enough to keep Nero secure.] Send your representative to Ostia, Caesar, send him, but look for him in a big diner: you will find him lying there with some murderer, mixed up with the sailors and thieves and runaway slaves, among the torturers and the makers of cheap sedans and the idle drums of a castrated priest of Cybele, flat on his back. There is equal license there, shared mugs, a couch held in reserve for no one, and a table not too removed from anyone.

(8.167-78)

The drinks on offer at the bathing establishments are doubly marked as foreign by the choice of the terms *thermarum* from θερμά (rather than *balnea*) and *calices* from κύλιξ (rather than *pocula*). This implied cultural movement from the alien periphery toward the center is employed by the satirist as a foil for the sanctioned movement of the moral youth out toward the periphery of the empire as a soldier. Lateranus consumes the
foreign rather than taking the place he is ready for as a contributor to the security of the wider Roman culture. Lateranus does not serve his proper function, but must be sought out in a degraded diner (popina) that is characterized as a debased space through a collection of reprehensible persons. The representative (legatum) of the emperor reclines as an equal with a murderer and is intermixed with an assortment of dubious persons, among whom lies a castrated priest of Cybele (resupinati ... galli) as an explicit marker of non-Roman status. This scene of degraded dining is further marked as contaminating by the emphasis on the total lack of social stratification among the customers. Rather than an instance of the ideal cena, this tableau represents the height of the potential danger of corrupted foodways, as the legatus of Caesar can have no legitimate amicitia with the debased customers of the popina. Somewhat earlier in the poem, ‘Juvenal’ asserts that ditch-diggers (and thus other members of the general populus) prefer the food of the popina to the diet of the antique senatorial order:

haec olim nostri iam luxuriosa senatus
cena fuit. Curius paruo quae legerat horto
ipse focis breuibus ponebat holuscula, quae nunc
squalidus in magna fastidit conpede fossor,
qui meminit calidae sapiat quid uolua popinae.

These were once even the luxurious dinner of our Senate. Curius himself placed the vegetables, which he had gathered from his little garden, on his small hearth, (food) which now a filthy ditch-digger in a big shackle feels revulsion for, a (slave) who remembers what the covering of the hot popina tasted.

(11.77-81)

This promiscuous mode of eating represents the polar opposite of the highly regimented experience of the elite cena in the venue of the triclinium, where each position at the couches was hierarchically coded based on proximity to the host and even the quality of the available view. Cf. Plutarch Moralia 619.b-f for the hierarchical arrangement of guests at a cena. For an excellent discussion of the Roman ideal of convivial equality and the complications of that ideal, see D’Arms, John (1990). The Roman Convivium and Equality. In O. Murray (Ed.), Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposium (pp. 308-320), Oxford: Claredon Press.
The author, in this equation of a luxurious dinner of the ancient Senate with a meal unacceptable to the lowest order of slave, deploys the motif of moral decline certainly, yet the starkness of the contrast is tempered by the expectation set up in 11.21-23 that expenditure qualifies as *luxuria* based on the relative wealth of the persons in question.\(^\text{189}\)

Questionable persons, represented by the slave in this passage, are marked by their aversion to the restrained culinary habits of those with a solid claim on *Romanitas*, while the *popina* and other associated spaces like the brothel are concurrently marked by their association with debased groups of marginal Romans and foreigners. The corrupted space of the *popina* is one within which the nominal identity of the legate is consequently nullified by his choice and manner of associations.

In contrast to this intentionally disturbing image of the collective shadow of Roman dining enacted at the *popina*, the satirist offers an illustration of the (hypothetical) normative baseline from which he measures the myriad forms of Roman deviance. The authorial *persona* describes what sort of slaves will attend at his idealized *cena*:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{plebeios calices et paucis assibus emptos} & \quad 145 \\
\text{porriget incultus puer atque a frigore tutus,} & \\
\text{non Phryx aut Lycius [non a mangone petitus} & \\
\text{quisquam erit et magn's]: cum posces, posce Latine.} & \\
\text{idem habitus cunctis, tonsi rectique capilli} & \\
\text{atque hodie tantum propter contiuia pexi.} & \\
\text{pastoris duri hic filius, ille bubulci.} & 150
\end{align*}
\]

Plebeian cups bought with a few *asses*, offers an uncultured boy—and one protected from the cold, not a Phrygian or a Lycian [there will not be anyone sought from a slave-dealer at great expense]: when you ask for something, ask in Latin.

\(^{189}\) ‘Juvenal’ accesses this dichotomy of ancient (Roman) versus modern (debased) employments of the same materials in the image of the representative Virro, who *ut multi, gemmas ad pocula transfert / a digitis* (like many, transfers his gems from his fingers to his cups), whereas Aeneas would have placed them *in uaginae fronte* (on the face of his scabbard, 5.43-45). The author deploys a similar *topos* at 11.93-109, where it is asserted that the ancient Romans would break up *magnorum artificum … pocula* (cups of great artists) in order to decorate their horses and that they ate *Tusco farrata catino* (mush from a Tuscan bowl) because silver was reserved for their weapons.
They all have the same outfit, trimmed and straight hair,
And only combed today on account of the dinner party.
One is the son of a hard shepherd, and the other of an ox-herd.

(11.145-51)

The forms of the author’s usual criticism of sumptuous practices can be detected in the inverse model of this passage. Cheap, common cups replace morally suspect goblets of gold and gems. The slave boys are de-sexualized by being well-covered (a frigore tutus), simply dressed (idem habitus cunctis), and short haired (tonsi rectique capilli). Rather than being foreign luxuries acquired from a slave-dealer at great cost, these slave-boys are native-bred sons of rough herdsmen (pastoris duri hic filius, ille bubulci). These unadulterated, native slave-boys contrast with the supercilious, foreign slaves of the bad host in Satire V:

*flos Asiae ante ipsum, pretio maiore paratus
quam fuit et Tulli census pugnacis et Anci
et, ne te teneam, Romanorum omnia regum
friuola. quod cum ita sit, tu Gaetulum Gymnedem
respice, cum sities. nescit tot milibus emptus
pauperibus miscere puer, sed forma, sed aetas
digna supercilio. quando ad te peruenit ille?
quando rogatus adest calidae gelidaeque minister?
quippe indignatur ueteri parere clienti
quodque aliquid poscas et quod se stante recumbas.*

(5.56-65)
As in the previous passage, the luxury slave is characterized as deriving from the province of Asia (*flos Asiae*) and acquired for a higher price (*pretio maiore paratus*) than the wealth of the legendary kings of Rome. ‘Juvenal’ critiques slaves who are indignant to serve a client at table while the slave stands: that is, he critiques masters who allow their slaves to display this attitude. The ideal of the satirist is highly regimented, but not exclusionary, towards clients. The arrogance of the costly imported slave, however, is matched by that of the host, who segregates every aspect of the dinner along lines of status. The presence of the foreign slaves is only one of a constellation of luxury goods reserved for the master, including a mullet from Corsica or Tauromena (5.92-93).\(^{190}\) This opposition of textual signs for the dichotomy of the alien and the native is underscored by the command for the satirist’s guests to make requests in Latin, when they ask for something (*cum posces, posce Latine*). These Latin-speaking slave-boys thus are made to represent the complex of foodways that are coded as indisputably coherent with Roman Identity.

That the proposed dinner of the satirist serves as a foil for the stereotyped extremes of culinary depravity instanced elsewhere in his poems is all to the point. As I have argued in earlier chapters, the author reveals the terms of the relevant discourses, rather than a definitive codex of acceptable Roman behavior in the second century. Within the *Satires* themselves, however, the rhetorical position assumed by the author on

\(^{190}\) Among the more blatant examples of this *topos* is the comparison of the fine apples reserved *Virro sibi et reliquis Virronibus* (by Virro for himself and the other Virros) which are located in mythical and distant space, *qualia perpetus Phaeacum autumnus habebat* (the sort that the eternal autumn of the Phaeacians has) or *subrepta sororibus Afris* (snatched from the African sisters, i.e. the apples of the Hesperides), while the ill-favored guest is afforded the *scabie...mali* (disease of an apple) that a trained monkey *in aggere rodit* (gnaws on the Embankment, 5.149-55). Eating food from such a compromised space is loaded by ‘Juvenal’ with the defiling, and indeed dehumanizing, association of frequenting the most debased segments of the City. I would also suggest that the characterization of the monkey as *metuensque flagelli* (fearing the whip) is directed at the clients as a slur on their status as real Romans.
what constitutes normative *Romanitas* is consistent across his sundry *personae*. The confusion of native foodways by ever-increasing importation of the alien is one aspect of the larger concern of the author in the compromising of spatial boundaries due to the progressive effects of cultural exchange; the broader implications of this issue within the *Satires* will be examined in the following chapter.

**Conclusions**

Purchasing power (whether derived from disposable income, the squandering of one’s *patrimonium*, or the accrual of unsupportable debt) enabled the performance of Roman Identity through foodways. Money was the limiting factor in this highly contested discourse, in which the great majority of Romans would have lacked the simple option of degrading themselves to the extremes proposed by the author. For the majority of the potential audience for the *Satires*, the exhortations and negative *exempla* marshaled by the author against the abuse of food and the ritual of eating are of comparable utility to an admonition to not fly off into the heavens. In no way, however, is this observation tantamount to stating that the *Satires* were mere lurid caricature of elite *mores*, tabloid verse devoid of rhetorical payload. True, the author chooses *exempla* of deviance beyond the probable habits, if not even the fiscal realities, of his audience, yet the point is not what is eaten but whether it is excessive, not how elaborate the *cena* is but how it is conducted, not the particulars of one’s diet but whether they are congruent with the *mos maiorum* – whether they are compatible with *Romanitas*.

With the limitations of precise scale thus removed, the rhetoric of the *Satires* is applicable to the whole of its audience, and there should consequently be little
expectation that the written *Roma* of Juvenal holds any consistent lines of connection to the historical practices of the ancient Romans. There is no reason to assume that serving an entire roast boar for a dinner alone was ever rampant in *Roma* or elsewhere. Descriptions of the activities of the ultra-rich and imperially connected need be little more than urban legends or believable fabrications, yet the discourse itself and the assumptions on which it was predicated are recoverable and of significant utility for the study of historical Roman foodways and *mores*. Fiscal responsibility, personal health, social appropriateness, and the proper interactions between the orders; these are the terms of the discourse on food within which Juvenal sets his vetted *Romanitas*. In the negative space around his *exempla*, Juvenal delineates a construction of *Romanitas* through foodways accessible to the near-elite (and the elite). This construct stood in stark contrast to the competing discourse of conspicuous consumption and social display that is apparently integral to the human condition. To inveigh against *luxuria*, in this instance manifest in foodways, is to provide a way of avoiding the humiliation of inferiority. Inability directs its invective against what it claims to be lack of restraint. This denigration of excess can be read as a subterfuge to elide the inability to engage with a discourse predicated on excess. At issue for the satirist is the social entitlement of the near-elite to their place at the *cena*, while the potential for upward social movement on the part of outsiders is figured as a danger to the established *status quo*. The author seeks

---

191 The human (animal) drive for dominance has been expressed in differential material terms from the beginning of detectable material culture. For a synthetic study of the role of craft specialization in state formation, cf. J. Clark and W. Parry (1990) “Craft Specialization and Cultural Complexity.” Research in Economic Anthropology 12: 289-346. The authors suggest that the patronizing of specialized craftsmen by the elite was a significant means to the creation of rank and social prestige.
to create a totalizing discourse that defines Roman status in terms of refinement, ethical purity, and self-control rather than in terms of access to wealth.\footnote{192}

Again, it must be noted that there is a fundamental disconnect between the rhetorical construction of \textit{Romanitas} in the \textit{Satires} and the operation of status in historical \textit{Roma}. Just as the marriage and ethics laws promoted by Augustus envisioned a society that did not exist or come to exist due to their provisions, the internal discourses of the \textit{Satires} should not be taken as directly reflective of the real. The rhetoric of moderation and self-control of the \textit{Satires}, however, is consonant with the ethos of the Trajanic and Hadrianic principates, during which Juvenal was active. The historiographer Tacitus places an aside in his authorial \textit{persona} concerning the deviant foodways of the past:

\begin{quote}
\textit{luxusque mensae a fine Actiaci belli ad ea arma quis Servius Galba rerum adeptus est per annos centum profusis sumptibus exerciti paulatim exolevere. causas eius mutationis quaeerere libet. dites olim familiae nobilium aut claritudine insignes studio magnificentiæ prolabebantur.}
\end{quote}

Luxuries of the table, practiced with squandered expenses through the one hundred years from the end of the Actium war to those battles by which Servius Galba got control of affairs, little by little got old. There is value in probing the causes of this transformation. Families of the nobility once rich or distinguished in reputation fell into ruin due to a passion for magnificence.\footnote{193}

\begin{quote}
\textit{(Ann. 3.55)}
\end{quote}

The explicit claim of the author is that culinary excess has no place in the normative \textit{mores} of his time. Tacitus repeatedly deploys the misuse of food as a sign of moral depravity, a symptom of a wider disease.\footnote{193} This \textit{topos} is also widely employed by
Suetonius, who paints his imperial characters with a broad brush. What is of importance is less the particulars of the historical or other narrative in question, than the shared assumption that the corruption that was detectable within the person’s relationship with foodways was symptomatic of more generalized moral deviancy. In this manner, a wider reading of the intertextual literature of the second century reveals a master discourse on the interconnection of foodways and mores in the literature of Juvenal’s time. While this literature might be casually categorized as broadly Post-Augustan, I would suggest that some alternative nomenclature, perhaps something on the order of ‘adoptive imperial literature,’ would much more accurately reflect the nexus of the political and literary discourses within the appropriate Zeitgeist. Fixed in this larger frame, the global rhetorical stance of the Satires is internally consistent. The second century was a period of profound reanalysis of the Roman socio-political world. Even the coinage of this period was replete with invocations of cardinal virtues: liberalitas, tranquilitas, aequitas, pietas and many others. It is consequently to be expected that the associated literature reflected a certain concern for a secure linkage of action to meaning. As perhaps the most public and ubiquitous performance of Romanitas, the use of food was a practice utterly exposed to the scrutiny of satire, and, as was the case for many other modes of social competition, at variance with the ideal of the aureum medium. It is at the juncture of practice and ideology that a contested space is opened, where significance is undetermined and the satirist may attempt to assign meaning by the targeting of his invective. Taken from this perspective, the rhetorical content of the Satires concerning foodways and Roman identity does not require an apologetic

health by remedies lighter than the lusts with which it blazes 3.54). Cf. also above the characterization of Haterius as possessed of a constellation of deviance (Ann. 6.4).

194 Cf. Suetonius Claud. 33, Ner. 51, Vit. 13.
explication as something beyond the pale of its literary milieu. The author makes use of a style and emphasis appropriate to his genre, while the argument rests on broadly shared axioms of social correctness. As has been explored in earlier chapters, across the five books of the *Satires* the core principle under contest in Juvenal’s discussions of foodways is the nature of *Romanitas*. 
Chapter V:
Negotiating a Gendered Rome

cum tener uxorem ducat spado, Meuia Tuscum
figat aprum et nuda teneat uenabula mamma,
patricios omnis opibus cum prouocet unus
quo tondente grauis iuueni mihi barba sonabat,
cum pars Niliacae plebis, cum uerna Canopi
Crispinus Tyrias uermo reuocante lacernas
uentilet aestiuum digitis sudantibus aurum
nec sufferre queat maioris pondera gemmae,
dificile est saturam non scribere. ...

When a soft eunuch takes a wife, and Mevia transfixes
a Tuscan boar and holds hunting spears with a breast bare,
when that one, the one who while he shaved my beard rasped
when I was a youth, when that piece of Nilotic scum, when that home-born
slave of the Canopus Crispinus challenges all the patricians in resources,
when he airs summertime gold on sweaty fingers
while his shoulder sustains Tyrian purple cloaks,
and he would not be able to endue the weight of a larger gem,
then it is difficult to not write satire. ...

Juvenal, 1.22-30

Introduction

The force of this assertion is certainly programmatic, but the underlying logic is
not to be discounted from analysis for that reason. Given that social disorder written
broadly is given as the reason for the composition of satire by ‘Juvenal,’ it is telling that
the satirist leads off his recitation of the provocations that impel his verse with a matched
pair of gender deviations. What possible use could a eunuch have for a wife? Due to his
altered nature, the eunuch is unable to participate in the normative life course of the Roman male *par excellence*: the *paterfamilias*. Similarly, Mevia, as a representative of women generally, serves as an icon of the woman that is not a woman. Her performance of the definitively masculine act of killing a boar is sharply dissonant to her implied licit function within the *familia*. Either instance represents the potential for social categories to be nullified through the actions of deviant members of a class or by liminal individuals. That the author follows this opposed pair with an extended attack on a former slave whose riches rival those of the patricians is telling. Crispinus represents a case of social malfunction and category confusion coherent with that of the eunuch or the Roman Amazon; the author nowhere implies that any of these three outcomes is the expected or most common outcome of the respective situations. Most eunuchs remained unmarried, most women did not hunt boars, and certainly most slaves never rivaled any patrician in wealth. What then is the satirist’s point is citing these exemplars of vice as incitements for his composition? Each of these occurrences is a local symptom of broader social malfunction. The existence of each outlier is symptomatic of a broad shift presumed to have taken place sometime after the virtuous past, whenever that is located.

Each instance of moral contagion is a potential vector for the infection of a social system prone to collapse in its fundamental nature; ‘Juvenal’ operates based on the assumption that the Roman social order is subject to an inherent principle of entropy. What is the theoretical model of gender that underpins the arguments of the satirist? Despite the occasional allusion to a better past grounded in the *mos maiorum*, the author returns constantly to the hypothesis that *Romanitas* requires the diligent agency of each potential Roman. This diligence is particularly necessary in the face of the deletory
influences of the gender deviance of the range of persons excoriated by the satirist. Gender is conceptualized in the *Satires* as an unstable product of deportment, dress, taste, and—by no means most importantly—sexuality. As such, gender becomes a paradigm for the dissection of the gamut of depraved *mores*, and ‘Juvenal’ deploys this *topos* as a tool for revealing the hidden interior morality of the objects of his verse.

**Moral Contamination**

Moral depravity is figured by ‘Juvenal’ as a material contamination or disease agent that lingers on the skin and on all that it might touch. This essence of corruption, as written in the *Satires*, is baneful and indelible. While discussing the deleterious effects of hypocritical *cinaedi* on public *mores*, the authorial *persona* of *Satire II* posits a moral contagion so virulent that it might easily pass through an entire population like a plague:

\[
\ldots dedit hanc contagio labem \\
et dabit in plures, sicut grex totus in agris \\
unius scabie cadit et porrigine porci \\
uaque conspecta liuorem ducit ab uua. \\
\]

\[
\ldots \text{Contact handed over this disease,} \\
\text{and it will give it to more, just like an entire herd in the fields} \\
\text{falls dead by the itch and the mange of an individual boar,} \\
\text{and as one grape takes blight from another it has seen.} \\
\]

80

(2.78-81)

The logic of either agricultural metaphor is that the diseased individual demands removal from the group before the pathogen can sweep through every individual. The theory of the transmission of moral disease extends even to the mere sight of deviance.\(^{195}\) The author ties this disease model of immorality to the sexuality of the philosophical *cinaedi*

---

\(^{195}\) A similar theory of moral contagion underlies the discussion of observant learning of vices in *Satire XIV*: cf. 14.31-37. The authorial *persona* links the corrupting force of domestic *exempla* of vices (*vitiorum exempla domestica*) to the dictates of Nature (*sic natura iubet* 14.31-32).
(Socraticos cinaedos 2.10) with the use of the sexual connotation of the pathological itch (seabie).\textsuperscript{196} This conception of contamination is then mapped across the interconnected constellation of vices, where conviction on one count functions as an argument of probability to argue for conviction on those counts that remain.

This literal connotation of contagion is similarly instanced in Satire VI, where the satirist juxtaposes an unattainable ideal with the likely contamination of the majority of women. On one side is placed a prodigy of a wife that demands maximal worship at the temple of the goddess of marriage, while on the other is set the girl unfit to touch the fillets of Ceres and whose father fears her kisses:

\textit{delicias hominis! Tarpeium limen adora
pronus et auratam Iunoni caede iuuencam,}
\textit{si tibi contigerit capitis matrona pudici.}
\textit{paucae adeo Cereris uittas contingere dignae,}
\textit{quarum non timeat pater oscula}....

O the follies of a man! Worship the Tarpeian threshold, face on the ground, and sacrifice a gilded heifer to Juno, if a woman of chaste head falls to you. Few women are even worthy to touch the fillets of Ceres, the kind of women whose kisses a father would not fear.

The putative level of moral right required to touch the fillets of Ceres apparently constituted a level of chastity (pudor) somewhat less than that outline in the previous line (capitis matrona pudici), whereas the third level of female purity proposed in line 51 represents something closer to the lower extremity of feminine morality. The kisses (oscula) that the father fears are explicitly marked as pertaining to the mouth by the choice of oscula over the more abstract option: basia.\textsuperscript{197} By this compositional choice,

\textsuperscript{196} For the sexual meaning of an itch, cf. Catullus 16.9 and 88.2, Priapea 26.4. Juvenal employs the same meaning at 11.163.
\textsuperscript{197} Cf. E. Courtney (1980), \textit{ad loc. cit.}
the author underscores the physicality of the potential contamination of the daughter’s mouth. The emphasis on the materiality of the contamination is a crucial component of the operation of contamination in the *Satires*.

This conception of contamination lingering on the surface of the abused mouth is recapitulated in the references to drinking vessels tainted with use by a morally compromised individual. The Oxford Fragment of *Satire VI* contains a passage of particular relevance to the question of moral contamination occurring through the sharing of food. The authorial *persona* directs the harshest possible invective against the deleterious effects of allowing *cinaedi* to hold a place within the household:198

\[
in quacumque domo uiuit luditque professus obscenum, tremula promittit et omnia dextra, inuenies omnis turpes similesque cinaedis. \\
his violare cibos sacraeque adsistere mensae permittunt, et uasa iubent frangenda lauari \\
cum colocyntha bibit uel cum barbata chelidon. \]

5

In whatever home at all lives and plays a male who has admitted himself obscene, he has promised everything with a tremulous right hand, you will find everyone foul and just like a faggot. (Wives) allow them to violate the foods and to stand by the sacred table, and they command vessels that ought to be shattered to be washed, when Cucumber has drunk or when bearded-lady Chelidon does.

(6.O.1-6)

What is this lawless attack on the food that the wife allows them to enact? The male who has admitted his depravity (*professus / obscenum*) menaces the food with a form of violence (*uiolare cibos*), whereby his characteristics as a *cinaedus* are readily transferable to the food even by the sight of himself standing near the sacred table (*sacraeque adsistere mensae*). As with the diseased pig or the blighted grape mentioned above, the *cinaedus* can destroy what is healthy through his mere presence, and his touch can render

---

198 Cf. also 5.128-29 where the selfish patron Virro is supposed by the authorial *persona* to view the lips of a poor man as similarly contaminating.
objects indelibly contaminated to the extent that they should properly be destroyed (*frangenda*) rather than washed (*lauari*). Just as the vessels ought to be shattered (*uasa ... frangenda*), the purity of the house itself is threatened by the wife’s refusal to draw appropriate categorical boundaries as the passage continues:

```
purior ergo tuis laribus meliorque lanista,
in cuius numero longe migrare iubet
psyllus ab eupholio. quid quod nec retia turpi
iunguntur tunicae, nec cella ponit eadem
munimenta umeri pulsatamque arma tridentem
qui nudus pugnare solet? pars ultima ludi
accipit has animas aliusque in carcere nervos.
shed tibi communem calicem facit uxor et illis
cum quibus Albanum Surrentinumque recuset
flaua ruinosi lupa degustare sepulchri.
```

Purer and better than your sacred home-gods is a gladiator-trainer, in whose troop the bare-skinned is commanded to move it far from the well-covered. What about the fact that nets are neither joined to the vile tunic, nor does the one who is accustomed to fight naked put the built-up arms of the shoulder and the struck trident in the same cell? The very last section of the school accepts these lives, and the other (accepts) fetters in the jail. But your wife makes the cup ‘share and share alike’ for you and them, with whom a blond whore of a dilapidated tomb would refuse to taste Alban and Surrentine (wine).

(6.O.7-16)

Between the husband and the *cinaedi*, ‘Juvenal’ posits a natural antagonism, which is figured in the distinctions between different types of gladiators. Although some problems remain unresolved in the text, it is clear that the author intends to point out that even a contemptible *lanista* takes care to segregate his gladiators based on some hierarchy of moral value. The ironic force of this illustration is that a *lanista* is capable of making fine distinctions between persons who are all *infames*, while the wife is unable (unwilling, actually) to make the obvious division between a confessed *cinaedus* and her own husband. In allowing the *cinaedi* to roam freely within their house, the wife has
allowed the entire house—represented metonymically by the household gods (laribus)—to become polluted; the vessels as well as the food and drink that they contain are all contaminated by the moral depravity of the cinaedi. In sum, the Romanitas of the husband is nullified by the moral laxity of his wife. By way of contrast, even when presented with fine wine, a common whore (lupa) is unwilling to so much as taste (degustare) food with the cinaedi, demonstrating how much superior is the discernment—and consequent morality—of the whore than that of the wife. Contamination of the act of eating and drinking thus represents the potential nullification of Roman identity, in no small part because it is symptomatic of a lack of moral discernment.

Gender Inversion

In a gendered world system, any action that does not fall unambiguously within the sphere of one’s proper gender is made suspect in the Satires. As has been seen in the logic of the satirist’s arguments on other modes of deviance, a slight element of observable deviance is taken as indicative of the entire complex of associated moral flaws. Within a speech assigned to a female interlocutor, Laronia, incensed by the hypocrisy of a cinaedus inveighing on sexual morality, the satirist embeds the argument that the number of women that transgress their gender is far smaller than that of effeminate men:

magna inter molles concordia. non erit ullum exemplum in nostro tam detestabile sexo.
Tedia non lambit Cluuiam nec Flora Catullam: Hispo subit iuuenes et morbo pallet utroque. numquid nos agimus causas, ciuilia iura nouimus aut ullo strepitu fora uestra mouemus?
There is a great unanimity among pathics. There will not be any example of such a detestable thing in our sex. Tedia does not lick Cluuia and neither does Flora lick Catulla: Hispo gets under young men and palls due to both diseases. Do we plead cases at all, do we know the civil statues, or do we move your Fora with any clatter? Few women wrestle, few eat the high-protein diet. (2.47-53)

Laronia denies the existence of female counterparts to the molles, at least as regards the precise Parallel to the oral sexuality of the pathic men. It could be objected that such transgressive women are precisely the sort frequently depicted within the arguments of the authorial persona; however, a woman who kept to the ambit of her gender as constructed by ‘Juvenal’ would be of no interest to the satirist, just as a similarly normative man would be of no use within the rhetoric of the Satires. Certainly, the system of neat dichotomies within the text had a limited correspondence to the daily practice of the swarming masses of the Roman city, yet I would argue that these dichotomies closely map the conceptual framework of the society of Rome in the author’s time. Rather than the precise outline of male and female gender, the Satires preserve the form of the discourse on gender, and that discourse was fixed to the idea of gender inversion. Simply put, transgressive behavior was a doppelganger of the appropriate behavior of the opposite gender:

uos lanam trahitis calathisque peracta refertis
uelera, uos tenui praegnanantem stamine fusum
Penelope melius, leuius torquetis Arachne,
horrida quale facit residens in codice paelex.
notum est cur solo tabulas inpleuerit Hister
liberto, dederit uius us cur multa puellae.

You draw out the wool and bear back the worked fleeces by the basket, you twist the spindle pregnant with fine thread better than Penelope and more lightly than Arachne, the sort that a unkempt mistress makes sitting on a stump. It is well-known why Hister filled the notebooks with his Freedman alone, and why he gave much to his girl-wife while he was alive. The woman who sleeps third in a big bed will be rich.

The female interlocutor balances her denial of the prevalence of female gender inversion with the charge that the Socratic *cinaedi* practice the hyper-feminine and archaic task of spinning wool better than even the Homeric paragon of the good wife (Penelope) and the girl able to best the goddess of craft (Arachne). It is significant that the skill of the *cinaedi* becomes a crucial part of the indictment against them; it is indicative of the depth of their supposed depravity that they are able to attain to a skill that would put nearly all women to shame. The interlocutor then returns the discussion to the question of hypocrisy, asserting that Hister paid off his wife to allow him to live the lifestyle of a *cinaedus* in private. The underlying assumption is that all that would be needed to live of covert life of deviance would be the bought collusion of one’s wife. The remainder of the satire is replete with images of gender inversion, which serve as indictment and proof of the moral depravity of their objects. The phrase *more sinistro* of 2.87 gives an effective summation of the *topos*.

---

200 Cf. also 2.99-109, where ‘Juvenal’ juxtaposes the incongruity of Otho’s effeminacy with his role as a general with the better generalship of actual women: Semiramis and Cleopatra VII. Otho represents a hyperbolic case of gender inversion, in that he is said to have indulged in stereotypically female vices that neither actual woman permitted herself.

201 Juvenal references the desire to keep gender deviance hidden on other occasions, notably at 9.70-89, for the sake of the legal prerogatives of a parent or otherwise. Much as for screen actors of previous decades such as Rock Hudson, and perhaps still, it is likely that the choice to live openly as what the Romans would have termed a *cinaedus* would have entailed social disabilities far beyond the question of inheritance. With the discourse turned so violently against even the hint of gender deviance, it may well not have been practical for a member of the elite to embrace the identity of the *cinaedus* publicly.
Beyond the complicity of the paid off wife, the covert cinaedus required the services of a number of enablers to have any hope of keeping rumors to a minimum. In *Satire IX*, the disgruntled Naevolus berates his patron from the ingratitude of taking so many of his sexual services without adequate recompense. Beyond servicing the desires of the patron himself, Naevolus claims to have saved the marriage by bedding the wife and siring children to be passed off as those of his patron:

nullum ergo meritum est, ingrate ac perfide, nullum quod tibi filiolus uel filia nascitur ex me? tollis enim et libris actorum spargere gaudes argumenta uiri. foribus suspende coronas: 85
iam pater es, dedimus quod famae opponere possis.
iura parentis habes, propter me scriberis heres,
legatum omne capis nec non et dulce caducum.

Has nothing therefore been earned, ungrateful and perfidious man, is it nothing that a little son and daughter were born for you from me? For you are rearing them and you delight to spread these arguments of your manhood in the books of events. Hang crowns on your doors: 85 now you are a parent, we gave you what you can set against the gossip. You have the rights of a parent and will be written as an heir because of me, you take every legacy and sometimes an accidental bequest as well.

(9.82-88)

In sum, the pathetic patron is entirely beholden to Naevolus for his capacity to function as an unimpaired member of Roman society. Beyond removing the obviously detrimental inability to inherit, Naevolus claims to have provided a defense against the gossip (famae) directed at his patron. In order to have any hope of functioning within the strictures of Roman society, the authorial persona argues that concessions must be made to the assiduous audience prepared to identify the signs of a covert deviance. ‘Juvenal’ imputes even to the actual cinaedus a desire to avoid fama.
The Performance of Gender

If gender is conceded to be a construct imminently vulnerable to dissolution, it becomes all the more vital to maintain the integrity of one’s performance across all venues, especially in the sphere of public action. In order to attain Romanitas per one’s gender, it becomes necessary to take active steps to communicate a conformity with the gender expectations of the audience. In the context of legal practice, ‘Juvenal’ assails the incongruity of attacking feminine proclivities while outfitted in dubiously masculine dress; that the scene takes place in the masculine space of the legal court intensifies the cognitive dissonance:

... sed quid
non facient alii, cum tu multicia sumas,
Cretice, et hanc uestem populo mirante perores
in Proculas et Pollittas? est moecha Fabulla;
damnetur, si uis, etiam Carfinia: tales
non sumet damnata togam. 'sed Iulius ardet,
aestuo.' nudus agas: minus est insania turpis.
en habitum quo te leges ac iura ferentem
uulneribus crudis populus modo uictor et illud
montanum positis audiret uulgus aratris.
quid non proclames, in corpore iudicis ista
si uideas? quaero an deceant multicia testem.
acer et indomitus libertatisque magister,
Cretice, perluces. ... 

But what
will others not do, Creticus, when you put on sheer garments,
and inveigh against Proculas and Pollitas as the populace marvels at this outfit? Fabulla is an adulteress;
let her be condemned, if you like, and Carfinia as well: the condemned woman will not put on such a toga. ‘But July blazes, I’m sweltering.’ You should do it naked: insanity is less vile. Behold the get up in which the populace recently victorious with fresh wounds and that mountain throng with their plows laid aside listens to you conveying the laws and the rights.
What would you not cry out, if you saw such things on the body of a judge? I question whether sheer garments are appropriate for a witness. Creticus, you sharp and untamed teacher of liberty,
Here the authorial persona returns to the favorite theme of hypocrisy, in this instance centered on the question of the sartorial presentation of an orator. The interlocutor Creticus is termed a *magister libertatis* for his zeal in prosecuting the sexual deviance of Roman women, here represented by the mythographic reference to Proculla and Pollita. The satirist mocks the appeal to discomfort as a reason to resort to such clothing in the heat of July; dress is a moral question, not one of expediency, for the authorial persona. Even a woman condemned to wear a toga, like a prostitute due to her sexual deviance, would not choose to wear fabric of the type favored by Creticus. Hyperbole, certainly, but the point is clear.

The satirist is concerned to note that Creticus himself would object to a judge making the same fashion choices, with the implication that the orator is quite aware of the potential for the *multicia* to be read as a sign of deviance. Yet for the satirist, the most crucial aspect of Creticus’ deviance is the effect on the general populace of seeing a member of the elite so comporting himself. The metaphor of the single sick pig infecting the herd discussed above immediately follows this passage. Irrespective of his private morality, however suspect, Creticus fails as a Roman due to his toxic effect on the *populus/uulgus*. It is not sufficient to be Roman in one’s private *mores*, one must act Roman on the stage of public life. Further, the discontinuity between the appearance and the actuality of deviance tends to be resolved in favor of the latter:

```
foedius hoc aliquid quandoque audebis amictu; 85
nemo repente fuit turpissimus. accipient te
paulatim qui longa domi redimicula sumunt
frontibus et toto posuere monilia collo
atque bonam tenerae placant abdomine porcae
```
et magno cratere deam.

Some time or other you will dare something more vile than this outfit; no one becomes utterly vile at an instant. Men will welcome you little by little, men who wear long fillets at home on their foreheads and place necklaces on their entire necks and placate the Good Goddess with the belly of a young female pig and with a large crater (of wine).

(2.82-87)

In this aside, ‘Juvenal’ demonstrates the conceptual link between appearance and essence that underlies the logic of gender performance within the Satires. Incongruity is occasionally conceded to be possible within the Satires, but it is represented as a phenomenon both rare and temporary. This point is crucial. For all but a vanishing remnant of cases, the authorial persona argues his moral assertions from the position that observable behavior is inextricable from the essential character of the person in question. Thus the multicia of Creticus that is gendered as too transgressively feminine for even a woman condemned to wear the toga of a prostitute is figured as appropriate for a class of persons situated even further from proper Roman masculinity along the gender axis: men who worship the women’s goddess. In time, the lesser corruption that would allow Creticus to choose the expediency of comfort over his duty to set the proper example, will, in the logic of the satirist, result in the complete collapse of the orator’s moral fabric. Again, mores are figured as subject to an innate entropy that may be exacerbated by a lack of attention to proper social conventions.

The authorial persona examines the opposite side of this discourse in the case of posturing cinaedi, who put on the surface appearance of hyper-masculine Romans to obscure their proclivities. Again, the satirist concedes a potential disconnect between appearance and essence; it should be noted, however, that the social view of the satirist is
decidedly pessimistic in its global expectations of virtue. ‘Juvenal’ is importantly less willing to have confidence in the appearance of virtue than that of vice:

\[ \text{frontis nulla fides; quis enim non uicus abundat} \\
\text{tristibus obscenis? castigas turpia, cum sis} \\
\text{inter Socraticos notissima fossa cinaedos?} \]

\[ \text{hispida membra quidem et durae per bracchia saetae} \\
\text{promittunt atrocem animum, sed podice leui} \\
\text{caeduntur tumidae medico ridente marisceae.} \\
\text{rarus sermo illis et magna libido tacendi} \\
\text{atque supercilio breuior coma. ...} \]

Appearance has no trustworthiness; for what neighborhood does not overflow with grim perverts? Do you castigate vile acts, although you are the most notorious hole among the Socratic faggots? 10

Hairy limbs and indeed stiff bristles throughout your arms guarantee a fierce soul, but swollen hemorrhoids are cut from your smooth asshole while the doctor laughs. They have infrequent speech and a vast libido for keeping quiet and hair shorter than their eyebrows.

(2.8-14)

Some aspects of the performed gender of the Socratic *cinaedi* may be attributed to a premeditated desire to deceive their audience, as for example their grim countenance or affectation of being taciturn, while even adventitious characteristics like hairy limbs or long eyebrows retain an element of volition, in that they are pointedly not trimmed. The respectable *persona* enacted by the *cinaedi* is not, for all their efforts, an impenetrable mask. The effects of their lifestyle are written on their bodies to be read by anyone in a position to read them, as is the laughing doctor. In short, the *cinaedi* attempt to lie with their actions and their bodies. The satirist contrasts this mode of life with that of the man living openly as a *cinaedus*:

\[ \text{... uerius ergo} \\
\text{et magis ingenue Peribomius; hunc ego fatis} \\
\text{inpto, qui uultu morbum incessuque fatetur.} \\
\text{horum simplicitas miserabilis, his furor ipse} \\
\text{dat ueniam; sed petiores, qui talia uerbis} \]

170
Herculis inuadunt et de uirtute locuti
clunem agitant. ...

... That is why Peribromius
(acts) more truthfully and more like a free man; I impute this fellow
to the Fates, the man who confesses his disease with his face and his walk.
Their lack of duplicity is to be pitied, the madness itself gives
them pardon; but worse are those men who attack such things
with the words of Hercules and once they have spoken about virtue
shake their ass. ...

(2.14-21)

The choice of this Peribromius to display his morbum (disease) without an effort at
subterfuge is cast as a more moral choice than that of the Socratic cinaedi, to the extent
that the satirist is willing to concede that this simplicitas is miserabilis (to be pitied). The
crucial distinction between the two classes of cinaedi is their level of agency in their
performance of gender. Without that calculated act of the covert cinaedi, the gender
performance of Peribromius can be excused along three lines of argument: that it is due
to the Fates, that it is a disease, or that it is a form of madness. As with the choice of
the orator Creticus to wear inappropriate fabric discussed above, the question here is the
moral value of agency in the performance of gender, not the moral value of gender or
sexuality per se. Peribromius is a known threat that can be circumvented by exclusion, as
could be done with a diseased pig (2.78-81). Creticus and the Socratic cinaedi threaten
the health of Roman society by their confusion of gender lines and the resultant difficulty
in effecting a segregation of the diseased.

Leaving aside such temporarily covert deviance, the general stance of the
authorial persona is that observable behavior is a reliable indicator of the inner moral

\[202\] Despite the willingness of the satirist to excuse pathic behavior in this passage, there should be no
confusion about the stance of ‘Juvenal’ toward cinaedi. The authorial voice is aggressively in opposition to
any form of deviance from his formulation of Romanitas.
condition. In his discursus of the degenerate scions of noble houses, ‘Juvenal’ notes that
the self-presentation of the non-Roman areas of the world does not deceive:

\[
forsitan inbellis Rhodios unctamque Corinthon
despicias merito: quid resinata iuuentus
cruraque totius facient tibi leuia gentis? 115
horrida uitanda est Hispania, Gallicus axis
Illyricumque latus; ...
\]

Perhaps you despise the unwarlike Rhodians and oiled-up Corinth rightly: what will the depilated youths
and the smooth legs of that whole race do to you? 115
Hairy Spain is to be avoided, and the Gallic region,
And the Illyrian coast; ...

(8.113-17)

Here is the dichotomy of body hair set out in full terms; the depilated Greeks are
unwarlike and harmless, whereas the hirsute inhabitants of the periphery are to be given a
wide berth. Similarly, ‘Juvenal’ references a pumiced backside as part of a constellation
of moral deviance:

\[
cur Allobrogicis et magna gaudeat ara
natus in Herculeo Fabius lare, si cupidus, si
uanus et Euganea quantumuis mollior agna,
si tenerum attritus Catinensi pumice lumbum
squalentis traducit auos emptorque ueneni
frangenda miseram funestat imagine gentem?
\]

Why should a Fabius, born in the house of Heracles,
delight in the Allobrogici and the Great Altar, if he is greedy,
if he is shallow and softer than a Euganean lamb,
if he, rubbed smooth as far as he soft ass goes with Catanian pumice,
betrays his ancestors, and as a buyer of poison
defiles his aggrieved race with a statue that ought to be shattered?

(8.13-18)

The authorial persona begins his enumeration of vices with greed, moving on to lack of
understanding, then to generalized effeminacy and the damning mark of the pumiced
backside. The subsequent two lines come as no surprise to the audience trained to expect
the potential for all vices from the demonstration of the presence of others. In the rational of the satirist, it is a natural consequence of the former vices that this Fabius would be a poisoner. Deviation in the presentation of gender has the potential to corrupt an impressionable audience. It is the first step on a slippery slope toward the life of the *cinaedus* in all its details. Most crucially, the authorial *persona* figures such deviation as a sign of a general corruption capable of erupting into any of a myriad of particular vices and crimes if left unchecked. The deviation of one’s performance from the supposed norms of masculine and feminine gender itself is equated with a departure from an identity consonant with *Romanitas*.

**Reading Sexuality**

It is appropriate at this point in the discussion to turn to a direct examination of the role of sexuality in the construction of gender identity by the authorial *persona*. It has been recognized that the relative agency of the participants in a sexual act was of more semantic relevance than the act in question *qua* act or the sex of the participants in absolute terms. Sexual participants can be broken down into active versus passive categories or segregated based on other dichotomies, e.g. paying versus paid, or free agents versus those under compulsion. For the author of the *Satires*, each of these axes comes into play, but the central concern remains the root motivation of the sexual act. Sexuality may range from blandly licit to dangerously illegal, yet the satirist underscores the semantics of sexuality as a means of examining the interior life of his characters. The authorial *persona* notes that parents often pray for their children to be granted

---

outstanding beauty, without thought for the potentially deleterious effects of such a blessing on their children:

\[
i nunc et iuuenis specie laetare tui, quem maiora expectant discrimina. fiet adulter publicus et poenas metuet quascumque mariti irati reddent, nec erit felicior astro Martis, ut in laqueos numquam incidat. exigit autem interdum ille dolor plus quam lex ulla dolori concessit: necat hic ferro, secat ille cruentis uerberibus, quosdam moechos et mugilis intrat.
\]

Go now and take joy in the looks of your young man, whom excessively great trials await. He will become the public adulterer and dread whatever punishments the enraged husbands return, nor will he be luckier than the star of Mars, that he should never fall into their snares. But sometimes that pain exacts more than any laws concedes to pain: one kills with steel, another with bloody lashes, and the mullet enters some adulterers.

The abnormal beauty of the youth may well lead him to a career as the neighborhood adulterer with all the privileges and liabilities pertaining thereto. ‘Juvenal’ imagines that the potential punishments awaiting the adulterer are insufficient to turn him from his course once begun. In the subsequent lines the satirist imagines that such a youth would begin by sexually servicing those he had feelings for and end by hiring himself out for wages to whoever could pay. The operation of sexuality is thus figured as a process all too subject to entropy; once begun, it is strongly probable—in the paradigm of the authorial persona—that a degraded moral trajectory will be carried through all the way to its logical conclusion. The actual ability of Roman adulterers to avoid sodomy with a mullet through some intermediate level of self-control is immaterial to the rhetoric of the satirist. For ‘Juvenal,’ sexual deviance—as with other forms of deviance from proper Romanitas—leads inevitably to a constellation of associated vices.
Horace explored a similar theme by placing the advice against committing adultery in the voice of a slave remonstrating with his master. The themes explored include even the comedic commonplace of the lover hiding in the chest from the enraged husband, but the more serious points of the significant potential danger from interference with the wife of another Roman are foregrounded:

\[
\begin{align*}
& te \ coniunx \ aliena \ capit, \ meretricula \ Davum: \\
& peccat \ uter \ nostrum \ cruce \ dignius? \ acris \ ubi \ me \\
& \text{nature intendit, sub \ clara \ nuda \ lucerna} \\
& quaecumque \ except \ turgentis \ verb \ caudae \\
& clunibus \ aut \ agitavit \ equum \ lasciva \ supinum, \\
& dimittit \ neque \ famosum \ neque \ sollicitum, \ ne \\
& ditor \ aut \ formae \ melioris \ meiat \ eodem. \\
& tu \ cum \ proiectis \ insignibus, \ anulo \ equestri \\
& Romanoque \ habitu, \ prodis \ ex \ iudice \ Dama, \\
& turpis \ odoratum \ caput \ obscurante \ lacerna, \\
& non \ es \ quod \ simulas? \ metuens \ induceris \ atque \\
& altercante \ libidinis \ temis \ ossa \ pavore. \\
& quid \ refert, \ uri \ virgis \ ferroque \ necari \\
& auctoratus \ eas, \ an \ turpi \ clausus \ in \ arca, \\
& quo \ te \ demisit \ peccati \ conscia \ erilis, \\
& contractum \ genibus \ tangas \ caput? \ estne \ marito \\
& matronae \ peccantis \ in \ ambo \ iusta \ potestas, \\
& in \ corruptorem \ vel \ iustior? ... \\
\end{align*}
\]

Someone else’s wife captures you, a little whore captures Davus: which one of you sins more worthy of the cross? When sharp nature drove me, under a bright lamp some nude girl or other took the strokes of my turgid tail or the lusty girl shook her reclining horse with her butt cheeks, it caused neither gossip not concern, whether a richer fellow or one of better build ejaculated in the same place. When you, having thrown off your insignia, your knight’s ring, your Roman dress, go forth as Dama rather than a judge, a vile man with a cloak covering your scented head, are you not what you pretend to be? You enter in dread and you tremble in your bones with fear alternating with lusts. What does it matter, whether you go liable to be burned with branches or slain with steel, or whether you are closed up in a vile strongbox, where a girl aware of her mistress’ sin sent you, and you touch your crunched head with your knees? Does not the husband of the sinning wife have a just power against both of you, or even a more just power against the seducer?

(Horace, *Sermones* 2.7.46-63)
Unlike modern versions of Puritanism, the persona of Davus is not concerned here with sexual desire or its gratification *per se*. Rather, the poet advises his readers toward a more prosocial choice than the disruptive and illegal act of adultery; even a slave, clearly less than a real Roman, would know better than to risk life and status over a physical urge. There is more of the burlesque in this passage than is often present in the *Satires* of Juvenal, yet in essential points the two satirists are in agreement. As with the desire for food or any other physical pleasure, it is necessary to practice restraint.

The example of vice, like the infected grape, is figured as the most powerful inducement to depravity, especially if it is continually before the eyes of the young as a feature of the household. Women are cited frequently for their tendency to seek out one lover after another, which in this instance is attributed to the mother’s depravity:

```
rusticus expectas ut non sit adultera Largae filia, quae numquam maternos dicere moechos tam cito nec tanto poterit contexere cursu ut non ter deciens respiret? conscia matri uirgo fuit, ceras nunc hac dictante pusillas implet et ad moechum dat eisdem ferre cinaedis. sic natura iubet: velocius et citius nos corrumpunt uitiorum exempla domestica, magnis cum subeant animos auctoribus. ...
```

You hick, do you expect that the daughter of Larga would not be an adulteress, the one who was never able to say her mother’s adulterers so quick or weave them together with such a rush that she did no have to take a breath thirty times? The maiden was a conspirator for her mother, now she fills up little wax tablets as her mother dictates and gives them over to the very same *cinaedi* to carry to her own adulterer. That is the way Nature commands it: more rapidly and more quickly do domestic examples of vices corrupt us, since they worm into our minds with great authority. ... 

(14.25-33)
The daughter has undergone an apprenticeship of sorts under the tutelage of her infamous mother and her abetting *cinaedi*. The authorial *persona* here posits an anti-patriarchal order, so to speak, composed of all those who stand against the normative, licit mode of sexuality. These form a social complex of mutual assistance against the legitimate demands of the relevant husband. This passage strongly recalls a number of passages in *Satire VI* on the role of *cinaedi* in enabling female sexual deviance.

In each of the passages just examined, the sexually deviant person has ceded any claim to the normative gender identity promulgated by the satirist. The adulterous youth and vir cannot function as a proper husband, father, and eventual *paterfamilias*, while endangering himself and setting a turpid example for his household. Similarly, the adulterous daughter cannot hope to function properly as a wife and mother while directing much of her energies toward sexual (and presumably emotional) gratification and sharing her confidences with her deviant mother and her enabling *cinaedi*. While the satirist in effect concedes that these and many other instances of what are figured as sexual depravity are the ground state of human sexuality toward which all persons will drift in the absence of better models and personal diligence, still the authorial *persona* is unwilling to grant that any of the enumerated forms of non-normative sexuality are valid options. Each model of deviance entails an abdication of *Romanitas*, just as it predicts a likely degradation of the individual across multiple axes of vice.

**The Gendering of Space**

The true Roman must be perpetually vigilant in the face of the influx of foreign *mores* along with the trade of the conquered world, yet the presence of endemic
corruption poses a similarly dire threat to the *Romanitas* of the City. There is not within the *Satires* a conceptualization of Rome that allows for spatial compartmentalization or clear segregation of deviance to be effected. While particular spaces are perpetually marked as contaminated through their association with unsavory activities or persons, that contamination does not remain localized, due to the boundary-crossing deviance of those belonging to spaces nominally clear of such contamination. Through their actions or their failure to enforce appropriate spatial boundaries, the elite themselves confound the required distinctions.  

'Juvenal’ illustrates this depraved version of elite agency in the disrespect of elite women for sacred space:

\begin{quote}
\textit{i nunc et dubita qua sorbeat aera sanna}
\textit{Maura, pudicitiae ueterem cum praeterit aram,}
\textit{Tullia quid dicat, notae collactea Maurae.}
\textit{noctibus hic ponunt lecticas, micturiunt hic}
\textit{effigiemque deae longis siphonibus implent}
\textit{inque uices equitant ac Luna teste mouentur,}
\textit{inde domos abeunt; tu calcas luce reuersa}
\textit{coniugis urinam magnos uisurus amicos.}
\end{quote}

Now wonder with what scorn Maura sniffs the air, when she passed the ancient shrine of Chastity, and what Tullia says, the nursling of the same breast as famous Maura. Here by night they place litters, they urinate here and they wet the image of the goddess with long sprays and in turn they ride and climax with the moon as witness, then they go home: when morning returns, you tread on your mate’s urine on the way to see your great friends.

\begin{quote}
(6.306-13)
\end{quote}

The revulsion of Maura toward the altar of the goddess Chastity (*Pudicitia*) marks her as deviant, by inverting the proper objects of such revulsion (*fastidium*) into the action that

\footnote{At 11.111-16 ‘Juvenal’ asserts that the *templorum quoque maiestas praesentior* (the majesty of the temples was also more present) in the times of a more pristine Roman morality, when the gods saved the Capitol from the Gauls.}
she performs at the shrine.\textsuperscript{205} The elite women defile the image of the goddess with their urine and then engage in deviant sexuality with the moon (the goddess \textit{Luna}) as sole witness, as they alternate taking active and passive roles (\textit{uices equitant ac... mouentur}).\textsuperscript{206} No doubt the satirist intends to convey the impression of these women carrying the contamination back to their respective homes, but he chooses to elaborate the enduring contamination of the sacred public space. The impersonal second person addresses all male Romans that might attempt to carry out their normative social functions by the light of day; proper Romans are forced to contact the lingering contamination of nocturnal deviance produced by members of their own families. Illicit feminine associations intrude into the masculine space of \textit{amicitia}.\textsuperscript{207}

The actions of Maura and her compatriot are especially problematic to the authorial \textit{persona} as an instance of category transgression: they violate the expected actions of their social class and thus cause the intersection of what should be segregated spaces. ‘Juvenal’ is highly concerned with the isolation of areas that he marks as morally suspect. Among this class of spaces within Rome, the Embankment (of the Tiber) is referenced at multiple points as a locus of particular debasement.\textsuperscript{208} This zone of the City, along with the Circus, is mentioned casually in reference to a place for Plebian fate (\textit{Plebeium... fatum}) to be read (6.588-91). In Book III, ‘Juvenal’ again references this zone as a haunt of the debased:

\begin{quote}
\textit{... tumes alto Drusorum stemmate, tamquam}\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{205} R. Kaster (2005): 113 proposes that having \textit{fastidium} toward the appropriate objects was a mark of status.
\textsuperscript{206} That the women have sedan-chairs (\textit{lecticas}) is an indication that they hold elite status. The alternation of active and passive sexuality may be the most potent signifier of deviance in the passage.
\textsuperscript{207} Cf. also 6.268-75 for the gender inversion of the marriage bed by the wife’s introduction of \textit{lites} (lawsuits) and \textit{iurgia} (brawls); the bed is altered from a place of repose into another public (masculine) space in which the husband is forced to contend at law as if with another man.
\textsuperscript{208} Cf. fn 190 in Chapter IV for the use of the Embankment as emblematic of debased space at 5.149-55.
feceris ipse aliquid propter quod nobilis esses,  
ut te conciperet quae sanguine fulget Iuli,  
non quae uentoso conducta sub aggere texit.  
‘uos humiles’ inquis ‘uo|li|g|i| pars ultima nostri,  
q|u|o|r|m|u|n|e|m| o|u|e|a|t|q|u|i|m|a|t|e|e| p|a|r|e|n|t|i|s,  
ast ego Cecropides.’ uius et originis huius  
gaudia longa feras. tamen ima plebe Quiritem  
facundum inuenies, solet hic defendere causas  
nobilis indocti; ueniet de plebe togata  
qui iuris nodos et legum aenigmata soluat;  

… You swell up from the high ancestry of the Drusi, as if  
you yourself did something on account of which you are a noble,  
so that a woman, who gleams with the blood of Julius, would conceive  
you, not the hired woman who weaves under the windy Embankment.  
‘You are scum,’ you say, ‘the last part of our mob,  
no one of whom would be able to show the fatherland of (his) parent,  
but I am of the ancient nobility.’ May you live and take long delights  
of this origin. All the same, you will find a well-spoken Roman  
from the lowest plebs, who is accustomed to defend the cases of the  
ignorant nobleman; from the toga-clad plebs shall come a man  
who solves knots of right and enigmas of the laws;  

The rhetorical point in play in this passage, as in Satire VIII generally, is that  
inherited noble status in itself is no guarantee of the excellence of the individual.²⁰⁹  
While the argument of the satirist is designed to strip the validity of nobility asserted only  
on account of notability (propter quod nobilis esses), a stark distinction is still drawn  
between elite status (quae sanguine fulget Iuli) and the debased creatures that dwell under  
the windy Embankment (uentoso conducta sub aggere). It is precisely because such  
places carry the negative valence of their associations with the debased persons and their

²⁰⁹ ‘Juvenal’ reiterates the assertion that location is not destiny at 10.48-50, speaking of Democritus cuius  
prudentia monstrat / summos posse uiros et magna exempla daturos / ueruecum in patria crassoque sub  
aere nasci (whose prudence demonstrates / that the greatest men, ones about to provide great exempla, are  
able / to be born in a fatherland of idiots and under a thick air). While conceding that such an anomaly is  
possible, the author relies on the axiomatic belief that such an outcome is quite unlikely. The author  
explores the opposite proposition, that a wicked man can be born anywhere, at 14.38-41, using Catiline as  
an exemplar of vice. The point being advanced in either passage and generally is that birth does equate to  
destiny; the agency of the individual must intervene. The protreptic discourses of satire are thus of great importance.
mores that the assertion that useful Romans may come from such places has such a potent rhetorical force. Examples of such virtue from the Embankment and its like are ultimately figured as exceptions to normative expectations, as much as are degenerate members of the elite. The Embankment is ultimately figured as a liminal space beyond which space ceases to be Roman and at which Roman Identity was open to contest with a bias toward its rejection.\textsuperscript{210} Willful travel into such compromised zones is figured within the \textit{Satires} as an act perilous to the stability of one’s Romanitas.\textsuperscript{211}

Among the \textit{exempla} drawn from those who cross the normative boundaries of their social ambit and thus act as vectors for the transmission of moral contagion between contaminated and pristine Roman spaces, the empress Messalina is singled out for a particularly severe treatment. The empress is titled by ‘Juvenal’ the \textit{meretrix Augusta} (whore empress, 6.117) and is accused of habitually frequenting a brothel to sell her services:

\begin{verbatim}
    mox lenone suas iam dimittente puellas
    tristis abit, et quod potuit tamen ultima cellam
    clausit, adhuc ardens rigidae tentigine uoluae,
    et lassata uiris necdum satiata recessit,
    obscurisque genis turpis fumoque lucernae
    foeda lupanaris tuit ad puluinari odorem.
\end{verbatim}

Soon when the pimp is already sending his girls off, she departs depressed, and all the same the very last, what she was able, she closes her stall, still burning with the lust of a stiff womb, and worn out by men but as yet unsatisfied she goes back, with her cheeks shaded by the smoke of a foul lamp, the vile woman carted the odor of the brothel to the imperial bed.

\begin{center}
(6.127-132)
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{210} ‘Juvenal’ asks who would be willing to accompany a friend so far from the City (\textit{quis tam procul adsit ab Urbe}) and be so heroic as to travel beyond the mass of the Embankment (\textit{molem aggeris ultra}, 16.25-27). The author is using hyperbole to emphasize how limited friendship could be when self-interest is at stake, yet the essential point remains that the Embankment could function as a conceptual boundary of Rome proper.

\textsuperscript{211} The space of the stage of the arena also constituted zones of peril for the elite; cf. 8.183-210 for \textit{nobiles} who disgrace themselves so. Nero similarly debases himself at 8.225.
Messalina, as a vector of moral contagion, transports the stench (odorem) of the whorehouse to the bedroom of the palace.\textsuperscript{212} The stark juxtaposition of the whores\textsuperscript{\textit{harehouse}} (lupanaris) and the imperial bed (puluanar) should represent an insurmountable gulf, as the denizens of that debased space would never be able to gain admittance to the imperial presence. Since Messalina prefers (praeferre, 6.117) a brothel to the Palatine, however, no containment of the contagion is possible. The greatest issue for the satirist is a fundamental disturbance in the empress’ discernment of what is to be preferred. Since a guardian of that distinction has chosen to surrender to her deviant urges, the segregation of space cannot be maintained, and the Roman system of meaning is called into question. In short, the empress fails to display the authorized fastidium (disgust) for the brothel.

**Conclusions**

The author of the Satires constructs a system of reading gender based on the assumption that there exists a broadly accepted norm of gender criticism. I do not argue that the actual performance of gender in the complex Roman world system actually

\textsuperscript{212} To my knowledge, it has not been previously recognized that Messalina is depicted as being pregnant when she frequents the brothel. The satirist asserts that Messalina ostenditque tuum, generose Britannice, uentrem (showed your womb, O well-born Brittanicus, 6.124). Juvenal uses uenter in this sense later in the same satire: homines in uentre necandos (people in the womb needing to be murdered, 6.596). Why would the satirist claim the empress could show her womb? Most editors and translators take the \textit{uoluae} of line 6.129 as metonymic for clitoris, but I suggest that its literal signification of ‘womb’ is intended. J. N. Adams, The Roman Sexual Vocabulary (1982): 105 notes that the word selection of the translators of the Vetus Latina (Bible) “would suggest that \textit{uulua} had the specific sense ‘womb’ during the second century.” Adams (1982): 103-104 also suggests that \textit{tentigine} applied to a clitoris (landica) in this passage, but both terms are quite rare and the literal signification of \textit{tentigine} derives, as does the word, from the passive participle of \textit{tendo}—stretched/stiff. Juvenal uses \textit{uulua in} the sense of ‘womb’ at 2.32 and \textit{uoluæ} as the ‘womb’ (of a pig) at 11.81, the only other usages in the Satires. Martial agrees at 13.56, as does Horace at Epist. 1.15.41. Messalina thus has the \textit{rigidae tentigine uoluæ} (tension of a stiff womb) because she is near term; this condition also enables her to ostenditque... uentrem. She carries not only the stench of the whores\textsuperscript{\textit{harehouse}} back to the imperial presence, but carries a potential future emperor into the whores\textsuperscript{\textit{harehouse}} and contaminates the space (uentrem / uoluæ) that is by rights his. Awareness of the ultimate fate of Messalina would have strongly colored any reference to her infamous exploits with, as is likely, a degree of satisfaction at the punishment of the corrupt.
conformed to any such unitary system. I do, however, suggest that ‘Juvenal’ relies on a system of discussing gender performance and critiquing deviance that was common at least in outline to much of the Latin literature of the Imperial period. For the purposes of his arguments, the author relies on standard axes of comparison: e.g. *durus* versus *mollis*, or *leuis* versus *horrida*. While aware of individual variation, the satirist works from the theory that *mores* are subject to an intrinsic entropy; if the individual is to achieve the status of unqualified Roman in the view of ‘Juvenal,’ he must embrace a limiting construction of the masculine gender, one which proscribed not merely the objects and manners of sexuality but also the modes of dress and bodily comportment. Further, this potential Roman must subscribe to the corollary disciplining of his dining habits, his movement through space and use thereof, as well as his taste in consumption more generally. In summation, *Romanitas* and unqualified masculinity represent an identity within the *Satires*. The lack of control over appetitive desires for food, sexuality, or possessions is read by the satirist as a sign of effeminacy. It is perhaps because the sexuality of other Romans was so little subject to direct observation that the field was so ripe for speculation, based on the slightest hints in otherwise non-sexual behavior. Within the *Satires*, then, the intentional construction of gender and its consequent critique is presented as an all-pervasive occupation of the elite. To opt out of this system of meaning, as the satirist asserts that some *cinaedi* did, would be to cede one’s claim to any identity within the normative social order. Social pressure that could potentially drive a *cinaedus* to hide his lifestyle under the cloak of a wife and supposed children could be as

---

213 I use the pronoun ‘he’ advisedly, under the supposition that only a male was able to fulfill the literary criteria of the identity *Romanus*. 
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effectively brought to bear on any Roman man. Juvenal thus provides further evidence of
the centrality of gender to the discourse of Roman identity.
Chapter VI:
A Personal Rome: the Threatened Self Mapped Across Contested Space

non est Romano cuiquam locus hic, ubi regnat
Protogenes aliquis uel Diphilus aut Hermarchus,
qui gentis uitio numquam partitur amicum,
solus habet. nam cum facilem stillauit in aurem
exiguum de naturae patriaeque ueneno,
limine summoueor, perierunt tempora longi
seruitii; nusquam minor est iactura clientis.

There is no place for any Roman here, where some
Προτογενῆς or Διφύλος or Ερμαρχὸς rules,
who never shares a friend (a flaw of his race),
he alone owns him. For when he drips into a ready ear
a particle of the poison of his nature and country,
I am pushed aside from the doorway, the seasons of my long service
have perished; there is nothing of less consequence than casting off a client.

Juvenal, 3.119-25

Introduction

The Roman world of the second century is written within the Satires from a
vantage centered in the urban fabric of Rome, and treats the wider empire only as its
diverse affairs pertain to the lives and mores of the proper inhabitants of the Roman
city.214 The pan-Mediterranean and multi-polar civilization of the second century is
pointedly reduced to an alien tableau of potential forms of contamination, while the
social complexity of Rome itself is concurrently abridged into a series of highly artificial

214 S. H. Braund, 'City and Country in Roman Satire' in S. H. Braund (ed.), Satire and Society in Ancient
Rome (Exeter, 1989), 23-47; Braund notes that the satirist situates himself predominately in public, urban
space.
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dichotomies of the self and the Other. The passage above expresses the perception that the coexistence of the Roman and the Other within a single space, whether social or material, is not possible. The symbolic logic of the speaker allows only for replacement and nullification.

What, then, was the object of embedding the array of Roman space, both physical and notional, so extensively within his rhetoric? Juvenal had no aspirations as a geographer in the first instance. On the contrary, his poetic imagery relies to great extent on the topographic knowledge of his audience to complete the spatial context for his verse. What the author provides is an interpretational framework for coloring the comment-worthy aspects of Roman space as it impinges into the lives of his intended audience. For the author, space—like food or sexuality—is loaded with a moral significance that may be read, and demands to be read. As with the other discourses intersecting the *Satires*, the articulation of space is written as a quantity under perpetual contest; the moral significance of the topography is threatened by the imposition of the alien in all of its potential manifestations. It is this potential for transformation through contact with the Other that is of crucial importance to the arguments of the satirist. In this chapter, I will suggest that spaces coded by the satirist as ‘Roman’ are made to serve as reservoirs of secure identity and points of reference for the evaluation of more liminal zones of the social topography. As was discussed in the previous chapter on foodways, space was a discursive element of daily life that was subject to the moral choices of the individual, especially the elite individual. I will argue that Juvenal composes space from an assumption of some uncorrupted, ideal center located at an unspecified place and at an uncertain time. The settings of his *exempla*, however, function as vectors of social
contagion due to more proximal acts of pollution. Further, the fungibility of Roman
space can be viewed as a metaphor for the vulnerability of the elite body, as the
compromised inviolability of each unit serves as a textual locus for the social anxieties of
the satirist.

The Influx of the Other

Social stability and the resultant predictability of outcomes is the unspoken
aspiration of the conservative authorial persona. Rome is written as a perversion of the
just world, so long as alien mores continue to intervene. The influx of the people and
commodities of the exterior world is figured as a natural force by representatives of the
authorial voice, something like the intermittent floods of the Tiber. The influx of the
Other is represented in metaphor by the flow of contaminated water at multiple points
within the text. In the passage above, the author represents the nature (naturae) and the
culture (patriaeque) of the Greek Other as a potent liquid poison (exiguum de ... ueneno)
that might be easily dripped into the willing ears (facilem stillauit in aurem) of
corruptible members of the elite. Although the flood of alien mores and populations is
written as an almost impersonal phenomenon, agency and the concomitant moral fault is,
nevertheless, attributed to segments of the Roman populace:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{quae nunc diuitibus gens acceptissima nostris} \\
\text{et quos praecipue fugiam, properabo fateri,} \\
\text{nec pudor obstabat. non possum ferre, Quirites,} \\
\text{Graecam urbem. quamuis quota portio faecis Achaei?} \\
\text{iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes} \\
\text{et linguam et mores et cum tibicine chordas} \\
\text{obliquas nec non gentilia tympana secum} \\
\text{uexit et ad circum iussas prostrate puellas.}
\end{align*}
\]

The race that is now most delightful to our rich men
and which I would particularly avoid, I shall rush to confess and bashfulness won’t get in the way. Romans, I am unable to endure a Greek Rome. Although, what is the portion of Achaean dregs?

For a long time already the Syrian Orontes has streamed into the Tiber, and right along with itself it has imported language and customs, crossways lyre chords, even indigenous drums, and the girls commanded to whore themselves at the Circus.

Within the persona of Umbricius, the satirist critiques the rich (diuitibus) for their corrupt preferentiality toward Greeks and, by extension, other resident aliens in the Roman city.

The transformative potential of the foreign is underscored in the phrase Graecam urbem (Greek City, i.e. Greek Rome). The persona proposes a moral dipole without gradation or subtlety, yet the essential point is consonant with the pervasive logic of the Satires and their author: the seductive contamination of alien or degenerate cultures represents an existential threat to the Roman state. As with the poison (ueneno) of the opening passage, contamination is twice represented as liquid in nature within this excerpt. The speaker questions what portion of the human refuse are even Greek dregs (faecis Achaei), and the Syrian Orontes is imagined to flow down (defluxit) into the Roman Tiber.\(^{215}\) As a river in flood carries all manner of detritus before it, the Orontes is an infectious vector carrying the totality of the inferior alien culture: language (linguam), customs (mores), and sundry incidental elements of culture.\(^{216}\) There is an element of religious taboo in this imagery as well, as the Tiber River is itself a deity.

\(^{215}\) The choice of verb is significant here and in the following passage in that either variant of fluo, -ere effectively expresses the effortlessness of the flow of corruption into a healthy system. I would suggest that the author conceptualizes the moral universe as having a natural impulse toward entropy, represented in the downhill tendency of water.

\(^{216}\) The memory of a simple passage through the Forum Boarium would have colored this anti-ekphrasis, so to speak, with the vivid experience of the Cloaca Maxima discharging the sewage of the Subura into the Tiber. I would suggest that this image of the contaminating flow of the Cloaca Maxima is implicit to 3.58-65 and is also accessed by the author at 5.104-106, where a vile river fish is said to be a “home-bred slave of the banks, fat with the raging Cloaca / and used to reaching the vaulted sewer of the middle of the Subura” (uernula riparum, pinguis torrente cloaca / et solitus mediae cryptam penetrare Suburae).
The author returns to the image of the river of foreign filth pouring into Rome in *Satire VI*, where the Greeks are once more deployed as the carriers of this cultural plague. In the form of the equation of peace (*pacis*) and luxury (*luxuria*) is encoded the proposed nature of a healthy relation of the Roman state to the Other as adversaries in open conflict:

\[
\text{now we suffer the evils of a long peace, and luxury} \\
\text{more savage than arms settles in and avenges the conquered world.} \\
\text{No crime or deed of impulse is absent from a place where} \\
\text{Roman poverty has died. Here to these very hills} \text{295} \\
\text{flowed Sybaris, here also Rhodes and Miletos} \\
\text{and even Tarentum, garlanded, grumbling and soaking drunk.} \\
\text{(6.292-97)}
\]

Perversely, the outcome of Roman military superiority—*Romanitas* par excellence—is exposure to every contagion of the conquered world, which gains its revenge thereby. Roman frugality (*paupertas Romana*) is set in opposition to foreign luxury (*luxuria*) in an all or nothing contest for possession of Rome. These poles of the binary cannot coexist and each dictates the presence or absence of associated vices and virtues. Spatial imagery is significant in this passage, particularly in the image of personified Luxury reclining onto its elbow (*incubuit*) like a dinner guest, although it is more savage than arms (*saevior armis*). The ‘*istos*’ of line 295 amplifies the force of *hinc fluxit* to strongly mark the influx of the Greeks into Rome itself as a counterstrike for the outward expansion of the empire. The conclusion of the passage makes clear that once again the
primary concern of the satirist is the importation of foreign *mores* along with their luxuries and their persons:

*prima peregrinos obscena pecunia mores intulit, et turpi fregerunt saecula luxu diuitiae molles. quid enim uenus ebria curat?*

Obscene cash first imported foreign *mores* and rich elegances shattered the ages with filthy luxury. Indeed, what does drunken lust care about?

The ages (*saecula*) of the *mos maiorum* prove friable in the face of foreign *mores* and luxuries. Here again the author returns to his concern over the role of excess wealth as an enabling factor in moral corruption. In the view of the authorial *persona*, the influx of alien culture is a proximal cause of Roman degeneration, but the root cause of vice is again given as the inability to properly regulate the moral choices afforded by wealth.

The problematic nature of peace for a culture that derived much of its identity from its prowess in warfare intrudes repeatedly into the discourse on *mores*. While ‘Juvenal’ figures the influx of alien *mores* as a threat, ‘Horace’ lauds the transformative power of one subaltern culture on the imperial power as a positive cultural resource to be exploited:

*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis intulit agresti Latio. sic horridus ille defluxit numerus Saturnius et grave virus munditiae pepulere; sed in longum tamen aevum*

---

217 ‘Juvenal’ often links imported commodities to moral depravity, as with the case of a degenerate Fabius *tenerum attritus Catinensi pumice lumbum* (rubbed smooth with Catanian pumice, his delicate loins that is, 8.16). Cf. also the discussion of Indian perfumes in the context of adultery at 6.466.

218 Sallust attributes moral decline at Rome to “leisure and abundance” (*otio atque abundantia*) and locates it in time “before Carthage was destroyed” (*ante Carthaginem deletam*) and the Roman state thus no longer faced an existential threat (*Iug. 41*). Sallust asserts that “when that dread of the enemy departed, obviously those things that favorable conditions love, licentiousness and arrogance, made their way in” (*ubi illa formido mentibus decessit, scilicet ea, quae res secundae amant, lascivia atque superbia incessere*). As with the use of this *topos* in the *Satires*, the historiographer takes the correlation of peace and moral decline as axiomatic, hardly demanding demonstration—*scilicet*. 
Captured Greece seized her savage victor and bore the arts into rustic Latium. Thus that hoary meter, the Saturnian, flowed out, and (the arts) drove out that grave poison to elegance; but all the same through a long age remained and today remain traces of the countryside.

For (Latium) applied its acumen to Greek texts late, and the calm after the Punic wars began to ask, what utility Sophocles and Thespis and Aeschylus bring.

(Horace Epist. 2.1.156-63)

‘Horace’ thus deploys the opposite aspect of the discourse on the assimilation of the alien into Roman culture. The later use of *defluere* by Juvenal is prefigured here by Horace as the outward flow of a native Latin meter, which the author figures as a *grave virus / munditiae* (grave poison to elegance). In anything, it is probable that the position taken vis-à-vis *otium* and alien *mores* by Horace is aberrant in reference to the preceding and subsequent articulation of the discourse. It is also reasonable to suppose that the relevant passages of Juvenal act as a reanalysis of the model of cultural interaction proposed by Horace. Two crucial refinements demand to be interjected at this point: first, that the two authors did not inhabit the same Roman *milieu*; second, that the alien culture in question is that of Greece, not farther afield. Juvenal is prepared, at times, to concede the validity of Greek culture in the proper measure, as when locates an approving notice in the *persona* of Umbricius:

\[
\textit{iamque uetus Graecos seruabat cista libellos}
\]
\[
\textit{et diuina opici rodebant carmina mures.}
\]

and the already ancient chest was preserving the Greek books, and the ignorant mice were gnawing the divine poems.

---

219 It is possible that the reference to the Saturnian meter is a passing critique of Lucilius as well, who experimented with satire in that meter before settling on hexameter.
‘Juvenal’ is not, however, prepared to accede to wholesale cultural assimilation as is ‘Horace,’ even in terms of literary production. ‘Horace’ views Greek culture as a resource to be exploited in expanding Roman culture, while ‘Juvenal’ views all alien cultures as potential threats to the integrity of his version of Roman Identity.

It is of no little importance where the locus of contamination or Otherness is constructed within a text. On what axis or in what dimension is the threat located? Even in the instance when the authorial persona does not offer an explicit answer, the conception of contamination as something exogenic remains:

... o pater urbis,
unde nefas tantum Latiis pastoribus? unde
haec tetigit, Gradiue, tuos urtica nepotes?
traditur ecce uiro clarus genere atque opibus uir,
 nec galeam quassas nec terram cuspidce pulsas 130
nec quereris patri. uade ergo et cede seueri
iugeribus campi, quem neglegis.'...

... O father of the City,
From where (do) the Latin shepherds (have) such a great pollution?
From where has this stinging-nettle touched your descendants, Mars?
Look, an elite man famous for his family and his wealth is getting handed over to a man, and you neither shake your helmet nor strike the ground with your spear, nor bitch to your father. So hurry and withdraw from the acres of the savage field that you neglect. …

(2.126-32)

Having failed in his role as defender of Rome, the god Mars (Gradiue) ought, in the view of the speaker, to withdraw from the Campus Martius. The identity of the martial god has been nullified by the prospect of one elite man marrying another, and so Mars must surrender to the prospect of replacement in the training field that bears his name. The moral logic underlying this assertion is instanced broadly within the Satires for all forms of deviance: normative Roman values cannot coexist with forms of deviance. For an
individual man or the width of the Campus Martius, *Romanitas* and *nefas* cannot intersect. More than simply the marriage of *mares* (males) or of *hombres* (men), the speaker pointedly selects his terms: *uir* (elite man) to a *uiro* (elite man). The broad category of unspeakable pollution (*nefas*) as well as the stinging nettle (*urtica*) are figured as exogenic and are juxtaposed to the *topos* of the simple, native Roman shepherds (*pastoribus*), who are the descendents of the native god *Mars Gradiuus*. The passage deploys a constellation of terms related to warfare, elite status, and Roman masculinity: *Gradiue, uiro, clarus, genere, opibus, galeam, cuspidse, seueri*. Yet, all this is *nefas*. Further, the norm of reciprocity underlying the formula ‘*do ut des*’ is here invoked to evict the god from the space that he does not care to defend. The marriage of one elite man to another is a symptom of the arrival of moral contagion from some unspecified external space.

When it serves the rhetorical needs of the moment, ‘Juvenal’ is willing to stipulate some particular source for this moral infection, and when he does so, deviance is most often sited east of Greece. I would suggest, however, that for the author, the more precise conceptual locus of deviance is anywhere outside of Rome. In *Satire IX*, the authorial *persona* responds with words of reassurance to Naevolus, who is troubled that he may in the future find it difficult to earn his living by servicing the sexual desires of pathics:

*ne trepida, numquam pathicus tibi derit amicus
stantibus et saluis his collibus; undique ad illos
conuenient et carpenti et nauibus omnes
qui digitto scalpunt uno caput.*

Have no worries, you will never lack a pathic patron while these hills are standing and safe; toward them in sedan-chairs and ships they gather together from everywhere,

---

everyone that is who scratches their head with one finger.

(9.130-33)

‘Juvenal’ asserts in the strongest language that there will never be a lack of customers, as long as the hills of Rome are standing. The satirist’s hyperbolic mode of argumentation notwithstanding, the structure of the argument is based on a binary division between the City and the world. Everyone (omnes) from everywhere (undique) that is pathic congregates at Rome, whether they arrive in sedan-chairs (carpentis) from nearby or in ships (nauibus) from some distance. Contaminated space is everywhere both near and far; by native disposition, it is everywhere except Rome itself. This centripetal movement of deviance is a recurrent idea in the Satires, where all the world orbits the City.

What, then, is the outcome of the movement of external deviance into Roman space? ‘Juvenal’ imagines the souls of the corrupted Romans making their way from the contaminated space of their Rome into an underworld that is figured like some doppelgänger of the idealized Rome of the mytho-historical past:

esse aliquos manes et subterranea regna,
Cocytum et Stygio ranas in gurgite nigras,
atque una transire uadum tot milia cumba
nec pueri 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
sulpura cum taedis et si foret umida laurus.
illic heu miseri traducimur.

That there are certain ancestor-spirits and kingdoms underground, Cocytus and black frogs in the Stygian abyss,

and that ever so many thousands cross the water in one skiff
not even boys believe, other than those who don’t yet wash for a coin.
Yet suppose these things are true: what would Curius and both the
Scipios think? What would Fabricius and the spirit of Camillus? What the legion of Cremera and the youth annihilated at Cannae, the souls of so many battles, whenever such a shade arrived among them from here? They would desire to be purified, if any sulphur were provided with torches and if there were some wet laurel. Alas, there we are ridiculed as wretched men. …

(2.149-59)

The satirist concedes that the underworld is a myth, but asks that his audience conjure the scene where the paragons of Roman virtue create an ideal Rome by their mere presence. ‘Juvenal’ uses these exemplars of uncontested Romanitas to model for his audience the appropriate response to the influx of the deviant Other: religious revulsion. Whenever such a shade (talis... umbra) comes to them from the satirist’s Rome (hinc), the shades of the ancient Romans lust (cuperent) for ritual purification. The authorial choice of cuperent (they would lust) and taedis (torches) pointedly responds to the sexual deviance of the recent shades by showing the sanctioned response to the presence of pathics—lust for purification rather than for the pathics. These torches signify purification rather than operating as symbols of (illicit) passion. The fact that the ancient spirits practice a normative response to the contamination of their pristine space is figured by the satirist as the reason that they ridicule contemporary Romans as wretched men (miseri traducimur).

It is not merely that the true Roman does not practice deviance, but that he knows how to correctly respond to the influx of deviance.

Just as for the invasion of the underworld, the outward movement of corrupted Romans is interrogated by the satirist as a vector for the spread of moral contagion. The passage continues with an authorial caveat that the performance of the definitively Roman act of conquest does not guarantee the Romanitas of the victors:

... 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. et tamen unus Armenius Zalaces cunctis narratur ephebis mollior ardentis sese indulsisse tribuno. aspice quid faciant commercia: uenerat obses, hic fiunt homines. nam si mora longior urbem induerit pueris, non unquam derit amator. mittentur bracae, cultelli, frena, flagellum: sic praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores.

… We have indeed projected arms beyond the shores of Ireland and (beyond) the recently captured Orkneys and the Britons content with the smallest night, but the things that now occur in the city of the victorious people those whom we have conquered do not do. Nevertheless, one Armenian, Zalaces, is said to have been more pathic than the other youths and to have bestowed himself to an ardent Tribune. Look at what commerce causes: he had come as a hostage here they become humans. For if an excessive stay dresses the boys in the City, a lover will not ever be lacking. They throw away their trousers, knives, reins, whip: thus they import juvenile Roman mores to Artaxata.

The rot at the heart of the City strips the expected meaning from the act of conquest, since the putative moral gradient has been reversed. It has become the conquered Other that does not do (non faciunt illi quos uicimus) what happens in Rome. The City (urbem) is figured as a seductive mode of clothing, which prolonged contact (mora longior) is able to wrap around the susceptible youth (induerit pueris). Should this happen, the apodosis promises that a lover will not ever be lacking (non unquam derit amator). This sentiment is congruent with that expressed in Satire IX, where the authorial persona lapses into Greek to assert that αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος (the cinaedus himself attract a man, 9.37). The model of deviant sexual commerce here is complementary to that proposed above at 9.130-33, where the willing top should have no fear of running short of bottoms. Finally, the discourse of contamination is inverted by the transport of
elite pre-adult Roman mores to the Armenian capital (*praetextatos referunt Artaxata mores*).\(^{221}\) Taken in the context of the broader representation of the movement of moral contagion outlined above, this oppositional discourse can be seen as an amplified indictment against corruption at Rome: i.e. if the mores practiced at Rome can corrupt the transplanted Other as well as his space on his return home, then they must be corrupt indeed.\(^{222}\)

The author deploys this *topos* of amplification again in the depiction of a Senator’s wife who runs off with a troop of gladiators:

\[
\text{nupta senatori comitata est Eppia ludum}
\]
\[
ad Pharon et Nilum famosaque moenia Lagi
\]
\[
prodigia et mores urbis damnante Canopo.
\]

Eppia, married to a senator, accompanied a gladiator troop to Pharos and the Nile and the infamous walls of (Ptolemy son of) Lagus, while Canopus condemned these ill omens and the mores of the City.

(6.82-84)

As a member of the senatorial class, Eppia is categorically excluded from interaction with the *infames* gladiators that she chooses to accompany outside of Roman space. Her actions are evil-omens (*prodigia*), even in the region of Alexandria and along the Nile.

As a representative of the Roman elite, however, Eppia makes the mores of the City (*mores urbis*) the object of scorn even to the vile city of Canopus. The imported

---

\(^{221}\) The use of the adjective *praetextatos* marks these mores as specifically elite, since only magistrates and the children of the elite wore the *toga praetexta*. The use of this clothing term also amplifies the related imagery of *induerit* in line 168. These mores are something external that one becomes accustomed to and chooses to put on like clothing; the element of agency is crucial for the rhetoric of ‘Juvenal.’ Cf. J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante, *The World of Roman Costume* (Wisconsin, 1994), 13, also Juvenal 1.78 for the *praetextatus adulter* meaning a youth.

\(^{222}\) Tacitus deploys a similar *topos* in his *Germania*, where he examines the mores of the Germans as a foil for a discussion of Roman mores. In statements of the type ‘*plusque ibi boni mores valent quam alibi bonae leges*’ (there, good mores are more efficacious than good laws are elsewhere), the author arguably places Rome in the position of the inferior comparison (*Ger.* 19). J. B. Rives, *Tacitus Germania: Translated with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 1999), 51 notes that while Tacitus had multiple authorial objectives beyond the intent “to confront his degenerate fellow citizens with a picture of the uncorrupted *Germani*,” the “opportunity for investigating such topics was very likely one of the things that attracted Tacitus to this genre.”
contagion has become an endemic moral disease that can be exported back into a now less-corrupt outer world. The author thus figures the influx of alien mores as a transformative threat to Roman space, if they are allowed to fully gestate without the appropriate resistance.

**Domestic Space**

As the most sequestered reserve of Romanitas within the gradations of exclusion set up by the author, domestic space has the capacity to positively color whatever is located within it and to be compromised, to an even greater degree, by the same. The authorial persona counterpoises a contrastive pair of dining furnishings in the context of the extended discussion of dining in *Satire 11*:

\[
illa domi natas nostraque ex arbore mensas
tempora uiderunt; hos lignum stabat ad usus,
annosam si forte nucem deiecerat eurus.
at nunc diuitibus cenandi nulla voluptas,
il rhombus, nil damma sapit, putere uidentur
unguenta atque rosae, latos nisi sustinet orbis
grande ebur et magno sublimis pardus hiatu
dentibus ex illis quos mittit porta Syenes
et Mauri celeres et Mauro obscurior Indus,
et quos depositus Nabataeo belua saltu
iam nimios capitique graues. ...
\]

Those times saw tables born from our own tree in the home; wood was lying at hand for these uses, if, by chance, the East wind had cast down an ancient nut tree. But now, the rich have no delight in dining, the turbot and the antelope have no taste, the perfumes and the roses seem to rot, unless massive ivory supports the wide round tables - and a rearing leopard with an enormous gape from those teeth which the gate of Syene and the quick Moors and the Indian even darker than a Moor exports, and which the beast in the Nabatean grove lays aside already too heavy for its head. ...

(11.117-127)
In the home (*domi*) of the idealized past, it is appropriate to make use of what is already to hand. It is significant that the nut tree sanctioned for use in making tables is represented as having been felled by forces of nature rather than having been harvested for its eventual use. So long as it lived, it had utility as a source of home-grown food, and it would thus have been an extravagance to squander this primary utility for decoration. The recapture of its lost utility for a secondary purpose is thus virtuously Roman. By contrast, the *domus* of the dilettante rich is suffused with imported luxuries to the extent that even extravagant foods and refinements lose their savor if not presented with the expected degree of alien sophistication. The author moves across a range of alienation from the Moors to the distant Indians as he colors the ivory with its alien origins. Further, the ivory must by properly worked, expense added to expense. The presence of these luxuries depletes the *Romanitas* of the *domus* much as the marble is said to deplete the numinous character of the Shrine of Egeria in *Satire III*.\(^{223}\) As always, it is the deviant tastes of the elite that corrupt the space of the home; the imported furnishings are both symptomatic and themselves contagious. The use of the sanctioned local material ties the *domus* to the Roman, whereas the imported alienates domestic space by tying it to the Far. The boundary between conceptual categories is breached.

While the *limen* (threshold) of the Roman doorway serves within the *Satires* as a concretization of the more abstract concept of a division between domestic and public space, it is the actions of the masters of the house that are figured as having the power to ratify or to nullify that boundary. Thus, the operation of the *limen* is made to serve as a

\(^{223}\) Cf. 3.18-20 (discussed in Chapter II) and 11.116.
visible symptom of moral disorder. The satirist commonly deploys this symbol to interrogate the purity or contamination of domestic space and consequently of the members of the family within. ‘Juvenal’ articulates this conception of domestic space clearly in his discussion of moral education in Satire XIV:

\[
\text{nil dictu foedum uisuque haec limina tangat}
\]
\[
intra quae pater est. procul, a procul inde puellae}
\]
\[
lenorum et cantus pernoctantis parasiti.
\]
\[
maxima debetur puero reuerentia, si quid
\]
\[
turpe paras, nec tu pueri contempereris annos,
\]
\[
sed peccaturo obstet tibi filius infans.
\]

May nothing foul touch these thresholds by speaking or by seeing within which there is a father. Far away, far away from there the girls of the pimps and the song of the all-night-long moocher. The greatest reverence is owed your boy, if you are planning something disgusting, and you should not disregard the years of your son, but may your infant son block the way as you are about to sin.

(14.44-49)

The mode of contamination here envisioned encompasses the act of speech as well as mere observation of something foul. The use of tangat is significant in that it denotes the physicality of the verbal and visual contagion and the concern that it not be allowed to touch the thresholds. With the qualification intra quae pater est, ‘Juvenal’ indicates that his concern is with only the specific limina that pertain to the Roman man par excellence: the paterfamilias. The authorial persona asserts that the existence and the presence of the son should compel the nominal pater to fully embrace his Identity. Many of the favorite targets of the satirist are enumerated as instances of the non-Roman that belong to

---

224 Cf. also the discussion of Persius 1.107-110 in Chapter III, where limina are deployed as a metaphor for amicitia. The access to domestic space was a crucial determinant in the creation of interpersonal relations and thus to the respective identities of the excluded or the included.

225 As discussed in Chapter II, I contend that Juvenal conceptualizes communication, whether verbal or written, much in the manner of the speech act proposed by J. L. Austin.
exterior space. Further, it is the grounding of the man within this privileged domestic space through a proper relationship to his infant son that delimits his ability to sin.

Much as the Embankment might function as a conceptual barrier between Rome and the more contaminated exterior world, the *limen* is deployed by ‘Juvenal’ as a sort of membrane that in its ideal state is impermeable to the corruption of exterior space. The relationship of domestic to public space is thus conceived as analogous to that between Rome and the outer world. When the authorial *persona* constructs his idealized dinner in *Satire XI*, he again figures the *limen* along these lines:

```
sed nunc dilatis auerte negotia curis
et gratam requiem dona tibi, quando licebit
per totum cessare diem. non fenoris ulla
mentio nec, prima si luce egressa reuerti
nocte solet, tacito bilem tibi contrahat uxor
umida suspectis referens multicia rugis
uxatasque comas et uoltum auremque calentem.
protinus ante meum quidquid dolet exue limen,
pone domum et seruos et quidquid frangitur illis
aut perit, ingratos ante omnia pone sodalis.
```

But now, with your concerns postponed, deflect your business affairs and give yourself welcome rest, when it shall be allowed to pause for an entire day. Not any mention of interest, and if your wife is accustomed to return by night (when she left at first light), may she not produce bile for silent you, as she drags in her splendid garments wet with suspicious wrinkles, tousled hair, and her face and ear burning (in a blush). Strip off whatever causes you pain before my threshold, put off your house and slaves and whatever gets broken or is lost due to them, before everything put off your ungrateful friends.

(11.183-92)

In multiple instances of language figuring withdrawal and separation, the satirist enjoins his guest to separate himself from the travails of the exterior world of Roman action. The use of *dilatis* (drag off), *auerte* (turn aside), *cessare* (draw back), and *exue* (strip off) each contribute to the image of a volitional separation from the entanglements of the
compromised Roman social space exterior to the *domus*. One of the crucial points being advanced by the satirist is that the friend is allowed into the purer domestic space within the *limen*. In the condition of its normative operation, *amicitia* makes domestic space continuous among those that share its bond.

The inverse of the positive example of domestic space detailed above is the theme of exclusion explored by the author and again frequently linked to the *limen*. As the *limen* of the true *pater* excludes all manner of corrupt persons and practices, its antithesis, the *limen* of the corrupt *diues*, excludes only what it should allow and welcomes only what it should properly not allow:

...iubet a praecone uocari
ipsos Troiugenas, nam uexant limen et ipsi nobiscum. 'da praetori, da deinde tribuno.'

... He commands the Trojan-born elite themselves to be summoned by a herald, for even they themselves plague his threshold along with us. ‘Give to the Praetor, give next to the Tribune.’

...iubet a praecone uocari
ipsos Troiugenas, nam uexant limen et ipsi nobiscum. '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? ...

... He commands the Trojan-born elite themselves to be summoned by a herald, for even they themselves plague his threshold along with us. ‘Give to the Praetor, give next to the Tribune.’

But a freedman is before them. He says, ‘I am here in front. Why should I fear or hesitate to defend my place, although I was born beside the Euphrates, which the pathic holes in my ears prove, can I deny it?...

... He commands the Trojan-born elite themselves to be summoned by a herald, for even they themselves plague his threshold along with us. ‘Give to the Praetor, give next to the Tribune.’

The Trojan-born elite annoy the rich man’s threshold (*uexant limen*) just as do the rest of the lesser clients. The satirist implies that these men should be the *amici* of the *diues*, as should the Praetor and the Tribune. The *limen* should not operate as a barrier to the interior space of the house for these socially important persons; the spatial expression of *amicitia* has thus been perverted by the interest in wealth alone, as shown by the preferment of the Eastern freedman, who has no qualms about asserting his place before
the officers of state. The deviant values of the this *paterfamilias* are represented in the operation of his threshold of his *domus*, much like those of the *cinaedi* of *Satire II*, who display their moral inversion through the inverted function of their limen:

...*sed more sinistro*
*exagitata procul non intrat femina limen:*
sol*is ara deae maribus patet. 'ite, profanae,'*
*clamatur; 'nullo gemit hic tibicina cornu.'*

…But driven far away in an ill-omened way
a woman does not enter the threshold:
the altar of the goddess is open to males alone. ‘Go away, foul women!’ is shouted, ‘the flute-girl groans on no horn here.’

The satirist stigmatizes the social practices of the *cinaedi* by asserting that they are done in an ill-omened manner (*more sinistro*). As with the *diues* above, the owner of this *limen* chooses to repel from this *domus* those with a normative claim on a right to enter; instead of one being present as a wife, all women are driven far off (*exagitata procul … femina*). Roman space, as is the case for all aspects of the written Rome of Juvenal, is vulnerable to the choices of those in a position to cause defilement.

The primal threat to the sanctity of domestic space is the morality of those who have the right to move across its boundaries. The role of agent of this contagion is often filled by the character of the corrupt wife, a favorite *topos* of the satirist:

*imperat ergo uiro. sed mox haec regna relinquit *
*permutatque domos et flammea conterit; inde *
*auolat et spreit repetit uestigia lecti. *
*ornatas paulo ante fores, pendentia linquit *
*uela domus et adhuc uirides in limine ramos. *
*sic crescit numerus, sic fiunt octo mariti *
*quinque per autumnos, titulo res digna sepulcri.*

---

226 The opposition in this phrase is with the positively-valenced term *dexter*; cf. *dextro pede* in Petronius, *Satirica* 30.6.

227 The theme of exclusion deployed here has strong resonances with the imagery of 4.64, as discussed in Chapter IV.
Therefore she commands her man. But soon she abandons these kingdoms and exchanges houses and wears out her veils; then she flies away and seeks again the traces of the spurned bed. She leaves the door decorated just before, the hanging drapes of the house and the branches still green on the threshold. Thus the number grows, thus there have been eight husbands in five autumns, a matter worthy of the inscription of her tomb.

The wife who has seen many doorways decked with green branches (*uirides in limine ramos*) is a threat to the system of meaning embedded in those symbols. In this instance, the wife is denigrated by a reference to the number of her husbands and the time it took to accomplish that sum. The linkage between the wife and the threshold as lynchpins in the creation of domestic space has been ruptured. ‘Juvenal’ here figures the aberrant permeability of the *limen* in the casual impermanence of the marriages that cause it to be decorated in vain. It fails to retain the wife, the *sine qua non* of domestic space, within its sanctioned bounds, and thus the *limen* fails to protect the *Romanitas* of one *domus* of the eight. The social contract that makes Rome function has been broken.

The exists in each of these instances a sense that deviant choices entail a necessary social cost. The *pater* that chooses to retain his debased lifestyle must face the certainty that his infant son will be corrupted. The *diuex* will not know the reciprocal ties of proper *amicitia*. The exclusion of women entails exclusion of the *cinaedi* from normative society. The wife of eight husbands must face the recognition that the identity of wife is for her all but meaningless. For every mode of deviance there is a cost for the wider the social order of Rome:

*quis totidem erexit uillas, quis fercula septem secreto cenauit auus? nunc sportula primo limine parua sedet turbae rapienda togatae.*
Which ancestor ever erected so many villas, which devoured seven courses in private” Now the tiny handout sits on the very threshold to be snatched by a toga-clad mob.

There is in this passage a causal linkage proposed between the fiscal excesses of the modern elite and the fiscal necessity for the toga-clad mob (turbae... togatae) to seek a handout. Two related aspects of social deviance are alluded to within the text. First, the modern elite are accused of dining in private, an action that nullifies the core meaning of the normative *convivium*. Second, the *sportula* must be snatched (rapienda) from the threshold. In both of these images, ‘Juvenal’ portrays the relationship between patron and client as severed. They do not see each other; they do not live together. The *limen* again functions to segregate the worlds of the patron and his clients. The putative *auus* better understood the normative operation of the patron-client system. Of particular importance for the present argument is the satirist’s focus on the act of building as a key mode of fiscal deviance. As with the deviance of dining in excess and alone, the act of building can easily drift from a necessary and pro-social activity into a means of fragmenting Roman society.

**Space Outside of the Human Scale**

The proper operation of the Roman city requires a functional distribution of space. The distortions of communal space produced by the excesses of the elite are figured by the author as a threat to the collective identities of the Roman state. It is the vice of construction outside of the human scale that entails the constriction of the space available to the remnant of society. The satirist interrogates the value of such unbounded constructions:
quid refert igitur, quantis iumenta fatiget porticibus, quanta nemorum uectetur in umbra, iugera quot uicina foro, quas emerit aedes?
nemo malus felix, minime corruptor et idem incestus, cum quo nuper uittata iacebat sanguine adhuc uiuo terram subitura sacerdos?

What does it therefore matter, in how many colonnades he wears out his cart-animals, in how much shade of the woods he is carried, how many acres close to the Forum (and) what houses he buys No evil man is blessed, even less so the seducer and himself an unchaste man, with whom recently lay the filleted priestess about to go underground with her blood yet alive.

The end of this vocation is not a blessed state; ‘Juvenal’ couches his refutation of the value to unbounded space per se in a rhetorical question: quid refert igitur. For all that, the wicked man (malus) is not truly happy (felix). The emperor Nero is critiqued by the historians for having built all of Rome into a structure for his personal amusement.

Suetonius cites a selection of contemporary sentiments written out or popularized in Greek or in Latin (multa Graece Latineque proscripta aut uulgata), among which is the couplet:

\[
\text{Roma domus fiet: Veios migrate, Quirites, si non et Veios occupat ista domus.}
\]

Rome will become a house: migrate to Veii, Romans, as long as that house is not seizing Veii also.

(Nero 39)

---

228 The infamous Domus Aurea, concerning which Suetonius states that non in alia re tamen damnosior quam in aedificando domum a Palatio Esquilias usque fecit, quam primo transitoriam, mox incendio absumptam restitutamque auream nominavit (not in another matter, however, was he more wasteful than in building a house from the Palatine to the Esquiline, which he at first named the Transitoria, but soon destroyed by fire and restored, he called the Domus Aurea, Nero 31). M. T. Griffin, Nero: the End of a Dynasty (Routledge, 1987), 129 notes that this “epigram helps to confirm that hostility was directed at the Domus Aurea rather than at the general plans for urban reconstruction.” Tacitus narrates these events in a much more balanced manner, giving credit to the improved building regulations put in place after the fire by Nero, while nevertheless critiquing the scale and effects of the Domus Aurea (Ann. 15.43).
The cognate aspect of this discourse is seen in praise for the emperor Vespasian for returning the improperly sequestered space to the people:

*hic ubi sidereus propius videt astra colossus*  
*et crescent media pegmata celsa via,*  
*invidiosa feri radiant atria regis*  
*unaque iam tota stabat in urbe domus.*

5

*hic ubi conspicui venerabilis amphitheatri*  
*erigitur moles, stagna Neronis erant.*  
*hic ubi miramur velocea munera thermas,*  
*abstulerat miseris tecta superbus ager.*  
*Claudia diffusas ubi porticus explicat umbras,*  
*ultima pars aulae deficientis erat.*

10

*reddita Roma sibi est et sunt te praeside, Caesar,*  
*deliciae populi, quae fuerant domini.*

(Martial, *Spectacula* 2.1-12)

Allowed that the tone of this poem is similar to panegyric rhetoric, the point remains that the author here deploys a discourse on space that is congruent with that of the *Satires.*

The arrogation of space outside the human scale for the pleasure of a single man is explicitly figured as an attack on the space of the Roman people. The poet illustrates the deleterious effects of a deviant interest in building by claiming that the arrogant field (*superbus ager*) of Nero had stolen the roofs from the wretched people (*abstulerat miseris tecta*). Martial is interested in questions of proportion not category, much as is Juvenal. In line 4 even the arrangement of the words is designed to emphasize the sprawl
of the emperor’s house, as unaque and domus bracket the line and figuratively enclose the entire city. 229 At the same time the author speaks approvingly of the scale of the Flavian buildings that supplanted the Domus Aurea. It is a question of the ratio of scale of expenditure to utility; the Amphitheatrum Flavium represents normative Roman values, since it serves a pro-social function for the wider population. The irony of terming Nero ‘uncultivated, wild’ (feri) is profound, given the pretensions of that emperor to all aspects of high culture, and this appellation is all to the point. Nero did not understand that the nature of Romanitas did not allow for personal excess that negated the ties of social reciprocity. In his total disregard for the claims of other Romans, the emperor was more like a wild beast than a normative member of the cultured elite. 230

Along these lines, the properly ordered Rome of ‘Juvenal’ does not allow for such extreme segregation of public space, as is seen in the critique of the general ramifications of the narcissistic concern for comfort on the part of the diues:

si uocat officium, turba cedente uehetur
diues et ingenti curret super ora Liburna
atque obiter leget aut scribet uel dormiet intus;
namque facit somnum clausa lectica fenestra.
ante tamen ueniet: nobis properantibus obstat
unda prior, magno populus premit agmine lumbos
qui sequitur; ferit hic cubito, ferit assere duro
alter, at hic tignum capiti incutit, ille metretam.
pingua crura luto, planta max undique magna
calcor, et in digitu clauus mihi militis haeret.

If duty calls, the rich man will be carried through as the crowd yields and will run above their faces in an enormous Liburnian (galley) and indeed along the way he will read or write or even sleep inside; for with its closed window the sedan chair makes sleep.

229 This poetic effect has in all likelihood been noted in previous studies.
230 It should be reiterated here that I am discussing the character of Nero as created by Martial, Suetonius, and others. As an exemplar of deviance and excess, Nero was ‘good to think with’ for moralistic authors. I am particularly interested in the discourse on the use of space current in the late first and early second centuries.
Nevertheless, he will arrive earlier: the wave in front obstructs us as we hurry, the nation that follows presses our sides with its huge throng; one strikes with his heal, another with a hard sedan-chair pole, but this guy strikes a log into a head, and another (uses a) keg. My legs are fat with mud, next I am trodden upon from everywhere by a huge foot, and a soldier’s nail sticks in my toe.

(3.239-48)

This passage could be perhaps dismissed as simple envy and frustration on the part of the persona Umbricius, yet the luxury of the diues has practical implications for those afoot. Those who carry the abnormally massive sedan-chair (ingenti... Liburna) occasionally strike others with the hard poles (assere duro) by which they carry it. Space is itself permeable to the diues in every fashion, but, in the written Rome of the satirist, that malleability comes at the cost of the gamut of negative consequences for the poor. The overly packed roads represent a positive danger to the poor, due to the luxurious spaces of the elite:

```
nam si procubuit qui saxa Ligustica portat
axis et euersum fudit super agmina montem,
quid superest de corporibus? quis membra, quis ossa
inuenit? obritum uolgi perit omne cadauer
more animae. domus interea secura patellas
iam lauat et bucca foculum excitat et sonat unctis
strigibus et pleno componit lintea guto.
haec inter pueros uarie properantur, at ille
iam sedet in ripa taetrumque nouicius horret
porthmea nec sperat caenosi gurgitis alnum
infelix nec habet quem porrigat ore trientem.
```

For if the axle that carries Ligurian stones falls over and pours an overthrown mountain over the throng, what will remain from their bodies? Who finds the limbs, who the bones? Every corpse of the mob perishes crushed utterly in the manner of their soul. Meanwhile, the house without a care is washing the plates already and stirs the little hearth with a puffed cheek and clacks the oily strigils and sets out the linens with a full flask.

---

231 There is much that might also be said of the antithesis between the pastoral fantasies (simplistic, predictable) of Horace and Vergil and the sophisticated and threatening urban space of satire, but that discussion can be saved for another venue.
These matters are hurried along variously among the boys, but the man himself already sits a novice on the bank and shivers at the loathsome ferryman and the unfortunate man does not hope for a shit of the muddy abyss, nor does he have a tiny coin in his mouth which he could offer.

The Ligurian stones (*saxa Ligustica*) are representative of any imported stone, a luxury commodity drawn into the Roman streets by the habits of the elite. The man crushed by the overturned stones is clearly not impoverished in an absolute sense. He has a house (*domus*) as well as slave boys, and the utensils are being prepared for a bath when he makes his expected return. The dead man is in all probability a citizen, but he does not enjoy the bodily impenetrability owed to a Roman.\(^{232}\) His body is obliterated like that of a slave given over to a *carnifex* (professional slave executioner), and his soul it transported entirely out of Rome to the banks of the Styx, where it cannot even reach the underworld proper due to the lack of the fare. In this instance, the refined sensibilities of the elite have produced the absolute annihilation of a member of the sub-elite. The wider awareness of such interconnectivity between the actions of the elite and the lived experience of the sub-elite informs the discussion of elite *mores* throughout the *Satires*:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{balnea sescentis et pluris porticus in qua gestetur dominus quotiens pluit. anne serenum expectet spargarque luto iumenta recenti?} \\
& \text{hic potius, namque hic mundae nitet ungula mulae. parte alia longis Numidarum fulta columnis surgat et algentem rapiat cenatio solem.}
\end{align*}
\]

The baths cost 600,000 and the portico, in which the master rides however often it rains, cost more. Or should he wait around for a clear day and spatter his cart animals with fresh mud? Here it’s better, for here the hoof of an elegant mule gleams. In another section, a dining room rises up, propped on tall columns of Numidian (marble), and snatches the chilly sun.

The experiences of Roman space available to the audience of the Satires allows the author to elicit and to authorize moral disgust against the excesses of the deviant elite. ‘Juvenal’ reanalyzes extravagant articulations of space and material designed to code for sophistication and status into signs for tasteless overindulgence. In doing so, the author conforms to the wider Roman discourse on the civic use of space and expenditure.

Conclusions

Within the text of the Satires, Roman space is constructed as permeable, vulnerable to intrusions and contaminations, just as is the figurative Roman body. Normative spatial boundaries and semantic associations become unstable in the presence of deviant mores, much as the body does in the presence of disease. The Roman City is susceptible to division and to the piecemeal nullification of its meaning through the uncontrolled influx of Otherness in the form of alien persons, mores, and material culture. Segments of space can consequently become contaminated in such a fashion as to cease to be Roman, despite their location or historical significance. Such spaces in turn become pockets of compromised identity with the potential to pass the moral contagion onto those who frequent them. Through their tainted choices, deviant persons act as vectors to bring the contagion across the boundary of the limen and into domestic space. “Juvenal” thus models Otherness as a disease infecting the City layer by layer and threatening to replace all vestiges of Romanitas. The authorial persona, in concert with the other personae within the Satires, implies that the use of space in the Roman City is a zero-sum game, where the transgressions of the elite are tied to an increasing constriction of the
spatial security of sub-elitist Romans. The use of space can and must be read by the observer as a moral text; ‘Juvenal’ offers a set of rubrics for so reading space, rubrics that are designed to direct the readings of his audience. The arguments within the Satires are based on beliefs on the nature of contamination and space, beliefs which the author presumes to represent the consensus opinio. It is not necessary to suppose that Juvenal is altogether correct in his assumptions for the Satires to have value as evidence of the Roman discourse on the intersection of mores and space. Whatever the exact position of the satirist relative to the Zeitgeist, it is clear that the use of space was a moral question for the literary elite of the first and second centuries. It is equally clear that the precise point of articulation between refined elegance and immoral excess was under fierce contest. On one side of the debate can be advanced the Satires, while on the other stand the material remains of those in disagreement.
Chapter VII: Conclusions: Authorized Emotions and Roman Identity

*nemo satis credit tantum delinquere quantum permittas: adeo indulgent sibi latius ipsi.*

No one believes it is enough to transgress only as much as you allow: they indulge themselves so much more extensively.

Juvenal, 14.233-34

Juvenal does not seek to produce a fully rationalized philosophical system in the *Saturae*; these poems, both individually and in the context of their respective books, take the appearance of a semi-congealed stream of cultural *ekphrases* (verbal icons, so to speak)—touchstones and bald assertions that respond to the rhetorical needs of the moment within the broad flow of the particular argument at hand. If there are occasional departures from a previously asserted stance, there is no need to attribute such apparent disparities to a remarkable or a pointed hypocrisy on the part of the authorial *persona*. The dictates of the genre are themselves confined to the discourses present in the literature of second-century Rome and those earlier works that have intertextual importance. Although the *Satires* claim for themselves this quality, they do not represent a definitive statement of a normative Roman moral system.\(^{233}\) This caveat should in no way be taken as a critique of the poet or his product; it is merely the recognition that the search for what was not intended to be present is a sure way to misconstrue the text.

\(^{233}\) No such unitary system existed.
There remains much of crucial value in these poems for the scholar of Roman antiquity, but the extraction of that value requires a more balanced appraisal of the interconnection of the texts and their world than what has been thus far proposed in the scholarship.

Taken in sum, the author offers his audience an interpretational framework often grounded in the worst of human emotions: envy, hate, pride, and fear. The poetry authorizes these responses as patriotic, as really Roman, much like the ever-more-demagogic appeals of early-twenty-first-century American political discourse have tended to divide the nation along dichotomies convenient to the would-be demagogues. The hatred and fear that inform the contemporary debate on immigration or the so-called War on Terror are essentially congruent with the insecurities that motivate the satirist’s invective against the Other. In many passages, the gratification of assenting laughter is insidiously close by even for the contemporary lector, if not in the misogyny of Satire VI, then certainly as a balm for wounded academic pride proffered by Satire VII. Yet, for all the manifest Roman bile, there is no less evidence of the better instincts present in the second-century literary discourse. Juvenal writes in a highly empathetic manner of the travails of the near-elite, a literary conceit that might best be described as a foreshadowing of the excellent condescension of the Victorian era. The primary concern of the author rests with those whose station affords them the ability to make morally significant choices.

No doubt, the author engages in one textual performance after another, but one should have an equal degree of assurance that much of the authorial voice of Juvenal is preserved within the hexameters. We may call these shifts in aspect or tone personae, but there is no solid rational for completely divorcing the poet from the content of his
poetry, even in those cases where the persona is specifically named. The biography of the man is certainly not present in his poetry, yet the choice of themes and modes of argument let slip the issues of significance to the author. The text also reveals the criteria by which each value judgment may be made. Juvenal cannot reveal the precise quanta of food that must be distributed to a client, but his verse does show that this category of behavior is essential to the creation of the identity ‘patronus.’ Each person is judged by the social ramifications of his or her choices. The Roman in isolation is no Roman at all; a person is Roman through action alone, not by essence.

While the details of the satirist’s treatment of the link between action and identity are collectively of great significance to Roman Studies, I have suggested that the injudicious promotion of small components of the larger arguments can lead to a misapprehension of their broader implications. The Satires represent much less a case of the weighty recitation of lines of choice artistry and vast import to be dissected at leisure than one where the reader must catch the meaning as it flies. Although a particular apothem, e.g. orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano (one should pray that there be a healthy mind in a healthy body), may superficially represent the drift of a satire, the global effect cannot be encapsulated in any fragment of the whole; the satires are individually an dizzying experience of concept and color that engenders a mental state with the objective to delight and to persuade.

---

234 As in the case of Umbricius in Satire III or Naevolus in Satire XI.
235 I borrow a turn of phrase here from William Blake’s Eternity: He who binds himself a joy / Does the winged life destroy. / But he who kisses the joy as it flies / Lives in eternity's sun rise.
236 Cf. Horace, Ars Poetica, 341-44. J. D. Reeve, “Seven Notes.” The Classical Review 20.2 (1970): 134-136 proposes to delete line 10.356 based on a supposed logical dissonance between the satirist’s proposition that virtus is the only way to a tranquil life (10.364) and the suggestion that health is to be requested from the gods. Pace Reeve, there is nothing aberrant about a Roman praying for health while advocating the moral primacy of virtus. I suggest that ‘Juvenal’ here advises his audience to pray for what cannot be controlled (sanitas) while taking personal responsibility for what is in their purview (virtus).
Just as the oration of a trial lawyer does not stick in the mind of the juror in all its intricate detail, the poem functions as a performance of a theme that leaves its trace on the emotions and mind of the hearer in the form of a *Gestalt* more than as a transcript to be scrutinized word by word. The *truth* of the *Satires* is to be sought in the shape of all the collected points and colors of the song, not in the orientation or character of any single point on the curve. There is no need for the constructed stream of consciousness embodied by the sixteen poems to be mutually coherent and linear in the fashion of historiography. These works have a greater verisimilitude for being less like the edited versions of an oration published after the fact; even *Satire X* takes more of the form of an emotional rant than that of a reasoned discourse on quietism.

Perhaps the most apt metaphor the digital age has to offer is that of the image generated by a CRT (cathode ray tube) display that is composed of the rapid sequence of varying color and intensity as the beam of electrons sweeps back and forth across the screen too fast to perceive; the verse of Juvenal shifts in a violent and apparently erratic manner from the perspective of the individual lines at a fixed time, but from the perspective of the flowing time of its intended audience, the discrete satires are polished and harmonious crystallizations of worldview, each of which reveals the elements of the master discourses of identity and society in the early second century.

What the author offers in the collection of his many authorial voices is an authorized perception of the Roman world rather than the reality. This perception is arguably more valuable that many facts would be, as it reveals not just what was, but what was conceptually important to the Romans of the second century. Here I return to

Furthermore, the *orandum est* construction of 10.356 is congruent with many similar gerundive constructions in the texts of Cicero, for example.
the observation of Foucault cited in Chapter II, that "speech is no mere verbalization of conflicts and systems of domination, but that it is the very object of man's conflicts." The Satires are designed to ratify a specific Roman identity by nullifying all others. Again, it is a small step to take between the “radically undetermined” masculine identity posited by Maud Gleason and a radically undetermined equation between the legal status of cives Romanus and Romanitas in the Satires. What I have attempted to demonstrate is that Juvenal conceives of Romanitas as just such a constructed quantity with uncertain ties to all of the external characteristics that were taken as corollaries of elite Roman status: wealth, political office, noble ancestors, education, et cetera. Within the Roman socio-political reality of the early second century, none of these factors could be reliably employed as a means of discrimination in the manner desired by the poet. The Satires represent a major act of aggression in the culture wars of the Trajanic and Hadrianic principates, through which the poet attempts to seize control of the discourse of Roman identity. Juvenal offers a totalizing interpretational framework through which his audience is invited to assign signification to their world line-by-line through their approving laughter.

The nearly contemporary and broadly apposite Annales of Tacitus offers an appraisal of the interest of the Roman elite in criticizing both moral faults and efforts to mitigate those excesses. The historiographer locates this assessment in the persona of Tiberius, as the emperor makes his formal reply to the Senate concerning a proposed sumptuary law. After having made the objection that it might have been preferable for the aediles to have passed over such “exceedingly strong and bloated vices” (praevalida

---

et adulta vitia) rather than having raised the issue with the result that “it becomes obvious
that we are unequal to these disgraceful acts” (ut palam fieret quibus flagitiis impares
essemus), the persona of Tiberius is made to state this perspective:

mihi autem neque honestum silere neque proloqui expeditum, quia non aedilis aut
praetoris aut consulis partis sustineo. maius aliquid et excelsius a principe
postulatur; et cum recte factorum sibi quisque gratiam trahant, unius invidia ab
omnibus peccatur. quid enim primum prohibere et priscum ad morem recidere
adgrediar? villarumne infinita spatia? familiarum numerum et nationes? argenti
et auri pondus? aeris tabularumque miracula? promiscas viris et feminis vestis
atque illa feminarum propria, quis lapidum causa pecuniae nostrae ad externas
aut hostilis gentis transferuntur? (3.54) ‘Nec ignoro in conviviis et circulis
incusari ista et modum posci: set si quis legem sanciat, poenas indicat, idem illi
civitatem verti, splendidissimo cuique exitium parari, neminem criminis expertem
 clamitabunt.

For me, however, it is neither respectable to remain silent nor profitable to speak
out, because I do not hold the duties of an Aedilis or a Praetor or a consul.
Something better and more high-minded is demanded from the emperor; and
while each man takes for himself the gratitude of deeds done rightly, the odium of
one man is taken as a fault by everyone. For what should I begin to prohibit first
and to return to ancient morality? The unbounded spaces of villas? The races and
the number of household slaves? The weight of silver and of gold? The marvels
of bronze and of paintings? Clothing confused for man and women, and even that
particular flaw of women, due to whom our funds are handed over to foreign or
hostile races for the sake of gems? (3.54) Nor am I unaware that such (practices)
are held up for criticism at banquets and at gatherings, and that a cutoff point is
requested: but if someone were to ratify a law and set out the penalties, those very
same people will be shouting that the state is being overthrown, that utter death is
being prepared for every illustrious man, that no one at all is devoid of fault.
(Tacitus Ann. 3.53-54)

Having objected that ‘something better and more high-minded’ (maius aliquid et
excelsius) befits the emperor, Tiberius sketches a catalogue of Roman discourses on vice.
The topoi enumerated by ‘Tiberius’ are congruent with much of the content of the
Satires: extravagant construction, foreign slaves and elite superfluity, gender confusion,
and feminine vapidity. The speaker notes his awareness that these topoi (ista) are the
objects of contention at banquets and gatherings (in conviviis et circulis); polite dinner
and social conversation is figured as including the formulaic repudiation (incusari) of moral deviance. ‘Tiberius’ is thus made to assert that all of these vices and their opposites are the components of an elite discourse on proper mores. If these themes could be so explored in these social settings, it is no great leap to suppose that the same themes would have been no less objectionable couched in a poetic genre such as satire.

‘Tiberius’ notes that limits are even called for (modum posci). If enactment of laws could be discussed, a discussion of the contours of excess would be all to the point. At this point, the author reveals a crucial observation on the nature of Roman mores: they constitute a contested discourse. ‘Tiberius’ claims that if someone were to actually act on the invective being hurled against these and related vices, the very same people would be shouting (idem illi ... clamitabunt) that the civilization was being turned on its head (civitatem verti). But why would taking legal action against these celebrated vices be thought to threaten the order of society?

The consequence of enacting this discourse into law would be the end of the system of signs through which Romans established their status; it would be equivalent to “preparing utter destruction of every individual elite man” (splendidissimo cuique exitium parari) by making the hypocrisy of everyone apparent: i.e. that “no one was guiltless of crime” (neminem criminis expertem). There is a certain pleasure to be found in complaining about the state of things and about the outrageous behavior of one’s acquaintances and rivals, yet the creation of elite Roman identity required the freedom to practice these modes of self fashioning, as it demanded the opposing aspect of the discourse as a restraint on deviance. The summation is a sort of symbiosis of action and critique.
I have argued that the multiple devices of humor employed by the author ranging from irony to deflation to hyperbole and the rest are all compatible with the presence of a serious underlying moral standpoint and a consistent rhetorical objective. The fact that individual satires concentrate their attention on different themes does not constitute an argument that they are globally dissonant. Close examination, in fact, reveals that themes explored at length in one satire, Satire VI for example, occur throughout the five books of the Satires. Based on what is known through the wider literary discourse, the literary sophistication of Juvenal’s intended audience would have been able to process the meaning along with the artistry of the Satires. While I accept that all literary productions contain personae rather than the direct expression of the authorial voice, I suggest that these personae present arguments and images that are derived from the worldview of the author. As such, the set of these personae can be used to investigate the moral logic of the author. There is thus no valid reason to set the various articulations of Juvenal’s authorial persona against one another in a contest to determine which is the genuine authorial voice: all are, and none are.

The creation of meaning through the pronouncements and performances of these personae is effected through reliance on the intertext of the previous satirists and the literature of the Post-Augustan period generally, in particular, historiography, epic, and drama. Lucilius is cited as the originator and the prime model of what the author claims to be doing, although Horace is linked to the identity of the project as well. While it has been argued that the Romans did not have a fully articulated theory of genre, and that the concept of genre itself does not account for the variability in artistic activity, I suggest that the discursive force of the claim to be writing inside the ambit of a prior author is an
Juvenal does not simply recapitulate the forms of his predecessors, just as no artist ever precisely matches the forms of his influences or models. *Variatio* is all to the point. There need be no positive statement of what *satura* is; there need only be rhetorically motivated statements of what it is not. Juvenal was not doing what Vergil did with the Aeneas myth or with shepherds. He was not doing what Seneca did with the Phaedra myth. He was not doing what Tacitus did with the Julio-Claudian emperors. And that set of negations held vital significance. The act of locating his authorial voice within a particular tradition is crucial to the rhetorical efficacy of the *Satires*. By so doing, Juvenal was able to create himself as a moral critic positioned to engage with the discourse of the nature of Romanitas.

This fundamental question of what constituted Roman identity—what observable actions were consonant with that claim—is explored by Juvenal through every aspect of Roman action and daily life. Among this plethora of criteria, the author frequently returns to the use of food as a prime signifier of Romanitas and Otherness. Two factors made the examination of foodways a powerful tool for attacking deviance. First, the use of food is an inescapable quotidian discourse that was normatively performed in public. The rituals and norms of dining were intimately familiar to all Romans, and each person was acquainted with both the performance and the evaluation of these practices. Second, idiomatic approaches to food may be used to segregate absolute wealth from the articulation of status. Within the *Satires*, social obligations and relations are frequently figured in the use of food. *Luxuria* and *avaritia* are both thus figured as symptomatic of an antisocial, deviant character incompatible with a claim to Romanitas. Food in general,

---

as well as more overt poisons, has the potential to nullify identity and to throw society into confusion. As such, the use of food is a prime signifier of morality and thus Roman identity.

The choices that underlie the articulation of space are similarly indicative of the inner nature of a potential Roman. Space is immanently mutable as written in the Satires. Like the body, it is susceptible to violence and distortions that call into question its basic identity. The world of the Satires is figured as a series of encircling threats to Romanitas. Otherness constantly threatens to flow into the Roman City, and further, into the Roman domus. This gradient is a given. The responses of an individual to this influx, however, are of key moral relevance. Through individual choice, space is compromised and, in turn, the growing contamination of polluted loci is spread, again by through the choice of deviant individuals, to the extent that the limen can no longer function as a personal boundary. The progression of this alienation of Rome from Romanitas is characterized as so virulent that the City itself could represent a threat to those coming from the now less contaminated outer world. As with the use of food, the profligate use of space and material is cast as symptomatic of deviance. The lust for spaces outside of the human scale is as damning as the desire to consume an entire boar by oneself. In this manner, Juvenal uses the articulation of space to dissect the mores of those who control it. The competing claims of the criticism of excess and the need for display made this contested discourse attractive to the satirist, as did the broader effects of these choices on the ranks of Romans with whom the elite had social obligations. As with all of the practices interrogated by the satirist as signs of depravity, the use of space is figured as a moral question that had important effects on Roman society far beyond the individual.
Within the constructed world of the *Satires*, the Roman individual is not conceded to exist apart from Roman society. Every choice is a moral choice symptomatic of the person’s relationship to the entirety of *Romanitas* as instanced in the Roman people and their material world. In each of the discourses that have been explored within this study, the author identifies the personal agency within selection and expenditure as the locus of the moral crux. The question of Roman identity is thus linked to a larger network of patterns of consumption and social exchange. Globally, the *Satires* are a set of protreptic orations, each one arranged on a theme that is pursued in a seemingly stream-of-consciousness fashion. This effect is a product of intentional style; the *Satires* employ a mode of argumentation that piles on *exempla* until every counterargument is preemptively squelched. In the daily practice of life, the quantity that is too much is always a little more than one personally does; it is always negotiable, contested. In the written Rome of the *Satires*, however, a bright line is drawn firmly enough to engender certainty and far enough from the mean to allow nearly anyone to assent. Viewed from this perspective, the discourses represented in the *Satires* are essential for the negotiation of a private and a collective *Romanitas* in the second century. Spanning what on more careful consideration is an essentially unitary corpus of texts, the authorial voice of Juvenal vividly models for his audience the authorized emotional responses of a *mens sana* (healthy mind) confronted by the spectacle of deviance.
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