POETIC PROJECTION IN JUVENAL'S *SATIRES*[*]

OSMAN UMURHAN

This article investigates how Juvenal complicates his own authority as a moralizing poet by speaking in the voice of a female character located at Rome who exemplifies issues of inconsistency and authorial destabilization that are the very essence of Juvenal's *Satires*. Specifically, this woman in Satire 6.398–412 poses serious challenges to Juvenal's desire to eradicate Rome's vices: one, she is a woman, where elsewhere women are often the recipients of satiric attack; two, she purports to condemn vice in a way similar to Juvenal's programmatic claims to combat moral depravity at Rome; three, her criticism of moral decay in Rome indirectly criticizes Juvenal's practice of satire as a male activity. In the process, this female voice also confuses the satirist's language of mockery and attack.[1] She ultimately complicates a unified articulation of the poet's voice, which complication, in turn, calls into question his programmatic aim to expose and attack others for their vices.

This female character diffuses the satirist's voice. This diffusion, however, does not suggest that the author has compromised his aim to tackle Roman decay. Diffusion simply equates to meaning in Juvenal's *Satires*. In fact, recent studies recognize that complication and inconsistency constitute the very operation of meaning in other literary genres

* I would like to thank Robert Cape, Jr., Joy Connolly, and Todd Penner for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Special thanks are also due to the anonymous readers of *Arethusa* whose suggestions greatly enriched this investigation. All remaining errors and infelicities are solely my own.

1 Cf. Plaza 2006.53–105 and Rosen 2007.207–42. Plaza's excellent study analyzes the principles of mockery and humor that are distinct in each of the Roman verse satirists. Rosen investigates the nature of mockery in Roman satire with particular attention to its roots in Greek comedy. He offers a provocative look at self-mockery in Juvenal's Satires 5 and 9.

Arethusa 44 (2011) 221–243 © 2011 by The Johns Hopkins University Press

such as epic (O'Hara 2007, Pavlock 2009). We ought to add satire to this list as well. I argue that Juvenal challenges his audience to interrogate his kaleidoscopic views of Rome and the satirist's self, and does so beyond the generic conventions of satire, a genre that emulates the declamatory style and language of epic (de Decker 1913). This female voice offers a unique, cross-gendered perspective on Rome unlike that of Juvenal's verse satire predecessors and an outlook that playfully compels his audience to participate in the execution of his programmatic aim, namely to combat moral decay in the city.

Overall, Juvenal's female poetic projection contributes to an inconsistent, yet varied landscape that fittingly mirrors the extreme behavior the satirist observes. Not only is this inconsistency a convention of satire, I will argue, it is also a key feature that underlines the complex strategy of Juvenal's self-representation. The female image in Satire 6 mirrors several characteristics of Juvenalian satire: she undercuts Juvenal's aim to practice satire, initiates his poetic self-deprecation, and creates humor at the expense of both herself and her audience. We find ourselves face to face with an anonymous woman cast in the guise of the male satirist: the self-portrait of a hermaphroditic crusader.

THE HORATIAN PRECEDENT: FIGURES OF THE SATIRIST

The Roman satirist creates an intimate self-consciousness that traditionally distinguishes satire from many other Latin literary traditions such as epic, history, and tragedy.[2] *Persona* theory, a major technique for locating the author's emotions and personal perspective within the text, regards the poet as one who assumes various voices or "masks" to articulate a variety of perspectives on the topic at hand, from gender and sexuality to issues of class, politics, and religion.[3] It is useful to consider Horace in light of this theory, since so much of satire depends on the emulation of

2 Roman lyric, however, shares with satire a demonstration of the author's personal emotions. One need look no further than the lyrics of Horace's *Odes*.

3 Cf. Highet 1954, Anderson 1982, Winkler 1993, Miller 1994, Braund 1988, 1996a, and 1996b, Iddeng 2000, Schmitz 2000, and Mayer 2003. Highet argues for the biographical approach, which assumes that the narrator reflects the thoughts and opinions of the historical Juvenal. Anderson, Winkler, and Braund, on the other hand, argue for the more poetic functions of *personae* in the genre of Roman satire. Mayer contends that the ancient reader did not necessarily distinguish the writer from the *personae* in any given text.

and indebtedness to one's generic predecessors. Horace's *Sermones* and *Epistles* provide a precedent for the examination of the poetic self (Freudenburg 1993, Oliensis 1998, Cucchiarelli 2001, Keane 2005).

Verse satirists playfully enlist themselves as characters in their own literary creations. Recent studies on satire have defined this as surrogacy or the use of dramatic stand-ins for the author (Richlin 1992, Oliensis 1998).[4] Horace is notable for his use of a series of surrogate satirists in his *Sermones* to challenge and undercut the narrative authority of the dominant voice (Freudenburg 1993, Oliensis 1998). Horace draws on the favorite themes of diatribists such as Bion of Borysthenes to direct laughter and criticism at his own mishandling of diatribe themes. An author's self-criticism hopes to impart some form of ethical guidance to his audience. Philodemos, a contemporary of Horace, does exactly this when he seeks to guide fellow Epicureans who may threaten to stray from the path of philosophical integrity.[5] Or self-mockery can strengthen the authority of the author and help win the audience's sympathy.[6]

In a similar manner, Horace draws attention to the flaws of his own moralizing at certain junctures in the *Sermones* and *Epistles*. In the *Sermones,* Horace enlists himself as a subject for scrutiny. He redirects his criticism of other people's moral shortcomings onto himself and thereby becomes the sole target of satire (Freudenburg 1993.21). Horace initiates this criticism by fashioning himself as an inept, unkempt bumpkin in *Sermones* 1.3, a stock character reminiscent of Roman comedy.[7]

---

4 Richlin 1992 terms this technique "literary ventriloquism." Cf. Oliensis 1998.53–61, Keane 2002a. Surrogacy is not limited to Roman writers of satire; cf. Pavlock 2009 for her examination of poetic substitutes in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

5 In his study of Philodemus, Sider 2004 discusses the author's use of *parrhesia* in two epigrams: *Anth. Pal.* 9.570 and 9.512 (or nos. 3 and 29 per Sider's enumeration in his 1997 *Epigrams of Philodemos*). Sider defines *parrhesia* as "a way in which one Epicurean can speak frankly with another" (90). These two epigrams, Sider argues, elicit pleasure among their listeners for their playful criticism of Philodemus's own philosophical failings. The philosophical message in both epigrams serves as an oblique method of imparting ethical guidance; it is a help to those who stray to remain on the straight and narrow. Sider traces this form of ethical assistance from Homer's *Iliad* 9 through Sappho, Pindar, Plato, and the rest of the Greek philosophical tradition.

6 Plaza 2006.167. For a specific look at the process of self-mockery in the verse satirists, cf. 167–256.

7 Cf. Freudenburg 1993.27–33 for a thorough investigation of *Sermones* 1.3.29–34 with a specific focus on the influence of the Socratic dialogue and Cynic diatribe on Horace. This comic self-image of the bumbling buffoon induces the audience to identify him with Horace, a man not too stable in his emotional demeanor, with torn clothing that is suggestive

Horace employs the image of a male disheveled poet as one among a larger syndicate of surrogates in the *Sermones*. In the second book of the *Sermones,* other dramatic characters begin to substitute for the Horatian satirist and function as stand-ins as the satirist himself becomes less prominent.[8] These three stand-ins—Ofellus, Damasippus, and Davus—reflect some conventional features of the stock characters of Roman comedy such as the gaping shoe (*calceus*, 1.3.32) of Horace's self-portrait in *Sermones* 1.3. The satirical threesome also remind us of the historical circumstances of Horace's life such as the loss of Horace's property due to the proscriptions of the civil war. In a larger strategy of self-reflection, Horace intertextually uses these surrogates in Book 2 to expose the satirist of Book 1 and thus negate the Horatian satirist's earlier claims to moral superiority. Horace's self-incrimination relies on the audience's recognition that this process is taking place. By imbuing the stand-ins with qualities attributed elsewhere to the Horatian satirist, the satirist initiates a process of self-targeting that draws him into the same line of fire reserved for others.[9]

Overall, the Horatian satirist paints the self-portrait of a floppy-footed clown sporting an awkward haircut, who is both indecisive and somewhat doubtful of his ability to carry out the task of guiding others

---

of one not from urban Rome but the countryside, and intelligence not readily recognizable upon first glance. Horace does not fit the expected mold and, therefore, exposes himself to criticism and laughter (*rideri*, 1.3.30) at these shortcomings. The author's playful self-insertion into the text articulates an informal involvement in the very scenarios he advises others to act upon. Cf. Turpin 1998, who views the speaker of *Sermones* 1.1–3 as both an Epicurean and a parasite—a stock figure of Greek and Latin comedy—both of whom may appear distinct but in Horace's rendering are not. Turpin argues that the connections between the parasitic and Epicurean dimensions of the speaker contribute to a larger comic effect, namely the parodic depiction of Horace and Maecenas as a philosophizing parasite and his *rex*.

8 Oliensis 1998.51–63 places particular emphasis on how the Horatian satirist in Book 2 incriminates, if not undermines, his own poetic authority through the figure of the three stand-ins; cf. Keane 2002a.227.

9 The author's self-criticism even transcends his own generic bounds. Horace perpetuates his self-deprecation in his later collection, the *Epistles*, where he alludes to his self-fashioning in the *Sermones*. In *Epistles* 1.94–100, the poet addresses the theme of inconsistency with a parallel between his messy physical appearance and his wavering sentiments. Horace asks the interlocutor to look beyond the poet's disheveled appearance and to consider that his appearance signals the mind's lack of stability. Like the *Sermones* 1.3 passage, the author invites scrutiny with particular attention to his awkward haircut (*inaequali tonsore capillos*, 1.94) and two tunics, one ragged (*trita*, 1.96), the other new (*subucula*, 1.95), and his awkwardly fitting toga (*toga . . . impar*, 1.96). His clumsy clothing signals the author's self-revelatory commentary and triggers laughter (*rides*, 1.95).

by example. In the *Sermones* and *Epistles,* the author invites the audience to laugh at (*rideo*) and mock his personal disposition. At this juncture, we may ask two interrelated questions: what purpose do these less than complimentary and authoritative stances serve? And what larger issue might these self-deprecating images of the poet address? Horace's vacillation and general self-introspection articulate the larger challenges the poet faces in writing satire. For Horace, the law and satire are intimately connected despite their seeming incompatibility.[10] His discussion of this incompatibility affords the satirist an opportunity to reflect upon the personal predicament of his writing satire under the growing restraint of Octavian's rule. In *Sermones* 2.1, Horace imagines keeping his sword—a symbol of satire's invective and critical bite—protected and stowed away so long as Octavian protects Horace and others in their circle. The author employs a self-conscious gaze that uses wit and humor to playfully moderate a potentially abrasive subject before the future emperor Augustus. His readers are left with images of a poet left between a rock and a hard place.

Horace's *Sermones* and *Epistles* reveal an intricate relationship between the author and his peers. Both collections emphasize his struggles not only to practice satire, but also to impart sound ethical advice. As the examples of surrogacy above demonstrate, the satirist takes the edge off his scrutiny of others by exposing himself to the same pitfalls he criticizes in others. This redirection highlights Horace's own shortcomings as a practitioner of ethical guidance, but simultaneously offers his personal failings as an example for others either to follow or avoid.

JUVENAL: THE SATIRIC "I"

Approximately one hundred thirty years after Horace, Juvenal bursts onto the literary scene at Rome railing against all the inequities and moral decay that flood the city and curb his social and literary upward movement. Juvenal devotes much of his Satire 1 to setting out his general program for the collection. This plan includes jabs at representatives of corruption: the nouveaux riche, foreigners, hack actors and writers, the city of Rome itself, and the sexually immoderate and depraved. Satire 1 illustrates the

10 Lowrie 2005 takes this argument a step further with an analysis of the possible relationships between law and song in Rome's first extant legal document, the Twelve Tables.

myriad of vices that then are systematically examined in greater detail throughout the remainder of Book 1 (Satires 1–5).

How does Juvenal indicate his personal involvement in his literary landscape? The *Satires* opens with the author's voice as he inveighs against one of Rome's vices, endless recitation. Thus Juvenal sets the groundwork for his marginalization as he seeks audience sympathy for his cause. The poet highlights his own distress *in medias res* and his efforts to counter his unfavorable position at Rome. Then Juvenal, qua speaker, introduces a series of self-reflective personal pronouns and verbs that represent the satirist himself (1.1–6):[11]

> Semper *ego* auditor tantum? numquamne reponam
> vexatus totiens rauci Theseide Cordi?
> impune ergo *mihi* recitaverit ille togatas,
> hic elegos? impune diem consumpserit ingens
> Telephus aut summi plena iam margine libri
> scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus Orestes?[12]

> Will *I* always only be the listener? Will I never retaliate
> for those times I was harried by rough Cordus's *Theseid*?
> Without punishment, therefore, will one recite Roman
> comedies
> and the other elegies *to me*? Without punishment will
> the immense Telephus
> consume my day or a thus far unfinished Orestes written
> in an already filled margin of a full book?

First, the introductory *ego* (1.1) and *mihi* (1.4) offer a glimpse of the satirist's self-focalizing perspective. In particular, he decries himself as only the "listener" (*auditor*, 1.1), a role that emphasizes his passivity and lack of active participation in the recitation. This marginalized characterization serves as an odd assertion of the author's literary authority—the satirist is assaulted (*vexatus*, 1.2) by the recitation. Juvenal, however,

---

11 Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli 2005 contend that Juvenal and his satiric voice represent a break from the satiric tradition. Unlike his satiric predecessors, Juvenal's voice has been completely absorbed by the generic practices that he aims to imitate (220).

12 The Latin text of Juvenal is from Willis' 1997 Teubner edition. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

uses this opportunity to set the stage for his later, active stance in 1.19ff., which is a response to his passivity in the opening. In the meanwhile, the opening ascending tricolon of rhetorical questions stresses the satirist's frustration with the current literary scene.

Furthermore, the satirist's perspective in 1.1–6 contributes to the construction of his voice. Juvenal's assumption of an active role as the *invector* suggests a larger strategy to have his audience see as he sees, a technique termed "antimetathesis."[13] The satirist's tactic behind antimetathesis also reveals the complexity of the satirist's voice. He quotes not only from epic, tragic, and elegiac writers past and contemporary, but also from his genre's predecessors.[14] For example, the satirist cites an array of Roman and Greek sources, from Roman *togatae* (1.3) and *elegi* (1.4), to Greek tragic heroes (*Telephus*, 1.5; *Orestes*, 1.6). *Togatae*, specifically, denote comedies with Italian settings and Roman dress.[15] Juvenal's aggravation at the gamut of generic forms in Rome suggests an initial distancing from all popular literary genres including Roman ones. The poet's attention to multiple popular genres is not too distant from Horace's own trans-generic communication between the *Epistles* and the *Sermones*.[16] Nor does Persius, Juvenal's Neronian predecessor, neglect to employ multiple voices to articulate varied responses to a variety of topics in his satires.[17] These variable mouthpieces do not indicate carelessness but a concerted strategy on the satirist's part to address larger philosophical or social issues in the satire.

Juvenal's second book of satires simply consists of one satire of epic length, 6, that, most notably, showcases the poet's anger against women. The satirist's abuse of women, however, is much more sophisticated than

---

13 Henderson 1999.252–55 in his essay "Pump up the Volume." According to Henderson, Satire 1.1–13 functions as the "mimesis" of a preliminary stage before the act of writing that serves to situate the reader's position and "trajectory" (252).

14 According to Henderson 1999, Juvenal appropriates a bevy of epic details, from the *Aeneid* to Valerius Flaccus's *Argonautica,* that enable a novel maneuverability within his own textual landscape.

15 Cf. Courtney 1980.84 and Braund 1996a.75.

16 Cf. Jones 2007.123–44 for a thorough look at the variety of generic forms (from historiography to elegy) Juvenal employs in his satiric performance.

17 On Persius's use of multiple voices in his *Satires*, cf. Reckford 1998 and Plaza 2006.221–35. In examining Persius's Satire 3, Reckford cogently argues for the difficulty behind the ever-shifting relation between the *personae* and the author because Persius's voices continually shift and blend. The collection of voices in Satire 3—the narrator, observer, student, and adviser—address the larger Stoic concern over philosophical and bodily integrity.

simple misogyny. His invective and criticism of female vice function as a rhetorical template from which to address a variety of other vices as in the earlier satires of Book 1. His attack on women in Satire 6 implicates both sexes with the charges of hypocrisy and disregard for the sanctity of marriage. Some of Juvenal's women act as ciphers through whom he aims at underlying targets such as male gladiators, eunuchs, and other male figures who do not adhere to their prescribed gender roles. In the following, I argue that Juvenal not only uses the tactic of surrogacy, like Horace before him, but he also uses this type of indirection to target himself in Satire 6.

THE ANONYMOUS WOMAN OF SATIRE 6

Midway through Satire 6, the reader finds Juvenal ranting against female intrusion into male dominated spheres of activity. The poet criticizes one woman's desire for a eunuch (6.366–78) and singles out another for her love of song (or magic, *cantus*, 6.379), musicians, and her excessive prayers for the success of their performances (6.379–97). He proceeds to take a stab at another woman, specifically an anonymous woman who loiters about Rome's city gates, conversing in the company of military men, fabricating and disseminating information to everyone she encounters (6.398–412):

> sed cantet potius quam totam pervolet urbem
> audax et coetus possit quae ferre virorum
> cumque paludatis ducibus praesente marito
> ipsa loqui recta facie siccisque mamillis.
> haec eadem novit quid toto fiat in orbe,
> quid Seres, quid Thraces agant, secreta novercae
> et pueri, quis amet, quis diripiatur adulter;
> dicet quis viduam praegnantem fecerit et quo
> mense, quibus verbis concumbat quaeque, modis quot.
> instantem regi Armenio Parthoque cometen
> prima videt, famam rumoresque illa recentes
> excipit ad portas, quosdam facit; isse Niphaten
> in populos magnoque illic cuncta arva teneri
> diluvio, nutare urbes, subsidere terras,
> quocunque in trivio, cuicunque est obvia, narrat.
>
> But let her sing brazenly rather than fly throughout the entire city,

> the one who is able to endure the social intercourse of men and,
> while her husband is present, to speak with a straight face about these things with
> uniformed generals and with her milk-drained breasts.
> This same woman knows what's happening in the whole world—
> what the Chinese are up to, the Thracians, the secrets of a stepmother
> and son, who is in love, which adulterer is in demand.
> She will declare who impregnated the widowed woman and in what month,
> with what words each has intercourse, and in what positions.
> She's the first to see a comet heading for the Armenian and Parthian king;
> she snatches up the talk and recent rumors near the city gates
> and makes others up; how the Niphates has submerged communities, and there entire fields have been inundated
> in a great flood, cities are tottering, lands are subsiding—
> on whatever street corner, and to whomever she comes across, she tells.[18]

Juvenal's abuse of the woman operates on several levels of meaning. The passage functions beyond a superficial display of misogyny in that the woman mimics specific features of Juvenal's brand of satire.[19] The unnamed woman parodies Juvenal's poetic program in three ways: her commentary on Rome reflects the satirist's own poetic agenda in the *Satires*;

---

18 According to Courtney 1980.313, the passage epitomizes the gossiping of men and women. Cf. also Friedländer 1895.23. For some primary source comparanda, see Semonides 7.12ff., Theophr. *Char*. 8, and Plaut. *Trin*. 199ff. for similar characterizations of women as busybodies.

19 The transition between lines 6.412 and 413 makes it difficult to argue with certainty that the woman in 6.398–412 is the same one discussed in 6.413–33. 6.413–33 describes a similar type of woman who engages in the male activity of bodybuilding and visitations to the baths at night. The woman vomits multiple times and angers her observant husband. Her loss of bodily control falls in line with the satirist's general concern for the integrity of social and bodily limits; cf. Umurhan 2008. In addition, the phrase *gravis occursu, taeterrima vultu* (6.418) may suggest a link to the preceding passage in its description of her appearance, as Courtney 1980.257 suggests.

her use of geographic place names displays her authorial perspective and knowledge of general events; and like the satirist, she hears firsthand all that transpires at various locations around Rome. I argue that this anonymous woman resembles a particular man: Juvenal. She objectifies the key functions of Juvenal's satire in her guise as a gossipy know-it-all prostitute. Such characteristics question Juvenal's authority to combat Rome's moral decay.

KEY FEATURES OF THEMATIC RESONANCE

The anonymous woman of Satire 6 displays personal and generic features of the poet found elsewhere in the *Satires*. Upon mapping out these key resonances, I discuss those parallels that challenge Juvenal's larger programmatic aim to battle the multitude of vices in Rome.

Urbs in 6.398 serves both a thematic and topographic function in the *Satires*. *Urbs* echoes the scope of the Juvenalian narrator's poetic content and agenda established in the first programmatic satire where the satirist proclaims Rome both the stage of depravity and the source of his poetic inspiration. Within an initial catalogue of vices and depraved characters, he inserts a self-conscious, programmatic statement about the composition of satire as it relates to the city, Rome (1.30–32):

> difficile est saturam non scribere**.** nam quis iniquae
> tam patiens *urbis*, tam ferreus, ut teneat se . . .
>
> It is difficult not to write satire. For who is so able to
> endure
> an unfair *city*, so calloused that he can restrain himself . . .

Herein, the satirist coordinates with Rome the spark for his inspiration (or exasperation) and his *apologia* for composing satires. In this way, Juvenal, at the beginning of his literary project, establishes the city and its depraved dregs as his satiric Muse. In just the same way, *urbs* determines the woman's actions and physical locale within the urban space of the city.[20]

Coetus (6.399), or social intercourse, typifies other programmatic declarations of the material of Juvenalian satire from Satires 1 and 10. In

20 Rome features as the main contact area of vice in Books 1 (Satires 1–5) and 2 (Satire 6), with the sole exception of Satire 4, whose setting is Alba Longa. Alba Longa was the site of Roman power before the city of Rome itself and may therefore represent a proto-Rome.

Satire 1.86, *discursus* expresses the programmatic function of the hustle and bustle that constitutes his collection, the *libellus*. Elsewhere, the phrase *coetus virorum* (6.399), "the gatherings of men," looks forward to the near synonymous phrase *occursus hominum*, "the meetings of men," in Satire 10.47–50. Here Juvenal equates his practice of satire with the practice of the philosopher Democritus, who, the satirist claims, derived his comic material from the interactions of men.[21] *Coetus virorum* (6.399) also serves as a double-entendre. It not only suggests social intercourse with soldiers but also sexual union with them.[22] The sexual pun insinuates that part of her job description entails prostitution.

This unidentified woman who flits about the city is part of a panoptic vignette that Juvenal also uses elsewhere. She mimics the satirist's use of geographic space, an "all-seeing" capability that characterizes the poet's authorial perspective. Like Juvenal, she knows what is happening in the world (*orbis*, 6.402), including what the Chinese are up to. She demonstrates an intimate knowledge of things that take place behind closed bedroom doors, such as sexual positions in another's bedroom (*modis quot*, 6.406). She is the first to recognize the falling comet that impends doom for the Armenian king and Parthians (6.407–09), areas that are geographically peripheral to Rome and represent the edges of the known world. The woman's actions and attributes in 6.398–412 are miniature versions of the satirist's own range of narrative focus and knowledge.

Her knowledge of events inside and outside of Rome employs geographic space as a rhetorical framing device. Rome determines Juvenal's location within the city in the first programmatic satire, 1.31. In Satire 2, however, frustration appears to reach a new limit. The poet's exasperation with the urban space of Rome and its depravity elicits his desire to flee the city. Specifically, he outlines a direction of flight from the city of Rome (*hinc*)—the geographic, political, and cultural center of the empire—to beyond the outlying regions of its northern periphery, Scythia.[23] A similar topographic scale is used in Satire 10 to designate the satirist's poetic range, stretching from his source material at Rome to the city's expansive

21 In 10.51–53, Juvenal states his preference for the Democritean method of scrutiny for its success in exposing the trivial behavior of men.

22 Cf. Miller 2005.288. See also McGinn 1998 and 2004, who investigates possible areas of prostitution within the city of Rome. He argues for a greater distribution of areas open to prostitution than previously believed.

23 "Ultra Sauromatas fugere hinc libet et glacialem / Oceanum, quoties . . . ," "It's suitable to escape from here [Rome] beyond Sarmatia and the icy Ocean, when . . ." (2.1–2).

sphere of influence as far west as Cadiz and as far east as the Ganges river region.[24] These striking parallels in language and rhetoric not only draw attention to the stab at women that informs Satire 6, but also suggest that what the woman does is very much like what Juvenal does.

In addition to Juvenal's content and topic, the urban area also serves as the unnamed woman's position in Rome. Rome's city walls (*ad portas*, 6.409) and the street corner (*in trivio*, 6.412) physically orient the nameless woman where she may easily encounter the masses or witness the interactions of men (*discursus* and *coetus*). Such areas of contact are not unfamiliar to the satirist also. In Satire 1, Juvenal situates himself at Rome's crossroads, cramming his notebooks with observations of passersby on a street corner in Rome.[25] The poet appears once again in Satire 2, where he witnesses an overflow of catamites from Rome's city blocks. In both these instances, a symbiotic relationship emerges between the poetic material and its physical source.

The verb *ago* in 6.403 echoes vocabulary used by Juvenal in Satires 1 and 10 to discuss his activity as a writer of satire. In the opening of Satire 1, he proclaims the contents of his collection, the *libellus*, to be "whatever men pursue."[26] That which men pursue includes the range of emotions and basic human interactions that forge and define identities. The word *libellus* offers another detail of self-reflection that Juvenal uses to identify himself and his writing project in the programmatic first satire. This tag describes the written product as a whole, a consciousness of its literary form, and a manifesto of the satirist's dissatisfaction with Rome.

The parallels above articulate a close affinity between Juvenal as satirist and the anonymous woman. She exhibits fundamental features of the poet's self-construction as a writer of satires as observed in Satires 1, 2, and 10. Her focus centers on the events of the city (*urbs*), peoples' activities (*coetus*) within the city, and she is physically situated around city landmarks (*in trivio, ad portas*). I argue that all these resonances make the nameless woman a putative stand-in for the satiric poet, who, thereby, achieves a satiric leveling that invites the reader to criticize Juvenal in

---

24 "Omnibus in terris, quae sunt a Gadibus usque / Auroram et Gangen . . . ," "In all the lands, which stretch from Spain to as far as Dawn and the Ganges . . ." (10.1–2).

25 "nonne libet medio ceras inplere capaces / quadrivio?" "Is it not pleasing to fill my spacious tablets in the middle of the crossroads?" (1.63–64).

26 "quicquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas / gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli," "Whatever men pursue—prayer, fear, anger, desire, enjoyment, hustle and bustle—is the mash of my little book" (1.85–86).

the same way he vehemently exposes other depraved characters such as foreigners, catamites, and hypocrites. If this is the case, what about the satirist or his craft does Juvenal reveal or expose?

JUVENAL'S SURROGATE: THE CHATTY, KNOW-IT-ALL PROSTITUTE

Juvenal's complex strategy of self-representation raises questions about the purpose behind two seemingly contradictory aims. On the one hand, the poet avers his responsibility to combat vice at Rome but, on the other, he imbues his female character with qualities that mirror his own. Therefore, the female surrogate exhibits additional features that enrich the satirist's self-exposure. These include the validity of her information, her countenance and biological features, and the nature of the place where she disseminates this information. These various aspects of the anonymous woman figure her as a chatty, know-it-all prostitute in 6.398–412 and, by extension, as the satirist.

I will expose layer-by-layer those elements that suggest identification with Juvenal, the satirist. The words *fama* and *rumor* (6.408) and the phrase *quosdam facit* (6.409) cast the nameless woman as a gossip. *Fama* and *quosdam facit* explain the content of the information she disseminates to passersby. Not unlike the satirist, she acquires her source material at Roman topographic coordinates, Rome's city gates (*ad portas*, 6.409), and gathers hearsay and rumors (*famam rumoresque*, 6.408) at those very gates while also fabricating others (*quosdam facit*). The narrator provides details that include apocalyptic scenarios of natural disasters on the empire's geographic periphery, Armenia (*Niphates*, 6.409), great deluges, toppling cities, and massive earthquakes.[27]

Nor is the spread of rumors an isolated incident restricted solely to 6.398–412. The poet illustrates how rumors spread through the streets of Rome in Satire 9.110–13. In this installment of the satirist's *libellus*, the narrator recounts with sympathy a certain male gigolo's (Naevolus) abuse at

27 Jones 2000 analyzes how the flood and other natural disasters enumerated in the passage serve to connect the forces of nature with the power of the emperor Trajan. According to Jones, the flood detail is the only fabricated element of this catalogue. Juvenal borrows images and ideas from Trajan's column and other sources to connect the power of the emperor with that of nature. Jones suggests that the female gossiper's conflation of both historical and fantastic elements, dating to the reign of Trajan and his conquests in the eastern territories, illustrates the "insidious nature" of rumors.

the hands of his client. Juvenal advises Naevolus not to disclose his secrets to anyone in Rome since *caupones* (innkeepers, or even pimps) facilitate their swift spread onto streets or crossroads (*compita*, 9.112) (9.107–13):

> quod tamen ad cantum galli facit ille secundi,
> proximus ante diem caupo sciet, audiet et quae
> finxerunt pariter libarius, archimagiri,
> carptores. quod enim dubitant componere crimen
> in dominos, quoties rumoribus ulciscuntur
> baltea? nec derit qui te per compita quaerat
> nolentem et miseram vinosus inebriet aurem.
>
> Nevertheless, what he [Naevolus's rich client] has done
> at the cock's
> second call, the innkeeper will know next before dawn
> and will
> hear at the same time what the confectioner, head-chef,
> and
> carvers have fabricated. What charge do they [slaves] not
> hesitate to construct against their masters whenever they
> avenge their beatings with rumors? And there will
> always be
> someone who seeks you, who are unwilling, out on the
> streets
> and, while intoxicated, saturates your wretched ear.

The satirist imagines an inebriated gossiper who seeks out and harasses Naevolus on the streets.[28] These topics and urban areas—gossip, revenge, brothels, and street corners—evoke an urban scenario similar to that in 6.398–412 and the satirist's general physical location in the city. Given these thematic and physical correspondences, the intoxicated gossiper who harasses his unwilling listener recalls the satirist's own misfortune as the passive listener of recitation in Satire 1.1–4, discussed earlier. At the same time that Juvenal garners sympathy, however, there appears an opportunity for self-criticism. The drunk individual also suggests a

28 The only other instance of *compitum* is at 15.42, where the crossroads is the site for an Egyptian feast that soon goes awry and sets the stage for Egyptian cannibalism.

playful poke at Juvenal himself by turning the tables: the implication of the analogy is that the satirist disseminates his satire to unwilling listeners and readers of his *Satires*.[29]

We may venture outside the *Satires* for a moment to consider Martial, a near contemporary of Juvenal. Martial offers the example of a man whose chattiness and breadth of geographic knowledge appear to challenge the authenticity and presentation of his information. Martial berates a man, Philomusus, in Epigram 9.35 for his garrulousness and seemingly worthless fabrication of material in order to earn a free dinner (*Epigrams* 9.35):[30]

Artibus his semper cenam, Philomuse, mereris,
  plurima dum fingis, sed quasi vera refers.
scis quid in Arsacia Pacorus deliberet aula,
  Rhenanam numeras Sarmaticamque manum,
verba ducis Daci chartis mandata resignas,
  victricem laurum quam venit ante vides,
scis quotiens Phario madeat Iove fusca Syene,
  scis quota de Libyco litore puppis eat,
cuius Iuleae capiti nascantur olivae,
  destinet aetherius cui sua serta pater.
Tolle tuas artes; hodie cenabis apud me
  hac lege, ut narres nil, Philomuse, novi.

With these skills you always earn your dinner,
  Philomusus,
  since you fabricate most of them, but relate them as
    if they are true.
You know what Pacorus is deliberating in the Arsacian
  [Parthian] palace;
  you recount the Rhenish and Sarmatian band;

29 Satire 9.9–11 represents a satiric self-referential image in the guise of Naevolus, whom the interlocutor identifies as a witty joker with a biting sense of humor; cf. Rosen 2007. Braund 1988.170 sees Naevolus as the archetypal satirist; cf. Habinek 2005.186.

30 Colton 1970 (1991.247–54, with slight revisions) offers some discussion of the echoes of Martial in Juvenal's *Satires* 6.398–412. Colton provides a line-by-line analysis of Juvenal's appropriation and subsequent "improvements" of Martial 9.35. He, however, does not explain the nature of these improvements other than to demonstrate variations in meter and word order that distinguish the authors' vignettes. The text of Martial is from Lindsay 1989.

you unseal the words of the Dacian general committed
to documents;
you see the victory laurel before it comes;
you know how often dark Syene [a Nile region] is
doused by Pharian rain;
you know how many a ship sails from the Libyan
shore;
for whose head the Julian olives grow,
and for whom the aetherial father intends his garlands.
Away with your skill! Today you will dine with me
provided that you say nothing new, Philomusus.

Of especial interest is Martial's presentation of Philomusus's news mongering (9.35.12). Juvenal's anonymous woman showcases a skill that mirrors Philomusus's geographic knowledge (9.35.3–9). His news, like the brazen woman's, includes the happenings in regions outside mainland Italy and similarly designates the edges of the Roman world: Sarmatia (4), Dacia (5), and Syene (southern Nile region, 7), to name a few. Philomusus fabricates his information about what takes place around the world. Both the garrulous Philomusus and Juvenal's unidentified woman relay their information in a social setting, the former at dinner and the latter at a crossroads. These parallels are noteworthy and suggest the makings of an imperial stock character. Juvenal's and Martial's characters are both chatty gossips, prone to fabricate particulars and showcase knowledge of the empire's geography.

In sum, we have observed how the woman's actions as a gossip in 6.398–412 mirror Juvenal's practice as a satirist elsewhere in Satires 9 and 10 and, to some degree, in Martial's Epigram 9.35. I suggest that the woman who sings about the city qualifies as one of several brief projections of Juvenal's poetic exercise. So what are we to make of a woman who impersonates a satirist? The unnamed woman's voice in this vignette conforms to other descriptions of the satirist practicing satire and situated at Rome (1.30–31, 1.63, 2.8), as I have demonstrated above. As the narrator of this passage, the satirist seeks to combat the woman's depravity and, conversely, her attempt to usurp his authority for satirizing. And on another level, the gossip's resemblance to the satirist in poetic form and action parodies Juvenal's practice. Any clear-cut distinctions between the satirist and the anonymous woman are consequently blurred and thus leave the basis of Juvenal's attack on Rome on shakier ground.

THE FEMALE SURROGATE'S SEXUALITY AND A GENERIC DEFINTION

The descriptions of the female surrogate's breasts (*sicca mamilla*, 6.401) and facial expression (*recta facies*, 6.401) introduce another feature of the satirist's complex self-projection and further call into question his authority as a combatant in the war against vice. The vignette (6.398–412) describes the female surrogate flitting about the city with a flat chest as a presumptuous man. She is not a typical fertile woman (Keane 2002b.16).[31] Both traits signal that this surrogate is suspect. She is pretending to be someone she is not, the very characteristic Juvenal impugns in Satire 2.[32]

Intra-textual readings illustrate how the resonance of these two features with other programmatic descriptions contributes to the execution of Juvenal's self-parody. Her "straight face" countenance enriches the peculiarly distorted gendered image. Just as *coetus* ("social interaction," 6.399) recalls other illustrations of the satirist doing satire, so too does the phrase *recta facies*. In another satire, 10, the satirist criticizes a man's hope for a long life by vividly illustrating the physical and biological ailments of old age (10.188–272). Here the synonymous phrase *recta vultus* (10.189) reminds one of the strain exerted by the Satire 6 female character in conversing among men (Elmore 1925).[33] Her engagement in this masculine activity may also account for the lack of femininity signaled by her dried breasts (*siccis . . . mamillis*, 6.401). On the other hand, *recta facies* may signal a rather brazen gesture in that she faces the men she converses with instead of having her eyes downcast as a sign of conventional female modesty (Viden 1993.155). Nonetheless, both variations suggest that this type of expression is a physical and emotional manifestation of confidence that, in the context of the larger vignette in question, befits a man and is contrary to the nature of a woman.[34]

---

31 *Uber, mamma,* and *papilla* are synonymous with *mamilla* in Juvenal.

32 *fronti nulla fides,* "Do not trust in appearances" (2.8). See the *OLD* entry *frons* 2a, 4a, and 4b ("appearance" or "expression") whose definitions are nearly synonymous with those of *vultus* and *facies*.

33 Courtney 1980.314 suggests that *recto vultu* of 10.189 is synonymous with *recta facie* to mean "the set face of self-assurance." Ferguson 1979.203 suggests the translation "straight-faced and straight-chested."

34 The sentiment that one's physical exterior reflects one's psychological mood can be found as early as Lucilius M43: "Quae facies, qui vultus viro?" ("What [sort] is the man's appearance and his expression?") and M44: "Vultus item ut facies, mors, icterus morbus,

The unidentified woman's dry breasts also evoke the image of a cross-gendered, paradoxical figure in 6.398–412. The gossiper's dried breasts signify the abandonment of her biological assignment, namely to suckle and nurse her children (Viden 1993.155). Her inability to act according to her feminine nature signals both a biological transgression and social faux pas in her association with military men. Furthermore, her dried breasts contradict the traditional Roman female domestic role characterized by the epithet *domiseda* (Bellandi 2003.32). Taking up the issue of gender, Franco Bellandi suggests that the phrase *siccis mamillis* be read as opposite to the image of Sostratus, an unknown orator, who speaks with sweaty armpits (*madidis . . . alis*) in Satire 10.178. Ultimately, the paradoxical qualities inherent in the female surrogate's facial expression and physical features illustrate a landscape of gender and social confusion.

Breasts, in addition, play a more substantial role in Juvenal's description of satire as a genre and the execution of his self-effacement. As well as being fashioned into examples of moral degeneracy, women's bodies and their regenerative associations serve a programmatic function for the satirist.[35] Juvenal targets bodies and those objects that lack containment, especially those represented as "fluid" and "open."[36] The female body also triggers the satirist's concerns about consumption—of food and a general copiousness—that brings the image of breasts into further relief. Satire 6, for example, opens with the figure of a cave woman from a bygone era (6.1–18). Catherine Keane notes that the satirist aligns the primitive woman's lactating breasts with the same richness that characterizes vice in Satire 1 (Keane 2002b).

I argue that the breasts of the female surrogate in 6.398–412 evoke similar associations with supply and fertility. *Mamilla,* like *ubera,* qualify as a regenerative feature of the woman's body that attracts the satirist's

---

venenum" ("His expression is like his appearance; it's death, jaundice-disease, poison") where *facies* suggests the external appearance, or reflection, of the person's inner state of mind, *vultus*; cf. Warmington 1967.15 (ft. a).

35 Keane 2002b contends that the breasts (*ubera*, 6.9) of the cave woman at the opening of Satire 6 are emblematic of satire, especially because of their fullness and association with food.

36 Gold 1998.374 reads the gossiper's dried breasts as contrary to characterizations of "fluidity" associated with women in light of rhetorical and medical views on "wetness" and "dryness." For more on literary and medical characterizations of the male as self-contained and closed and women as fluid, boundless, and receptive, see Newbold 1979, Miller 1998, and Reckford 1998.

special attention and creates a target. The anonymous woman's breasts, however, are neither lactating nor copious like those of the primitive cave woman who opens Satire 6. She is simply sterile. Her body, in fact, resembles the satirist's topography of Rome, an area marked by sterility and moral depravity.[37] The surrogate's breasts are dry and conflict with the "openness" and "wetness" typically associated with the women of classical literature and therefore, by inverse suggestion, represent that which is male.

Building on these medical and gendered readings of Roman satire and women as programmatic symbols for Juvenal, the woman's *facies* and *mamilla* represent seemingly contradictory biological attributes that fashion a general paradox. The poet illustrates a general disjunction in his description of her behavior and physio-biological attributes. There appears to be two processes at work here. In one, Juvenal creates enough resonances between himself and the woman stand-in to suggest a resemblance, if not surrogacy. Two, upon establishing these connections, Juvenal undercuts the woman's and—by extension—his own attempts at doing satire. The satirist's humor has its consequences in that it also subverts his own position.

How do these various resonances contribute to Juvenal's self-parody, and why? Let's disentangle the intricate mode of operation here. On the one hand, the surrogate's dried breasts indicate that the practice of satire is one that opposes female moistness but is aligned with masculine dryness. The satirist, thereby, presents his substitute without one of the basic regenerative traits associated with the gossip's gender and sexuality. She, in turn, also undercuts the image of the cave woman in Satire 6 and, in this way, blurs distinct social and gender boundaries, the very transgression that Juvenal consistently criticizes in the *Satires*. This jab at her suggests that the practice of satire is male gender specific. Since he strips the surrogate of a key biological feature, her attempts to gossip and practice her trade around Rome are not only fruitless, but also expose her to the satirist's scorn and mockery.

Another level of meaning remains: how does this surrogate articulate Juvenal's definition of satire? Juvenal invites his reader to flirt with the

37 Juvenal offers another parallel between the topography of the body and the space of Rome in Satire 2.12–13. Here a laughing doctor, another surrogate of the satirist, slices off a catamite's hemorrhoids that represent his anatomic core. By extension, this core and its associations with sexual depravity represent the decay that is Rome—a city that is also the topographic center of its empire. For a full discussion of Juvenal's metaphorical use of anatomic and physical space, cf. Umurhan 2008.

possibility that he, as a writer of satire, must embrace the qualities of both sexes to deliver his product. This satire, as defined by his programmatic plan in Satire 1, includes musings on the interactions of men, their suspicious and contrary behavior centering around the city of Rome; musings delivered by the satirist from the street corners of Rome. This ambitious panoply of material cannot be captured by one man with one perspective alone, but requires the multiple voices a cast of characters provides.

If, in fact, Juvenal fashions himself a singer of satire like a hermaphroditic Tiresias, this is a new manifestation of the idea of a *farrago*, the "mixed-bag" that constitutes his *libellus*, the *Satires*.

CONCLUSION

Although Juvenal's use of the anonymous woman destabilizes his authorial voice, this subversion does not detract from but, in fact, clarifies the satirist's programmatic aims. I hope to have demonstrated that the surrogate of 6.398–412 unlocks a prism of meanings that are both complex and the essence of Juvenalian satire. The female image, on one level, undercuts the satirist's own articulation of satire through a mixture of self-deflation and mockery. Juvenal calls attention to this mockery of himself as a writer of satire in two ways: by likening the stand-in's satiric practice to his own in and around Rome and by confusing her bodily identity. Elsewhere, the satirist aligns himself against a range of characters including Lucilius, the founder of satire, the tattered satirist figure, Umbricius, in Satire 3, and the gossipy, know-it-all busybody. The gossip operates within a larger syndicate of surrogates who draw attention to Juvenal's programmatic intention to battle vice and also redirects the poet's satiric attacks upon himself. Reversing the assault invites the reader to mock him on the same grounds with which he so vociferously demeans the gossip in Satire 6 and others.

Juvenal's female poetic projection, either for purposes of self-exposure or for the reinforcement of his trade as satirist, forces the reader to perpetually cross-examine his claims to write satire. Why does Juvenal implicate himself in this way and thus allow for audience scrutiny? The satirist's collection acts as a performance piece. Like a modern stand-up comic, Juvenal relies on audience participation and sympathy for the success of his humor. As the satirist infuses qualities of himself into the female image, we become spectators of a satiric performance in drag (Gunderson 2000). We become more willing participants in Juvenal's criticisms of moral depravity when he encourages the reader to apply satire to the

satirist himself. This elicits laughter, but at whose expense? The audience laughs at a cross-dressing Juvenal whom the satirist at several junctures in the text has singled out for mockery, just like the sexually depraved, the nouveaux riche, and other literary performers at Rome. We, the audience, laugh at Juvenal, who laughs at us for those very moral failings we laugh at him for showcasing.

The satirist pulls the rug out from underneath everyone, including himself and his audience. But this is his satiric act, a defining imprint on the genre of verse satire that is at once exasperating and innovative. This inconsistency is not simply a form of indirection, but a key tactic in the author's articulation of the variety and contradiction that is the Rome of his day.

Rutgers University

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

Barchiesi, A., and A. Cucchiarelli. 2005. "The Body as Self-Referential Symbol," in K. Freudenburg, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge. 207–23.

Bellandi, Franco. 2003. "Siccis . . . mamillis: (Giovenale 6, 401)," *Paideia* 58.32–39.

Braund, Susanna. 1988. *Beyond Anger*. Cambridge.

———. 1996a. *Juvenal: Satires, Book 1*. Cambridge.

———. 1996b. *The Roman Satirists and their Masks*. Bristol.

Colton, R. E. 1970. "Juvenal 6.398–412, 6.419–33, and Martial," *C&M* 31.151–60.

———. 1991. *Juvenal's Use of Martial's* Epigrams. Amsterdam.

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

Cucchiarelli, Andrea. 2001. *Satira e il poeta: Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones*. Pisa.

de Decker, J. 1913. *Juvenalis declamans: étude sur la rhétorique declamatoire dans les Satires de Juvénal*. Ghent.

Elmore, J. 1925. "*Recto vultu* and *recta facie* in Juvenal," *AJA* 46.268–70.

Ferguson, John. 1979. *Juvenal: The Satires*. New York.

Freudenburg, Kirk. 1993. *The Walking Muse*. Princeton.

———. 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge.

Friedländer, L. 1895 (English repr. 1969). *Essays on Juvenal* (trans. J. R. C. Martyn). Amsterdam.

Gold, Barbara. 1998. "The House I Live In Is Not My Own: Women's Bodies in Juvenal's *Satires,*" *Arethusa* 31.369–86.

Gunderson, E. 2000. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor.

Habinek, Thomas. 2005. "Satire as Aristocratic Play," in K. Freudenburg, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge. 177–91.

Henderson, J. 1999. *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry*. New York.

Highet, Gilbert. 1954. *Juvenal the Satirist: A Study*. Oxford.

Iddeng, Jon W. 2000. "Juvenal, Satire, and the Persona Theory: Some Critical Remarks," *SO* 75.107–29.

Jones, Frederick. 2007. *Juvenal and the Satiric Genre*. London.

Jones, Prudence. 2000. "Juvenal, the Niphates, and Trajan's column: (Satire 6.407–412)," *HSP* 100.477–86.

Keane, Catherine. 2002a. "Satiric Memories: Autobiography and the Construction of Genre," *CJ* 97.3.215–31.

———. 2002b. "Juvenal's Cave-Woman and the Programmatics of Satire," *CB* 78.5–20.

———. 2005. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. New York.

Lindsay, W. M. 1989. *Martialis Epigrammata*. Oxford.

Lowrie, Michèle. 2005. "Slander and Horse Law in Horace, *Sermones* 2.1," *Law and Literature* 17.405–33.

Marx, Friedrich. 1963 (orig. 1903–04). *C. Lucilii Carminum reliquae* (2 vols.). Amsterdam.

Mayer, Roland. 2003. "Persona <I> Problems," *MD* 50.55–80.

McGinn, Thomas. 1998. *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*. Oxford.

———. 2004. *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor.

Miller, Paul Allen. 1994. *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness*. London.

———. 1998. "The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility," *Arethusa* 31.257–84.

———. 2005. *Latin Verse Satire: An Anthology and Critical Reader*. London.

Newbold, R. F. 1979. "Boundaries and Bodies in Late Antiquity," *Arethusa* 12.93–114.

O'Hara, James. 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic.* Cambridge.

Oliensis, Ellen. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge.

Pavlock, Barbara. 2009. *The Image of the Poet in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Madison.

Plaza, Maria. 2006. *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying*. Oxford.

Reckford, Kenneth J. 1998. "Reading the Sick Body: Decomposition and Morality in Persius' Third Satire," *Arethusa* 31.337–55.

Richlin, Amy. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus* (rev. ed.). Oxford.

Rosen, Ralph. 2007. *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford.

Schmitz, C. 2000. *Das Satirische in Juvenals Satiren*. Berlin.

Sider, David. 1997. *The Epigrams of Philodemos*. Oxford.

———. 2004. "How to Commit Philosophy Obliquely: Philodemus' Epigrams in the Light of his *Peri Parrhesias*" in J. T. Fitzgerald, D. Obbink, and G. S. Holland, eds., *Philodemus and the New Testament World*. Leiden. 85–101.

Turpin, William. 1998. "The Epicurean Parasite: Horace, Satires 1.1–3," *Ramus* 27.127–40.

Umurhan, Osman. 2008. "Spatial Representation in Juvenal's *Satires*: Rome and the Satirist," Ph.D. diss. New York University.

Viden, Gunhild. 1993. *Women in Roman Literature*. Goeteburg.

Warmington, E. H. 1938 (rev. 1967). *Remains of Old Latin*. Cambridge, Mass.

Willis, Jacob (ed.) 1997. *D. Iunii Iuuenalis Saturae Sedecim*. Stuttgart.

Winkler, Martin. 1993. *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal*. Hildesheim.