



American Philological Association

Rhetoric and Morality in Juvenal's 8th Satire

Author(s): S. C. Fredericks

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 102 (1971), pp. 111-132

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2935941>

Accessed: 01/02/2012 09:45

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Philological Association and The Johns Hopkins University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

RHETORIC AND MORALITY IN JUVENAL'S 8TH SATIRE

S. C. FREDERICKS

Indiana University

Juvenal's Eighth Satire abandons the mood of pure *indignatio* so prevalent in his early satires and provides a new moral atmosphere which has been described as more hopeful and positive.¹ The satire takes the rhetorical form of a persuasive speech in the *genus deliberativum*, and central to its structure is a lengthy moralizing passage (71-145), addressed to the aristocrat Ponticus, on how to govern a province. Yet in both its rhetorical and moral aspects the satire refuses to be reduced to such simple terms, for the satirist offers his positive advice in terms of negative examples and most often conducts his case by telling Ponticus how not to behave. Juvenal thus seems more intent on

¹ G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford 1954) 114; W. S. Anderson, "The Programs of Juvenal's Later Books," *CP* 57 (1962) 155. Highet 114 also remarks that the satire is a persuasive speech on the order of a *Suasoria*, consequently belonging to the *genus deliberativum*; see 273, note 3, where he calls the central passage the *propositio*. Anderson 154-55 considers all the satires of the third book transitional and interprets the mood of the Seventh Satire as hopeful and positive.

On Juvenal's use of rhetoric, see Josué de Decker, *Juvenalis Declamans* (Ghent 1913); E. J. Kenney, "Juvenal: Satirist or Rhetorician?" *Latomus* 22 (1963) 707-8, on rhetoric as essential to Juvenal, i.e., it is his idiom; R. Marache, "Rhétorique et Humor Chez Juvenal," in *Hommages à Jean Bayet*, Collection Latomus 70 (1964) 474, on the relation of rhetoric to humor in Juvenal; W. S. Anderson, "Juvenal and Quintilian," *YCIS* 17 (1961) 50, whose point is well taken, that we cannot fit Juvenal's unique poems into absolutely defined rhetorical *genera*.

Also used in the preparation of this paper were I. G. Scott, *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal*, Smith College Classical Studies 8 (1927); H. A. Mason, "Is Juvenal a Classic?," in J. P. Sullivan (ed.) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire* (London 1963) 93-176, reprinted from *Arion* 1 (1962) 8-44 and 2 (1962) 39-79; W. S. Anderson, "Anger in Juvenal and Seneca," *UCPCPh* 19 (1964) 127-96.

On the early satires, see W. S. Anderson, "Studies in Book I of Juvenal," *YCIS* 15 (1957) 33-90. On the later satires, see A. D. Pryor, "An Approach to the Later Satires of Juvenal"; resumé in *BICS* 8 (1961) 85.

providing humorous descriptions of vice than positive moral exhortations, and the relationship of the invective against the aristocrats (part "A") to the morality advocated by the satirist (part "B") remains an unsolved question.² In order to understand the basic unity of the Eighth Satire, parts A and B should be considered together in context and the satirist's moral stance should be taken as integral to the poetic structure and not external to the poem. When this is done, Juvenal appears not as a sterile moralist, but becomes a witty satirist.³

The satire is addressed to Ponticus⁴ who resembles the other contemporary *nobiles* mentioned in the poem because there is a contradiction between the high pretensions of his lineage (*stemma*) and his diminutive reality.⁵ Ponticus is never mentioned in connection with any noble deed he has actually accomplished but serves as an

² S. Sacks, *Fiction and the Shape of Belief* (Berkeley 1964) 7-8, has discussed this A-B type of satire in which a satirist offers some positive moral stance in addition to the rhetorical invective against vice and degeneracy. His ideas are accepted tentatively by R. Paulson, *The Fictions of Satire* (Baltimore 1967) 20, note 11. Readers of satire often have problems in reconciling its positive moral contributions (B) with its brilliant satirical attacks (A). See Ellen D. Leyburn, *Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man*, Yale Studies in English 130 (New Haven 1956) 29-30. Fundamental to all these works and to all recent work on verse satire is Mary Claire Randolph, "The Structural Design of the Formal Verse Satire," *Philological Quarterly* 21 (1942) 368-84.

³ Highet (above, note 1) 104-5 thinks Juvenal has become a positive teacher of morality in the third book, but his satirical powers begin to fail him. C. W. Mendell, "Satire as Popular Philosophy," *CP* 15 (1920) 138-57, focuses his attention on isolated lines instead of whole poems and therefore concludes that all the Roman satirists are popular moralists. Even so recent an article as that of D. Wiesen, "Juvenal's Moral Character, an Introduction," *Latomus* 22 (1963) 440-71, is a misdirected attempt to salvage Juvenal's moral integrity and high purpose. See Maynard Mack, "The Muse of Satire," *Yale Review* 41 (1951) 80-92, who presents some interesting analogies between Alexander Pope and Juvenal by demonstrating the moral character (*ethos*) of the satirist in general to be a fictional one; he is direct, simple, honest, frank, truly patriotic, and so forth. Mack has also shown how Augustan critics reviled Pope because the *ego* in his various satires did not correspond to what was known about the real Pope. On the contrary for Juvenal, scholars have tried to fit the satiric *ego* to a real person about whom we know practically nothing.

⁴ Highet (above, note 1) 114 calls Ponticus a man with "a triumphal name and a long tradition of aristocratic descent." Indeed, this is his fictional role in the satire; as historical personage, he is entirely unknown.

⁵ Highet 272, note 2 points out that "Juvenal brings in nearly every distinguished family in Rome somewhere in this satire: the gens Aemilia in 3 and 9; Curia in 4, Sulpicia in 5, Valeria in 5, Fabia in 14, Cornelia in 21 and 105 and 231, Claudia in 21, Junia in 27, Antonia in 38 and 105, Sergia in 231, Julia in 242." He follows F. Gauger, *Zeitschilderung und Topik bei Juvenal* (Bottrop 1936) 57.

object of correction and moral exhortation while the satirist provides him with straightforward, honest advice in the commonplace manner of the simple, plain-speaking, moral, patriotic satirist.⁶ Thus Ponticus and the satirist are clearly antithetical. Aristocratic origins lead not at all to the good conduct demanded by the satirist but cast a more lurid light on wickedness. The very essence of Ponticus and his kind is pretension and vanity whereas the satirist's idea of *uirtus* is just the opposite, simple and unassuming. The final lines of the poem, as a matter of fact, demonstrate how the satirist's advice is a further definition of the vice of the aristocrats, for their own insufferable arrogance leads them to take pride in a disgraceful aetiology which the satirist, simple and moral as he is, is too ashamed even to mention (272-75):⁷

et tamen, ut longe repetas longeque reuoluas
nomen, ab infami gentem deducis asylo;
maiorum primus, quisquis fuit ille, tuorum
aut pastor fuit aut illud quod dicere nolo.⁸

Ponticus is not Everyman; he is the representative of the degenerate aristocrats who are the satiric object of this satire. They go to absurd lengths to justify their pride in their lineage, and the ridiculous aetiology all the more manifests the reality of their kind—they are degenerates, thieves, and murderers at heart.

Stemmata quid faciunt? The two words, *stemmata* and *faciunt*, established a major tension in the poem between the high pretensions of the nobility and the fact that they are really do so little. Surprisingly perhaps, such prosaic words as *facio*, *labor*, and their opposites are essential to the poetic diction of this satire, for in their very simplicity they act antithetically to the high sounding names and titles of the nobles which often constitute a parody of the epic. Some examples of the prosaic words are: (1) the simile of the lazy dogs (*canibus pigris*, 34)

⁶ Mack (above, note 3) 86-8.

⁷ Highet 273, note 6: "The 'thing he will not name' is a thief, one of the two groups which, according to legend, joined to become the earliest citizens of Rome. The pointed avoidance of the word emphasizes one of the chief lessons of Satire 8—that a Roman noble ought not, as governor of a province, to be a thief: see 8.89-134."

⁸ Citations are from W. V. Clausen, *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuuenalis Saturae* (Oxford 1959: OCT), unless otherwise specified.

for the listless nobles; (2) the haughty personality of Rubellius Blandus described (40-41):

tamquam
feceris ipse aliquid propter quod nobilis esses,

(3) the heroism of Cicero, *nouus Arpinas* (237), on behalf of Rome (239): *in omni monte laborat*.⁹ By contrast, the blustery, vacuous titles and descriptions attached to the aristocrats act as a humorous parody of the epic: for example, *Teucrorum proles* (56) and *Cecropides* (46; 53).¹⁰

In delivering his mocking diatribe against the degeneracy of contemporary nobles, the speaker also destroys the case for the aristocrats' pride in their high birth. The satirist has no interest at all in recalling or dwelling at length on any favorable examples from aristocratic traditions though he does recall unfavorable ones like the traitorous sons of Brutus, founder of the Republic (261-65). Or he may mention a great name from the past in order to explicate, by antithesis, some contemporary and shameful crime of the present nobility which caricatures (*traducit*, 17) what the ancestor did. All I have said is implicit in the opening scene of the satire (1-9):

Stemmata quid faciunt? quid prodest, Pontice, longo
sanguine censerī, pictos ostendere uultus
maiorum et stantis in curribus Aemilianos
et Curios iam dimidios umeroque minorem
Coruinum et Galbam auriculis nasoque carentem,
[quis fructus generis tabula iactare capaci
Coruinum, posthac multa contingere uirga
fumosos equitum cum dictatore magistros,]¹¹
si coram Lepidis male uiuitur?

⁹ Other occurrences of forms of *facio* also function poetically. The time-honored contrast between words and deeds is evident in 25 and 143; in 163 and 223 the deeds of aristocrats are evil deeds. The appearance of *piger* in 248 is a comment on its earlier use inasmuch as Marius severely punished the lazy soldier. The appearance of *labor* in 104 as a metaphor for wealth (the interest of the nobles) is an ironic comment on its later use in the Cicero passage where it means "effort."

¹⁰ Scott (above, note 1) 22-39 discusses many examples of rhetorical *figurae* from Satire 8. Juvenal's extensive use of the "grand style" is epic in its rhetorical qualities and can be regarded as self-parody as well as a parody of the rhetoric of epic.

¹¹ Lines 6-9 are bracketed in the texts of Clausen and U. Knoche, *D. Iunius Iuuenalis* (Munich 1950), both of whom follow Hermann and regard the omission in G as the correct reading.

This is a physical representation, deliberately grotesque, which depicts the absolute decadence and absurdity of the contemporary nobility.¹² As the scene of old statues (*ueteres cerae*, 19) is grotesque, the idea of cultivation of *maiores* is also grotesque. It is out of touch with the reality of a degenerate age and a decadent posterity. We might also exploit the pun inherent in *maiores* and say that the ancestors are supposed to be the "greater." The crumbling, decayed *imagines* of the *maiores* (*dimidios*, *minorem*, *caentem*; the diminutive, *auriculis*) demonstrate how diminished the great houses really are. In the standard speech on Roman tradition, we should expect mention of the *mores*, the way the *maiores* did things in the past, and the *maiores* themselves, the great men of old who are now examples for their posterity. The Eighth Satire argues with examples of immorality and crime (not *mores*), and of base men (not *maiores*). The very idea of *stemma* is absurd.

These opening lines also offer a contrast with one of Seneca's Moral Epistles (44).¹³ In many ways the literary characteristics of Seneca's letter to Lucilius are reversed in Juvenal's satire. In the first place, the letter is a positive moral exhortation with no emphasis on denigration of the nobles. Rather Seneca exploits a terminology of aristocratic piety (*patricius*, *maiores*, *stemma*, and many others) to support an argument for *philosophia*, *mens bona*, and *uirtus*. In Juvenal's satire, virtue and morals are mentioned only to support the negative argument that the aristocrats, both past and present, cannot and have not fulfilled their own pretensions. In the second place, it is important that Lucilius be singled out as an *eques Romanus* (44.2). Seneca says Lucilius makes too little of himself (*te pusillum facis*, 44.1), and so he tries to encourage him by pointed arguments. The satirist, on the other hand, tells the aristocrat, Ponticus, that the aristocrats make too much of themselves, and so he constantly tries to reduce the inflated nobles to a realistic level. Finally, unlike the satire, the letter says

¹² J. W. Aldridge, "Dance of Death," *Atlantic Monthly* 22 (July 1968) 89-91, has coined the phrase, "psychic garbage." The satirist's description of the decay of the external world (here, the *imagines* crumbling in the *atrium*) is a metaphor for the inner life of man (in this case, the moral degeneracy of the nobility).

¹³ Highet, "Juvenal's Bookcase," *AJP* 72 (1951) 384, lists 44.5 (*non facit nobilem atrium plenum fumosis imaginibus*) as the background for the first nine lines of the Eighth Satire.

nothing of what not to do, but only of what to do, namely, to reach the heights of true nobility by following in the footsteps of Socrates, Cleanthes, and Plato (44.3). Seneca takes the terminology and converts it into a philosophical argument for the good life; Juvenal merely lets us see its fatuity. Seneca is serious; Juvenal humorous.

The whole *exordium* (1-38) of the satire is important for setting up its basic themes, and there are two more paradigms of that satiric theme in the next lines for discussion (9-18):

effigies quo
tot bellatorum, si luditur alea pernox
ante Numantinos, si dormire incipis ortu
luciferi, quo signa duces et castra mouebant?
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?

The first paradigm is given in the warrior ancestors who arose at dawn to do battle, contrasted with the contemporary noble who stays up all night gambling. Inasmuch as military glory is an essential part of *mos maiorum*, its absence or perversion plays an important part in the satire. The later passage on Cicero (231-44), for instance, has displaced to a *nouus homo* all the meliorative terms which belong by right to *nobiles bellatores*. A man of civilian career is a more honorable soldier for Rome than his patrician counterparts (236): *consul uigilat*, in order to stop Catiline, not to gamble. The second paradigm is the sad fate of the mighty Fabian *gens*, the most illustrious family of Republican history. The epic quality of the family's pretension to descent from Hercules is reversed in a ridiculous parody (15), *Euganea quantumuis mollior agna*. The degenerate Fabius is also avaricious (*cupidus*), a theme looking ahead to the satirist's advice on governing a province; and vacuous (*uanus*), a theme looking forward to the attack on the *superbia* of Rubellius Blandus (39-70). The further antithesis between the depilated Fabius (*attritus*) and his rugged ancestors (*squalentis auos*)

establishes the theme of "trading" ¹⁴ since the degeneracy of the descendants caricatures their ancestors' glories. This is re-emphasized in numerous oxymora, in which two contradictory terms are placed together and one term "translates" the other. Two examples are Lateranus, *mulio consul* (148), the whole passage (146-82) being a developed caricature, and Nero, *citharoedo principe* (198) and *mimus nobilis* (198-99).

The Fabian passage also reveals murder by poison, a crime mentioned in the Neronian passage (211-30) as the wickedest of all and one which leads to the pollution (*funestat*) of the family. The crime of poisoning is the *reductio ad absurdum* of evil in the poem; that is, it is so vile a crime that it necessarily meets just retribution: the *imago* of the *emptor veneni* will have to be smashed to pieces (*imagine frangenda*). "The punishment fits the crime" is an important saying for satire,¹⁵ for whenever the satirist threatens the criminal with violent punishment he is thereby describing further the crime which has been perpetrated. The punishment destined to befall the degenerate, criminal Fabius is a fit one: his pretensions will be shattered; Fabius, like his *imago*, will have no niche in the traditions of his family, a family whose status he lowered by being a member of it. The fore-ordained smashing of Fabius' *imago* is the central symbol of violence in the poem¹⁶ and serves as a metaphor for the justifiable destruction of the *stemmata*. The whole satire may be viewed as a poetic exegesis of this central symbol, for it is a paradox that the very thing the nobles care about the most—their *stemmata*—will escape their grasp in the end because their own worthlessness, decadence, and criminality invalidate their glorious lineage.

¹⁴ J. D. Duff, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae XIV* (Cambridge 1898) ad 8.17, equates *squalentis* with *hirsutus*, "shaggy." It may also be proleptic with *traducit*. In either case, the triumphal ancestors are disgraced, so I think there is point to Duff's remark that the "common silver-age use of *traducere*, 'to make an exhibition of,' 'to parody,' is perhaps derived from the custom of marching prisoners in mockery through the streets of Rome in triumph." Symbolically in the poem, the triumphal ancestors become the scourged prisoners of a decadent tradition, debased by their own posterity. In the Second Satire, the shades of the dead *maiores* speak of themselves as being ridiculed by their homosexual descendants (*miseri traducimur*, 2.159).

¹⁵ See Paulson (above, note 2) 13 on punishment or threatened punishment which serves a literary purpose in a satire. Cf. K. Burke, "The Imagery of Killing," *Hudson Review* I (1948-49) 151-67.

¹⁶ Paulson 9-20 on the poetic function of the central symbol of violence in satire.

Now follows that part of the exordium which is devoted to a presentation of the satirist's moral advice (19-30):

tota licet ueteres exornent undique cerae
 atria, nobilitas sola est atque unica uirtus.
 Paulus uel Cossus uel Drusus moribus esto,
 hos ante effigies maiorum pone tuorum,
 praecedant ipsas illi te consule uirgas.
 prima mihi debes animi bona. sanctus haberi
 iustitiaeque tenax facit dictisque mereris?
 agnosco procerem; salue Gaetulice, seu tu
 Silanus: quocumque alio¹⁷ de sanguine rarus
 ciuis et egregius patriae contingis ouanti,
 exclamare libet populus quod clamat Osiri
 inuento.

The satirist's advice here is ironic, for he proposes no return to the vigor of the ancestors, no return to the glories and greatness of the past. That approach might have appealed to the pride of the aristocrats, especially since the whole point of the negative portion of the satire is that pride is the very essence of the aristocracy. Rather the satirist, straightforward fellow that he is, proposes a simple morality of *uirtus* (ethical virtue, not military valor), *mores* (morals, not *mos maiorum*), and *bona animi* (not wealth, *bona*). This is precisely the kind of advice which would not appeal to any of the aristocrats in the poem, Ponticus included. The advice is really offered as a criticism of improper values the aristocrats hold dear.

The irony continues, for the satirist tells Ponticus his fatherland would cheer him for his moral deserts (*mereris*, 25) and grant him a metaphorical *ouatio*. At this time under the Empire, of course, the *ouatio* was the highest triumphal honor to which a noble not a member of the Imperial family could aspire. But why does he promise this type of triumph for the man who has acted morally? It is because virtue is so important to the satirist that he joins, metaphorically, moral success and an *ouatio*? Or more subtly, because morality among aristocrats is so rare a thing that any virtuous man among them is an amazing hero by contrast? The latter explains more fully all the

¹⁷ In line 27, I read *alio* with Knoche and the MSS as opposed to Clausen who reads Richards' emendation, *alto*.

negative passages of the satire (and the negative is still more extensive than the positive in this satire). The reappearance of the good and virtuous noble is like the rediscovery of the dying god, Osiris, who has returned to life.¹⁸ The one word, *rarus*, should put us on our guard for irony here: what else but that rare good aristocrat should be regarded as a dead god returning to life in so criminal a society? The mentions of the *ovatio* and Osiris are not an invitation for the nobles to demonstrate virtue so much as an ironic criticism of their evil behavior at present.

The *exordium* is then completed, not by moralizing, but by humor (30-38):

quis enim generosum dixerit hunc qui
indignus genere et praeclaro nomine tantum
insignis? nanum cuiusdam Atlanta uocamus,
Aethiopem Cycnum, pravam extortamque puellam
Europen; canibus pigris scabieque uetusta
leuibus et siccae lambentibus ora lucernae
nomen erit pardus, tigris, leo, si quid adhuc est
quod fremat in terris uiolentius. ergo cauebis
et metues ne tu sic Creticus aut Camerinus.

All the themes mentioned above are encapsulated here, along with a valid exploitation of *indignatio* (*indignus*, 31), valid because it is shameful and improper that there be a contradiction between the name and the reality. The passage is obviously humorous, and the ideas here are all central to the attack on the *stemmata*. In sum, the passage presents old themes in new metaphorical dress: (1) the misshapen girl, named Europe, as a metaphor for the criminal *nobiles*; (2) the lazy dogs, smooth (*leuibus*) with old (*uetusta*) mange, as a metaphorical return to the depilated Fabius; (3) the savagery of the real lions, tigers, and panthers as metaphorical equivalent of the fierceness of the *bellatores*. This passage is a sure hint that the poem is really a humorous explication of vice and not a moral tract. The specific vice is pride in family

¹⁸ J. E. B. Mayor, *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal* (2 vols., London, 1878²) ad 8.29. Cf. Anna L. Motto and J. R. Clark, "Per iter tenebricosum: The Mythos of Juvenal 3," *TAPA* 96 (1965) 267-76. In Satires 3, 6, and 13 Juvenal used myths of departing gods (or the end of the Golden Age) to depict symbolically the loss of a moral society; he thus explained evil aetiologically. Here in Satire 8 the rediscovery of Osiris as a simile for the return of a once-upon-a-time lost morality is simply the reverse case.

pedigrees which leads to an absurd contradiction between pretensions and realities. The name of a thing and the reality behind the name should coincide, but they certainly do not in the case of the nobles.

The following passage (39–70), a *sermo* with Rubellius Blandus, is simply an explication of vice. As we might have expected in this Eighth Satire with all its ambiguities, the passage shows a tension between the old Juvenal and the new.¹⁹ The old Juvenal, because the lines are partly an invective on terms of a *locus de superbia*, especially indicated in *monui* (39). The new Juvenal, because Blandus is allowed to condemn himself in his own words in the manner of a Horatian *sermo* (39). The *persona* of the satirist remains similar to that of the early satires; it is the form of his argument that changes as I said previously when I called the satire a deliberative-type rather than a pure invective-type. In these lines on Rubellius Blandus, Juvenal borrows a Horatian model, to be sure, but the thrust of the argument has all the savagery of the indignant satirist. These tensions are all present, but they lead to humor, not to moralizing.

With *tumes* (40), we see that Blandus is metaphorically swollen or inflated with his own self-importance; he is later mentioned as such (*inflatum*, 72) because of his high birth. His pride goes to the absurd lengths of his title, *Cecropides* (46; 53), and he even receives the address, *Teucrorum proles* (56). But as an inflated bag-of-wind is all the emptier, Blandus' pretensions are vanity also in the etymological sense of vanity—they are “emptiness.” He can do nothing for himself in the two standard aristocratic careers: law (47–50) or the army (51–52). In both, he is outdone by plebeians, his social inferiors. Again, the satirist mentions a physical representation of Blandus' intrinsic worthlessness, the broken Herm (*trunco Hermae*, 53) which returns us to the broken crumbling *imagines* of the ancestors (1–9). *Tua uiuit imago* (55) now appears as another oxymoron or paradox: contradicting what is said in *uiuit*, *imago* means Blandus is his own death mask because he is *nil* (53) or *simillimus trunco Hermae*. Looking back, we now see that the satirist's *uiuas* (46) is also ironic because Blandus' essence is his lifeless pride in his high birth.

¹⁹ Scott (above, note 1) 41 implies a tension in the Eighth Satire between two rhetorical impulses—the epideictic invective (as in Satires 1–6) and the persuasive (the formal organization of the Eighth).

With the simile on the pedigree race-horses (56-70), the satirist exploits, in the same imagery, what he has already said of Blandus. The winning horse enjoys a deserved triumph while the loser goes under the hammer despite his fine pedigree, a pedigree describable as an equine *stemma*: *respectus maiorum* (64), *gratia umbrarum* (64-65), and *tituli* (69). The punishment of the losing horse is, of course, the punishment of the proud, but worthless, aristocrat; *segnipedes* (67) is thus a striking satiric epicism.

Now the satirist commences his positive advice which forms the central argument of the satire (71-78):

haec satis ad iuuenem quem nobis fama superbum
trahit et inflatum plenumque Nerone propinquo;
rarus enim ferme sensus communis in illa
fortuna. sed te censi laude tuorum,
Pontice, noluerim sic ut nihil ipse futurae
laudis agas. miserum est aliorum incumbere famae,
ne conlapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis.
stratus humi palmes uiduas desiderat ulmos.

Rarus sensus communis (73) is reminiscent of the earlier *rarus ciuis* (27-28); Blandus is the bad citizen, and in these lines and those following the satirist will contrast Blandus' character with what he wants Ponticus to be. Imagistically, *agas* is a *facio*-word while the metaphors of the collapsing building and the strewn vine-sprout recall the opening image of the crumbling death-masks. Now the satirist states his positive advice (79-80):

esto bonus miles, tutor bonus, arbiter idem
integer;

It is the same simple moral demand he made earlier in the *exordium* (22-23), but instead of developing his thoughts in any serious, ethical arguments he treats the subject once more with humor. He begins with the theme of *arbiter integer* (80-86):

ambiguae si quando citabere testis
incertaeque rei, Phalaris licet imperet ut sis
falsus et admoto dictet periuria tauro,
summun crede nefas animam praeferre pudori
et propter uitam uiuendi perdere causas.
dignus morte perit, cenet licet ostrea centum
Gaurana et Cosmi toto mergatur aeno.

The lines on Phalaris show how heroic a role is expected of the aristocrat; to maintain his good faith and sense of shame, he should be willing to face the fiery tortures of the cruelest tyrant of Greek legend. But the example goes too far, and any serious moral point is lost in declamatory inflation. It parodies its own seriousness and is humorous, hyperbolic, and fantastic.²⁰ Further, this legendary example is joined incongruously to a contemporary one of the urbane world of the poet Martial by the mention of Lucrine oysters (*Gerauna*) and the perfumer Cosmos.²¹ Here are two distinctive moral outlooks, the same two the satirist has been playing off one against the other throughout the satire. Both are equally unreal but placed together for grotesque, humorous effect: (1) the traditional confrontation of the true noble with the evil tyrant; (2) contemporary decadence where *pudor* refers only to gustatory habits and body odors—an example humorous because it is an exaggeration of a trivial subject. Both exaggerated examples are inescapably connected in the final word, *aeno*, “brass cauldron,” which of course refers specifically to Cosmos’ perfume vessels; but by a pun it also recalls Phalaris’ bull, another brazen vessel in which victims were immersed. The ambiguity easily allows the humorous impression that living like a contemporary noble (a moral, metaphorical death—*dignus morte perit*²²) is more of a “death” than anything Phalaris could dish out.

The next lines (87–110) comment on the theme of *bonus tutor* since Ponticus will some day be governor of a province. The passage is certainly a peculiar one if we are to suppose it written as an exhortation to virtue. First of all, the satirist’s plea that Ponticus should take pity on the poor provincials has more emphasis on “poor” than it does on “pity” (89–90):

miserere inopum sociorum:
ossa uidēs rerum uacuis exucta medullis.

²⁰ Scott 46–90 discusses many examples delivered *augendi causa*, giving a mock dignity to a perhaps serious subject; or providing dignity in an unseemly context as here.

²¹ See Mayor (above, note 18) *ad* 8.86, for a list of Martial’s poems in which Cosmos is named: 1.87, 3.55, 3.82, 9.26, 11.8, 11.15, 11.49(50), 12.65 (my numbers refer to Lindsay’s OCT, 1929²). Especially in the first two poems in the list, personal odors are connected with a trivially social “sense of shame,” not the weighty, traditional *pudor* for which the satirist argues.

²² Ramsay in the Loeb (revised edition, 1940) translates the phrase: “the man who merits death is already dead.”

Or as we see in the clever apostrophe to Chaerippus, the provincial (95-97):

praeconem, Chaerippe, tuis circumspice pannis,
cum Pansa eripiat quidquid tibi Natta reliquit,
iamque tace; furor est post omnia perdere naulum.

In short, the satirist argues his point about *bonus tutor* ironically because he does not argue to morality at all but says that it is not worthwhile to steal from those who have already been robbed; the governors are metaphorically pirates (*piratae Cilicum*, 94.)²³ Then, in another reversal, peace under such governors is made to look more like a disastrous war (98-110):

non idem gemitus olim neque uulnus erat par
damnorum sociis florentibus et modo uictis.
plena domus tunc omnis, et ingens stabat acervos
nummorum, Spartana chlamys, conchyliis Coa,
et cum Parrhasii tabulis signisque Myronis
Phidiacum uiuebat ebur, nec non Polycliti
multus ubique labor, rarae sine Mentore mensae.
inde †Dolabella atque hinc† Antonius, inde
sacrilegus Verres referebant nauibus altis
occulta spolia et plures de pace triumphos.
nunc sociis iuga pauca bouum, grex paruus equarum,
et pater armenti capto eripietur agello,
ipsi deinde Lares, si quod spectabile signum.

gemitus and *vulnus* (98) are metaphors from warfare: what the nobles have done and do in peacetime is the equivalent of the robbery and piracy which go on during warfare (as well there are *occulta spolia* and *triumphos*, 107). Roman provincial administrators treat their own *socii* (99) like enemies, and any tiny plot of ground that remains is treated like enemy territory (*capto agello*, 109). This whole passage is another humorous explication of vice and another negative example for Ponticus. The brief word to be a *bonus tutor* thus leads the satirist to a criticism of Romans who impoverished the allies. The third passage is also humorous rather than moralizing (113-23):

²³ Highet (above, note 1) 113 notices how the satirist argues that it is not worth Ponticus' while to steal from impoverished allies, but he does not realize that thereby the satirist argues to Ponticus' lower nature, not his higher.

forsitan inbellis Rhodios unctamque Corinthon
 despicias merito: quid resinata iuuentus
 cruraque totius facient tibi leuia gentis?
 horrida uitanda est Hispania, Gallicus axis
 Illyricumque latus; parce et messoribus illis
 qui saturant urbem circo scenaeque uacantem;
 quanta autem inde feres tam dirae praemia culpaе,
 cum tenuis nuper Marius discinxerit Afros?
 curandum in primis ne magna iniuria fiat
 fortibus et miseris. tollas licet omne quod usquam est
 auri atque argenti, scutum gladiumque relinques.

The satirist tells Ponticus he may rightly despise the scented, depilated Greeks with their effeminacy and lack of military vigor. Words like *resinata* (114) and *leuia* (115) are the sexual opposites of *horrida* (116), which is also used to describe the martial character of Hispania. The satirist also tells Ponticus to spare Africa, not out of pity or fellow-feeling, but because it is not worth Ponticus' while to incur guilt and danger over a province which Marius Priscus should forbear to rob warlike peoples (*fortibus et miseris*): they have weapons and can fight back, unlike the depraved Easterners.²⁴ The satirist again argues to Ponticus' weaker nature, and implies he is a haughty (*despicias*) aristocrat, incapable of being a real soldier.

In each instance, whether the *bonus miles*, *bonus tutor*, or *arbiter integer* is the subject, the satirist offers his positive advice to Ponticus only to use it as a departure for some humorous criticism. The accumulative effects of A and B parts of the poem serve to make a cynical, rather than hopeful, statement—namely, that the simple type of virtue proposed by the satirist is impossible of attainment for aristocrats with such high ambition to a place in the family pedigree. I therefore do not find the mood of the poem a hopeful one,²⁵ but I can agree with Highet when he views the satire as “a curious poem, astringent and sour.”²⁶ In this sense the Eighth Satire is akin to Juvenal's earlier efforts: it is correct to call the poem “cynically humorous” or

²⁴ Highet 113 is surprised at this argument of the satirist because he has missed the irony here.

²⁵ As Anderson and Highet do (see above, beginning of note 1).

²⁶ Highet (above, note 1) 116 in contradiction of his earlier remarks, especially 113, where he believes Juvenal is thinking of the nobles as morally curable.

“humorously cynical,” but not morally hopeful, for its real subject matter is the absurdity of *stemmata* as a moral ideal. Both A and B parts of the satire contribute humorously to denigrating this ideal and the nobles past and present who pursue it.

The satirist continues in his role of the simple, honest truth-teller (125-26):

quod modo proposui, non est sententia, uerum est;
credite me uobis folium recitare Sibyllae.

But what kind of truth is he telling here with *folium Sibyllae*? Of course, the *folium* is an ironic substitution for *uerum* since the reference is to the prophetic Sibylline Books in the keeping of the noble, traditional, priestly college, the *quindecimviri sacris faciundis*. However, it is certain that this “truth” cannot be a serious or factual one, for the subsequent lines offer some of the most fantastic figures we have yet seen, in the person of the governor’s wife as a Harpy (*Celaeno*), in the legendary Picus, the Titanomachy, and Prometheus (127-33):

si tibi sancta cohors comitum, si nemo tribunal
uendit acersecomes, si nullum in coniuge crimen
nec per conventus et cuncta per oppida curuis
unguibus ire parat nummos raptura Celaeno,
tum licet a Pico numeres genus, altaque si te
nomina delectant omnem Titanida pugnam
inter maiores ipsumque Promethea ponas.

Satire often assumes this sort of contradictory stance between a pose of simple truth and an obvious fantasy,²⁷ and the contradiction is meant to be deliberately absurd. The point here is that all concern with *stemmata* and family titles is fatuous. The pretensions of the nobles are raised to mock-epic proportions and made to look absurd. Finally, the figure of Prometheus, mythical founder of mankind, should catch our attention here. The satirist seems to be offering a *stemma* to Ponticus which is absurdly overstated and comically

²⁷ See Anderson, “Anger in Juvenal and Seneca (above, note 1),” for a discussion of “truth” and “exaggeration” as two complementary aspects of the satirist’s *persona*. Cf. Paulson (above, note 2) 3; Mason (above, note 1) 107 and *passim*.

mythological.²⁸ If only he shows some real moral worth, Ponticus can say any outlandish thing he wants about his ancestors, including the tautological statement that his ancestor was the very first human being. With such ironic overstatement the satirist lets the aristocrats satisfy their ambition for *alta nomina*, but the implication behind such allusions to mythology is that the whole pursuit of family pedigrees is a foolhardy system of values. The admonitory section of the satire (B) then closes with the satirist's insistence (135-45) that any crime the aristocrats commit is all the more disgraceful because they have such fine public reputations to maintain, and each and every crime they commit is also a horrible sin against the glorious precedents their ancestors set. The *nocturnus adulter* (144) is therefore another example of a noble who caricatures his forebears, and the passage as a whole is another explication of vice (*animi uitium*, 140).

Highet terms lines 146-268 the *confirmatio* of the satirist's earlier advice (71-145) to Ponticus—but the more important thing is that the *confirmatio* is a development of negative ideas.²⁹ These final passages are really individual invectives, bringing back the indignant mood of Juvenal's earlier satires. Each subsequent example causes the nobles to look more absurd.

The first invective *exemplum* in the series is "fat Lateranus," certainly a most brilliant passage in the poem for its sustained sense of the ridiculous (146-82). The satirist first sets the scene (146-47):

praeter maiorum cineres atque ossa uolucris
carpento rapitur pinguis Lateranus.

Lateranus himself, *mulio consul* (148), who appears against the scene, is

²⁸ On the first two allusions, see Roscher's *Lexicon*, "Picus" and "Titanen (1)." With this *exemplum augendi gratia* we are already in a mythological hyperbole, but Picus is a somewhat reasonable choice because of his associations with Mars and Jupiter; in versions of his myth, he appears as warrior and king as well. But then the Titans, an even "higher" name (*alter* is thus ambiguous, meaning both "lofty" and "ancient"), carry us beyond reasonable bounds; as a mythological source for the Roman nobles they are at once too removed and too inclusive since, in the Orphic cosmology, all mankind is created from their ashes after their defeat by Zeus. Cf. M. P. Nilsson, "Titans," *OCD*.

²⁹ Highet (above, note 1) 273, note 3. He correctly understands that "the bad examples form a climax of infamy, from Rubellius Blandus, who is noble but useless, through Lateranus, who is noble but degraded, to Damasippus, who is still worse degraded, and Gracchus, worse yet, and then to Nero, murderer and fool, ending with Catiline and Cethegus, murderers and traitors."

an absolutely degenerate noble. Once again we have a theme of *pudor* developed here. Lateranus is supposed to act the consul; instead, his whole character is taken up with being a low type of chariot driver (*mulio*). The *uirga* of the consul's office (mentioned as such previously in lines 23 and 136) is for Lateranus the mule-driver's rod (*uirga*, 153). The *manipli* (153) are not companies of Roman soldiers but the bundles of hay Lateranus feeds his horses. *More Numae* and *Iovis ante altaria* (156), he yet takes his oath by a barbarian goddess of horses, *Epona* (157). Then follows the description of the *popinae* (158-62):³⁰

sed cum peruigiles placet instaurare popinas,
obuius adsiduo Syrophoenix udus amomo
currit, Idymaeae Syrophoenix incola portae
hospitis adfectu dominum regemque salutat,
et cum uenali Cyane succincta lagona.

The whole description of Eastern vulgarity is opposed to the ideal notion of Lateranus as a Roman general at the frontiers of the Empire, for the speaker comments upon him (169-70):

maturus bello Armeniae Syiaequae tuendis
amnibus et Rheno atque Histro.

Lateranus' potentialities are never achieved, of course, and he appears instead at the *popina* in Ostia with low-life companions (171-80). In the scene, Lateranus is equalled to the thieves and murderers with whom he associates. Then what could be more ironic than the inflated apostrophe, *Troiugenae* (181), after a scene of the lowest sort of degeneracy? Lateranus is a shameful contradiction between his high office (*consul*, 148; *legatum*, 172) and the absolute decadence in which he really belongs.

The satirist passes on to two worse examples of shame, Damasippus and Gracchus (183-84):

quid si numquam adeo foedis adeoque pudendis
utimur exemplis, ut non peiora supersint?

After stating that Damasippus the mime and Gracchus the gladiator

³⁰ Duff (above, note 14) *ad* 8.158, caught the twist in *instaurare*; not *popinas*, but *Latinas ferias*, should be the object of ritual renewal.

are more shameful than Lateranus, the satirist develops an argument to prove it. Lateranus' disgrace was in guilt by association with the low-life *popina* (*aequa ibi libertas, communia pocula*, 177), but Damasippus goes a step further because he plays up to the *populus* which constitutes his audience. That is, Damasippus is inferior to the *populus* to whom he has sold his voice (*vocem locasti*, 185), as Lentulus is also inferior (187-92):

Laureolum uelox etiam bene Lentulus egit,
iudice me dignus uera cruce. nec tamen ipsi
ignoscas populo; populi frons durior huius,
qui sedet et spectat triscurria patriciorum,
planipedes audit Fabios, ridere potest qui
Mamercorum alapas.

The *populus'* actions are unforgivable and thoroughly shameless,³¹ but by contrast the actions of the patricians who play before the people are even worse; after all, mime is the lowest of all the theatrical performances. In terms of poetic irony, the roles of the patricians in the mimes turn out to be real—they are caricatures. *Patricii, Fabii, Mamerci* become, in the mime, *triscurria patriciorum, planipedes Fabii, alapae Mamercorum*. The aristocrat is *collega stupidi Corinthi* (197) instead of a colleague in the Roman magistracy. Next follow the description of Gracchus as *retiarius* in the gladiatorial *ludus* (209-10):

ergo ignominiam grauiorem pertulit omni
uolnere cum Graccho iussus pugnare secutor.

Now the man ordered to fight the degenerate noble is the one disgraced. The professional gladiator suffers shame from association with Gracchus, a situation which reverses the relationship of Lateranus to his low-life friends. The series from Lateranus, to Damasippus and Lentulus, to Gracchus has reversed the roles of disgracer and disgraced.

Nero is the most degenerate of all—the polluted parricide (211-30). His particular crime is turned by the satirist into a parody of the *Oresteia* (215-21), especially appropriate for the Emperor who appeared on stage in tragic dress. Here the themes of pollution (*polluit*, 218) and murder by poison (217) directly recall Fabius the poisoner in the

³¹ Duff *ad* 8.189, on the phrase, *frons durior*, to indicate lack of shame.

exordium (17-18). Finally, with the supreme irony of *generosus princeps*, the satirist shows how Nero no longer acts like a Roman at all, but like a perverted Greek (224-30):

haec opera atque hae sunt generosi principis artes,
gaudentis foedo peregrina ad pulpita cantu
prostitui Graiaequ apium meruisse coronae.
maiorum effigies habeant insignia uocis,
ante pedes Domiti longum tu pone Thyestae
syrma uel Antigones seu personam Melanippes,
et de marmoreo citharam suspende colosso.

The *stemma* of a great Roman family is visible no longer; the Emperor has now earned the *Graia corona* instead. The *insignia* are not those for triumphs or other great deeds on the state's behalf, but *insignia uocis*. The military valor of the great Domitii is debased by Nero's Greek tragic costuming.³² The Roman who should be highest of all in esteem—namely, the *Princeps*—is the least Roman and most Greek of all we have yet seen in the poem.

Now the satirist attacks the memory of Catiline and Cethegus, high-born arsonists and traitors (231-44). These, as high-born as any (*sublimius*, 232), are actually the enemies of Rome and are described like the Gauls (*Senonum minores*, 234) who sacked the city in 390 B.C. after the battle of Allia. So their punishment reflects their crime: the *tunica molesta* (235); they deserve to have the fire they had planned for their city. Cicero, conversely, is described as a soldier fighting on behalf of Rome (*uexilla uestra coerces*, 236; *galeatum ponit ubique praesidium*, 238-39) whereas Catiline and Cethegus are *hostes* of Rome. Cicero, *hic nouus Arpinas ignobilis* (237), earns all the highest military glories, and even the titles, *parens* (243) and *pater patriae* (244), though he remained *intra muros* and *in toga* (240). The satirist metaphorically equates Cicero with a great *imperator* and thereby makes him superior to Octavius (note the sarcasm in calling him "Octavius" rather than "Augustus;" he earned the same titles as Cicero, but *udo caedibus adsiduus gladio*, 242-43). Octavius is a brutal character because of the

³² See Mayor (above, note 18) *ad* 8.228. He quotes Suetonius' life of Nero (1) on the illustrious Domitian *gens*, noted for military achievements and numerous triumphs. By synecdoche, any or all members of the line are meant here with the singular, *Domiti*.

prodigious Roman bloodshed which provided his glorious titles. It was a free Rome (244) that gave Cicero his titles.

The second example is Marius (245-53):

Arpinas alius Volscorum in monte solebat
poscere mercedes alieno lassus aratro;
nodosam post haec frangebat uertice uitem,
si lentus pigra muniret castra dolabra.
hic tamen et Cimbros et summa pericula rerum
excipit et solus trepidantem protegit urbem,
atque ideo, postquam ad Cimbros stragemque uolabant
qui numquam attigerant maiora cadauera corui,
nobilis ornatur lauro collega secunda.

Like Cicero, Marius is on the side of the *facio*-imagery, but an even lower class of citizen. In his early life he is a *mercenarius*, that is, so poor he does not even till his own property. Then, he is a private soldier. Yet when Rome has need of a great general, Marius fulfills the role and slaughters the Cimbri, as is described in a hyperbole (251-52):

stragemque uolabant
qui numquam attigerant maiora cadauera corui,

The hyperbole signifies that the aristocrats, in the person of Lutatius Catulus the *nobilis collega*, have been bested at their own expertise—the art of war—by a low-born, poor Arpinate.

Juvenal now proceeds to a clever parody of Livy who chronicled the august origins of Rome and demonstrated the decline of the state until his own times. Livy's work therefore justified the pride of the noble houses in their family traditions, whereas Juvenal does just the opposite and shows their claims are not so important because so many praiseworthy deeds were accomplished by plebeians like the Decii (254-57), or people of even lower class. The Decii are especially interesting because they are the only example on the satire of a son who really follows in his father's footsteps and makes his words and deeds comply with the family's reputation.³³ In all the other

³³ See Livy, 8.9.8, on the first Decius, whose words at his *devotio* find a reminiscence in these lines of Juvenal; and 10.28.15, on the second Decius, who repeats his father's words and actions.

examples noted so far, the son or descendant traduces his father's or ancestor's claim to glory. And the Decii are plebeian, down to their *nomina* (255). The final examples also parody Livy; reminiscences from the first two books of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, the age of the kings and early Republic, make up these lines of Juvenal (259-68):

ancilla natus trabeam et diadema Quirini
et fascis meruit, regum ultimus ille bonorum.
prodita laxabant portarum claustra tyrannis
exulibus iuuenes ipsius consulis et quos
magnum aliquid dubia pro libertate deceret,
quod miraretur cum Coclite Mucius et quae
imperii finis Tiberinum uirgo natauit.
occulta ad patres produxit crimina seruus
matronis lugendus; at illos uerbera iustis
adficiunt poenis et legum prima securis.

In turning the tables on the nobles' claims, the satirist mentions Servius Tullius, *natus ancilla* (259), the last of the good kings, who earned his honors (*meruit*, 260)—he consequently belongs to the *facio*-imagery of the poem. When he mentions the slave who saved the state from betrayal at the hands of Brutus' sons, he avoids praising the founder of the Republic but denounces his sons. At the same time, he emphasizes how the sons were executed by the axe, a just punishment under the laws of the Republic which they had violated. In his story, Livy (2.3-4) emphasizes the heroism of Brutus in executing his own sons for treason. Once again, we see the contradiction between expectations and results, for what was proper (*deceret*, 263) for the sons was action at which Cocles, Mucius, and the *uirgo*, Cloelia, the greatest heroes of legend, might marvel. In returning as he does to the legendary times of the early Republic—the period Livy says in his preface he likes the best—the satirist attacks the very origins of aristocratic pride. He uses the same sources the *nobiles* would employ in making an argument to the past and to tradition, but he argues that the nobles overrate their own claims, for many who ought to have been their inferiors have exercised the highest virtue.

In no way are the *nobiles* superior; in fact, they are often worse than inferior—many of them are the enemies of Rome. In each and every instance, their pursuit of *stemmata* is viewed as some sort of

perversion. *Stemmata quid faciunt?* The satire provides an answer: *nihil* (269-75):

malo pater tibi sit Thersites, dummodo tu sis
 Aeacidae similis Volcaniaque arma capessas,
 quam te Thersitae similem producat Achilles.
 et tamen, ut longe repetas longeque reuoluas
 nomen, ab infami gentem deducis asylo;
 maiorum primus, quisquis fuit ille, tuorum
 aut pastor fuit aut illud quod dicere nolo.

The satirist merely feels shame at the end of the poem, a shame akin to his indignation at the contradiction between pretensions and actualities.

Consequently, both A and B parts of the satire contribute to Juvenal's attack on aristocratic pride in the *stemmata*. What he says in his own hyperbolic fashion is not that contemporary nobles are curable, but that they do indeed pursue the wrong ideals. If Juvenal does provide a positive moral statement, it is his assertion that the inclusive ideal of common humanity is superior to the exclusive, family loyalties of the *nobiles*: *mos* comes before *maiores* and *uirtus* is not inherited but due to individual effort. Consequently, Juvenal makes both a positive and a negative moral statement in the Eighth Satire, but both kinds of statements are essential to the structure of this poem and cannot be separated from Juvenal's irony, hyperbole, and wit. Seen in the light of previous interpretation, the Eighth Satire is an outstanding example of Juvenal's poetic skill. Although it differs in rhetorical form and moral emphasis from his early satires, it is in no way an inferior work.