Arethusa 31.3 (1998) 369-386

"The House I Live in is Not My Own": Women's Bodies in Juvenal's *Satires*

Barbara K. Gold

I. Preface

This is an essay about bodies: how they are represented and what that representation reveals about the fears, desires, and attitudes of the society that produced them. [1] Concepts of physiology and corporeality determine identity--both male and female, but especially female--throughout ancient texts. I am interested in discovering how Roman satire defined the relationship between body and "self" for women: how it shaped, controlled, and represented the female self through the gendering of the body. My original intention in writing this essay was to examine the bodies of women as they are represented in the Roman satirists. But I soon realized that I was both confining myself too narrowly and also spreading myself over too wide an area. As I reread the texts, two things became clear: female bodies could only be examined in the context of bodies in general, and Juvenal has a unique way, among all the Roman satirists, of focalizing bodies. [2]

In the texts of antiquity, gender and sexuality intersect in complex and difficult ways. [3] The "ontological regime" of gender [4] and its performative **[End Page 369]** aspects--which are so foregrounded in satire--do not encourage us to look at gender as static, distinct, limited, certain, or innate. Gender categories in ancient texts are not set up in such a way as to constitute a binary taxonomy, but rather they operate on a sliding scale of enormous complexity showing extraordinary fluidity and multiple possibilities for change. There is an inherent contradiction in the way gender is imaged, described, and defined in ancient literature. In many genres of literature, gender comes into being for the reader through the acts characters perform; maleness and femaleness seem naturalized by their discursive regimes. [5] This is especially true in drama, where several factors, particularly the fact that men played women's roles, constantly called into question absolute gender dimorphism in dress, words, voice, and behavior. [6] Gender, therefore, has to be investigated as a fictive construction that supports various regimes of power (such as heterosexuality) and carries with it certain cultural assumptions that underlie the writer's fears and attitudes. Any discussion of women's bodies, in ancient literature in general and in Roman satire in particular, benefits from attention to men's bodies and from a willingness to see gender not as a fixed category, but as a fictive or performative construction molded and controlled by the discourse in which it is embedded.

On the other hand, these literary texts reflect cultures that operated publicly in a highly dimorphic manner. Each negotiation and subversion of gender roles was based on a felt, observed, and legislated division into oppositions, of which the most important was the opposition between male and female. Established paradigms, myths, texts, and laws existed that gave these oppositions form and life. Under every questioning and reimagining lies this set of well-defined differences between the sexes that made itself felt in so many ways in ancient myth.

Thus dimorphism and the subversion of dimorphism coexist, mutually reinforcing each other. Zeitlin poses the following questions for fifth-century b.c.e. Greek drama: "How did these works elaborate the rules for the oppositions between male and female, both cognitive and social, and **[End Page 370]** at the same time hold them up to question, even seditious scrutiny? How did the standard divisions between nature and culture, private and public, inside and outside, family and state, prove both useful and also too restrictive as a set of dichotomies?" [7] These questions could equally well be asked of the

Roman culture and society of Juvenal, but the cultural and generic contexts are vastly different and so, therefore, will be the way in which we pose the question and the answers we find. In Greek drama, a questioning of the basic cultural oppositions was foregrounded both by the material and by the mechanics of the theater; even if women's attempts to overturn the dominant order did not ultimately succeed, the possibilities of role inversion and gender blurring were frequently present and the ambiguities were allowed to hold center stage.

But the conditions of production are different in satire. Although there is as much reference to and playing with the idea of male/female dichotomies, satire seems to foreground them mainly with an eye toward reinforcing the hierarchies and oppositions, leaving fewer questions unanswered and for a shorter period of time, thus making much clearer its generic tendency toward a conservative view of society. Or, to put it in theatrical terms, the cross-dressers stay in role much longer in Greek drama, and their role-playing seems to have greater lingering effect.

II. Juvenal's Bodies

I will examine Juvenal's *Satires* with a primary focus on *Satire* 6, his famous and lengthy diatribe against women, to show the way in which bodies are represented in Juvenal's texts. In his *Satires*, Juvenal seems constantly to be alluding to an ideal that is always missing but nonetheless present in the satirist's very obsession with its negative counterpoints. The perfect, contained male body is conspicuous by its absence. Juvenal's implied ideal Roman man displays no discrepancy between outer appearance and internal character; there is in such a hypothetical character a seamless continuity between perfect form and a perfect character. [8] A tongue-in-cheek example of this perfection appears in *Satire* 11, where the speaker issues an invitation to a simple dinner and describes his simple, **[End Page 371]** native-born servants whose outer appearances perfectly match their inner qualities: *ingenui vultus puer ingenuique pudoris* ("a boy with an decent, well-bred face and of well-born, decent character," 11.154). [9] The ideal seems to be a body that is an open window to the character and soul, a perfect human form that carries within it similar perfection. There is no deception, no discrepancy.

The mind/body split is resolved in quite a different way for women and other deviant characters in Juvenal. Women in these satires are obsessed with and defined by their bodies. Women's bodies are the sites on which their difference is marked and their inferiority expressed. Far from revealing a seamlessness of outer and inner traits, women's bodies, beginning with Pandora, have been seen as the site of concealment and deception. [10] They are, to use Tertullian's metaphor, a "temple over a sewer." [11] From Hesiod onward, woman is figured as "a body, reduced essentially to a belly, and finery . . . The finery is what . . . makes woman into a beautiful surface, an exterior." [12] Women often conceal by their altered appearance the horror and danger within (6.115-24, 457-59, 461-73, 481). This deception can come in the form of clothing, jewelry, makeup, and perfume. They also disguise themselves as men in their dress and behavior parading around in men's clothes or with dry breasts, *siccis mamillis*, 6.401 (6.100-02, 242-45, woman in court; 246-67, women gladiators; 398-401, woman in a military setting; 434-56, the woman philosopher and literary **[End Page 372]** critic). [13] They fool no one, but make themselves figures of ridicule trying to sell themselves as something they are not.

Juvenal's women are mostly bodies, and if they are characterized by any other trait, it is an unpleasant form of behavior or moral flaw that simply underscores their materiality. A woman in Juvenal can also be a sewer over a sewer. The virago who whips not only her neighbors but even their dogs is *gravis occursu, taeterrima vultu* ("a terror to meet, terrible to look at," 6.418). There is the wealthy woman who coats her face with mudpacks, plasters, and moistened dough--"does she have a face or a sore?" Juvenal inquires (*facies dicetur an ulcus?* 6.473). Here the outside does mirror the inside (as in the case of men), but only in purely negative terms. Never do we find a beautiful female body that covers a beautiful soul. The outside may be temple or sewer, but the inside is always a sewer, and the deceptive aspect of her gender is always present.

Juvenal controls women's bodies by a process of deforming and dismembering them. He often describes women not by their whole appearance but by individual body parts. He seems particularly focused on breasts (not surprisingly). Juvenal refers to women's genitalia, a common focus in other satirists, rather less often than we might expect, [14] but breasts are a reasonable substitute, since they, like genitalia, define a woman's sex, and they also act as metaphors for women's gender and behavior, depending upon how they are described.

Breasts in Juvenal can be large (6.9, 7.148-49, 13.162-63), naked (1.22-23; 6.122-24, 490-91), or dry (6.401). Women are defined by their breasts: on a breast continuum, large is best and dry is worst. So, in a passage devoted to assuring the listener that we can expect certain traits to appear in particular sets of people, the speaker asks: "who in Africa marvels at a woman's breast that is larger than the chubby baby who sucks it?" (13.162-63). [15] The rustic, savage, mountain wife in the prologue to *Satire* 6, a relic of the good old days, offers her large breasts to her lusty infants to suck (6.9). [16] **[End Page 373]** Naked breasts are marked as bad and are associated with women who are otherwise deviant in their behavior; see, for example, 1.22-23, where Mevia goes hunting for a Tuscan boar with naked breasts (*nuda mamma*) or 6.122-24, where the empress Messalina goes to a brothel to prostitute herself, naked with gilded nipples (*nuda papillis auratis*). Dry breasts, of course, carry the whole weight of invective against a woman who is so little a part of her sex that she does not even possess the capability of being a mother. So in 6.398-401, one negative example "plays the other" (i.e., a man). This woman attends public meetings and speaks to a general in her husband's presence *recta facie siccisque mamillis* --"head high and nipples dry," 401. [17]

When Juvenal does mention genitals, they are invariably wet. So, in *Satire* 10, where the speaker characterizes all women as slaves to lust, he asks: "what will any woman deny to her clammy crotch?" (*udis inguinibus*, 10.321-22). [18] Elsewhere, in a dinner invitation, the speaker tells his guest to leave all his worries behind, including his gadabout wife who is out all day long and returns at night with her dress damp and creased, her hair a mess, and her face flushed with sexual excitement (11.185-89). [19] Dampness and moisture are often associated with women, especially with female genitalia, and they have further linkages to other negative attributes (foul, enclosed, hidden, threatening). [20] **[End Page 374]**

The ancient medical and rhetorical writers associate dryness (as well as lightness and warmth) with *pneuma* (the animatory principle) and with the ideal, male body. [21] The opposite qualities--dampness, coolness, and density--were regarded as negative and were associated with women. As Irigaray and Kristeva point out, women's excretions (bodily fluids of any sort, in particular menstrual blood) are typically represented as polluting and female sexuality as an uncontainable flow, an unclean seepage. [22] This seepage and fluidity are part of the same field of discourse as pollution on the one hand and lack of self-identity, form, and control on the other.

Roman satire, too, figures the solid, the closed, and the finished as male and privileges these qualities over the open, the fluid, and the boundless, which are ascribed to women.[23] In satirists like Juvenal, however, the leaking, fluid vessels of women's bodies lead paradoxically not to growth but rather to sterility. [24]

Women, then, are characterized in Juvenal as embodying deception and fluidity and as associated with corporeality. They are described by reference to individual body parts. Because they are seen as segmented and **[End Page 375]** fluid beings whose outer and inner selves are disconnected, they are not perceived and represented as whole entities or as self-contained subjects. Women are often described as trying to emulate men in their behavior, [25] but they cannot ever become men in substance or mind since their fundamental beings are characterized by qualities completely opposite to those ascribed to men. [26]

It should not cause surprise that women are represented as trying to emulate men; women were accused of appropriating male qualities at least as far back as fifth-century Greece. But Juvenal seems equally interested in the opposite kind of sex-role crossovers and deviants: men trying to emulate women. Juvenal's *Satires* are littered with such figures. They enable him to speculate on the traits that constitute a "real man" through negative examples. In *Satire* 6, he attacks a sodomite (*cinaedus*), who pretends to be a pathic, a friend and a confidant to the wife. [27] This *cinaedus* is in his appearance non-threatening in the extreme, with his made-up face, his delicate voice (*vox mollior*), his effeminate, swishy moves, his saffron dress, and his hairnet, but he turns out to be a sexual performer in bed (*in lecto fortissimus*, 6.O.25), a triphallic man (he drops his Thais role for Triphallus, 6.O.26)--in short a real man (*purum virum*, 6.O.28). [28] In order to prove that this *vir* really is a *vir*, his sexuality has to be overdetermined: his alter ego is Triphallus ("the 3-cocked man") and in bed he is *fortissimus*. For this *cinaedus*, appearance is no index of character; rather, like a woman, his external self conceals a very

different character and sexuality. Since there is a gap here between appearance and reality, the speaker needs to pound home evidence of his virility. The size of his penis needs to be wildly exaggerated; indeed, his overly large penis would have been considered a grotesque and undesirable characteristic. [29] **[End Page 376]**

Elsewhere, Juvenal again focuses on men who deceptively display a male appearance while harboring female genitalia. [30] In *Satire* 2, one of Juvenal's two satires about pathics and homosexual prostitutes (for which, see the preceding essay by Walters), the speaker says: *frontis nulla fides; quis enim non vicus abundat / tristibus obscenis?* ("faces are not to be trusted; isn't every street full of moralizing immoralists [or pathics]?" 2.8-9). [31] These *tristes obsceni* wear the disguise of hairy bodies, which should attest to manliness (*atrocem animum*, 2.12), but actually cover up a "smooth [i.e., depilated] anus" (*podice levi*, 2.12). [32] While elsewhere the disguise is a costume, a theatrical role, or facial makeup, here it is the person's actual body that pretends to be what the soul is not. [33] The body's "adornment" (in this passage "hairy limbs and arms stiff with bristles," 2.11) marks the person's gender and his place in the sexual hierarchy.

But gender here is a more than usually complex term; it is difficult to place the people who inhabit Juvenal's landscape or even to assign them to a gendered category. Such a character as the *tristis obscenus* (moralizing immoralist) is a man by his sex, but by behavior, presentation, and gender (if gender is seen as performance), he is represented by Juvenal as more of a woman. Thus he has to try to disguise himself as the man he **[End Page 377]** wants to appear to be. In their actions, such men are transgendered: they are evaluated as men even though in their actions and behaviors they are emulating characteristically female traits. [34] They never, however, become the other sex or the other gender. But such men are deemed to be more like women because they blur the distinction between the sexes, a line that was drawn strictly, at least according to the cultural code that provided the underpinning of Juvenal's *Satires*. [35] Any person not belonging to one gender category or the other is characterized in Juvenal by traits associated with females (effeminacy, submissiveness, permeability, deception), and any freeborn man who assumed a pathic position was stigmatized and incurred the shame of being subordinate (and thus effeminized). [36]

Other so-called men in Juvenal's *Satires* disguise themselves in women's dress and female theatrical garb. In *Satire* 2, after an ironic exposé of the stern Roman moralists, [37] the speaker condemns one particular exam-ple: Creticus, a degenerate, aristocratic lawyer, who goes to court to pros-ecute adulteresses wearing a see-through toga (2.65-68). Creticus tries to cover up his suspect gender identity and hypocrisy by playing the stern moralist. But to no avail, the speaker thunders: you, Creticus, "fiery and headstrong (*acer et indomitus*, 2.77) champion of human freedom--you are transparent" (*perluces*, 2.78). Creticus' hypocrisy is revealed by his assumption of a woman's garb while he is maintaining a high moral tone; in his case, clothes do not make the man, but rather broadcast the slippage between his pretended character and his real, underlying perversion. [38] The turpitude that taints Creticus is like a plague (*contagio*) that can spread to all men just as mange or scab infects animal herds (2.78-81). [39] Creticus **[End Page 378]** thinks that his dress is a disguise, but it actually is an obvious mirror to his true, shameful self.

In the next section of *Satire* 2, Juvenal broadens his example of one man in drag to include both a wider scope of behavior (than simply wearing a dress) and a larger group of people who display this kind of behavior. The degradation happens by degrees; no one, says the speaker, sinks to the bottom all at once (*nemo repente fuit turpissimus*, 2.83). So what starts in small with Creticus in drag, grows into a whole crowd of cross-dressers, draped in fillets and necklaces, celebrating the rites of the Bona Dea, which was traditionally an all-female ceremony. [40] The entire ceremony is an inversion of the customary Bona Dea rites (*more sinistro*, 2.87). Again and again, Juvenal hammers home the perversions of these inverted male worshippers of the Bona Dea and their similarities to the traditional female worshippers. One carefully applies his makeup in a particularly sensual way (2.93-95); [41] another practices fellatio with a Priapean wineglass (2.95); a third, admiring himself in a mirror, [42] is compared to the emperor Otho, the pathic warrior, who applied mudpacks to his face just as women do (2.99-109). [43] Finally, the "depraved crew of Cybele," their voices squeaking (*fracta voce*, 2.111), follows this line of degradation to its logical conclusion: they "sever the lump of useless meat" and cross over the gender line to become emasculated "women" (2.115-16). [44] **[End Page 379]**

Male deviance thus functions as one part of the code in the semiotics of gender. In many Western texts, categories of sex and gender serve to organize human beings into comprehensible hierarchies, but Juvenal's gender categories are complex, arranging people into overlapping strata with reinforcing characteristics. One might expect that men would be characterized by attributes opposite to those predicated of women (corporeality, deception, fluidity) and, further, that men's bodies would act as markers of their social status and power. In texts other than Juvenal's, we often find men as the unmarked, unadorned norm and women marked as deviations from this norm by their bodily adornment. I think that the key to Juvenal's schematization of human beings lies in his fascination with male transvestism and the equation of such behavior with effeminacy and pathic status.

Why does Juvenal necessarily equate transvestism with turpitude, effeminacy, and pathic status? Transvestism was an accepted part of ancient ritual and drama, but, in those settings, it did not have a necessary connection to effeminate behavior. [45] In ritual and drama, transvestism was generally used at least partly to reaffirm sex roles and hierarchies, and it appeared in controlled circumstances that were sanctioned by the state as part of state-run festivals. [46] But, in Juvenal, every instance of cross-dressing is connected to deviant behavior. [47] Juvenal seems to reserve special disgust for transgressive men who degrade themselves by taking on women's roles and dress. [48] Such men are defined in a visual, material, and external way by **[End Page 380]** their bodily adornments, which locate them in an ambiguous place on the gender and social scale. They, like women, are characterized by disguise and deception, fluidity of gender traits, and corporeality. Their conventional association with spiritual and mental characteristics is broken. They are defined by their bodies and their sexuality--normally female attributes--and not by their social status as Roman male citizens. Juvenal's pathic male transvestites are not articulated as ideal, aristocratic, Roman males by their bodily appearance, but are degraded to the lower status of women. [49] In fact, in their excessive and overdetermined attention to body and self, they are seen as lower than women on the power scale, as objects rather than subjects of male (their own and others') desire, and as overly invested in their private and individual existence and thus not full contributors to public political and social life. [50] This public role is what defined a man's very essence and distinguished him from women.

Thus the conventional idea that the body is the site of social definition and locates gender breaks down in Juvenal's *Satires*. Women disguise themselves as men, and men appropriate women's dress and roles. Women no longer perform even their most conventional roles: their dry breasts and their wet crotches that lead only to sterility prove their inability to nurture children. Men even try to usurp this female function by marrying each other, but their marriage is sterile. Juvenal's only "real man" (*purus vir*) is the triphallic *cinaedus* in *Satire* 6, who drops his role of female prostitute and reveals himself as a superman (6.O.25-26), an overdetermined stud who has to prove his virility by revealing not one but three sex organs. And, in bringing to the stage a "triphallus" as the only *purus vir*, Juvenal reinforces by his very irony and exaggeration exactly the point he has been making throughout: a "real man," by the standards of early Republican Rome, simply does not exist anymore. **[End Page 381]**

III. Looking for Juvenal's Men

Thus those of us who set out to investigate texts about women only to discover once again that they are really about men can add Juvenal to this list of texts. Juvenal's longest and most vitriolic satire is, or seems to be, all about women. This *Satire*, the sixth, is usually entitled "Against Women," "The Legend of Bad Women," "Roman Wives," "The Ways of Women," or the like. [51] True, many different types of women are pilloried in this diatribe, but there are as many men who act/dress/look/think like women here and elsewhere in Juvenal's *Satires*. Moreover, when women themselves are described, it is in the language of, by analogy to, or in relation to men. The satirist's primary fascination seems to be with men who act like women (or, at least, who do not act like men) or women who appropriate and imitate normatively male behavior; he has a special horror of disintegrating gender codes and holes in the net of the system.

The satirist's concern is less with women than with men's sexual inadequacies. [52] His anxieties, often implied more than stated, are about the breaking down of the neat, clear code system that purportedly existed back in the days of the Punic wars (6.287-91). [53] There is, instead, a great proliferation of genders, which are constantly being performed in the *spectaculum* of Rome. [54] He implies that, whereas in "normal" times (the Good Old Days as recreated in the prologue to Juvenal 6?) one might

have expected sex and gender categories to sort out differences and create comprehensible hierarchies, one can no longer count on this.

If we read *Satire* 6 as focused on the construction of male gender and the displacement of male anxieties onto women, who become a kind of accidental target, this poem fits rather neatly into Juvenal's corpus, which is full of satires about Roman male inadequacies (e.g., *Satires* 2, 3, 4, 8, 9). Such a reading makes more sense of the satirist's deep-seated anxieties, which were not after all about women in particular--or maybe even about **[End Page 382]** women at all--but about the rips in the system that flattened the hierarchy, confused the clear-cut boundaries of gender and sexuality, and called into question social and political roles.

Juvenal uses the transgressive bodies of his *Satires* to symbolize his anxieties about the society of second-century c.e. Rome. The hybrid gendered beings who inhabit Juvenal's *Satires* provide evidence of the satirist's horrified fascination with performing bodies that refuse to remain within categories. By putting these deviant creatures--women and pathic male transvestites--on stage, Juvenal uses the performance of gender and the focalization of bodies to mark the boundaries of the appropriate and acceptable in Roman society. [55]

Hamilton College

Notes

1. The first part of my title is taken from Hélène Cixous; see Cixous and Clément 1986.68.

2. When I refer to "Juvenal," I mean the persona assumed by the author in the *Satires*, not any historical person. On this see Anderson 1982.3-10, 418-25; Braund 1988.1, 183-85, 188-90, 196-98.

3. Much work has been devoted lately to sexuality in antiquity and to the blurring of gender distinctions. For antiquity see, e.g., Keuls 1985; Richlin 1983; Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin 1990; Halperin 1990; Konstan and Nussbaum 1990; Winkler 1990a; Gleason 1995; Hallett and Skinner 1997 (both of these editors have also published many valuable articles on sexuality in the ancient world); Gold 1998; for the contemporary period, see Butler 1990a, 1993, and the bibliography cited in her notes.

4. Butler 1990a.viii.

5. See Butler 1990b.270-82. See also Merleau-Ponty, who says that the body is "an historical idea, not a natural entity" (1962.170).

6. For a good discussion of the fluidity and dynamism of gender relations, see Zeitlin 1996.

7. Zeitlin 1996.3.

8. This is also true of the male body in archaic and classical Greek art and literature; see Bassi 1995.5.

9. Another negative, tongue-in-cheek exemplum of a seamless inner/outer continuity, this time in an imperfect character, comes in *Satire* 9, where Juvenal says to Naevolus: *deprendas animi tormenta latentis in aegro / corpore, deprendas et gaudia; sumit utrumque / inde habitum facies* ("One can detect in a sickly body the torments of the soul and its joys too; from there the face derives its smiles and frowns," 9.18-20). Cf. for this sentiment Lucilius fr. 662 Krenkel: *animo qui aegrotat, videmus corpore hunc signum dare*. My translations of Juvenal are from Rudd 1991; Green 1967; Ramsay 1918, rev. 1950; and are partly my own.

10. This is true also for male deviants; see Juvenal's statement in *Sat*. 2.8: *frontis nulla fides* ("you can't trust appearances"). For women as the site of deception and concealment, see Hesiod *Works and Days* 60-82, *Theogony* 570-89. See also duBois 1980.44 and Jonathan Walters' essay in this volume.

11. Tertullian *De cultu feminarum* I.1 (Migne 1844, vol. I, cols. 304-05). For another such formulation, see John Bromyard who compares women who wear finery to "the painted tombstone that conceals a rotting corpse" (quoted in duBois 1980.46). See also Tertullian *De virginibus velandis* in Migne 1844,

vol. II, cols. 899-900; O'Faolain and Martines 1973.132-33. On female bodies, see Baker 1991.7-25 (11 for the Tertullian quote), Wyke 1994.134-51.

12. Loraux 1990.30.

13. On women behaving like men in Juvenal *Satire* 6, see Vidén 1993.152-60.

14. See Richlin 1984.67-80, esp. 71-75; also Richlin 1983, Chapter 2 for a discussion of the totally negative figuring of breasts and genitalia in Roman satire.

15. Juv. *Sat*. 13.162-63: *quis / in Meroe crasso maiorem infante mamillam?* Meroe was a kingdom in Africa on the Upper Nile, a part of Kush. The example given here from 13.162-63 targets not just women but African women and carries a tinge of racism as well as misogyny. Africans, however, are not the only ones with big breasts; this appears to be a trait of women in general, cf. *Sat*. 6.9.

16. The adjective *magnis* in *Sat*. 6.9 modifies *infantibus*, but the implication is that the breasts sucked by these large babes are big too.

17. See Vidén 1993.155 for this translation and a discussion of the passage. She takes *recta facie* to mean that she boldly faces the men she is talking to instead of casting down her eyes in modesty.

18. One might expect women's wet genitals to be associated with female biological functions such as menstruation and childbirth. In Juvenal, however, it is quite the opposite. The wetness is associated with pure lust that leads to nothing, only to sterility (see the Miller essay in this volume). On the danger represented by female abjections such as menstrual blood, which cannot be absorbed (literally or into the category of female sexuality) or subordinated to male categories, see Gallop 1988.54.

19. Here and elsewhere Juvenal does not make it explicit that the crotch itself is wet, but rather transfers the moisture to clothing or another body part or another person. See *Sat*. 9.3-5, where Ravola (a slave) is punished for being caught with a beard still wet from rubbing Rhodope's crotch (and his action is compared to a slave licking a pastry, 5): *quid tibi cum vultu, qualem deprensus habebat / Ravola dum Rhodopes uda terit inguina barba? / nos colaphum incutimus lambenti crustula servo*. I would contend also that in *Sat*. 6.318-19, the "dripping legs" (*crura madentia*) could be dripping not with sweat or wine but with vaginal secretions. (Juvenal implies that the legs are already wet before the wine splashes down them.) For other possible references to female genitalia in a same-sex context, see *Sat.* 2.49 and 6.306-13.

20. Here, as elsewhere in this essay, there will inevitably be some repetition from earlier essays in this volume. I will reiterate points that others have made because they are important to my argument and for readers who read the individual essays as self-contained units rather than as parts of a connected whole. For metaphors of dampness, moisture, and seepage, see Richlin 1984.72-74; Gleason 1995.xiii, 84-87; Reckford (essay in this volume), esp. Section I. See also Gallop 1988.151-52.

21. On the qualities associated with maleness and femaleness by the medical writers, see Gleason 1995.82-102, especially p. 85, and the bibliography cited there. The ability to declaim in a deep voice (the sign of a nobler nature) was connected to the amount of *pneuma* in one's body, and the more *pneuma* you drew in, the lighter, dryer, and warmer you were. Women and eunuchs, of course, could not declaim in a deep voice and thus possessed less *pneuma*.

22. For women and bleeding (positive and negative), see King 1983.109-27, Grosz 1994.202-10, Kristeva 1982. Grosz has a good discussion of corporeal flows especially in writers such as Kristeva and Irigaray. See also von Staden 1992.7-30; Carson 1990.137-45, 153-58. Kristeva points out that men are associated with fluids also, but their fluids, tears and semen, are non-polluting and do not defile the bodies from which they emanate as, e.g., menstrual blood does for women.

23. See Edwards 1993.174, where she quotes a passage from Seneca in which he figures virtue as dry and hard and pleasure as wet and soft (Sen. *De vita beata* 7.3).

24. On women as open, leaking vessels and the connection of this symbolic set to sterility, see Miller's essay in this volume; also on bodies in general as leaky vessels, see Reckford on Persius (essay in this

volume). Reckford, however, sees Persius as performing reconstructive surgery on these leaky bodies, recomposing the fragmentary shards in his act of *compositio*. I would contend that Juvenal's bodies are all unbounded, uncontained, and disconnected and that the only solid, closed bodies are the absent ideal that Juvenal seeks, but presents always as elusive and missing.

25. See especially *Satire* 6 and Vidén 1993 on this satire.

26. On the separation of women, as outsiders and inferior, partial beings, from men who are regarded as superior, complete, and the norm, see King 1983.112-13.

27. As Braund and Cloud point out, Juvenal *Sat*. 2 is about "homosexuality as it appears in *both* its dissimulated *and* in its admitted forms" (1981.204).

28. The Oxford fragment of *Sat*. 6. cited here may or may not be genuine; this has been much debated. See Courtney 1980.304 and the bibliography cited there; he argues that it is genuine. As Konstan says, "assuming attributes of the opposite sex is not a sign of 'homosexuality' but a . . . violation of the proprieties of power and domination" (1993.14). Juvenal's target is not so much homosexuals as men who assume the submissive role in a sexual relationship and therefore assume female characteristics.

29. Indeed, in Athens at least, small penises seem to have been prized. Exaggeratedly large penises were seen mainly on satyrs and on the comic stage and were paired with other undesirable bodily characteristics (see, e.g., Aristophanes *Clouds* 1009-19). The ideal male citizen described in the *Clouds* by the *kreitton logos* has all the qualities that defined manly excellence; these did not include a large penis. Therefore, a "Triphallus," whom Juvenal sarcastically calls the only *purus vir* in Rome, would (in Greek terms at least) resemble a grotesque satyr more than a sleekly-built, desirable, citizen male. See, on the delineation of male attributes in fourth-century Athens, Winkler 1990b, esp. 37, 41; Dover 1978.124-35. I thank David Konstan for these references.

30. *Satire* 2 is a text about deception and dissimulation; see Jonathan Walters' essay in this volume on *Sat*. 2. See also on this, Gleason 1995 passim and 1990, esp. 406-11, where she discusses the physiognomists who could see the inner character of people behind their deceptive appearances.

31. Cf. *Sat*. 6.O.20-21: *haud tamen illi / semper habenda fides* ("but this teacher is not always to be trusted"). What is not to be trusted here is the inference that a person is a *cinaedus* from his lascivious and effeminate movements. You cannot trust anyone even to be a *cinaedus* if he looks like one.

32. Cf. Persius 4.35-36, where the depilated genitalia of a pathic become female genitalia in the space of two lines. See Richlin 1983.188-89; Gleason 1990.405, n. 63, for comments on beardless ephebic beauty as less attractive.

33. Interestingly, Varro gives as one etymology for *obscenus* that it refers to what should only be talked about openly on stage (*quare turpe ideo obscenum quod nisi in scaena palam dici non debet*, *Ling*. 7.96). Thus Juvenal's words *tristes obsceni* might carry a hidden reference to these pathics being "on stage" or making spectacles of themselves. See Jonathan Walters' essay (this volume) for a discussion.

34. For this concept of transgendering, see Duerst-Lahti and Kelly 1995.6, 28, 33 and McManus 1997.91-118, who discusses transgendering in Vergil's *Aeneid*.

35. See the discussion above, Part I. McManus points out that charges of effeminacy were used to criticize many different traits "that had little connection with sexuality" (1997.95-96).

36. This seems to be implied both by the *Lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis* and the *Lex Scantinia*. The *Lex Scantinia* apparently made illegal the sexual use of an *ingenuus* by another male (see Richlin 1983.224-25). See also on these laws, Edwards 1993.34-62, 70-73.

37. For Laronia, see Braund 1995.207-19.

38. See Braund 1996, who points out that Juvenal's *perluces* (2.78) is a brilliant double entendre, indicating both Creticus' see-through dress and his see-through behavior (144). In another pun, on *testem* (2.76), the speaker questions whether even a witness (or testicle) should wear such a garment.

39. This *contagio* is not Creticus' transvestism but a more serious disease underlying his cross-dressing: his effeminacy and homosexuality.

40. See *Sat*. 6.314-41, where one man in drag (Clodius) bursts into a celebration of the mysteries of the Bona Dea. Here Juvenal is more focused on the orgiastic behavior of the women involved and presents us with the ultimate male fantasy of women so oversexed that they welcome into their unisex ceremony anything male, even a donkey or a detached penis.

41. Cf. the toilette scene in 6.O.20-22, a description of the bisexual *cinaedus*. The comparison highlights the perversion of the worshipper in *Sat*. 2.93-95. On the makeup scene, see Braund 1996.148-49.

42. For the association of women and mirrors, see Wyke 1994.135-36.

43. As Konstan points out, the figure of Otho, who carries a mirror into war and applies facepacks, is contrasted with the more manly behavior of Semiramis and Cleopatra, and the conquering general is found to be more effeminate than a defeated barbarian queen (1993.13). Cf. 6.461-62, where a woman spreads on a similar facial pack made of dough (*ridenda . . . multo / pane tumet facies*). Another allusion to transvestism and deviant behavior in this passage comes in 2.91-92, where the worshippers are compared to the Baptae, devotees of the Thracian goddess Cotyto. Cotyto's worship probably involved cross-dressing.

44. Here, sex and gender are confounded since the primary organ that marks a person as physically a male, the penis, has been removed. Cf. *Sat*. 9.50-53, where a pathic (Virro) celebrates the Matronalia, a woman's holiday in honor of Juno. The word *turpis*, used in 2.111 to describe this crew of Cybele, seems to be a code word for deviant behavior; cf. 2.71, 83. The *Satire* continues with other examples of male degradation and effeminacy: a male wedding (in which the "bride" cannot bear offspring even with the aid of fertility drugs, 117-42); the same man, Gracchus the bride, appearing in the arena as a *retiarius* (the lowest form of gladiator and one often associated with effeminacy, 143-48; cf. 6.O.7-16, 8.199-208); finally an effeminate Armenian youth, lover of a Roman tribune, who was more manly than the tribune until corrupted by his stay in Rome (2.163-70).

45. Greek ritual and drama included many instances of cross-dressing; see, for example, Zeitlin 1996.341-74, Ferguson 1938.36-41, Simon 1983.90-91. Roman ritual and drama offer fewer examples of this; Plautus' *Casina* stands as a rare exception. Pantomime and non-literary Italian popular drama such as Atellan farce contained other examples. For pantomime, see Richlin 1992.173-78; for Atellan farce, see Cody 1976.461-76, Arnott forthcoming, MacCary and Willcock 1976.36-38 and note 2.

46. See Gold 1998.

47. See Richlin 1983.xxix, n. 11, where she discusses societies in which gender-crossing was/is acceptable.

48. Cf. *Sat*. 2.54-57, where a man actually engages in the ultimate women's work, spinning and weaving.

49. There is even an implication that women do not have a claim to be called *homines*; were they marked as boundary crossers and therefore not worthy of the name? See 6.283-84, where an adulterous wife defends herself against the charge of adultery by saying to her husband *homo sum* (= "I have the right to err as all humans do"?).

50. See Foucault 1986.41-43. Gleason, asking why a man would indulge in practices such as depilation and dainty grooming if he knew he would incur hostility and scorn by so doing, hypothesizes that such practices translated the ideal of ephebic beauty into adult life and that some people (mostly women and boys) must have found this look attractive (1990.405).

51. "Against Women": Humphries 1958, "The Legend of Bad Women": Mackail 1895.223, "Roman Wives": Rudd 1991, "The Ways of Women": Ramsay 1918.

52. I would like to express my debt to W. R. Johnson's 1996 essay "Male Victimology in Juvenal 6," which has been very helpful to me. See also for masculine identity/values and code-breaking in ancient texts, Zeitlin 1996.passim.

53. See Johnson 1996.177-79.

54. For Juvenal's view of Rome as a living theater and the Romans as spectators, see Gold forthcoming, *Perception*. See also Jonathan Walters' essay in this volume.

55. See Jonathan Walters' essay in this volume on the value of stigmatizing deviant behavior for preserving the respectability of the viewers. I would like to thank several colleagues for their helpful comments on my paper: Shelley Haley, Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz, and Carl Rubino, all of Hamilton College, and Barbara McManus, College of New Rochelle.

Bibliography

Anderson, William S. 1982. *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton.

Arnott, W. G. Forthcoming. "Love Scenes in Plautus," in *Scaenica Saravi-Varsoviensia: Beiträge zum antiken Theater und seinem Nachleben* (eds. J. Axer and W. Görler). Warsaw.

Baker, Moira P. 1991. "The Uncanny Stranger on Display: The Female Body in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Love Poetry," *South Atlantic Review* 56.7-25.

Bassi, Karen. 1995. "Male Nudity and Disguise in the Discourse of Greek Histrionics," *Helios* 22.3-22.

Braund, Susanna H. 1988. *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*. Cambridge.

------. 1995. "A Woman's Voice?--Laronia's Role in Juvenal *Satire* 2," in *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments* (eds. Barbara Levick and Richard Hawley), 207-19. London.

------. (ed.) 1996. *Juvenal: Satires Book 1*. Cambridge.

Braund, Susanna H. and J. D. Cloud. 1981. "Juvenal: A Diptych," *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 6.195-208.

Butler, Judith. 1990a. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York.

------. 1990b. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," in *Performing Feminisms* (ed. Sue-Ellen Case), 270-82. Baltimore.

------. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York.

Carson, Anne. 1990. "Putting Her in Her Place: Woman, Dirt, and Desire," in Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin 1990.135-69.

Cixous, Hélène and Catherine Clément. 1986. *The Newly Born Woman* (trans. Betsy Wing). Minneapolis. (Originally *La Jeune Née*. Paris 1975.)

Cody, Jane M. 1976. "The *Senex Amator* in Plautus' *Casina*," *Hermes* 104.453-76.

Courtney, E. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal.* London.

Dover, K. J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*. Cambridge, Mass.

duBois, Page. 1980. "'The Devil's Gateway': Women's Bodies and the Earthly Paradise," *Women's Studies* 7.43-58.

Duerst-Lahti, Georgia and Rita Mae Kelly (eds.) 1995. *Gender Power, Leadership, and Governance*.

Ann Arbor.

Edwards, Catharine. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.

Ferguson, W. S. 1938. "The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion," *Hesperia* 7.36-41.

Foucault, Michel. 1986. *The Care of the Self: The History of Sexuality,* vol. 3 (trans. Robert Hurley). New York.

Gallop, Jane. 1988. *Thinking Through the Body* (eds. Carolyn Heilbrun and Nancy K. Miller). New York.

Gleason, Maud W. 1990. "The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-Fashioning in the Second Century c.e.," in Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin 1990.389-415.

------. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.

Gold, Barbara K. 1988. "Dionysus, Greek Festivals, and the Treatment of Hysteria," *Laetaberis* 6.16-28.

------. 1998. "'Vested Interests' in Plautus's *Casina*: Cross-Dressing in Roman Comedy," in *Gender and Genre in Roman Comedy and Elegy* (ed. Sharon James), special issue of *Helios* 25.17-29.

------. Forthcoming. "The Perception of Urban Life in Juvenal's Satires," in *The Shapes of City Life in Rome and Pompeii: Essays in Honor of Lawrence Richardson, Jr.* (eds. Mary T. Boatwright and Harry Evans). New York.

Green, Peter (trans.) 1967. *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires.* Baltimore.

Grosz, Elizabeth. 1994. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington.

Hallett, Judith P. and Marilyn B. Skinner (eds.) 1997. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton.

Halperin, David. 1990. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love*. New York.

Halperin, David M., John J. Winkler, and Froma I. Zeitlin (eds.) 1990. *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Princeton.

Humphries, Rolfe (trans.) 1958. *The Satires of Juvenal.* Bloomington.

Johnson, W. R. 1996. "Male Victimology in Juvenal 6," *Ramus* 25.170-86.

Keuls, Eva. 1985. *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*. New York.

King, Helen. 1983. "Bound to Bleed: Artemis and Greek Women," in *Images of Women in Antiquity* (eds. Averil Cameron and Amélie Kuhrt), 109-27. London.

Konstan, David. 1993. "Sexuality and Power in Juvenal's Second Satire," *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 18.12-14.

Konstan, David and Martha Nussbaum (eds.) 1990. *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Society*, special issue of *differences* 2.1.

Kristeva, Julia. 1982. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (trans. Leon S. Roudiez). New York.

Loraux, Nicole. 1990. "Herakles: The Super Male and the Feminine," in Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin 1990.21-52.

MacCary, W. Thomas and M. M. Willcock (eds.) 1976. *Plautus: Casina*. Cambridge.

Mackail, J. W. 1895. *Latin Literature*. New York.

McManus, Barbara F. 1997. *Classics and Feminism: Gendering the Classics* (The Impact of Feminism on the Arts and Sciences). New York.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1962. "The Body in its Sexual Being," in *The Phenomenology of Perception* (trans. Colin Smith), 154-73. London.

Migne, J. P. 1844. *Patrologia Latina*. Paris.

O'Faolain, Julia and Laura Martines (eds.) 1973. *Not in God's Image*. New York.

Ramsay, G. G. (trans.) 1918, rev. 1950. *Juvenal and Persius*. Cambridge.

Richlin, Amy. 1983. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. New Haven; rev. ed. Oxford 1992.

------. 1984. "Invective Against Women in Roman Satire," *Arethusa* 17.67-80.

------. 1991. "Zeus and Metis: Foucault, Feminism, Classics," *Helios* 18.1-21.

------. 1992. "Reading Ovid's Rapes," in *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (ed. A. Richlin), 158-79. Oxford.

Rudd, Niall (trans.) 1991. *Juvenal: The Satires*. Oxford.

Simon, E. 1983. *Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary*. Madison.

Vidén, Gunhild. 1993. *Women in Roman Literature: Attitudes of Authors under the Early Empire*. Göteburg.

von Staden, Heinrich. 1992. "Women and Dirt," *Helios* 19.7-30.

Winkler, John J. 1990a. *Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York.

------. 1990b. "Phallos Politikos: Representing the Body Politic in Athens," *differences* 2.29-45.

Wyke, Maria. 1994. "Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Ancient World," in *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night* (eds. Léonie J. Archer, Susan Fischler, and Maria Wyke), 134-51. New York.

Zeitlin, F. I. 1996. "Playing the Other: Theater, Theatricality, and the Feminine in Greek Drama," in *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*, 341-74. Chicago.

.