

JUVENAL—MISOGYNIST OR MISOGAMIST?*

By SUSANNA H. BRAUND

Juvenal is charged with misogyny. The evidence brought against him is *Satire* 6.¹ A secondary charge is that of unstructured composition.² This paper will attempt to show that the case is unfounded. My contention is that the poem is shaped by contemporary discourses about marriage, in particular the treatment of marriage in rhetoric. The understanding of the poem's ideological grounding thus gained will provide a basis for exploring the complex interrelationship of author, speaker, addressee, and audience in the poem.

The role of intertextuality in Greek and Latin literature is well established, especially with reference to those classical texts most obviously exhibiting self-conscious artistry or 'literariness'. Satire, despite its characteristic claims to humility, realism, and ordinariness,³ exhibits a high degree of literariness and allusiveness, which frequently manifests itself as parody.⁴ Where this involves other literary texts it is relatively easy to detect and analyse.⁵ But intertextuality is not confined to written texts. It was long ago recognized by De Decker that rhetoric exerted a profound influence upon Juvenal.⁶ Although De Decker's observations consisted predominantly of small-scale instances, the same phenomenon is visible on a larger scale too. That is, as well as utilizing the tropes and topoi of declamation, Juvenal was evidently affected by the patterns of certain kinds of rhetorical speech in the conception of some of his satires. And, as with cases of literary allusion in satire, so in the cases of the interrelationship with rhetoric, this intertextuality usually manifests itself as parody. A good example is provided by Juvenal, *Satire* 13, which is a parody of the rhetorical set-piece, the *consolatio*. In this poem Juvenal offers cynical consolation for the loss, not of a member of the family, but of a small sum of money.⁷ The present paper attempts to show that *Satire* 6 is most illuminatingly regarded as a poetic version of a standard rhetorical set-piece on the theme of whether or not a man should marry. This develops in detail the suggestive comment of Cairns that *Satire* 6 should be categorized as an example in poetry of a *progymnasma*, more

* I wish to express my thanks to the organizers and participants of the Women in Antiquity seminar in Oxford, who heard an early version of this paper in 1990; to Peter Wiseman and Jane Gardner for their many helpful comments on an early draft; and to the Editorial Committee for their constructive suggestions. I alone am responsible for what is presented here.

¹ For the charge of misogyny, see e.g. G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (1954), 103; K. M. Rogers, *The Troublesome Helpmate: A History of Misogyny in Literature* (1966), 41. Critics do not agree upon the theme of *Satire* 6. Those who see it as a 'catalogue of women', include: J. Ferguson, *Juvenal: The Satires* (1979), 185; M. R. Lefkowitz and M. B. Fant, *Women's Life in Greece and Rome* (1982), no. 157; J. E. Carr, 'The view of women in Juvenal and Apuleius', *CQ* 58 (1982), 61; W. S. Anderson, *Essays on Roman Satire* (1982), 275; D. S. Wiesen, 'The verbal basis for Juvenal's satiric vision', in *ANRW* II.33.1 (1989), 733. For the satire as a dissuasion from marriage: Highet's chapter-heading (above), 91: 'Advice to Those About to Marry'; L. I. Lindo, 'The evolution of Juvenal's later satires', *CPh* 69 (1974), 25; D. Singleton, 'Juvenal 6.1–20 and some ancient attitudes to the golden age', *G & R* 19 (1972), 151–64, following H. A. Mason, 'Is Juvenal a classic?', in J. P. Sullivan (ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature 2: Satire* (1963), 137. Both views in: M. Coffey, *Roman Satire* (1976), 127; M. M. Winkler, *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal* (1983), 147; J. Henderson, '... When satire writes "Woman"', in S. H. Braund (ed.), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome* (1989), 89–125; idem, 'Satire writes "woman": Gendersong', *PCPhS* n.s. 25 (1989), 68. Neither view is followed by E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (1980), 252, who seems to regard the poem as a 'one-off'.

² On the poem's structure no consensus has emerged,

as indicated by Anderson's comment (op. cit. (n. 1), 255 with 275 n. 2): 'Scholars have been divided in their proposed solutions: the brave have assumed a coherent organization; the prudent have abandoned what seemed a thankless and futile effort, denying any structural unity.' Disagreement about the structure of the poem relates to disagreement about the theme of the poem, see n. 1.

³ For the claimed ordinariness of satire, see e.g. Hor., *Sat.* 1.4.38–42, *Juv.* 1.79–80.

⁴ On the relationship of satire, parody, and irony, see L. Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody* (1985), esp. 52–68. As M. Fusillo observes ('Il testo nel testo: la citazione nel romanzo greco', *MD* 25 (1990), 27), there is a risk of reducing parody to synonymy with intertextuality.

⁵ e.g. on the relationship between Petronius' *Satyricon* and the *Odyssey*, see Averil Cameron, 'Myth and meaning in Petronius: some modern comparisons', *Latomus* 29 (1970), 400; A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus. Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor* (1983), 192. On Horace, *Satires* II.5 as parody of the scene in which Odysseus consults Tiresias, cf. N. Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* (1966), 228. Horace, *Satires* II.4 recalls the backdrop of Platonic dialogues, in particular, the *Phaedrus*: see S. H. Braund, *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires* (1988), 144 and 247, n. 67. Juvenal's *Satire* 3 is illuminated by Virgil's first *Eclogue*: see C. Witke, *Latin Satire* (1970), 133–4. *Satire* 4 reworks Statius' panegyric epic poem, *De Bello Germanico*, now lost, on Domitian's German campaign. Parody of an epic topos, the storm at sea, appears in *Satire* 12: see I. G. Scott, *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal* (1927), 83–8. For an analysis of the 'literariness' of *Satire* 6, see Wiesen, op. cit. (n. 1).

⁶ J. De Decker, *Juvenalis Declamans* (1913).

⁷ M. P. O. Morford, 'Juvenal's thirteenth satire', *AJP* 94 (1973), 26–36; A. D. Pryor, 'Juvenal's false consolation', *AUMLA* 18 (1962), 167–80.

specifically 'an inflated example of the *thesis* "Ought a man to marry?"'.⁸ Treggiari shares this insight with her observation that 'the anti-marriage tradition comes to full flower in Juvenal's notorious sixth satire, which exploits the whole range of philosophical and popular *topoi* against women and marriage';⁹ she does not elaborate further. This paper develops the argument that the poem may be fruitfully regarded as a dissuasion from marriage, or a *λόγος ἀποτρειπτικός γάμου*.¹⁰

In order to substantiate this claim, the evidence, both internal and external, will be marshalled. An examination of the content of the poem will demonstrate that *Satire 6* is neither a specimen of the catalogue of women nor an incoherent outpouring of every conceivable Roman misogynist prejudice, not least because Juvenal misses some obvious tricks if that were the case (Section I). Rather, there is a preoccupation with adultery (Section II) and with *pudicitia*, chastity (Section III), which indicates a concern with marriage in particular as opposed to women in general. There follows a consideration of the treatment of the theme of marriage in other forms of contemporary discourse with which Juvenal and his audience were familiar, particularly the rhetorical tradition (Section IV). With the rhetorical framework of the poem established, the implications of Juvenal's location of misogyny in an unsympathetic speaker will be considered (Section V).

I

An examination of the content of *Satire 6* suggests that it is mistaken to view it as a catalogue of abominable women like the *ψόγος γυναικῶν* which appears in Stobaeus (*Ecl.* IV.22.7). There existed literary precedents of varying kinds for this, of course, most obviously the poem (or fragment) of Semonides of Amorgos, which seems to take the form of a catalogue with its list of negative images of women (sow, vixen, bitch, earth, sea, donkey, ferret, mare, monkey) followed by the sole positive image of woman, as a bee.¹¹ Another kind of catalogue available as a model was the *Catalogue of Women* attributed to Hesiod, evidently a paratactic sequence of episodes, each concerning a woman or women, her sexual partner(s) and offspring, in a sequence without structure which could be continued virtually indefinitely and in which the episodes could be arranged in any order.

It seems evident that Juvenal's poem does not belong in this tradition for several reasons. Firstly, *Satire 6* is not as organized or systematic as might be expected of a catalogue nor as repetitious or predictable in structure. The description of female misconduct oscillates between the individual and the typical. This movement between the specific and the general sustains interest through the variety of modes of presentation but indicates that the catalogue, epic or otherwise, is not Juvenal's model.

Further, if Juvenal were setting out to present a catalogue of abominable women, or even a misogynistic *tour de force*, he might be expected to cast his net as wide as possible and incorporate a truly broad range of charges. Yet comparison of *Satire 6* with earlier Greek and Roman invective against women reveals that there are some topics prominent in earlier literature which Juvenal scarcely touches upon, or even wholly omits. For example, he omits topics elaborated in Semonides' poem. He does not criticize women for filthiness, continual eating, nagging, stupidity, changeability, stubbornness and laziness or for stealing. Nor does he utilize lengthy animal analogies:¹² the animal comparisons in the poem are few and very brief.¹³ Moreover, the type of animal comparisons for the purpose of invective which are most

⁸ F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (1972), 75.

⁹ S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (1991), 223.

¹⁰ cf. Stobaeus in *Ecl.* IV.22 περὶ γάμου ('concerning marriage'), item 2 ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαθὸν τὸ γαμεῖν ('that marriage is not good'). Thus R. Schuetze, *Juvenalis Ethicus* (1905), 35: 'noster amicū monet ut matrimonio desistat'. Courtney, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 252, raises this as a possibility, but then pulls back: 'no firm links can be forged with the rhetorical tradition as it survives'.

¹¹ For a feminist reading of Semonides, see N. Loraux, *Les enfants d'Athéné* (1981), 95–117.

¹² e.g. Semonides, *passim*; Hesiod, *Theogony* 594–9 (women as drones); Phocylides quoted in Stobaeus

IV.22.1 (bitch, bee, sow, and mare).

¹³ The trite comparison with a bereaved tigress, *orba tigride* (270); the woman addressed as a most savage viper, *saeuissima uipera* (641); Messalina in the brothel calling herself Lycisca (123, an allusion, via the Greek word for wolf, to *lupa*, a prostitute); and *ganit* (64), a word typically used to describe a dog's whimper, see *OLD ganio* 1. I exclude 'rara auis in terris nigroque simillima cycno' (165): the expression is proverbial (A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlicher Redensarten der Römer* (1890), *auis* 2), used by Seneca in a similar context, 'si bona fuerit et suavis uxor, quae tamen rara auis est' (Jerome, *Adv. Iouin.* 1.47 = Sen. fr. 56).

common in Latin literature, namely those concerning particular parts of a woman's body, are entirely absent from *Satire* 6.¹⁴

Another topic which we might have expected to receive expansive treatment in *Satire* 6 is the allegation that women indulge in drink, a topic which is elaborated often and at considerable length in Aristophanes¹⁵ and in stories about early Rome recorded by the elder Pliny, Valerius Maximus, and Gellius.¹⁶ Given that Cato is said to have viewed wine-drinking as an offence as serious as adultery,¹⁷ it seems surprising, and significant for our understanding of the poem's theme, that this topic receives no extended treatment in *Satire* 6. In fact, in the entire poem the topic appears only once in general terms (301–5, linked with *Luxuria*) and twice in specific contexts, where it is fleeting and incidental to other more major themes: firstly in the travesty of the Bona Dea rites (315) where drinking is simply one minor component in the Dionysiac prelude to sexual activity,¹⁸ secondly in the graphic description of the boorish woman who keeps her dinner-guests waiting, then suddenly drinks so much that she vomits it all up again (425–32). The fact that Juvenal neglects the condemnation of women's drinking evinced in comedy and moralists indicates that his presentation of female misconduct has a different focus.

A further typical allegation of misogynistic literature is that by marrying a man makes himself a slave to his wife. This appears in both Greek and Latin sources (e.g. Sen., *Contr.* 1.6.7) and is, of course, a theme adopted in Latin love elegy, where the poet-lover frequently speaks of the 'slavery of love', *seruitium amoris*.¹⁹ Again, although the topic seems one potentially fruitful for the satirist, Juvenal gives it scant attention. In the entire poem the theme appears in only two passing allusions — 'now inserting his stupid head in the noose of marriage' (*stulta maritali iam porrigit ora capistro*, 43) and 'she rules' (*regnat*, 149) — and one longer section, ll. 208–24, heralded by 'the yoke' (*iugum*, 208) and closed by mention of 'her dominion' (*haec regna*, 224).

Moreover, two particular types of woman found in Roman literature are notably absent from *Satire* 6: the witch (as exemplified in Horace's Canidia and Lucan's Erichtho) and the prostitute or courtesan (the *meretrix* who features regularly in comedy and occasionally in elegy, the hostess of the *Copa* in the Appendix Vergiliana and the prostitutes who occur in the epigrams of Martial).²⁰ Juvenal's omission of such women, who obviously present satiric opportunities, is clearly significant. Men do not marry witches or prostitutes.

II

These factors, then, indicate that *Satire* 6 does not belong to the genre of catalogue or all-embracing misogynistic rant. Such a poem would look very different and would also perhaps tire the audience if the sole device of structure were the paratactic list. A poem of this length needs the more definite direction which derives from a narrower and more specific theme. The nature of this theme is indicated by the poem's preoccupation with marriage and adultery, which is announced in the second word, *Pudicitia*.²¹ *Pudicitia* stands prominently at the

¹⁴ e.g. comparing a woman's breasts to a mare's teats, Horace, *Epode* 8.7–8. On invective against women which uses animal comparisons, see A. Richlin, 'Invective against women in Roman Satire', *Arethusa* 17 (1984), 70–1 and esp. Martial 3.93, using comparisons with animals and insects in an attack on an old woman.

¹⁵ e.g. Ar., *Lysis*. 195–208, *Thesm.* 556–7, 733–62, *Ecl.* 43–5, 132–43, 1112–24.

¹⁶ Pliny, *NH* xiv.89–90, for examples of traditional disapproval of drinking by women, cf. Valerius Maximus vi.3.9. Livy 1.57.9 for Lucretia as the epitome of abstemiousness. Pliny (loc. cit.) and Gellius x.23.1–3 record Cato's view that it was male kinsmen's wish to check whether or not a woman had indulged in secret drinking that caused them to kiss close female relatives on the lips. Cf. too Plut., *Mor.* 265b on the *ius osculi*.

¹⁷ Gellius x.23.3; cf. *ibid.* 4–5; Richlin, *op. cit.* (n. 14), 78 n. 10.

¹⁸ On women's consumption of wine, see G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus* (2nd edn, 1971), 217; O. de

Cazanove, 'Exesto: L'incapacité sacrificielle des femmes à Rome (à propos de Plutarque *Quaest. Rom.* 85)', *Phoenix* 41 (1987), 159–61. In the Bona Dea rites we are told that the wine-bowl was referred to as a honey-pot and the wine as milk, Plut., *Mor.* 268d–e, cf. 20, Macr., *Sat.* 1.12.25. I am grateful to Nicholas Purcell for this observation.

¹⁹ On *seruitium amoris*, see F. O. Copley, 'Seruitium Amoris in the Roman Elegists', *TAPhA* 68 (1947), 285–300, amplified by P. Murgatroyd, 'Seruitium Amoris and the Roman elegists', *Latomus* 40 (1981), 589–606.

²⁰ See P. Howell, *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial* (1980), on Mart. 1.34.7 for references.

²¹ Similarly in *Satire* 5 *amicitia* is announced as the central topic at l. 14: both poems allege the disappearance and destruction of their central concept. On the prominence of the theme of *amicitia* in Juvenal, see R. Seager, 'Amicitia in Tacitus and Juvenal', *AJAH* 2 (1977), 40–50 and R. A. LaFleur, 'Amicitia and the unity of Juvenal's First Book', *Illinois Classical Studies* 4 (1979), 158–77.

beginning and again in the middle of *Satire* 6. For the Romans, the concept of *pudicitia* meant sexual purity; that is, it implied not only virginity for the young unmarried girl but also chastity within marriage on the part of the wife, as is shown by the frequent occurrence of *pudicitia* in epitaphs.²² It is not therefore surprising that in this satire *pudicus*, *pudor*, and *pudicitia* are important words.²³

The whole opening section of the poem confirms that the theme is marriage and wives. Lines 1–13 present a sketch of marriage and family life in the Saturnian Age: the family sharing a single cave with their animals. Leaving on one side the ironic tone of this passage,²⁴ the implication seems to be that at the beginning of time chastity was assured, possibly because there was no privacy for anyone to perpetrate deception. This too is the point of the contrast of Stone Age woman with Cynthia and Lesbia (7–8): the latter are mentioned in order to evoke the genre of love elegy which celebrates, encourages, and sometimes deplores infidelity.²⁵

The preoccupation with *Pudicitia* continues in ll. 14–20, Juvenal's version of the myth of the departure of the virgin goddess in disgust at human behaviour found in Hesiod and Aratus.²⁶ His version is that the goddess *Pudicitia* remained on earth in the Olympian Age, but only until Jupiter's adolescence, presumably an allusion to the commencement of his 'romances' with mortal women. At that point, *Astraea* and *Pudicitia* left mortals to their own devices. He goes on to allege that people have been committing adultery ever since the Silver Age, whereas all other crimes arrived later, in the Iron Age (21–4); here Juvenal adapts the myth of the ages of metal, found in Hesiod and Aratus, to his theme.²⁷ Adultery predates all other crimes.²⁸

The speaker now asks his addressee Postumus incredulously if he is really planning to marry and sarcastically impugns his sanity (25–37).²⁹ He offers as Postumus' defensive response an appeal to *Ursidius*' example (38–40):

sed placet Vrsidio lex Iulia, tollere dulcem
cogitat heredem, cariturus turture magno
mullorumque iubis et captatore macello.

Ursidius supports the Julian law; he intends to bring up
a darling heir, though he thereby forfeits the bearded mullets
and fattened doves — all bait from the legacy-hunting market.³⁰

Postumus' supposed naïvety provokes an indignant outburst from the speaker (41–7) to the effect that, if *Ursidius* marries, anything can happen, because *Ursidius* is the most notorious adulterer in town. It is ridiculous that the adulterer seeks a chaste wife (*antiquis . . . de moribus*, 45, referring back to the Golden Age) when he has been so busy seducing the women of Rome.³¹ The re-construction of *Ursidius* as the infamous *Latinus* of the adultery mime, evidently a favourite plot in this popular type of entertainment,³² conveys the improbability and absurdity of this scenario.

²² See R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (1942), 295–6; cf. Virg., *Georg.* 2.524, 'casta pudicitiam seruat domus', part of the praise and idealization of country life, see R. F. Thomas, *Virgil Georgics* (1988), ad loc.; cf. Hor., *Od.* III.5.41; Liv. III.45.6; Sen., *Ag.* 110; for the inverse, cf. Sall. *B.C.* 13.3, 'mulieres pudicitiam in propatulo habere', on the decadence of modern morals; and the curse uttered by Ovid, *Ibis* 349–50, 'nec tibi contingat matrona pudicior'. For *pudicitia* as *mulieris propria uirtus*, see Jerome's quotation of Seneca, *adv. Iovin.* 1.49.

²³ e.g. 6.193, *sermo pudicus*; 137, *pudicam*; 49, *capitis matrona pudici*; *pudor* at 252 and 357; cf. 287, *castas*.

²⁴ Well shown by Singleton, op. cit. (n. 1).

²⁵ Juvenal evokes Propertius 11.32, complaining initially about Cynthia's suspected infidelities but then accepting the fact that Roman girls long ago gave up *pudicitia*. Propertius' poem also names Lesbia (45) and refers to the Saturnian Age (52); see Mason, op. cit. (n. 1), 136–7.

²⁶ See Hesiod, *WD* 197–201 and Aratus 96–136; cf. Ovid., *Met.* 1.149–50.

²⁷ See Hesiod, *WD* 106–201 and Aratus 96–136.

²⁸ cf. Hor., *Sat.* 1.3.104–6: 'abhinc absistere bello, oppida coeperunt munire et ponere leges, ne quis fur

esset, neu latro, neu quis aduler' ('Thereafter they began to avoid war, to build towns, and to pass laws making it an offence for any person to engage in theft, armed robbery, or adultery').

²⁹ Lucilius provides a satiric precedent on the madness of marrying: 'qua propter deliro et cupidi officium fungor liberum' (646W) ('wherefore do I go mad and do the duty of a man eager for children').

³⁰ The translation of Juvenal is Niall Rudd's (1992). On the Julian law see below, Section IV. The meat-market is portrayed as taking the place of the human legacy-hunters who feature in Roman satire — most obviously in Hor., *Sat.* 11.5 and Juv., *Satire* 12; also Juv. 5.98, 10.202.

³¹ cf. Sen., *Ep.* 94.26, 'scis improbum esse qui ab uxore pudicitiam exigit, ipse alienarum corruptor uxorum' ('you know that he who demands chastity from his wife but is himself the seducer of others' wives is unreasonable').

³² See J. C. McKeown, 'Augustan elegy and mime', *PCPhS* n.s. 25 (1979), 71–84. On the dangers allegedly incurred by adulterers caught in the act, see A. Richlin, 'Approaches to the sources on adultery at Rome', in H. P. Foley (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (1981), 394.

The speaker continues his blunt affirmation that there are no chaste women in Rome by suggesting that Postumus should make a thank-offering to Juno, the goddess of marriage, if he can find a chaste wife (47–9). In one breath he (ironically) invites Postumus to prepare his house for the wedding (51–2), in the next he warns that women like Hiberina are not ‘satisfied with a single man’ (*contenta . . . uno*, 54), i.e. *uniuira*, the quality so much valued by the Romans and a concept ‘strictly Roman’.³³ He bolsters his argument by saying that it is inadvisable to rely upon a country girl’s reputation for chastity until her conduct in town is observed, slyly adding that everyone knows what goes on in the country, a further reference to the adulterous liaisons of myth attributed to Jupiter and Mars. This section is crucial for understanding the poem: here the speaker states bluntly the utter improbability of finding a chaste wife, a statement which the rest of the poem is designed to ‘prove’.

The first ‘proof’ of his assertion comes immediately, in the speaker’s direct appeal to Postumus to use his own eyes. In two ‘innocent’ questions (60–2) he asks Postumus if he can see a woman who matches up to his prayers in the arcades or in the theatres, both places frequented by women. The implication is that this is impossible. He proceeds to illustrate his warning with the scenario of an aristocrat called Lentulus decorating his house to celebrate the birth of a child (78–9), a son who resembles a gladiator. This horrific scenario uses the social extremes of Roman society to ‘prove’ the speaker’s view that no women are chaste.³⁴

The opening of the poem, then, establishes the specific concern with adulterous wives rather than with wicked women in general. This is underscored by the explicit reappearance of Pudicitia some 300 lines later, in a past-present contrast which recalls the opening of the poem. Now (306–13) her cult is old (*ueterem*, 308) and long obsolete.³⁵ Instead of the contrast between the Golden Age and present times, the contrast here is between the days of the Republic when Hannibal was at the city-gates (286–305) and modern times,³⁶ when wives enjoy sexual frolics together on their way home: they take turns ‘riding’ one another³⁷ and then urinate against the statue of Pudicitia, with the consequence that in the morning their husbands tread in puddles of their wives’ urine. The women’s attitude to Pudicitia indicates graphically their views on marriage and fidelity.

These two passages which feature Pudicitia play an important role in the structure of the poem. The theme of Pudicitia initiates a prologue (1–24) which refers to the Golden Age to mark a decline in morality. A second prologue (286–300) features the altar of Pudicitia and refers to the days of republican chastity, again to condemn the decline in morals. Accordingly, the poem reaches a climax (634–61) in another comparison which marks a decline from the wicked wives of tragedy to modern wicked wives. The poem encompasses the flight, obsolescence, and disappearance of Pudicitia.

III

The concern with wives, especially adulterous ones, is further borne out by an examination of the poem’s content.³⁸ This shows that the vast majority of topics either explicitly treat adultery or adapt other misogynistic topoi to incorporate adultery.³⁹

Most obvious are the explicit examples of wives’ infidelity to their husbands. (1) Lines 60–75, women in theatres. Women give way to their sexual urges and are portrayed treating actors as female fans treat modern performers, fondling mementoes, such as

³³ On the *uniuira*, see S. B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves* (1975), 161; Lattimore, op. cit. (n. 22), 296 n. 251 and G. Williams, ‘Some aspects of Roman marriage ceremonies and ideals’, *JRS* 48 (1958), 23–4. Certain rituals were reserved to *uniuira*: J. Gagé, *Matronalia* (1963), 59–60, 120–2. Cf. n. 74 below.

³⁴ On the Romans’ horror of adultery between women of high status and men of lower status, see Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 9), 308 and cf. n. 85 below. For an example, Plin., *Ep.* vi. 31. 4–6.

³⁵ Thus Livy x. 23.

³⁶ Juvenal here incorporates the classic Roman explanation of the decline in morals, cf. Sall., *B.C.* 10; D. C. Earl,

The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome (1967), 17–19.

³⁷ For ‘in . . . uices equitant’ of the sexual act, here between women: J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (1982), 166.

³⁸ For the legal framework, see J. F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (1986), 77–8.

³⁹ Not surprisingly, the words for husband (*uir, maritus*) and for adulterer/adulteress (*adulter* and *moechus/moecha*) occur frequently in the poem: *uir* fifteen times; *maritus* eighteen times; *adulter* five times; *moechus* five times out of a total of eleven instances in Juvenal’s poems and *moecha* once from a total of twice in Juvenal’s poems.

the underwear, of their idols (70); it is alleged that they willingly sleep with the actors (73). (2) Lines 82–113, the extended example of a senator's wife, Eppia, who elopes with her lover, a gladiator named Sergius. Particular emphasis is placed on the fact that Eppia is a bad wife, who neglects husband, children, family, fatherland, and reputation. (3) Lines 115–35, the emperor Claudius' wife, Messalina. She was supposedly so over-sexed that she worked in a brothel by night and was not satisfied even then. This is a reworking of the theme of women's voracious sexual appetite, a theme common in ancient literature about women, both serious (e.g. Aristotle, *Gen. An.* 1.20 728a) and comic (e.g. Aristophanes, *Lysis.* 124–35). Juvenal draws attention to the act of adultery here not only by the startling oxymoron *meretrix Augusta* ('whore-empress', 118) but also by the description of Messalina returning to her husband's *pulvinar* (132).⁴⁰ Significantly, Messalina makes her way to the brothel surreptitiously, wearing a hood, *cucullus*; besides being part of the lubricious flavour favoured in such stories of members of the imperial household indulging in the low life,⁴¹ the *cucullus* seems to be especially associated with adultery in the poems of Juvenal.⁴² (4) Lines 279–85, the wife caught in the arms of a slave or a knight. The scene of confrontation is presented in lively dialogue. (5) Lines 314–45, the perversion of the Bona Dea rites. This exclusively female ritual is presented as a frenzied and drunken orgy, leading to a climax in which the women will summon *anything* male — even a donkey — to satisfy their sexual appetite (329–34). (6) The 'Oxford' fragment. These lines present many objections to keeping a *cinaedus* (a passive homosexual) on the household staff,⁴³ of which the crowning and surprising allegation is that it is impossible to trust these *cinaedi* ('haud tamen illi semper habenda fides', O 20–1),⁴⁴ for an adulterer may lurk under the guise of a *cinaedus*. Paradoxically, the softer he looks, the more athletic he will be in bed. This is the context of the famous Juvenalian tag, 'quis custodiet ipsos custodes?' (O 31–2), 'who is to guard the guards themselves?' (7) Lines 366–78, adultery with eunuchs. One of their attractions is that no abortions are needed (368), a fact which clearly shows that the women are thought to have sexual relations with the eunuchs. (8) Lines 379–97, women fall for musicians. These they treat like pop-stars (like the actors earlier, ll. 60–75). Adultery can be assumed. (9) A particularly important topic which presupposes adultery is the allegation that women produce spurious children,⁴⁵ which occurs prominently near the start and the end of the poem. Lines 76–81 depict a gladiator's child born into the house of an aristocrat and ll. 592–609 suppose the birth of a black child into a respectable household. Given that the primary purpose of Roman marriage was for the procreation of heir(s) for the husband (e.g. 38–9, *tollere . . . heredem*; 600, *decolor heres*),⁴⁶ the thwarting of this purpose through the deception of adultery is probably the paramount offence against the institution.

Many more sections of the poem introduce the theme of adultery where it is not obvious or intrinsic to the theme announced. This extension of the theme of adultery offers further support to the thesis that the poem is an argument against marriage on the grounds of likely infidelity by the wife. (10) Lines 136–41, the rich wife. In the brief treatment of this standard topic, instead of complaints about the rich wife ruling her husband in terms familiar from earlier literature,⁴⁷ the criticism is that she has bought the freedom to communicate blatantly with her lover(s). (11) Lines 200–23, a list of the torments of marriage. Here, the adultery theme reappears with the assertion that the husband will be obliged by his wife to write into his will as heirs more than one of the rivals for his wife's affections (218). (12) Lines 231–41, the

⁴⁰ *pulvinar* denoted the bed of the emperor, as quasi-divine being, *OLD pulvinar* b, e.g. Suet., *Dom.* 13.1, Sen., *Dial.* xi.16.4.

⁴¹ e.g. Suet., *Ner.* 26.

⁴² cf. 6.330, 8.145 *nocturnus adulter* disguised *Santonico . . . cucullo*.

⁴³ cf. 14.30 where the *cinaedi* of the household abet the lady's adultery by carrying messages.

⁴⁴ The wording recalls 2.8, 'frontis nulla fides'. In his description of the disguised adulterer (O 21–2), Juvenal reworks several details from *Satire* 2.93–8, a passage which portrays passive homosexuals and effeminate staging their own Bona Dea rites, e.g. *fuligine* as eye make-up O 21, cf. 2.93–5; *reticulatus* O 22, cf. 2.96; note the incidence of yellow fabrics in both (*croceis, galbina*).

⁴⁵ *adulter/adulterium* was derived by Romans from *ad* + *alter*: e.g. Papinian, *D.* XLVIII.5.6.1 'propter adulterium in nupta committitur, propter partum ex altero conceptum composito nomine' ('strictly speaking adultery is committed with a married woman, the name being derived from children conceived by another'), cf. R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (1991), s.v.

⁴⁶ cf. e.g. Plaut., *Miles Gl.* 703–15.

⁴⁷ See Hor., *Od.* III.24.19–20; Eur., *Phaethon* 158–9, with the commentary of J. Diggle; Arist., *NE* 8.1161a1; Mart. VIII.12. The *uxor dotata* was a stock character-type in Roman comedy, R. L. Hunter, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (1985), 90–2, E. Schuhmann, 'Der Type der *uxor dotata* in den Komödien des Plautus', *Phil.* 121 (1977), 45–65.

mother-in-law *topos* (as prevalent in the ancient world as it is in modern comedy).⁴⁸ Among the complaints is that the mother-in-law teaches her daughter how to conduct an affair with a lover, herself deceiving the guards or bribing them to allow her daughter's illicit liaison or simulating illness so that her daughter can visit her, for the purposes of adultery.⁴⁹ (13) Lines 268–85, quarrels in bed. This too incorporates the topic of adultery. The wife's cause of complaint is hypocritical: she bewails her husband's affairs with boys and with an invented mistress (272) when all the time in her desk she has letters from her lover. (14) Lines 350–65, poor women (or, at least, relatively poor).⁵⁰ The example, Ogulnia, who hires all the necessary entourage for a visit to the games, yet lavishes the remains of her family fortune on presents for the athletes she favours, clearly carries an implication of adultery, given the obvious analogy with the actors earlier (60–75).

(15) Lines 398–412, the 'gossip' or 'busy-body'. This woman encroaches on a male preserve by chatting with her husband's friends (and in her husband's presence too, *praesente marito* (400), to his greater embarrassment). Prominent among her topics of conversation are illicit liaisons, fought-over lovers, and the cause and circumstances of the widow's pregnancy. Again, a general complaint against women is adapted to the specific theme of adultery; many other, non-adulterous topics could have been attributed to the 'gossip'. (16) Lines 413–33, the wife who is vicious towards any lowly neighbours who inadvertently disturb her slumbers yet inconsiderate herself in her evening visit to the baths. Although there is nothing explicit about adultery in this section, the description of the woman's *aliptes* (anointer or masseur) at the baths is suggestive. (17) Lines 434–56, the intellectual woman ('worse still', *gravior*). This type of wife allegedly never stops lecturing people and thereby invades another male preserve (explicit at 445–7; cf. the case of the 'gossip' above). Especially significant is the choice of topic: Juvenal has her forgive Dido: 'periturae ignoscit Elissae' (435). Virgil's Dido was a woman of the highest status who could be and was regarded as having had an illicit relationship which involved her breaking her vow of fidelity to her husband Sychaeus: hence the power of her story as a moral *exemplum* for the Augustan audience of the poem.⁵¹ In *Satire* 6 the intellectual woman's sympathy for Dido may be intended to reveal something of her own morals and seems to be an (indirect) introduction of the adultery theme into this section.

(18) Lines 457–73, the beautification of women with jewellery and cosmetics. In this stock theme,⁵² it is alleged that female shamelessness does not know where to stop and extends to the public display of rich jewels, accusations redolent of sumptuary legislation such as the Oppian laws forbidding or limiting the display of wealth by women.⁵³ More important for the present enquiry is the charge that the woman labours at home to improve her appearance, for the benefit not of her husband but of her lovers (464–6).⁵⁴ In this way the standard topic of cosmetics is adapted to the theme of infidelity. (19) Lines 474–511, a description of the typical pattern of the woman's day. The unfaithful wife is pictured getting ready for an assignation with her lover⁵⁵ and being thoroughly vicious with the slave who is dressing her hair (487–93), itself another *topos*.⁵⁶ The time and attention lavished on her coiffure — a council (*consilium*, 497) is held to discuss it⁵⁷ — is contrasted with her lack of concern for her husband or the cost.

⁴⁸ Donatus says that Terence departs from usual practice in presenting on stage a mother-in-law who is a noble character (*ad Hecyram* 198 and 774).

⁴⁹ Σ: 'simulat aegritudinem socrus, ut habeat facultatem ad se filia ueniendi causa adulterii' ('the mother-in-law feigns illness, so that her daughter has an opportunity of visiting her for the purpose of adultery'); cf. Ov., *Am.* II.2.21 and Mart. XI.7.7, both of visits of a friend.

⁵⁰ I suggest that the following sequence of sections be adopted: *cinaedi* (Oxford fragment), eunuchs (366–78), Ogulnia (350–65), singers (379–97): the Ogulnia section introduces discussion of singers by its mention of public entertainments. Contrast the OCT, which has the sequence Ogulnia (350–65), *cinaedi* (Oxford fragment), eunuchs (366–78), singers (379–97); contrast too Martyn's text (J. R. C. Martyn, *D. IVNI IUVENALIS SATYRAE* (1987)), where the sequence is *cinaedi* (Oxford fragment), Ogulnia (350–65), eunuchs (366–78), singers (379–97). Martyn and I agree, however, in placing the Oxford fragment after 345 and on the excision of 346–8 (following Ribbeck and Clausen) as a doublet of O 30–2.

⁵¹ On this aspect of Dido, see Williams, *op. cit.* (n. 33), 23–4.

⁵² For cosmetics as a standard topic, cf. Ov., *Rem. Am.* 351–6, *Medic. Fac.*, Lucian, Ἐρωτες, 38–41.

⁵³ cf. Liv. xxxiv.1–8, Val. Max. ix.1.3, Tac., *Ann.* III.34, Orosius iv.20.14, Zonaras ix.17.1; G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani* (1912, repr. 1966), 254, P. Culham, 'The Lex Oppia', *Latomus* 41 (1982), 786–93 and idem, 'Again, what meaning lies in colour!', *ZPE* 64 (1986), 235–45.

⁵⁴ cf. Lucil. 534–5W, 'cum tecum es, quiduis satis est; uisuri alieni sint homines, spiram pallas redimicula promit' ('when she is with you, anything will do; should other men be coming to see her, she brings out her chin-ribbons, her mantles, her headbands').

⁵⁵ Indicated by the location, the temple of Isis (489); cf. *Sat.* 9.22–5, note *moechus* 25.

⁵⁶ cf. Mart. 2.66, Ov., *Am.* 1.14.16, *A.A.* 3.239.

⁵⁷ The language here recalls Domitian's *consilium* in *Satire* 4: *sententia*, 498, cf. 4.136; *censebunt*, 500, cf. *censes*, 4.130; 'tamquam famae discrimen agatur aut animae' (500–1), cf. 'tamquam . . .' 4.147–8.

(20) Lines 511–91, the superstitious woman. Even this section includes illicit liaisons. The priest of Cybele (*ingens semiuir*, 512–13) pardons the woman who has not abstained from (illicit) sex⁵⁸ during a particular holy period (535–41). Among the other agents of the supernatural consulted by the wife are the eastern diviner who promises her a lover or a rich man's legacy (548–9: with an invitation to think that the legacy is for services rendered?) and the astrologers whom she asks about her husband's death, about her mother, sister, uncle and — the climax to the list — about her lover (565–8). (21) The final section of the poem alleges adultery indirectly: the husband is cynically urged to give his wife the abortifacient she wants, because if she goes ahead with the pregnancy, he will not prove to be the father of her child (599–600); that the child is mentioned as the husband's heir (*heres*, 600–1) revives the earlier topic of the husband's will (218).

This detailed examination of the poem shows that the vast majority of topics are intrinsically relevant to the theme of adultery or are adapted to become so.⁵⁹ This suggests that there are very strong internal grounds for viewing *Satire* 6 as a dissuasion from marriage, a λόγος ἀποτρεπτικός γάμου, chiefly because of women's alleged infidelity.

IV

We turn now from the internal evidence of the poem itself to a consideration of the external evidence of rhetoric. The palpable influence of the rhetorical tradition upon Juvenal's poems together with Juvenal's probable identity with the *facundus Iuuenalis* mentioned by Martial⁶⁰ alone suggest that it is profitable to look in this direction. But it is possible to go much further. Cairns justifies his view (above, n. 8) that *Satire* 6 should be categorized as an example in poetry of a *progymnasma* on the basis that 'because they were childhood exercises, they [sc. *progymnasmata*] can be considered as the minimum formal rhetorical equipment of any literate person from the Hellenistic period on'.⁶¹ This is borne out by the ancient evidence: according to the treatise of 'Pseudo-Dionysius' (possibly third/fourth century A.D.), the subject of the desirability of marriage was set as an elementary exercise in θέσις writing more often than any other subject.⁶² Hence Juvenal's audience was in a position immediately to identify the poem as growing out of and indeed thoroughly engaged with the rhetorical tradition.

The ideological nexus surrounding marriage and adultery in the rhetorical texts may be gauged from a broad evidential base. The titles and themes of the speeches preserved by the Elder Seneca in his *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* show that wives and adultery were standard topics of declamation.⁶³ Valerius Maximus devotes a section of his handbook of *exempla* for orators to *pudicitia* (6.1). Material in the early books of Livy falls into a similar exemplary category, in particular the stories of Lucretia (1.57–9) and Verginia (III.44–9), despite their marked political slant.⁶⁴ Later, among the *Minor Declamations* attributed to Quintilian is one

⁵⁸ The expression 'uiolato . . . cadurco' (the sex act has 'profaned the coverlet' 537) seems to imply adultery.

⁵⁹ Only a few topics in the poem are not explicitly linked with adultery: the beautiful wife so expert at spending her husband's money (142–60); the proud wife (161–83, though 'intactor omni . . . Sabina' 163–4 introduces the theme of chastity: the Sabine women were examples of *pudicitia*, cf. Juv. 10.297–9); the woman who uses lewd speech (184–99); women who enter the law-courts (242–5, unless the charge on which women are defendants in court is adultery).

⁶⁰ R. Syme, *Roman Papers* III (ed. A. R. Birley, 1984), 1134.

⁶¹ Cairns, op. cit. (n. 8), 75; cf. D. L. Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (1957), 177ff. and D. A. Russell, 'Rhetors at the wedding', *PCPhS* n.s. 25 (1979), 106 on *progymnasmata*; the latter discusses the epithalamium specifically.

⁶² [Dion. Hal.] *Ars* 261 (translated in D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson (eds), *Menander Rhetor* (1981), Appendix 362–81); cf. Russell and Wilson *ad Men. Rhet.* 400.32ff. for some other references.

⁶³ e.g. the title of Sen., *Contr.* 6.6; *adultera uenefica* ('the adulteress who was a poisoner'); in *Suas.* 2.21 a *controversia* is mentioned 'about the woman who argued before matrons that children should not be reared and is therefore accused of harming the state'; the outline of *Contr.* 2.7, 'A man with a beautiful wife went off abroad. A foreign trader moved into the woman's neighbourhood. He three times made her propositions of a sexual nature, offering sums of money. She said no. The trader died, leaving her all his wealth in his will, to which he added the clause: "I found her chaste." She took the bequest. The husband returned and accused her of adultery on suspicion.' See De Decker, op. cit. (n. 6), 23–9 for some detailed congruences between the *Controversiae* and *Satire* 6.

⁶⁴ On *pudicitia* in Valerius Maximus and Livy, see E. Fantham, 'Stuprum: public attitudes and penalties for sexual offences in Republican Rome', *Echos du Monde Classique* n.s. 10 (1991), 273–82. On Livy's political engagement, see Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 9), 212, Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32), 383, and on the value of Lucretia as an *exemplum*, see Richlin, op. cit. (n. 14), 68.

entitled 'the pregnant adulteress', *praegnans adultera* (277), again testifying to the concern with chastity. But of paramount importance is the evidence of Theon's *progymnasmata*⁶⁵ (second century A.D.) and of Quintilian in his *Institutio Oratoria* (only a couple of decades earlier than Juvenal). Aelius Theon cites as examples of a θέσις: οἶον εἰ γαμητέον, εἰ παιδοποιητέον, εἰ θεοὶ εἰσι, 'if one should marry, if one should have children, if there are gods' (12.242); he lists εἰ γαμητέον, 'if one should marry', as one of the practical (αἱ πρακτικαί) as opposed to theoretical (αἱ θεωρητικαί) types of θέσις (12.244) and later he distinguishes simple (ἄπλα) and compound (συνεξευγμέναι) types with the examples, 'Should one marry?' (εἰ γαμητέον) and 'Should a king marry?' (εἰ βασιλεὶ γαμητέον) respectively (12.253).⁶⁶ At *Institutio Oratoria* 11.4.24–5, Quintilian gives a list of the *theses* (general or abstract questions) which have affinities with or belong in the class of deliberative oratory, including whether town or country life is preferable, whether the lawyer or the soldier deserves the greatest praise, whether one should marry (*ducendane uxor?*) and whether one should seek political office. It is significant that all these topics receive attention from the writers of Roman satire, town and country most obviously in Horace, *Satires* 11.6 and Juvenal 3,⁶⁷ the lifestyle of the soldier and the lawyer at the opening of Horace *Satires* 1.1 (ll. 4–12),⁶⁸ political office in Horace, Persius, and Juvenal (e.g. Hor., *Sat.* 1.6 and 11.6, *Ep.* 1.7, Pers., *Sat.* 4, Juv. 10.56–113), and marriage in Juvenal's sixth satire.

Quintilian provides further illuminating evidence. At *Institutio Oratoria* 11.4.22 he lists as his first example of 'commonplaces' (*communes loci*) the practice of denouncing the vice of adultery, again showing the prominent concern with marriage and infidelity. And at 11.5.8 he distinguishes indefinite from definite questions with the example, 'Should a man marry?', *an uxor ducenda?*, and 'Should Cato marry?', *an Catoni ducenda?* This language is reflected in *Satire* 6 most closely at 201–2 where the words *ducendi nulla uidetur causa* ('there seems to be no reason for marrying') betray the rhetorical thesis which forms the backbone of the poem. Furthermore, *Satire* 6 is evidently presented as a persuasion by the speaker to his addressee Postumus and in that respect its thesis resembles the definite type of question, 'Should Postumus marry?', *an Postumo ducenda?* On the basis of the prominence and treatment of the themes of marriage and adultery in the rhetorical tradition, then, the poem gains coherence when viewed as a variation on a standard theme of rhetoric.⁶⁹

It may be possible to go still further and on the basis of a comparison between *Satire* 6, especially its opening, and Menander Rhetor's treatise *περὶ ἐπιθαλαμίου* to suggest that *Satire* 6 presents an adaptation or inversion of the epithalamium.⁷⁰ Menander Rhetor recommends that when delivering an epithalamium the orator's first proposition should be that marriage is a good thing, ὅτι καλὸν ὁ γάμος (401.1); clearly the precise inverse of this statement might serve as a title to *Satire* 6. Menander then recommends (401) that the orator begin at the beginning of time, with the creation of Marriage immediately after Chaos, and move on to mention Zeus and Prometheus and then link marriage with the marks of civilization — sailing, farming, philosophy, law, and government. Then the orator should proceed to deliver an encomium on those marrying, praising the bride and bridegroom for their origins, talents, and beauty (403–4). Then, in the prescription for the *κατευναστικὸς*, 'the bedroom speech', delivered as an encouragement to enter the marriage chamber, Menander urges the orator to utter a prayer that the bride and her husband produce children which resemble them (407).

Juvenal adapts these points, and in the same sequence. For the god of Marriage, he substitutes the goddess Pudicitia (l. 1), picturing Pudicitia on earth in earliest times (the Saturnian Age), 'when earth was young and sky was new' ('orbe nouo caeloque recenti', 11). He alludes to the story of Prometheus (who produced 'men formed of mud', 'compositiue luto' 13)

⁶⁵ On the *progymnasmata* of Theon, see Russell and Wilson, op. cit. (n. 62), xxv–xxvii.

⁶⁶ cf. Sulpicius Victor, *Inst. Or.* 3, Hermogenes, *Prog.* 11; and Aphthonius (late fourth/early fifth century), *Prog.* 13 who discusses the desirability of marriage as a theme for rhetoric.

⁶⁷ For other, shorter, passages on the theme of town and country in Roman satire, see S. H. Braund, 'City and country in Roman satire', in S. H. Braund (ed.), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome* (1989), 43–7.

⁶⁸ One might surmise that the theme of Juvenal's incomplete sixteenth satire was similarly a comparison of

the soldier's life with the lawyer's life.

⁶⁹ Similarly Cairns, op. cit. (n. 8), 38–49 categorizes *Satire* 3 as an 'inverse' syntaktikon (the farewell of a departing traveller); within this framework the poem delivers a dissuasion from city life, cf. Braund, op. cit. (n. 67), 23–8.

⁷⁰ For the use of Menander Rhetor to illuminate the genres of rhetoric at earlier periods, see Cairns, op. cit. (n. 8), 34–75, cf. I. M. LeM. DuQuesnay, 'Vergil's First Eclogue', in F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar III* (1981), 53ff.

and mentions Jupiter, not in praise of his unions with women and nymphs, as Menander suggests, but to suggest that Pudicitia remained on earth only until Jupiter began to enjoy a sex life of illicit liaisons (15–16). Instead of seeing Marriage as a causal force in civilization, he views adultery (which presupposes the existence of marriage) as the earliest of the many crimes humans commit (21–4, e.g. *anticum*). Juvenal goes on to invert the requirements of the epithalamium by heaping criticism instead of praise on the wife and husband, paying more attention to the wife, as an orator would do in an epithalamium.

Reference to Menander in fact helps account for the two paragraphs early in the poem which seem to offer equal criticism of both husband and wife, namely ll. 136–41 and 142–60. Moreover, the women in these two sections might on the face of it seem to be ideal wives, in Menander's terms, the first being rich and the second beautiful. Juvenal explodes the myth by revealing the sordid 'truth'. From the bedroom speech Juvenal borrows the motif of the prayer that a man's children should resemble him — not only in character but in looks, to offer proof of paternity.⁷¹ This point appears early in the poem (76–81) and again towards the end (592–609), but in inverted form, as he imagines obviously spurious children being presented to the addressee.⁷² Finally, we might note that Menander urges the use of mythological examples (408.30–409.8). Juvenal inverts this too, offering not the positive examples suggested by Menander but images of mythological wives with negative associations, particularly at the close of the poem: Medea and Procne (643–4), the Danaids, Eriphyle, and Clytemnestra (655–6). This analysis suggests that Juvenal was familiar with the standard sequence of topics prescribed for the occasion of the *epithalamium* and adapts or inverts them for his satiric purposes. Members of his audience would have been alive to this adaptation of the rhetorical training in which many of them had shared.

To trace the interrelationship of Juvenal's poem with rhetoric is not to reduce *Satire* 6 to the status of a game of 'recognize the topos'. An understanding of the treatment of marriage in rhetoric informs the treatment of marriage in poetry and vice versa, with no subordination of one to the other. Nor is there any suggestion that the rhetoric or poetry inhabit a plane inferior to social 'reality'. Both, like other forms of discourse, are engaged in the construction of images of 'reality'.⁷³ These images are of course ideologically loaded in order to fulfil their persuasive purposes and they thus articulate certain desires and anxieties. Rhetoric, like poetry, not only reflects the concerns of the élite but itself becomes an intrinsic constituent of the experience of the Roman intelligentsia. All these forms of discourse, poetry, rhetoric, philosophy, and legislation, are channels through which views of Roman morality are constituted, rehearsed, reinforced, and transmitted.

The same interrelationship holds good for other forms of discourse on wives and marriage, including the epitaphs which contain encomia of wives by their husbands, of which a classic example is the so-called *Laudatio Turiae*.⁷⁴ and the writings by philosophers such as Aristotle, Theophrastus, Epicurus, Seneca, and Plutarch.⁷⁵ An issue of particular interest was whether it was a good thing or not for a philosopher to marry, εἰ ἐμπόδιον τῷ φιλοσοφεῖν γάμος, raised, for example, by Musonius Rufus (p. 74.15), which seems to be a limited application of the indefinite rhetorical *thesis*, 'Should a man marry?', in Quintilian and similar

⁷¹ cf. Hesiod, *WD* 235 with M. L. West, *Hesiod. Works and Days* (1978), ad loc.; Cat. 61.221–5, Hor., *Od.* IV.5.23, Mar. VI.27.3–4, Chariton II.11.2, and in epitaphs *EG* 243b and *CE* 387.8–11 cited by Lattimore, op. cit. (n. 22), 276–7; contrast Mart. VI.39 'in grabatis tegetibusque concepti materna produnt capitibus suis furta' ('creatures conceived on truckle-beds and mats betray by their features their mother's adulteries', ll. 4–5). A fragment of Seneca praises the *pudica* as not spoiling her ancestors' blood by clandestine offspring, Jerome *adv. Iovin.* 1.49).

⁷² The inversion is most obvious at 597–8 where the husband is urged to administer an abortion-inducing drug to his wife, to prevent him from being presented with a child who does not resemble him.

⁷³ See in general P. L. Berger and T. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality* (1967) and on Roman antiquity M. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality 3 The Care of the Self* (trans. R. Hurley, 1988) and P. Veyne 'The Roman Empire', in P. Aries and G. Duby (eds), *A History of Private Life* 1 (trans. A. Goldhammer, 1987), 5–234.

⁷⁴ cf. also Lattimore, op. cit. (n. 22), 295–7; Libanius, *Decl.* 26.9 (6 p. 516 Foerster) on the praises of a prospective wife. Note Juvenal's reference here (6.230) to funerary monuments, 'titulo res digna sepulchri' ('a feat which should be carved on her tombstone').

⁷⁵ Important material is preserved through the copious quotations and references in Jerome's treatise *Adversus Iovinianum* 1.41–9; see Schuetze, op. cit. (n. 10), 35–44, also Epicurus fr. 19 Usener. Foucault, op. cit. (n. 73), 145ff., for the pronouncements on marriage of the philosophical schools. Seneca's *De Matrimonio* presumably supported marriage; its themes and arguments were probably inverted by Juvenal in *Satire* 6 (on his likely acquaintance with other works of Seneca e.g. *De Ira*, see Anderson, op. cit. (n. 1), 293–361, esp. 315, 341). Many points in the γαμικά παραγγέλματα addressed to the bride and groom by Plutarch (*Moralia* 138a–146a) appear in Juvenal's poem in inverted form, as allegations against women.

to Theon's enquiry, 'Should a king marry?', both noted above. Whereas Musonius supported marriage, Theophrastus, in contrast, attacked it as unsuitable for a philosopher. Accordingly, there are a number of parallels between Juvenal and Theophrastus (as reported by Jerome).⁷⁶ Whether Juvenal knew the work of Theophrastus directly or indirectly is immaterial; he is clearly using some elements from the philosophical tradition to bolster his argument against marriage. The evidence runs counter to Courtney's conclusion that 'the attempt to study Juvenal's poem in the light of a literary tradition is unprofitable';⁷⁷ on the contrary, Juvenal appears to be thoroughly immersed in all forms of contemporary discourse on the theme of marriage.

The legislation about marriage and adultery constitutes another element in the ideological nexus. The condemnation of adultery in *Satire* 6 reproduces a concern which can be traced (or projected) back to the beginning of the Republic in the law on adultery allegedly instituted by Romulus⁷⁸ and situated in the second century B.C. in the stern declaration about the husband's right to kill his wife attributed to Cato by Gellius and thus evidently in currency in Juvenal's time.⁷⁹ The vision and condemnation of ubiquitous adultery in contemporary Rome strikes the tone of an old-fashioned Catonian moralist.⁸⁰

We can go further. The reference to the Augustan legislation early in the poem (38)⁸¹ evokes the problematics of the unprecedented intervention of the state into private morality underlined by Edwards.⁸² Since traditionally a woman's conduct within the home was a matter for her family, in particular her father and her husband,⁸³ the legislation may reflect a situation in which private morality was deemed insufficiently self-regulating; whether or not this was so, the laws represented the emperor's exertion of power over the private lives of individuals. The provisions of the legislation include two areas of particular relevance to *Satire* 6. Firstly, it incorporates the predictable double standard for women and for men⁸⁴ which is articulated at the opening of the poem where the most notorious of adulterers is depicted seeking a pure woman whom he can marry (38–46). Secondly, it reflects the horror of alliances between women of the élite and men of lower status which recurs throughout the poem.⁸⁵ In this respect this and other legislation reveals a concern during the early Principate to maintain or strengthen the distinctions of the existing social stratification.⁸⁶ The motives were economic as well as socio-political. As Wallace-Hadrill argues, one of the functions of marriage, at least among the wealthy classes, was 'to act as a vehicle for the transmission of property from generation to generation';⁸⁷ this helps explain Augustus' encouragement of the family through legislation which imposed penalties upon the unmarried and childless.⁸⁸ These ideas seem to correspond closely with the emphasis which emerges from a study of *Satire* 6 upon the proper conduct and function of marriage, namely, the husband's control over the wife, with the purpose of providing genuine heirs.

Similar concerns may have motivated Domitian's re-enforcement of Augustus' legislation on marriage and adultery, reported for example by Martial in a cluster of poems at the opening

⁷⁶ Conveniently listed by Courtney, op. cit. (n. 1), 261; cf. J. van Wageningen, 'Seneca et Iuvenalis', *Mnemosyne* 45 (1917), 417–29.

⁷⁷ Courtney, op. cit. (n. 1), 252.

⁷⁸ Dion. Hal. II. 25.6, Plut., *Rom.* 22.3.

⁷⁹ Gellius X. 23.4–5.

⁸⁰ cf. Juv. 2.40, 'tertius e caelo cecidit Cato', 'a third Cato has dropped from the sky'; 3.314 where Umbricius speaks wistfully of the days when Rome experienced so little crime that it was 'satisfied with a single prison' ('uno contentam carcere'); 5.108–12 where the speaker longs for the ordinary courtesy of patron–client relationships which (allegedly) pertained in the days of Seneca, Piso, and Cotta. On the old morality presented here see n. 112 below.

⁸¹ Lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis (18 B.C.) and Lex Papia Poppaea (A.D. 9). For full discussion see Gardner, op. cit. (n. 38), 127–31, Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 9), 277–98 and Edwards (see n. 82).

⁸² C. Edwards in ch. 1 of her forthcoming book, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge), discusses the Augustan legislation, in particular its function as symbolic discourse and its ambivalence. I am most grateful to Catharine Edwards for making her

manuscript available to me. Cf. also Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32), 381 and now Fantham, op. cit. (n. 64), 267–91, an examination of attitudes to adultery.

⁸³ On *patria potestas*, see Gardner, op. cit. (n. 38), 5–11 and on marriage *cum manu* and *sine manu*, see A. Watson, *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic* (1967), 10–27 and Gardner, 11–14.

⁸⁴ Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 9), 299–309; cf. Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (trans. H. M. Parshley, 1988), 221–2.

⁸⁵ cf. n. 34 above. Cf. Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32), 385 on the extra opprobrium in such cases.

⁸⁶ B. Levick, 'The *Senatus Consultum* from Larinum', *JRS* 73 (1983), 114 connects legislation on marriage and adultery with that on public performance and *infamia*, perceiving 'a nexus of measures in the early Principate to . . . strengthen the existing social structure and keep its strata distinct . . . and to demonstrate acceptable canons of behaviour'.

⁸⁷ A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Family and inheritance in the Augustan marriage-laws', *PCPhS* n.s. 27 (1981), 59; cf. P. Veyne, 'La famille et l'amour à Rome', *Annales* 33 (1978), 39–40.

⁸⁸ cf. Gardner, op. cit. (n. 38), 77–8.

of his sixth book of epigrams.⁸⁹ But Domitian had a reputation for committing adultery among other outrages (e.g. Suet., *Dom.* 1.3) and is memorably characterized by Juvenal as 'an adulterer stained by a union worthy of the tragic stage' ('tragico pollutus adulter concubitu', 2.29–30). Given this and other attacks by Juvenal upon Domitian, primarily in the second and fourth *Satires*, it seems at least plausible that Juvenal's evocation of the legislation against adultery in a setting in which adultery evidently abounds may be targeted at Domitian's hypocrisy and Martial's adulation of Domitian. The evidence of coins with the legend PVDICITIA minted early in Hadrian's reign⁹⁰ suggests that *pudicitia* was a live issue at the time when Juvenal was writing.⁹¹ Since it was common practice for an emperor to advertise his (positive) self-definition through denigration of a predecessor who could be charged with the opposite,⁹² it seems likely that Juvenal in *Satire* 6 both reflects and in turn helps to shape current ideology with his direct and indirect attacks upon Domitian.⁹³ The prominence of Puditicia in *Satire* 6 and the evocation of the Augustan/Domitianic legislation coheres with contemporary concerns. At the same time, the poem borrows from and contributes to the debate in rhetorical and philosophical discourse about marriage.

V

So far I have attempted to show that *Satire* 6 is a satirical reworking of a standard rhetorical set-piece on the theme of whether or not a man should marry, into which Juvenal has incorporated both stock rhetorical models and themes of the encomiastic and philosophical traditions, which reflect Roman concerns with the purpose and management of marriage. I now wish to consider the contribution made by the poem to that debate by means of an examination of the character of the speaker and his interrelationship with his addressee and with the audience, and thereby return to the issue of misogyny in the poem.

The basic preliminary is that 'the speaker' is a creation of the author Juvenal and not a mouthpiece for his own personal crusade against Roman wives. The concept of the *persona* is invoked in scholarship on satire, essentially a dramatic form, where in studies of narrative the implied author and implied audience are key concepts.⁹⁴ Again, reference to the exercises in declamation which members of the Roman élite experienced is helpful. The orator was trained to be able to adopt different masks or moods according to the needs of the occasion, ranging from indignation to pathos.⁹⁵ It is not, then, surprising to find that the Roman satirists, like Roman orators, were capable of creating a variety of characters. The variety of *personae* available is manifested particularly in the satirical works of Horace and Juvenal.⁹⁶

Juvenal has created a character who is evidently an extreme misogynist. The extremity of this character is indicated by his own explicit statements and by other elements of self-revelation, including his exaggerated claims and his angry vocabulary and tone of voice. More oblique indications reside in his expression of male fantasies and anxieties in the poem.

⁸⁹ See Mart. 6.2, 6.4, 'censor maxime . . . plus debet tibi Roma, quod pudica est' ('greatest of censors . . . yet more Rome owes you in that she is chaste'), 6.7.

⁹⁰ See *BMCRE* p. 355, nos 911, 912, 913, p. 537 nos 1877 and 1878, p. 540, no. 1899.

⁹¹ R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 500, convincingly argues that Juvenal's poems were written during the years A.D. 115–130 and later reiterates, *op. cit.* (n. 60), 1125 n. 37, that 'there are no valid reasons for supposing that Juvenal had published anything before 117'.

⁹² See E. S. Ramage, 'Juvenal and the establishment: denigration of predecessors in the *Satires*', in *ANRW* II.33.1 (1989), 640–707. For the role played by satire in articulating paradigmatic imperial ideology, see S. H. Braund, 'Paradigms of power: Roman emperors in Roman satire', in K. Cameron (ed.), *Humour and History* (forthcoming).

⁹³ On the Hadrianic context behind criticism of Domitian in *Satire* 7, see A. Hardie, 'Juvenal and the condition of letters: the Seventh Satire', in F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar VI*

(1990), esp. 179–90. Hardie in an unpublished paper which he has generously shown me mounts a similar argument for a Hadrianic back-drop to *Satire* 3; if he is right, this has important implications for *Satire* 6, given that *Satire* 3 is of earlier or contemporary date; cf. Syme, *op. cit.* (n. 91).

⁹⁴ On *persona* theory Anderson's work is central, *op. cit.* (n. 1), esp. 3–10; for an excellent restatement of this approach, see the forthcoming study of Horace by K. Freudenberg (Princeton). On narrative, see J. J. Winkler, *Auctor and Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (1985).

⁹⁵ The range of tones available are set out in for example *Rhet. ad. Herem.* III.23–7 and the technique of character delineation (*notatio*) and appropriate dialogue (*sermo-inatio*) at IV.63–5.

⁹⁶ See Braund, *op. cit.* (n. 5), 197–8. In the case of Juvenal, there is a broad homogeneity within Books I and II (i.e. *Satires* 1–6), where the *persona* is essentially an indignant character, while the later books develop an increasingly ironic, detached and cynical *persona*.

A very important statement which the speaker makes relatively early in the poem is that he cannot stand even the perfect woman (162–83). Crucial is the following passage:

sit formonsa, decens, diues, fecunda, uetustos
porticibus disponat auos intactior omni
crinibus effusis bellum dirimente Sabina,
rara auis in terris nigroque simillima cycno:
quis feret uxorem cui constant omnia? (162–6)

Suppose she is beautiful, graceful, wealthy, fertile, and also has ancient ancestors dotting her hallway; suppose she is purer than any Sabine with streaming hair who stopped a war — a rare bird, as strange to the earth as a black swan; who could endure a wife who was such a paragon?

This explicit statement is crucial for our understanding of the character of the speaker. His objection indicates that he will never be satisfied. Even in a paragon he can find a fault, if nothing else, pride:

malo,
malo Venustinam quam te, Cornelia, mater
Gracchorum, si cum magnis uirtutibus adfers
grande supercilium et numeras in dote triumphos. (166–9)

Better,
better, I say, a common slut than you, Cornelia,
mother of the Gracchi, if you combine with your massive virtues
a disdainful expression, and count your triumphs as part of your dowry.

The example is chosen to suggest (but not assert) that the perfect woman is unbearably proud.⁹⁷ In this way Juvenal makes the speaker reveal himself as biased. Coming so early in the poem, this statement provides an important orientation: this speaker is a misogynist.

This passage also contains an important linguistic sign of the speaker's character: his intolerance ('quis feret ...?', 'who could endure ...?', 166). This feature reappears significantly in the finale to the poem, at 651, 'illam ego non tulerim ...' ('I cannot abide the woman ...'). The many signs of rage in *Satire* 6 contribute to the same impression, as Anderson has demonstrated with reference to Book 1 of the *Satires*.⁹⁸ For example, the speaker's first direct address to Postumus (21–37) is marked by an outburst of amazed questions, which are often a mark of *indignatio* ('... dedisti?' 'have you given ...?', 27; '... ducis?' 'are you taking ...?', 28; and 'ferre potes ...?' 'can you endure ...?', 30–2) and by vocabulary which belongs to the language of *indignatio*; this continues through the entire poem.

As well as the linguistic signs of anger, the massive, epic, scale of the poem⁹⁹ and its apparent lack of structure, an effect achieved by asyndeton and the sudden shift of topic from section to section, contribute to the characterization of the speaker as a single-minded obsessive. For example, at 184–99 he appears to announce a series of minor faults in women which irritate their husbands ('quaedam parua quidem, sed non toleranda maritis', 184), yet only one fault is elaborated. Again, at 474–5 he appears to promise a description of the typical pattern of a woman's day with the words, 'it is worth the trouble to study in detail what such women do to put in the day' ('est pretium curae penitus cognoscere toto quid faciant agentque die'), but gets no further than the woman's vicious punishment of the household slaves in the morning: the cruelty theme apparently distracts him from his avowed programme.¹⁰⁰ These broken promises are not signs of Juvenal's flawed composition but elements in the characterization of the speaker. Someone calm and collected and rational — a philosopher

⁹⁷ 'If' implies where 'since' would assert; evidently the speaker does not dare utter such an assertion (cf. Courtney, op. cit. (n. 1), ad 6.166); nevertheless the condition is tacked on at the end so that in Tacitean mode it reverberates longest. *quotiens* 'whenever' at 180 is similar; cf. Wiesen, op. cit. (n. 5), 726.

⁹⁸ Anderson, op. cit. (n. 1), 278–84: angry rhetorical questions and the theme of 'enduring' are two classic marks of *indignatio*.

⁹⁹ *Satire* 6 is by far the longest satire in extant Roman verse satire: it is nearly 700 lines long (661 + 34 lines in the Oxford fragment) and occupies the whole of Juvenal's second book on its own.

¹⁰⁰ Juvenal uses the same technique of the broken programme at *Sat.* 1.127, conspicuously *not* followed by an account of the daily round.

expounding his system of beliefs, for example — would be able to make such a statement and then fulfil it; but this angry, raging, fuming misogynist is much more likely to be distracted from his avowed intent.

Hyperbole is another characteristic of the obsessive misogynist. For example, in his dissuasion from marriage the speaker frequently rages against domineering wives, thereby suppressing the frequent situation of Roman brides on their first marriage, when they were often very young — marriage was permitted from the age of twelve for girls¹⁰¹ — and left the paternal home and moved into the husband's home. On both counts, this must have rendered the young bride very much a stranger and potentially very isolated. The domineering wife is, in part at least, a fiction mustered as an element of the speaker's 'proof'. His hyperbole is not reliable *reportage* but one of his strategies of persuasion.

The reliability of his description of the women-only Bona Dea rites is also flawed. This episode is evidently to be read as the product of a misogynist's lurid imagination in its blend of women's thrilling and threatening behaviour. Adopting a moralizing stance to condemn the product of his own fantasy, the speaker regrets that old Roman rites (*ritus ueteres*, 335; the emphasis on antiquity sounds Catonian), and especially public rites (*publica ... sacra*, 335–6), are not free from such corruption, and finishes the section with a then–now contrast between the old days when respect for religion existed and now when a Clodius can be found at every altar violating the rites (342–5), a generalization from the infamous incident of 62 B.C. when Clodius infiltrated the Bona Dea rites in Caesar's house.

Juvenal, it seems, presents to us a character who delivers an indignant dissuasion from marriage, a poetic treatment of a rhetorical *θέσις*, in which he appropriates traditional Roman morality in order to condemn contemporary women. How persuasive is he? Some weaknesses in his presentation have already been indicated: his hyperbole, his unreliability, his incoherent rage, his universalization of female faults. The finale to the poem (627–61) displays most fully Juvenal's undercutting of his misogynist. Solely on the linguistic level, this passage exhibits a dense concentration of the characteristics of rage which in such abundance emphasize the dominance of passion over reason.¹⁰² The speaker's inconsistency reinforces this impression. He makes sweeping claims about women poisoning their stepchildren (627–33) and by way of proof adduces Pontia, who boasted of killing her own children. He then introduces Greek tragedy as an image of fictionality (634–7) to contrast with his contemporary allegations, but proceeds to use his citation of Pontia, a modern Medea/Procne figure, to guarantee the truth of the murderesses of tragedy. Then he uses the contrast between tragic and modern women to damn the latter still further for acting out of not passion (such as anger, *ira*, 647, *rabies*, 648) but greed (*conputat*, 651).¹⁰³ The inconsistency of his argument betrays a man desperately seeking to make a case. Worse still, his attack on women for being calm and calculating coheres ill with the bulk of his condemnation in which he typically attacks women for their lack of self-control, both physically and emotionally, particularly in the spheres of lust and anger. This contradiction is crystallized in ll. 649–52, where the epic-style simile¹⁰⁴ which likens women who are carried away by emotion to a falling rock (649–50) is followed by the condemnation of the woman who 'coolly commits a hideous crime' (*scelus ingens sana facit*, 651–2). Yet it is evident that the only person out of control here is the speaker himself. He proceeds, via an updated and inverted version of the mythological tale of Alcestis, to a hyperbolic climax reminiscent of the picture of life in Rome in Book 1 with his assertion that every day, everywhere, on every street, one meets modern equivalents of the women of mythology who allegedly murdered their husbands (655–6):

occurent multae tibi Belides atque Eriphylae
mane, Clytemestram nullus non uicus habebit.

Every morning you meet Eriphyles in dozens, and also
daughters of Danaus; every street has a Clytemnestra.

¹⁰¹ L. F. Raditsa, 'Augustan legislation concerning marriage, procreation, love affairs and adultery', *ANRW* II.13 (1980), 317; Gardner, *op. cit.* (n. 38), 38–41; Treggiari, *op. cit.* (n. 9), 398–403. For an example of the age gap, see Quint. *IO* 6 pr. 5.

¹⁰² Discussed in Braund, *op. cit.* (n. 5), 3–6.

¹⁰³ On the speaker's assertion that satire can replace tragedy because modern wives exceed the wicked wives of

tragedy in their cold-bloodedness, see J. C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (1974), 165 and W. S. Smith, 'Heroic models for the sordid present: Juvenal's view of tragedy', in *ANRW* II.33.1 (1989), 811–23.

¹⁰⁴ The simile has epic antecedents in Homer (Hector: *Iliad* XIII.136–46) and Virgil (Turnus: *Aen.* XII.684ff.); here, however, the movement does not come to a halt.

This hyperbole offends common sense.¹⁰⁵ To believe his picture of Rome — a Rome peopled by Clytemnestras and other husband-murderers of tragedy — would be akin to deriving a picture of life in contemporary Britain from satirical entertainments such as *Spitting Image*.

Moreover, the speaker's high moral stance is undercut by his apparent failure to persuade Postumus to refrain from marriage. This emerges from following the addressee's changing situation.¹⁰⁶ At the start of the poem, the addressee, the bachelor Postumus, is contemplating marriage and searching for a suitable wife. The speaker warns him against it, on the grounds that there is no chaste woman left, because adultery has been so rife for so long (thanks to playboys like Ursidius, *moechorum notissimus*, 42). As part of his argument, he presents two long, named examples of unchaste wives, Eppia and Messalina. Two puzzled questions about marriages which are apparently happy are then attributed to Postumus;¹⁰⁷ he has his illusions shattered. First: if all women are so dreadful, why does Caesennia's husband call her *optima* (136)? The answer (137–41) is, because she is very rich (her dowry of a million sesterces amounted to the senatorial census). The second question is: why is Sertorius blazing with passion for his wife Bibula (142)? The answer (143–60), because she is pretty. The speaker predicts that as soon as she loses her looks, she will be divorced. But until then, she has everything she wants. Then Postumus, having had two seemingly happy marriages explained on highly cynical and disillusioning grounds, is given a final, despairing question (161): does no woman then seem acceptable? The speaker's answer is negative (162–83), as we have seen above.

The speaker's failure to persuade Postumus is indicated by his marriage (marked by the description of the wedding-feast and presents, 200–5) and by the speaker's list of the torments that marriage will bring for Postumus if he is attached to his wife (*uxorius*, 206). These torments chart the multitudinous forms of humiliation that Postumus experiences as husband, culminating thus in the final section: his wife refuses to bear his children; she kills his children; she kills him. That is why the poem ends where it does: with the wife poisoning her husband or attacking him with an axe. That is what has happened or will happen to Postumus. So the poem has a loose storyline which provides an underlying structure,¹⁰⁸ charting Postumus' 'progress' from bachelorhood through marriage to death at the hands of his wife, a 'progress' which in a fine piece of ring-composition is portrayed as madness at its start (the self-inflicted madness in choosing to marry, marked by *caligantes . . . fenestras*, 31, 'vertiginous top-floor windows') and at its end (the madness induced by drugs administered by the wife, *animo caligo*, 613, 'darkness of mind'). This story confirms that the poem is not a broadside against women in general but a specific argument against marrying. It also indicates the failure of the speaker's rhetoric: instead of persuading Postumus to remain unmarried, he narrates his decline into marriage and his fall because of marriage.

VI

I have attempted to demonstrate that *Satire* 6 is best understood not as a general diatribe against women but as a dissuasion from marriage, a λόγος ἀποτροπεπτικός γάμου, informed by contemporary rhetoric and delivered by a misogynist. This misogynist is also a misogynist, a kind of Roman Alf Garnett, created for the audience's entertainment. The fun lies in his use of the ammunition of traditional Roman morality not to support but to subvert the morality encoded in the legislation on marriage. That is, whereas the prominence of Pudicitia and the

¹⁰⁵ On the failure to allow for hyperbole by those seeking to use satire as source material for Roman social history, see Braund, *op. cit.* (n. 67), esp. 1–2, 26 with nn. 6–8.

¹⁰⁶ The analogy proposed by O. Weinreich, *Römische Satiren* (1949), LXI–II and picked up by Coffey, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 246 n. 63 and Winkler, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 148 with the sequence of scenes on Trajan's Column is helpful, not only in drawing attention to the paratactic sequence but also in suggesting an underlying principle in the ordering of those scenes. In what follows, I adapt the theory suggested by W. S. Smith Jr., 'Husband vs. wife in Juvenal's sixth Satire', *CW* 73 (1980), 323–32.

¹⁰⁷ Ll. 133–5, a *praeteritio*, do not fit here and seem to belong between 626 and 627, where they pick up the mention of poison used to befuddle the husband and transfer the topic to step-children. See Highet, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 267: '133–5 are obviously misplaced and must follow 626'. Read *nimia* for *minimo*, with Martyn, *op. cit.* (n. 50).

¹⁰⁸ cf. on the structure of *Satire* 5, M. Morford, 'Juvenal's Fifth Satire', *AJP* 98 (1977), 219–45, esp. 233–7 and 245, in which the two menus follow the sequence of dishes at a *cena*; Smith, *op. cit.* (n. 106), 323–4 also draws this broad analogy, although the detailed comparison of common elements is not convincing.

past-present contrasts might have led us to expect the speaker to advocate marriage as part of a restoration of traditional morality, he confounds us by acknowledging the ubiquity of adultery and delivering a dissuasion from marriage. Yet this dissuasion is flawed by his personality and his evident failure to convince his addressee.

Does this then amount to an oblique exhortation to marriage by Juvenal? Nothing so positive or explicit. It is characteristic of satire to explore an issue in apparently black-and-white terms through an extremist character and to undercut that character without taking sides.¹⁰⁹ In this way the author of satire has it both ways. He uses his extremist character to deliver an invective against an individual or group of victims, be they women, foreigners, homosexuals, social climbers, or *nouveaux riches* — generally ‘out-groups’ or the powerful¹¹⁰ — and at the same time renders the extremist the victim of his own more subtle type of attack. Here in *Satire 6*, Juvenal’s speaker poses as a Catonian moralist but is reduced from his lofty position by the attack upon his hubristic hypocrisy.

University of Exeter

¹⁰⁹ Other examples of such characters include Damasippus in Horace, *Satires* 11.3, whose sudden fervent missionary zeal for Stoicism sits ill with his previous life-style; Catus in *Satires* 11.4 who inappropriately elevates gourmandise to the level of philosophy;

and Naevolus of Juvenal’s ninth *Satire* who complains angrily about his ex-patron but appears to have earned the bad treatment which he has received.

¹¹⁰ On the satire of out-groups, see Richlin, *op. cit.* (n. 14), 67.