

## THE LITERARY SUBSTRATA TO JUVENAL'S SATIRES

By G. B. TOWNEND\*

In Roman poetry of the late Republic and the Augustan age, allusiveness was an essential element in poetic technique. In Virgil in particular there is an immense debt to earlier writers for words, phrases and rhythms, all contributing to the poet's effect; although the reader's understanding of the basic meaning of the lines suffers little from his limited awareness of the more erudite allusions. The same thing is true of Horace, with the added consideration that in satire, as in Athenian Old Comedy, burlesque and parody play an important part. Only occasionally is there reason to suspect that our ignorance of Lucilius or other lost writers, Greek or Latin, prevents us from recognizing the whole tone of a passage. It is difficult to ascertain whether Lucilius himself had made literary borrowing an essential element in the satirist's technique; but it must be accepted as such from Horace onwards.

In Persius especially much of the notorious obscurity which the reader encounters is due largely to the way in which almost every word in some passages carries with it a reference to Horace or some other earlier poet. Nisbet, in his illuminating essay on Persius in Sullivan's book on satire,<sup>1</sup> gives a good example, showing how Persius i, 40-1, 'rides, ait, et nimis uncis naribus indulges', is a blend of four different phrases from Horace. 'Persius would have been very hurt', Nisbet goes on, 'if any of his cleverness had been missed.' The fact remains that, in reading Persius, modern readers often miss not only the refinements of his wit, but his main drift.<sup>2</sup> If we were better read in Latin, and knew not only Horace by heart but also Lucilius and who knows what else (for the scholia on Persius are not much help in this respect), we should, I am confident, be less inclined to write off major sections of Persius, or indeed the whole book of satires, as incomprehensible. Borrowing has here become more fundamental than it was in Horace's technique, and at the same time more complex.

The tendency continues with Juvenal, and it will be my aim to show that his use of allusion is markedly more complex again, comprising as it does not only reference to earlier writers for purely literary effects, but also oblique acknowledgements of a debt to prose authors no less than to poets, the recognition of which may sometimes fill in the body of factual knowledge necessary for our understanding of Juvenal's basic themes. Thus he often borrows for purposes of straight burlesque, based on Virgil or Ovid: Ucalegon in iii, 199, purloined from the Sack of Troy,<sup>3</sup> or 'consedere duces, surgis tu pallidus Aiax' in vii, 115, lifted almost bodily from the beginning of the great debate in *Metamorphoses* xiii.<sup>4</sup> Even the hiatus after *Samo* in iii, 70 echoes the same effect with the same word in *Aen.* i, 16. Horace lends a certain amount, as when 'verum nequeo dormire' in *Sat.* ii, 1, 7 becomes 'quem patitur dormire' in Juvenal i, 77. So far the trick is like Persius', but a good deal simpler.

The reminiscences of Martial, which are so prominent in the first nine satires in particular, have rather a different function. H. L. Wilson<sup>5</sup> distinguished two types of borrowing: on the one hand, the straight verbal quotation, such as 'quanta est gula' in i, 140,<sup>6</sup> or 'ardeat ipsa licet' in vi, 209;<sup>7</sup> on the other, the exploitation of Martial's ideas in completely different words, as in the account of Chione in iii, 136 and Martial iii, 30 as the prostitute whom the poor but honest citizen cannot afford. Both types occur together in v, 146-8, where client and patron eat distinct varieties of mushroom, as they do in Martial iii, 60 (an epigram which contains in a few lines the germ of the whole fifth satire), while the patron's own dish consists of 'boletos . . . quales Claudius

\*This paper was originally read at a meeting of the Cambridge Philological Society in March, 1973. I am indebted to the comments and criticisms of various members.

<sup>1</sup>*Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire* (1963), 44-5.

<sup>2</sup>For example in v, 4, 'vulnere seu Parthi ducentis ab inguine ferrum', it would be pardonable to hesitate as to whether the Parthian is drawing back his bow to shoot or extracting an arrow (surely a

paradox?) which has struck him; were it not for the close parallel of Hor., *Sat.* ii, 1, 15, 'aut labentis equo describat vulnere Parthi', in a passage similarly rejecting the claims of epic on contemporary themes.

<sup>3</sup>*Aen.* ii, 311-12.

<sup>4</sup>xiii, 1-2.

<sup>5</sup>*AJP* xix (1898), 193-209.

<sup>6</sup>From Mart. v, 70, 5.

<sup>7</sup>From Mart. viii, 59, 12.

edit', an actual phrase from Martial i, 20. Wilson lists something over a hundred examples of one type or the other, without drawing any very helpful inferences. At all events, the borrowings are so numerous and so patently advertised that Juvenal cannot be suspected of surreptitious plagiarism; and there is no reason to doubt Martial's own claim<sup>8</sup> that the epigrams were very widely read, so that references would easily be picked up by the alert reader. The reader could also hardly help observing that virtually all of Juvenal's vivid reportage of everyday life in Rome was in fact a matter of literary borrowing, as is the whole of the poet's *persona* as the poor Roman citizen, who features so prominently in satires i, iii and v, and whom Highet almost all the time and H. A. Mason in his weaker moments<sup>9</sup> assume to be the satirist himself.

Of course imitation may be combined with personal observation, as probably happens in Horace's fifth satire. Here, no matter how many episodes may be copied from Lucilius' journey to Rhegium,<sup>10</sup> the encounter with Virgil and Varius, with its expression of intense affection, can hardly be other than genuine. But the function of Juvenal's borrowings from Martial is evidently quite different. Two things are particularly significant about Martial in this connection: first, he is a joker, never shocked or distressed by the most horrific details that he relates from everyday life; second, his setting is essentially and unmistakably the world of Domitian, even when he is writing in Spain under Trajan. When Juvenal opens his first sketch of Roman life in i, 23, he leaves no doubt that this is Martial's scene, already several years, probably as much as twenty, in the past. Mevia, Crispinus, Matho are all Flavian figures from Martial, as Massa and Carus are informers from Domitian's last years, and the *magni delator amici* in line 33 can hardly be other than the great Regulus. Marius Priscus,<sup>11</sup> the one apparent exception because his prosecution falls in the year 100 under Trajan, is nonetheless a creature of Domitian's reign, already in line for the proconsulate of Africa for 97/8, and perhaps actually appointed, before Domitian was murdered in September 96. What Juvenal is doing in this section, and throughout the rest of the first satire, is to announce that his material belongs to a previous generation but is still first-rate scandal, to be reproduced with mock horror and enjoyed with gusto. His reference to Lucilius' personal attacks in line 154 has long been recognized as a rehandling of the first satire in Horace's second book, where Trebatius gravely warns the critic of society against causing offence—a motif which Persius was likewise to take up in his own programme-satire. It has no more immediate relevance to Juvenal's situation than the lurid and unhistorical picture of the burning of critics by Tigellinus.<sup>12</sup> When Juvenal concludes the opening statement of intent with the famous claim that he will attack the dead,<sup>13</sup> he is not merely playing safe, any more than Horace is in his ingenuous disclaimer in *Sat.* ii, 1—he is repeating in plain terms what he has already made clear by his evocation of Martial in the earlier part of the same satire.

This much is clear enough. However, the demonstration that the major edifices of the satires are constructed on the flimsy foundations of Flavian epigram may not be enough in itself to establish the essential frivolity of Juvenal's whole treatment of the splendid corruptions of life under Domitian. I believe that the clear hint in the first satire should be enough to alert the reader; but plenty of scholars have observed and recorded the echoes of Martial, as J. B. Mayor does, without drawing this conclusion, or indeed any other. For traditional scholarship, at least in the last century, it was all too often enough to report literary parallels. Another group of echoes may reinforce the significance of the borrowings from Martial.

The seventh satire, on the condition of the man of letters, opens with a reference to the emperor as patron:

et spes et ratio studiorum in Caesare tantum;  
solus enim tristis hac tempestate Camenas  
respexit.

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.* v, 13; vi, 60; viii, 61; ix, 97; xi, 3, etc.  
<sup>9</sup> *Juvenal the Satirist* (1954), 5-9, 40-1, and *passim*; Mason in Sullivan's *Satire*, 129-30. Elsewhere (pp. 96-7, 117-18, 124-8, etc.), Mason is well aware of the derivative nature of Juvenal's material.

<sup>10</sup> e.g. N. Rudd, *Satires of Horace* (1966), 54-6.  
<sup>11</sup> i, 49-50. Cf. *PIR*<sup>1</sup> ii, p. 348, M 239; Syme, *Tacitus* 70-1.  
<sup>12</sup> i, 155-7.  
<sup>13</sup> *ibid.* 170-1.

Hight<sup>14</sup> took these lines as completely serious, and argued from them that the bitterness which he observed in satires i to vi was in due course tempered by the effective patronage exercised by Hadrian when he established the Athenaeum, and that Juvenal is now expressing his gratitude to the new emperor. Helmbold and O'Neill,<sup>15</sup> who read the whole poem with more attention, remarked that if the opening was a dedication to Hadrian,<sup>16</sup> hardly anything after the first twenty lines supports it very effectively, quite apart from the fact that all the identifiable characters named belong unmistakably under that earlier patron of poetry and the arts, Domitian, and that they are deployed with far too much chronological consistency to be regarded merely as a group of stock *exempla*. If this conclusion were doubted, and the tone of the opening were still felt to be serious, doubt should be dispelled by the recognition that much of the overtly panegyric language employed is taken directly from the court poets who sang the praises of the acknowledged tyrants of previous generations. It may not be significant that in line 21 the phrase *ducis indulgentia* is borrowed from one of Statius' most extravagant *Silvae*,<sup>17</sup> in praise of Domitian. More striking is the dependance of the opening lines themselves on lines from the fourth eclogue of Calpurnius Siculus, for whom the great patron of the arts is, of course, Nero. The first echo is plain enough:<sup>18</sup>

me quoque facundo comitatus Apolline Caesar  
respiciat (87-8)

and it is supported by another, hardly noticeable in itself:

non eadem nobis sunt tempora, nec deus idem:  
spes magis arridet (30-1).

The two echoes are reinforced beyond the range of doubt by the much more obvious, and long recognized, echo in line 27, where Juvenal's

frange miser calamum vigilataque proelia dele

comes without disguise from Calpurnius, in the same eclogue, line 23:

frange puer calamos et inanes desere Musas.

Only the last of these three appears to have caught the attention even of Mayor; and so long as they are taken simply as adaptations of the traditional language of panegyric from one benign emperor to another, they were hardly worth noticing in the first place. The grouping in their new context shows that Juvenal's borrowing was anything but casual: recalling as they do the falsity of Nero's circle, they become forceful burlesque, providing a devastating send-up of the literary scene of whichever emperor is in fact the satirist's target. Everything else in the poem makes it clear that the target is Domitian.<sup>19</sup>

But the seventh satire is not concerned only with poetry, although the misfortunes of the poet occupy nearly two fifths of the total bulk. In addition to taking note of the echoes of Neronian and Flavian panegyric, the reader in Juvenal's day can hardly have missed the close relationship to Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, published, as now seems certain,<sup>20</sup> at some time during the first decade of the second century,

<sup>14</sup> *op. cit.* 13-14, 111-12.

<sup>15</sup> *Cl. Phil.* liv (1959), 100-8.

<sup>16</sup> The traditional date of satire vii has been determined to some extent by reference to that of vi, forming the preceding book, where lines 407-11 have been taken (e.g. by Hight, 12-13, Syme, *Tacitus* 776) as indicating events in Trajan's Eastern campaigns in A.D. 113-16. In fact, there is no evidence that the Romans or Parthians observed the comets of 110 and 115 (cf. Hight's n. 14 on p. 236); whereas we are informed that the comet of A.D. 79 was referred by Vespasian specifically to the king of Parthia (Dio lxvi, 17, 3). One could take Juvenal's reference to the earthquake (vi, 411) more seriously and identify it with that at Antioch in 115, if it were not linked with

the nonsensical flood in the preceding lines. For all that, books ii and iii of the satires may well be placed either late in Trajan's reign or early in Hadrian's.

<sup>17</sup> v, 2, 125. The line starts with *ergo age*, just as iv, 20 starts with *hoc agite*.

<sup>18</sup> It was brought to my notice by S. T. Chapman, B.A. of Grey College, Durham.

<sup>19</sup> The reader can have been left in no doubt from the start that *Caesare* in line 1 could not be taken as referring to the reigning emperor, whether Trajan (whom the cap would hardly fit in any case) or Hadrian (whom it might). It was essential for the tone of the opening section to be unmistakable; and this effect is achieved at once by the literary reminiscences.

<sup>20</sup> Syme, 671-3.

whether in 101, to celebrate the imminent consulate of Fabius Justus, to whom it is dedicated, or about 107, when it appears to be mentioned in two letters of Pliny.<sup>21</sup> Contemporary readers will immediately have taken the hint of the dedication to recognize that the *Dialogus* was not in fact a work of the Flavian age, despite the consistent dramatic setting and the explicit date in the middle of Vespasian's reign. All too many scholars from the Renaissance onwards, less perspicacious and less aware of the importance of the genre in determining the style of a work, were led to believe that it was Tacitus' first literary essay and to place it under Titus or Domitian. In precisely the same way, scholars from at least as early as the fourth century have assumed that the Domitianic material in Juvenal vii was topical and had led to disgrace and banishment for the author.

Apart from these misapprehensions, which neither Tacitus nor Juvenal could have anticipated, the two works have certain essential features in common, including the general theme of the decline of literature as pictured in the context of the Flavian age. Most striking is the account in the two works of the unfortunate position of the poet. Saleius is named by Tacitus' spokesman as the successful poet under Vespasian, and he may write fine verses—or, as Juvenal has it:

ipse facit versus atque uni cedit Homero  
propter mille annos (38-9)

but for them to reach the public he has to arrange a *recitatio*: 'et domum mutuatur et auditorium extruit et subsellia conducit et libellos dispergit.' Every detail except the last occurs in Juvenal vii, 40 and 45-7, although the satirist has his own additional points to make. If the reading goes well, says Tacitus, all the poet gains is 'clamorem vagum et voces inanis et gaudium volucre' (9, 4). This is expanded by Juvenal:

at Serrano tenuique Saleio (the same poet, it should be noticed)  
gloria quantalibet satis est, si gloria tantum est (80-1).

He rounds it off with his account of Statius' triumphant but profitless recitation of the *Thebaid*, where 'fregit subsellia versu' (86), but in spite of this

esurit, intactam Paridi nisi vendit Agaven.

Juvenal is here concerned with financial profit, as constantly throughout this satire; and it is noticeable that this idea, with the metaphor from feeding already expressed in *esurit*, would run on perfectly well six lines further on with

haud tamen invideas vati quem pulpita pascunt.

The only possible source of profit is in writing libretti for ballet, but there is not much joy in that. The sequence is in fact interrupted by the five notorious lines which are supposed to have caused Juvenal's banishment, in which he describes how the actor-manager, Paris, surpasses all the noble patrons in distributing military commissions to those he wishes to favour. The change of course in the argument has suggested to many critics, and most notoriously Highet,<sup>22</sup> that Juvenal has here inserted a passage from an earlier lampoon, as he calls it, which does not really fit.

Reference to Aper's speech in the *Dialogus*, however, makes clear the origin of Juvenal's train of thought. At the beginning of the same chapter (9, 1), in which he deals with Saleius' lack of success, Aper says: 'carmina et versus . . . neque dignitatem ullam auctoribus suis conciliant neque utilitates alunt; voluptatem autem brevem, laudem inanem et infructuosam consequuntur.' For once, Tacitus here acknowledges financial rewards, however obliquely. His main emphasis, though, here as elsewhere, is on *dignitas*, which is largely a question of public position and the acquisition of *gratia*. For those of equestrian rank in particular it may involve advancement in the *cursus*, where financial profit also accrues. Thus the military tribunate or prefecture becomes relevant, exactly as it does to the indigent horse-lover in Juvenal i, 58. The dispenser of privilege, as Paris is portrayed by the satirist, 'militiae multis largitur honorem' (88);

<sup>21</sup> vii, 20; viii, 7.

<sup>22</sup> *op. cit.* 239.

and he can presumably advance the author of his ballets to similar positions of profit, instead of merely paying a fee. Promotion is thus linked with payment, as suggested by Aper's words in the *Dialogus*. Juvenal's lines are still something of a digression, but this is a constant tendency on his part. At all events, the *Dialogus* shows clearly the immediate source of the idea by which the satirist has allowed himself to be distracted,<sup>2 3</sup> and the grouping of closely-related points within a few pages of either work demonstrates that this is almost certainly a case of actual borrowing, and not merely of dependence on a common written source or school commonplace.

But the role of Paris in this section has further implications. His ability to abuse his artistic position so as to surpass the nobles in distributing commissions is in itself an indictment of the age, and demonstrates conclusively that the apparent compliment to the emperor as the grand patron of the arts in the opening lines is not to be taken seriously. In just the same way the apparent praise of Vespasian in *Dialogus* 41, 4, as 'sapientissimus et unus', is robbed of almost all its effect by the frank admission in chapter 8 of the same work of the political prominence of Eprius Marcellus and Vibius Crispus, and their abuse of power despite their questionable characters. Any reader of Tacitus would have been aware that Eprius had been executed by Titus for treason within four years of the dramatic date of the *Dialogus*, just as Paris was to fall a victim to Domitian four years later again. The way in which Tacitus introduces Eprius and the less criminal Vibius into the *Dialogus* is probably the clearest indication he gives of the way in which he intends an age to be judged by the quality of its most prominent characters. Juvenal's account of the activities of Statius, with its curious sexual overtones, in vii, 82-7, tallies nicely and achieves exactly the same effect. Both works, ostensibly giving an appreciation of the literary situation in the previous generation, succeed in damning what they could at first sight be taken to be praising. Both in general subject-matter and in technique Tacitus has been able to show the satirist the idea for a fresh satire.<sup>2 4</sup>

Another work produced during the same period of ten years or so appears to have influenced the form of the satire. This is the *de Viris Illustribus* of Suetonius, beginning with the still extant sections on grammarians and rhetoricians, and continuing, as I have argued recently, with a natural extension from rhetoricians to orators, and from orators to the other main group of prose writers, historians, before branching out into what appears to have been the most elaborate and extended series of Lives, those of the poets, of which the surviving biographies of Terence, Virgil and Horace can be taken as samples.<sup>2 5</sup> This list of five categories is the same as that displayed in the seventh satire, but in precisely the reverse order, as Juvenal, a poet despite all, places his own profession first and relegates that of Suetonius, the *grammaticus*, to an inglorious and ridiculous position at the end. The coincidence of the five groups is too close to be coincidental. It is interesting to notice that Juvenal has followed Suetonius as if reluctantly by including a disproportionately short section on historians—seven lines out of a total of 243—in order to preserve the pattern of the *de Viris* and to make it clear that he is turning Suetonius' work on its head. In its own way the biographical work seems to have contributed to the genesis of the seventh satire quite as much as the *Dialogus* of Tacitus.<sup>2 6</sup>

<sup>2 3</sup>The *Dialogus* points to a solution of the problem in Juvenal's text at vii, 139, where the MSS present variants in *fidimus eloquio* and *ut redeant veteres*, one of which at least must be a metrical gloss (hardly original variants, as Highet, p. 291). The latter phrase, while patently derived from Mart. xi, 5, 5, 'si redeant veteres, ingentia nomina, patres', for a comparison of Domitian's virtue with that of the ancient fathers, bears a close relationship to the discussion in *Dial* 17, 7, where Aper criticizes the labelling of Messala, Pollio and Cicero as *antiquos ac veteres* (and so 15, 1). Juvenal, wishing to refer to the great republican orator, exploits the phraseology of Martial's piece of flattery together with the reminiscence of Tacitus' category of *veteres*. The *ut* was puzzling enough to make the late editors suggest a much easier, but untimely, alternative

in *fidimus eloquio*. Eloquence as such has already been disposed of in lines 115 ff.

<sup>2 4</sup>Wherever the two works have points in common, it seems to be the *Dialogus* which presents them in a more coherent form and which can be called upon to explain Juvenal, and not *vice versa*. Everything we know of the two writers suggests that Juvenal would readily adapt ideas from Tacitus, never Tacitus from Juvenal.

<sup>2 5</sup>*Proc. Class. Assoc.* lxix (1972), 27. Suetonius arranged his sections according to a logical plan, which is not apparent in Juvenal's adaptation.

<sup>2 6</sup>The account of Statius' financial difficulties in the years before A.D. 83, in lines 82-7, may well be derived from Suetonius' biography of the poet, if the series of poets in the *de Viris* extended so far.

There is yet another way in which Juvenal's dependence on earlier works of literature needs to be considered. I do not think that enough recognition has been given to the problem of how much an audience under Trajan or Hadrian might be expected to understand of detailed references to Flavian society, which are so essential to the full appreciation of the satires. To-day we are continually at a disadvantage. For example, when we read in viii, 93-4 how 'et Capito et Numitor ruerint damnante senatu, piratae Cilicum', we happen to know that Cossutianus Capito was convicted of *repetundae* in Cilicia in A.D. 57, because Tacitus describes the case in the *Annals*.<sup>27</sup> We do not know whether or when Numitor (or Tutor, as he is more probably to be called<sup>28</sup>) was convicted on the same charge, nor when, whether and with what result Pansa and Natta, mentioned in line 96, were involved in similar prosecutions; nor why Juvenal apostrophizes one Chaerippus as spokesman of the Cilicians. Juvenal's readers must have picked up these points fairly quickly, and dozens more, including the identity of Rubellius Blandus and of Lateranus in the same satire; yet the events in question must have taken place sometimes as much as sixty years before, and hardly ever less than twenty. Nothing suggests that historical memories were as good as this, even in educated circles—unless they were reinforced by, if not completely dependent upon, literary works of some prominence. Syme has already suggested<sup>29</sup> that Juvenal would not have twice referred to the exile of Marius Priscus, in the first and eighth satires, had not Pliny published a full account of the trial in his letters.<sup>30</sup> Pliny did not in fact provide anything like a systematic account of the preceding decades: the fact that he does describe Priscus' trial is probably the reason why this event is the only one after Domitian's death explicitly mentioned by Juvenal. For the reigns of the three Flavians, only one source could be assumed as familiar to any reasonably well educated reader when the earlier satires were published, apparently at some date after about A.D. 110—the *Histories* of Tacitus, to which Juvenal appears to refer in ii, 102-3, 'res memoranda novis annalibus atque recenti historia', in connection with a detail of Otho's effeminacy which Tacitus does not in fact mention. If we possessed more than the opening books of this work, all sorts of problems would become clear to us. Just as the satirist took for granted his reader's familiarity with Martial, Calpurnius and Statius on the plane of purely literary allusion, so he could assume a knowledge of the *Histories* to reinforce uncertain personal memories of the Flavian age.

If any of the satires must have presented problems of this sort when it first appeared, as it does to-day, it is the fourth, on the iniquities of Crispinus and Domitian's cabinet-meeting concerning the giant turbot. Although the setting of this satire is undisguisedly Domitianic, it appears to contain not a single echo of Martial, verbal or substantial; unless the rather commonplace idea in line 72, of the fish too big for the dish, picks up Martial's early xenion-epigram xiii, 81 to the same effect. This might suggest that here at least Juvenal had decided to do without the sort of dependence on earlier literature which I have been discussing. However, the fragment of Statius' lost poem on Domitian's German war, inserted in the margin at line 94 by the crazy annotator who seems to have worked not long after the early satires were published,<sup>31</sup> makes it clear that it is to some extent the source of Juvenal's catalogue of imperial *amici*. So much is common knowledge. What is not often clearly recognized is that the point of this section always depended to a great extent on the reader's familiarity with the German war poem. John Griffith, some years ago,<sup>32</sup> went so far as to argue that this section at least must have been composed in the mid-eighties, while Statius' poem was still fresh. But the end of the satire, is unquestionably later than

<sup>27</sup> xiii, 33, 3.

<sup>28</sup> Kajanto, *Latin Cognomina* (1965), 179, 362, shows how rare both names are. The family of C. Vellaeus Tutor (*cos.* A.D. 27, as *PIR*<sup>1</sup> iii, V 233) may have produced a descendant to reach the praetorship but probably nothing higher. The name Numitor seems to have intruded from a reminiscence of

*Aen.* vi, 768, *et Capys et Numitor*, where the name occupies the same place in the line.

<sup>29</sup> *Tacitus*, 500, 776.

<sup>30</sup> *Epp.* ii, 11, 12, with vi, 29, 9.

<sup>31</sup> *CQ* N.S. xxii (1972), 378 ff.

<sup>32</sup> *Greece and Rome* xvi (1969), 135.

Domitian's death in 96; and in the seventh satire, apparently written no earlier than the end of the first decade of the next century, Juvenal could still count on the reader's memory of so old and apparently ill-fated a panegyric as that of Calpurnius on Nero. However surprising this may seem, Calpurnius is still extant, as are the *Silvae* of Statius. It may be that the latter's *German War*, despite its unfortunate connections, survived as the model for later poets wishing to celebrate, for example, Trajan's Dacian war, just as Pliny's *Panegyric*, admittedly of a model emperor, continued to be employed as an example by generations of later orators.<sup>33</sup>

Granted, then, that a part of the fourth satire at least depends on this lost work of Statius, I think we are justified in looking to it, albeit conjecturally, for an explanation of what E. J. Kenney, among others, has regarded as the most unsatisfactory of many features in this poem.<sup>34</sup> In lines 34-36 Juvenal abandons his attacks on Crispinus to invoke the muse Calliope and to invite her to sit down, because the subject is historical—'res vera agitur'. He goes on fatuously to claim credit for hailing the muses as *puellae*, whether as virgins or as young girls. The lines form an isolated unit, before the narrative of turbot and council begins. They barely make sense; and in so far as they do, they appear extraordinarily silly.

Yet Juvenal is not a silly poet, nor a bad rhetorician, as Kenney judges him on the evidence of these lines. Whenever we can work out his meaning, he does make sense, just as Persius always does in the end, in his different way. The fatuousness of these lines can only be the fatuousness of parody, and of a poem which professed to deal, not with traditional Greek myth, but with historical fact: 'non est cantandum: res vera agitur'. The target does not have to be the same work parodied in lines 94 ff.; but the *German War* certainly marked a departure from the manner of the *Thebaid*, already well under way; and an apostrophe to the Muse, similar to that which opens both *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*, is likely to have emphasized the point. Since we have seen in satire vii how Juvenal likes to refer more than once to a single work which he is parodying, simple economy of hypotheses suggests that the source of these curious lines is to be sought in the same work exploited further on in the same satire. There may be further references to Statius' poem in other pieces of burlesque in Juvenal's account of the council-meeting,<sup>35</sup> but nothing stands out from the context quite so curiously as the apostrophe to the Muses.

The fourth satire contains many other problems, of a more strictly historical nature, concerning matters which might be expected to have puzzled the first generation of readers, at least twenty years, and probably a good deal longer, after the events which it describes, under the dramatic date of A.D. 83. By the beginning of Trajan's reign, what would the reader make of the story lying behind line 105, 'Rubrius offensae veteris reus atque tacendae'? The scandal is unknown to us; although the name of the culprit and the lapse of time implied suggest that this is the same story that Suetonius mentions in *Nero* 28, 1, concerning the rape by that emperor of a Vestal called Rubria. There is no hint in Tacitus' *Annals* as we have them, and even if the event is to be placed in the last two years of Nero's reign, the *Annals* are unlikely to have been produced as early as the publication of the fourth satire: their tradition has certainly left no trace in any satire before possibly the tenth.<sup>36</sup> Some retrospective

<sup>33</sup> cf. W. S. Maguinness in *OCD*<sup>2</sup>, p. 774. Likewise see Dilke in Dudley, *Neronians and Flavians* (1972), 231, n. 76, for the use of some of Statius' *Silvae* as models.

<sup>34</sup> *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* N.S. 8 (1962, 30: 'A declaimer's transition of the most palpable kind, an obvious and awkward device to conceal patchwork'.

<sup>35</sup> Possibly *itur ad Atriden* in line 65, if the panegyrist was rash enough to equate Domitian with Agamemnon; but since *Atrides* implies one of a pair of brothers, the younger of whom was notoriously cuckolded by his queen, as Domitian was alleged to have been by Domitia, the compliment must have been in grave danger of misfiring. For another example of

repeated quotation from a single work, cf. n. 52 below.

<sup>36</sup> In particular, Juvenal's account of Gracchus as a male bride (ii, 117 ff.) is almost identical with that found in Tac., *Ann.* xv, 37, 4: Suet. *Nero* 29; Dio lxxiii, 13, 2, of Nero himself. Juvenal could hardly have ignored the more famous reprobate if he had met the story in this connection. Nor could he well have omitted the charge of setting fire to Rome from his catalogue of Nero's vices (viii, 223 ff.) if he had encountered it in the form that it takes in the same three sources. These stories appear to have little circulation in Rome until Tacitus unearthed them (in Cluvius Rufus?), cf. *CQ* xxii (1972), 383.

remark in one of the lost books of the *Histories* seems the most probable source which Juvenal could rely on his readers having encountered.<sup>37</sup>

This is only one of many obscurities on which the *Histories* might have cast light, for us as for the original readers. We do not understand the point of the reference in line 53 to the obscure Palfurius and the completely unknown Armillatus as authorities of the doctrine that all that is particularly fine in the sea belongs to the treasury. Palfurius seems to have survived into Nerva's reign, but no later:<sup>38</sup> some reference in the *Histories* seems essential if he was to mean anything specific to readers some years later. Again, Pompeius must be a *delator* (line 110), since Juvenal says so; but something further ought to be known about him if the passage is, or ever was, to make sense.

These are comparatively minor problems, and ignorance of the character of Armillatus and Pompeius has never appeared to make the satire as a whole difficult to understand. The same can hardly be true of the major problem presented by the poem: namely, the relationship between the two halves, and the point of the attack on Crispinus in the first 33 lines. Kenney<sup>39</sup> criticizes the attempt of Helmbold and O'Neill to solve the problem of connection by drawing attention to the role of Crispinus in the first section as 'a tiny reflection of the larger, more savage and more ridiculous Domitian'.<sup>40</sup> His objection that most of the characteristics of Domitian involved in this comparison are to be found in writers other than Juvenal appears to me to be wide of the mark. If, as I have suggested, in other satires Juvenal can be seen to be presupposing a familiarity with certain earlier works of literature, here in particular he is presupposing a knowledge both of Statius' panegyric and of Tacitus' *Histories*. There is more force in Kenney's criticism of the thinness of the characteristics attributed to Domitian and Crispinus in the alleged comparison. Helmbold and O'Neill have in fact spoilt their case by missing a number of points which make the comparison much more complex, and much more dependent on literary references.

Two things are asserted about Crispinus in the opening lines: that he enjoys lengthy porticoes and spreading woodlands close to the Forum; and that he committed incest with a Vestal virgin. These two charges have little to do with Domitian—little, but not nothing. The latter indeed may be regarded simply as part of the traditional portrait of the utterly depraved man, as we find it in Sallust's account of Catiline.<sup>41</sup> But the two things connected patently belong to another stock figure, that of Nero as he appears in the literary sources of Juvenal's own generation. Nero's usurpation of a great area in the centre of Rome for his *Domus Aurea*, with its great parks and the threefold *porticus miliariae* of which Suetonius (but not Tacitus) tells us,<sup>42</sup> was notorious enough at the time when Trajan was building his great baths on top of the main structure of Nero's palace; and his lack of sexual restraint had been emphasized, as I have suggested, by the allegation of incest with a Vestal which Juvenal seems to refer to in his account of Rubrius later in the satire. While the comparison between Crispinus and Domitian is explicitly stated in lines 28 ff., with the *a fortiori* argument that the emperor must have surpassed the excesses of his minister, that between Domitian and Nero is slipped in at the beginning of the main section in lines 37-8, when *Flavius ultimus*<sup>43</sup> is glossed as *calvo . . . Neroni*. The first generation of sources on Nero, on which Juvenal drew before the *Annals* or the Suetonian Life were available must already have included two further points which are echoed in the fourth satire. The model for Domitian's cabinet-meeting which discussed fish when the Germans were threatening the frontiers, as Juvenal asserts in lines 147-8, is that other meeting

<sup>37</sup>The gerundive *tacendae* suggests 'which ought not to have been repeated by the historian', as 'res memoranda novis annalibus' in ii, 102 suggests 'which the historian ought to have mentioned'—the detail of Otho's mirror being one from the tradition which emphasized Otho's effeminacy, which Tacitus for the most part ignores (cf. *Hermes* lxxxix (1961), 242; *AJP* lxxxv (1964), 369).

<sup>38</sup>The scholiast, quoting Marius Maximus, says that he was expelled from the Senate by Vespasian,

became a Stoic and informer, and was condemned after Domitian's death. He is probably 'Seras the philosopher' of Dio lxxviii, 1, 2, executed as an informer under Nerva.

<sup>39</sup>loc. cit. (above n. 34), 30-1.

<sup>40</sup>*AJP* lxxvii (1956), 70.

<sup>41</sup>*Cat.* 15, 1.

<sup>42</sup>*Nero* 31, 1.

<sup>43</sup>Nero himself was of course *Claudius ultimus*.



summoned in the spring of 68 by Nero, when Vindex was in arms in Gaul, and the emperor entertained his councillors by showing them his water-organ.<sup>44</sup> And Juvenal's final reflection in 150-2,

atque utinam his potius nugis tota illa dedisset  
tempora saevitiae, claras quibus abstulit urbi  
inlustresque animas impune et vindice nullo,

clearly echoes a similar wish expressed by the elder Pliny<sup>45</sup> that Nero had stuck to such follies as divination instead of to murder. Juvenal may actually be emphasizing his debt to an early author in his lines involving a play on the name Vindex, which Suetonius says was much bandied about at the end of Nero's reign.<sup>46</sup> Domitian practised his reign of terror *vindice nullo* precisely in so far as, unlike Nero, he inspired no effective senatorial revolt and fell a victim *cerdonibus*.

The parallels, then, are not merely between Crispinus and Domitian, but also between Crispinus and Nero and between Nero and Domitian—servant and tyrant, and one tyrant and another. It remains true that the actual parallels between Crispinus and Domitian do not amount to much, as Kenney observed. There is the obvious parallel of the two great fishes; but the argument that Domitian's extravagance might be assessed from that of his minister fails to strike a vice to which the emperor appears to have been particularly prone. In any case, Crispinus' offence concerning the mullet is not in itself one of his major faults: 'sed nunc de factis levioribus', says Juvenal in line 11.

It is necessary to look closely at the development of the first ten lines. Here, like Clausen, I am inclined to follow Jahn in omitting the pious gloss, *nemo malus felix*,<sup>47</sup> with its limp supplement, *minime corruptor et idem*, in lines 8-9. Thus restored, the sense runs smoothly enough: 'Crispinus is utterly depraved, with his addiction to women who are properly tabu. All his riches and extravagance go for nothing, because he committed incest with the Vestal who was his paramour, destined to be buried alive.' At this point the poet switches to *factis levioribus* and the great fish, and we hear no more of Crispinus as the slave of lust. But the charge has been made with great emphasis in the opening lines, and cannot be allowed to slip from notice. The adjective *incestus* may lack a verb, but *cum quo nuper vittata iacebat* is explicit enough, with its finite verb, and in the imperfect at that. The adverb *nuper* is used several times by Juvenal to refer to historical events in Domitian's reign,<sup>48</sup> such as the relationship between the emperor and his niece in ii, 29 and the governorship of Africa by Priscus in viii, 160. The presumption must be that here likewise we have a reference to an actual event during the same period.<sup>49</sup>

Our sources happen to have left us an unusual amount of information about the execution of Vestals during this reign. In 83, give or take a year, three priestesses were allowed to commit suicide after a rigorous enquiry. About ten years later the chief Vestal, one Cornelia,<sup>50</sup> previously cleared of such charges, was tried in absence at the Alban villa and condemned to be buried alive, according to ancient practise. Her lovers were flogged to death in the comitium. Pliny, in his lurid account of the episode,<sup>51</sup> names one Celer, a Roman knight, as protesting his innocence; Suetonius suggests that there were several others. One Valerius Licinianus, according to Pliny, realized that the uncertainty of the evidence would not prevent his conviction and withdrew to Sicily,

<sup>44</sup> Suet., *Nero* 41, 2.

<sup>45</sup> *N.H.* xxx, 14.

<sup>46</sup> Suet., *Nero* 45, 2, based apparently on the elder Pliny's *Histories* (*Hermes* lxxxviii (1960), 108-9).

<sup>47</sup> On the other hand, the triteness of 'the evil man is doomed to misfortune' may be justified if this is in fact the theme of the whole satire, to be expanded as 'self-indulgence extends from the venial to the mortal and leads to destruction'.

<sup>48</sup> Except when the reference is tied to the immediate context (i, 111; xii, 16). So the one temporal use of *modo* in ii, 160-1, of the conquest of the Orkneys, refers back to the early years of Domitian's reign.

<sup>49</sup> The phrase *res vera agitur* should not suggest that only what follows is historical. The claim is essentially burlesque, and assertions in the opening section are the stronger without it.

<sup>50</sup> Evidently the one whose election in A.D. 62 (at the age of not more than ten, according to Gellius i, 12, 1) is recorded by Tacitus (*Ann.* xv, 22, 4), presumably on account of her later notoriety. The only other Vestal appointment he records (*Ann.* ii, 86, 1) is significant because of the resignation of Occia after 57 years.

<sup>51</sup> *Epp.* iv, 11, 6.

where he supported himself by teaching rhetoric;<sup>52</sup> he does not appear to have returned after Domitian's death, and may have been lucky to escape alive.

Cornelia was clearly the only Vestal buried alive during this period; and, in a Domitianic context, it is impossible to suppose, as Duff tentatively suggests *ad loc.*, that 'sanguine adhuc vivo terram subitura' could imply merely 'who might have been buried alive'. Juvenal's Vestal must be Cornelia herself, and Crispinus is stated to have committed incest with her. If this means anything, it means that he was known to have done so; and he was accordingly one of the *stupratores* so barbarously executed in about A.D. 93. Plenty of details remain obscure: in particular, whether he was praetorian prefect at the time. Juvenal, in line 32, describes him as 'iam princeps equitum', which is most easily interpreted as meaning the commander of the Guard; but it is far from clear to which period in his career this description refers, and Martial, who is the only other writer to mention Crispinus at all, in two epigrams written before the prosecution of Cornelia,<sup>53</sup> provides no clues. It is not surprising, incidentally, that he did not regard the executions as the proper subject for an epigram. While it seems unlikely that so spectacular a disaster striking a praetorian prefect would have escaped notice in the sources, it may be significant that Dio, whose account of the fall of Cornelia has not survived, does remark that Domitian could not rely even on his prefects, whom he had tried while still in office.<sup>54</sup> But this sort of obscurity need cause no surprise. Juvenal was not giving a systematic account of the event; and his failure to clarify such an important issue only emphasizes that he must have been able to take for granted that the reader would be familiar with the basic facts. Pliny, writing to a friend early in Trajan's reign,<sup>55</sup> perhaps ten years after the event, can say 'et sane putabam te, quia tunc afuisti, nihil aliud de Liciniano audisse quam relegatum ob incestum.' By the time Juvenal came to deal with the subject, Tacitus had evidently dealt with the affair more systematically in the *Histories*, and he does not need to be explicit.

If we conclude, then, that Crispinus, some ten years after his appearance at Domitian's council, was found guilty of improper relations with the senior Vestal and was duly flogged to death, the pattern of the fourth satire gains in clarity. Crispinus is hailed as a sexual criminal of the worst sort, at least in the eye of the law. His vast wealth is of no avail, because he has committed incest with the Vestal and (the satirist does not need to say) has paid the penalty for it. His earlier conduct showed what was to be expected, in gross self-indulgence in another and less criminal sphere. The comparison with Domitian, already suggested in connection with the fish, now gains in perspective. As Juvenal can omit specific reference to Crispinus' violent death, so he can also pass over, what he describes in unpleasant detail in ii, 29-33, the incest of Domitian with his own niece. Pliny, in his letter on the case of Cornelia, had already made an explicit comparison with the imperial incest; and so apparently did Tacitus, as he promises in the opening to the *Histories*:<sup>56</sup> 'pollutae caerimoniae, magna adulteria'. Juvenal did not need to labour the point, for readers who knew the literature.

It should now be clear, I hope, how curiously oblique is the equation between Crispinus and his master, with Nero as a third party in whom the themes of extravagance, sexual ruthlessness, tyranny and violent death all converge. Juvenal's reliance on literary awareness of allusions is particularly striking in that on the surface only one parallel is adduced, and that a misleadingly trivial one—the undue attention devoted to giant fish. The other elements in the equation are stated only on one side or the other: Crispinus' incest, Crispinus' residence in the heart of Rome,<sup>57</sup> Domitian's violent

<sup>52</sup> *ibid.* 1-3, 11-14. Juvenal appears to quote Licinianus' apostrophe to Fortune in that same letter ('facis enim ex senatoribus professores, ex professoribus senatores'), when he describes the rise of Quintilian in vii, 197-8 ('si fortuna volet, fies de rhetore consul; si volet haec eadem, fies de consule rhetor').

<sup>53</sup> vii, 99; viii, 48.

<sup>54</sup> lxxvii, 14, 4, in the epitomes of Xiphilinus and Zonaras.

<sup>55</sup> *Epp.* iv, 11, 15.

<sup>56</sup> i, 2, 2.

<sup>57</sup> Domitian's buildings in the centre of Rome appear not to have caused criticism (Suet., *Dom.* 5); though Plutarch criticized his mania (*Poplic.* 15, 5). The Flavian palace on the Palatine certainly rivalled Nero's in respect of the actual buildings.

death. Similarly a further element in the satire is never explicitly stated: the chronological development, whereby the Crispinus of the early period, who wastes money on big fish and big houses and uses too much scent (for this is the only charge laid against him when he appears at the council-meeting, in line 108), is contrasted with the criminal who meets his end ten years later; and the emperor who plays with *nugae* in A.D. 83 already anticipates the master of the terror who is to execute the innocent Acilius Glabrio,<sup>58</sup> as well as Crispinus, in the early 90's, and to meet his own death by assassination in 96. In both halves of the poem, Crispinus' and Domitian's, the spotlight plays on the trivial earlier period, while the more deadly development is merely foreshadowed. The actual appearance of Crispinus among the councillors in line 108, which Kenney regards as inexplicably awkward, is to be explained partly as a balance to Domitian's appearance in line 29, where Crispinus is properly the target, partly as a cheerful acknowledgement, 'And of course our friend Crispinus was there too'.<sup>59</sup> It was important to make it clear that in the earlier period Domitian was preoccupied with *nugae* and Crispinus was notorious only for his use of scent.<sup>60</sup>

The relationship between the two parts of the satire may thus be established in thematic terms, with the additional point, first made by Stegemann and developed by Anderson,<sup>61</sup> that there is a chiasmic arrangement of major:minor, minor:major in the faults of the two main figures as outlined. The structure is still unusual, for Juvenal especially; but rather less so if viewed in the tradition of the satiric genre, with reference to those satires of Horace, particularly ii, 6, supported by *Epistle* i, 7, where the latter half consists of an *ainos*<sup>62</sup> or explanatory fable, to bring out certain points in the more discursive main section which precedes. Horace has used the same device in a number of *Odes*, mainly in the third book: such as 3, on Troy, 5, on Regulus, and 11, on Hypermnestra. In each of these the *ainos*, containing incidentally a good deal of direct speech, bears a relationship to the opening section which is not very clearly defined and has to be worked out by the reader with the use of a good deal of ingenuity and perhaps of some extraneous knowledge. This structural device is hardly typical of satire as such (it appears not to occur in Persius at all); but it is not surprising if it is considerably more complex in Juvenal than it ever was in Horace. Perhaps some use was made of it in the intervening tradition by the mysterious Flavian satirist, Turnus, a knowledge of whose works might do a good deal to explain certain problems in Juvenal's development of satire. If it appears to be an innovation for the *ainos* to describe an actual event, Horace might well have claimed that the dealings of Philippus and Vulteius Mena in the seventh *Epistle*, as well as the heroism of Regulus in the fifth Roman Ode, were as near to actual history as anyone could ask. At all events, allowing for a certain increase in complexity since Horace's time, we may recognize that the tradition of satire contains enough indications to explain almost everything in the puzzling relationship between the two halves of the fourth satire.<sup>63</sup>

This, accordingly, is one final way in which Juvenal relies on a substratum of other literary works. If his technique in the fourth satire is different from that in the remainder of the first three books, it is probably because the publication of Tacitus' *Histories*, as the first coherent account of the reign of Domitian written after that emperor's death, inspired the satirist to experiment in a new sort of satire, based principally on the contrast between the critical historical record and the contemporary

<sup>58</sup> Juv. iv, 95-6; Dio lxvii, 14, 2.

<sup>59</sup> In addition, it may be assumed that Crispinus occupied a similar position in Statius' list of councillors, which presumably provided Juvenal with his list of names in the first place.

<sup>60</sup> So in i, 26-9 Crispinus is attacked for his Egyptian birth, his purple clothing (as in Martial viii, 48), and his jewellery. The statement at the beginning of iv, 'et est mihi saepe vocandus ad partes', probably refers not to that satire but to his repeated appearance in iv itself.

<sup>61</sup> Stegemann, *De Juvenalis dispositione* (1913), 30 ff. (not available to me); Anderson *YCS* xv (1957), 68-80.

<sup>62</sup> For the *ainos*, cf. Fraenkel, *Horace* 95, etc.

<sup>63</sup> No solution is offered as to the difference of treatment between the two parts. The discursiveness of the first part is matched by the opening of Hor., *Sat.* i, 2 and 3, in both of which there is a discussion of Tigellius' character before the main theme is announced; the second part is constructed with a straightforward artistry which is probably unique in Juvenal, apart from the narrative of shipwreck in 12, 17-82, and is to be compared with Hor., *Sat.* ii, 6, 79-117; *Epp.* i, 7, 46-95. If this means that the *ainos* is to be considered more important than the section which it is supposed to explain, the same can fairly be said of Hor., *Od.* iii, 5, 13-56; 27, 25-76.

poetical panegyric as exemplified in Statius' *German War*. It was not an experiment that could be easily repeated. The seventh satire, in a similar way, appears to have been set off by the combination of fairly recent works by Tacitus and Suetonius dealing with the position of the man of letters in society. Which of these satires came first, nor how they fit into the pattern of the other early satires, I see no way of determining. Certainly none of the others appears to be so closely dependent on individual works of literature, despite the immense debt to Martial in i, iii and v, and the close dependence of i in particular on the earlier satirists, which is a dependence of a different and less remarkable kind. If we possessed more of the literature of the reign of Trajan, we might be able to sort out the roots of others among the early satires, particularly vi, on women, and viii, on high birth. It is, after all, the result of a pretty fortuitous train of events that we possess the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, and of a still more erratic one that we know what we do of the *de Viris Illustribus*; while the survival of the four lines from Statius' *German War* is due to an almost unbelievably haphazard chance. This chance, however, points the way to an understanding of how Juvenal made use of a previous literary work as the basis of a satire of his own; and from this example it is possible to suggest solutions to several of Juvenal's more difficult puzzles.

After the scabrous ninth satire, which presents hardly any such problems and provides no clues as to its literary antecedents,<sup>64</sup> the fourth and fifth books, containing satires x to xvi, appear to operate on an entirely different plane. Despite the mastery of satire x, all that it is in fact is a rehandling of a stock theme already treated satirically in Persius ii, though here illuminated by a magnificent series of rhetorician's *exempla*, including the vivid account of the downfall of Sejanus. As Syme has conjectured,<sup>65</sup> this may well owe elements to Tacitus' *Annals*, and the borrowing seems chronologically plausible, especially if the later satires followed the first three books after a considerable interval. But so far as we can tell, the close dependence on Domitian's reign has now ceased,<sup>66</sup> whether because the initial stir caused by the *Histories* had now subsided or because people were beginning to forget their original attitude to the Terror. There are no further historical references of any significance, only anecdotes such as Catullus' escape from shipwreck in xii, a notorious but undefined case of swindling in xiii, and the outbreak of cannibalism in xv, the last firmly dated to the middle of Hadrian's reign. Nothing suggests that Juvenal is still exploiting literary materials, apart from rhetorical works in prose or verse, in anything like the same way he does in his first three books. The later satires are often regarded as less interesting, because they are more remote from everyday life, and more dependent on book-learning, like the satires of Persius. In fact it appears rather that what has happened is that Juvenal has exhausted his most fruitful vein of literary exploitation, which had enabled him to employ many of the same complex techniques which are found in Virgil, to create entirely novel works from the words and ideas of his predecessors of all sorts. Once these techniques were abandoned, satire becomes a routine, almost as the writing of elegy became for Ovid once he was banished from Rome.<sup>67</sup>

It is curious that Juvenal's success should in part have depended upon so refined a device as this, especially that it should make any difference to us today, when the secrets of the literary dependence of the satires have been so largely lost along with the works on which Juvenal drew. But the effect of countless lines in Virgil is only slightly diminished by our ignorance of the models he was using. This is a curious feature of allusiveness in literature, almost equally apparent in the way in which certain plays of T. S. Eliot appear to be based on models in Aeschylus or Euripides, although

<sup>64</sup> Unless the scabrous Ravola and Rhodope in the fourth line are meant to point us to some sub-literary production of the day—whether in the tradition of Petronius or a mime, where such sexual oddities appear to have been most at home.

<sup>65</sup> Tacitus 777.

<sup>66</sup> As it already has in the later part of satire viii, where line 211 switches from the almost completely Flavian scene of the earlier sections to a series of *exempla* containing Nero, Catiline, Marius, Decius, Brutus and Thersites (very much the same material as

is handled in 10), steadily receding into the past as if Juvenal has decided to abandon his favourite period for good.

<sup>67</sup> This should not be taken to support the dubious tradition that Juvenal was banished from Rome, at this point or any other. He was never dependent on a particular group of documents in the same way that Suetonius was, whose later *Caesares* probably show a decline precisely because he was deprived of the imperial letter-files (*CQ* N.S. ix (1959), 285-93).

the audience can seldom be conscious of the effect this ought to be having on their reactions. The reader and the critic are still advised to observe the clues whenever they can.

We cannot tell how far Juvenal's contemporaries themselves picked up the references, except that we know that one of them, perhaps still before the publication of Tacitus' *Annals*, felt the need to write in a number of them which he had succeeded in identifying, particularly the parody of Statius' *German War*. Nor can we judge to what extent the poet intended, or contemporaries judged, the criticisms of Domitian's reign to be applicable to later society. However this may be, the satires do not appear to have made a great impact, if we can trust the very limited evidence available to us. The one author who might have referred to him in some way is the younger Pliny,<sup>68</sup> always anxious to establish his intimacy with major literary figures. His first nine books were probably completed before the first of the satires appeared,<sup>69</sup> and he will have left Rome for good shortly after. But if it is true that no one really regarded Juvenal as an important writer until the fourth century,<sup>70</sup> something of his failure may be attributed to his exaggerated belief in the ability of readers to recognize such a wide range of references.

*University of Durham*

<sup>68</sup> Hight, 19.

<sup>69</sup> A. N. Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (1966).  
27-41.

<sup>70</sup> Hight, 181-8.