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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation will present a new interpretation of Juvenal's third Satire. Few would argue that the time is not ripe for such an effort: two recent commentaries on Juvenal have provided close-up views of this work, but no assessment that embraces the several poetic systems within this large satire has yet appeared. Its size—322 densely packed Silver Age Latin hexameters—itsel presents a challenge to criticism but, to its author, may have represented an opportunity for the unfolding of genuine talent. This dissertation holds that Juvenal is a major poet in his language but that interpretation has not yet succeeded in demonstrating this for his third Satire.

The premise of Juvenal's quality as a poet requires a new departure in criticism of the third Satire. This writer believes, above all, that the text—in this case, Clausen's corrected Oxford text of 1966—can demonstrate Juvenal's artistry if appropriately set in its intellectual context. Very little of this text remains in doubt, so that Satire III has, for over two decades, stood ready for systematic interpretation.
The systems which I, in attempting this analysis of Juvenal’s poetry in III, shall apply are clearly founded in Roman satire and ancient rhetoric or are represented in some way in the work itself. No one, to my knowledge, has ever seriously argued that Juvenal was ignorant of rhetoric or of the Lucilian tradition in Roman satire. But it has been argued recently that Juvenal was unaware of persona criticism. Was he? Does a satire which employs the term persona in two theatrical contexts support such a theory or not? Surely it cannot—not in the flagship satire in an author’s first book. Exploration of the idea that Umbricius and the ego of Juvenal III are satiric personae with some dramatic qualities is thus indicated.

Chapter II below, where criticism involving these two personae is undertaken, also presents a poetic interpretation of the imagery in Satire III. Again, is this anachronistic? Hardly: importation of sense-imagery into prose fell under the rhetorical concept of enargeia, and it is difficult to conceive how this can be excluded from poetry, where it is much more at home than in prose.

The imagistic interpretation offered in this dissertation asserts that the tiny drama enacted between the ego and Umbricius depends on two insights connected with these personae. The ego is an instance of homo urbanus, with appropriately sophisticated attitudes towards folly and vice, his associates, religious observance, and the attractions of the
city, including periodic vacations from it and the aspiration to writing poetry. Umbricius is a shade, recently dead but unaware of this, who acts as vates and proceeds to initiate the ego into the mysteries of poetry. Naturally, the imagery of death and threats of death found throughout Satire III contributes to these inferences; the imagery of initiation is virtually confined to the ego's lines.

Not only must satiric personae exhibit this imagistic or sensory configuration, just as Horace's ego must seem to travel to Brundisium, but they require a moral dimension, too. Chapter II argues that Umbricius's moral virtue is pudor, or his sense of self-restraint and of public decency. The word-family in root pud- appears a handful of times in key passages in which this moral topic either serves as a preface to brief exempla of vice or is itself developed in an anecdote. The ego's apparent lack of such a well-defined virtue marks him as an ingénue and as the target of the strong impression to be made by the vates upon the initiate. The moral question put to the ego is an outgrowth of Umbricius's decision to leave Rome for good: are you truly ready to resist any temptation in my bill of complaint? will Rome spoil you morally and as a poet? It strikes me that the other Satires in Book I are the answers.

That such strong characterization can emerge at all from a text ostensibly devoted to the topic of the dilemma of the poor, honest native in the saeva urbs is a considerable
testament to Juvenal's poetic powers. But he goes much further than this, as the range of situations in the work suggests and, more importantly, the satiric characterization of the ego requires. The comic typing of this persona proceeds almost entirely from his own mouth and places him, along with every other pauper, poet or not, in the position of replying to taunts and jibes, derision and mockery. He is De Decker's (1913) viva vox of satire who is constantly imagined as answering questions and challenges throughout Umbricius's sermo.

From this it may be deduced that there is a structure of pauses while the ego puzzles over his answers. Chapter III explores the rhetorical background of the wit and humor leading up to these pauses. This discussion shows that Juvenal employed a fabella resembling that developed early by Lucilius and later used by Cicero in de Oratore II as his principal vehicle of situational wit and humor. Cicero was inclined to trust situational comic forms far more than verbal, and he explains why: the fabella, as anecdote, possesses sufficient dramatic properties to fit it to many settings, and it can expand towards perpetuae facetiae, or continuous mirth. The flexibility of the fabella helps to explain its wide use in formal oratory and informal conversation. From the latter it comes to satire, as several significant examples from Horace and Persius show, after passing through an early development in the fabula, of which Lucilius may have been aware.
An analysis of the res, or materiae, of Satire III in Chapters IV and V shows that the entire work can be marked into fabellae ranging from five to thirty lines long. The commentary on each fabella includes (1) identification of the parties to the wit or humor; (2) establishment of the occasion or situation; (3) identification of the butt of the wit or humor, who is also a party to it, even if absent; (4) identification of elaboration or details of the story line, with particular notice of the telling detail; and (5) demarcation of the punch line or comic narrative point. Interpretive comments linking these findings to the imagistic, dramatic, and other systems in the poem follow for each fabella.

The discovery of Juvenalian fabellae fosters new literary insights into Juvenal III. For instance, the tale of poor Cordus, evicted by a tenement fire, is shown to be a fable whose last lines are uttered by the opici mures. Similarly, the identity of the one who cautions the late-night diner in lines 268–277 emerges as that of a captator whom Umbricius impersonates. In such fabellae as these, Umbricius seeks to forewarn the listener, while in others he provides a means of defense against those who lack pudor. Broadly speaking, such cautions consist of detailed portrayals of vice and folly, and certain fabellae openly supply a thumbnail rhetoric on how to ridicule both human failings without loss of pudor.
The instructive and cautionary cast of Umbricius's fabellae take clear aim at the ego's poetic aspirations. The initiation of the ego into the mysteries of high poetry surprisingly metamorphoses into a bath in the laughter of satire. Like Horace and Persius before him, Juvenal derides achievement in "high" poetry as a way of clearing the ground for satire.

But the main risk in such a program is this: how does the satirist-vates insure himself of an audience? In part, Juvenal does this as his predecessors did it--by defining the audience of poetic satire. To a limited extent, Juvenal satisfies this requirement of the typical audience-defining satire by making Umbricius aim his remarks first at the ego and then at homo urbanus, aristocrat, knight, middling Roman, isolated and downtrodden pauper, and finally at those whose birth or nationality places them below even the poorest free-born Roman. Of all these, only those with an intact pudor will feel free to enjoy satire. Beyond this qualification, however, lies another: the sophistication to understand and interpret accurately the artistic endeavor that Juvenal proposes for the genre.
FOOTNOTES

INTRODUCTION

1 Ferguson 1979, 135-158; Courtney 1980, 151-194.

2 McCabe 1986, 80-82.
CHAPTER I

The Background of the New Interpretation of Juvenal III

Anyone who, having read and appreciated Juvenal's third Satire, looks to ancient and modern sources and interpretations finds a formidable array of works awaiting him or her. When one adds to this a search in ancient and modern literature on the theory of the comic as it touches on satire, the danger of becoming lost begins to be quite genuine. A final discouraging fact is that, while a virtual army of scholars has left its tracks on this soil, none has left behind guideposts to a synthesis of the humor of the work with its poetic, rhetorical, and dramatic systems. This Chapter offers such a guide to the literature on Juvenal III.

The key, as it seems to me, to seizing the opportunity offered by this considerable body of comment is selection. In the interest of the program set forth in the Introduction, materials not directly relevant to the views offered there have been relegated to the notes. For instance, many brief notices on the wit and humor in specific passages of Satire III are cited only in notes to Chapters IV and V, and the detailed findings of Romano¹ on irony and of other scholars on such satirical effects as mock epic, etc., have had to be
similarly abbreviated. Likewise, schemata resembling those of De Decker² and Hight³ are really only gross structures, though principled rhetorically. This dissertation seeks not so much another such scheme as it does a level at which the entire work can be read with appreciation of the interaction of all apparent systems, imagistic or quotidian, serious or comic, thematic or narrative or dramatic.

But also, in the interest of making this a readable account, I have been forced to sort the materials that discuss Juvenal III into groups and to treat them as notes or as views deserving a fuller account in the text. Materials from modern commentaries, as well as from the scholiast, are found in the fabella-by-fabella discussion in Chapters IV and V or in footnotes throughout this dissertation. The ancient sources on wit and humor in satire generally, and particularly in formal verse satire as Horace wanted it done, are the first to undergo examination in this Chapter. Then the larger, relevant modern interpretations and specialist studies are rendered under four headings: rhetoricist, literalist, literary impressionist, and persona-theorist.

The view of this Chapter is that Juvenal raised and reprogrammed, as it were, a good many of the same issues of wit and humor as Horace. The vehicle of these issues in Book I of Juvenal is Satire III. Only here do we find Juvenalian farrago cast as a sermo between friends and learn of the debasement of wit and humor at the hands of fools whom
Umbricius rather handily demolishes with his own brand of wit and humor. Here, too, is a highly organized rendition of daily urban life in the form of anecdotes and scenarios and fable, with dissimulation and impersonation, with narratives of anxious moments and almost obscene violence—all spoken between friends with the variety of tone which Horace proposed for the art of *sermo*:

\[
\text{est brevitate opus, ut currat sententia neu se}
\text{inpediat verbis lassas onerantibus auris,}
\text{et sermone opus est modo tristi, saepe iocosus,}
\text{defendente vicem modo rhetoris atque poetae,}
\text{interdum urbani, parcentis viribus atque}
\text{extenuantis eas consulto (Hor. S. I.10,9-14a).}
\]

_Brevitas_ does not refer directly to the final length of a given satire but to thought, or _sententia_: resist, Horace says, the temptation to expound on the sunrise when narrating the outcome of a long day's pleading in a closed courtroom. The thinning out or dilution (extenuantis) of the rhetorical and poetic powers results, for Horace, in the varied tones of actual conversation; the balance between _triste_ and _iocosum_ that the "witty yet civil" _urbanus_ exhibits depends on the curtailment of elaborate thinking or opinion (_sententia_), to keep the listener interested; the interchange of postures (defendente vicem) serves to limit tirade and the tiresome doubts which this last inevitably raises about character or ethos; in short, Horace indicates the literary effects such as good humor or seriousness, wit or tone, desirable in formal poetic satire.
Just as Horace was not a second Lucilius and rejected his style as too closely resembling Attic comedy (S. I.4.6-13), Juvenal appears to have been unwilling to replicate for a city and society a century older a Horatian scheme of how satire was to function. For example, we do not find Juvenal doing anything resembling the following:

\[\text{liberius si dixero quid, si forte iocosius, hoc mihi iuris cum venia dabis: insuevit pater optimus hoc me, 105 ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum qualeque notando.} \]
(Hor. S. I.4,103b-106)

Brief, traditional, and explicit moral *exempla* like those introduced by these lines from Horace are rare and hardly programmatic at all in *Satire III*, and in *Satire I*, Juvenal tells why the neighborhood is no longer the source of such examples it once was:

\[\text{qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita, vehatur pensilibus plumis atque illinc despiciat nos? 'cum veniet contra, digito compesce labellum: accusator erit qui verbum dixerit "hic est."'} \]
(Juv. I.158-161)

Juvenal clearly thought that to name the names of the vicious and criminal—or to write so such names could somehow be deciphered—was probably to invite death and certainly disrepute. But, just as in this passage from *Satire I* a disembodied voice of prudence cautions a satirist ready to scourge the city, so the personae of Juvenal III take up like issues in a similar style. In sum, Juvenal dramatized morality in some way.
This requires that a different stance in criticism of Satire III be adopted than has until now been manifest. This poem employs as the overall situation sermo itself—between the ego and Umbricius—so that judgment on whether or not Juvenal meets, or even acknowledges, Horace's prescriptions for sermo defendens vicem is based on inference from style rather than on deduction from explicit meaning. Juvenal does not expend nearly the effort to sustain a mode of conversation that Horace does, e.g., in the Damasippus Sermo (II.3). How, for instance, is the reader to know whether Umbricius is truly mocking a Quirinus, as in lines 67-68, or has adopted for the moment the style and tone of one whose aim it is to mock Quirinus? If Umbricius says, moreover, towards the end of his talk (lines 315-318a) that he could go on, but the day is ending and his driver is anxious to get on with the journey, it is, I believe, as much an allusion to Horace's parcentis viribus atque extenuantis eas as it is a bow to verisimilitude of situation. A number of programmatic utterances having to do with the desired effects of the genre of satire are made in this way in Satire III.

One other example must suffice to illustrate the need for a new critical approach. Umbricius defends his decision to leave Rome because that decision is based on pudor, or his sense of restraint and public decency. In the course of justifying his decision to leave, he reveals emotions ranging from indignation to politeness, but these always trace back
to his pudor. This is a facet of his personality which has perhaps been overshadowed in search for flaws in his charac- ter and has not yet, to my knowledge, been fully analyzed as Umbricius's moral virtue. But pudor restrains his attack on vice and his bitterness, and it summarizes the honesty which requires him to lay open his life to his friend. This sort of verisimilitude--that of character or ethos--endears him to his honest, middling Roman reader and permits the flow of wit and humor to proceed at a pace that never bores, as Horace requires.

But unrelenting focus on the serious moralistic and po- etic accomplishments--Umbricius's pudor and his status as a shade--threatens the implicit balance in satire of triste and iocosum. On the whole, however, Juvenal struck a balance be- tween the two effects, as irony and wit were the only way to deal with supplanters. Friedlaender remarks of Umbricius:

Der Gegenstand, die Schattenseiten des Lebens in Rom für den unbemittelten und zugleich ehrenhaften Mann, erfor- derten vor Allem lebhafe Schilderung, worin Juvenal seine Hauptstärke hatte, und die hier um so wirksamer ist, da Alles, was er dem Umbricius in den Mund legt, den Eindruck des Selberlebten und Selbstempfundenen macht. Nirgends is hier Phrase oder ein blos rheto- risches Pathos. Die Auffassung ist durchweg mehr humor- istisch als bitter.4

A significant portion of this study is therefore devoted to an understanding of how Juvenal managed "not to tire his lis- tener with words toiling like pack animals," as Horace color- fully puts the problem. To deny Umbricius's claim on pudor comes, I believe, to the same thing as denying Roman forti-
tude in the face of death or threats of death, signs of which virtue are to be found in death-bed or gallows humor. For Umbricius's strength in the course of his class's social and economic extinction translates, in the poem, into the fortitude to confront violent death without the loss of his poise or his sense of humor.

Roman resilience under circumstances ranging from the mortifying to the deadly can be plentifully illustrated from the joke types in Cicero's discourse on wit and humor, but one anecdote roughly contemporary with Juvenal will serve to show how natural his contemporaries thought gallows humor. Vespasian (Suet. Vesp. 23 fin.) as he lay dying said, Vae!... puto deus fio. The wit here lies in the twitting of those so credulous as to believe in an afterlife, which Juvenal treated in Satire II as a fairy-tale for infants (lines 149-152). Suetonius thought Vespasian's witticism derived from physical and mental fortitude (Vesp. 24), whereby he fought the illness that had left him bedridden; his last words were, "An emperor ought to die on his feet," and he expired as he tried to rise. Evidently, realistic Roman adults during the first century of the Empire regarded the myths of Hades and of the transmigration or deification of souls as fictions suitable to imaginative displays of poetry and even to joking with unlikely situational premises. Suetonius indicates how little danger or fear cowed Vespasian's sense of humor (Vesp. 23): Ac ne metu quidem ac periculo mortis extremo abstinuit iocis.
Perhaps the example of Vespasian is extreme, but if Umbricius saw extinction in disdainful faces and gestures or in every street, joking might remove the fear or anxiety and allow his natural strengths to shine through. His own sense of humor would balance the bleakness of his prospects.

Moreover, the lines above from Horace S. I.10 recommend that rhetoric as well as poetry be selectively consulted by the satirist when he was looking into the means of producing the emotions denoted by tristi and iocosus. On the iocosum, Juvenal could consult either Horace or Persius, who both recommend the spirit of comedy; Horace, however, specifically rejects writing which sounds like comedy (S. I.4,54-56a) and places serious poetry far from satires, which are sermoni propriora (S. I.4,39-44). Horace treats satire as a form of poetry distinct in character from the high passion of true poetry as well as from comedy, which he says is prose in meter and tantamount to sermo merus (S. I.4,45-48a). But he still reserves conversation as a source of materials in retaining it as one standard for evaluation of the poetry of satire. For in S. I.10 Horace adds, as we have noted, the qualification that the sermo be defendens vicem, and this governs satire's theoretical stance towards wit and humor.

There is, moreover, some evidence that defendens vicem need not be read only in the OLD's meaning of 'assuming the role of'. What factors determined the contour of satire as sermo defendens, since neither Horace nor Juvenal seriously
believed its sting had been drawn? Horace dramatically re-
stated his position in S. II.1, where he likens his satires
to a sheathed sword, to be unlimbered only if he himself was
attacked undeservedly:

\[
\text{at ille,} \\
\text{qui me conmorit—melius non tangeres, clamo—,} \\
\text{flebit et insignis tota cantabitur urbe.} \\
(\text{Hor. S. II.1,44b–46})
\]

The dramatization of the defensive stance and function of po-
etic satire—particularly as it touches on the matter of de-
rision—could not be clearer.\(^5\)

Horace, in these lines, and Juvenal, in Satire I, laid
claims upon the cultivated urban audience's sense of wit and
humor and on their readiness to acknowledge an injury upon
the citizen and to defend against it, whether inflicted on or
by a writer. The satirist in post-Lucilian Rome had to dis-
claim personal attack to obtain a fair hearing,\(^6\) and by Ju-
venal's time the Emperor's legislative and judicial powers
had reduced even the parlor game of guessing at intended tar-
gets to futility. The importance, then, of the satirist's
not disgracing himself was sharper for Juvenal than for his
predecessors,\(^7\) and it is not hard to imagine how carefully
Juvenal searched rhetorical theory and satirical practice for
predictable, time-honored, safe forms of joking, into which
he could insert alarming or disturbing new content.

Indeed, satirists in the Lucilian tradition were from
the first quite aware they were walking on eggs. Lucilius
was conscious of the effect of laughter on those who are the
butt of a joke:

facile deridemur; scimus capital esse irascier.  
(Lucil. 654 W=658 M)

And Persius is warned by his nameless interlocutor of much
the same result if he comes too close to the nerve:

'sed quid opus teneras nordaci radere vero
auriculas? vide sis ne maiorum tibi forte
limina frigescant: sonat hic de nare canina
littera.' per me equidem sint omnia protinus alba.
(Pers. I.107-110)

Horace's little talk with the lawyer Trebatius circles about
the same subject--the malum carmen--in S. II.1, and in the
end adopts a more theoretical note on suitable topics for wit
and humor in poetic satire:

'esto, siquis mala; sed bona siquis
iudice condiderit laudatus Caesare? siquis
opprobriis dignum latraverit, integer ipse?
'solventur risu tabulae, tu missus abibus.'
(Hor. S. II.1,83b-86)

The necessity under which the satirist labored, that is, to
keep himself clear of opprobrium while yet arousing laughter
at the object of his wit or humor, exactly--and, I think,
significantly--corresponds to Cicero's injunctions in this
regard upon the orator:

locus. . .et regio quasi ridiculi. . .turpitudine et de-
formitate quadam continetur; haec enim ridentur vel sola
vel maxime, quae notant et designant turpitudinem ali-
quam non turpiter. (Cic. de Or. II.58,236)

This general definition, which Cicero later tailors for the
orator,\(^8\) indicates that the fountainhead of the ridicule is
moral turpitude, while a minor spring is to found in physical
deformity. These passages are sufficient to show (a) that
Roman satirists in the Lucilian tradition were aware of a theory of the ridiculous which Cicero summarizes as mainly aimed at exposing moral turpitude to laughter, and (b) that the wit or humorist could achieve his effects only if he did not bring disgrace on himself.9

Horace's rejection of the extreme of comedy appears to be more than a metrical preference or a matter of tone: he also rejects an unrefined ridiculum. What is ridiculous by way of comic attack at a festival, where excesses are easily forgiven, may be obnoxious when it comes to treating of serious things. Discussion of the ridiculous in the ancient theorists inevitably comes to this question: to what extent may wit and humor be permitted to harm a fellow-citizen?

The Platonic formulation of this problem will not mislead anyone into thinking that the Roman satirists tried to avoid all malicious intent. Juvenal's selection of embarrassing topics in Book I precludes much direct influence from Plato or Aristotle. Instead, one looks to Cicero for usable theory. Lane Cooper asserted but did not prove10 that Cicero reconciled Plato and Aristotle on to geloion, but surely he meant that Cicero tied what Plato saw as the moral content of to geloion—kakon defined as ignorance of self without the power to harm—to the main thrust of Aristotle's effort, that is, to the classification of ethical behaviors into such humorous "characters" as the bomolochos. The earlier views of Plato virtually rule out laughter among Guardians as among
serious men; his later views assigned comedy and satirical verse to slaves and noncitizens and forbade satire of citizens if not ridicule of things.  

Aristotle is quite terse--almost forbiddingly so--on the use of jokes (ta geloia) in oratory (Rhet. 1419b3-9), but he relaxes somewhat on wit in the form of smart sayings (ta astéia) as an attribute of style, saying they derive from proportional metaphor or simile and possess an actuality, or energeia, which sets the point of the wit before the eyes (Rhet. 1411b22-31). Aristotle, in fact, comes close to developing a doctrine of plausibility in wit based on situation and character (Rhet. 1412b21-33). Cicero adapts his hints on plausibility in wit to Platonic moral ends and truncates Plato's moral definition of to geloion--by accepting harm to a citizen's cause in litigation through wit or humor--to accept numerous applications to serious situations in public life.

In reality, Cicero developed the critique of wit and humor much further than his philosophical predecessors. If he placed, for instance, Caesar Strabo's discourse in the Book of de Oratore (II) devoted to inventio, then probably he thought wit and humor just that--inventio, or means of finding arguments when other means fail, as he says. Cicero, the orator and rhetorician, was not burdened like Plato with the requirement that citizens be good in principle or deadly serious in every single public act or, like Aristotle, with the notion that distinctions among the effects of language
had to derive from ethical differences. Instead, Crassus's ability to make wit and humor run throughout a speech is praised and Caesar Strabo's *sermo* exemplifies what is lauded. Finally, Cicero's critique proves its flexibility when he applies, in *Off.* I.37,133-134, the rule of restraint in wit and humor to conversation and notes the power of Caesar Strabo's conversational style in court to defeat others' more elaborate oratorical efforts. Cicero's desire to imbue conversation with *lepos*, to prevent one's part in *sermo* from betraying a defect of character, and the like, illustrates how satire adopted materials from daily conversation.

The rhetorical focus of this study of Juvenal III will, as may be surmised from the foregoing remarks, center not on isolation of the effects which have given rhetoric a bad name but instead on identification of joking as a major effect of Roman satire. Detailed discussion on this subject will be restricted to wit and humor that arise out of situation; the *proprium* for use of wit and humor in the conversational style of *sermo* will be noted; finally, brief study of the problem of verisimilitude and plausibility and discussion in detail of the typical format of situational joking—the *fabella*—will help to clarify the humorous or witty effects which Juvenal brings to bear on his subject in *Satire III*.

The hypothesis adopted for examination below is that Juvenal used a pattern of *fabellae continuae* to structure the *sermo* between the *ego* and Umbricius. The principal example,
outside of satire, of the hilarious potential of continuous anecdotes is Cicero's account of Crassus's attack on the spendthrift Brutus (de Or. II.55,222-226).\textsuperscript{16} The ironical and broadly satirical cast of Crassus's perpetuae facetiae derives principally from the proprium for this sort of humor: situational joking, as opposed to merely verbal wit (de Or. II.60,243). Verbal wit could not readily expand without changing into situational humor or even lapsing from humor altogether (de Or. II.62,252 fin.-254).

Since the endurance, as it were, of verbal wit and humor is so slight, determination of the lengths of the fabellae in Juvenal III in Chapters IV and V is based on changes in the res, that is, in situation. This effort will de-emphasize such effects as mock epic or tirade in favor of putting this satire's structure on the sound footing of the topics it treats in the order designated by the poet. Hopefully, this will inject a note of probability into widely held views on the anecdotal cast and reminiscent aura of this satire.

Yet published criticisms of Juvenal's third Satire offer little in the way of a comprehensive literary understanding of its various systems. Until our perception of Juvenal as an artist improves, this work will continue to be the subject of specialist studies, e.g., of sententiae; irony, and like technical features which center on rhetoric; or our literal understanding of ostensible meaning will increase or decrease with the discovery and application of new historical and bio-
graphical data; or literary-critical impressionism, with its "feeling" for the whole derived from significant or "telling" passages, will continue to fluctuate between the polarities of modern value-judgments; or, finally, readers of Juvenal III may assess the ego and Umbricius by means of persona theory, the chief risk appearing to be that of hasty judgments, according to personal tastes, on a literary creation such as Umbricius. For convenience, I term these four approaches the rhetorician, literalist, impressionist, and persona theorist, respectively.

The first modern critic to focus at length on the rhetorical aspects of Juvenal's satire was Josué De Decker (1913). *Juvenalis Declamans*, still invaluable, is a study of the influence of the schools of declamation upon the satirist's invention, composition, and style. But *Satire III*, as Friedlaender remarks, seems unimpaired by declamation, and De Decker's counts of various declamatory devices confirms his predecessor's insight. The *loci communes*, for example, show few instances. An unbalanced compositional scheme, with its elaboration of exodium and peroration, is considerably more evident in other *Satires* than in III. In his analysis of Juvenal's composition, De Decker proposes a law of satire having to do with the *viva vox*. This concept defines an auditor who could or in some cases does respond to the chief speaker of a satire. The *viva vox* in *Satire III* is, since he can be understood to answer Umbricius in a hypothetical way,
the ego of lines 1-20.\textsuperscript{20}

De Decker sets apart from his hypothesis of declamatory influence on Juvenal his ability to dramatize with verisimilitude and compares it favorably to the melodramatic efforts of the salons.\textsuperscript{21} De Decker's examples from III show that in this work Juvenal avoided bombast, redundancy, and other abuses of the oratorical style, except perhaps in his tendency to create sententiae\textsuperscript{22} and his fondness for dramatizing with the rhetorical question.\textsuperscript{23} De Decker (1913, 139) rightly concludes that the notice in the Life implies Juvenal's revulsion to declamation:

\begin{quote}
   Pendant de longues années, Juvénal a vécu dans cette atmosphère où la colère et l'indignation étaient de règle, où les moindres méfaits prenaient les proportions d'un parricide, où l'on excitait artificiellement afin de prendre la plus possible au tragique des situations qui n'avaient rien de réel.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

While De Decker specifies these humorless proceedings, he leaves implicit the observation that satire was surely a curative. The study here undertaken will attempt to reveal the seriousness, or lack of it, with which the fantastic postures and implausible personations in III can be credited and, conversely, the humor that plays about subjects treated with close attention to verisimilitude.

Adamietz's study (1972) of Juvenal III deserves the rhetoricist label not because of any close affinity it possesses to the scheme of classical rhetoric--faith in which as a viable tool of modern criticism utterly collapsed with the pre-World-War-I culture that supported it--but because he devises
what amounts to a rhetoric of thought, comprised of similarities and opposition, having to do with themes of the work. Adamietz's main thrust is to establish a compositional structure by the study of antitheses of thought and their role in the content and boundaries of the scenarios for the poem.²⁵

Juvenal, Adamietz claims, followed a principle of compositional articulation that was based on antitheses such as poor vs. rich, success vs. failure, and country vs. city (the most important ones).²⁶ Juvenal articulated Satire III not merely by shifts from one underlying antithesis to another but by description of external appearances in terms of one leg of an antithesis, which in turn created the expectation in the reader that the other foot, so to speak, would inevitably fall.²⁷ It is reasonable to anticipate—and so it turns out—that Adamietz's method necessarily produces a segmented pattern of composition in lines 21-314, as opposed to the four-part architecture of an oration.²⁸ In his scheme, lines 1-20 and 315-322 assume controlling positions, the former introducing the ego's comment on Umbricius's decision to leave Rome and preparing the external circumstances of the meeting of the two at the Porta Capena, the latter tying off a possibly infinite enumeration of reasons for departure.²⁹

Table 1 below lists Adamietz's findings for lines 21-314 as deduced from his text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Section Title</th>
<th>Antitheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-29a</td>
<td>Honest livelihood impossible</td>
<td>success/failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29b-40</td>
<td>Dubious, lucrative livings</td>
<td>success/failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-57</td>
<td>Profitable immorality</td>
<td>success/failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-48</td>
<td>Umbricius's situation</td>
<td>success/failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-57</td>
<td>Successful rivals</td>
<td>success/failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-125</td>
<td>Livelihood of clients</td>
<td>Roman/foreigner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-136</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Roman/foreigner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor/rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137-189</td>
<td>Living on one's capabilities</td>
<td>poor/rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137-163</td>
<td>Effects of privation</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subsection</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147-153a</td>
<td>Subsection</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153b-163</td>
<td>Subsection</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164-189</td>
<td>Expensive lifestyles</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>danger/safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190-196</td>
<td>Collapse of buildings</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197-222</td>
<td>Danger of fire</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223-231</td>
<td>Preview of country life</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232-238</td>
<td>Peril of sleeplessness</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>insomnia/sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239-267</td>
<td>Dangers of traffic</td>
<td>poor/rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268-314</td>
<td>Dangers of the night</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268-277</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>poor/rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278-301</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>poor/rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302-314</td>
<td>Section and transition</td>
<td>city/country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aAdamietz 1972, 42–74.*
The neatness and concision of Adamietz's scheme cannot, however, conceal the fact that, if antithetical motifs are all there is to Juvenal III, it is hardly a poem. We might ask, with Adamietz's contemporary, the semiotist Lotman, if these redundant antitheses ('poor vs. rich' appears in eight separate segments) do not communicate a content too diffuse for poetry. Adamietz's antitheses are too isolated from other systems in the poem, such as that of the imagery which pronounces Umbricius a shade or the ego an initiate. This imagery tells the reader why it is a significant act of literary interpretation to look back at lines 1-20 from the standpoint of 315-322. But Adamietz's insistence on external appearances does have the merit of invalidating the extreme literalism of Hight's approach, which denies exaggeration to much that Umbricius says. This is particularly clear in Adamietz's judgment of the so-called tirade on the Greeks:

Es scheint freilich sehr fraglich, ob ein Pauschalurteil in dieser Schärfe der eigenen Position Juvenals entspricht und nicht vielmehr das Ethos des Umbr. bezeichnet werden soll.

A drawback of this insistence on external appearances is that of ignoring the distorted meanings of externals—distortions caused by wit and humor, a large component of which is irony. The study here undertaken will attempt to balance a segmented structure resembling Adamietz's on assessment of poetic systems in Juvenal III.

Alba Claudia Romano, in her study (1979) of irony in Juvenal, takes her point of departure from the discourse on wit
and humor in Cicero's *de Oratore*, but she turns with little discussion of the ancient sources to modern definitions of irony. From *de Or. II*.67,269, she offers this valuable conclusion: "Cicero enlarged the concept of irony, which from then on no longer meant only saying the contrary of what is meant but could also mean saying something different."\(^3\) No doubt this innovation freed the orator, especially if he chose to treat his materials more in the conversational than the contentious style,\(^4\) from the opprobrium of outright lying if not a charge of irrelevancy.\(^5\) What makes Romano's study fundamentally rhetoricist is her insistence on a strategy devised by the ironist and carried out with typically rhetorical devices.\(^6\)

Romano's stance on irony in *Satire III*\(^7\) offers not only the arguably useful umbrella concepts of intentional irony, including verbal irony\(^8\) and, provisionally, parody\(^9\) and burlesque\(^10\), and of unintentional irony, covering dramatic, situational, Romantic, and cosmic irony\(^11\); her stance also issues in the logical necessity of seeing in the ego of satire a detached persona with limited dramatic functions. This persona, however, she surrounds with Ehrenpreis's cautions,\(^12\) which condemn the automatic assumption that the satirist is, in a given case, employing a persona: besides irony, reasons for positing ironic literary personae include suspension of reasoning, remarks made with the intent of tricking a correspondent, and communication of ideas otherwise unacceptable to
the reader. These limitations prove useful in describing the ego of Satire III as an ironist with a satirical bent.43

It seems clear from the preceding that certain aspects of one specialized rhetorical study may aid in understanding another. If, for instance, De Decker sets off from declamatory influence Juvenal's ability to dramatize with verisimilitude, Romano's discovery of dramatic irony in Satire III may aid in specifying what passages De Decker had in mind. Similarly, Adamietz's segmented structure, in which the reader is urged on von Abschnitt zu Abschnitt, is surely valid in one sense: as a system, it corresponds closely to the outline of a day in the life of a client (external reality appears to impose the step-by-step approach), and this verisimilitude violates the expectation, established in lines 1-29a, of being about to hear a declamation. Still, one would have to say that the rhetorical critique of Juvenal III has not been incisive from the standpoint of finding out how the whole poem functions, or where and why it strikes us—and probably struck the ancient reader—as saturated with wit and humor.

With the essential difference in mind that Adamietz does not attempt to classify or organize narrative units of the ostensible meaning, like Hight and De Decker, but only repeated motifs of the res, we now turn to the subject of how critics have dealt with the wit and humor of Juvenal III. In general, such criticism has approached its subject on a much smaller scale than that of the entire satire; the preferred
working text ranges from a single word up to ten or so lines. This upper limit on the usual texts of comic criticism corresponds quite closely to the average length of the fabella in Satire III.

Juvenal is acknowledged a master of the vivid vignette by critics whose aim was appreciation and broad interpretation: Duff,44 Haight,45 Kernan,46 Mason,47 Coffey,48 Green,49 Knoche,50 and Anderson,51 either explicitly recognize the vignette or anecdote, or allude to one or more such as an implicit procedure in rendering narration. Even the work of Witke, which stands at the opposite, tragic pole from criticism of the comic effects in Juvenal III, converts the anecdote into a principle on which a structure of the work may be founded.52 Among critics of Juvenal's wit and humor, however, results have been surprisingly divergent in light of this general agreement on method.

Published studies of the wit and humor in Juvenal III have ordinarily been too brief to be systematic, or they have undertaken to prove that there is much (or something) that is funny, humorous, or surprisingly witty in this work. Dunn broadly challenged attribution of a uniform grimness to Juvenal--especially in Satire III--by arguing that actio was probably employed by the poet during recital to soften the bitterness into humor, so that modern readers can only arrive at Juvenal's humorous intentions by trying to think and react as if present in the poet's audience. In order to facilitate
this act of imagination, Dunn emphasizes three facets of humor in Juvenal III: (1) the "adventures and troubles and pastimes" which "appeal to one and all alike;" (2) the poet's ability to "bring an impassioned invective to a ridiculous anti-climax;" and (3) Juvenal's "skill in impersonation." More recently, Marache analyzed Juvenal's means of carrying out his ironical intentions via humor and rhetoric. These means, each instance of which Marache exemplifies almost exclusively from Satire III, are periphrasis; replacement of an abstract noun by a concrete image; parody; straightforward hyperbole; pressure on the normal to produce paradox; concrete realization of hyperbole without calling attention to it; and the suggestion through hyperbole of a pleasant, if imaginary, scene. Martyn concentrates on just one aspect of Juvenal's wit: the ridiculum para prosdokian. He notes that the usual format of such joking consists of a "lead-in" of four to five lines drawing on a host of devices "that will build up the grandeur. . . and will prolong the suspense, thereby making the climax, or anti-climax, more surprising, incongruous, ridiculous and laughter-provoking." The final word or words exhibit a sharp contrast in vocabulary and usually involve a shift into sermo plebeius and the banal, but occasionally this process is reversed.

More generally, Marache and Dunn acknowledged the need to understand that Juvenal meant Satire III to be read for its wit and humor; Marache's observation that Juvenal's
narrative is studded with concrete images, for which abstract terms or names can easily be found, holds special promise for interpretation of narrative types of wit and humor. Dunn's strong notice on impersonation and Juvenal's effectiveness with this device in revealing imposture in Sat. I is carried forward without difficulty to Sat. III,\textsuperscript{56} which is, in its way, a casebook on imposture. Finally, Martyn has defined how the \textit{para prosopektian} joke works in Juvenal; I add only that he, by arguing for a distinct beginning and end in such jokes, also tacitly assumes a middle in which the satirist successfully positions his materials so that the end actually seems to violate expectations raised at the beginning. Over this course, debate on comic effects in Juvenal has advanced from detection of these to analysis of the components of artistic control. In this advance, it became necessary, in order to appreciate the wit or humor in climactic devices, to examine more of the text for \textit{res} relating to the humor. This suggests that the \textit{fabella} is the basic unit susceptible to continuous development of wit and humor in Satire III.

That a rhetorical appreciation of Juvenal's wit and humor could serve to impart greater balance to other types of analysis is perhaps nowhere more evident than in persona theory itself. Irvin Ehrenpreis's idea, in his essay, "PERSONAE," that the ironic persona in satire requires suspension of reason, an intention to trick a correspondent, or communication of ideas unacceptable to the reader helps to explain
what rhetorical functions impersonation and comic narratio
serve in Juvenal III.⁵⁷

On all these points, the geniality of the wit and humor
is an important qualification. For surely it is the aim of a
satirist, who puts a humorous narration into the mouth of an
Umbricius, not only to deceive the correspondent genially by
the apparent seriousness of narrated fact but to open his
eyes through laughter at an absurd climax, as when Umbricius
hints at the pyromaniac skeleton in Asturicus's closet. But
suspension of reason is more evident in the ego's proposal of
relegation to a desert isle or his hatred of poets reciting
in August than in Umbricius's invective against foreigners--
both of which passages are accompanied by strong marks of
irony. The distancing of the artist from his personae in Ju-
venal III grows from the credibility which their motives ac-
quire in the course of artistic manipulation of situational
wit and humor in a specific dramatic framework.

The dramatic framework is what Ehrenpreis emphasizes at
the cost of ethos: persona theory's "most illuminating ap-
lications are made to works whose structure depends on the
speaker's having an ambiguous character."⁵⁸ In the same par-
agraph, Ehrenpreis asserts that "any communication involves a
kind of pose," a concept which he terms necessary to coherent
communication (since a fortiori total revelation of oneself
is chaos and in effect concealment).⁵⁹
But when this necessity is itself manipulated so as to become a method of communicating attitudes otherwise unacceptable to the reader, the result is a special form of art, the "ironical persona." I use this to designate a disguise that is intended to be seen through, a mask that the reader at first supposes to be genuine but at last sees removed. In such a literary structure, the author's fundamental tone also reverses itself; what sounded sober is transformed to mockery. For the device to succeed, the reader must be tricked during the early stages of the work and be undeceived during the later, and in his gradual apprehension of the meaning of the work, the process that removes the disguise must provide a dramatic turning point.60

In the sense that Umbricius's persona seems to evaporate, or evanesce, as I assert in Chapter II, Ehrenpreis's remarks on the dramatic turning point straightforwardly apply to the last lines of Juvenal III. But here direct applicability must be said to end. It is impossible to conclude from this satire that Juvenal is mocking Umbricius; in fact, the confluence of two dramatic lines--of the day-into-night drama of the poor, honest native and of the initiation of the vates by a shade unaware of his own death--only then adds to the other ironies the irony of the ingénu. If by this the reader's perception of any figure in the poem is shaken, it is his perception of the ego of lines 1-20.

E. de Saint-Denis, in setting out to show that the early Satire III was not exempt from flashes of humor, shows that the range of Juvenal's "salt" and "Italian vinegar," as well as his most subtle and refined laughter, is considerable: the brutal encounter of the drunken bully with the lone pedestrian (III. 292-296), the cruel insults heaped on the pauper in the theater (153-158), and the popular caricatures of
Artorius and Catulus (33-36) illustrate the less subtle, but popular, sorts of comic situation that come in for jeering.\textsuperscript{61} Saint-Denis appears to have been struck by the potential of the ordinary to produce unexpected results in Juvenal's hands, whether by narration alone or by greater compactness, where the unexpected turns into paradox.\textsuperscript{62} He finds verbal wit, puns, alliteration, assonance, homoioteleuton, and the whole jingling apparatus of declamation to be infrequent in III; the list of loan-words in lines 67-68 perhaps is the high-water mark of this froth.

Far more important are furtive allusions addressed to cultivated readers: these require the reader's collaboration. Saint-Denis places--correctly, I think--the early allusion to the Daedalus myth in line 3 in this category and shows that the comic pleasure felt at line 80 derives from the invitation to the audience to say, "Daedalus!" when they hear \textit{sumpsit pennas}.\textsuperscript{63} Literary pastiche is to be expected, as the schools encouraged parodies of well-known lines of epic and tragedy along with travesties of myth or legend. Juvenal's great achievement in Satire III with such materials is the scene which closes with the \textit{pauper} on the banks of the Styx; this, Saint-Denis implies, relieves the pathos of the scenario with the servants and dinner-table awaiting the now-dead master, and is thus more than simple parody or travesty.\textsuperscript{64}
Saint-Denis clearly appreciates Juvenal's comic range but adds by way of caution here, that when the poet pretends to treasure the crambe repetita of the schools,

nous devons penser que, souvent. . . il prend plaisir à pasticher et à mystifier, en élève habile et irrévérencieux, qui connaît à fond les recettes de la cuisine et qui la relève de sauce piquante.65

The implicit notion of the poet "in the guise of an adroit and irreverent pupil" is scarcely very far from open acknowledgement of the concept of the persona, particularly when Saint-Denis has already recognized the utility of Umbricius—"le personnage mis en scène"—as purveyor of invective of high mettle.66 The surprising contresens of parody, literary pastiche, mock epic, sadness in the manner of elegy, and the like operates by means of a veiling of intention, while Umbricius's invective makes him a credible satiric character long before many such subtleties come into play.

Saint-Denis's refusal to reduce Juvenal's wit and humor to their rhetorical techniques comes from his sense of the endless traps which the humorist lays for those who want to explain everything funny in a satire. On the other hand, Saint-Denis issues a compelling call to go much further toward acknowledging the collaborative role of the audience in the satirist's humor, particularly in situational (his idéal) as opposed to verbal humor.67 This, however, does not appear possible without study of the satirist's means of manipulating his materials to produce this effect when he desires.
The relatively open way in which Juvenal makes suggestions about personae, joking, and the *ridiculum* in *Satire III*--as comments on the everyday life of the ordinary Roman or Italian--appears on the whole both to soften the harshness of invective\(^6^9\) and to lighten the seriousness of the materials out of which the poetic structures are built. In general, invective predominates in Umbricius's *sermo* down to line 189, and, as we shall see in the following chapters, ironical dissimulation is the hallmark of this part of the satire; in lines 190-314, the poetic structure growing out of the imagery of death and the Underworld is forwarded principally by means of the class of humorous effects which Cicero called *narratio* (*de Or. II.66, 264*); in this, laughter emerges from a comic pattern which the audience imposes on events as narrated rather than out of an impulse to laugh at a punch line engineered by the poet. We might look, therefore, for signs of the satirist's invitation to the audience to supply the missing piece of the puzzle of wit or humor not only where Saint-Denis's ironical *contresens* is detectable but also in narrative *fabellae*.

The special problem of Umbricius's invective against foreigners will receive extended discussion in Chapter IV. Invective, as David Worcester observed,\(^6^9\) has many faces: curses, epithets, metaphors, similes, and epigrams transformed into *sententiae*.\(^7^0\) In invective, the lack of imitation of other literary forms requires the satirist to choose
his vocabulary from the prosaic language of everyday life, as lines 100b-108 adequately show. Epithets like 159 vano Otho-
oni, abound in Juvenal III; similes, like 45-46 tamquam... mancus, and metaphors, like 123 veneno, are not so common;
the satirical curse has been ruled out, unless it has been turned on its head in lines 312-314, with their felices ata-
avos and felicia saecula. Invective, whether short or long, is strongly marked by high emotion and thus is somewhat dis-
counted by the reader, especially, Worcester argues, when it is angry.71

Invective is not, despite its rather protean critical capacity, the sole means at the disposal of the Roman satir-
ist: I would submit, with Worcester,72 that burlesque, with its mimetic component, is a satirical tool which lends itself more consistently to extended development, with less strain on the narrative effort, than invective. Worcester's high burlesque employs the trappings and language of such "high" genres as epic and tragedy to satirize a low or mean subject, while in low burlesque the elevated subject is dosed with low language.73 That low burlesque harks back to the remote his-
tory of Latin satire is, I believe, one statement which Juve-
nal wished to make in the Numa-Camien frame enclosing the eictae Camenae, whose sacred grove has been turned into transients' housing (lines 12-18a). Of the two types of high burlesque—parody and mock epic—the Achilles ebrius ac petu-
ulans of line 278 has his aristeia in lines 291-301, and, as
we shall see later, the intervening lines 279-290 develop further epic trappings and even a subplot. The epic style as a whole is adopted in such parody. On the other hand, the mock-Gigantomachy (lines 254-261a) does not persist until the end of the episode on the banks of the Styx (264-267); here a different epic tradition dramatizes the pauper's encounter, as Magnini says, with l'apparato burocratico dell'aldilà. The vocabulary of this pastiche facilitates the shift from one epic tradition to another while developing sympathy for the victim, nameless as he is.

In Juvenal III, insofar as the mock genres develop such sympathy for one character or another, they tend to avoid the hurtful intent and painful elements of the comic impulse. The ironies which develop out of, say, mock necromancy, are more impartial and more closely tied to dramatic setting than Worcester's grotesquerie—as with the Greek's sexual exploits in lines 109-113, wherein bizarre prowess is treated with unkind fascination. The jeering note of grotesquerie distinguishes it from irony developed in mock genres, while the tendency to develop a persuasive catalogue in grotesquerie makes its tone suitable to invective. How far grotesquerie will be tolerated appears to depend on the audience's memory of the speaker's good intentions—in fact, on his ethos.

It is apparent from the foregoing that to dwell on parody, invective, grotesquerie, and the like is to do no more
(and no less) than to judge the effects for which an author
strives in formal verse satire. Worcester's distinct cate-
gories of satirical rhetoric fall on a continuum principally because each term interprets tone. As useful as this may be in some respects, variations of tone can hardly be expect-
ed to supply us with a compositional plan of Juvenal III, as
Romano's study of irony has adequately shown. Like Worces-
ter's categories, Romano's three main types of irony are de-
FINED BY THE DEGREE OF AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT AND THUS ALSO
form a continuum having to do with tone. Verbal irony is
the least mystifying, dramatic irony requires the most effort
to understand, while the irony of manner—or ingénu irony, in
which the speaker organizes and collects materials as truths
which are obvious to himself—falls between the first two.
This audience-oriented approach is, Romano freely admits quite the opposite of the method of Cicero and Quintilian,
who studied the effect of irony on the speaker's ethos.

Modern approaches to the wit and humor of Juvenal III
have developed sophistication in detection of the rarefied
yet witty allusion, and attempts to explain more such occur-
rences in the satire has led to a fuller appreciation of the
coherent anecdote in the narrative. On the technical side,
isolation of types of wit and humor along classical rhetori-
cal lines has emphasized the anecdotal, while Dunn's early
work has served to keep the character of the speaker an im-
portant consideration. Despite Ehrenpreis's denials that
consideration of the ambiguities raised by the ironic persona would lead to rhetorical ethos, it became clear that evasion of the ancient rule that a speaker was in control of his own ethos simply led to an audience-oriented preoccupation with such effects as irony, parody, and so on. Such effects only pose, from the author's viewpoint, their own problems of control—principally in tone and how this is interpreted—and thus provide but partial insights into a succession of literary effects in satire. They possess a deceptive explanatory power, as comic effects, of compositional procedures.

But even these prospects dim when we look to literalist criticism for help. This approach to Juvenal's third Satire is so widespread and has been so persistent, that there is need here only to discuss a single, but cogently argued, instance. Hight, in two monographs, presented his reading of Juvenal III (1961) and defended his literalist method by way of attack on persona theory (1974). Hight's interpretation amounts to the following main points: (1) it is the subject of urban life which unifies the poem; (2) the motif of resistance to urban life is Umbricius's condemnation of vice coupled with pastoral yearnings; (3) the three themes of the satire may be stated as a syllogism which reads, "Given (a) the power and wileness of the cosmopolis, with (b) the added conflicts of the rich with the rootless middle class and of the foreigner with the native, (c) no honest, poor native can make a living or live well in Rome"; (4) even
though the introductory comments of the ego and Umbricius
give a "figure of Umbricius," the voice throughout is the
voice of Juvenal; (5) the section on poverty (21-189) holds
together emotionally but not logically because it is flawed
by Umbricius's anger; (6) the section on the dangers of
city life (190-314) betrays "hardly any exaggeration," so
that Umbricius remains the mouthpiece of Juvenal.

Hight expounded the thinking which underlies these ear-
lier views in a general discussion of the "autobiographical
fallacy" in literature (1974). Here he lists non-narrative
satires, in which the "author himself appears to be speaking
in the first person," and narrative satires "intended to be
or to seem autobiographical" as genres of literature having a
viewpoint centered on an "I" but lacking clear marks of fic-
tionalization. From the non-narrative satires he excludes
Juvenal III, "which (after an introduction) is a monologue
put in the mouth of a certain Umbricius." This clearly
glosses over the ego implicit in Satire III.1-20, and it is
not certain that Hight wishes to include Juvenal III even
among such narrative satires as Horace's S. I.5 and I.9,
which do not, like S. I.8, purport to be fictional.

Where can Hight have wanted to place Juvenal III? The
answer appears to flow from Hight's fairly involuted views
of the satirist's personality. Since we know that Hight
considered Umbricius a 'mouthpiece' for Juvenal, we can over-
look the innuendoes in this critic's application of this and
synonymous terms to the satiric "I" in his discussion of Kernan (1959) and Anderson (1982b=1964). For in S. I.5, Horace feigns ignorance of the immense importance of the settlement between Octavian and Antony which was the purpose of the Journey to Brundisium, and in S. II.6 the satirist denies that he ever hears news of significance from Maecenas, which is patently false statement.

The relevance of these last two examples to the problem of the ego of Juvenal III is this: Hight, with Fraenkel, claims that the satirist employs the "I" because he perceives satire as an instrument of self-portraiture. So, it may fairly be asked whether, e.g., Horace has not altered his attitude toward presentation of self between the two books of Sermones, or whether, in fact, the weighty decision to write satire did not change the personality of the poet, as may be the case for Juvenal III. Hight, I submit, offers no answer here because he sees the poet as an unchanging person with exceptional powers to experience life and to render it in poetry. Hight also steadfastly refuses to see the tensions in the persona of the poet (which Anderson proposes) as literary events but, instead, regards them as "inconsistencies...in the poet Juvenal himself." This may be true, but how can anyone decide with almost no reliable biographical information on Juvenal?

If Hight finds that Horace assumes "poses," "faces," or "guises" in S. I.5 and II.6, are we to believe Horace
master of only obvious kinds of such dissimulation? Had Hигет been aware of Ehrenpreis's (1963) strictures on persona theory, he might have seen that occasionally the satirist would choose to manufacture an ironical mask for himself for the purpose of having it torn away. Juvenal in Satire III creates the persona of the obligingly polite if disbelieving friend, but it is not an aimless shot in the dark that Umbricius invites himself in his clodhoppers to the ego's villa to hear the ego's satires. Surely no reader of Juvenal or Horace will credit the literal surface of their satires, important as this is, with the capacity to explain every meaning to be found in each poem. Expenditure of all poetic effort on verisimilitude would never produce satire as Horace wanted it done; sheer literalism, the case for which Hигет has overstated in his two monographs, relies heavily on biographical data for interpretation of poetry, and in the case of Juvenal this is fatal, for literalism then can paraphrase but not interpret.194

The third type of criticism of Juvenal III, which I have termed "literary impressionist," rarely looks to reconstruct the poet's biography but instead selects some aspect of Juvenal's style for comment. A good example of the impressionistic approach to selected passages is this, from Scott:

Juvenal [in Satire III] dwells upon the poor man's hard circumstances and further amplifies the theme by contrast with the luxuries of the rich. As is usual in the satires, the details are arranged without regard to climax, but simply pile up, not so much for the sake of logical proof as for the sake of impressing the reader
by the multitude of detail. Scott goes on to show that, except for rhetorical climax, Juvenal employs the elements of amplification—itsel one of two essentials of the lofty style—quite freely in III; the other essential ingredient of *hypnos*—*pathos*—"lies in his 'indignatio', or, to be more exact, in his invective against the vices of his day." If this were the case for Juvenal III, Scott would be right to question the balance of *triste* and *iocosum* in this work; as she makes the point that *iocosum* was pegged in ancient rhetoric as stylistically plain, however, the applicability of her remarks on *hypnos* to Juvenal III is still to be tested. Scott asserts that the attack on the Graeculus hovers between invective and illiberal jesting, or *bomolochia,* and notes regular (but not continuous) use in III of epic, both humorously and seriously.

The large number of humorous effects which Scott claims for the corpus derives mainly from the epic usages in *Sat. IV, V, and XII.* The fairly even balance of mock and serious epic imitations in III, along with their brevity, indicates that epic allusions in this work achieve only local effects and are subservient to a larger effect which cannot be termed an accumulation amounting to the sheer multitude of detail. Epic imitation cannot account for all the wit or humor in *Satire III,* but it might, with its tendency to high feeling, suggest that III, along with I and V, depicts some sort of crisis.
Another literary-impressionist essay, Mason's thought-provoking "Is Juvenal a Classic?", indicates that Juvenal's wit undermines, since it is not merely verbal, the clarity or enargeia, of the high style. But the impression, derived from this clarity, that Juvenal was deeply concerned about social conditions, lacks credibility. According to Mason, two characteristics of Juvenal's style in Satire III substantiate these claims. The first of these—Juvenal's admulatio of the wit in Martial's epigrams on identical topics—implies that the satirist lay under compulsion less to the world of facts than to a set of stock literary topics.

The second characteristic, the declamatory tone of the satire as a whole, suppresses dramatic development of the meeting of the two friends in favor of increasing the "range of tones beyond those Martial allowed himself in his epigrams."

It is here that Mason's problem really starts, for if it is his aim to show that "Umbricius...does not speak to Juvenal, he declaims to the world," and proceeds to prove it by citing line 9b, which is attributed to the ego, then Mason is presenting as a conclusion the assumption that "Umbricius is not Martial, but Juvenal himself." There is no doubt that certain lines in Satire III defy the tag 'colloquial', but surely Mason, on his own evidence, cannot deny, since "each single section is built up in a different way" to (presumably) its own unique tone, that local declamatory effects must submit to an overall viewpoint that is
conversational in its lack of unified tone and even humorous.

I agree in principle with Mason that Juvenal, in order "to create his own poetic reality... has borrowed from ordinary life topics and situations that provoke powerful feelings," but it does not strike me as decisive that the poet occasionally falls back on literary devices most suited to expression of such feelings, that is, epic and declamation, unless the critic can discern the poet's rationale for making one of these devices the dominant one. This study owes a debt to Mason for many perceptive remarks about Juvenal's wit in Satire III--particularly for support in the assertion that the wit is primarily situational and not verbal and for the beginnings of a rationale for the satire's segmented structure--but Mason's acceptance of the autobiographical identification of Umbricius with Juvenal and denial of dramatic significance to the meeting of the two old friends at a moment of crisis is as unfriendly to poetry as extreme literalism.

It is difficult to underestimate the importance of Maynard Mack's essay (1951), "The Muse of Satire," to the thinking of persona theorists in this century. He firmly established the literary persona--in the case, that of Pope--as an artifice of rhetoric which possesses a remarkable clarifying power for the understanding of satire. The substance of his argument on artifice in satire is that, no matter how personal it may sound,
we overlook what is most essential if we overlook the distinction between the historical Alexander Pope and the dramatic Alexander Pope who speaks. ¹²⁸

This distinction stands out sharply when a satire possesses a pronounced dramatic structure or when "the relation of the speaker to the author is extremely oblique, not to say antithetical." But in satires that advance more by a formal plan than by drama or contrast of character, perception of the persona becomes less certain. This occurs because the formal satire generally portrays the "warfare of good and evil... viewed from the angle of social solidarity rather than private introspection." The poet's sensibility, however rancorous it may be, cannot alter the layering of thesis, or the attack on vice and folly, upon antithesis, which illustrates or implies a philosophy of rational control.¹¹⁶

More specifically, Mack calls upon the critic of satire to take special note of the ethos of the satirist. Here he appeals to the three elements of persuasion in classical rhetoric: invention, appeal, and "the weight of authority that comes from the hearer's estimate of the speaker's character." It is worth noting how largely Juvenal figures in Mack's further thoughts on this topic:

For the satirist especially, the establishment of an authoritative ethos is imperative. If he is to be effective... he must be accepted by his audience as a fundamentally virtuous and tolerant man, who challenges the doings of other men not whenever he happens to feel vindictive, but whenever they deserve it. On this account, the satirist's apologia for his satire is one of the stock subjects of both the classical writers and Pope: the audience must be assured that its censor is a man of
good will, who has been, as it were, forced into action. Difficile est saturam non scribere.\textsuperscript{127}

As it turns out, each occasion on which the satirist's ethos appears is the rhetorical occasion of citation of himself.\textsuperscript{128} If Mack seems stilted in his language on this point, it is perhaps owed to the difference between natural egotism and the planned rhetorical manifestation of the self. In Juvenal III, the occasions of the presentation of ethos are very complex, involving as they do slight and genial deceptions about the ego. On this head, Mack has been less than prophetic: Umbricius has often had to bear the brunt of both roles even though the fictional role of the adversarius is the less open to misinterpretation.\textsuperscript{129}

Readers of Juvenal cannot expect that Mack will enlighten them with the three "voices" of Pope in his satires, but the intellectual exercise proves its worth as a pattern of what we can expect from Umbricius. Pope adopts the role of the (1) naïf, or ingénu, of the (2) pro bono publico defender, or hero of his own discourse, and of the (3)

man of plain living, high thinking, lasting friendships; who hates lies, slanders, lampoons; who laughs at flat-
terries of himself; who is "soft by Nature, more a Dupe
than Wit;"\textsuperscript{130}

and so on. Umbricius is never the ingénu without irony, and I argue below that, because his audience are urbani, he cannot use this voice. Indeed, it is questionable—under the opprobrium of emigrating from Rome without good cause—whether Umbricius speaks directly pro bono publico; yet he seems
to have the ego's good in mind, at least. But if there was ever a detectable influence on Pope from classical Roman satire, the quotation just above delineates it. In the light of the various ways in which Umbricius has been misunderstood, however, Juvenal's reputation as a contriver of the successful satirical mask based on wit and humor has suffered perhaps more than Pope would have allowed.

This paper will attempt to rescue part of Juvenal's due in this respect by analyzing the wit and humor Umbricius aims at his targets. This will clarify how central the concept of ironical impersonation or other dissimulation was to Umbricius's ethos in the eyes of Juvenal's audience. The array of voices, firmly based upon Umbricius's pudor, is far longer than Mack's list for Pope, and their interaction establishes a ground on which the imagery can work its effects.

Juvenal's third Satire was the test case in Kernan's introduction of persona theory into criticism of Roman satire in his seminal *The Cankered Muse* (1959). Kernan asserts that, while Juvenal usually has his satirist speak to an adversarius, in III the poet reverses the roles and makes the adversarius, or Umbricius, into the principal speaker.\textsuperscript{131} To the ego of III.1-20 Kernan assigns the functions of scene setting and of hinting at Umbricius's themes; the ego praises unspoiled natural beauty by contrasting it with Rome's ugly ostentation, and he sneers at the Jews.\textsuperscript{132} Umbricius, for his part, evokes a friendlier reaction—the reader's sympathy
--and stirs up indignation at the evils he faces; at line 58 he drops his "mock humility" and "launches into direct invective against the sycophantic and parasitical Greeks and Syrians" and "then commences an attack, still in the vituperative manner, on the prevailing condition where wealth has become the measure of man in Rome, rather than birth or virtue."\textsuperscript{133}

At approximately the center of the work lies the praise of rural Italy; following this, Umbricius dramatizes "the physical ugliness and dangers" of Rome, and concludes his "magnificent tirade" with a mildly ironical invitation to himself to visit the satirist at his villa.\textsuperscript{134}

The lasting value of Kernan's work derives, as far as this study of Juvenal III is concerned, chiefly from his care in setting all the important pieces of the puzzle of the satire, so to speak, upon one table. He lays the ineffectuality of paraphrase to render the quality of Juvenalian satire at the door of the satirist's rhetorical brilliance and poetic ability; disintegration of the work into a hodge-podge is prevented by unification of the panorama of Rome around the theme, that "the possession of excessive wealth...saps Roman vitality and morality."\textsuperscript{135} The artist uses his words to control audience reaction in scene after scene, so that every detail is reflexive: the words leave the satirist's mouth to describe the scene but they also bounce back to define the satirist who chooses these details and uses this language. This process combined with a variety of direct statements about his feelings and attitudes creates the personality of Juvenal's satirist.\textsuperscript{136}
Thus far it is clear that Kernan is including the persona of Umbricius in this characterization of the satirist as opposed, one surmises, to the usual *adversarius*.

But his concluding comments on Juvenal go too far in making Umbricius a Stoic "denying divinity to Fortune by fortitude" and implicating him in a contradiction of words advocating wisdom and reason and deeds playing upon the sense of outrage.\(^1\) At a more technical level, Kernan appears to hold that Umbricius—a simple man who only wants to get at the truth—is deceptively skilled in rhetoric for a plain spoken man;\(^1\) the vividness thus rhetorically created in the examples of depravity suggest "a conscious attempt to capitalize on human delight" in such displays—in a word, prudence.\(^1\) By his insistence that satire is not history (or autobiography), Kernan ascribes to satire a revelatory function depending on a "spectacular manner."\(^1\) This perhaps leads him to adopt Anderson's view that Umbricius is the last true Roman, who is leaving a Rome itself no longer Roman.\(^1\)

I shall here pass over, as read, Anderson's earlier views on Juvenal III, since these have been accurately rendered by Kernan, and describe Anderson's work in persona theory by means of his development of Kernan's thought. In 1964 Anderson published a lengthy article on "Anger in Juvenal and Seneca", \(^{\text{(1982a)}}\) in which he attacked the problem of how far Juvenal was aware of the difficulties into which the persona of the satirist plunged in his indignation. He specifically
tested Kernan's hypothesis of tensions induced in the persona by the conflict between its public and private aspects.

For example, the satirist says or implies that he is a blunt speaker, but the reader infers that he is also a rhetorical artist. As to Satire III, Anderson sees Umbricius claiming honesty and simplicity (III.41-42) but asserts that his bluntness is vitiated by his tendency to address an imaginary audience, as in lines 54b-57 with the generalizing second person singular or with the Quirites in 58-61a.\textsuperscript{142} Anderson further argues, the blunt man in his indignation cannot allow humor to invade his perspective, which is far from that of the urbanus: he cites in particular III. 6-9 as an example of ironical introduction, noting that Umbricius never discusses the poets reciting in August; so there may be more humor in this work than has been suspected.\textsuperscript{143} A conflict of truth and exaggeration in the satirist's persona appears, furthermore, in III as Umbricius's refusal of rural Cumae or of the rus in urbe.\textsuperscript{144} These features of satire are broad hints to the reader to "distinguish between the satirist's 'truth' and truth itself."\textsuperscript{145}

I am convinced, however, that Umbricius is committed to exhibiting his pudor more than his bluntness or rhetorical expertise. Without an acceptable ethos, as Kernan noted, no attack on folly or vice, however blunt, is assured of a sympathetic hearing. The generalizing tu is a problem more complex than Anderson here suggests, and it will be treated
below on a case-by-case basis. One example must do to illustrate this complexity: if, in lines 267-277, Umbricius can be shown to impersonate a captator, then who is the tu in 276 tecum and in the five second-person singular verbs in this passage? Given the impersonation, the tu must be the pauper. As to Anderson's second point, the imagistic interpretation laid out in Chapter II incorporates all of Anderson's main points of evidence in the imagery of vatic initiation. This image establishes a context for both the irony and the moral earnestness with which Umbricius treats the ego and disarms the ego's urbane attitude toward folly, vice, and real evil.

As to the other tensions in the satirist's persona, Anderson supplies some interesting insights and answers to long standing questions. The satirist, like Umbricius in lines 198-202, may allude to epic "in order to gain a meretricious pathos" that adds the right note to

episodes, which in themselves constitute extreme instances, in a patently literary, not to say humorous, manner so as to force us to dissociate ourselves from ... indignation and rather to enjoy the dramatic creation.\textsuperscript{146}

I am not quite so convinced as is Anderson that the satirist is a saint or prophet trapped in the city which he both loves and hates,\textsuperscript{147} nor do I believe that the humor only serves, in lines 190-314, to devalue indignatio or ira. Similarly, I cannot agree with Hight or with Anderson that Umbricius is a jaundiced failure with pretensions to objective morals,\textsuperscript{148} since Umbricius's means have not yet totally evaporated: he
is only speculating on what could happen to him if he stays in Rome until his money is gone.

The problem of the conflict between Umbricius's reason and his irrational impulses is not treated by Anderson, but I would say that it cannot be done until a better understanding of Umbricius's character is formed. Anderson is on the right track in proposing that:

Juvenal expects his Roman readers, especially since they have long been trained in the art of dissimulatio as applicable to the portrayal of indignation and of other useful rhetorical emotions, to remain rational throughout the satirist's tirades, to distinguish reality from the satirist's distorted version of reality.149

The study proposed below of Juvenal's use of wit and humor will go far toward specifying in the fabellae the degree of dissimulation, and the thematic importance of the imagery150 will shed new light on the problems of tensions in the persona of the satirist.151

It has been my purpose in this introduction to provide, on a basis of what Juvenal's predecessors say satire ought to be, an overview of representative approaches to Juvenal's third Satire, as well as to make my own position clear. Not everything published has been given detailed consideration, and probably not all will fit into only a single classification of criticism which I have used. In one sense, that is a good development, since those classifications represent polarities which the critic must avoid when he tries to assess a work with the scope of Juvenal III; in another way, it is not so good, because attention to the merits and defects of
such sound works of scholarship as we have examined so far has obscured the notion—recently showing all the signs of being set in concrete—that Umbricius is a fundamentally flawed character with few redeeming traits. Against this trend the present work will take a stand in defense by summoning a wide array of evidence from within the poem and by judging the appeal of Umbricius to his Roman audience through his sense of wit and humor.

Important lessons, too, can be learned from the four critical approaches which I have outlined above. Rhetoricism, which in modern hands gives off an aura that purports to be value-free as a heuristic method, sometimes suggests that Juvenal's audience did not perceive ethos in satire. Extreme literalism in Hight's hands produces no compelling reason for the biographical search and flounders on its treatment of dissimulations like impersonation; further, the literalist notion that the poem's subject is capable of unifying the work of art is at best dubious, and it explains little without sizeable extraliterary assumptions. Literary impressionism, as was to be expected, is too dependent on short texts for sound conclusions about literary effects extending throughout longer texts, and it may occasionally manifest a tendency to impose narrow literary values on the poem while disregarding expectations of Juvenal's audience.

Finally, persona theorists show a tendency to be too independent of the text, particularly in discussion of the
dilemmas they raise about the attitudes of the persona of the satirist. Whether persona theory needs Ehrenpreis's restrictions if it is to avoid the charge of manufacturing a logically infinite string of personae is open to question; since these restrictions approximate the principles of dissimulation by impersonation, a new interpretation of the poem's literary systems is essential to application of persona theory to so obvious a candidate as Juvenal III. If the wit and humor of narrative and ironical dissimulation can be shown to affect the persona of Umbricius by lifting the rather odious charges against him and proving him altogether more pleasant and complex a character than has been suspected, then we must allow that this satire is a work of mature artistry and not one of a diseased or jaundiced imagination.
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1Romano 1979, 87-97.
2De Decker 1913, 72-73.
3Highet 1961, 254.
4Friedlaender 1895, 189.

5In discussing the restrictions which audience and situation place on the use of wit and humor by the orator, Antonius says (Cic. de Or. II.52,230): Omnino probabiliora sunt, quae lacessiti dicimus quam quae priores, nam et ingeni celebritas maior est, quae apparat in respondendo, et humanitatis est responsio; videmur enim quieturi fuisse, nisi essemus lascissiti.

6Legally this meant avoidance of infamia resulting from prosecution for libel or slander, which is what Trebatius hints at and Juvenal implies. Note, however, that Juvenal (I.153b-157) omits mention of any legal procedure which might be regarded as due process.

7Persius (I.107-134) appears more concerned with the reception, by a select audience, of his satire as poetry in the spirit of Old Comedy than with popularity achieved by low wit or mean humor. For a clear and concise discussion of this passage and of the climate in which it was written, see Morford 1984, 36-38 and 7-12.

8See Cic. de Or. II.58,237-59,238.

9Cf. also Antonius's observations at Cic. de Or. II.56, 228 fin., on Crassus's character: cum omnium sit venustissimus et urbanissimus, omnium gravissimum et severissimum et esse et videri, quod isti contigit uni, [id] mihi vix ferendum videbatur. The jealousy is a professional one and is not meant seriously.

10Cooper 1922, 90.

11Cooper 1922, 98-140, cites and translates the most significant passages from Plato and Aristotle on the poetics of comedy and the comic effect. Plato's early views, as set
forth above in only their basic form are found at Rep. 388d5-389a1, 452d6-e2, and 606d5-d7. Philebus 48a3-50d2, especially 49d11-e4, establishes the definition of to gelenon in specific versions of self-ignorance lacking the power to harm. At Laws 816d2-e10, Plato exhibited a less stringent attitude to comic effects by leaving burlesque and the like to slaves and hired foreigners, while the other limitations noted above are found at Laws 934c7-936b2.

12 This is clearly the implication of Antonius's view at Cic. de Or. II.56,230 fin.: erat tanta in Domitio gravitas, tanta auctoritas, ut, quod esset ab eo obiectum, lepore magis levandum quam contentione frangendum videretur. Compare also de Or. II.58,236 fin.: maxime quod tristitiam ac severitatem mitigat et relaxat odiosasque res saepe, quas argumentis di-lui non facile est, ioco risuque dissolvit. Given the different setting, the terminology is strikingly similar to that used by Horace, S. I.10,9-14a.

13 For example, age governs the suitability of hyperbole, Arist. Rhet. 1413a3-b2.

14 Strabo terms his discourse sermo at Cic. de Or. II.58, 235 ad fin., as does Antonius at II.57,234; cf. also Cic. Brut. 218-219, where sermo is used virtually as a synonym for dialogus.

15 Verbal wit and humor is surrounded by Cicero with cautions and faint praise (de Or. II.60,244-65,263), chiefly because the one who constantly employs verbal jokes risks having his character injured by failing to perceive or foresee elements of the situation in which he is or will be speaking that make a joke inappropriate or frigid or mean and unnecessary. Satire III does not strike me as having more than the merest handful of verbal jokes, and one finds little enough in the commentaries on this head.

16 Cicero elsewhere alludes to this speech in defense of Cn. Plancus as an example of cavillatio (de Or. II.54,218) and of perpetua festivitas (de Or. II.54,219).

17 De Decker 1913, 20-54, deals with the loci communes, which he separates from the loci philosophumeni, 54-66. He cites no instances of the latter category from Juvenal III; of the loci communes, he names only the following examples from Sat. III directly in his text: (1) de saeculo, lines 45-46, 44-45, 312-314, 139, 168, 138, 6-9, and 190-198; (2) de fortuna, lines 38-40; (3) de divitiis, lines 137ff., 160ff., and 147ff.; (4) de crudelitate, none. Juvenal's ability to keep his poetic talent clear of the deleterious influence of the salons is also indicated by the density of the loci in Sat. III as opposed to the corpus. Of De
Decker's direct citations or mentions in his text (not in his footnotes), _loca de saeculo_ appear in III eight times of 87 for the corpus, or about 9% of the examples; (2) _de fortuna_, once in Sat. III out of 36 instances for the corpus, or less than 3%; (3) _de divitiiis_, three times in Sat. III out of 18 in the corpus, or about 17%, which is not surprising in view of wealth's thematic importance in Sat. III.

De Decker (1913, 73) notes only a disproportion of lines devoted to attack on foreigners in Rome (III.58-125)—nearly a majority of the first part of the body of work which De Decker sees, however, as breaking off at line 163. He notes two _egressiones_, at lines 13-16 and 18-21, a feature of declamation which was so prevalent that Quintilian was led to comment at some length on its spread into the courts (Inst. IV.3.1-17, cited by De Decker 1913, 89). De Decker (1913, 83) allows classical balance of harmony and proportion of arrangement, only to Sat. X, with the silver and bronze medals going to VII and XVI; on this point, De Decker felt that "Ju vénal a bien dû, jusque dans une certaine mesure, tenir compte de la loi formelle du genre satirique, qui exigeait l'abandon propre au langage parlé" (1913, 84).

De Decker 1913, 90-91, makes it plain from Boissier's comments (90, n. 2) that the _viva vox_ is a fictional construct.

De Decker concludes that the general lack of dialogue (except in IX) leads to dominance of invective over conversation, rhetoric over philosophy and reflects _declamationes_, in which one rarely answered his opponent except hypothetically (1913, 98-99).

See De Decker 1913, 91, n. 1, for this exception; 100-103, with n. 1 on 102, for what he considers that Juvenal retained in this respect from the satiric tradition; 144, on the lack of overdone descriptions in Sat. III.

Propositio occurs in Sat. III three times out of 41 for the corpus, or just over 7% of the time (De Decker 1913, 104-107), at III.58-60, 268, and 288; more subtle variations of this technique are found by De Decker (1913, 107, n. 1) at lines 41, 164-166, and 197-198, making six of 52 instances, including those in his footnotes, or 11.5%. There are no instances of proof by example (1913, 107-110) in Sat. III. Reasoning by gradation (incrementum) is noteworthy (1913, 112), comprising seven instances of 56 (1913, 111-117), or 12.5% of all examples, which are concentrated in Sat. VI. Highly developed antitheses were an idiosyncrasy of the _declamatores_, and Sat. III possesses six of the 36 instances (1913, 117-124) or about 17%, but De Decker does not list all the antitheses from Sat. V, which he says is completely
permeated with this technique. Sat. III has one (lines 114-115) of the four instances of preteritum in the corpus (1913, 124-125); abrupt transitions (1913, 125-135) will be discussed below when the limits of the fabella are investigated. Sententiae which are, strictly speaking, a matter of style and not arrangement, occur with regularity in the first part of Sat. III (lines 143, 152-153, 164-165, 51-52, 53-54, 60-61, 182-183, 116-117, 100, and 26-28) but fade in the late going (lines 230-231, 281-282, 209, and 300) for 14 times out of 169 in the corpus, or just over 8% (1913, 154-172). The only hint of bombast in III is at lines 60-61 (1913, 141).

23De Decker (1913, 175) cites but two instances of apostrophe in Sat. III (lines 60 and 67); this is a feature of Juvenal's style which, De Decker claims (1913, 174), he aimed at persons and things indifferently. Of the two types of oratorical repetition, geminatio does not appear in Sat. III (1913, 187-188), and anaphora surfaces twice, at lines 26-27 and 107-108 (1913, 193). De Decker (1913, 180-182) cites seven cases of rhetorical question in Sat. III, out of 86 for the corpus, or just over 8%. The great quantity of sententiae and rhetorical questions in the corpus makes these two stylistic features of the corpus significant indices of declamatory influence, and the 8% level for each in Sat. III indicates that this work lies in the middle of Juvenal's stylistic stream.

24De Decker 1913, 139.

25Adamietz 1972, 5-6, 38-74.

26Adamietz 1972, 6.


28This is the most likely conclusion from Adamietz's last three paragraphs. Cf. his 1972, 76-77: "Die einzelnen Motive sollen nicht nur aneinandergereiht und dabei verknüpft werden, sondern sie sind so organisiert, dass der Leser schrittweise bis zu einer extremen Situation geführt wird."
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30A concise and readable account of Lotman's The Structure of the Artistic Text (1970) and The Analysis of the Poetic Text (1972) is to be found in Eagleton 1983, 101-103. Of particular relevance are these remarks: "A poetic text is 'semantically saturated', condensing more 'information' than any other discourse. . . . Poetry has a minimum of 'redundancy'---of those signs which are present in a discourse to facilitate communication rather than convey information---but
still manages to produce a richer set of messages than any other form of language. . . . Every literary text is made up of a number of 'systems' (lexical, graphic, metrical, phonological and so on), and gains its effects through constant clashes and tensions between these systems. Each of the systems comes to represent a 'norm' from which the others deviate, setting up a code of expectations which they transgress."

"Lotman's position on re-reading or retrospective reading is typically semioticist, that is as Eagleton 1983, 102-103, relates, "A poem, in fact, can only be re-read, not read, since some of its structures can only be perceived retrospectively. . . . Whatever we perceive in the text is perceived only by contrast and difference: an element which had no differential relation to any other would remain invisible. Even the absence of certain devices may produce meaning: if the codes which the work has generated lead us to expect a rhyme or a happy ending which does not materialize, this . . . may be as effective a unit of meaning as any other" (original emphasis).
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Romano 1979, 15-19. The detachment of the ironist from his subject is vulnerable to attack (1979, 31-33). The comments in these last pages make it clear that Umbricius is no ironist but is nevertheless a persona. It is significant that seven of the 59 instances of irony in Juvenal III, or almost 12%, are found in lines 1-20, or just over 6% of the lines of the poem. Such a concentration points to the ego of lines 1-20 as the ironist, and Romano's quotation from D. C. Muecke's The Compass of Irony (1969) on her page 32 is especially revealing in this respect. But see Muecke's later views, 1982, 51-52.

The engagement of the satirist with his society is comparable to anyone else's until he sits down to write; at this point, he distances himself from his society. See Romano 1979, 17.
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77 Worcester 1940, 76, says that "the principles of burlesque are extensions of the principles of invective," but that does not lead him to classify grotesquerie as invective. Juv. III.113, which is bracketed in the Oxford text, is significant in this respect, because it ties 109-112 to the
invective; it is not itself grotesquerie as are these four lines, since it states what the calculated aim of the Greek "machismo" is. I argue in Chapter V that lines 112-113 are reversed, but that hardly affects this point.

Worcester 1940, 68-69, quotes the scene in Rabelais in which Panurge preaches to Dingdong and the shepherds, while they drown, about the good things to be found in the afterlife and says of this huge incongruity, "We accept the substitution of an archdevil's scale of values because Rabelais has expressed his own kindliness and humanity in a hundred ways." Similarly, the reader accepts the grotesque scale of the Greek's sexual maneuvers because Umbricius's occasional urge to have a girl (if he can afford the asking price) is, by comparison, pudor.
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Worcester 1940, 9, mentions Quintilian only in passing. Romano notes that Cicero and Quintilian did not analyze irony from the standpoint of its effects but attended "primarily to the relation of irony to its author rather than its audience" (1979, 29). But ancient rhetorics were written not to instruct audiences but to teach orators.
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Hight does not specify how far Umbricius's introductory comments run, but by his structure of Satire III (1961, 69-70 and n. 13) these appear to end at line 57.
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Hight 1961, 73.

Hight 1961, 74.

Hight 1961, 69 and n.12, uncritically accepts Giri's (1921, 539) unprovable idea that some experiences portrayed in Satire III are too elaborate to be credible in an ordinary
Roman and so must be Juvenal's own experiences. What is remarkable here is not Hight's conclusion but his insistence on the unappealable verdicts of commonsense thinking.

**Hight 1974, 325**, with original emphasis.
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**Hight 1974, 326**: "The 'I' of non-narrative monologue satire (they say) is an imaginary figure, a mouthpiece or persona, which the satirical poet, like a ventriloquist with his dummy, causes to utter certain ideas formed into certain words, but not necessarily the ideas of the poet himself. Cf. 1974, 327, "unreal persona"; 1974, 328: ". . . a mask temporarily assumed by the real Horace"; 1974, 329: ". . . he [Persius] preferred to have an imaginary mouthpiece express affection for a possibly notional Cornutus. . . ."
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**Hight 1974, 333-334.**
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**100** This is unquestionably the case with Giri (see n. 92 above), and it appears to underlie Hight 1974, 329: "What has this. . . . to do with the career of a typical satirist? . . . part of a typical satirist's career. . . . In fact, a 'typical satirist' does not exist. . . ."

**101** See Anderson 1982a, 300, summarized by Hight 1974, 329. Hight here overlooks a most important comment by Anderson: that "the satirist. . . . constructs episodes, which in themselves constitute extreme instances, in a patently literary, not so say humorous, manner so as to force us to disassociate ourselves from his vaunted indignation and rather to enjoy the dramatic creation" (Anderson 1982a, 308).

**102** Hight 1974, 329-330.
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**104** On this point, Hight is adept at concealing his assumptions: for instance, if the subject of urban life 'unifies' the work, then what is the need for rhetorical architecture--wouldn't the vagaries of conversation depend on a process of wandering from and returning to this subject far more than an oration would? Further, if Umbricius's anger mars lines 21-189, what replaces this anger in 190-322? It seems to me that Hight, in seeing "hardly any exaggeration"
in these lines, defends his "mouthpiece" assessment of Umbricius's role by substituting effect for cause. Other literalists, such as LaFleur (1976, 385-388) have seen the wisdom of giving up on Hight's biographical aims; unlike LaFleur, Gérard (1976, 478) is still unwilling to treat Umbricius as fictional—alone of all his characters—and he has been chided for this in Smith's review (1981, 225). Like LaFleur, Marche (1980, 368 n. 3) tinkers with persona theory but remains a literalist (1980, 366-367) by insisting on Juvenal's sincerity at III. 156-157.
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113 Mason 1963, 122.
114 Cf. Scott 1927, 22-23, who claims that the numerous examples from Juvenal III sometimes create a humorous effect.
117 Mason 1963, 126-130.
118 Mason 1963, 126.
119 Mason, 1963, 135, says in full: "I am inclined to suspect and certainly to hope that there is a special point in the external structure and the general tone; that, in a word, Umbricius is not Martial, but Juvenal himself recalling in verse the recitations he had so often delivered in prose and laughing both at himself in that role and at the attempt by contemporary writers of solemn hexameters to take themselves seriously."
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Green, in his introduction to his revised translation of Juvenal's *Satires* (1974, 43–44) exhibits an extreme form of literary impressionism, comparing Juvenal's tendency to work "through images rather than by logic" and to create the effects of "cinematic montage," especially in III; cf. 1974, 46. Labriolle and Villeneuve, in their introduction, find that the poet in Juvenal dominates the rhetor (1951, xiv) and that Umbricius is less a representative of his class than an impassioned witness against the vices of a higher class which he sees from below (1951, xiii).
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Kernan 1959, 69–70.
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Kernan 1959, 77; Kernan does not use the term, 'prurience', here, but there is little doubt that he defines it. Cf. his 1959, 25-26.
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Kernan 1959, 78-79 and n. 3; cf. also 73, n. 6. and Anderson 1982a, 145. Interested readers may wish to consult Kernan 1959, 14-30, on his generalizations about the mask of the satirist. It seems to me that, although Kernan published his results four years before Ehrenpreis established his restrictions on the ironic persona, he is careful to note the reactions that drive the reader away from the extreme autobiographical approach. These are, chiefly, the notion that the persona of the satirist is being mocked (1959, 15); the pose of simplicity, which when coupled with the inference of humble but honest origins, is too pastoral a portrait to be believed of the city-dweller (1959, 16-18); the hypertraditional moral code with its violent indignation trailing reason in its wake (1959, 18-19); his overdark pessimism (1959, 19-20). This public personality conceals the private one and thus creates tensions in the persona which mainly stem from the conflict between claims to truthfulness and distortion of reality in the satirist's depiction of vice (1959, 22-23). See also Anderson 1982a, 293.
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See LaFleur 1976, 402-404, with notes, for a description of Cumae ville after Domitian's improvements. It remains possible that Juvenal was referring to the environs of Cumae.
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Anderson 1982a, 308.

Anderson 1982a, 305-306.

Anderson 1982a, 312.
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Imagery here means vividness imparted to thought by words denoting sensory experience and not merely the simile and metaphor of Anderson, 1982a, 139, 147.

Winkler 1983, 220-223, terms Umbricius the "device of the unreliable satirist," calling the latter's part of the sermo in Satire III a "lengthy tirade against the city of
Rome." But on what texts does he base this opinion? Umbri- cius "protests his virtues too much" in lines 41-48; lines 60-61 on Umbricius's "Greek Rome" contradict the ego's vacuis Cumis in line 2 because Cumae is a Greek settlement; the Dae- dalus paradox in lines 24-25 and 78 betrays confusion; the "base and ludicrous circumstances of his journey" contradict his grandiose (moral?) pretensions; the umbra in his name marks him as a "benighted fool." Fourteen lines and one du- bious etymology condemn a character which the poet required over 300 lines to construct!? Others such as Musurillo 1961, 172-173, Fredericks 1972, 13, Witke 1962, 246, and Romano 1979, 202-203, pay lip service to the persona of Umbricius but are not persona theorists. Mack 1951, 85-88 has useful remarks on the ethos of the satirist and on the adversarius.

152 Another contributor to this tendency is LaFleur 1975, 58; cf. LaFleur 1976, 405-410, who terms Umbricius a "poetaster" on the slimmest of evidence. Rudd 1976, 170-181, dis- cusses the problem of mask and sincerity, and concludes that the persona, where it may with validity be applied in criti- cism, restrains curiosity about the poet and directs readers to the work of art itself, while the theory of the poet's sincerity "reminds us that the poet is, after all, a man speaking to men." Rudd draws many interesting examples from Horace; Umbricius is mentioned only in connection with an- cient distrust of the overly versatile, and therefore devious, character (Rudd 1976, 162, citing Juvenal III.74-108).

153 This strikes me as far more important a goal than de- ciding if one approach or other is anachronistic, as McCabe has done on Kernan, Anderson, Motto and Clark (1965), and others who criticize Juvenal's poetry. I see by McCabe's note 11 (1986, 84) that he picks no quarrel with persona the- orist "scholars who argue...from the past."
CHAPTER II

The Personae of Umbricius and the Ego

The primary concern of this chapter will be to derive from Umbricius's words the portrait of himself that a reasonably intelligent, educated Roman would be likely to arrive at by the end of Juvenal's Satire III. At times, Umbricius appears to burst out of the confines of conversation between himself and the ego of lines 1–20 to address just such a Roman, but dramatically no one else is there but the two interlocutors. On the face of it, this oddity wants explanation if only as the sympathetic audience which Umbricius imagines in his exasperation. If such an explanation, however, is taken as grounds to condemn his reliability,¹ then the critic has failed to see that the poet, whether in the character of the ego or an Umbricius, is engaged in fictive discourse. The poet is not employing natural discourse, in which "all utterances...can be taken as the verbal acts of real persons on specific occasions in response to particular circumstances".² Instead of writing history, the poet represents such utterances as acts of Umbricius, and these are fictions, so that the relationship between reader and author does not conform to the conventions of natural discourse.³ Umbricius
and the ego may conform to some, or all, of the conventions of natural sermo, but the poet who made them does not, nor is there any implication that the poet is prevaricating: he is just not saying in the usual sense of that word.  

When Umbricius addresses the Quirites or implies, by his remark that all the poor ought to have packed up and left Rome long ago, a far larger audience than the ego alone, what does he mean? Does he speak for the poet, who (we might naturally suppose) wanted his works to reach a wide audience? Is Umbricius Juvenal's 'mouthpiece', as Hight claims, or is there something in apostrophe and the tutoyer that implies an audience larger than that which is dramatically represented, which affects the poem to such an extent that straightforward common sense cannot serve to interpret it? The answers to these questions must, it seems, arise from an inquiry into the art which prompted them; answers ought also to grow, as much as possible, from what we know an informed Roman of Juvenal's day to have been capable of thinking.

To apply, as is done in this chapter, the shorthand of image criticism and persona theory perhaps appears to remove any hope of sensible answers from the realm of probability, since the Romans never heard of either. But such nominalism has no place when it comes to understanding the artistic problems of Juvenal III, because these can in large part be stated in terms which every educated Roman comprehended. The image, for instance, would be understood as an appeal to the
evidence of the senses by means of *enargeia*, or the effect of causing an action to take place as before the eyes. Personae would be understood to be characters in dramatic settings usually perceived as fictional, as in comedy, or heroes of legend or myth, as in tragedy. Probably Roman expectations in regard to both of these properties of *Satire III* would be changed by the awareness that satire is neither oratory nor drama, but there is little reason to suppose that the Romans allowed laws of genre to impose full compartmentalization of thought about literature.

The intelligent and educated Roman reader of Juvenal's third *Satire* would, as I have implied, have addressed the apostrophe to the Quirites by forming an opinion about the ethos of the character who was speaking. He would likely have determined if the character was in such distress that the appeal—bordering on the *quiritatio*—was warranted by citizenship and the circumstances. Further inquiry would depend on the hypothetical Roman's interest in the working of the literary genre before him, but there is little doubt that his sensitivity to even single words would lead him to this threshold. He would want, for instance, to know a good deal more of what Umbricius implies about himself in lines 190–314 than most of our modern critics appear to want. He would understand that decisive proof of Umbricius's viewpoint would be better delivered by the narration that dominates the second part of his speech than by the forthright argumentation
of lines 21-189: one can tolerate only so much combativeness before he tires of it and dismisses it from his attention. In short, the Roman reader's thought would be formed if not dominated by rhetoric, and he would await with pleasure the heightening of experience which the poet's use of enargeia would bestow on the otherwise ordinary. He would find answers, which we can understand, to questions which we can formulate in terms comprehensible to an educated Roman.

The omission of lines 190-314 from any very extensive consideration by modern critics of Juvenal III demands, moreover, an accounting that does not rely entirely on arguments that rhetorical disposition was distorted by Roman declaimers of Juvenal's time. In fact, it appears that the organization of Satire III along classical lines—with brief prologue and epilogue, and long but balanced argumentation and narration—includes a short captatio benevolentiae for the purpose of initial presentation of self. This clarity of structure raises the expectation that the ethos of Umbricius will possess continuity, and this is, I believe, significant for the reader's perception of his persona.

My reasons for this belief are best illustrated by the questions which criticism ought to be asking about Umbricius. For instance, if his identity as an honest (41 mentiri nescio) Roman (60 Quirites) of moderate means (23-24 res. . .exiguis) is established early in lines 21-189, then does his ethos undergo any change in lines 190-314? The latter part
of Umbricius's speech is easy to cite for instances of why we, as readers, should feel anger, frustration, hatred, but does this section tell us that Umbricius is feeling such emotions as clearly as lines 21-189 do? For instance, does a character whose scruples (60 pudor) actually prevent him from condemning Greek immigrants out of hand as a class (61 quam-vis quota portio faecis Achaei?), who has his pudor thrown in his face when he is tossed out of his seat at the theater (154 si pudor est) in favor of the children of whores—does his fear turn into panic under attack in the street? Is his anger out of control, or is it used as a weapon? Does he see fear used against the pauper?

It is, I think, these two great emotions of anger and fear which are intended to play upon the reader's sympathy for Umbricius. And this sympathy is established in a way the details of which we shall examine in the remaining chapters. An outline of Umbricius's persona will include the fact that he can find no position in the city which both is honorable and pays enough to allow him to survive: his modest means are rapidly disappearing (21-24a). Umbricius is also not a young man (26-28): the number of years before him is uncertain (27). He is leaving his place of birth and residence for Cumae, but it is a Cumae for the tired (fatigatas) and childless (Daedalus). This oblique allusion to Cumae (25) not only arouses a direct sympathy for Umbricius, but it also suggests a kind of heroism in the face of the dreadful (27
Lachesi), of death. Umbricius's words have therefore managed to set out his frustration and his fears and a broad vulnerability in just a few phrases. He is, despite the rather lofty diction, only human, and subject to the course of life and death.¹⁴

The remaining introductory material in Umbricius's prologue is, I believe, intended to rouse indignation, or anger, in this moment of reflection (40 quotiens voluit Fortuna iocari). May the freedmen let a contract for every necessity (38 foricas) in Rome; let them dispose of life and death for popularity's sake, and then let them cart the bodies off to the tomb: it's all one huge joke anyway. (The mordant tone in these lines, 29b-40, comes almost from beyond the grave.) Perhaps nothing else is to be expected from such riffraff as Artorius and Catulus (the scholiast on 35 notes parasitorum for buccae).

But Romans who have responsibilities--family, marriage, position--ought to know better than to tempt fate (41-47). In Imperial Rome, everyone is a client, but it is an irony that even the highly placed must fear the revelations of clients who hold a significant threat over their sponsors (49-54a).¹⁵ It is fairly clear that Juvenal's other characters, such as Trebius, are never believed in such matters, since Juvenal compares them to the scurra (Juv. V.156-173) or dinner-wit or jester (V.1-5). On the other hand, Naevolus knows only too well that he will be believed on inquisition and
therefore fears for his life (Juv. IX.70-91) if the true paternity of Virro's children comes to light. Umbricius's secretum honestum avoids this extreme of scurrility.

But if Umbricius is no scurra nor Hamlet dickering with actors, his ethos nevertheless contains the seeds of either good comedy or interesting tragedy, and he will return to these proprieties in his fantasy of country life (168-179). Here, in lines 41-57, his specific stance and attitude toward Rome's rampant corruption is present only by implication: pudor, self-restraint, scruples. The switch into the second person singular—the personal—in 51-57 points to just such a personal characteristic as pudor which leads Umbricius to see himself as maimed (47-48): his honesty in word and deed have maimed him, angry as he may have been in each circumstance.

But Umbricius's prologue (21-57) is linked to the succeeding narrative of foreigners in Rome not merely by pudor in 60, which readers expect because it is Umbricius's moral ace, but also by the literary datum that lines 58-125 are a narrative elaboration of the structure of lines 21-57. The shift in tone and feeling between these segments of Satire III owes its effects to the perception that the ego's persona is still addressed self-consciously in Umbricius's prologue, while Umbricius has become the only perceptible interlocutor in lines 58-125. A table of the parallel structures of these segments will help to clarify this statement and its implications for the persona of Umbricius.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21-29a example (Umbricius)</th>
<th>58-61 example (Greeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29b-40 counter-example with catalogue and geographical reference (comites per oppida)</td>
<td>62-65 counter-example with catalogue and geographical reference (Syrus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-48 rejection of counter-example and catalogue on moral grounds</td>
<td>66 rejection of counter-example and catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-80 second catalogue, a: geographical (Greeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-85 effect on narrator as a Roman client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-100a second catalogue, b: (1) chiefly theatrical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100b-113/112 second catalogue, b: (2) patron-client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-54a shift from lower to upper classes</td>
<td>114-118 shift from lower to upper classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-122a rejection of catalogue on social grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54b-57 effect on narrator as honest Roman of modest means</td>
<td>122b-125 effect on narrator as Roman client</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fact that most of the deviation in lines 58-125 from the narrative pattern of lines 21-57 consists of catalogues argues for a structural similarity between these two segments which is deceptive in terms of change in Umbricius's ethos. For it is the shift of subject in the "examples"--from Umbricius to the Greeks--which requires the brief statement in 81-85 of the effect of the arrival of Greeks in Rome upon Umbricius the Roman client. He only seems to remain the same person as his emotion rises. In fact, the insertion of his personal comments (me. . .nostra in 81-85) into the long second catalogue serves to emphasize the images which unify this fractured list of vices: these are principally the motivating destination of the Greeks migrating to Rome (72 viscera magnarum domuum, 113 secreta domus) and the numerous references to the body in parts b (1) and b (2) of the second catalogue. The injection of Umbricius's notations in 81-85 secures this lengthy catalogue from tedium, to be sure, but it also removes himself from his position as Juvenal's self-conscious narrator to a more self-involved viewpoint that begins to require Umbricius to think and react like the pawn that he finally becomes in 122a-125.

His anger leads to this isolation, and 58-125 are anger apparently not much restrained by pudor (60 nec pudor obstabit). Umbricius is in a killing mood by the end of the tirade (123 exiguum de...veneno). But he is honest enough to recognize that Greeks alone cannot account for this rot in
amicitia. Orientals make themselves obvious (61b–65). And just as bad as these are the credulous Romans (66–68, creditur in 92–93, 122b–123), who are fools enough to allow Greeks to witness their wills (81–82). The result of Roman credulousness is that the Greek assumes the roles of all possible clients.

Umbricius initially takes offense at the foreigners' violation of propriety (63 mores). Foreigners have ruptured whatever goodwill lay in the mutual give-and-take of client and patron and, in fact, threaten this very institution of social relations. I sense that, if there is a restraint on Umbricius's anger, here it is pride or even disgust.

But his only weapon for retaliating upon such insults is his wit. Some of this wit lies in the sheer exhibition of foreignness (64 non gentilia) and is merely verbal (62–68, chiefly). The second catalogue (67–80) thus begins with verbal wit and pauses in reductio ad absurdum (the second allusion to Daedalus, 79–80). Umbricius's wit thereupon becomes more dramatic, more directly related to the properties of situation and hence more comic. Lines 86–112 gradually build from the stupid and ridiculous, on through the offensive imitativenss of the Greeks, to revulsion at an attempt to seduce an avia. Umbricius's own sympathy is finally shown to lie with the vulnerable Barea: no Roman could feel anything but disgust at Egnatius.
In tracing the parallelism of the two passages in Table 2, it thus becomes possible to see several interesting things about Umbricius. First, he tries to balance lines 21-57, or 37 lines, against lines 58-125, or 64 hexameters, but to little avail: the arguments against Greeks and Orientals have almost twice the weight of the argument on the bleakness of his prospects. As we documented the emotions that seem to underlie what Umbricius says in lines 21-125, his wit then surfaced as an expression of his anger and perhaps, one suspects, also as a means of defense against charlatans and rogues of all stripes. Detailed analysis of Umbricius's wit and sense of humor must wait until Chapters IV and V, but at this preliminary stage we can see that, if this is tirade, it scarcely comes straight from the furnace. The planning and cool dissection in the invective against the Hellenophile and his minions is too symmetrical to what precedes it, and too lacking in evidence of the genuine passion of hatred, to be tirade pure and simple.

If lines 58-125 exhaust the range of sane men's responses to irritating people and situations, then lines 126-189 will surely end all dignity (126 ne nobis blandiar). The obsession with foreign dress in 58-125 is mutatis mutandis a matter of the Roman client's morning officium (126-128a) but soon expands to signify a man's wealth (134b-136). The examples of 128b-136 are, interestingly enough, just those situations which Seneca saw as driving the Roman into anger and
madness. But Juvenal combines these situations with the insults that one must suffer owing to others' greedy habits of mind, in order that Umbricius's narrative may possess that texture of urban roil the only sane response to which is to flee to the country (162b-163). Should one choose, however, to distinguish himself from the low-lifes of 126-158, then the honorable Roman of modest means can't even marry (160-161a), or inherit (161b), or get honest work (162a); inflation presses hard on his means to rise in life (164-167).

This flow of frustration and anger is interrupted by a fantasy of small-town life: if you were suddenly transported (168-179). . . . Umbricius's argument is that flaunting of wealth in the country is rare, but that life there is both grand (174 maiestas) and humble (169 mensam . . . Sabel- lam), full of laughter (175 exodium) and terror (176 formi-dat). The idyllic tone here illustrates the simplicity of which most Romans are capable in Umbricius's eyes.

But such simplicity, it is implied (180 ultra vires), does not fare well in urban life. The glamor (nitor) of city life really puts one in hock to his tailor (180-181). How else than by a pretentious poverty can one hope to attract the attention of a wealthy patron? Even on the high occasion that someone, free or slave, reaches manhood in your patron's house, you are obliged to buy the ritual cakes and thus as a Roman pay tribute to well-dressed slaves, and to keep your temper, too!
It is hard to know just what to think about the persona of Umbricius on the basis of this mixed bag. Probably the most revealing passage is that which points out how poverty makes a man ridiculous, i.e., lines 147-159. Lines 137-146 have just shown how little the pauper is believed, even on oath. Perhaps 147-158 are to be taken as self justification, for, as Seneca says of the urge to avenge wrongs done to one's loved ones, fere enim iustum quisque affectum iudicat quem adgnoscit.\(^3^5\) Umbricius confesses, I think, that being made to feel ridiculous\(^3^6\) because of the modesty of one's dress (147-151) or net worth (153b-158) is the standard whereby his bitterness is justified.

The effect of 137-159 is to demarcate Umbricius's persona from that of the scurra, and the emotional adjectives, infelix and durius in 152, dramatize the emotional content of this standard. No scurra wishes to be taken thus seriously. Further, to have his pudor flung in his face in a mocking tone (153b-158) is to raise again the question of what is left to restrain his anger. The answer is, I believe, only a thoroughly Roman\(^3^7\) respect for the law.\(^3^8\) Anger urges to injury,\(^3^9\) and here we see that Umbricius is honestus not only in word, but in deed, so far as the generalization of these specific experiences of paupertas can be read as his own.

It is this narrative slipperiness, this generalization in the specific situation, which raises the next question which any evaluation of the persona of Umbricius must answer
if possible: Could any ordinary man bear so much? Is Umbricius fictionally alive? I do not believe that the third Satire's introductory lines, 1-20, animate Umbricius nearly so much as they do the City; poor Jews are as animate, in their copinus fenumque supellex, as is the ego's friend whose cart holds all his housewares (10); Umbricius is not even identified by name until he is about to speak (21). His name itself moreover suggests a shade, and his destination, Cumae, has no clearly vivifying associations (4-5 ianua Baiarum et gratum litus amoeni secessus). The images of shade, dampness, and profound darkness (11-12, 17-18a) further suggest a rehearsal for another descent, that of the departing shade (Umbricius) to the underworld. Likewise, the associations of the Sibyl, via Vergil and Petronius, are with death. Finally, the incendia, lapsus tectorum, and mille pericula saevae urbis (7-8), it is implied, must have resulted in death. I believe that it is in the anticipation of grief that we are to understand digressu veteris confusus amici: one of Juvenal's few uses of amicus neither to denote a patron nor to connote disapproval. This phrase is a fictional irony: Umbricius may be dead, and the persona of the ego be his Aeneas, a sounding board to Umbricius's Anchises.

Numerous possibilities for tongue-in-cheek humor, with a touch of pathos, are thus available to the satirist in lines 21-189. For instance, Umbricius obviously thinks he is still alive (26-28) and possessed of his meagre fortune (22-24a).
The use of vivere, already most general, would become gently ironic: in 29b, it is Artorius and Catulus who are to live in Rome if one calls that living (vivant); in 182-183a, all us Romans live in ambitiosa paupertate. Intimations of death far outweigh any evidence that Umbricius is alive early in his soliloquy:

maneant qui nigrum in candida vertunt, quis facile est aedem conducere, flumina, portus, siccandam eluviem, portandum ad busta cadaver (Juv. III.30-32);

quondam hi cornicines et municipalis harenae perpetui comites notaque per oppida buccae munera nunc edunt et, verso pollice vulgus cum iubet, occidunt populariter (Juv. III.34-37a);

funus promittere patris nec volo nec possum; ranarum viscera numquam inspexi (Juv. III.43b-45a);

corpus non utile (Juv. III.48).

Certainly these expressions are used to lend emphasis to other points, but their net effect is to create an image of death affecting perception of Umbricius's persona. The many life-threatening situations or allusions to death—84 usque adeo nihil est, etc., 89 the Antaeus exemplum, 116 Stoicus occidit Baream, 118 the fall of Pegasus, 161 quis pauper scribitur heres, 172 nemo togam sumit nisi mortuus, and possibly 175 personae pallentis hiatum—serve to keep the impression, that Juvenal is listening to a ghost, on the edge of the reader's mind.

But I believe that—more importantly than the scattered references to disappearance or death in lines 21-189—certain
images of 190-322 serve to support the proposition that Umbricius hovers between life and death. How, for example, does the critic explain the images of chilliness (190 gelida Praeneste, 322 gelidos in agros) which neatly open and close 190-322? Is there some link of this image of chill to the feeling of fear that pervades 190-314? But, more specifically, how does this affect Umbricius's persona, which becomes more abstract and evanescent in these later lines?

The evanescence of Umbricius's persona must, I think, be equated with the Death of the Citizen. The total obliteration of Cordus's means in a fire (lines 208-211) is proleptic for other, more direct destructions. And Umbricius's feelings begin to fade soon after. The tenement fire is followed by Umbricius's last full-length, bitter allusion to the ability of the rich to survive (and profit from) a like disaster (Asturicus, especially 220b-222). Even here the "disaster" is greeted with mourning, however bathetic (lines 212-213). Thereupon follows the last full reference to the delights of country living (lines 223-231), again with flowing water and tenebrae. Here Duff refers tenebrae to Mart. II.14,12, but Juvenal's expression is forced and hence suggestive of death if the tenement fire is kept in mind, as it ought to be. Surely the rough synonym meritoria, or "temporary lodgings," in line 234 suggests how tenebrae is to be taken: rather more permanent lodgings.
The fact, also, that Cordus is driven out on the street naturally suggests the transitory character of the poor man's security. The poor man is hounded to death, through disease, by noise, with a thorough battering, and is finally totally obliterated by a load of stone falling on him. The rich can write or read or sleep as their sedans escape the crush of the street (239-242), or their slaves do the hard work as they go to enjoy the sportula (lines 249-253). The poor dead man must buy passage across the Styx (264b-267).

But Juvenal's point, as Duff believes concerning the sportula, is not so much taken up in the contrast of wealth and paupertas as it is in the contrasts of health and illness, happiness and misery, leisure and frantic bustle. Lines 232-267 open with an emphasis on number and proportion (plurimus) which Umbricius pursues almost relentlessly through the mock epic catalogue of urban afternoon dangers (236-261a) to the bustling little household whose master is now dead. A good deal of the pathos of 264-267 derives, it appears to me, from just this set of contrasts (264 properantur and 265 sedet); and the irony of 265b-267 lies in the sonority of the diction, a feat unattempted elsewhere in Satire III except perhaps in lines 18b-20.

If one is not lulled to sleep by rumbling wagons, it is because Rome is so full of itself, night and day--building materials, supplies of all kinds, pottery, falling rooftiles, crowds going everywhere, with litters of the rich floating
above the seething mass. The tone of rationality in Umbricius's understanding of the aetiology of stress and disease is quickly lost in a more general concern for the safety of the body and, failing that, the integrity of the corpse. The several military allusions, and the allusion to the Gigantomachy in lines 257-258, wittily and subtly load the dice against our hero's survival. Only the domus approaches being 261 secura: our hero is a modern Hector with few of Hector's abilities but is nevertheless finally isolated in that odd loneliness of heroes—the crowdwary self-consciousness in one doomed to face death alone becomes, in Umbricius, estrangement from the everyday and familiar, owing to a loss of proportion between individuals and human institutions.

This abrupt change from daylight to Stygian blackness is gradually retrieved from the absurdity of the scene in lines 251-261a, which tend to mock epic, by a horribly graphic nighttime event—a mugging. It is important, in terms of the identity of Umbricius, that this section (269-314) is generalized to the point that almost all the verbs of saying and thinking are in the second person singular, while here and in the preceding section, verbs in the first person gradually become the means of expressing motion and action (beginning with nobis obstat in 243 and calcor. . .mihi in 248 and running to 304). Umbricius the narrator becomes, through this use of the transparent tu, the target of the city's assault in a context of wills (intestatus), death (fata), and prayer
(276 votum, 300 adorat). Finally, the second person becomes an "it" (305 rem), and the "you" in 312 dicas seems as remote as the felices proavorum atavos.

The emotional center of this last long narrative is the actual mugging. The adjectives, 278 ebrius ac petulans, draw our attention to the fact that others besides Umbricius may be isolated and driven from anger to violence.⁴⁹ This faceless attacker tosses and turns and cannot rest until he pounds someone to bits; yet even this man's anger avoids the night watch (282b-285).⁵⁰ It is worth noting that Umbricius, as he strides toward the looming ambush, shifts into the first person (286-289); 288b miseræ cognosce prohoemia rixae ensures dramatically that this is reminiscence. This threat is as Roman as it is physical: the law is twisted to protect criminals. After he extracts⁵¹ details of your whereabouts that evening and of your place of residence, the attacker lodges a continuance bond against you:⁵² vadimonía deinde irati faciunt (298b-299a). The poor man's freedom is thus a refugiation of 267 infelix nec habet quem porrigat ore trientem—the freedom to escape with a few teeth.⁵³

The logic of this situation must pile fear on fear: robbery and murder (lines 302-305). Murder seems especially singled out for emphasis: by the Oxford text's punctuation of 305-308, murderers are compared to wild beasts kept in Rome's vivaria.⁵⁴ The clever transition from the murder weapon (305 ferro), via the synecdoche of iron, to the prison
(314) perhaps reflects a Roman's trust in justice. Seneca makes somewhat the same point in terms of the client:

Iratum vidisti amicum tuum ostiario causidici alicuius aut divitis quod intrantem summoverat, et ipse pro il-lo iratus extremo mancipio fuisti: irasceris ergo ca-tenario cani? et hic, cum multum latravit, objecto cibo mansuescit. Recede longius et ride! Nunc iste se ali- quem putat, quod custodit litigatorum turba limen obses-sum; nunc ille qui intra iacet felix fortunatusque est et beati hominis iudicat ac potentis indicium difficilem ianuam: nescit durissimum esse ostium carceris (Sen. de Ira III.37,2-3).

Naturally, no system of criminal justice is as efficient as Seneca or Umbricius would wish it to be. It is far more likely that Rome's ancestors are felices because they are long gone than because they had only one prison.

The flurry of seeming irrelevancies toward the end of this section of Umbricius's monologue serves to confirm the hypothesis that the correct lemma is the Death of the Citi-zen. This was foreshadowed by the mock-epic mourning in lines 278b-280a. The Citizen is murdered in one quick line (305). The allusion to Cumae recurs in Gallinaria pinus (307). And the image of the City as the underworld workshop of the Cyclopes (309-311) is not really lightened by refer-ences to the countryside or to the past: Rome is one prison --the final prison, death. The apparent irrelevancies are, when viewed from the standpoint of Umbricius's persona, most pertinent to his status of shade.

Any lighter tone delays until lines 315-322, when Umbri-cius turns to his purpose. He could rattle on if the animals were not impatient and the driver hadn't for some time been
indicating with his whip his desire to leave (317-318a). This symbol ought to be approached carefully: the sum of the ceaseless and violent motion in 190-314 was death. Is the motion here also an image of death (eundum est)? The line which follows, 317 *nam mihi commota iamdudum mulio virga*, certainly stands out for its alliterative force and poetic license with *syllabae ancipites*. The impersonal expression of the gerundive, moreover, balances the equally impersonal *vivendum est* in 197. If *nostri memor* is epitaphic, then why not the whole satire: is not satire a whip?

The evanescence of the persona of Umbricius cannot, therefore, be simply a device for poetic closure. His moving off is loaded with meaning by the catalogue of violent and destructive movement in lines 190-314. Perhaps the model for Umbricius, if there ever was one, died peacefully in his bed. Perhaps he even traveled to Cumae. But I think that *gelidos agros* (322), the cold earth, makes it unsafe to assume such things. *Satire III*, placed as it is between the gloomy Underworld scene of Roman "heroes" near the end of Juv. II and the death of the tyrant who revived the *lex Roscia theatralis* in Juv. IV, would be a veritable bright spot of moral uplift without the Death of the Citizen, and of Umbricius.

The sheer velocity and scale of incidents which provoke all manner of fear in 190-314 clearly indicate that fear replaces the anger of 21-189. Seneca has a great deal to say on these two emotions, and especially on the uses of fear to
repress anger. But Umbricius does not see the provocations from the Stoic sage's altitude: he cannot, for there is too much confusion in and pressure on him, and too little leisure in his typical day. But if this is so, why does he need reasons to leave Rome? He doesn't: he needs to feel justified --exhonorated from an odious charge--and this implies a judgment which the ego never grants him: only the satires themselves will reward Umbricius's pudor, which reappears in the last lines in their genuine politeness. Instead, Umbricius is made to plead his case,\(^9\) to dramatize his anger and fear, in a last rehearsal for his judgment in the Underworld.

In this sense, the character of Umbricius fulfills Juvenal's promise in the last two lines of Sat. I by the witty, comic, and sometimes pathetic animation of a humble creature who can be imagined as recently dead. Umbricius is thus neither noble nor long dead (see the scholiast on I.170-171), and few exempla in III fit such a pattern. No, Umbricius violates such an expectation, first by enduring as he was in life (ethos, 21-189), and then by narrating the humble and unheroic manner of his death (190-314). Juvenal has thus left the question of whether Umbricius is alive in some ambiguity.\(^6\) This dramatic license forces the reader to judge Umbricius on the merits of his case, which amount to pudor. The rhetorical structure of Umbricius's soliloquy therefore embodies the shift from the emphasis on ethos to an emphasis on circumstance in order to demonstrate that the run of
humanity in Rome cannot evade a similar fate, not even by philosophy: one is either a good man, or he isn't.

Within these limits, Juvenal really expects no more than that his audience will be confusus, or disturbed, along with the persona of the ego, for the audience is expected to develop a sympathetic and even friendly feeling, or amicitia, for Umbricius. That such an emotional reaction can be manipulated in this satire derives from the fact that, however often others may take our place from us in life, no one can die in our place. The basis of character is thus unchangeable, but like Umbricius we can no more see such an ultimate fact than we can escape it.\textsuperscript{61} Our emotions mask reality: the very trees seem beggars; Numa is in love with a nymph. But in the dramatic unfolding of these emotions--anger and fear--it is possible to glimpse not just personality but the fundamental and ennobling situation of the human animal: his struggle to retain his dignity against the downward pressure of his circumstances. Umbricius has not given this effort up --he has had it wrenched from him by death.

This view of the imagery of Satire III, when it is balanced against the poetic effort that is expended to convince the reader that Umbricius is leaving Rome, amounts, however, to more than the observation that Umbricius is unaware of his death. Another important question arises: What is the connection of the reality which Umbricius portrays to his status as shade? In a few words, how is versimilitude tied to the
patently imaginary?

The main device which Juvenal employs to forge this link is the repeated asseveration of reality by means of the enargeia of death, of deadly threats, and of experiences or artifacts, such as the carcer, which are tantamount to death. Juvenal uses the device of asseveration by death—-even in the first twenty lines--to avoid, in the case of the persona of Umbricius, a charge of special pleading. Events dramatized in any genre with moralistic aims can rarely be allowed to speak for themselves, but satire, it seems to me, is exposed to charges of ulterior motives in moralizing. But these must be attributable to something in a character's social, economic, political, religious, etc., circumstances, and I cannot find sufficient evidence in Satire III to call any one of these areas a tacit, or ulterior, motive for Umbricius. For he has abandoned all urban symptoms of the social and economic clientela to become his own vilicus in the country, and there is barely a suggestion of his political status, let alone of what he ever wanted to accomplish in that area. His religious motivation is minor but above reproach, since he obviously wishes to share such experiences with the ego.

Juvenal's careful exclusion of any significant motive for special pleading in effect clears the moral air: it permits assessment of Umbricius's responsibility for adversity, which, as we have noted, comes to pudor, while it leaves room to make light of the officium, a client's legal obligations,
and so on. Horace was, e.g., in S. I.9, a master, though in a different way, of the light touch with just such subjects. And if Umbricius cannot be excluded from the gallery of successful satirical characters on the grounds of moralistic or realistic interpretations, Horace S. II.5 quells any doubt that the imagistic interpretation—that *Satire* III is a *sermo* with the dead—falls within the scope of Roman satire.

By elimination, then, virtually the only objection of any significance for interpretation is that frequently raised against the highly rhetorical tone, smacking of the schools of declamation, which critics since De Decker have often assumed to be proven fact. We have, however, seen that he offers less than overwhelming evidence of declamatory influence on *Satire* III in proportion to its length, so that there is no impassable barrier to a search in another area for an explanation of rhetorical effects in this work.

If we leave aside for a moment the purely literary effects of the imagery of asseveration by death, it is possible to see quite plainly from the culmination of this series in 318 *nostri memor*—in the context of periodic escapes of *homo urbanus* to his country villa—that realism is brought to bear on the assumptions which compel one to remain in Rome. The sum of the evidence which Umbricius invents as his reasons for leaving Rome is this realism, but the rhetoric involved does not amount simply to a logical scheme but is *inventio*: it is this which makes more plausible his defense. We have
once or twice noted death-bed or gallows humor, combining asseveration by death and realistic scenes, so that it seems appropriate to turn to an account of other wit and humor in Satire III. Roman orators thought wit and humor a special category of inventio, and Cicero’s theory of wit and humor provided for a special relationship between this type of inventio and oratorical defense.

Umbricius’s ironical wit and often sardonic humor shift attention gradually from himself to the evidence, which comes in the end to obliteration of the citizen and by logical extension of himself. This process is the evanescence of the persona. The most apparent result of this is, the persona of the ego demonstrably becomes the concern of Umbricius’s epilogue. I have treated the tone of this passage as exhibiting amicitia, but the re-emergence of the ego, only now the satirist-to-be, indicates that all such terms as 'monologue of Umbricius', 'tirade', and so on are merely terms of convenience adopted for lack of a satisfactory term in English for what one does in speaking his own side of a conversation. The sermo of the ego and Umbricius, by serving as the frame work of Umbricius’s defense, mediates the underlying artistic conflict occasioned by Umbricius’s legendary status as shade in contexts made vivid through asseveration by death. The comicality of such a violation of literary proprieties is what the author of the Apocolocyntosis saw fit to emphasize. But Juvenal alters the effect of the shade's departing words
to one consistent with a sympathetic persona, in order to
turn Umbricius's lack of awareness of his death into a pro-
found poetic statement appropriate to formal satire.

The re-emergence of the figure of the ego at the end of
Satire III stands, I believe, for his metamorphosis by the
vatic vision. In establishing one of the properties of a
sermo--its setting--Juvenal has preserved the circumstances
of vatic vision. These are chiefly the lonely ambience, the
presence of the Camenae, the animation of trees and perhaps
also stone, and the foreignness of humans besides priest and
initiate in such a setting. What Juvenal achieves in Sat.
III.1-20 bears comparison to the opening lines of Hesiod's
Theogony or to the myth of Orpheus.\textsuperscript{19}

This much may be provisionally true of the propriety of
place, but what of the propriety of time? This, in terms of
the vatic vision, is the function of the delay in naming the
persona of the ego as that of the satirist until the final
two lines. The poet's initiation into the vatic mysteries is
announced by the shade to whom he has been listening, so that
the work itself is the reference for authenticity of poetic
vision. Juvenal, I think, so wished to assert that satire is
as much poetry as it is sermo that he built this self-refer-
cencing further into the poem. The problem of the meaning of
the self-referenced poem, however, can only be answered in
the context of the meaning of the whole poem and its parts,
to which the next chapters turn. But at this point it is
clear that the satirist is engaged in the definition of his audience through poetry that defines itself and its meaning as it is performed. Just as true poetry defines itself more in such 'doing' than in decoration, so the voice which utters satire's moral content in a serious poetic setting and on a formal plan deserves better than to be called a puppet.
FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER II

1 See below, nn. 25, 40, 64, and Winkler 1983, 220-223 and nn. 16-22, for a recent summary of this trend in criticism of Juvenal III. See also now Jensen 1986, 185, for a less one-sided view, which is still unsatisfactory: Umbri- cius is no more a legacy-hunter (1986, 191-192) than he is a poetaster, nor is his "dogged humanity...proved by his gift for self-deception" (1986, 196). Romano 1979, 90, sees 60 Quirites as ironic.

2 Elliott 1982, 88.

3 Elliott 1982, 88.


5 Mauss says (cited by Elliott 1982, 23 and 24, n. 9) that the Romans transformed the mythic persona or mask into the "notion de personne morale." Apparently, by the time of Terence, the word persona had come to mean 'role' in a comedy; persona and its derivatives were employed to denote personal character (especially sincerity or lack of it), fitness for one's work, and qualities in other areas of life, including perhaps most importantly, the concept of the legal persona, a reflection of the civil (Elliott 1982, 24-27). Alignment of the mask with the cognomen surely extends from very early Roman times, as the custom of funerary masks would indicate (Mauss 1979, 80).

6 Scott 1927, iv, says that ancient categories of style made no distinction between poetry and prose; she uses Cicer- ro's comments on the genus tenue, for instance, to supplement Horace on plain style. Similarly we find Cicero consulting prose and poetry indifferently to illustrate his typology of ex rebus wit and humor in de Oratore II.66,264-71,288. There was a proprium or lex operis for each genre, apparently, but this does not seem to have compartmentalized topics or subjects by genre. Ovid's Metamorphoses is a good example of a vast array of subjects adapted for suitable use in epic.

7 On the quiritatio, see Chapter IV, n. 63.
I give here examples of this tendency to ignore lines 190-314 in criticism: Marache 1980, 366-368, cites nothing from these lines directly in his text, and only one citation is found in his notes; likewise Marache 1964, 475-478, cites 21-189 eleven times, 1-20 three times, and the rest of the work not a single time in an article dominated by citations from Juvenal III; Witke 1962, 244-248, says (246), "All the inconveniences in 190ff. are those that befall the urban poor," but he quotes only 309-311; neither Adamietz (1972, 63-65) nor Anderson (1982c, 225-230) uses 190-314 to define Umbricius's persona; LaFleur 1976, 405, uses 190-314 to make a list of urban ills, virtually his only use of these lines.

I see nothing erroneous in a four-part division into prologue (1-20), argumentation (21-189), narration (190-314), and epilogue (315-322), since these are merely general groupings of style as it changes in the course of the poem.

The captatio benevolentiae of Umbricius appears to end in line 28, before his proposal to leave Rome. I argue in Chapter IV that the half-line propositio (29a) belongs at the head of lines 29-40 and does not serve as a tag on the end of lines 21-28; cf. Romano 1979, 89, her no. 5. Lines 41-48 are directly concerned with Umbricius's ethos, but their tone is patently too moralistic for captatio.

Hight 1961, 72.

Hight 1961, 74-75.

Laodike asks Hector to rest from his labors, tired as he is from defending his neighbors (II. VI.258-262), as does Helen (VI.354-358). Hector's mission and position will not permit him to admit fatigue, and he is not childless: Umbricius may thus be compared to his epic forebear as an anti-type—unheroic, yet not without stature.

The emphatic words are at line-ends and signify the course of a man's life: honestus, laborum, cras, senectus, bacillo.

Yet the commonplaces found in Sen. de Ira II.11, 3-5, assert that those who inspire fear must also be afraid. Juvenal may have had in mind Laberius's famous line to this effect (126 Ribbeck, cited in Basore's edition [1928, 190] of Seneca's moral essays, ad loc.); Laberius spoke the line in the presence of Julius Caesar: Necesse est multos timeat quem multi timent.

I am not quite so convinced as Witke 1970, 117 and n. 3, that "there is no room for laughter." Humor in Juvenal is best understood situationally, satire by satire, but laughter
may be of many kinds (e.g., derision, astonishment, etc.).


18 It is poetically significant that lines 41-48 conclude with a metaphor of the body in the rejection of the counter-example and its catalogues; the metaphor functions as a pinpoint source of light which fans out to a wealth of images of, and allusions to, the body in lines 86-113, which precede the rejection on moral grounds in lines 119-122a.

19 Cf. Sen. de Ira I.6,3 ad fin., on how the magistrate ought to reprove anger: first persuasion, then threats, next mild punishment, and last death.

20 On this sense of pudor, see Seneca de Ira III.37,1.

21 Sen. de Ben. I.5,1.


23 Sen. de Ira III. 32, 1 init.

24 Sen. de Ira III. 38.

25 Critical disturbance at the two allusions to Daedalus is unwarranted: the second allusion lies in a comic context and in a search for the origins of Greeks who are overly clever and arouse distrust; the first allusion arises in a gloomier context and reflects an insulated Roman viewpoint. Symbolism such as Fredericks 1972, 11-13, found in these allusions might lead one to doubt the soundness of Umbricius's plan to leave Rome, but surely this is a narrow point upon which to build the case for the unreliable persona. Cf. also Anderson 1982c, 230-232.

26 Laronia's speech nicely punctures the pretenses of pseudo-Stoics in Satires II, and perhaps the figure of Barea is meant to recall the mock trial there (36-81). But it is significant for the persona of Umbricius that he is here being made to plead his own case.

27 Sen. de Ira III.34,2-3.

28 Sen. de Ira III.34,1.

29 Sen. de Ira III.33.

30 Cf. Juv. II.1-3 for a similar motivation of the frustrations caused by the repulsive or immoral actions of
Bardon 1977, 999-1000, omits this passage in his consideration of réverie, but I am not clear as to why: surely lines 168-179 are as much a day-dream as 85b-86, 190-192, or 201-202, which Bardon does cite.

The child's fear of the persona, or mask, seems to be a commonplace: cf. Sen. de Ira II.11,2 fin., Sic ira per se deformis est et minime metuenda, at timetur pluribus sicut deformis persona ab infantibus. Colton 1966, 411-412, notes Mart. XIV.176. Witke 1970, 145 and n. 3, underrates the comic aspect by overrating the tragic: rural life is whole, not tattered and spoilt. Perhaps Juvenal had in mind here the scene in Iliad VI, in which Astyanax recoiled from the sight of his father in his helmet, and Hector laughed and pulled off his headpiece (lines 466-473). The symbolism is interesting, because later (lines 494-502) the donning of the helmet is juxtaposed to the mourning in Hector's home. Cf. Juv. I.169b-170a galeatum sero duelli paenitet, and the scholiast on Sat. III.175, whom we have no reason to doubt.

Witke 1970, 132-134, besides stretching the evidence for Juvenal's "eclogue for the urban poor," does not cite lines 168-179 for evidence of the pastoral aspects of Sat. III, although he later (1970, 144-146) appears to imply the pastoral connection in these lines.

I take 187b-188a accipe et istud fermentum tibi habe as politely spoken by the imaginary client to a house-slave. Sen. Ben. II.4,2-3 cautions the patron against the use of intermediaries as reducing the gratitude due from the client: the intermediary obtains the gratitude. Lines 184b-189 thus seem to be a reductio ad absurdum: no benefit is expected from the patron--scarcely a nod or a sneer--yet the client must still cultivate the rich man's slave, who is his only realistic hope with Cossus or Veliento. Compare the satisfying courtesy, in lines 318b-322, of Umbricius towards the ego.

Sen. de Ira I.12, 3 fin.

Sen. de Ira II.3,3-5 significantly distinguishes the immediate impression of injury from the active impulse consequent upon injury: only the latter is true anger--a feeling here made acute because it is fueled by ridicule. This scene in Juvenal, it seems to me, explores an interesting dramatic potential: the angry man who is powerless to do anything about his anger. Cf. Sen. de Ira II.11,1 fin.: Si vero sine viribus est, magis exposita contemptui est et derisum non effugit; quid enim est iracundia in supervacuum tumultuante frigidius?

Demosthenes, In Meid. 178-179, says that the accuser of the father of Charicleides, an archon who had personally removed the accuser from his seat in the Theater of Dionysus, got an indictment from the assembly but died before he could bring the archon to trial. But observe how Umbricius does not claim to have the law on his side, and that the law has a social basis (the census), not a religious basis, as at Athens. Demosthenes's implication is that the archon would have been condemned (In Meid. 180-181). And Juv. III.156 lenonum pueri quocumque ex fornice nati may allude to the daughter of Neaira whom Stephanus claimed as his own by a free marriage preceding his marriage to that courtesan. Juvenal was condensing these events from the Demosthenic corpus so as to add point to Umbricius's bitterness and justify his retort.

38 Sen. de Ira I.1.1.

Baiae, a resort of the rich, can have no clearly positive connotations for Umbricius except by way of reflected glitter. Cf. Fredericks 1972, 12-13, who, in concluding that Umbricius is an unreliable moralizer, presses the evidence too far. The pastoral tone of the epithets exists on the surface only: the shore and grove and even the secessus are characteristics of the Fields of the Blessed in Vergil's Underworld (see, e.g., Aen. VI.703-705). See Rohde 1925, 291-293 and especially nn. 59-63; cf. Verg. Aen. VI.77-80 and Austin 1986, 66 ad loc.; Rohde's discussion of Sibyllae is very thorough; early manteis tended to nomadic wandering, a fact which may help to account for the Cumaean Sibyl's association with roads, gates, and paths through mazes. In Athanassakis's (1973, 56) edition of the Apocolocyntosis, 1, the speaker says: [Claudius] Appiae viae curator est, qua scis et divum Augustum et Tiberium Caesarem ad deos isse; in Apoc. 13, Claudius is taken via the short route (Tiber and the Via Tecta) to the Underworld. The difference in tone of this from Juv. III compels one to take Umbricius's humanity seriously.

41 Duff 1970, 125, on line 3.

42 But not Horatian irony, as LaFleur 1975, 55, proposes. Umbricius is, on the proposal that he is dead, an amicus who is himself "past and never to return" (1975, 57).

43 Images of cold are found in lines 190-322 chiefly and, besides 190 gelida Praeneste and 322 gelidos in agros, 191 nemorosa inter iuga at least suggests cool mountains; 195 veteris rimae hiatum implies draftiness by onomatopoeia; 102 brumae tempore and 103 endromidem suggest not only cold but a remedy, 102 igniculum. Fire and the suggestion of it by
imagery and metaphor pervade Satire III, running from 8 incendia to 309 fornace and even perhaps 316 sol. To list all of these would extend this note unduly, but it is important to observe that Umbricius emphasizes the uses of fire for survival, i.e., to cook or ward off cold, as in 253 ignem and 262 foculum, or to light the night road, as in 285 multum flammarum and 287 candela, and in effect balances these against the destructiveness of fire, which as motif ends at 222 ipse suas incenderit aedes. Even the fire sequence issues in cold, for Cordus is driven naked into the street, 210 nudum.

44 Sen. de Ira III.6,4 init., describes the bustle of street life in much the same way as Juvenal.

45 Lines 254-261a, in their military allusions, rent clothing, timber, and stone, are likely meant to recall the burial of Hector (Iliad XXIV.782-804). The important distinction is that of pace: Hector's pyre is deliberately built, and his tomb is a calculated monument, albeit a sad one. This seems to me to be the point of the rhetorical question in Juv. III.259-260a: at least Hector's bones could be found in the ashes and laid to rest.

46 Duff 1970, 156-157, ad loc.


48 Hector, in Iliad VI, is strangely aware that Troy must fall (447-449) and of his doom in this respect (464-465). He will not be stayed at Priam's palace by his mother (263-265), nor at Paris's house by Helen (360-362), nor at his own home since he wishes to bid farewell to Andromache (390-398), nor by Andromache and the nurse holding Astyanax at the Skaian Gates (514-516). It is also significant that, whereas Hector had bidden his mother to gather the Trojan women to go out and pray to Athena, he sends Andromache home to her household duties. Umbricius, on the other hand, is imagining an unheroic version of the ordinary citizen's unexpected leave-taking: sudden and lacking any preparations owing to his family's ignorance that his doom lay in the veryordinariness of his sojourn. These reversals of the heroic proprieties result in a disturbing epic motif.

49 Cf. Sen. de Ira I.1,3 fin.-4).

50 Cf. Sen. de Ira III.32,1 ad init.

51 Such a menacing tone is coolly analyzed by Seneca, de Ira I.17,7 fin.

52 Cf. line 213b and Sen. de Ira I.2,1: Videbis...reorum mutuas sordes.
The metaphor of the state as a body and of the citizens as its parts is spelled out in Sen. de Ira II.31,7, and 209 libertas may indicate that Juvenal has res publica in mind here. I think we also see a concrete example of the maiming of which Umbricius complained in 48, where it is ironically linked to amicitia.

Cf. Sen. de Ira I.1,6 et passim for comparisons of the angry man to wild animals.

Seneca does, however, create the impression that anger has caused an unstemmable tide of crime, de Ira II.9,1.

Fredericks 1973, 66, proposes the useful insight that Rome is to be considered a prison. The simile pointing to the correctness of this insight is 308 omnes tamquam ad vivaria currunt. Death connects both vivarium and carcer. Witte 1970, 131, interprets Rome as a Daedalic maze, but this is surely wrong: it is Cumae that is Daedalic. Cf. Anderson 1982c, 231-232, on this point.

Juvenal here echoes, as Prof. Morford reminds me, Priam's departure from the Achaean camp with the body of Hector (II. XXIV.689-691). But the dramatic proprieties are, as with the death of Umbricius's pauper reversed: it is nearly evening in Juvenal, not just before dawn; a mulio, not Hermes, shows the way, which lies out of the city, not into it.

Cf. Duff 1970, 144, on line 154.

The scholiast on 299 may not be so far away from my interpretation (or vice versa) that Umbricius is dead and pleading his case: haec est paupertatis miseria, ut post caudem in se conlatam etiam et causas dicit.

Cf. Sen. Apoc. 12 ad init., where Claudius does not realize he is dead until he sees his funeral: Claudius ut vidit funus suum, intellexit se mortuum esse.

Motto and Clark 1965, 270, say that satire denies reversals and recognitions and any deeper sense of significance that might cause katharsis; they see (1965, 275-276) Umbricius as the shade of the past, but this cannot account for the conflict in the ego's feelings about a friend in line 1. The indirect handling of deeper feeling in satire makes katharsis more difficult, but not impossible.

Besides the imagery noted above and the symbolism of the mulio's actions, the followingasseverate reality by allusion to death: (1) ponenda. . .praemia sumas tristis and the death of amicitia in lines 56-57; (2) 78b in caelum iussu-seris ibit cannot promote safety, as imaginary as the act is;
all the time which the client has spent cultivating patrons 124 perierunt at the instilling of the Greek's 123 exiguum de. . .veneno; (4) 145 contemmne fulmina is surely to invite death. The freedom to introduce a fantastic note here and there in the asseveration of reality by death derives, it seems to me, from the insistent imagery with which Umbricius evokes Rome as the House of Death. One has, I think, only to look at Rome through the eyes of Petronius, as Arrowsmith has explained the themes of the Cena (1972, 122-149), to see how selective with his material Juvenal has been in creating this picture.

This is an effect which is often distorted in literalist criticism: trivial items are blown out of proportion and made to seem derogatory. See, in this regard, LaFleur 1976, especially 406-407.

See Green 1974, 35-37; Mendell 1967, 158, terms Umbricius's sermo an "arraignment," although Satire III "shows an increased care for the dramatic setting and construction, greater than that of any other satire" (1967, 156); Knoche 1975, 150, moreover, says it is "not fair either to Juvenal's attitude or to his poetic achievement to brush him off as a declaimer. . ."; LaFleur still clings to the old assessment, 1976, 430-431; Martyn 1979, 219, sees Juvenal as "first and foremost a poet. . .not. . .a rhetorician"; Witke 1970, 135, limits the rhetorical aspects to the "careful attention to detail and transition, the relative infrequency of direct discourse, and the relatively high style of the whole poem"; Fredericks 1974, 147, calls Umbricius's sermo "invective"; Ferguson 1979, xx-xxi, terms Juvenal "a master of controlled rhetoric," who "knows the force of digression and disproportion," citing as his supreme gifts his use of rhetorical language and his vividness; Courtney 1980, 154-155, quoting Hodgart 1969, 128, at length, appears to accede to Juvenal's comic gifts, insofar as these balance the rhetorical.

See Chapter I, pp. 22-23 and nn. 17-23.

Nostri memor also, as an epitaphic phrase, emphasizes the closure of the dramatic possibilities of the meeting of Umbricius and the persona of the ego. Note also Cicero, de Or. II.6,22-24, on the delights which well-off urbani anticipated in the countryside and, especially, the escape as if e vincis (22).

See above, Chapter I, pp. 13-15, for the type of humor; see also above in the present Chapter, pp. 83-86, 90-91 and n. 62.

Cic. de Or. II.24,99-72,295, which includes Caesar Strabo's discourse on wit and humor, is entirely on the
subject of *inventio*; for the attitude of defense in oratorical wit and humor, *de Or.* II.56,230. See Leeman 1963, 118-120; cf. Kennedy 1972, 207, who sees the discussion of humor as arising out of that of managing emotion, itself one of the three *officium oratoris* and a part of *inventio*.

69 See Hesiod, *Theog.* 1-10, 22-34. On the Orphic poems, see West 1983, 68-258, and on the inevitable layering of Hellenizing rationales over the shamanistic hero, *Theog.* 3-7. See also Ovid, *Met.* X. 86-154, especially on the gathering of trees, animals, and stones about Orpheus to form the sacred grove. That darkness and cold are associated with the poet's initiation in an underworld setting is clear from the preceding tale of Orpheus and Eurydice (*Met.* X. 1-85).
Chapter III

The Case for a Structure of Juvenal III

Based on Wit and Humor

This Chapter has, as its goal, the principal task of rendering plausible the case for extracting a structure of Juvenal's third Satire from the organization of its wit and humor and the adaptation of these to the personae of the work. The first part of the evidence in this chapter consists of materials drawn from earlier Roman satirists on the fabella or fabula. The second part of the evidence consists an overview of Juvenal's ironic and narrative fabellae, with particular attention to how his management of res produced wit and humor. From these texts a description of the essential elements of the fabella will be derived, along with a picture of how Juvenal typically arranged his materials in ironic and narrative fabellae. This evidence will help to explain how Juvenal enlarged the role of the satirical fabella, with special emphasis on what signals its opening and closing.

What we seek by Chapter VI is an answer to the question of how Juvenal used the rhetoric at his disposal to order his
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inventions and to make one Satire seem to be unified yet witty or humorous. One approach, which has never to my knowledge been consistently applied to Juvenal III, is to treat the fabella as the basic compositional unit of verse satire. The compositional virtue of the fabella is two-fold: first, as anecdote, it encloses within a restricted compass the minimal plot-like materials¹ required to make satire's moral points about behavior; second, satire's end of making morality go down with a smile, or spoudaiogeloion,² is served by the indirection with which the wit and humor are pursued in the fabella. The satirist, like the orator, could rarely permit himself to appear always to be striving for wit or humor, as this would call his seriousness (gravitas) into question.³ This could spoil laughter at turpitude and the like or, what is worse, raise a laugh against the satirist or the character for whom he wishes to develop sympathy. On the interpretation of Umbricius's persona advanced in Chapter II, we should certainly like to know if the fabella is a stylistic instrument adaptable to serious moral purposes, to a sympathetic reading of character, and to conversational tone. We are fortunate to be able to find acknowledgement of these problems in Horace and Persius on wit and humor.

But before we can turn to these predecessors of Juvenal, some definition must be given to the form in which the fabula or fabella will appear. Since the story-like cast of the fabula reveals at least a minimal plot, development of the
witty or humorous point logically proceeds from the res. To the extent that this is exclusively true—and does not also involve irony or purely verbal wit—the fabula may be thought narrative. The marks of narrative wit and humor are thus in part those of narrative proper—plausibility, clarity, and conciseness—and in part those of comedy, lying chiefly in the province of the grotesque. The ironical fabula also develops out of res, but the wit or humor marking its end resembles a contresens, as Saint-Denis has termed it. The ironical fabula possesses wit or humor because its point is not patently absurd or grotesque; rather, its irony requires the reader’s collaboration to draw forth and recognize the transparent sense of what is not being said but is nonetheless the ridiculum: as Cicero (de Or. II.67,269) so clearly states it, and Romano has restated it, cum aliter sentias ac loquare. To this subtle sort of irony may be added, especially in the older fabula, the more direct irony in which the opposite of what one says is the transparent ridiculum.

This distinction between the treatment of irony in the older Horatian and Persian fabula and the newer Juvenalian fabella is crucial to understanding Juvenal’s achievement with wit and humor in Satire III. As Saint-Denis warned, pitfalls in analysis of satiric wit and humor are legion, and nowhere else than in irony is this so true. But as my analysis will soon show, the direct irony of the older fabula apparently required early and prominent placement of the moral
of the story line. Juvenal avoided this configuration almost entirely in III; his ironical stories I therefore term fabel-
lae, along with his comic narrationes, in order to distin-
guish his practice from that of Horace and Persius. In fact,
there is some justification for this distinction in Horace's fable of the Country Mouse and the City Mouse, which he calls an ex re fabella (S. II.6,78). In this story, as in most fa-
bles, the moral is delayed until the end, where it is spoken by one of the animal characters. But if I may be so bold as to pose this problem as Juvenal may have seen it, how was he to introduce the delayed moral in the ironic contresens with-
out forever telling fables?

His answers to such a question are reassuring in their great diversity. The fabella in Juvenal III, whether ironi-
cal or narrative, is strongly characterized by impersonation of one of the parties to the humor. This alone has caused several problems in interpretation which I believe a sound understanding of the Juvenalian fabella and its elements will solve. In addition, verbal wit figures in the situational ridiculum in a number of Juvenal's fabellae but is not so frequent as to overwhelm the less pointed narrative effort in each story. Other satiric effects, such as mock epic, seem also subtly transformed in their pointedness so as to fit in-
to the controlled environment of the Juvenalian fabella. Fi-
nally, I will argue in Chapter IV that Juvenal was able to incorporate the older fabula itself into his new fabella and
to make the former the centerpiece of his poem. While it is
difficult to state in a few words just what the Juvenalian
fabella is, the functioning of its elements permitted the de-
velopment of well known satiric effects within a discipline
which amounted to a delay in the humorous or witty punch line
or point in both ironical and narrative fabellae; in ironical
fabellae, irony became less direct because it was so delayed
and because it emerged aliter rather than contrarie.

Horace advocated restraint in wit and humor and thus
conscious control of means to this end. We have, in Horace
S. I.1.64b-79 and 92-100, two fabulae, the first of which
draws on legend7 and thus seems contrived:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ut quidam memoratur Athenis} \\
&sordidus ac dives, populi contemnere voces} &65 \\
&sic solitus: 'populus me sibilat, at mihi pludo} \\
&ipse domi, simul ac nummos contemplor in arca.' \\
&Tantalus a labris sitiens fugientia captat} \\
&flumina--quid rides? mutato nomine de te} \\
&fabula narratur: congestis undique saccis} &70 \\
&indormis inhians et tamquam parcere sacris} \\
&cogeris aut pictis tamquam gaudere tabellis.} \\
&nescis, quo valeat nummus, quem praebet usum?} \\
&panis ematur, holus, vini sextarius, adde} &75 \\
&quis humana sibi doleat natura negatis.} \\
an vigilare metu examinem, noctesque diesque} \\
formidare malos fures, incendia, servos,} &76 \\
ne te copilent fugientes, hoc iuvat? horum} \\
semper ego optarim pauperrimus esse bonorum.} \\
&\text{(Hor. S. I.1.64b-79)}
\end{align*}
\]

The use of fabula to mean an anecdote with a witty or humor-
ous point derived from the narrated situation and its details
is quite clear in Horace's lines. There seems also to be a
provision for adding to res in lines 74-75 adde. . . .negatis,
which generalize human needs and mitigate the force of the
later 79 psuperrimus of the punch line. The characterization of the rich man of lines 70b-72—who is really, as the details in 76-78 show, a terrified miser—is delayed by the occasion; this is literary (68-69a), as it is posed as a moral exemplum and foil to the Athenian's outrageous remarks on wealth in 65b-66. This feature of the exemplum is, as I argue below, one aspect of the fabula which Juvenal modifies in his new fabella.

Horace very nicely follows this allusion to his original thesis in lines 1-3 by delineating the parties between whom the wit passes in such a way as to bracket the entire moral content of the Tantalus exemplum (69 te...79 ego). The te could, mutato nomine, be anyone in the audience who is laughing out of turn, while the ego casts himself in the role of the purveyor of sound moral advice. This conversion of stiff literary reference into sermo that sounds improvised occurs repeatedly in Umbricius's sermo; he does not mention himself often but relies on the voices of roles in which he has cast himself, that is, on impersonation, to convey his view.

The second example from Horace, the fabula in 92-100, is more significant for placing a limit on length (95 non longa est fabula) than for manipulation of structure pertinent to Juvenal's fabellae in Satire III.⁹

denique sit finis quaerendi, cumque habeas plus, pauperiem metuas minus et finire laborem incipias, parto quod avebas, ne facias quod Ummidius quidam; non longa est fabula: dives 95 ut metiretur nummos, ita sordidus, ut se non umquam servo melius vestiret, ad usque
supremum tempus, ne se penuria victus
opprimeret, metuebat. at hunc liberta securi
divisit medium, fortissima Tyndaridarum. 100
(Hor. S. I.1,92-100)

The apparent length of the *fabula* on Ummidius is six lines
(95-100), but in fact the moral is drawn prior to these lines
in 92-94, and this conforms to Horace's practice in our first
example, in which the moral point, embodied in a brief moral
*chria* on Tantalus, is set first.\(^1\) Perhaps this is to be ex-
pected of a satire on popular moral themes, but the fate of
Ummidius is still shocking, not just in the sense that his
own gloomy premonitions came true, but that--worse than the
tu addressed in 80-91--he has not only lost the love of fami-
ly and friends but has earned their hatred. One needs to
look no further than *Sat. I*.145-146 in Juvenal,

\[
\textit{it nova nec tristis per cunctas fabula cen\textsep; 145}
\textit{ducitur iratis plaudendum funus amicis. . .}
\] (Juv. I.145-146)

to discover the programmatic appeal of such exaggeration and
irony to the later poet.

Use of the *fabella* by Horace to develop sympathy for a
character in satire is found in the Fable of the City Mouse
and the Country Mouse of *S. II*.6,77-117. Horace significant-
ly defines this *ainos*\(^1\) as an *ex re fabella* in line 78: Cer-
vius tells the tale in a context of unconsidered envy of an-
other's wealth. The 41-line length of this *apologus* exceeds
the exemplary ten lines, but development of the *res* in two
tableaux--rural *cena* and urban--surely required it. More to
the point are the rough dozen lines devoted directly to
rendering the *rusticus mus* a sympathetic character: lines 79b-89 and 115b-117. His good manners in serving the better dishes to his guest from the city compare favorably to those of the urban host who tastes every dish first. But morally one admires the *rusticus* because he rejects the hidden threat of premature death as the price of a pleasure which really only amounts to satisfying the need to eat.  

Another anecdote, the story of Servius Oppidianus’s death-bed injunctions upon his two sons, Aulus the gambler and Tiberius the miser, closes with a moral drawn from a fable of a fox and a lion: to avoid political ambition as unsuited to the sons’ natures and inheritance.

```latex
Servius Oppidius Canusi duo praedia, dives antiquo censu, gnatis divisse duobus fertur et hoc moriens pueris dixisse vocatis ad lectum: 'postquam te talos, Aule, nucesque ferre sinu laxo, donare et ludere vidi, te, Tiberi, numerare, cavis abscondere tristem, extimui, ne vos ageret vesania discors, tu Momentanum, tu ne sequerere Cicitam. quare per divers oratus uterque Penatis tu cave ne minuas, tu ne maius facias id quod satis esse putat et natura coercet. præsterea ne vos titillet gloria, iure iurando obstringam ambo: uter aedilis fueritve vestrum praetor, is intestabilis et sacer esto.' in cicere atque faba bona tu perdasque lupinis, latus ut in circio spatiere et aeneus ut stes, nudus agris, nudus nummis, insane, paternis; scilicet ut plausus quos fert Agrippa feras tu, astuta ingenum volpes imitata leonem?  
```

(Hor. S. II.3,168-186)

The anecdote told about Servius (170 fertur) is 14 lines, while the Aesopic tag is the last five lines. Whether Servius speaks the tag to his sons, or Damasippus says them to the figure of Horace, is disputed. I am inclined to see
Servius's actual words as ending in line 181 with the curse, because the epithet, 184 insane, makes the transition back to the subject of madness, which is the thesis of this sermo between Damasippus and the tu who disbelieves him. The alternative is to give some of what follows line 186 to one of the two sons, but this eventually, by line 199, makes no sense in terms of Servius, who is not portrayed as having a daughter. And this division into an anecdote followed by a short Aesopic tag better fits the articulation of this passage by its witty devices of satirical curse and transparent moral since the overeager Damasippus turns the tale of Servius into an assault on Horace's patience. Fool that he is, he converts sympathy into hatred when he talks about losing one's paternal lands and fortune to political ambition.

The diverse purposes of Horace's fabula and Juvenal's fabella do not, however, prevent two observations. First, fabulae like Horace's have the character of rumor or of "stories that are going the round" and, because of their uniqueness, can scarcely fail to identify the butt of the wit or humor, mutato nomine or not. One senses that Juvenal in Satire I has posed Horace's question of S. I.1,23-25 anew--

ne sic ut qui iocularia ridens
percurram--quamquam ridentem dicere verum
quid vetat? (Hor. S. I.1,23-25) 25

--but has arrived at a far less light-hearted answer than Horace seems to have contemplated. Second, as we shall see when we come to Persius's discussion of this sort of fabula,
it is rooted in *sermo*—is, indeed, an essential part if not the whole substance of quotidian notions of *sermo* to an ordinary Roman—so that fictionalization could not, for Juvenal, stop with names but must extend to incident, word selection, and finally to the teller, the *persona*, himself.

Juvenal's choice of the *fabella* format for *Satire III* had implications for style, considered generally. For no satirist was bound to use only the *fabella* in situational wit and humor. A good example of a satirist making just such a choice among the numerous means at his disposal is Persius's fourth satire:

```
  ut nemo in sese temptat descendere, nemo,
  sed praece denti spectatur mantica tergo!
  quaesieris 'nostin Vettidi praedia?' 'cuiius?'  25
  'dives arat Curibus quantum non milvus errat.'
  'hunc ais, hunc dis iratis genioque sinistro,
  qui, quandoque iugum pertusa ad compita figit,
  seriolae veterem metuens deradere limum
  ingemit "hoc bene sit" tunicatum cum sale mordens  30
  cepe et farratam pueris plaudentibus ollam
  pannosam faecem morientis sorbet aceti?'
  at si unctus cesses et figas in cute solem,
  est prope te ignotus cubito qui tangat et acre
  despuat: 'hi mores! penemque arcanaque lumbi
  runcantem populo marcentis pandere vulvas.
  tum, cum maxillis balanatum gausape pectas,
  inguinibus quare detonsus gurgulio extat?
  quinque palaestriate licet haec plantaria vellant
  elixasque nates labefactent forcipe adunca,
  non tamen ista filix ullo mansuescit aratro.'
  caedimus inque vicem praebemus crura sagittis.
  vivitur hoc pacto, sic novimus.  35
  (Pers. IV.23-43a)
```

Here we have two *fabulae* introduced by allusion to Aesop. Persius wishes his reader to consider the two *fabulae* (25-32 and 33-41) as commenting on the harm that is done by carrying tales and by heeding them:  50 *nequiquam populo bibulas*
donaveris aures. The second fabula, being more offensive and further being told right to one's face, is a reason for not heeding any fabulae, as the reader may sensibly infer from line 42. Persius's point in 43a is that carrying tales is what Romans live for and, in fact, what they excel in, but that this must change. We note here a harshness which is both programmatic (34-35 acre despuat) and encompassed by the fabula format, which itself is rejected on philosophical grounds. It comes as no great surprise, therefore, that Persius encloses these two fabulae in the explanatory bracket consisting of lines 23-24 and 42-43a. With this device, he fits the fabulae into his scheme of dialogue, which differs in format from the more relaxed informal sermo.

Yet even this much on style must be qualified if we are to understand what appeal Persius's satire had for Juvenal. The second, harsh fabula, being de te, falls outside Horace's canon of politeness in sermo; it is also quite hypothetical, since the respondent is radically fictionalized. With this, it becomes apparent that the main speaker is really only putting words into his interlocutor's mouth and that this is harangue and not a genuine exchange of views. If this is so, then the motivations of the chief speaker fall under the suspicion which any sensible man would feel: can Persius seriously expect such a Roman to credit the pose of always rowing up stream, of never listening to rumor, of eschewing the city's fondest pastime? It hardly seems likely that Persius had
any such thing in mind but instead meant to exaggerate the figure of the stern Stoic sage and to dose him, too, with the vinegar of the Attic stage. We shall find that Umbricius uses similar acerbity in his invective against Greeks, but that his pudor has acted to restrain real abuse, a sample of which we find at Persius IV.33-41.

To judge by Satire III, Juvenal probably saw quotidian sermo in his day as tending to harangue, and Satire II is pretty strong evidence for his dissatisfaction with Socratic dialogue as practised by Stoics. Rudd claims that, in Juvenal's time, the libertas of such vehicles of satire as the iamb was smothered by the hyper-sensitive and heavy-handed proprieties of the nouveaux riches and the high spirit of Fescennines and of the Old Comedy was lost to almost automatic suspicion. Horace's literary circle must have, on Rudd's view, made a considerable difference to that satirist's view of the boundaries of libertas. Juvenal's task as a satirical poet—if, in fact, wit and humor were not to be confined to actio, or gesture, alone, as in pantomime, or to remain at the level of buffoonery, as in mime or farce—was to remake the genre both in form and format if it was to retain its contact with the tradition of Lucilius.

What has become clear about the use of the fabula in satire by two of Juvenal's predecessors is that this form of humor manifested not only the entertainment value and popular appeal of its parent in rumor or fama, nor only a potential
for moral instruction, but also that the artist could, by suggesting additional details *ex rebus* develop a logic of the narrated situation, or of the teller's circumstances, which reveals more than the words are actually saying. For example, Horace's lines 80-91, which lie between the two *fabulae* of *S. I.1*, have a story-like cast; in reality they consist of the philosophical device of the hypothetical illness followed by pertinent questions that are unanswerable from the moral position of the *avarus*, the whole being capped in the last line and one-half by a laughable simile, that of training an *asellus* to the bridle. The story of one *fabula* seems to continue on of its own accord; attention shifts away from the teller to the narrative itself as it develops its own logic; as a number of such narrative logics or rationales collect, they develop a literary allusiveness to other *fabulae*, which is an effect at times tantamount to invective or burlesque, or they allude to circumstances of the speaker, with considerable ironical potential.

A good illustration from Roman satire of how the anecdote fares when it is presented in an oratorical context developed for satiric *sermo* is found in one of our longest continuous passages from Lucilius. The most evident change is that the identity of the speaker, or persona, must be deduced from a lost part of the work, and so I include the introductory passage from Cicero (*Fin. I.3,8*):
While it is true that Cicero here calls this passage a *locus*, rather than *fabella*, it possesses the unmistakable traits of the latter: identification of the addressee; characterization of the satirized party; detail of the situation; the witty or humorous point (93 hinc . . . inimicus), which includes the occasion, that is, Scaevola's trial. Indeed, allusion to occasion is climactic; Lucilius treats this aspect of the anecdote as susceptible to compression within another functional element of the *fabella*. Scaevola, moreover, does not actually say that Albucius is a hypocritical nitpicker for bringing suit, but that is the witty inference.

The interaction of all five elements of the *fabella* is thus definitive: the wit or humor works only if the five elements—occasion, identification of the parties to the humor, characterization of the butt of the joking, elaboration or detail of the situation, or a charge growing out of this, and the humorous point or punch line—are present or easily inferred from expressions within the *fabella*. The *res* are
exploited to the very end, but closure is evident only when the teller criticizes behaviors of the satirized party. This and the roles of other elements of this *fabella* confirm my definition of the *fabella*: the functioning of its elements permits the development of well known satiric effects within a discipline amounting to a delay in the humorous or witty punch line or point.

In this passage, such criticism is established—but not overtly expressed—in the mention of Albucius's desire to be dissociated from any role remotely Roman. Instead of a tale with a moral as lead-in, the strategy is to dramatize how Scaevola only did what Albucius wanted: the first "chaere Tite". The added detail of the lictors chiming in with the second "chaere Tite" impels audience amusement toward laughter and justifies the characterization of Albucius as not only *inimicus* to Scaevola personally but *hostis* to the state. The *fabella* would therefore appear in formal satire with all five elements literally present only if occasion or new situation required them. Addition of details and compression of one element within another, as in the punch line (93b), heighten the suspense and permit the teller to effect closure at the high point of amusement, where virtually every word is made to judge the butt of the joking. As noted in my definition, in ironical *fabellae*, irony becomes less direct because it is so delayed and because it emerges *aliter* rather than *contrarie*. 
It is impossible to decide the full degree of Scaevola's contentiousness from this fragment alone, but *iunctura of hostis* and *mi* aligns Scaevola with the state, and anaphora of *hinc* opens the door to ridicule of Albucius's specific charge or charges. Such clever manipulation of how the audience regard the occasion marks witty or humorous *fabellae* as building blocks of continuous *sermo*. If, as Warmington says,¹⁹ Lucilius II is a single satire, the fragments assigned to it may exhibit the poet's conscious use of such a compositional device.

The remaining lines of what Warmington terms *S*, or lines from Scaevola's invective on Albucius,²⁰ show clearly that it consisted of at least two other witticisms (84-86 W, M) and, in consideration of the assignment of 53 W (=55 M) *fandam atque auditam iterabimus famam* to an early or initial position in the satire, perhaps of two other *fabellae*. Not only is it evident that Lucilius was aware of the whole cloth (fama) out of which he was trimming the anecdotes that are the life blood, as it were, of informal conversation (the usual meaning of *fari*), but Cicero also makes it clear that impersonation could be a considerable stylistic aid in invective (*de Or. III. 43,171*):

Conlocatizationis est componere et struere verba sic, ut neve asper eorum concursus neve hiulcus sit, sed quodam modo coagmentatus et levis; in quo lepide soceri mei persona lusit is, qui elegantissime id facere potuit, Lucilius:

"quam lepide lexis compostae! ut tesserula omnes arte pavimento atque emblemate vermiculato."

Quae cum dixisset in Albucium inludens, ne a me quidem abstinuit:

"Crassum habeo generum, ne rhetoricoterus tu seis."

(Lucil. 84-86 W, M)

Cicero's use of the term *persona* in this context of style is striking: from it, I believe, we are to infer that the pretense, or dissimulation, involved in impersonation is to include no small quantum of stylistic imitation in the interest of keeping verisimilitude: for instance, in 84-85 W, all but one opportunity for elision from *tesserulae* to *emblemate* are used, thus setting off the Latinate *vermiculato* for special emphasis. Mere Grecisms aside, this is a far kinder reply to Albucius's (62 W=72 M) *Si natibus natricem impressit crassam et capitatum* than his words perhaps deserve and it recalls the tack which Crassus took against Brutus of employing reminders of specific vices and folly. The pun in *Crassum*, while clearly a verbal witticism, also repays in kind, in this context, Albucius's snideness by reviving a charge growing out of a detail of situation.²¹

Warmington notes²² that Book XI, like II consisting of a single satire, contains at least five anecdotes on famous men. Fiske considers Book XI a "miscellany of such good stories,"²³ and this may be a fair characterization, as the large number of details which Warmington groups around the figure of Scipio Aemilianus (424-439 W=394-395, 397-410 M) seems suited to comic narrative. Several other things stand out in Lucilius XI. The five story beginnings which
Warmington sees (424-425 W=394-395 M, 440-442 W=413-415 M, 445-447 W=422-424 M, 448-449 W=411-412 M, 450-452 W=418-420 M) all contain the name of the person who is the subject of the tale and indicate in some way how the wit or humor of each anecdote may have been developed, e.g., 448-449 dictum praeconis... Grani, and 450-451 Quintus Opimius... et formosus homo fuit et famosus. In each of these are the same early appearance of identification and characterization as in Lucilius 87-93 W.

What has become clear in the above pages on adoption of the fabula in satire by Juvenal's predecessors is that, within the genre's entertainment value, popular appeal, and potential for moral instruction, the artist could, by lengthening or suppressing one of its elements, develop implication, innuendo, and the like. This opens the door to a new understanding of what seems mere rhetoric in Satire III. For example, is preterition of the name of Daedalus in line 80 just scintillating priamel? It cannot be merely that, since Umbricius means to lambaste Greek culture with this sarcasm. His main point, as it seems to me, is to repay the sarcasm in lines 67-68 by cavil at what Daedalus left behind--Athens and the empty pride she stood for even in the times of the sons of Erechtheus. The allusion, also, to the earlier, more sympathetic portrayal of this hero in line 25 illustrates that Umbricius still believes that the change to country living will do him much good, for just as Daedalus put off those
destructive (yet somehow faintly ridiculous) wings, so he himself will slough off urban habits and pretensions.

At some point in the fabella, as this example shows, the logical must submit to the poetic, because initiation in poetry is what Umbricius performs upon the ego, but more especially because poetry is Juvenal's claim upon his audience's attention. The artist is thus detectible, but can Juvenal's audience have interpreted his res so precisely?

The answer to this question, especially in terms of Juvenal's third Satire, can derive only from a thorough examination of its story-telling components, or fabellae. My reasons for using this approach are several, but the most important of them is that Juvenal III is composed entirely, with a single exception, of such fabellae. Because so many of his fabellae are ironical, irony must be a sizeable component of the implicit morality which Umbricius imparts to the ego, and thence to the poet's audience. Overt moralizing in Horace and Persius, when it comes from the ego or sympathetic characters, must be carefully considered, often in relation to context, but few doubt the vein of genuine metal refined after such a process. However, with the ego of Juvenal III, who announces himself in the first line to be confusus, doubt must linger, and Umbricius seems too practical to moralize freely and often. Instead, he suggests, through the humorous tales and scenarios that he relates, the proper conduct of life. To pick out moralizing in this landscape of witty and
humorous stories therefore requires, before it can become very specific, a census, so to speak, and a description of the characteristics of the Juvenalian *fabella*.

By my definition, Juvenal III consists of 28 *fabellae*, the longest of which (U.16, lines 160-189) encloses a *fabula* of the traditional sort (lines 168-179), with its moral set first. Twenty-six *fabellae* are attributed to Umbricius by the *inquit* of line 21, and two are spoken by the *ego*. Twenty of the 28 *fabellae* are ironical in their resolution in a punch line, while eight are narrative and lack an ironical ending; Umbricius delivers all eight narrative *fabellae*, five of which form a concentration in lines 190-242. I have set these two large groups in Table 3 below and put the ironical *fabellae* first, because the controlling frame of lines 1-20 and 315-322 is entirely composed of ironical *fabellae*. The postponement of the majority of narrative *fabellae* to their position after line 189, and their generally less strained tone, mark them as no less important than their ironical counterparts; but they are calmer, more intimate, and altogether less contentious.
Table 3
The *Fabellae* of Juvenal III²⁶

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ironical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Wit based on <em>discrepantia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Wish for the impossible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.2</td>
<td>29-40</td>
<td>The patient sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.3</td>
<td>41-48</td>
<td>Ironical sententiousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.4</td>
<td>49-57</td>
<td>Reproof of one as if error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.5</td>
<td>58-61</td>
<td>Passion, with feigned depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.6</td>
<td>62-66</td>
<td>Suspicion of concealed ridicule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.7</td>
<td>67-80</td>
<td>Repayment of sarcasm in kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.9</td>
<td>92-100a</td>
<td>Ironical admiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.10</td>
<td>100b-108</td>
<td>Witty exposure of folly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.11</td>
<td>109-113</td>
<td>The note of absurdity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.12</td>
<td>114-125</td>
<td>Friendly but ironical advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.14</td>
<td>137-146</td>
<td><em>Paraprospodokian</em> joke <em>ex rebus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.15</td>
<td>147-159</td>
<td>Conjecture in a sense not intended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.16</td>
<td>160-189</td>
<td>Pretense of not understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.19</td>
<td>223-231</td>
<td>Using another's irony to characterize him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.23</td>
<td>268-277</td>
<td>Wit applicable to character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.24</td>
<td>278-301</td>
<td>Calm answer to teasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.25</td>
<td>302-314</td>
<td>Ironical dissimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.26</td>
<td>315-322</td>
<td>Taking another's words in a sense not meant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.1</td>
<td>21-28</td>
<td>Humorous bodily representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.8</td>
<td>81-91</td>
<td>Humorous bodily representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.13</td>
<td>126-136</td>
<td>Extended comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.17</td>
<td>190-211</td>
<td><em>Apologus</em> of the <em>opici mures</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18</td>
<td>212-222</td>
<td>Hints about family &quot;skeleton&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.20</td>
<td>232-242</td>
<td>Comic <em>narratio</em> on the litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.21</td>
<td>243-253</td>
<td>Exaggeration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.22</td>
<td>254-267</td>
<td>Allusion to <em>historia</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Irony in the *fabellae* of Juvenal III operates with widely varying degrees of indirection. For example, the *ego's* lines, E.1-2, establish the occasion of the meeting of the two old friends and its setting. In the usual manner of the satiric frame, it provides "a semi-dramatic situation in which vice and folly may reasonably be dissected" and as such forms "an integral part of the poem," a setting for which Umbricius "pictures the turbulence and the decadence of Rome." The irony stems in part from the locale in the Vale of Egeria: what sort of view can be had of Rome from a cave? Clearly it is one that emphasizes man's proximity to the lower animals, and it is a dark vision which emanates from beside the pool. By contrast, Umbricius's last words (U.26) address the *ego* with a genial irony that anticipates an auditor who is also a man of wit and will take this *fabula de te* in an appropriate, friendly way. The wide range of tone, from the dismay of E.1, to the mysteriousness of E.2 and friendliness of U.26, illustrates the great flexibility of Juvenal's ironic *fabellae*.

The 25 *fabellae* spoken within this frame consist of 17 ironical and 8 narrative examples, and this ratio of about 2:1 is reflected in the proportion of lines (195:99). This imbalance in favor of irony is, however, less perceptible than expected. From the standpoint of Chapter II, where it was determined that anger is the dominant feeling down to line 189, and fear thereafter until line 314, we obtain a
ratio of 169 lines in U.1-16 to 125 lines in U.17-25, or only 1.4:1 in lines and 1.8:1 in fabellae. If the twelve lines of the traditional fabula on the rural fantasy—commonly called the centerpiece of Satire III—may be viewed as relief from anger and fear, the ratio falls to 157 to 125 lines, or less than 1.3:1. The dominance of narrative fabellae after line 190—five of the nine fabellae and 69 of 125 lines—here marks the narrative wit and humor as adapted by Juvenal to expressing the fears of the Roman pauper; the ironic fabellae reveal the anger and frustration of Umbricius within the limits of the pudor signalled in his captatio.

The premise of Table 3's division of all Juvenal III into fabellae is that the wit and humor are overwhelmingly situational (ex rebus) rather than verbal. The last century of scholarship has evoked very little in this work of verbal wit or humor, with its momentary brilliance and its tendency to imply the opposite of its literal wording. Juvenal apparently had little use for verbal wit in Umbricius's presentation of the plight of the pauper as a justification for leaving Rome. We find, instead, that the ego uses verbal para prosdokian in E.1 and that the captator makes an atrocious pun on testa and testamentum. These are not the only examples of verbal wit or humor, but in my opinion they are the most important. Umbricius has no patience with such rascals as the 158 pinnirapi cultos iuvenes iuvenesque lanistae, aside from using their desire to be admired as a way of
scorning them in his impersonations.

Moreover, Umbricius establishes a criterion for the judgment of wit and humor in U.15, when he asks,

quid quod materiam praebet causasque iocorum omnibus hic idem (Juv. III.147-148a),

and then proceeds to show how the minor flaws in the serviceable clothing for everyday wear becomes a source of joking at the pauper's expense:

nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se quam quod ridiculos homines facit (Juv. III.152-153a).

Concentration on the materia causaeque iocorum is scarcely more evident elsewhere in this work, and the echo in this phrase from rhetorical theory on ex rebus wit and humor is nicely bound to the theme that honest men wear honest duds.

This fabella also contains one of the two instances of the word pudor in Satire III (line 154). This I understand as a statement on the proprium of wit and humor. Here it is set in the mouth of the iuvenis railing at Umbricius in the theater and is quite ironical, since the youth neither preserves his own sense of self-restraint and public decency nor has a care for that of others. He deserves a far more stinging rebuke than Umbricius gives, but the latter's aim is to have the last laugh on such impudence, and so in line with his own pudor, Umbricius mildly reflects that this was, after all, what that fop Otho wanted.

I argue in Chapter IV that U.14-15 provide, besides insight into the plight of the pauper in court or at the
theater, a thumbnail rhetoric of wit and humor for defense in negotium or otium from such idiots. As the content of U.14 demonstrates, the mere mention of a name like Numa implies a host of moral meanings on pietas, and action-chriaes\textsuperscript{2} such as those on Scipio Nasica and Metellus Caecus carry the freight of moral meaning because of the Roman audience's familiarity with the anecdotes that made the names famous. Such practice was typical of the courtroom, and it recalls the sharpness of Lucilius's Scaevola in his Book II. They are too brief to be more than a detail of the fabella in which they are found, but they are an indicator of the sources of the Juvenalian fabella.

On the other hand, the traditional fabula as found embedded in U.16, with its early moral in lines 168-170, shows little development of story line but moves rather by a narrowing of focus from a panorama of a whole town's populace to the intimate picture of a child in its mother's bosom. In a word, Juvenal uses the older fabula as a transitional device to move from the expense of pretentious dinnerware (lines 165-167) to that of pretentious and fashionable clothing (lines 180-181). Juvenal's centerpiece thus resembles one of Adamietz's Verbindungsstränge, in that it overtly presents the rural "leg" of the urban-rural antithesis. I would add to this only that the artistry of incorporating the fabula into U.16 constitutes a statement on the boundaries of the fabella throughout Satire III. How this is so is the subject
of most of the remaining remarks in this chapter.

From the limited thematic development of the old fabula, it may be surmised that Juvenal's new fabella is not a direct outgrowth of theme. Themes such as ambitiosa paupertas contribute arguments to the main thesis that life in Rome is unbearable for the honest, middling native, but this does not make thesis or theme directly decisive for the fabella ex rebus. It is more logical to see thesis and theme as providing a criterion of relevance for res, since themes represent a division of thought. Such a criterion seems only one tool for selection of res in Satire III; some freedom from theme supports the indirectness with which Umbricius's irony works in his genial deceptions, dissimulations, and impersonations.

Because of these features, Juvenal's ironically witty or humorous fabella operates with far more subtlety than the old fabula, with its obvious moral and plain relation to theme. In U.16—as in many of the other ironical fabellae—the res are not openly stated until line 164, and even here it is a verb (164 emergunt) which suggests the subject: is the pauper's income anymore a means to rise in life? The answer, 164 haut facile, is also the answer to the three rhetorical questions (160 quis gener. . .aedilibus) that are simply details of the res. Lines 164-165a also present the pauper's reaction of disgust and frustration over his economic helplessness, and so identify him as a party to the dark humor of U.16. But if one looks for a single noun defining the res,
the wait is prolonged until 188 fermentum meaning, as I argue
towards the end of Chapter IV, "source of increase or pros-
perity." It does indeed look as if Juvenal employs the
'lead-in', suggested by Martyn, of three details of the res,
and virtually all the remaining developments are bracketed by
emergunt and fermentum: the villain 166 conatus, or infla-
tion, several facets of pretentious poverty, the moral exem-
plum of the centerpiece, itself prefaced by pudet, and last
the scenario, in lines 184b-189, of a special occasion at the
patron's domus.

It is only at this late point that Umbricius develops
the wit latent in the res. The other parties appear: Veii-
iento, the patron; his friends; perhaps his son or other
young relative; and the slave selling liba to the guests.
Since Veipiento is not going to speak to the pauper anyway,
the telling detail is 187 venalibus--the proverbial one straw
too many. "We clients have fallen under compulsion to pay
the tribute tax and to swell the savings of a well dressed
servant as well." The butt of such scathing wit is not the
slave who perhaps hears these angry mutterings but the patron
who gave the order to sell the cakes. Umbricius makes him
out as too much a skinflint to help his own slaves save for
their manumission or, barring that, even for burial.

Once the butt of such indirect and ironical wit is iden-
tified, it becomes easier to see what the guideposts were
along the path to the punch line in lines 188b-189. The
haughty Veiiento is probably foreshadowed by 162 aedilibus, by whom the pauper is never heard in consilio. The sale of ritual cakes is a detail of res signalled by 183b-184a omnia Romae cum pretio. The idyllic fabula of lines 168-179 turns into the mora in 183 quid te moror?—and thus retreats to the status of an egressio which implies the harried character of the audience, homo urbanus. The artistic subordination of the old fabula, now a transitional egressio between details of the res as classified by the antithetical conatus and fermentum, demonstrates that the governing principle of the new fabella is exploitation of the res adequately to lay the basis for wit. Juvenal makes this clear at another level of meaning, too: the mild irony of the rural exemplum, held up as it is to shame homo urbanus in his pretensions, is evidently thought insufficient to the task and must, owing to prolonged development of the res and to the delay in presentation of the butt of the joking, be supplemented by Umbricius's impersonation of the slave and by the pauper's scathing comment on the callous patron.

This in no way diminishes the importance of the res of the fabula itself—some of which are very significant to comprehension of the personae in Juvenal III—but the developments just outlined do show that incorporation of the old fabula into the new fabella, with its rhetorical development of its own res, is significant in discovery of the boundaries of Juvenal's format. The fabula's status as egressio implies
that Juvenal, in this satire, at least, regarded the old fabula as antithetical to the urbane wit necessary to express anger and frustration without damage to pudor. Its collocation with numerous details of the res of the new fabella demonstrates that relief from the passions evoked by the res is at best temporary and can, in the end, be nothing but a pleasantly ironic fantasy. And the indirect allusion to the occasion of E.1--Umbricius's digestus--in the old fabula implicitly comments on how the new fabella begins. For Juvenal seems to say that each new situation which Umbricius takes up for discussion hides another rope that binds the whole agmen Quiritium to Rome.

Another way in which the old fabula is instructive about the new may be found in its narrative cast. As I will argue in Chapter IV, the rural fantasy is high ground for Umbricius and he can see in many directions from it. Sympathy with Umbricius means in this instance a demand that the audience see things from his standpoint, even if only for a moment. But once the auditor enters the rural fantasy, he will emerge, it seems to me, only too ready for more relief from this urban madness. The old fabula thus psychologically prepares the audience for the transition in U.17 to the primarily narrative second section after line 190.

The development of the res in the old fabula may therefore be the pattern for Juvenal's narrative fabella. This pattern consists of a panoramic opening, followed by
reduction of the scope of the res to the intimate or personal. Such a pattern, with slight variations, Juvenal employs in all five narrative fabellae after line 190. In U.17, the fable of the opici mures, we first scan the countryside, but end up listening to the mice tell about Cordus's escape in his bedclothes, if those (210 nudum). U.18 opens on a crowd rushing to Asturicus's housewarming and closes on a rumor that names him as the arsonist. U.20 gives us first the pauper in his huge tenement and ends at the windows of a litter. U.21 then draws back far enough from the rich man's litter to realize the crowd but finishes on the minute details of what a slave trotting by is carrying on his head. U.22, again opening with a panorama of a thoroughfare, aims at drawing the epic weapon toward its victim and reduces all movement to the slow gurges of the Styx, beside which the pauper is stalled for lack of a farthing. In addition to these late narrative fabellae, U.1 begins with an overview of Umbricius's problems only to close on an image which suggests his present physical vigor, and U.8 considers from its start a class of people which Umbricius flees—laudatores, particularly the one who flatters an acquaintance's vocem angustum. In fact, of the eight narrative fabellae, only U.13, an extended comparison, does not strictly follow this pattern of panoramic co-ordination with the particular. Instead, U.13 is an attempt to render, person by person, the part of a crowd that the pauper might see in a brief moment; the
panorama, instead of appearing early as a point of co-ordination of later particulars, is narrowed somewhat and diffused throughout this *fabella*.

The final characteristic of Juvenal's *fabella* that requires comment is the tendency of some kinds of *res* to force, for maximum comic surprise, essential elements of the story to be delayed. U.16 presents examples of such delaying tactics, since the butt of the wit and the other parties to it remain unspecified until just before the punch line of this 30-line *ridiculum*. In U.24, the specific (legal) charge growing out of the mugging is compressed into and shapes the resolution of the *res* in the *pauper's* plea. Other *fabellae* exhibit compression, but not always of the same type. In U.5, for instance, the telling detail in 61 *faecis* is the next to last word in the punch line (61b) of this joke of feigned emotion and passion. In U.7, the sarcastic remark of lines 67-68 establishes one party to the joking and characterizes its butt through impersonation. Opposing this tendency towards brevity and compactness is, as we noted in Horace's *fabula*, discursiveness as to details. Juvenal's *fabellae* exploit the discursive quality of situational wit and humor in many ways: geographic catalog, list, priamel, aristeteia, extended litotes, and in particular furnishings of dwellings and components of their construction, along with details of dress and grooming. Some of these devices of expansion take up a sizeable part of certain *fabellae*, and in
their multiplication serve to prolong the agony of the butt of the joke, as in U.22 or U.7. In other cases, such as U.24, overparticular questioning amounts to a taunt, and in U.9 the verisimilitude of the minutest details of the actors' costumes and make-up fool the credulous into taking the persona for the real thing.

To summarize, Juvenal employs two generic types of comic fabellae to structure Satire III, ironic and narrative. The ironic fabellae have the more strained tone, because generally these express disturbance, anger, and frustration. Their contentiousness often derives from postponement of overt statement of the res to a point well within the fabella. Occasionally this feature is accompanied by postponement also of identification of the parties to the joking and characterization of the butt to a late point. The net result is that, in the ironic fabellae where such postponement or compression occurs, Umbricius seems to rail to no purpose—until he brings all the strands of the res together at the last moment in, or just prior to, the punch line terminating the joke.

Juvenal's narrative fabella follows a different line of development. Usually this involves a panoramic sweep of the scene of the res followed by exploration until the level of intimate detail is reached. Taken all together, the narrative fabellae seem much easier to understand than the ironic. In narrative fabellae, too, terms of opprobrium are scarce, and this promotes quieter resolution of the res, with
appropriately less dramatic tension than is found in such ironic *fabellae* as U.24. This relaxation of tension within the discursive narrative *fabella* thus permits freer amusement at the comic resolution.

From these considerations, it is clear that the Juvenalian *fabella* is not only flexible in the placement of its elements but also unpredictable as to its outcome, as good wit and humor should be. If Dunn meant to draw attention to this aspect of *actio*, I could not be in closer agreement, for timing in comic delivery is everything. Moreover, the narrow range of *fabella* length—20 of 26 instances falling between eight and fourteen lines—does not tire the listener with monotonous regularity of duration. *Dicacitas*, or rapid succession of short, sharp jests (Cic. *de Or.* II.54,213), does not seem to be the precise effect Juvenal was seeking with his new *fabella*. If Lucilius is any guide in ridiculing Albucius's speaking as *lexis conpostae ut tesserulae omnes* (84 W), Juvenal has avoided that tiresome flaw. Even if occasionally a transition from one *fabella* to another seems jarring in *Satire* III, the effect when one severs the *fabellae* from each other is not that of *tesserae* but of paving stones. Juvenal sought as smooth an effect as possible within the *fabella*, and if harsh transitions do appear, he probably saw them as desirable in comic discourse. And in poetry, to judge from the half-lines in the *Aeneid*, smooth transition was not altogether necessary.
From Lucilius 84 W also arises the question of how far, compositionally, wit or humor may be pressed before it dis-integrates into tesserulae. Uncontrolled addition of detail to an already offensive or disturbing ridiculum invites re-tort, as Cicero shows at de Or. II.65,262, where Lamia tries to defend against Crassus's barbs: Lamia's interruptions and impertinence were quelled. Indeed, in establishing his dis-tinction between ex rebus and ex verbis joking, Cicero twice mentions the effects of additions to joking just where he de-fines the oratorical fabella (de Or. II.59,239 fin.-242). This interesting coincidence is, of course, not definitive for verse satire, but Umbricius's sometimes lengthy replies to his own rhetorical questions, along with the extended roll of parties to the wit of U.13 and other such extensions of wit and humor, would surely have raised for Juvenal's audi-ence a question of the force of such additions. Certain of these could escape as mock catalogues and epic, but generally the proprium required that additions like the retort in line 159 at the end of U.15 preserve a good ethos while meeting a criterion of relevance to the res. If such a standard does not guarantee surprise in humor or wit, it surely provides for liveliness.

Just as Juvenal controls in his new fabella the unpre-dictability of good wit and humor, so there is new truth in the picture of the poet on the street corner (Sat. I.17b-18a) mulling over the day's happenings and picturing to himself
how such stories could be adapted to satire. Since this is
the same poet who found the cratory and sermo of his contem-
poraries unbearable, as II.14-15 and III.73-74 and 86-87a in-
dicate, to say nothing of their poetry recitals, he must have
felt justified in taking, as it were, his poetry out of doors
for the fresh air of "stories that are told" and in letting
the fabellae, in themselves, suggest their own organization.
The poet, thus free of the customary office of stating the
moral of the fabula, could still evoke morality implicitly by
means of wit and humor but—what is truly revolutionary and
renovative for the genre—also develop myth in the meeting of
the poet-ego with his mentor, Umbricius.

We must also regard as an important artistic decision
Juvenal's deliberate avoidance of emphasis on the vatic mys-
teries. His assignment of most of the divine machinery and
ritual to a fabella spoken by the ego is a rejection of myth
and legend as the sole means of fictionalization. Juvenal,
though he retained brief allusions to such figures as Egeria
and Daedalus and such places as Cumae, fictionalized Umbrici-
us, the teller of the new fabella, by means of imagery sug-
gestng his death. Prolonged discourse with a shade casts
doubt on the motivations of the correspondent, the ego. With
such doubt comes much of the irony which critics of Juvenal
III claim for this satire.

If we leave the dramatic irony of Umbricius's lack of
awareness about his own death aside for one moment, it is
possible to see that the ego is dramatically engaged in de-
ciding whether he merits the irony directed by so many of Um-
bricius's fabellae at homo urbanus. To Umbricius it is all
or nothing on this head, but he appears to know that the ego
may be able to effect a compromise—the summer in the coun-
tryside which Horace so loved. In U.26, Umbricius points to
precisely the main literary effect of Horace's fabula: one
laughs at the wit or humor appropriately and most heartily
when it does not touch oneself. Almost the same point is
made by Persius when he resorts to the fabula. And this as-
pect of the fabella derives from the aggressive nature of the
ridiculum even when adapted for attack on vice and folly with
adequate guidelines for protection of one's own ethos and of
the dignitas of one's friends.

So, as we turn, in the next two chapters, to considera-
tions of ethos and wit and humor in Juvenal III, we might
keep several points in mind: (1) How is it that Umbricius is
able to get away with telling so many fabellae de absentibus
without his pudor being seriously called into question? (2)
How is it that irony does not, by and large, rebound on his
own persona, as Ehrenpreis posits? (3) Has Juvenal altered
the moral impetus of the genre of satire so that it is now
more Roman, in Persius's sense of the business of relating
"stories that are told," than it is overtly moralistic, a
better vehicle of fiction than Horace dreamed, and better
poetry all the way around?
In conclusion, it has become arguable that effects of 
ex rebus wit and humor have a traceable substratum in the fabu-
la. That the fabula had, in some improvisational form, al-
ready by Lucilius's time found a place in Roman satire is ev-
ident from his Books II and XI; Lucilius, in using anecdote,
acknowledged its source in fama and its use in conversation;
he may have also adapted it to satirical discourse by limit-
ing explicit reference to the occasion of its use, because
economy of composition did not require repeated reference to
occasion. When Horace and Persius turned their attention to
the fabula, they paid particular attention to compositional
limits for this format of wit and humor. Each satirist
wished to appear to "carry tales" to some purpose and so made
the moral of the story an early, or at least prominent, fea-
ture of fabulae.

But because in poetry words can convey much more than
they denote, and because this feature of language is accentu-
ated in ironical wit and humor, we find that the punch line
engineered by Juvenal becomes embedded in and is sometimes
almost identical with the telling detail of moral character
or juicy tidbit of rumor. Horace felt that there ought to be
some limit, too, on the length or discursiveness of fabulae,
and he is apparently followed in this by Persius: about ten
hexameters was enough; Juvenal's average fabella has eleven.
The temptation to compare tales was also felt to be a feature
of perpetuae facetiae—surely this is what Horace meant by ne
sic ut qui iocularia ridens percurram—and even within Persius's restricted compass, two short fabulae are joined closely to illustrate one rather complex moral point. This, as I argue in Chapter IV, is what Juvenal is doing in U.9-10.

This potential of the fabula or fabella for articulation of discourse is, then, acknowledged by Juvenal's predecessors although this acknowledgment is more a matter of example than of fully explicit precept. The reason for this is, the source for fabellae lay outside art in daily conversation, which had no rules but what dignity would tolerate. That this dignity was often very sensitive, Juvenal's Sat. I sufficiently indicates; that Juvenal meant to collect dozens of potentially offensive fabellae in a bill of complaint is more broadly evident in III than in any other Satire of Book I. How he manages to group so many fabellae under the utilitarian rubric of eundum est, rather than any moral rubric, is at least partly a consequence of the artistic decision to render Umbricius fictionally credible, that is, adequately to fictionalize the teller. The result in III is that the correspondent or viva vox, who is the ego according to De Decker, or is the "straw man" in the figure of homo urbanus, becomes the focus of the doubt lost before the expert fictionalization of Umbricius.

While the finer points of this proposition must wait until the next chapters for explanation, it is now clear that Juvenal had hit upon a solution for the continuous use of
fabellae in satire. First, he eliminated the need to draw the moral prior to every tale by tying all the fabellae to Umbricius's decision to leave Rome and by submerging the ego's comments on this decision in evasive politeness. Second, elimination of the running moral commentary on the fabellae freed Juvenal to develop the ostensible meaning--of reasons for and justification of departure from Rome--in such a way that Umbricius seems a well rounded, sympathetic character in his own right and a credible persona. The fact, however, that moral inferences from the various fabellae are to be drawn by the auditores is evident from the first lines of Umbricius's sermo. This effort is soon left entirely to the audience, as punch line, anticlimax, parody, mock epic and necromancy, and the host of devices which indicate the presence of ridicule, wit, and humor pile up. The format in which the comic impulse asserts itself alongside the implicit moral is thus most conveniently understood and discussed in terms of the fabella.
FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER III

1 Paulson (1967, 4-5) points out that satire tends to exploit episodic forms, such as almanacs, lists, and collections of stories or anecdotes, in which considerations of plot are often minimal.

2 On the intensity of satire's pursuit of evil, in contrast with comedy's permissiveness, see Paulson 1967, 3-4. See Grant 1924, 137; also Giangrande 1972, 110, 115, and 120-121 with n.8, who sees Juvenal as far more serious than Horace on the subject of Rome.

3 The figure of the eiron, exemplified by Socrates, Scipio Aemilianus, and perhaps Cato Senior, symbolizes not only the extent to which irony could be thought to permeate life but also the high quality of this sort of humor: Cic. de Or. II. 67,271 perlelegans et cum gravitate salsum cumque oratoris dictionibus tum urbanis sermonibus accommodatum.

4 On narratio in general, see Cic. de Or. II.19,80: rem narrare, et ita ut veri similis narratio sit, ut aperta, ut brevis, and cf. Quint. IV.2,31: Narratio est rei factae aut ut factae utilis ad persuadendum expositio, vel (ut Apollodorus finit) oratio docens auditorem, quid in controversia sit. Eam plerique scriptores, maxime qui sunt ab Isocrate, volunt esse lucidam, brevem, verisimilem.

5 On comic narrationes, cf. Cic. de Or. II.66,264: in quibus est narration, res sane difficilis; exprimenda enim sunt et ponenda ante oculos ea, quae videantur et veri similis, quod est proprium narrationis, et quae sint, quod ridiculi proprium est, subturpia.

6 On the reader's collaboration in the transformative aspect of satire, see Miner 1972, 21.

7 Athenaeus 281 B relates that in the kathodos ton Atreidon Tantalus was so given to pleasure that he asked to be able to enjoy a life like that of the gods.

8 Juvenal may have imitated Horace with Sat. VI.027 quem rides? aliis hunc mimum! The comic context is also evident
at III.100-101a. The fact that both of these instances occur in passages that resemble or perhaps are diatribe points, as Fraenkel 1959, 94-95, indicates, to the Lucilian mold in which attacks on vice had been cast.

9Horace's emphasis on dress (sordidus) figures as an important motif in Juv. III, but the fear of starvation is truly eccentric, and is treated not at all seriously by the later poet: see below in Chapter V, on the fable of Cordus and the City Mice.

10Fraenkel 1959, 95, in a short list of the fabulae of Hor. S. I.1, limits the Ummidius fabula to lines 95-100, but inclusion of the moral of the tale with the tale itself violates no satiric canon, as Fraenkel's term, epimuthion, indicates.

11Fraenkel 1957, 143.

12See Rudd's discussion, 1966, 250-252.

13Kiessling 1961, 243 ad loc., says the fable of the fox and the lion is unknown elsewhere.

14Rudd 1973, 88, by the punctuation of his translation attributes lines 182-186 to Damasippus in propria persona, although he earlier acknowledged serious problems with attribution in this work, 1966, 174-175. Clearly Klingner's Teubner text (1970) here cited indicates that the tu of lines 182 and 185 is the viva vox, or respondent.

15On this see Harvey 1981, 113, ad loc., on line 24.

16See Juv. III.86b-87a, sermonem indocti; III.141-142; III.153b-158; III.292-296; cf. V.74-75, where the only words that seem truly addressed to Trebius are a snide reproof.

17Rudd 1957, 325-327.

18As Cicero says such additions will do, de Or. II.59, 242 and 63,255.


21We cannot be sure that Cicero quotes all three lines from a single anecdote, but the context of rhetorical ability in each fragment makes this conjecture a likely one.

23 Fiske 1920, 116.

24 Kirby's contrast of how Sappho's priamel, fr. 16.1-4, sounds as logical priamel as opposed to one appropriate to poetry is most apt (1985, 143).

25 The sole exception to this statement is U.16, which encloses a fabula of the older style, with early moralizing. This problem is discussed in detail in Chapter IV, pp. 252-254, 259-260.

26 In the rest of this dissertation, I shall use the system of designating speaker by initial and lines of an entire fabella by fabella number only when referring to the entire fabella. References to specific words or lines will continue as before--by line number.

27 Elliott 1960, 110-111.

28 On the role of the exodium in play cycles, see Duff 1970, 147 ad loc.

29 Romano 1979, 87-97, finds 35 pasages in Satire III with ironical content, of which 18 involve situational irony (her 1, 5-9, 10-11, 13-18, 20-21, 23, 26, 29, and 35) and 17 verbal irony.

30 Cicero uses the expression icoorum materiam at de Or. II.65,262 fin.

31 This echoes Ciceronian cautions on dignitas in the use of wit and humor by the crator, de Or. II.54,221; 56,229; and many times subsequently.

32 O'Neil 1986, 131-133, discusses at great length Quintilian's class of action-chriae (I.9,5).
CHAPTER IV

Personae, Tolerance and Intolerance, and Humiliation of the Pauper

I shall, in this and the next Chapter, with as few prefatory remarks as possible, define for each of the *fabellae* of Juvenal III its constituent parts and the working of its *res*. The establishment of themes from the first line of the satire requires, on the formal plan, pauses for reflection; so in a *fabella* the punch line or the climax of the narrative in the *ridiculum* signals a pause for laughter or a smile. It may be that a rapid succession of very short *fabellae* shows a trend towards *dicacitas*, as opposed to *cavillatio*. But over all such stylistic ideas hangs one demand on the audience of Roman satire: that of sensing the appropriate point at which to laugh.

As Chapter I showed, no scholar of Juvenal III has yet attempted to identify every humorous passage in this work, and probably this is an impossibility. The aim, therefore, is not so much to identify every occurrence of wit or humor as it is to make clear the *res* of a given passage that develops to a conclusion in the punch line or narrative *ridiculum*. 
The term fabella implies, from its root in fari, narrative as it is found in informal conversation, as Horace suggests with Cervius's fable at the end of Sermo II.6. But to focus discussion only on informal conversational style in the following chapters would be to miss the essential point that any narrative, however long or short, must sustain continuity. Before all else, short narratives like fabellae should begin and end at easily identifiable points, the natural candidates in the Latin hexameter being at line breaks and cesurae with a full stop.

This suggests that the boundaries of the fabellae of ex rebus wit and humor will largely coincide with the topics of division, as it is res that are most easily sorted along obvious, literal lines. But just as rhetorical divisiones are analytical categories of res and not simply an enumeration of parts (Cic. Top. 7.30, 5.28), so moral themes in Satire III may be regarded as divisions of res, which correspond roughly to the large subjects of De Decker's or Highet's outline. Confusion as to the res of a fabella is less likely to arise from themes than from attention to examples or details of catalogues, for the following reason: Juvenal, in Satire III, often allows an example, or what seems to be an example but is often a thematic transition, to grow by logical association or moral implication into the res of a new fabella.

Even so, narrative fabellae are not unduly complicated by such techniques; this analysis becomes, however, less
direct when it comes to fabellae of dissimulation in Juvenal III. Horace's satires sometimes exhibit considerable depth of impersonation, as in the comparable Damasippus Sermo (II. 3), and in Persius, impersonation and assignment of lines—often to a disembodied moral commentator—remain problems of interpretation. In Juvenal III, however, these features of dissimulation pose only limited and tractable problems for interpretation, as in the fable of the opici mures (U.17). More difficult at times is the decision about who, exactly, is the butt of joking in a given fabella, especially in joking de absentibus. Also somewhat complex are the sarcasms and the "friendly advice" directed at Umbricius as pauper. The lack of a prominent or transparent moral in such fabellae permits the reader to view the res as part of a dramatic sketch, as in the fabella of the captator (U.23), or even to see Umbricius as a dramatic character temporarily in the throes of a passion, as in the fabella of the querulous Quir-es (U.5). And much ambiguity in the humor is found in the fabula de te (U.26) closing Satire III.

Irony is a delicate web, as Romano's study indicates, but it is also a sticky one for interpretation under the circumstances outlined just above. The temptation to produce a guide to the irony, rather than the boundaries, of fabellae is considerable, but what would one gain from such effort besides another set of prescriptive rhetorical categories? We are after description here; little can be gotten from
imposing a typology of fabellae like Cicero's on Juvenal III, especially since Cicero did not believe his typology to be exhaustive (de Cr. II.71,289). From this standpoint, the position taken in Chapter III—to regard the fabellae as comprised of five parts, with occasional suppression of one element and frequent compression of one into another, as a set of definitive rules for the performance of appropriate wit or humor in anecdote—appears to be an important but overlooked path of interpretation. Explication of conformity to these narrative rules, since they incorporate a proprium of the ridiculum refined for satirical discourse, is therefore, along with discovery of the res and their local boundaries, a principal goal in Chapters IV and V.

The question, also, of the appropriate length of the fabella deserves comment here. Horace and Persius prescribe an exemplary length in fabulae of about ten lines; Juvenal's fabella is, on average, approximately eleven lines long. Though the actual instances range from five to thirty lines, there is a strong concentration in the narrow range of eight to fourteen lines (22 of 28 fabellae). More than half (15 of 28) fall within the even straiter band of nine to thirteen lines. The six fabellae which lie outside the eight-to-fourteen-line group are evenly divided into shorter and longer examples and are readily explained from the angle of compression of components or expansion of details.
It is significant that the longest fabella, U.16, incorporates a traditional fabula—one with its moral stated first--the fabula of the rural fantasy in lines 168-179. If almost every critic who has commented at length on Satire III can see the thematic centerpiece in these lines, is it not also possible to theorize that they are a focus for comment on the ridiculum? Umbricius develops sympathy here for the believer in such fantasy by using the humble rus to comment on the urbanite's vanity of his dinnerware, and the unexpected twist of comparing the rural maiestas to the degrading mimes in Rome satisfies the minimum requirements of humor while preserving a Lucilian perspective on the morality involved. The sting in this centerpiece is considerable, as is the artistry. For here the definition of the satirist's audience is sharpest when he acknowledges the theoretical base of the ridiculum with the exodium, or after-piece staged to relieve the passions of tragedy. There are, therefore, more than enough reasons to believe that an analysis of the ex rebus wit and humor of Satire III is a fruitful area for exploration.

Moreover, neither the ego nor Umbricius has fared well, as literary characters, at the hands of the extreme literalism of this century. The former persona is sometimes ignored while the latter is given a flawed or craven personality; words uttered by the ego are virtually attributed to Umbricius on no good grounds, and Umbricius's status as to life and
death has not clearly been identified as central to understanding this poem. But surely, if he criticizes vice and folly by laughing at them, he has adopted the high ground of one personal virtue or another, just as the ego seems to do, and Umbricius's status as shade at least opens the door to interpretation of some of his wit as gallows humor. Further, Umbricius's virtue is identified below as pudor, or the sense of self restraint, and I plan to show in the early going how this relates to the proprium of Umbricius's witty fabellae.

Another aim in these two chapters is to discover the general shape of the exchange between Umbricius and the ego as it progresses. From almost the very start of Satire III, language is strained, as in lines 12-18, nearly to the breaking point. It is my position that this is intentional; the causes of this strain are recognizable in the myth of the vatic initiation. The ego's anxiety disrupts his speech, and this occurs just as he supplies the setting for this rite. While the details of this hold some intrinsic interest as imitatio, the dramatic consequence is that the ego transforms himself into a member of the audience of Umbricius's sermo. Within this dramatic dianoia, Umbricius's discourse on urban life wends its way; its many turnings and shifts of emphasis and style, however, may with good reason be regarded as his approach to the individual or group whom he regards as the audience of his remarks. In most cases, this audience is one species of homo urbanus or another, and sometimes Umbricius's
approach is critical and ironical rather than friendly and open.

For it is the position of this dissertation that Juvenal attempted in *Satire* III to supply what he omits in *Satire* I: the receptive, sympathetic audience at whom his satura was aimed. Separation of this program from that of defining subject and style was not without precedent: Horace talks more in *Sermo* I.10 about his audience than he does in I.4, where his auditors are decidedly unfriendly. Juvenal performs this office of the poetic satirist under new conditions: his ego disparages the recitatio, as Horace's does not, and voices do not shout from the back of the hall as Horace's do but are instead simulated by Umbricius in numerous plausible settings of the urban context. Without this understanding of the considerable range and programmatic importance of Umbricius's dissimulations, interpretation of *Satire* III cannot be fair or complete.

Two final questions closely related to the problem of the sympathetic audience are addressed in this Chapter. No Roman reader could have overlooked the power of the invective against foreigners, and perhaps many but certainly some in Juvenal's audience could easily have taken offense at Umbricius's remarks in lines 58-125. I propose to show, however, that Umbricius's pudor is what he regards as the doormat to the foreign invasion of Rome and her great houses. With this gesture, he puts his treatment of the problem of what is to
be tolerated from noncitizens on an objective footing, so that if there is reason to see personal, rather than common, experience in his revulsion against their Daedalic cunning and useless artfulness, the flaw must be shown to exist in pudor itself. To treat one imbued with this virtue as if he were incapable of some very fine irony would be a mistake.

Closely related to Umbricius's revelations on social tolerance are, irony notwithstanding, his ambiguous pronouncements on the iactura clientis. The measure of his despair of any good coming to the pauper via the clientela is the intensity and truthfulness of the rural fantasy in lines 168-179. To retain a sympathetic audience for his complaints against the rich, he must ground his arguments on dramatization of his class's humiliation. This he does, but without very strict adherence to dramatic proprieties of time or place, since too much happens between the last hour before dawn and the late morning officium: the accosting of a prostitute, visits to court and the theater, a meal. Umbricius contemplates the daily schedule that the pauper—he himself—could be facing and reflects, in some of the pithiest lines in this work, how it all adds up to iactura, whether read as monetary loss or ejection from his patron's house, it scarcely matters. Over the years, such treatment simply comes to humiliation. The details of Umbricius's dramatization of this explosive issue, particularly in his ironical impersonations, form an essential part of his ethos and thus influence
the audience's view of his persona.

With these preliminary comments, then, interpretation turns to the opening lines of *Satire III*. While the principal persona of the first 189 lines will inevitably become Umbricius, Juvenal's use of the *ego* as a sounding board for Umbricius's decision to leave Rome is apparent from the start. For from the *ego*'s ethos may be derived a first, sketchy picture of the audience of Juvenal's satire: *homo urbanus*.

E.1, lines 1-9

Quamvis digressu veteris confusus amici laudo tamen, vacuis quod sedem figere Cumis destinat atque unum civem donare Sibyllae. ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni secessus. ego vel Prochytam praepono Suburae; nam quid tam miserum, tam solum vidimus, ut non deterius credas horrere incendia, lapsus tectorum adsiduos ac mille pericula saevae urbis et Augusto recitantes mense poetas?

This *fabella* poses interesting problems of interpretation for the student of wit and humor in this work. Agreement is widespread on the wit of the anti-climax in the last four words of line 9, but analysis rarely proceeds beyond this point. The idea that poets would willingly recite in August, the month of all Rome's escape to the countryside, is faintly ridiculous and a surprising culmination for a list of urban dangers. But these poets are not the butt of the situational humor in these lines and are not identified as parties to the humor. Instead, they are treated, like fire and collapse, as examples in a potentially long list of urban ills; line 9b alone cannot therefore be regarded as the punch
line of E.1.

Sound procedure in analysis of Juvenal's situational wit or humor would appear to dictate that the reader accept the order in which poet has arranged the res of a given fabella. Lines 1-2a suggest one of the parties to the wit of E.1--the ego; to him, however, I would add the tu in 7 credas, for reasons shortly to be examined. If identification of both parties to the wit of E.1 is not complete until line 7, then the occasion--the meeting of two old friends at the departure of one of them--is the only element of the fabella fully expounded in lines 1-2a. Lines 2b-5a expand on details of the occasion: the ego provides a rationale for going to Cuma and defends without embracing it this unusual decision. This defense, in turn, gives the ego an opportunity in line 5b to emphasize himself as a party to the wit in E.1: ludicrously, he proposes exile to Prochyta in preference to residence in the Subura. But to whom is this propositum made? Who is listening?

Very quickly after asserting his proposal, the ego invokes the first-person plural of social solidarity, which incorporates the vague and general tu of 7 credas. His confidence in this solidarity clearly depends on his ability to find and present (via rhetorical inventio) unpleasant urban experiences known to all Romans if not experienced by them all. It is likely that many poor Romans, who were forced to rent in the Subura, with its many unsound buildings, would
have known of nearby collapses of such dwellings; they may have had a fire; they are far more likely to have faced one of the *mille pericula saevae urbis* than many other Romans. With this broad category, however, the *ego* can turn to and single out as the other party to the wit the *tu* whose tastes insist on poetry recitals in August!

This person can only be a rich man. Only he is free of the fear of his home collapsing, because only he has the money to build soundly. His *sedes* will be largely free of fire because his wealth permits him to take advantage of expensive techniques of fireproofing, such as building entirely in cement, brick, and stone, without wood trussing. Naturally, the rich were not forced to live in teetering, multi-storied buildings, since they could afford the land to build in one or two stories. Moreover, the *ego*’s proposal of relegation to Prochyta was, like the reference to Baiae, aimed at the well-to-do, as this penalty was usually not available to the poor. The ironic wit evident in these *discrepantia* thus develops out of the definition of the *tu* as the butt of this humor by way of identification of the *ego* as a party to the joking in the *propositum* in line 5b; the punch line lies where the discordance of the *discrepantia* is greatest: lines 6-9.

The *ego* passes himself off as an urbane wit who ridicules appropriate targets without making a fool of himself in the process or needlessly harming or insulting his friends.
For *homo urbanus*, this might suffice as a statement of personal feeling, but the *ego* appears to derive little comfort from either his successful ridicule of the stupid rich or his faint praise of Umbricius's decision to leave Rome. The *tam-en* in line 2 says everything on the head of reluctant *laudatio*, and it reveals his disturbance at the unacceptable idea that any free Roman would leave Rome under no compulsion. The *ego* snatches at credible (7 credas) explanations of the uncertainty he feels. In his view, all that he and Umbricius will soon share is painful isolation (6 tam miserum, tam solum), and the *ego's* refusal either to wallow in this pain or to ignore it divorces his ethos from certain unfavorable stereotypes, such as those of the elegist or the Stoic sage. At this point, the best description he can give of this feeling is the hint that the loss of his friend is permanent. The psychology of this is strange: the *ego* cannot bring himself to admit the loss will be final, but he faithfully renders the setting which tells him so. From this, Juvenal's audience would recall that the *ego* early on asserted that he was *confusus*, or upset at his friend's departure, and they would regard the *discrepantia* as evidence of *fides* between genuine friends.

We shall see at the end of Chapter V that Umbricius treats this anxiety as natural to an aspiring poet. At several points in *fabella* E.1, the *ego* signals his desire to be noticed as a poet. Juvenal's audience, prompted by
9 recitantes poetas, might try to appreciate the poetic effects so far exhibited. Quite audible among these would be the forced hiatus in 8-9 saevae///urbis, which heightens the emotion of this phrase by suggesting that the urbs compares to a wild beast.11 At the same time, suppression of the length of the final -o in both first-person singular verbs (2 laudo, 5 praepono), as well as in ego itself, nicely suggests the ego’s modesty. But these audible felicities no more define good poetry than allusions or meter.

Moreover, the irony of the ego’s proposal of relegation rather than another day in the Subura, along with ridicule of the rich, suggests that the speaker of these lines fancies himself something of a wit. Taken together with his sophisticated manipulations of the hexameter, these insinuate that the ego wants to be understood as a satirist. But is he doing the right things to be so perceived?

In answer, I will assert here the hypothesis offered in Chapter II above: Juvenal offers to his readers every opportunity to read Satire III at the level of imagery. The essence of the imagistic series is that Umbricius is dead but unaware of this fact. In E.1, the imagery profoundly affects interpretation, because it establishes the two principal areas of evidence for Umbricius’s account: the visual (6 vidimus) and the reaction of revulsion (7 horrere). Visual imagery naturally possesses the broadest impact if only because humans express so much of what they think in terms that
appeal to the mind's eye and make events seem to pass before it. This is the very kernel of enargeia, and Umbricius will put it to much use. Revulsion, on the other hand, is an uncontrollable movement of the body away from a startling or disgusting event or thing, and it has an aspect that is virtually instinctive. The ego compares what is silly—poets reciting in August—to what is repulsive and opens the floor to Umbricius's sermo on the genuinely revolting side of urban life. And the imagistic series of Umbricius's death begins not at some later appropriate place but here. As we have already noted, the threats of death, conventional as they are, begin in E.1. The emotional adjectives in line 6, miserum and solum, surely contribute to the gloom in 7 horrere incendia, lapsus. Much in lines 1-5a is part of an allusion to the Vergilian underworld, and laudo itself may be seen as funereal. But even having accomplished all this, the ego is speaking only topically as he engages in this scene-setting.

The artificiality of the joking with discrepantia seems hollow, and he has rhetorically and poetically provided himself with much gloom to lift with the wit in lines 6-9. This development surely signifies that Juvenal was aware that wit and humor could lift gloom and repulse odious charges. It would, I suppose, have been enough if the ego had simply raised the odium attached to leaving Rome under no compulsion. But when one recalls the absurd lengths to which otherwise sensible men would go to leave those endless
recitations by Nero—including pretending to collapse and
die— the urge to laugh might, in Juvenal's audience, have
been irresistible. Ridicule of the tasteless in the point of
the joke and an elaborate allusion to mock death provoke
laughter, but not, perhaps, laughter of the heartiest sort.

If our picture of neither party to this joke at the ex-
 pense of the tasteless rich is complete, its thematic impor-
tance is obvious. A meaningful topic of Satire III is the
proper choice of friends, and this is how the ego has identi-
fied Umbricius and himself. The occasion on which they meet
itself provides a charge against which Umbricius must defend,
but he soon pushes this into the background and takes the of-
fensive against vice and corruption. This gradually occurs
in lines 21-57; there, occasion alters to hypothetical set-
tings and until U.26 serves unstated for each fabella.

In the matter of style, therefore, E.1 establishes most
of what can be expected of prologue—occasion and parties to
it—but also a psychology or ethos appropriate to the speak-
er. Here, the ego clearly identifies himself as homo urbanus
by the alternative explanations he offers of his friend's de-
cision to leave Rome. He is ambivalent on the notion of per-
manent migration from Rome but, as an aspiring poet, he con-
demns patrons rich and stupid enough to command recitations
in August. We might here observe, with Ehrenpreis, a certain
baffling irony and slight suspension of the reason, but if
the reader suspects he is being tricked only to be set right
later on, no deception is being aimed at Umbricius.\textsuperscript{16}

What is witty in E.1 is the utter diversity of the \textit{discrepantia} at which \textit{homo urbanus} shudders. It is as if every next paving stone is the one lightning will strike. The state of mind which this illustrates is hardly a healthy one, but it does require the reader to think back to the beginning: is not virtually every item of any substance here a thing to shudder at, from Umbricius's impending departure (of unknown permanence), to empty Cumae and the Sibyl, and Baiae and the Subura and relegation to Prochyta? A dominant feeling of revulsion that does not depend only on the fact that collapses of houses are \textit{adsiduos} and \textit{pericula} are uncountable has been building since line 1. Add fear and a pet peeve, and the reader has the very picture of the \textit{confusus poeta}.

This report of a disturbing experience in a vocabulary which is distinctively emotional must serve as the \textit{captatio benevolentiae} of the \textit{ego}. And we are obliged to accept the situation without a precise setting. Usually, as Cairns notes,\textsuperscript{17} the \textit{syntaktikon} was a \textit{laudatio}, often of specific locales or buildings in a city, but he later specifies Juvenal III as an "inverse syntaktikon":\textsuperscript{18} topical praise of the goal of one's travel works to the detriment of Rome beginning around line 170, while between this and the opening of the satire lies much direct attack on the home city. Literary canons are here, as several times later in the poem, being violated specifically in relation to the city or place of
residence. To the question of where the ego and Umbricius are at the time of departure, only E.2 provides the answer; it is an answer, as it turns out, quite relevant to 9 poetæs and to the array of strong emotions already presented with such urbanity. For the ego is about to be initiated into the vatic mysteries.

E.2, lines 10-20

sed dum tota domus raeda componitur una,
substitit ad veteres arcus madidamque Capenam.
hic, ubi nocturnae Numa constituebat amicæ
(nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur Judeis, quorum cophinus fenumque supellex;
omnis enim populo mercedem pendere iussa est
arbor et ejectis mendicat silva Camenis),
in vallem Egeriae descendimus et speluncas
dissimiles veris, quanto praesentius esset
numen aquis, viridi si margine cluderet undas
herba nec ingenuum violarent marmora tofum.

Occasion is specified throughout E.2, running from the picture of the cart under the Capena to the valley and caves and pool of Egeria. Tied to this evocation of place is the ego's approach to Umbricius: by line 17 they are near enough for intimate sermo, so that the parties to the humor of the wish for the impossible\(^1\) are clearly the ego and Umbricius. The locale itself reminds the ego of various details of their situation, including an anecdote about Numa, and these lead by the logic of sacred topography to the punch line in lines 18b-20. Here the telling detail of the 17-18a speluncas dissimiles veris prompts the impossible wish.

This leaves the question of who the butt of such mild joking is. The ego suggests fairly ironically that
pretification continue. He states that renovation should import the country into the city—referring, I believe, in 15 populo to Nero's grandiose schemes along these lines—if only to make the waters seem a bit more spiritual. The butt of such indirect attack seems to be the worldly-wise urbanus who thinks the city's ills can be fiddled away with some tinker-
ing.\textsuperscript{20} They cannot, the ego implies, for already marble—the veneer of Roman wealth and power—has polluted (20 violarent) what any Roman ought to hold sacred: the soil and the life it supports (20 herba). This de absentibus joke, on the ur-
banus who finds Numa's purported assignation, foreigners renting the sacred grove, and eviction of the Muses amusing or titillating to his sense of incongruity, treats its butt as one who lacks religio, or serious ties to his community.

With this wish, under these circumstances, Juvenal has created a persona with some dramatic qualities—with a city bred resignation to pia fraus which we do not find Umbricius tolerating in lines 137-139. This ego is, as initiate, also the respondent or viva vox of satire, upon whom the principal voice will impress his strong opinions. The appropriateness of this feature of Satire III to the religious setting, in which ritual silence becomes the rule for all except the priest, has not to my knowledge been remarked by previous critics of this work. Clearly, however, the choppy recall of the experience in lines 12-18a, which culminates in the heavy spondaic line and the hemistich dissimiles veris, supports
the idea that the *ego* has undergone some profound experience. His doubts center on religious and national *pietas*, and his wish for the impossible is his way of eliciting the truth from Umbricius.

Yet this *fabella* has, after the first two lines, so little to do with Umbricius that the audience may well wonder if the *ego* has not fallen into digression to no purpose. But all the disparate parts work together. Umbricius is pictured in lines 10-11 as we shall come to understand his plight: a smallish figure against a vast background. His means are so straitened, perhaps, or he has trimmed his baggage to such an extent that his *tota domus* fits onto *raeda una*, while *substitit*, which is far more suggestive and precise than a mere *statit*, implies yet one more step down in size from the small cart. This is the last we shall hear of the *ego’s* friend until line 21; he has merged into the setting, which is itself brought forward for elaboration. This supplies the criterion of the sacred place, where humans other than the poet and the Muses’ priest are forbidden. The humor exhibits the *ego’s* attitude to the setting, which ought to inspire awe but does not.

Is the city, the *ego* seems to ask, no longer habitable if its scale and taste have become so titanic and stupid that there is no longer a place in it for the average citizen of modest means and needs? Ancient readers of Thucydides’s account of the urban ills exacerbated by the plague in Athens,
of Aristophanes's sceptical dramatization of the possibility of an unharassed life in *Acharnians*, and of Theocritus XV on the effects of crowds on two humble devotees of Adonis, could reasonably answer, "Yes!" And this thought concerns the *ego* because he has come to this isolated corner of town not suspecting he will be initiated into the rites of poetry and its muses. He perceives that the *numen aquis* are absent, so that this vatic initiation is likely to have an unusual, even a surprising, character. The caves, for instance, are *dissimiles veris* and do not inspire appropriate religious awe, but its opposite, loathing.

Perhaps, under the mysterious circumstances, it is best that he does not get what he ironically wishes. Little from line 12 on inspires confidence in what to expect. The amusing little anecdote on Numa's assignation turns reverence on its head; the sacral language of 13 jars with the quotidian in 14; the entire grove has become a forest evicted by greed by line 16; our poet-to-be cleverly devises a spondaic line for his descent into the valley and caves of Egeria--only to find at the end in 18a that the finishers have been here, too! He is carried along by movement, by what he sees, and by thought to a point at which he renounces doubt about Umbricius's proposal to seek once more the *ingenuum tofum*.

This embracement of the symbol of poetic materials (*tofum*) is predictable from the ritual and mythic side but hardly on an ordinary day. Only the initiate is meant to feel
this poetic surprise. For from the first, when he meets the priest and is anointed (11 madidamque Capenam), he is drawn willy-nilly into rite. The priest (12 Numa) re-enacts the meeting of Orpheus and Eurydice (hic ubi nocturnae. . .constituebat amicae)\textsuperscript{21} beside the sacred fountain in the shrine within the grove (line 13). Only foreigners, with their strange baggage—is there a ritual meal in these?—are near, and the natives are absentee landlords (lines 14–15). Next, the trees are made to seem animate and the Camenae to come forth (line 16); finally, the priest and his candidate descend into the sacred valley and the caves to a pool, round which the \textit{ego} rises, with his impossible wish, back to full awareness.

Juvenal has, as may be guessed from the foregoing, very carefully indeed laid the groundwork for Umbricius's bill of complaint against Rome. Along with the persona of the receptive \textit{auditor}, he has established a style for Umbricius. This amounts in part to the \textit{lanx satura} concept of satire:\textsuperscript{22} any subject, no matter how apparently discordant with ostensible themes, may be piled on the \textit{auditor}'s plate, so long as wit or humor can bring it home to the inquiry. In part, also, Umbricius may answer moral questions, like those implicit in the words of the \textit{ego}, with specific examples, so long as they do not provoke by irrelevance a reaction in the \textit{auditor}. Umbricius will speak as if he possessed a character which would satisfy a moderately sensitive and cultured Roman citizen,
grounded in all the rhetorical tricks and in logical fallacy. Such an *urbanus* might even be something of a poet, in which case apparent disorder of the *ego*’s thoughts and feelings will not disturb him, as he will know that poets find the likenesses that are hidden from other men, who yet enjoy learning of such resemblances (Arist. *Poet.* 1448b2–6).

**U.1, lines 21–28**

hic tunc Umbricius 'quando artibus' inquit 'honestis nullus in urbe locus, nulla emolumenta laborum, res Hodie minor est here quam fuit atque eadem cras deteret exiguis aliquid, proponimus illuc ire, fatigatas ubi Daedalus exuit alas, dum nova canities, dum prima et recta senectus, dum superest Lachesi quod torqueat et pedibus me porto meis nullo dextram subeunte bacillo.

By the punctuation of line 21, it is clear that the parties to this *fabella* are the *ego* and Umbricius. With a nod to the aspiring poet in the momentarily ambiguous 21 *artibus*, Umbricius proceeds to lay claim to the role of *vates* in lines 26–28. In the course of this, Umbricius humorously characterizes himself as the target of the joke. The narrative *ridiculum* lies also in these lines, but its basis is found much earlier, in 22 *laborum*, as discussed below. The occasion is, strictly, his *propositum* in 24–25 *proponimus illuc ire*, which alludes to the occasion of the meeting dramatized in E.1–2: Umbricius's *digressus*. But the occasion as stated in U.1 is much less vivid and, in following the long *quando*-clause, actually begins a series of proposed settings that become arguments compelling Umbricius to leave Rome. Such settings, which most often amount simply to a change of subject after
the pause for laughter, will henceforth be acknowledged as new situations, as they lack the dramatic content of E.1-2 and U.26. What follows is almost totally a discussion of significant or telling details of this *fabella*.

One of the salient features of this passage—which is Umbricius's *captatio benevolentiae*—is a further diminution of him by reduction of his *res* in lines 23-24a. This satiric technique of exaggeration or diminution of size or importance was well known in Lucilius's day,23 and Juvenal's use of it here as a cap on the 22-24 *nullus*. . . *nulla*. . . *minor*. . . *exiguis* series performs several important functions. First, the light tone discounts any self-importance his audience may assign him and is that of *pudor*. Second, diminution of the importance of his wealth evokes sympathy for one who has lost *locus*, *emolumenta*, or *res* without distortion of the ethical order of these three relative to each other.24 Third, and most significant, is the balance struck in 21-24a between his *honestae artes* and the monetary and social rewards of the *clientela*. The morality implicit here marks Umbricius as the voice of injured honesty and the critic of vice.25 But the light tone masks the prologue of the bill of complaint, and the *nullus* series suggests from the very first the evanescence of the satiric hero.

Umbricius's *propositum* follows hard upon these developments in lines 24b-25. If one had caught an echo of Ovid's fate in the *ego*'s proposal of relegation, he is here
deflected from pursuing this connection. The circumlocution for Cumae--25 fatigatas ubi Daedalus exuit alas--subtly achieves this end. First, while it recalls Ovid's Metamorphoses, it denies that Umbricius is leaving because of misbehavior, sexual or otherwise: this Daedalus is worn out from work (25 fatigatas). Umbricius implies Daedalus's isolation, like his own in amicitia, and he acknowledges the ego's admission of his own uncomfortable loneliness in the city in line 6. Second, the allusion to a detail of the legendary inventor's role in construction of the Sibyl's labyrinth and in carving the doors to this entrance to the Underworld serves notice that important poetic statements, and not just parody, will be conveyed by the considerable number of myths and legends evoked in this satire.26 Daedalus, of course, is most important from the artist's point of view and will receive further study below on U.7.

The three lines (26-28) with which this eight-line sentence ends seem scarcely to possess the sharp wit that characterized the ego. Rather, some space is devoted to an allusion to the legend of Oedipus and the Sphinx in 26 recta senectus, 27 pedibus, and 28 bacillo; to the circumlocution for death in 27a; and to mock denial of prophetic abilities, in 27b-28, couched in the phrases of colorful elaboration on the topic of old age. Most significant of all, however, are the actual terms of reference to aging: they are one and all references to the body (26 canities, 27 pedibus, 28 dextram)
and its motions (26 recta, 27 torqueat, 28 porto). The type of humor in U.1 is that of the bodily representation, and the tone is not the more usual one of mockery of another, but one of self-deprecation and self-effacement. Not only then, is the tone convincingly that of pudor, but also the joke limits amusement at the Oedipus motif. For this is, finally, gallows humor.

This naturally means that the auditor is also to take Daedalus in a novel way. The motif of undressing and its implied opposite conveys quite serious social commentary later in III, and the dangers of flying come in for sharp mockery in the invective on foreigners. Here the emphasis is different: Daedalus is a transitional figure from the workaday world to that of myth, a story told by a vates. This is reflected in the change of style at 25 ire: Umbricius introduces his bill of complaint in sermo plebeius and only then begins the high-sounding epic style. The complaint is the main argumentative thrust of U.1. The Daedalus allusion signals by its style the approach of the humorous point of the narrative.

For, whatever the decoration of the passage, Umbricius is absorbed in relating his worry about his livelihood, and when he looks at his past, little strikes him as unusually fortunate. All his honesty and hard work have only served to keep him where he was or caused him to fall behind an inch at a time. The nullus series of lines 22-24a expresses, I would
submit, his irritation and depression at this state of af-
fairs. The last line of U.1 caps off these feelings with a
joshing mock pathos aimed at making the ego laugh off his
worrying about his friend: "At least I am going on my own
two feet—not even a walking stick for my good right hand!"

If this is the interactive aim of U.1, then what is the
purpose of the high-flown language of lines 25-28? Can it be
merely to exhibit such poetic niceties as 25 fatigatas ubi
Daedalus exuit alas, in which Daedalus is indeed separated
from his wings by ubi and exuit? Such things lend Umbricius
only a specious credibility as vates. He, like Daedalus, may
well be utterly tired of urban living, but one suspects that
he is also setting forward in this allusion a deep frustra-
tion comparable to the hero's. He is, in fact, laying claim
to heroic status. But is he doing so only to have a laugh on
himself? Hardly, for one does not hear such vivacious ex-
pressions of character as 26 nova canities and recta senectus
from a defeated man mocking himself, and one senses that
dread Lachesis herself cannot affect his backbone. The high
style of these lines is a cue for laughter and an obvious
sign of satire, but the whole effect can be visualized as he-
roic: it sets this strength, this amusement with oneself,
against annihilation and death. This fundamental opposition
of man and his environment achieves full expression in the
callida iunctura, 28 nullo dextram, which also manages to
suggest Umbricius's lonely honesty in a world full of liars,
thieves, and cheats, as U.3 will show.²⁹

The poetic reason that so much may be read into Umbricius's *captatio benevolentiae* is the virtual litotes which the *nullus* series and the triple anaphora of *dum* (lines 26-27) create. We know from John Keats that the statement of not being someone or doing something—his 'negative capability'—builds the capacity of poetry to suggest meaning beyond the literal.³⁰ For example, if Umbricius is no darling of the gods, no seer or Daedalus, then he may be what his name implies: an ordinary Roman who is, because it is his fate, an *umbra*. Such a man, when he avers that his *res* is dwindling, need not be understood as if he were staring at his wallet but might be imagined as becoming a shadow of his former self—in fact, an economic, social, and domestic *umbra*. The diminishing stature of Umbricius, pursued by stages in these 28 lines, also converges on his name: he is a shade. The final guideline in this matter of Umbricius's evanescence is the onset of old age, with its waning physical powers. Umbricius's body will start to fail him if he stays in Rome, so that wisdom dictates, as does the *enargeia* with which he portrays it, his departure.

Juvenal establishes in U.1, therefore, a sound claim on poetry for his persona of Umbricius. This claim culminates in the narrative *ridiculum* of lines 26-28, where Umbricius compares himself to Teiresias and thus asserts his priesthood. That this status as *vates* is to be taken as that of
poet is clear not only from the Daedalus legend—favorite of all "makers"—but also from the fact that he is telling it (24 proponimus). Underlying Umbricius's vatic and heroic claims are his labores, by which he makes a measurable livelihood; that at least some of these are physical labor, 25 fatigatas indicates. This last, with 24 deteret and 27 torqueat, form a series of physical images which reappear later in U.22, when the pauper is ground to pieces by a load of stone; here in U.1, this series on wear and fatigue spreads the physical imagery throughout the fabella. In sum, this is a true comic narratio in the Ciceronian sense: no true punch line exists, but only a pause for laughter at the exaggeration which compares Umbricius to Teiresias. 31

The tone is thus one of good humor and sanity. The latter tone of complaint in which Umbricius will treat the unacceptable aspects of his existence rises to anger and falls to resignation, however, so gradually, that the audience can only conclude that Juvenal is doing this for a reason. But it should not seem paradoxical that these emotions, properly handled, are not hostile to wit and humor. In the hands of a capable poet, proper attention to expression of such strong feelings as anger will reduce to manageable levels any irony directed at the persona of the satirist. Poetically, Umbricius's name serves as mask—concealing his death but revealing his social fate—while preserving its usual function of being the means whereby others call him into their lives.
This is, one suspects, an event that has not occurred recently, and the reader learns from U.2 one reason for this: thieves pay no social calls on honest men.

U.2, lines 29-40

cedamus patria: vivant Artorius istic
et Catulus, maneant qui nigrum in candida vertunt,
quis facile est aedem conducere, flumina, portus,
siccandam eluviem, portandum ad busta cadaver,
et praebere caput domina venale sub hasta.
quondam hi corniciones et municipalis harenae
perpetui comites notaeque per oppida buccae
munera nunc edunt et, verso pollice vulgus
cum iubet, occidunt populariter; inde reversi
conducunt foricas, et cur non omnia? cum sint
quales ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum
extollit quotiens voluit Fortuna iocari.

Umbricius launches into the substance of his sermo by briefly restating his propositum as cedamus patria. I would assert that cedamus patria is resumptive and is, in line with rhetorical practice current in Juvenal's time, intended to introduce narratio that will illustrate the proposal. As far as lines 29b-40 constitute the tale of Artorius and Catulus, they are clearly a single unit; without the implied (or perhaps actual) future in 29a cedamus, however, the jussives which follow have little point. In light of this, the full stop after 29a patria in the Oxford text has been a bit misleading; I would suggest a colon, as anticipating the examples called for by the rhetorical practice of the brief, resumptive proposal.

U.2 is so clearly a narrative unit that debate of its boundaries is not so important as iteration of this fabella's components. Cedamus patria is the last allusion to the
occasion of the meeting of the ego and Umbricius until the final eight lines of the satire. These two words help to economize on references to occasion because they stand at the head of a long list of stories and hold an emphatic and governing position. In short, they open the bill of complaint and serve as the formal occasion for 24 fabellae which follow U.1.  

The other parts of U.2 are readily identifiable. Identification of the parties to the joking is straightforward: Umbricius's first use of personal names gives us the actors. To some extent, Umbricius will be the stand-in for his class unless this is otherwise clarified, so that continual reference to himself as an individual is not strictly necessary. The characterization of the butt of the wit or humor follows immediately upon the names of Artorius and Catulus, and this amounts to their assessment in the census and two charges of wrong-doing. These are theft and perjury, and, as corniciones and later as building contractors, they have a predictably low census. Corniciones is the telling detail of their backgrounds, for it associates them with a trusted group but also with the killing field. Their political advancement only shows how they gain popular favor when really they ought to be branded with infamia; most likely they have attained aedilician or praetorian status—probably this is the force of 35 perpetui comites—since production of games by anyone outside the Imperial household was controlled by almost
exclusive allotment to such officials.\textsuperscript{37}

This summary leaves the punch line to the joke expressing a patient and cool sense of humor. Lines 38b-40 serve this function clearly: Umbricius implies the low status of Artorius and Catulus but concentrates his anger and alarm on their social mobility. The idea that cornicines could rise so high that their mere thumbs could signal life or death amounts to virtual lèse-majesté and was clearly a violation of the mos maiorum. Such effrontery cannot, in satire, go unpunished: it cries out for treatment by high burlesque. This Umbricius does by treating this odious pair as another Autolycus and Sinon, 30 qui nigrum in candida vertunt. Autolycus was reputed to have had the persuasive powers which this epithet expresses, and the imagery refers to Sinon's dark role in the burning and sack of Troy.\textsuperscript{38} This epic allusion lines 39-40 develop with considerable irony and simulated exaggeration. For Umbricius's purpose is not simply to record the usual complaint about shoddy construction but to fix the blame for it on a dangerous type—on Pin-Head and Puppy, the three-day financial wonders.\textsuperscript{39}

U.2 is Umbricius's first fabella de absentibus; a question arises as to how he is able to preserve a good ethos while engineering perpetuae facetiae at the expense of those who are not present to defend themselves. In this case he has de-fused, as it were, the explosive problem of Artorius's and Catulus's defense in two ways: first, by comparing them
indirectly to two of the greatest liars historia has ever produced and, second, by portraying their antics in bankruptcy as a lesson for those who believe legal remedies would work against these two slippery items. Fictionalization of their names is virtually immaterial to this question, since the public record will supply whatever names this roman à clef requires. The emphasis therefore falls on the inherent silliness of thinking that either man deserves a jot of consideration as a citizen of Rome. Both are beyond the pale but somehow still with us. They are one of Fortune’s little jokes, which any sane man would do well to acknowledge and avoid in amicitia. If this is less comforting than such long views on misfortune usually are, one must nevertheless laugh off this cosmic irony and turn to his own business.

U.3, lines 41-48

quid Romae faciam? mentiri nescio; librum, si malus est, nequeo laudare et poscere; motus astrorum ignoro; funus promittere patris nec volo nec possum; ranarum viscera numquam inspexi; ferre ad nuptam quae mittit adulter, quae mandat, norunt alii; me nemo ministro fur erit, atque ideo nulli comes exeo tamquam muncus et extinctae corpus non utile dextrae.

In these lines, Umbricius asserts his honesty in word (41 mentiri nescio) as well as deed (46b-47a me nemo ministro fur erit). The audience of this satire might reasonably expect a catalogue of vices eschewed by the speaker, but till now little would have led readers to anticipate the daunting problems formulated here. More striking, however, might be the fact that this catalogue opens on a literary note and
follows a pattern resembling a recusatio (cf. Hor. Carm. I. 6). But expectation is most thoroughly violated by line 48, which I consider to be both a metaphor of the death of Umbricius and the punch line to a joke spoken sententiously. Here the context of Umbricius's words has shifted from the now-distant literary scene to the civic excusatio, with unforeseen and powerful humor.

Juvenal has, as Saint-Denis would say, laid the trap in this sort of joking very carefully. The basic strategy is for Umbricius to deny that he participates in either bizarre or mundane vice; clearly, however, he can cement his claim to virtue more strongly if he can draw on testimony rather than rely only on protestation of innocence. He has two sources for such testimony: approval by a man widely recognized as disinterested and virtuous; or disapproval by someone universally recognized as self-centered and vicious. The great diversity in the origins of the vices in U.3 suggests that the second choice is the more natural and, besides, we have no disinterested third party through whom the poet could dramatize the first. What I am suggesting, therefore, is that line 48 should appear in quotation marks as the utterance of the self-centered thief (46 fur) of a provincial official-designate, from whom Umbricius imagines himself seeking a living. He has put in his request and been denied; when he seeks out the official to ask the reason, he is pompously given an excusatio from public service on the grounds of
physical infirmity.\textsuperscript{42}

To this interpretation, as it seems to me, there can be only two serious objections. The first of these is that, if he is impersonating such an official, the reply may not be unmerited, since Umbricius is merely seeking to gain a livelihood without much troubling himself about where the money ultimately originates. In other words, Umbricius's goal is simply utilitarian and has no relevance to any public or moral good. The second objection centers on how 47 tamquam is to be read—whether, in fact, it means 'as if', with inquit understood or, with Courtney,\textsuperscript{43} 'on the grounds that I am', with an understood sim in line 48. In the following paragraphs, I shall deal with each of these objections; we shall find that the first leads to a dead end of heavy-handed irony and the second must be decided against the interpretation of Courtney.

The detailing of occupations in this fabella opens with the activities of the recitatio and is a direct allusion to Persius:

\begin{quote}
\textit{sed recti finemque extremumque esse recuso 'euge' tuum et 'belle' (Pers. I.48-49a)}.
\end{quote}

As Persius soon proves, all this praise is empty: it is in fact a lie whenever the book is bad. Neither can Umbricius knowingly lie, nor can he praise a bad book, as if an oath forbade him. In this, he briefly resumes the role of the priest of the Muses. The activities with which he implicitly compares false book-praising make up the list of vicious and
lying professions which follows in lines 42b-46a--astrologer, assassin, witch, and go-between in adultery. The revulsion evoked by this catalogue is meant, as it seems to me, also to tar whatever living is to be made from toadying to bad writers. His feeling on this subject matches that of the ego's on August recitals, but we are made to see it with enargeia. With the same stroke, Umbricius sympathizes with the ego and warns him to expect no unearned praise if he becomes a poet.

But Umbricius is not finished with cautions. In lines 46b-47, he brackets this catalogue of dishonest professions with that of the crooked provincial official-designate. Here he makes clear that this catalogue, as opposed to that connected with Artorius and Catulus, applies to the educated and wealthy, for generally only they were eligible for high provincial posts. In anticipating a post as minister or comes to such a thief, Umbricius cautions the ego on the choice of amici. Almost the last word (47 exeo) refers to his propositiun, and from this context the reader is to gather that leaving Rome for good is the only moral course he now has.

If Umbricius had stopped at this point, it would be fair to argue that the rhetoric outperforms any other literary effort in U.3. Instead, lines 46b-48 are cast as a priamelic of the following form: I say I am not minister furi, and my departure alone says I am nulli comes, but that man said I was 48 mancus et extinctae corpus non utile dextrae. Juvenal has spent a good deal of care on indicating the relationships
between these three statements. For example, *ideo* alone, without another particle, is rare; here it links the first limb of the priamel, "No man will thieve with me in attendance", to the second, "I am leaving in no man's retinue," with the connecting "and for that reason." It hardly seems necessary, therefore, to translate 47 *tamquam* with the same meaning—'on the grounds that I am'—as Courtney does. Umbriicius has already given the reason why he is not leaving in the official's entourage: he will participate in no theft. It seems more logical to think that after *tamquam* will appear some telling detail from a scene of such refusal and that this will supply, in the official's own words, the reason he refused Umbriicius.

To supply the missing *inquit* in line 47 is a far better choice than to supply an understood *sim* in 48, as Courtney's translation requires. The effect is more vivid: ". . . as if [he'd said,] 'Maimed and body unfit for service owing to a missing right hand!'" If, as Courtney says, the *et* is epexigetic, it is hard to see why Umbriicius would want to explain *mancus*, which is scarcely complimentary and hardly improved by the implication that he is a thief. I believe we must accept the harshness of this expression and make *extinctae dextrae* depend on *corpus*. Umbriicius is using the phraseology of the *excusatio*, in which the physical infirmity (Iust. *Díg.* 50.5,7a) was put into the genitive. An example of this is Caesar Strabo's *excusatio oculorum* at *de Or.* II.68,275-276.
One other example of wit in an inquiry similar to that proposed for U.3 is found in *de Or*. II.67,269. Septumuleius had petitioned Scaevola to take himself as prefect with him into Asia; rather than refuse the man whose greed had led him to fill C. Gracchus’s severed head with lead to increase the bounty for its weight, Scaevola

'quid tibi vis,' inquit 'insane? tanta malorum est multitudo civium, ut tibi ego hoc confirmem, si Romae manse-ris, te paucis annis ad maximas pecunias esse venturum.'

While it is interesting that the theme of remaining at Rome in order to benefit from illegal or revolutionary or just plain bad behavior is present also in this anecdote, the scene shows that officials soon to depart for a province regularly held a gathering of clients in part, at least, to answer the questions of those who had been disappointed. The exchanges at these gatherings and at hearings on petitions for *excusatio* appear to have included wit and humor, sometimes directed at a defect of the body when that was the excuse alleged, and that repartee went as far as *dignitas* would allow.

Umbricius has impersonated such an official, who in turn conflates the two types of hearings, which, to judge from Cicero, must have been fairly informal. Umbricius’s official resorts, in the inveterate Roman manner, to joking on bodily deformity and must have thought himself quite a wit to have provided an *excusatio* when none was asked. If Romans did not think this cruel, they certainly would have thought it
sententious treatment of a client, particularly since the Porta Capena (where Umbricius and the ego are now standing) was *ubi solent proconsules salutari.* The place was public and the occasion honorific; overly clever insult to the dignity of a citizen was uncalled for.

The wit that may be called Umbricius's lies in two features of line 48. First, Umbricius causes laughter at the sententiousness with which he makes the official confess his intention to plunder his province. This supplies a testimonial of his own honesty: refusal by a thief. Second, Umbricius cleverly asserts the claim of the poet to be *utilis urbi* but only indirectly. For what can the official mean by *non utile* except *non utile mihi?* Proconsulars were strongly encouraged by tradition and by the *leges de repetundis* to speak and act for the *utilitas publica.* Preterition of the obvious *mihi* speaks indirectly for its moral opposite, *utilis urbi.* This, in effect, relates the honest occupation of *comes* to that of *poeta* or *vates* and is a caution to the initiate. It is as if the *sacra urbs* were somehow alive to the cheats and liars in her bosom.

A final note on 48: in *mancus et extinctae corpus.* . . . *dextae,* we have yet one more diminution of Umbricius, if only an imaginary one. The loss of his right hand is unreal but significant for Umbricius's evanescence. It is tempting to speculate with Dunn that *actio* in the reading of this work would at this dramatic point have much impact on the humor.*
The fact that U.3 is set out as a reply to, or consideration of, a rhetorical question is also important. It turns out that the question never was rhetorical except at the level of the imagery, since umbrae are unable to do much of anything as spirits. Juvenal uses rhetorical question here and in U.2 to establish two expectations: that vices and their defining virtues will be discussed and illustrated and that wit or humor will make an answer apparent. In both U.2 and U.3, a highly sophisticated form of ironical dissimulation permits the audience to read much into the character of each party to the humor, and the catalogues lend verisimilitude and an epic radiance to feelings and moral insight.

On the whole, the device of the rhetorical question represents a gain in plausibility in satire owing to the broad array of examples used to justify the decisive 'yes' or 'no' implied by such questions. Umbricius's success with this format in U.2 and U.3 overshadows the ego's similar efforts; these two fabellae, linked by so many structural similarities and comparisons of subject, are perhaps thus a case study for an aspiring poet. The tack that Umbricius will take with the rhetorical question in U.4 is, however, somewhat different: this will be a close examination of corrupted amicitia.

U.4, lines 49-57

quís nunc diligitur nisi conscius et cui fervens
aestuat occultis animus semperque tacendis?
nil tibi se debere putat, nil conferet unquam,
participem qui te secreti fecit honesti.
carus erit Verri qui Verrem tempore quo vult
accusare potest. tanti tibi non sit opaci
omnis harena Tagi quodque in mare volvitur aurum, ut somno careas ponendaque praemia sumas tristis et a magno semper timearis amico.

Line 57 concludes that portion, except for the final eight lines, of Satire III which can reasonably be understood to address the ego directly. But Juvenal has dulled instead of sharpened this feature in U.4 by adopting the joke of familiaris reprehensio quasi errantis. There had, in U.3, already been a drift toward vagueness in our picture of the ego, who was addressed initially only by his interest in literature. In U.4 the ego is seemingly tutoyered, but Roman readers soon must have come to see the tu as completely fictional, much as in contemporary modes of address in declamation and philosophy. Yet was Juvenal prepared to use, even for a limited effect, a style that Quintilian’s denunciation had made infamous? Or did he blend it with ironical dissimulation by depressing such Senecan effects as importunate button-holing of the reader and ironic questioning of the tu?

The literal reading of U.4 clearly sets forward a moral, but even a glance at the links of U.4 with fabellae that precede it complicates such a simple picture. Setting, which is presumably in the provinces since the name of Verres signifies as much, had already been suggested in U.3 as a co-op-tion of staying in Rome that the ego had not considered: an oversight Umbricius corrects, thereby closing the door on the last alternative to leaving Rome permanently. This narrowing of focus—drawing down to a minute inspection of an exemplum
--is typically Senecan, as Chapter II has shown. But here Umbricius shows a restraint that Seneca probably felt as unnecessary: the pauper's reproof of the patron is hypothetical only. Umbricius, rather than use the many opportunities for satire on the vices of such a Verres, focusses on how the client could have been corrupted by such a man.

Something has gone wrong with amicitia: "Dear be he to Verres who can prosecute Verres any time he wants" (lines 53-54a). The ability to extort patronage from magni depends, as lines 49-52 show, on perversion of the privacy which Romans saw as essential to amicitia relationships: no amicus these days will ask you to do him favors or carry out the officia of the cliens (49 quis nunc diligentur) unless you are guilty as he is of his crimes (conscius). Your memory must be aboil with damaging secrets forever cloaked in silence (50 occultis . . . semper . . . tacendis). This is dysfunction, as is clear from lines 51-52: the secretum honestum bound its participes to silence so that debts of gratitude (51 tibi se debere putat) could be paid and generosity displayed (conferet). In the normal course of the officium, if the secretum became fama, its traceability became grounds for ending amicitia. But no such termination is now possible. The occulta--'matters best kept in darkness'--suggest that the secretum honestum has been replaced by something far worse, and this signals a profound change in the silence normally surrounding transactions of amicitia. For now this silence is fearsome
(57 timearis) and of necessity everlasting.

The bright side of this development—if any of this can be so termed—is that the client will likely prosper from his ability to blackmail his patron. But both parties to corrupt friendship are guilty and stand in error, as the reproof of tu familiaris beginning at line 54b indicates. You should not, Umbricius says, put so high a price on every particle of gold which the Tagus washes down to the sea that you lose your rest! The rewards of this tainted amicitia will only make you unhappy (57 tristis); besides, you must leave all that gold behind you at the end of your life anyway (56 ponenda...praemia). Ultimately, your high placed friend will come to dread your very presence, and your relationship to resemble a crime. Umbricius treats these consequences as hypothetical—stored up in the future but nonetheless inevitable; he reprehends the tu as if in error, with humor and without the intent to harm that revealing the nature of the occultum would entail. The client can laugh at his own stupidity, for the patron's vice or crime is the malignancy.

Part of Juvenal's original artistry in U.4 arises from this transparency of the fictional tu. This device keeps, as Umbricius's pudor requires, obiurgatio at a remove, since the ego is not directly addressed here. Only an echo of Seneca's style remains, in the exemplum that explains what course of action to avoid; in reality the ego had never thought to make his living off the provinces, and Umbricius rejects it. In
this is the dissimulation so typical of Cicero's situational wit and humor, and Umbricius has prepared his audience for this dissimulation by impersonating the corrupt proconsul in line 48. He persists in his style of the direct question—however rhetorical it may be—and introduces a vice and its defining virtue. He, unlike a Seneca who had far less to fear from the magni, steers a careful course in these waters by sparing the patron any abuse. The effect becomes one of addressing Romans in general, to whom Umbricius will apply the epithet of Quirites in the next fabella.

As to what is the degree of irony here, and towards whom it is directed, there is probably no completely satisfactory answer. Clearly it shares few Senecan traits, since, being submerged in humor, it avoids dicacitas just as it avoids ob-iurgatio. These two features of the epigrammatic style, on which Quintilian censures Seneca, are nowhere to be found in U.4. Irony, however, continues in the imagery, which in U.4 pictures the Underworld in more detail than heretofore. The imagery of death (56 ponenda...praemia) and its causes (somno careas) persists, along with that of the silence (50 tacendis) and unhappiness (57 tristis) attributed to manes;\(^3\) the 50 animus sweats awaiting judgment which will be as complete and final as one could wish. The client is complicit in crime (49 conscius) and the patron due for prosecution (54 accusare); the charge is itself unknown (50 occultis), but it is certain that the gloom (54 opaci) which seems so appealing
on the river-bank is not the shade of rest from work but the murk of a clouded conscience (55 omnis harena Tagi quodque in mare volvitur). While these images foretell the extinction of the pauper later in U.22, the legal entanglements (consci-us, accusare) in U.4 forebode another in U.24, which leads to Umbricius's murder in U.25.

One last irony in U.4 may be directed at the initiation motif and thus be dramatic. In denying that the patron participem qui te secreti fecit will sense, and follow through on, his obligation to a client, Umbricius means that the client with pudor must still keep the secret. He thus alludes to the situation of the ego as initiate. Romans regarded the secreta of a rite like this as inviolate, and those who broke vows of secrecy would face divine intervention as if they had directly offended the god. Umbricius contrasts this informal initiation into the secrets of verse satire with the unsettling knowledge of a crime: no secretum honestum can survive such tainted moral air. To the satirist, naming names is clearly dangerous to himself, but Umbricius avers that obsession with secret knowledge (occultis tacendis) may be just as perilous. It is now no longer enough that the poet claim, like Catullus (102), that no secrets between fidi amici will ever pass his lips. The rot has set too far into amicitia for such protestations, and the object of the satirist's attacks—vice—may be just as dangerous as attacking the mighty by office, role, or name.
This issue of the limits on humor and wit *de absentibus* requires, in view of the apparent virulence of the 'tirade against Greeks and foreigners', further exploration. Does Umbricius, and through him Juvenal, exceed his brief as satirist: does Umbricius cede his *pudor* on the Orientals, and thus his reliability as a moralist? The tone of lines 58-314 indicates that this question oversimplifies the problem; the bang of excoriation ends with too painful a whimper in the murder (305 *agit rem*), and the discovery of vice and folly is too honest, for a collapse of this order in Umbricius's reliability.

We can arrive, I believe, at a clear and comprehensive understanding of Umbricius's right to criticize morality only by including an assessment of his wit and humor. If for instance he shows as little restraint in mockery as the Greeks he satirizes, he is an unreliable moralizer; if, however, his moral character passes this and other serious tests, then he must be viewed as reliable. This line of reasoning implies that, if he is a reliable moralizer, his meaning must exhibit a serious moral content aimed at the informed reader of Juvenal's time. For nothing else was quite so likely to destroy the impression of one's ethos of moral reliability as unsuitable wit or humor.\(^5^6\)

The gist of the limits imposed on wit and humor by Cicero and Quintilian was, in respect of oratory, to offend no one unnecessarily. The orator could ill afford to add odium
to the already unpleasant aspects of his client's being haled into court, and he could at best expect to have the ridicule he should heap on others hurled back at himself and his client. In satire, however, the artist is freer than the orator to dramatize or narrate responses to ridicule, because the artist alone is responsible for the invention of the conflict which he proposes to treat. He is both prosecutor and defendant in a court of morality, where a decision is necessary even if one side is silent, or is virtually so. He must, as Horace implies, assume various and sometimes opposing roles, and protect *absentes* from ill-founded attack and ridicule. From this fairness stems the audience's willingness to hear him out.

But after line 58 the style of the *sermo* alters when Umbricius at this point comes to cases and begins to narrate vignettes in which either the *pauper* (e.g., Cordus), or someone whom he must meet, deal with, or somehow take into his calculations, has a sizeable role. The point of view shifts at 58 from a direct account of Umbricius's own motives to a discussion, with less crowded examples, of moral causation.

One final matter must be treated before we take up the remaining *fabellae* and their groupings, and this centers on Umbricius's use of the term, *persona.* This term appears in III first in reference to the comic stage and falls in the middle of a *fabella* which attempts to account for the Greeks' persuasiveness:
an melior cum Thaida sustinet aut cum
uxorem comoedus agit vel Dorida nullo
cultam palliolo? mulier nempe ipsa videtur,
non persona, loqui: vacua et plana omnia dicas
infra ventriculum et tenui distantia rima.
(Juv. III.93b-97)

The sonority of these lines can perhaps be referred to the
partiality of drama for vowel-chiming—which of the short- and
long-o with -or- and -oe-, as well as of the frequent homoio-
teleuta in long- and short-a. Identical scansion of lines
95-97, with strong cesurae in 95-96, and enforced hiatus at
93-94 cum//uxorem, may be attempts to reproduce the metrical
effects of drama in the hexameter. Nor, in a fabella (U.9)
expressing ironical admiration, would this artistry have gone
unappreciated. But the moral point in this context is that
Greeks deceive only Romans with such mimicry and stain Roman
otium with their condescension to practise on their betters
what would never be tolerated among their peers.

Umbricius's other use of persona is again found in a
context of drama:

ipsa dierum
festorum herboso colitur si quando theatro
maiestas tandemque reedit ad pulpitum notum
exodium, cum personae pallentis hiatum
in gremio matris formidat rusticus infans,
equeles habitus illic similesque videbis
orchestram et populum (Juvi III.172b-178a).

Here we see again the chiming of o-sounds with -or and some
homoiooteleta of long-o, along with forced hiatus in lines
174-175 and 175-176, but the metrical effects are far less
formal. In fact, the position of personae in 175 prevents
formation of cesura in the usual location of the third foot of the hexameter; Juvenal's placement of the cesura after exodium seems to lend every word in the line special emphasis, as the alliteration suggests is proper. The implication that there is no need for Romans to see their native entertainments as devoid of all art only because these have no fancy Greek veneer is paralleled by the different—in fact, opposite—reaction of the infans. The mask frightens the child, whereas adults know that these old "after-pieces" are intended to have quite the opposite effect. The child's fear is amusing, because adults remember that they also grew to like the old melodramas and ceased to fear the spectacle and the grotesque masks. This sort of persona is incapable of fooling an adult, unlike the Greek actor's persona.

The contrasting effects of these personae possess moral dimensions, too: Umbricius is returning to the countryside in order to reclaim something of the old Roman ease of living and tolerance by one's neighbors, whose warmth and lack of pretentiousness will feel like a breeze in August. In the rural setting, the fear which the urbanite develops towards connivance and elaborate masquerades becomes as pointless as the child's unreasoning fear of the new and startling. Umbricius will shed the masks of the urbanus, because they will not be tolerated, and because they served no moral end in the first place. His task, as he has set it, will be to survive on his freehold, and this means hard labor punctuated by such
leisure pursuits as he may deem fit. The codification of otium into festivals with their various entertainments conducted without pretentious clothing or costumes is as close as Juvenal needs to come to outright condemnation of falsity and frippery here. At no point does Umbricius suggest that pudor may not condemn its opposite number among the vices.

Few commentators have defined the pudor of Umbricius in terms of the restraints imposed on the "tirade" against foreigners in Rome. Almost as soon as these fall under his direct scrutiny, he dampens the nearly irresistible urge to harm the target of his barb:

U.5, lines 58-61

quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris
et quos praecipue fugiam, propterabo fateri,
nec pudor obstabit. non possum ferre, Quirites,
Graecam urbem. quamvis quota portio faecis Achaei?

We have already observed that not here nor anywhere in the putative tirade is Umbricius in real danger of losing his pudor. This unexpected development, however, raises the question of why he suggests that this is about to happen—why, in fact, he injects this hint of passionate hatred into his sermo at this point. I would suggest that exhibition of such emotional strain as we find here is an ironical type of dissimulation. The loss of control threatened in 60a nec pudor obstabit is, in the fashion of comedy, blocked by the gloomy consideration that Greeks aren't the sole fountainhead of the pauper's troubles. The incongruity of such deep gloom with such hatred causes the audience to suspect that neither
emotion is genuine but is feigned for the speaker's ironical purposes.\textsuperscript{62}

Certain features of language in these four lines lend verisimilitude to the passions thus juxtaposed. Juvenal employs \textit{p-} and \textit{f-} sounds to suggest and perhaps imitate the speech of an exasperated man. In a flash, anger builds up to \textit{non possum ferre}, but it soon turns into exasperation at the contemplation of another, even more outrageous group than Greeks. Querulousness begins, logically, with \textit{60 Quirites}, and repeats so quickly afterwards (\textit{61 quamvis quota}) at the beginning of the next thought that the reader might suspect that such relatively minor and colorless words as \textit{quae} and \textit{quos} had already helped to establish tone before it became obvious. The choice of the verbs in this passage likewise suggests a comical figure who wants to flee or run to tell someone of his anger (\textit{59 fugiam, properabo}), but gloom blocks and finally overburdens (\textit{60 obstabit, ferre}) him. And Juvenal manages to suggest by means of word placement in line \textit{61} that, just when this desperate fellow begins to see another cause of his plight, he is surrounded on both sides by Greeks (\textit{Graecam. . . Achaei})! Umbricius, then, assumes a persona virtually opposite to the one he has already established: irony cannot be far.\textsuperscript{63}

The irony is not dramatic, in the sense that Umbricius is an \textit{ingénu} who simply thrusts his opinions upon his audience without a thought for his own ethos, but derives rather
from an almost philosophical treatment of what a man can or cannot tolerate. Tolerance of greed is the subject of lines 54b–57, and intolerance of the foreigner is the topic here: U.4 illustrates, with its Horatian moral, the effects of personal vice on one's health and social life; U.5 illustrates the effects of social vices on emotional stability. Representation of the pauper as a mature man in the throes of a passion nicely balances the ironic coolness of U.4, but in neither case can the words be taken literally. Umbricius assures us of his humanity by ridiculing one passion with another: this persona that he has adopted has a heart greater than a god's (it would seem)—he casts away pudor—he speaks of the dregs of humanity. Such lack of dramatic credibility prepares the ground for both the intensity with which Umbricius will treat foreigners and the Homeric length of the catalogue of their vices.

The net effect, therefore, of the ironical dissimulation in U.5 is complex and difficult to formulate. It fails as introduction to tirade, because it mocks the passion—hatred—so necessary to the tone of harangue; yet it does not disdain the poetic techniques of verisimilitude. Umbricius's impersonation of passionate man here juxtaposes a god-like willingness to dispose of human life with a craven desire to be spared further discomfort. The lesson is, I believe, a graphic one: intolerance of foreigners (as of any group outside one's circle of friends) has at bottom a cowardly fear
of the loss of creature comforts. This could not be better symbolized than by the choice of the detail of *faex* as a metaphor for the despised group, since one only notices, as it were, the lees after he has drunk all the wine. This pejorative metaphor helps the reader to detect the thrust of the verisimilitude in such ironical joking: it tempers the case to be made for hatred by belittling the loss at the hands of the hated group, but it does so without, as is sometimes said on the stage, "corpsing" the persona adopted for the purpose.

Lying within this comic manipulation of a dissimulated voice are the *res* themselves. The transitional 58 *divitibus gens acceptissima* manages to touch on several sensitive topics at once: social class, social relations, and kin groups, to name only the obvious. Terming the Greeks a *gens* is perhaps no exaggeration, as they become a *natio* in line 100, but *gens* does suggest how closely they have been embraced by the ruling Roman *gentes*. There appears to be little evidence that Greeks under Trajan and Hadrian were, as Balsdon says, enthusiastic about entering a public career in Rome, but the foundations were being laid for their explosion into these occupations under Antoninus and Marcus. The first step in this direction is just as Umbricius suggests with these words: Greeks supplant poor Roman clients, as the true superlative, *acceptissima*, implies. And Umbricius never takes up the notion that these immigrant Greeks may have left families behind; instead, he lets *gens* cover this subject, too,
by giving the word what turns out to be programmatic force. Unlike the Romans who adopted Greeks, he will call the Greek thing a Greek word.

This is, however, only apparent upon re-reading lines 58-125; perhaps what is most startling among the res in U.5 is the collocation, 60-61 *Quirites, Graecam urbem*. Sandwiched between two terms of almost sacred meaning to a Roman is pestilential Greece. *Quirites* was what the Romans called themselves, and only full citizens could appropriate this term. And to call the *urbs sacra* a *Graeca urbs* was not only virtual oxymoron but nearly sacrilege. But the full collocation implies that the Greeks have come between Romans and a meaningful civic life, and this is what Umbricius sets out to prove in succeeding *fabellae*. I would therefore assert that the ironic depression of the punch line, 61 *quamvis quota portio faecis Achaei*, contemplates an even more startling prospect of the flood from the Greek East. Such layering of surprise upon the outrageous invokes the additive rule in ex rebus development of witty *fabellae*, and Umbricius's impersonation of the querulous Quires produces, by *imitatio*, extreme compression of elaboration (61 Achaei), telling detail (faecis), and punch line.

The next *fabella*—on Oriental immigrants—is a joke which creates a suspicion of concealed ridicule.\(^6\) Orientals are treated as if they were debris floating on a river; the punch line (66) so depicts the uncivilized prostitute that
ridicule of those who find her grata may be suspected.

U.6, lines 62-66

iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes
et linguam et mores et cum tibicine chordas
obliquas nec non gentilia tympana secum
vexit et ad circum iussas prostare puellas.
ite, quibus grata est picta lupa barbara mitra.

The muting of such ridicule is, however, so well done, that
the irony seems to dominate this passage. It is not without
purpose that the catalogue of traits non gentilia begins at
63 linguam and ends with 66 mitra. I am not so certain as
Courtney that the prostitute's native language is Greek; she is so foreign here that perhaps Greek is a lingua franca
of trade. The auditory image is one of loud, incomprehensi-
ble racket in which language has little use, anyway. The
prostitute is treated as an animal (66 lupa) already trained
by its master (65 iussas), and the proffered transaction
needs no words to reach fulfillment. In fact, the picta mit-
ra is like a sign on a shop and just as graphic. Umbricius's
vocabulary, then, is ironical but not derogatory, in itself,
of his Roman audience.

What, then, creates the suspicion of concealed ridicule?
There are, I believe, two components of this humor in U.6.
The first is based on the comparison of urban hurry and bus-
tle to a river: Umbricius poses as a guide through the caco-
phony and is a Charon figure. It is, I think, faintly ridi-
culous that such a gloomy figure should say, "Pass! you lov-
ers of half-wild whores in gaudy hats," or words to that
effect. The other component of the humor is comic in tone: the punch line sounds like a manipulative command whereby the clever character separates sane men from fools: "Everyone who has stopped beating his wife, please raise his hand." A trap is buried in the words, and in Umbricius's punch line the trap is the wild savage decked out as civilized, urbane love. The pauper, naturally, cannot afford such a puella grata, for the same reasons which forbid him a normal life in other respects: cost, danger, and disgrace. The a-sounds, which Ferguson noted in line 66,\(^{68}\) take on a curious, hinting sound, and may be cautionary laughter.

It may well be asked, What does a prostitute's costume matter in a society which condoned prostitution more openly than ours? To this, I would answer that, on Umbricius's latter words, for a Roman male to avail himself of a lady of the night meant very little, but that dress signified honor and one's intentions towards his fellow man; a lupa, whatever her status, is ready to devour her customer, while a Chione has at least some pretensions to culture, since she is a hetaira. Behavior such as visiting a prostitute is virtually a public act and is certainly impossible to keep quiet, so that one only risks ostracism if she who is grata to oneself is not so to those upon whom he depends for a livelihood. Indirectly, therefore, Umbricius is reflecting on the secretum honestum by pondering its content; it may be unfair that the rules are stricter for the Roman pauper than for the gens acceptissima,
but his anger on this head was feigned, anyway; rather, the moral question—and with it, the modest laughter here sought—is how the pauper is to keep his integrity in the court of Verres, who is a very urbane man, indeed.

That this interpretation of U.6, which finds its context or situation as far back as line 49, at least points in the right direction is supported by the fact that someone must be speaking lines 67-68, and Umbricius is least likely, because of pudor, to utter them.

U.7, lines 67-80

rusticus ille tuus sumit trechedipna, Quirine, et ceromatico fert niceteria collo. hic alta Sicyone, ast hic Amydone relict, hic Andro, ille Samo, hic Trallibus aut Alabandis, Esquillas dictumque petunt a vinine collem, viscera magnarum domuuum dominique futuri. ingeniun velox, audacia perdita, sermo promptus et Isaeo torrentior. ede quid illum esse putes. quemvis hominem secum attulit ad nos: grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes, augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus, omnia novit Graeculus esuriens: in caelum iusseris ibit. in summa non Maurus erat neque Sarmata nec Thrax qui sumpsit pinnas, mediis sed natus Athenis.

It is, if we accept the character of Umbricius that I have spelled out in this chapter, almost inconceivable that he should address a fellow Roman with mockery; yet a sarcasm gloomier than the feigned moroseness of a few lines earlier and wholly incompatible with the pudor of Umbricius—has been universally attributed to this same persona on no firm basis. Valla, for instance, saw 67 Quirine as meaning, o Romule; L (ecce, inquit) openly stated that Umbricius utters lines 67-68 but saw direct address of any Roman (o tu Romane). The
first hand in the scholia took no position on either matter but chose instead to emphasize the palpable exaggeration in these two lines: *ecce, in quantum Romani rustici didicerunt luxuria<ri> et pal<a>estris uti et phylacteriis, ut athletae, ad vincendum!* The modern commentators continue the scholiast’s lead, but they all emphasize the speaker’s mockery of the Greek words. I would only point out that Horace had allowed the clever Grecism its place in satire, but he also implied that this sort of joking was not funny anymore but had, in fact, become hackneyed. It hardly does Juvenal any credit as a Roman satirist if critics still hear Umbricius braying at Greek polysyllables.

Juvenal was more subtle in his approach to satire than that, and the truth of this statement cannot be clearer than in this instance. The nature of the problem rests on identification of the parties to the wit in this *fabella*. The needed clarification is quite simple: lines 67-68 should be enclosed in quotation marks for attribution to a speaker impersonated by Umbricius. The sarcasm in lines 67-68 targets an ultraroman Quirinus, whose tried and true *rusticus* is now to be found lolling about the palaestra; 'Quirinus' as an epithet also insults Umbricius, who is seeking his Roman roots in the *rus*. We see, moreover, the touchstone in the details of U.7—what a man wears on his limbs, if anything—that becomes so prominent at the end of the *sermo* between Umbricius and the *ego*; the even more significant moral equivalency
between a man's honesty and his apparel is, though suggested at the close of the preceding *fabella*, here exploited for the first time. Juvenal's point is that truly poisonous sarcasm begets hatred, but civilized men like Umbricius respond in kind when it is, perhaps, within their power to respond with violence. Repayment of sarcasm in kind held an honored place in satire, and Juvenal's audience would readily have recognized its use here.  

The exact identity of the one who utters the sarcasm of lines 67-68 need not detain us for long. He is clearly foreign, since he directs his attack at just those things that Romans saw as quintessentially theirs. Umbricius perceives an assault on Roman culture, and he replies in kind with jibes at Greek culture as a whole, whether native or adopted. Perhaps a Syrus from lines 62-66 speaks. Umbricius's sarcasm, however, is not so much outright mockery as it is the failure to specify the nationality and profession of one whom he directly addresses (74b-75a). If the sarcastic man is a Syrian, the first catalogue in 69-70 never quite reaches Syria; if he is a native Greek, he is unfavorably compared to barbarians on the edges of the Empire (79-80). He is not a native speaker of Latin, as Umbricius's patient (but insulting) explanation of the name of the Viminal indicates. Who he is matters not one-tenth as much as what he is, or can be induced to do.
This attitude towards the foreign clientele at Rome is
typical of the Roman magnate, but Umbricius is not so blind
as this class. He states that, whatever forsaken corner of
the Greek world they departed, these Greeks come to Rome in
order to worm their respective ways into the inner circles of
the great houses and eventually to gain control of them (line
72). Their means are wit, nerve, and the gift of the gab.
As to what they are: they can be anything the occasion asks,
but the main point is that they sweat. They fear jumping off
a cliff into thin air less than exposure of their motives.
The power to order them about thus means little without dis-
covery of their covert aims. Like Daedalus, they wish to
seize the powers of godhead by soaring above the heads of
their fellow men; like the hero, they are landing in Italy;
like him, they sprout wings (line 80) when ordered to do the
impossible. One can therefore safely infer, as he is encour-
aged to do by the priamel form of lines 79-80,\(^2\) only that
every Greek must possess the skills of a clever and well
schooled Athenian, as antic a fool as the latter may appear.

Again Umbricius closes a fabella on a cautionary note:
beware Greek fashions. And again he strikes at the illusions
of homo urbanus, this time in the figure of Daedalus Atheni-
ensis. If Umbricius has been three kinds of fool for staying
in Rome for so long as he has, he still has his self-respect
and some of his res left; Daedalus was a sad figure because
he lost all that was valuable to him, including his son. But
it is, Umbricius implies, well to recall that Daedalus lost all because of his hubris. Here we see the error-scarred beginning of the hero's end, and the sting in all this is considerable. But the sting is most of all directed at the one who would insult a Roman through mockery of the *rusticus* who, as Mayor's citations show, was the object of considerable trust. This *rusticus*, Umbricius implies in his allusions to far reaches of the Empire, has conquered you, clever Athenians and all, and he deserves your respect even at play.

U.8, lines 81-91

...horum ego non fugiam conchylia? me prior ille signabit fultusque toro meliore recumbet, advectus Roman quo pruna et cottana vento? usque adeo nihil est quod nostra infantia caelum hausit Aventini baca nutrita Sabina? quid quod adulandi gens prudentissima laudat sermonem indocti, faciem deformis amici, et longum invalidi collum cervicibus aequat Herculis Antaeum procul a tellure tentitis, miratur vocem angustam, qua deterius nec ille sonat quo mordetur gallina marito?

While the upstart foreigner might escape serious trouble for insulting a *rusticus*, he could not expect light treatment from a patron for the same offense. Knowing this, the foreigner (who, by the allusion to Greek myth in 89 Antaeum, is probably Greek) resorts to flattery. Perfection of an unctuous phrase for every occasion when *conchylia* are worn is the true moral signature of the Greek (82 signabit). But lest this point be missed by his noble reader, Juvenal constructs a joke based on bodily representation; the extent of his artistry becomes apparent only when we understand that he has
turned the comic device of "the Emperor's new clothes", or something like it, on its head.

U.8 opens with the unusual reference to clothing as conchylia; these dyed ceremonial garments are then hyperbolically compared to an image of sails (83 advectus...vento) in, perhaps, a rarefied allusion to the return of Theseus—yet another Athenian with ambitions fatal to others. These heroic overtones, however, no sooner rise than they are pricked: the conchylia have bodies in them (82 fultusque toro meliore recumbet) and the ships are hauling mere plums and figs to Rome.73 Umbricius then takes up the motif of the body and its nourishment and weaves it into an image of his infancy. How trivial is it, he asks, that I drew my first breath from the caelum Aventinī? or that I was nursed on the Sabine olive? The exact phrasing of 'how trivial is it'—usque adeo nihil est—is, I believe, intended as a key to the image of nakedness. For just as the picture of Umbricius that the reader conjures up is one of the naked baby whose drives are to breathe and to eat, so are we meant to see those favorites who sit above him at table and sign above him on a document: under the garb of their present fortune, in their pasts, we see them, too, shivering in their rags, mere nothings lying on a crate of after-dinner fruit.

Yet Juvenal is not done with this imagery, as the concluding lines of U.8 show. The winds that blew these parasites into Roman dining-halls have become flattering breezes:
86 quid quod adulandi gens prudentissima laudat. . . . It is significant that laudare appears in the invective on foreigners and in the opening remarks of the ego. Umbricius means for the ego to weigh this word and to reflect on its social implications, and Juvenal the artist intends his readers to calculate the impact of this term in the context of forced flight from the city (81 fugiam). In both cases—in conversation as in criticizing writing—is it not remarkable how empty praise passes the time? We Romans live almost in the caves of Aeolus, so deaf have we gone to the meaning of what we hear. One praises the mere talk (sermonem) of a dimwit (indocti), another the looks of my amicus (though deformed from birth), one compares the neck of a hypochondriac to the musculature of Hercules lifting Antaeus off his feet, and yet one more is struck by my friend’s squawks when I have always thought he sounded like a hen when a cock gets at her. The significance of laudare, therefore, reaches from the string of comic situations which Umbricius is here narrating to that of the syntaktikon which this sermo is not: laudationes may be equally trivial but are not similarly harmless.

The function of satire to cast moral blame upon genuine evil-doers as a caution to the urbane could not be clearer than in U.8. But the originality of Juvenal as an artist is manifold and reveals itself, as it were, to the initiate of the genre only with careful study—the true thrust of 87 sermonem indocti—and the good sense to realize that the poet
wastes no words. By the latter I mean specifically that the four flatteries of the adulator are each ridiculous and each expandable into a joke. We have already noted the Roman fondness for joking about bodily deformities. Juvenal exhibits also a contempt for Greek humor and wit in the Antaeus simile and in 90 miratur (cf. Cic. de Or. II.71,288). His point with this series of four items is that once a sensible Roman has a moment to collect his thoughts he cannot but be struck by disgust at the fraudulence of the flattery.

Juvenal has used a most appropriate type of humor—the narrative—to induce this moment of reflection. The refusal to elaborate on indocti, deformis, and invalidi builds, in a Roman angered by adulators, an almost electric potential at 90 angustam. Here the urge to enlarge upon at least a shred of the truth is irresistible; laughter rises from situation, as defined by the natural path of the sermo, and not from any conscious trap planned by Umbricius.

That this is the structure is evident from the start of the next fabella, on the effects of flattery.

U.9, lines 92-100a

haec eadem licet et nobis laudare, sed illis creditur. an melior cum Thaida sustinet aut cum uxorem comoedus agit vel Dorida nullo cultam palliolo? mulier nempe ipsa videtur, non persona, loqui: vacua et plana omnia dicas infra ventriculum et tenui distantia rima. nec tamen Antiochus nec erit mirabilis illic aut Stratocles aut cum molli Demetrius Haemo: natio comoeda est.

It is clear, from the opening sentence of U.9, that the
closing remark of U.8 was not so much a part of Umbricius's 'program' to discredit obnoxious foreigners as it simply crept out in natural reaction to the absurd. The persona picks up the thread of ironical attack, however, by intimating that lines 90b–91 (on the cock and hen) are a Roman and not a Greek reaction. At the same time, the credulous Roman, here appearing in the straw man's role of the spectator of comedy, gets no praise, and this is done for a reason: Umbricius's aim is to sharpen the cleavage (97 rima) between sensible Romans and too-clever Greeks. His strategy is to embarrass the credulous by showing how they are duped. To this end, the peculiarly Greek type of joke expressing ironical admiration does double service."

First, the situation itself—with Romans in the audience and only Greeks on the stage—is a comment on the demise of Roman comedy as a community activity in the capital. This is an important prelude to Umbricius's later comments on rural theatrical productions, and the emphasis on the radical visual effects of the Greeks' costumes here in U.9 is offered as proof of Roman credulity. But an odd thing surfaces in Umbricius's examples: the illusion is, the closer one looks at it, more convincing rather than less. The Greek acting the wife or maid can disrobe almost completely, and the illusion of femininity lingers. Umbricius strongly implies this is offensive to Roman tastes; it also conjures up a most repulsive moral picture of credulous Romans. For who is more to
blame for this state of affairs—the Greek who depends on such tricks for a livelihood or the Romans who bray their stupidity by applauding such trash? No excuse exists for the Romans; the Greek is allowed to plead the ubiquity of Antiochus and his ilk in his homeland.

This plea leads directly to the ironical point, at least as far as the social commentary is concerned. Is it not wonderful that the whole nation of Greeks are comedians? It is not, of course, but the underlying thesis of such a statement bears not so much on Greek cunning as on the consummate ease with which such deceptions come off. Greek actors, Umbricius is saying, come to Rome knowing their business: they are perfectly aware that comedy works only when the production can unify language with scene, costume, and movement. That is the purpose of the poetic display in lines 93–97 and the implied acts of dressing and undressing: such things create *dramatis personae*. They fool the adult Roman because, in an almost Stoic sense, he assents to these sense impressions.

In its style, U.9 is also deceptive, but only to the eye reading the page. This *fabella* opens as a complaint against Greeks and proceeds to list in uncomfortable detail such minutiae of dress and behavior that the bearer of such a tale could be called prurient. But the ironic point precludes so harsh an assessment of Umbricius's character. The ironic expression of wonder causes the reader to cast back over the earlier parts of this *fabella* to find missed clues: in
particular, he will look for clues which, had they been more obvius, would have told him that humor and not prurience was the benchmark for interpretation. In this search, it becomes clear that Juvenal has combined the naming of the parties to the humorous situation with the characterization of the parties to be satirized by the first full stop. The emphasis on 93 creditur may seem stark, but the moral meaning of the word is borne out in the rest of the fabella, and its thematic significance for the Satire as a whole is difficult to underestimate. This is especially so here, where the believability of the persona is one of a group of significant details drawn from the realm of comic theater.

This context and these details make it abundantly lucid that U.9 is not the "us-against-them" statement of prejudice that it at first seems but an acknowledgement of how far into the fabric of Roman life the immorality of degrading interactions between Greek and Roman has soaked. Misuse of otium was, for the Roman, a more sensitive issue than it is to us who seem to have so much more leisure to waste.76 Poor use of idle time led to poor character in a man, and institutionalization of the misuse of otium in magistrates' decrees to hold pantomimes becomes, given clever Greek actors and cedulous Romans, genuine travesty. It is a situation which any man with a grain of sense would avoid in favor of its simpler rural cousin, the maiestas. But it is a poison which the urbanite must drink if he is to enjoy his otium—either that or
go without. He can die slowly by sipping at such cups or die early by working himself too hard and never relaxing.

There is one final note on style that I would like to offer here: I believe that the ending of the narrative line in the elegiac hemistich of line 100a was meant by Juvenal as an assertion of the almost ineradicable influence of the Greeks on Roman life and culture. The tone of natio comoeda est, with an almost magical metamorphosis of actors into their personae and these personae into an entire people, recalls Ovid's similarly silly etiologies of present disasters in the human condition. The figure of Daedalus hovers over this landscape (line 80) and sustains the tone of fabulous explanation that runs throughout U.9. This treatment of the absurd in the broadest of all comic situations—the comedy of life—is quite deft when one remembers that satire was to possess serious moral content. Added to this are Juvenal's poetic maneuvers to convince the reader that the actors on the stage really are Greek males: in this, he resembles Persius, who was the master of ironical admiration. Perhaps we do not yet hear the braying laughter and urbane mockery which Persius associated with the stage and with satire, but there is in Juvenal no mistaking the one who shouts euge! from the audience: it is ourselves.

U.10, lines 100b-108

rides, maiore cachinno concutitur; flet, si lacrimas conspexit amici, nec dolet; igniculum brumae si tempore poscas, accipit endromidem; si dixeris "aestuo," sudat.
non sumus ergo pares: melior, qui semper et omni
nocte dieque potest aliena sumere vultum
a facie, iactare manus laudare paratus,
si bene ructavit, si rectum minxit amicus,
si trulla inverso crepitum dedit aurea fundo.

The transition from the theater to a new situation in
the dining room is only gradually suggested in this fabella,
as is appropriate to a witty exposé of folly. 77 The Lucilian
hodge-podge makes an appearance and leads the reader from the
telltale braying of its first four words to the degrading ex-
posure of Roman symposiasts in the punch line (108). Perhaps
the most important development for the thesis of this study
is the translation of the persona of the theater into its mo-
ral equivalent in ordinary, everyday life: the social mask
(105 vultum, 106 facie). The persistence of the dressing mo-
tif in 103 accipit endromidem and 105 sumere explains how the
Greek acquires this social persona: he makes himself indis-
tinguishable from those around him.

But Juvenal, both as a poet and as a humorist, is too
much an artist to be content with an account of a merely skin
deep metamorphosis. He seeks to account for laughter and
weeping first in character and then in setting. By parading
these before his audience, he succeeds in accounting for the
ordinary citizen's xenophobia, the sources of which are sev-
eral. No one, for example, trusts the person who laughs too
loud or long; the absence of genuine fellow-feeling in com-
miserating tears (101-102 flet. . . nec dolet) is not so easi-
ly discovered but is, when found out, more disturbing. The
man who puts on a cloak when you ask a fire against the cold or sweats when you say, "I'm hot," has no self-respect. The expression in line 103 recalls the guilty friend (49 consci-us) whose brain is heating to the boil on fires of occulta that can never be told: that such knowledge could exist even hypothetically in a Graeculus esuriens is deeply annoying. In postponing this topic until U.11 Juvenal, however, puts off dealing with such strong emotion; instead, Umbruicius re-sorts to irony in line 104.

This irony develops out of the verbal irony in 104 non pares and melior. These mean the opposite of what they de-note and imply that the best Greek is morally worse than the poorest Roman like Umbruicius. The poor, honest native has at least the privilege of keeping his own counsel and is master of his own appearance, but the Greek takes, like the good ac-tor that he is, his cue from those around him: his face, his gestures (ever aimed at flattery), or even such idle enter-tainment as immortalizing a belch or the sound of urine striking the bottom of a golden bowl. The implication is not at all that the Greek is embarrassed by these revelations but that the amicus (107) tolerates reprehensible behavior in his guests. In effect, the witty exposé culminates in revelation of the presence of the butt, the powerful Roman, at these di-vertimenti, and discloses how the technique of identification of the parties to a joke may control the reaction to it. In U.10 the delay in naming the amicus as the butt of the joking
permits unhindered development of the catalogue of Greek folly and achieves compression in the punch line. The poetic aspect of this delaying tactic is that it turns the mirror of laughter (100b rides) and witty exposé on the foolish Roman, as in E.1. It probably does not go too far to say that the sound issuing from the bowl is the correlative of the moral commentary, just as its gold fabric betrays the social class of its owner.

Several other poetic excellences in U.11 serve to confirm Juvenal's larger poetic claim. First, the imitation of Horace Carm. I.9,5 frigus ligna in 102 igniculum brumae could hardly have been missed by Juvenal's educated audience. The new version of this callida iunctura ⁷⁸ alerts the reader to the satirist's spirit of aemulatio, which was a consistent feature of Latin poetry. Juvenal implies that poetic words, such as bruma, ought to be imported into satire, because there is a function for them there—beside diminutives. The Roman who uttered his wish for a "firelet" gets no quadrimus of Sabine vintage but whole gallons and no thaliarch but a clown in a Greek cloak. With just two words, Juvenal is able to suggest the well-heeled Roman reminiscing on Horace over the canapés and to enlarge the range of language permissible in satire.

Another poetic achievement in U.11 is that Juvenal manages to do a great deal with an impossible predication in lines 104b-106a:
qui semper et omni
nocte dieque potest aliena sumere vultum
a facie (Juv. III.104b-106a).

One wonders how anyone can imitate the face of someone in the
dark. But, as Umbricius later explains, it is only the poor
client cast from his patron's doorstep who must endure the
night without enough light. The limpet Greek need never un-
dergo this minor inconvenience: he basks in a continuous ra-
diance.

This predication, impossible as it appears, expresses
Umbricius's irritation succinctly and without drawing undue
notice to itself. It also manages to suggest the excessive
length of the dinner that serves as the setting for this fa-
_bella: the Roman dinnergiver observed propriety if his meal
started at sunset and ended before dawn, as Umbricius's later
example of the humble dinnergoer shows. A subtler allusion
in _nocte dieque is that to the motif of a full day in the
life of the dispossessed native. Umbricius is unwittingly
searching, from his darkness, in the light for his murderer,
and the Greek supplanter is a logical candidate for the role.
Is this figure not an accomplice by virtue of his calculated
destruction of the life-sustaining _clientela? He can be lit-
tle else if Umbricius can show that the Greek drags the pa-
tron into total degradation and then blackmails him.

The first step in this proof is the punch line, which
reveals to the reader the _amicus. Too long a dinner with too
much drinking betrays the body: the urge to pass one's water
is irresistible. That anyone abases the already low game of *cottabus* fundamentally perverts the relaxation sought in dinner parties. *Otium* is stained, and reputations hang by a thread. The stage is thus set for the sexual farce that follows in U.11; similarly, the client will be amply warned of the imminent poisoning of goodwill towards clients in U.12, where the social machinations of Greeks result in a *pauper’s* bodily ejection. The social "murder" of the poor native begins, therefore, with a low but apparently harmless entertainment; yet Umbricius manages to align this event with the rhetorical purpose of rendering an account of his departure from Rome. That even such details, in a transition from the subject of Greek vice and outlandishness to the subject of the effects on Romans, serve Juvenal well is testimony to his poetic powers.

The second stage in Umbricius’s proof that to be Greek is to be a criminal presents the evidence of sexual behavior and, in relating this specifically to the *domus*, seeks to trace to its roots one source of *occulta* or *secreta*.

U.11, lines 109-113

praeterea sanctum nil <restat> ab inguine tutum, non matrona laris, non filia virgo, nec ipse sponsus levis adhuc, non filius ante pudicus. scire volunt secreta domus atque inde timeri. 113 horum si nihil est, aviam resupinat amici. 112

This short passage has more than its share of textual problems, and an understanding of the changes which I have adopted is necessary before proceeding. The first of these
occurs in line 109: I have, with Martyn altered nihil to nil and inserted restat as best reflecting the probable original text. I can, with him, see no serious objection to the monosyllable, especially since, in so short a passage completely dominated by rhetorical negatives, the author would very likely attempt variatio in the bracketing negative. The stronger nil, meaning 'absolutely nothing' as opposed to merely 'nothing', seems to me to be required in the military metaphor that Martyn has detected in tutum and supported with his restat. The home, Martyn argues, possesses like the military camp a sanctity which left each tutum, or 'well guarded'. The Greek's 'assault' on the stronghold of Roman life and customs is described in a catalogue of sexual conquests which, in effect, names the other parties to this horrid irony. U.11 could, as a brief for justified anger, hardly be surpassed, Seneca Junior notwithstanding.81

The second and probably more serious change which I have made in U.11 consists of two things. First, I have chosen to regard the Oxford text's line 113 as genuine and not cobbled together out of materials from lines 52 and 57.82 Second, I see the positions of lines 112 and 113 as having at some early point been reversed. Line 113 has nothing to recommend it as wit or humor after 112 but, on the contrary, moralizes in a manner inconsistent with the ethos of Umbricius as we have so far understood it. My preference actually has more to do with Martyn's 'absolutely nothing' than with any tradition of
manuscripts or scholia, which are uniformly silent on this line's placement: nothing is more likely to be violated than the expectations raised by such expressions as 'never', 'always', and 'absolutely nothing'.

But to classify the wit as para prosdokian would be precipitate. Instead, readers of Juvenal must, like those of Persius, ask from time to time, Who is speaking? To answer, "An unknown interpolator," simply begs the question and raises the specter of the echt Juvenal once more. My proposal is this: in line 113, we hear a version of what the Roman urbanus guesses the Greek's aim to be. To translate, as this "straw Roman" does, sexual misbehavior into political power is perhaps too easy an insight: this would not correspond to the utter corruption which Umbricius wishes to illustrate in U.11. The urbanus, because he thinks politically, thinks nihil, which admits exceptions, but the Greek thinks nil, which does not. The Greek, thinking like a soldier, believes only in causing the greatest harm and pain to his enemy in pursuit of victory; the Roman is not thinking of victories but of accommodation, compromise.

In summary, then, Umbricius takes the words of the urbanus in line 113 as now placed in a sense which the latter did not suspect. The irony of this rather nasty joke that fate plays on the urbanus is that the sexual assault on the avia strikes a note of absurdity. The avia is presumably past the age when sex promises very much to her (the promise must
be far different to the younger members of the family). The clever Greek probably has divined this, but proceeds anyway, since his purpose is to render mortal insult on the *urbanus* and at the same time to perpetrate a deed, prosecution of which would prove too embarrassing for even a magnate—witness Augustus's problem with Julia. The Greek wins by a bold strategem worthy of Ulysses in Ithaca: he says and does the outrageous without suffering reprisal, even if he gains no hold from his previous lack of success. The *urbanus* overlooks the possibility of such bold strategems at his peril.

Plot complications of the *fabella* must, it seems to me, appear before the last position (except perhaps in narrative humor). If, as I have argued, line 113 is this complication in the form of the inner thoughts of the *urbanus*, then it surely ought to follow the catalogue of victims to whom sex promises happiness—little else can be the point of 111 *pudicus* and its emotional correlates in lines 109-111. Likewise, line 113 ought to precede 112 to produce the most searing wit possible. The dilemma Umbricius poses to his straw man is devastating, and in this mini-drama Umbricius has once more kept his *pudor* in respect of Greeks as well as Romans by dissimulation in the *fabella*. The deception in this dissimulation rests principally on disguising the fact that U.11 is a *fabula de te* and is not just empty moralizing in the Stoic manner.
The new situation of U.12 thus arises more from a putative Stoic style than from the res of U.11. The unnamed Egnatius, betrayer of Barea, is the first figure in a tableau of Greeks whose purpose is the iactura of the Roman client.

U.12, lines 114-125

et quoniam coepit Graecorum mentio, transi gymnasia atque audi facinus maioris abollae. Stoicus occidit Barea delator amicum discipulumque senex ripa nutritus in illa ad quam Gorgonei delapsa est pinna caballi. non est Romano cuiquam locus hic, ubi regnat Protogenes aliquis vel Diphilus aut Hermarchus, qui gentis viti numquam partitur amicum, solus habet. nam cum facilem stillavit in aurem exiguum de naturae patriaeque veneno, limine summover, perierunt tempora longi servitii; nusquam minor est iactura clientis.

The third and final step in Umbricius's proof of Greek criminality opens with the outright accusation of the vice of lying. But even here he passes over what, by implication, must be many examples of mendacity with the transitional verbs coepit and transi—bypassing, in line with his pudor, the effete vices of the gymnasium. Umbricius addresses his urbanus with the familiar imperative like the Stoic, who wished to distract his audience from the noise of the world, but also like an amicus who wishes his friend to receive the best advice. Tone changes in lines 114-118 because Umbricius draws forward the prime example of the Greeks' perfidy from a tableau of their mendacious countrymen, and not because an 'improver' revised the passage. Umbricius assumes the mantle of the Sibyl and guides his listener past the iron gates of the palace of Dis. The urbanus (for whom one reads with
growing uncertainty the *ego* must *facinus audire*, like Aeneas or Rhadamanthus.87

Umbricius's model of Greek vice is Egnatius, who testified *de maiestate* against Barea Soranus and his daughter, Servilia, on charges of treason and magic. But the anger is directed against Egnatius not because he was an informer—a role established by Augustus and made a paying proposition by Tiberius—but because he betrayed an *amicus*. Umbricius, in effect, sets at opposite poles *Stoicus* and *amicus*, as line 116 shows. The mock honorific, *senex*, inverts the order of apposition established in line 115 (*Stoicus*. . .Baream dele- tor amicum) not merely for meter or variation but to connote the inversion of roles—since Egnatius was the younger—and signal the lying perversity of all Greeks. Now comes another flying Greek, this time on a winged horse; he has drunk at the spring of the Muses but imbibed a pack-horse's soul. The eventual execution, under Vespasian, of Egnatius was, if we admit the comparison to Bellerophon, of Jovian temper: he aspired to too much and abused the gods' friendship.88

From these dubious heights the audience descends to the mundane: the truth is that ordinary Greeks displace whatever Romans they choose. The *hic* in line 119 harks back to the *illo* of line 98 and helps to recall what accomplished actors the Greeks are; here the *vitium gentis* is monopolizing one's patrons. The prosaic vocabulary of lines 119–122a, together with the minor anti-climax at the end of 118, serves to pre-
pare the listener for the advice that Umbricius is about to impart and sets the stage for the commercial metaphor concluding this *fabella*.

These final lines (122b-125) transmit two cautions to Umbricius's listener. The first of these is pretty simple: Romans should consider any Greek, regardless of his ordinary appearance, as he would any poisoner. His every whisper is to be examined for hostile intent, and, mind, he does come from a nation of actors. Added to such extreme scepticism is a warning about what will happen if a poor Roman's vigilance drops: his patron will throw him out the door, and all that time spent in cultivation of favor will be lost (124 *perierunt*). For nowhere else is the *iactura* of a client *minor*.

This ambiguous expression has been taken by modern commentators to mean, approximately, "Nowhere [but in Rome] does the ejection of a client cause less of a stir." I have no particular objection to this reading: it may be correct. But I would note that the scholiast renders *iactura* as *damnum*, or 'loss' as against 'profit'. This better fits the inevitable meaning of 124 *perierunt* than the modern translations, and it makes perfect sense if we view 125 *clientis* as a subjective genitive. The client is the one who loses, and what he loses is his livelihood. There can be little doubt that this is consistent with the character of Umbricius, who has all along worried about the erosion of his own means. It appears logical, also, that Umbricius would dissimulate on
the source of his income by making iactura sound ambiguous.

But if this fabella purports to give friendly admonition by way of advice,⁹⁰ what is the advice? For clearly the admonition centers on Greeks. In my opinion, the advice is that the client try to control the events that are within his power. Umbricius admits these are few, and may be limited to picking a place to land when he is tossed out of doors! The force, therefore, of iactura as the modern 'ejection' is comical and the advice, on this interpretation, not serious. The admonition thus consists of something on the order of: "When a Greek whispers, watch your wallet." For the consequence of a serious lapse in the client's vigilance on this point is not the voluntary servitium of the free Roman client but involuntary servitude brought on by penury and debt.

We have detected, it would appear, a number of surprising themes in the so-called 'tirade'. The character of lines 58-125 is not so clearly that of the Lucilian agon but still retains a strong adversarial tone in Umbricius's search for his murderer. The Greek is portrayed as a principal accomplice; the Oriental contributes a background of raucous music and deafening clatter which suggests the urban environment itself may have a part in the pauper's demise. The governing ethical question has been, however, one of how far the typical urbanus can afford to be tolerant of those who, like the Greeks portrayed in this section of Satire III, bear him no goodwill. Umbricius's admonitions come to thorough
scepticism on this head.

But does he advocate intolerance by decrying Roman ease? This, I believe, would fall outside a good ethos and for that reason would find few listeners. Romans regarded their *otium* as hard-won and their luxuries as their due. *Loci de luxuria* fall on deaf ears. But a sensible Roman just might listen with favor to a case for intolerance of the flashy and overly clever. He might be persuaded to establish and enforce guide lines of behavior in his *domus* that would protect it from charlatans and low-lifes of any sort. He could, Umbricius suggests, be less dependent on hired help for the education of his children and for beautification of home and estate: if he hires Greeks, they are likely to be actors, scene shifter s, aviators—amusing but deadly. But perhaps these could be tolerated if only Romans didn't invite them to dinner!

If the tone is partly mocking up to line 80, it turns serious thereafter, for Umbricius regards himself as directly affected by the presence of Greeks at table in his patron's house. Inevitably, as we have seen, the Greek will affect—and not for the better—the relation between the grandee and the poor Roman carrying out the *officium*. The line of tolerance must, Umbricius suggests, be drawn around the *domus*. The guest, Greek or not, must honor the host's wishes, spoken or unspoken; if the Greek is privy to so much (113 secretâ), then he especially should be on his good behavior. Anything less can only cause the patron-client exchange to deteriorate
and ultimately collapse. Confidence in the whole process of the *officium* will decline, but the first to suffer will be the *pauper*. With the *pauper* will go the good sense of the *rusticus*, who can be chaffed in the street but cannot be replaced by a clown. Tolerance, Umbricius implies, has its place out of doors in urbanity; intolerance begins at one's threshold and underlies a code of behavior for guests.

To some extent, also, it is possible to follow the contours of this attack on foreigners from the standpoint of the *fabellae*. For example, U.5 and U.6 are short enough to suggest, if not actually constitute, *dicacitas*. The rapid alternation of feigned passions in U.5 and the subtle mockery of the Roman devoted to exotic prostitutes in U.6 lay the groundwork for the exchange of sarcastic remarks in U.7: the first of these in lines 67-68 is short, as is Umbricius's tart reply in lines 79-80. In much the same vein, Umbricius peels the smooth hide off Greek flattery to reveal in two rather insulting lines (90-91) the ugliness it praises. After this midpoint, between U.8 and U.9, he turns ironical admiration on Greek actors—indeed on the whole tribe—and then (U.10) with much wit exposes the folly of drinking deep with such companions. He returns momentarily to the style of *dicacitas* in U.11, reeling off a list of the Greeks' sexual targets that culminates in the absurdity of a liaison with an *avia*. But in the end, he leaves off any attack which might be thought motivated by anger to twit the *urbanus* with a
little friendly advice on *amicitia*. In sum, these *fabellae* more cogently compare to a mixture of *dicacitas* and *cavillatio* typical of *perpetua festivitas* than to a tirade motivated by hatred.\textsuperscript{92}

The limited development of plot in satire carries with it one of the chief pleasures of the genre: the full and precise definition of the difficulties faced by the persona and of his attempts to remedy them. In *Satire III*, Umbricius first defines himself as a *pauper* (lines 21-57) and then affirms his moral status as an honest Roman (lines 58-125); his economic remedies are few, and his aversion to lying translates into revulsion at the *gens acceptissima*. In the rest of this chapter, I shall examine lines 126-189 for further definition of Umbricius's persona and his difficulties: his humiliation at the hands of his actual or potential patrons, who are generally defined as the newly rich.

The fact that this section of the work opens with a narrative *fabella*—the slightly extended comparison—is interesting. Throughout lines 126-189 runs almost a covert comparison between Umbricius, the *pauper*, and those around him. At first, he is merely in the street and being jostled, but he soon begins to examine each bystander and passerby for his moral qualities (U.13). Next, he imagines his veracity is under attack in court (U.14), where he defends himself by violating the expectations of his detractors' questions. He then (U.15) attacks the law on theater seating by coolly
explaining it as Otho's idle fabrication, whereas in legal fact a *senatus consultum* of 23 A.D., requiring an *eques* to show three generations of free birth, is the relevant document. Umbricius's *pudor*, it would seem, requires him to offer the Othonian conjecture to avoid offending the *dignitas* of his superiors. Finally, Umbricius circles back to the *domus* in the longest *fabella* (U.16) in the work. Here he examines the universal source of the *pauper's* economic problems, 166 *conatus*, and ties this to moral shame at minor pretensions. This leads Umbricius to offer the comparison of urban and rural life (lines 168-179), with emphasis on the dramatic *persona* discussed above. Since this *egressio* terminates in acknowledgement that everything in Rome has its price, including birthday cake at his patron's, Umbricius only escapes deep embarrassment here by pretending not to understand what is said to him by a slave. He can't openly confront the fact that his rich patron is so stupid as to sell party favors to actual or potential clients, but the covert contrast between sensible *pauper* and *nouveau riche* is clear enough for the reader attuned to such irony.

But this summary of the contents of lines 126-189 cannot show how much closer to narrative this section is than those preceding it. Umbricius is now less concerned to dwell on the flaws of those around him than he has been up to line 125. He instead permits the stories to tell themselves, only once, unexpectedly, intervening with any directness (U.14).
This attitude is significant in thematic development: each of these fabellae illustrates how the pauper is gradually robbed of his civic standing by being deprived of the meritum he derives from the officium. He binds this theme to his general proof (that he is right to leave Rome) by narrating the rural maiestas, but the most intriguing development yet for our understanding of Umbricius and his thesis will be found in his impersonations of those he despises. These impressions lend him a liveliness as narrator which he otherwise lacks in U.13-U.16 and they serve to sustain the illusion that he is alive and talking with the ego.

The first fabella of this section establishes this narrative expectation firmly in the minds of the audience. The conlatio had been recognized by Cicero as a type of narrative humor. But Juvenal has, in the interests of rendering urban complexity faithfully, multiplied the comparisons and made them both overt and implied.

U.13, lines 126-136

quod porro officium, ne nobis blandiar, aut quod pauperis hic meritum, si curet nocte togatus currere, cum praetor lictorem inpellat et ire praecipitem iubeat dudum vigilantibus orbis, ne prior Albinam et Modiam collega salutet? divitis hic servo cludit latus ingenuorum filius; alter enim quantum in legione tribuni accipiunt donat Calvinae vel Catienae, ut semel aut iterum super illam palpitet; at tu, cum tibi vestiti facies scorti placet, haeres et dubitas alta Chione deducere sella.

The overt comparison of most importance in this fabella is that between the pauper and the rich. Umbricius seems to
class with himself the *ingenuorum filius*; with the rich, the praetor and his colleague, the two slaves, and indirectly the tribune, whose salary is used to measure the slaves' pocket money. The women—Albina, Modia, Calvina, and Catiena—are by implication well off, as the first two are *orbae* whom, if penniless, no *captator* would pursue, and the second pair are at least made rich by their servile liaisons. Chione, however, is a "common-or-garden tart,"94 whom Umbricius aligns temporarily with the *pauper*. The idea that the rich get what they want with their money while the poor native gets shoved aside is grafted onto this comparison with, I believe, the purpose of gaining the assent of the audience.

But once Umbricius has his audience nodding in time to nearly every word, certain uncomfortable subtleties bob to the surface. For example, the fact that the *pauper* is *nōcte togatus* is ridiculous, since he has no regular duties at that time but only dresses so because his betters do. Yet the praetor drives his lictors before him at this late hour headlong toward the house of two old maids who aren't asleep yet! As if this absurdity of overdressing were not enough for a good laugh, Umbricius anticipates the scene of long lines of clients with their *culinae* outside their patron's door (lines 249–250) faithfully awaiting the favor they will probably not receive. Juvenal here also means to recall the stupid and self serving jostling for order in line that he depicted in *Satire* I.101b–110a: in III.130, Umbricius ridicules the new
situation of the scramble for wealth and judges it a needless anxiety (127 curet).

This consultation of ordinary experience continues, but it becomes apparent that Umbricius wishes to startle the complacent urbanus with the behavior of slaves. The rich man's slave shoves the native son aside in the road; another pays a modest fortune just to have sex once or twice with a woman of rank. The violence of these illicit movements strongly suggests the later development of verbs of motion to symbolize death: inpellat and ire praecipitem already suggest dangerous movement, and palpitet describes the convulsions of death as well as of sex. The native, however, modestly cludit latius, just as the prudent pauper later hangs back (135 haeres) from his Chione out of doubt that he can afford her. This imagery is intended to startle the audience into moral awareness of the actors in this narrative.

For what are these well-placed Romans but scorti? They dress to curry favor and collect the cash; they accept money (from slaves!) for sex or they dangle their inheritances before their suitors. Perhaps all this is clear from the conlacio, but the crowning absurdity is that even the whore, on her alta sella, comes off well in the comparison, implied in this phrase, to the praetor and his collega. Juvenal was by no means the first to exploit the denunciatory possibilities of the litter, one version of which was the sella: Brown has collected numerous examples from Dinarchus, Cicero's
Philippics and Verrines, Martial, and Juvenal. The relevant features of Brown's discussion are (1) that "[t]he role of the litter is strongest in Satire 1, in which it serves as a recurring symbol of the injustice Juvenal feels impelled to denounce," and (2) that the lounge-chair (cathedra, sella) was associated with effeminate behavior or women.\textsuperscript{95} Perhaps one reason Brown did not incorporate this passage into his discussion is the ambiguity in the meaning of sella in U.13. Just what the prostitute's "high seat" was has been the subject of conjecture; has no one surmised that it might be her litter, and thus a symbol of her costliness and feminity, while at the same time alluding to the daytime symbol of the praetor's office?\textsuperscript{96} It is difficult to see why Juvenal would have delayed this word to the last position in this fabella if he had not intended it to have some such devastating impact.\textsuperscript{97}

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that the humor of this passage lies in this one word. Neither is it Umbriicius's aim to develop a punch line after 134 at tu, as it might sound to some ears. Narrative wit and humor develop out of a storyline and here, minimal though it is, the story is that of the man and woman in the street: no one lacks a purpose in such inconvenience, all are either going somewhere or awaiting someone, and the variety of their fortunes is reflected in their means of conveyance or its manner. Public morality demands that poverty and insignificance make way for
wealth and position, but Umbricius dramatizes the true morality: honest people make way for whores, praetors included. So it is that the lashing that he has promised 'us Romans' (126 ne nobis blandiar) hits the most sensitive spot—sexual mores—in a way that suggests that few of the rich can escape. The boisterous cavalcade of urban denizens rushing and shoving toward a tryst seems, because it is a narrative of typically foolish behavior, to include one and all in the conlatio. The simple detail of Chione's *alta sella* completes all significant aspects of the extended comparison and turns moral opprobrium back where Umbricius believes it belongs—on the wealthy and powerful—without risking a display of anger (although there is plenty of that underlying U.13) or a loss of pudor.

U.14, lines 137-146

*da testem Romae tam sanctum quam fuit hospes numinis Idaei, procedat vel Numa vel qui servavit trepidam flagranti ex aede Minervam: protinus ad censum, de moribus ultima fiet quaestio. "quot pascit servos? quot possidet agri iugera? quam multa magnaque paropside cenat?" quantum quisque sua nummorum servat in arca, tantum habet et fidei. iures licet et Samothracum et nostrorum aras, contemnere fulmina pauper creditur atque deos dis ignoscentibus ipsis.*

Characterization of this *fabella* as contra exspectatio-nem is owed to a variety of factors, none of which singly would compel attribution but taken all together leave no other choice. At the bottom of this joking lies the ironical treatment of those who discredit honest citizens: the witness stands trial (de moribus...quaestio). The good faith
and credibility of the pauper are "destroyed" by the anticlimactic series of servos, iugera, and paropside. Umbricius's response to this trivialization of the poor man's fides is his ironic remark on the strongbox. This directly counters, with little humor, the accuser's attempt at wit in this series. Such inversion of the usual roles in courtroom humor posts weak results for the wit and humor—a lackluster anticlimax and an angry-sounding retort of the poor witness. But this may indicate that Juvenal has located a different source than verbal para prosdokian for ridicule of pretentiousness.

This other source depends, as the opening and closing lines of the fabella indicate, on imagined divine intervention for the effect of surprise in contra exspectationem joking. U.14 opens with an allusion to the Scipio Nasica chosen by the Senate to meet the ship bearing the representation of the Mother of the Gods (Liv. 29.14,8). Nasica's qualifica-
tion for this honor had been prescribed by the oracle: that he be the best man in the city (Liv. 29.11,6). But men of such purity are rare. Umbricius thus appears to say, what matters is not so much that one may attack a witness's fides as that this can be ruinous to ordinary honesty without just cause and without appeal. One is summoned to bear witness, and the proceedings are turned into a quaestio de moribus; the inquisition itself seems to rest on an unpleasant and sneering attitude towards the details which convince tout le monde that one is well off. It is as if the witness is
expected to swear and be perjured on the cost of his plate.

Umbricius is thus careful to embed in the early stages of this fabella the implication that one need not be a poor Roman to be so afflicted. His alignment of the virtuous Nasica, Numa (here by name), and P. Caecilius Metellus Caecus, who rescued the Palladium from the Temple of Vesta when it burned in 241 B.C., poses a set of answers to the de moribus quaestio that makes the line of inquiry into wealth and property seem deeply insulting. For the sake of religious fides, Nasica risked his reputation and young career; Numa devoted his life to peace and justice; Caecus lost his sight. Their acts of virtue put at risk far more than the wealth that they were not at the time counting, and this, too, they would have sacrificed had it been appropriate. Instead, their word was the state's bond, and their acts its fides. No wealth of theirs could have safeguarded the res publica from the wrath of the gods. Similarly, Umbricius avers, the oath of the pauper binds him before the gods and risks far worse than death--to be allowed to survive under their long displeasure. If the inquisitors de moribus genuinely think that slaves, acres, serving plates, and coffers bulging with gold will be solace to one hounded by the Furies, then they are deluded to a degree that rational argument cannot cure.

Umbricius concludes, therefore, by assuming the most violent end possible for perjurors--death by lightning--as the test of a Roman citizen's fides. This premise accomplishes
far more than to counter an irrational attack with an equally irrational defense. By employing this tactic, Umbricius accuses the inquisitor de moribus of Greek effeteness; he wraps himself in Jove's robes and leaves the Cabeiri to those who would invoke them. Presumably, those who dine on paropsides might tend to fear minor Greek Furies, or at least have a care for their pudor.98

But the vain inquisitor, Umbricius compels the audience to feel, scarcely pauses but rushes on to cap his accusation of the pauper with a charge of contempt for the gods. If this charge is only implied, so much the better, as it is the more easily credited. But is this oratorical flourish credited in heaven? can the inquisitor be waiting at the cesura for a divine sign? If he is, Umbricius unleashes his own lightning of wit into the silence: "The gods have pardoned me!" Juvenal, in so dramatizing this courtroom scenario, asks his reader to imagine a thunder of laughter rolling across the corona of the hearing, as person after person tunes in to the meaning of the pause and the point of the exclamation.99

The pretensions of the nouveaux riches so evident in U.14—their thirst for status, admiration for wealth, and bragging de luxe—can scarcely go unnoticed by Juvenal's Roman audience. Umbricius has, to be sure, opposed these foibles to the native's fides. But the most important point is dramatic, not rhetorical: the ardent desire of the novus
homo was to present himself credibly in court or in some other public proceeding. One need not search, for instance, very far in Pliny’s letters from his early career to detect his anxiety on this point.¹⁰⁰

The characterization of the novus homo’s public career as depending, even if only in a small way, on mockery of the sworn word of the honest, poor citizen is a sad comment on the end of fides. On the premise that if one Roman is so insulted so are they all, Umbricius could condemn the entire class of his contemporary novi, but he is scarcely capable of such fanaticism; the point is, rather, that if the pauper is unprepared to defend himself against mockery with the very keen knives of wit and humor, he too risks any chance he may have to get ahead in life. Without adequate defenses, the poor, honest witness faces the ruin of his reputation at a single blow. U.14 is a fabella cautionary to the aspiring poet, told by a shade who believes he is still alive to a scribbler who pretends he is a pauper.¹⁰¹

If Umbricius has armed the ego in U.14 with a type of wit or humor quam quod . . . ex his omnibus nihil magis ridetur (Cic. de Or. II.70,284), in U.15 he supplies a practical psychology of mockery of the poor.

U.15, lines 147-159

quid quod materiam praebet causasque iocorum omnibus hic idem, si foeda et scissa lacerna, si toga sordidula est et rupta calceus alter pelle patet, vel si consuto volnere crassum atque recens linum ostendit non una cicatrix? nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se
quam quod ridiculos homines facit. "exeat" inquit, "si pudor est, et de pulvino surgat equestri, cuius res legi non sufficit, et sedeant hic lenonium pueri quocumque ex fornice nati, hic plaudat nitidus praeconis filius inter pinnirapi cultos iuvenes iuvenesque lanistae." sic libitum vano, qui nos distinxit, Othoni.

The programmatic elements of this fabella are its most prominent features, and these are programmatic in two ways: (a) lines 152-153a, the much remarked epigram on the bitterness of poverty, establish a standard for the ridiculum that does not incorporate pudor and is, in fact, mockery; (b) the allusion to L. Roscius Otho, proponent of the law on seating in the theater, resumes the program of the ridicule of the dead set forth in Satire I, here serving as the punch line to a humorous explanation from conjecture.

The epigram on infelix paupertas has been taken from its context by many critics of Satire III and justly admired, and there can be little doubt that such activity among Juvenal's readers serves an aim of the poet: to be remembered. But to cite lines 152-153a as evidence "which suggests personal experience"\textsuperscript{102} is to erect a literalist assumption as a conclusion and to ignore the rhetorical context on which the epigram draws. Umbricius is, in U.15, supplying to the pauper a thumbnail rhetoric on the ridiculum for the purpose of defense from mockery. Furthermore, many remarks in U.15 are based on the premise that the poet to whom Umbricius speaks will become a satirist, so that the moral content of this fabella must be addressed. A final question must also be asked
and answered: does Umbricius confine the mocking _iuvenis_, or _scurrula_, to Rome, or is this a type to be encountered nearly anywhere?

U.15 supplies in almost every instance straightforward responses to these proposals and this question. It cannot be clearer that Umbricius addresses an explosive emotion—the _pauper’s_ confused feeling of anger and embarrassment at being taunted about the rags he wears. In terming these the _materiam_. . . _causa_que _iocorum_, Juvenal alludes directly to Caesar Strabo’s very words on this subject (as noted in Chapter III) and implicitly to those of Lucilius:

_Si hic vestimenta elevit luto,
ab eo risum inprudens ac cacchinnum subicit._

(Lucil. 682-683 W=647-648 M)

This very general assertion has no clear context, but commentators have suggested illness,¹⁰³ drunkenness, or the Todes-_kampf_.¹⁰⁴ Juvenal, who probably had better access to Lucilius than we now do, evidently chose to overlook speculation on this point and to follow the Horatian lead:

_iracundior est paulo, minus aptus acutis
naribus horum hominum; ridedi possit eo quod
rusticius tonso toga defluat et male laxus
in pede calceus haeret: at est bonus, ut melior vir
non alius quisquam, at tibi amicus, at ingenium ingens
inculto latet hoc sub corpore._

(Hor. _S. I_.3,29-34a)

Like Horace, Juvenal has eliminated the _lutum_ (which is to be found in a more logical place at III.247a) and emphasized the innate and simple—if not entirely rustic—virtue of the ordinary citizen. Juvenal’s _aemulatio_ of Lucilius is therefore not unharnessed ambition but an alloy of Lucilian sting and
Horatian good taste, and the somewhat disreputable subject is one that both he and Martial (VII.33) felt free to exploit.

This sort of subject along with the phrase *materiam* ... *causasque iocorum* naturally suggests that Umbricius searches in U.15 for a lever to be used against those who mock the poor on account of their clothing. Such a search could only have been in rhetoric, and the transposition of Ciceronian phraseology virtually untouched is a strong argument that Juvenal understood the strength of ironical dissimulation in opposing mockery and the flexibility of the *fabella* in making suspense a feature of acceptable wit and humor. Cicero acknowledges, in the most general terms, the *locus in turpiculis et quasi deiformibus ponitur* (*de Or.* II.61,248), which surely includes soiled and torn apparel. Yet in the same sentence he asserts that identical *loci* can serve either the serious or the joking speaker, depending on whether the *res* is serious or not. Later, he restates this addition to the *proprium* when he concludes the section on verbal humor:

> Sunt etiam illa venusta ut in gravibus sententiis, sic in facetiis—dixi enim dudum rationem aliam esse iocci, aliam severitatis, gravium autem et iocorum unam esse materiam. ... (*Cic.* *de Or.* II.65,262).

From this passage it is evident that the *loci* and *materia* are identical, that is, represent such things as torn clothing or a deformed body; similarly, the phrase *ratio ioci* is synonymous with *res* and amounts to the covert purpose of joking. The latter, I believe, is what Juvenal means by *causas*, and in U.15 it cannot be plainer that the *iuvennis* whom Umbricius
impersonates only taunts the pauper for the satisfaction of rousing in him a speechless mixture of anger and shame.

The effect sought with such mockery, i.e., the causae, ratio, or res, strongly resembles that sought by the lawyer whom Umbricius impersonates in U.14: the silencing of one who can testify to the bad effects on the lower classes of the avarice and ambition of their superiors. The signal difference between the two fabellae is that in court the pauper at the worst may have counsel available, whereas in the theater he defends himself alone. In public there are fewer restraints on risible personal attacks than in court, and this is reflected in the length of the attack in U.15. Exceeding five full hexameters, this is the longest of Umbricius's impersonations and contains materials that are most difficult to refute—the evidence of what the pauper wears. But the problem, as Juvenal has posed it, has a solution which is not hostile to pudor.

Umbricius defines the shape of the morality of the new situation in U.15 by limiting his remarks to the tears in the pauper's clothing and the effects on appearance of repairs. The most important of the former he terms a volnus, and the repair he calls a cicatrix (lines 150-151). And the phrasing of this observation as a rhetorical question is a device of seeking benevolentia and of securing a good ethos. The powerful references to the body in the terms for these features of dress load them with moral significance: despite the
usually reliable test of dress, one simply cannot distinguish an honorable man by his weeds if he dresses for wear rather than for fashion. In this relatively straightforward context of meaning, wounds and scars are the veteran citizen's badges of honor and attest to his public morals; in the meaning drawn from imagery, we are witnessing Umbricius's death wounds.¹⁰⁸

At the latter level of meaning, morality is, as we have seen, far from obvious and often relevant only to the specific situation of Umbricius as a shade. In the case of U.15, however, the words of the taunting iuvenis recall four vicious professions dealing in misery and death: the leno and praeco, and the pinnirapus and lanista. The insult appears to imply that the pauper is lower than a man of one of these professions, among whom the iuvenis numbers his own father.

The mocker—better, scurra—overlooks the likely fact, however, that his father was a freedman: was he actually in a position to stand on pride and claim the status of eques? Not according to the senatus consultum of 23, which required three generations of free birth as a qualification for this class.¹⁰⁶ That this tradition kept on causing problems into the reign of Hadrian is shown in Ulpian's version of a rescript of that Emperor: Libertinus si ius anulorum impetraverit, quamvis iura ingenuitatis salvo iure patroni nactus sit, tamen ingenuus intellegitur (Just. Dig. 40.10,6). This cozy arrangement, whereby freedmen could claim native birth
while at the same time preserving their patrons' rights to a portion of their estates, inevitably left the pauper worse off relative to these classes; the equites of ius anulorum were tempted to act like snobs; the worst of these would, even in their new-found otium, cross the line into scurrility. The point, then, is not so much that one finds fools who stand on their slender legal rights or cannot resist boasting at the expense of others, but that this boasting has become the style of their otium, and is, as Umbricius puts it in so many words, the only drama such scurrae choose to applaud in a theater: themselves.\textsuperscript{107}

Umbricius implies, in 148 omnibus hic idem, that such worthless equites were to be found only at Rome, but the ambiguity of these words is not helped by the scholiast's reading of id est pauper for hic idem, for omnibus may mean 'the whole world'. Nor can we cast forward for the contrasting behavior of small-town officials in U.16 for an implied hic illic distinction. Instead, we are compelled to ask whether Umbricius's audience would assume that sudden promotion to equestrian status was normal only at Rome.

The evidence suggests that this was so. In the Augustan settlement, knighthood was bestowed automatically through the largely honorary municipal office of tribunus militum a populo.\textsuperscript{108} No such eques, if he had migrated to Rome, would ever have needed to consult a low ancestry. The evidence for conferment of equestrian status by the Emperor is not plentiful,
but it shows that mass enrollments occurred only after seri-
ous depletion of the class. Gaius and Vespasian saw fit,
moreover, to draw primarily if not exclusively on the Italian
and provincial upper crusts for this purpose. At Rome, on
the other hand, qualified men were promoted to equestrian
rank either by grant of *equus publicus* or by adlection to the
decuriae iudicum and generally only after some sort of inqui-
sitio; mere possession of HS 400,000 did not suffice at Rome,
and the *ius anulorum*, if it was a distinct grant, was surely
exceptional.¹⁰⁹

The upshot of this detailed discussion is that Umbricius
would be regarded as perfectly within his rights to retort as
he does to the insult thrown at him in public. Quintiliani
might have hesitated on this point, but Cicero makes no bones
about *scurrae*, or for that matter anyone who chooses mockery
and insult over a lighter touch with wit: they deserve what
they get in retort.¹¹⁰ Indeed, Caesar Strabo's entire discus-
sion of the subject of humor is aligned with the position of
reply and is geared to defense.¹¹¹ Umbricius tries to aid his
fellow *pauper* with the advice on wit in U.15, and he has no
need to invoke the heavy hand of the Emperor to do so but on-
ly to stand in its shadow. His reply to the *scurra* thus ful-
fills *pudor* because he says that it was Otho who originated
class distinctions in the theater. Probably the reference to
the tribunician power, now in the hands of the Emperor, was
enough to silence loud disrespect for a citizen, just as in
the Republic it could silence debate threatening the plebs. Thus the final sting in Umbricius's retort is the hint in 159 Othoni: the mere suggestion of that least of Emperors--whom men far richer and more powerful than all but perhaps a few equites feared because he dealt with his enemies secretly and without preamble--characterizes the target of the wit far better than any adjective.

The brilliance of Juvenal's artistic achievement in U.15 can hardly come into doubt. Even the reluctant admit the sententia on poverty into Parnassus, but it is not with this that criticism must halt. The clear announcement of a new subject at the beginning and the one-line retort at the end erect a definite boundary around the fabella which no naming of its parts can supply. Juvenal's unblushing importation of rhetorical terminology into the theater is an achievement in itself; it is a daring that recalls Cicero. Juvenal's re-working of the locus on torn or soiled clothing as a fit object of laughter followed Horace's lead, without Horace's low keyed, but stubborn boasting. Instead, the scurra does the boasting, upon whom the roof falls with a crash. This improvement in the narrator's position is one that Horace, I think, would have approved.

Nor is Umbricius's impersonation in U.15 the only evidence that Juvenal has bettered his predecessors in the matter of what the satirist's persona may reasonably assert. U.15 is, after all, the springboard for the longest fabella
in *Satire* III: lines 160-189. This *fabella*, with its substantial *egressio* on rural theatrical entertainments, would be only partly intelligible without the sartorial contrast of *U.15* or the claim on piety of *U.14*.

**U.16, lines 160-189**

quis gener hic placuit censu minor atque puellae
sarcinulis inpar? quis pauper scribitur heres?
quando in consilio est aedilibus? agmine facto
debuerant olim tenues migrasse Quirites,
haut facile emergunt quorum virtutibus obstat
res angusta domi, sed Romae durior illis
conatus: magno hospitium miserabile, magno
servorum ventres, et frugi cenula magno,
fictilibus cenare pudet, quod turpe negabis
translatus subito ad Marsos mensamque Sabellam
contentusque illic Veneto duroque cucullo.
pars magna Italiae est, si verum admittimus, in qua
nemo togam sumit nisi mortuus. ipsa dierum
festorum herbo colitur si quando theatro
maiestas tandemque redit ad pulpita notum
exodium, cum personae pallentis hiatum
in gremio matris formidat rusticus infans,
aequales habitus illic similesque videbis
orchestram et populum; clari velamen honoris
sufficiunt tunicae summis aedilibus albae.
hic ultra vires habitus nitor, hic aliquid plus
quam satis est interdum aliena sumitur arca.
commune id vitium est: hic vivimus ambitiosa
paupertate omnes. quid te moror? omnia Romae
cum pretio. quid das, ut Cossum aliquando salutes,
ut te respiciat clauso Veiento labello?
ille metit barbam, crinem hic deponit amati;
plena domus libis venalibus: accipe et istud
fermentum tibi habe. praestare tributa clientes
cogimur et cultis augere peculia servis.

The considerable amount of material covered in *U.16* and the fact that the modern structure breaks at lines 189-190 require some resolution of the problem of the meaning of the last three lines. Generally, Duff, Green, and others have chosen either to alter the reading of 187 *libis* or to interpret one or more words in these lines *in malam partem*. The
variance in meaning ascribed to these three lines is perhaps the greatest in all of Satire III.

The reason for this is not far to seek: Valla's *libis* (on the MS. authority of *VL*) is far better than *libris*, but the difficulty of this *lectio* has proven unproductive for interpretation. In my opinion, however, the nature of Valla's change, which prevents Umbricius from uttering or even passing along a nasty sarcasm directed at the patron, indicates the nature of the solution to this difficulty. The problem here is, when posed as a question, "Who is speaking, and who is addressed?" Ferguson¹¹² and Courtney¹¹³ take *accipe et istud fermentum tibi habe* as said by the client to the slave: 'Take your money and keep your cake—and may it give you indigestion!'. Each thus infers that the client has lost his temper, and in this Duff concurs.¹¹⁴ The slave gets the heat on this interpretation, and Umbricius's anger, though it show only in a surrogate's intemperate words in public, is yet his own anger for all that.

But will his *pudor* permit this and still be *pudor*? On the interpretation of the persona of Umbricius that I have advanced, it cannot, and little here or elsewhere in Satire III will support the notion that Duff *et al.* have proposed. Duff's objections to taking *libis* as the object of both *habe* (double dative with *tibi*) and *accipe* (dative by attraction), with *istud fermentum* in apposition to the understood accusative object of *accipe*, cannot stand. Besides, Romans did not
always utter tibi habe in scorn but often used this phrase with accipere as a formula for the transfer of property, as Duff's and Courtney's examples sometimes show. On the face of it, no word in this whole expression need be pejorative except istud, and here, if it is, it is inconsequential, as the seed cake is merely ceremonial anyway.

The only solution which accounts for every word here and at the same time preserves Umbricius's pudor is this: the slave utters these words politely to Umbricius, the client, who then goes on to render his understanding of them in lines 188b-189. And this is precisely where the humor erupts. The slave speaks for the host, his master, with pro forma politeness: "Take this cake and keep it, slight though it is, as a source of increase to you and yours." There is no reason to think that even a rich man's slaves could be openly impertinent towards clients, and the metaphorical meaning of fermentum (source of increase, cause of growth) well suits the conventional thought: thanks for the tip, and here's your party favor; may all this be a benefit. Umbricius, however, pretends to misunderstand what is said to him: he takes fermentum to mean, for the moment, a 'cause of anger'. He grasps quite well the meaning of the slave's words but takes this situation—of paying for a trivial gift, in order to exchange politenesses—as itself a description of the rights of the pauper: to be forced, like subjects of some province, to pay tribute not to Rome, but to a slave! 
As often in this work, the clinching argument for one interpretation or another is to be found in the details. The payment is not just to a slave but to a well dressed one who has his own savings, which is itself growing with every passing client (189 augere peculia). The long line of favor seekers here pictured before the patron's door is the consequence of the tenues not having lined up and left Rome long ago (162b-163). The slave's fine clothing comes partly out of their dwindling pile, and one's own servants seem to have bottomless gullets: 183b-184a omnia Romae cum pretio.

Such details, on this interpretation, also serve to solidify the frame in U.16 around the sudden translation of the 'you' to the countryside in lines 168b-179. This frame describes the death of the pauper's fortune by a thousand cuts: he can't marry upward if his census is less than his fiancée's hope chest; neither is he written in as an heir nor consulted on fiscal matters by the aediles. Conatus presses on his means, and the cost of even a hospitium miserabile is exorbitant. A fashion which demands plate and scorns stoneware (168a fictilibus cenare pudet) meets its nemesis in the cost of ritual cakes. The moral example of simple holiday dress in the small town thus receives pointed emphasis in 180 habitus nitor and the excessive borrowing of funds to support a Roman wardrobe, which in turn introduces the "arrangement" at Veiento's or Cossus's front door: big occasion or small, legitimate ceremony or not, you pay to see the man.
The one thing that it was easier for a Roman than us to see in U.16 is the alternation of otium and negotium. The framework here is the client's daily business, which culminates in the séance at his patron's sometime before midday. Into this is injected the rural fantasy on dress and the maiestas, or summer stock. The beaming good moral health of smalltown residents almost clumps across this page of smooth, urban dispiritedness. Yet this rustic scene also conveys an essential ingredient of Roman otium: serenity. The cacophony ceases, the language becomes direct and prosaic, and the scene passes before the reader's eye without preamble or apology. For a Horatian moral, it suits fine.

If Juvenal had been content to leave it at that, his readers would have had little cause to complain. But his art would not let it be: he introduces comment, by way of this exodium, which looks both back to the Greeks on stage at Rome and forward to the fear and gloom which emerge in lines 190-314. How Juvenal gets from the outright moralizing of 168 turpe negabis and 171 si verum admittimus to the poetic rendition of emotion in the plain style is fascinating and instructive.

Little in Satire III so much reminds the reader of Persius as the bemused moralizing with which this somnium ruris begins as the allusion to clay ceramic. Juvenal here reworks the materials from Persius II.52-60: the dream free of illness he transforms into the rural fantasy, while the joy of
receiving a gift of gold and silver plate becomes the anxiety of choosing whether to dine on it or on clay. Like Persius, also, Juvenal softens the remonstrative tone by requiring the tu to imagine an illustrative scene from daily life. Here, however, Juvenal parts company with Persius; it soon becomes clear that Juvenal has employed what sounds like moralizing on fashion in dining as a springboard to his actual subject of the criticism of fashion in dress. In lines 169-170 and 177-180, the hic-illic distinction serves to peg down the display of rugged country types (Marsos), country food (men-sam Sabellam), and country clothing (Veneto duroque cucul-lo). If Juvenal were bent on surprising his readers with unannounced and unnecessary egressiones, this densely allusive preface and the first word--171 pars--of this rural fantasy would hardly suffice.

The nine lines of the rural fantasy itself have a style that is most important to this work. The first sentence is on the pattern of the interrupted period, with a si-clause set between the main clause and its predicate. The predicate itself in 172a--nemo togam sumit nisi mortuus--ends in a bu-colic diaeresis and confirms metrically not only the subject of country life but also the use of the humble subject to render divine design. The example of this design is, as the reader at Rome could expect, a statement of the ceremonial purpose of the theater. At this point Juvenal invokes a somewhat higher style with a postponement of subject--from
172 ipsa to 174 maiestas—without metrical gymnastics; the sentence pattern is repeated in its essentials in a lower style in 174b-175a for exodium, yet with a forced hiatus between it and notum. The sequence of serious play before comic afterpiece was probably traditional, and the change in style is, up to this point, likely to reflect the change in what the audience watch.

Beyond this, the poet is free of mimetic obligations but yet continues in a style much the same as he has latterly adopted. We have another forced hiatus at 175-176 hiatum/in, with its onomatopoeia in rendering a child's speech and its pun on technique. Cicero saw repeated hiatus as one among several standards of plain style (Orat. 77 ad fin.), and the expression, maiestas dierum, is a likely candidate for another such standard: application of metaphor to commonplace events and things (Orat. 81). Here are no forced repetitions requiring a raised voice, as just afterwards in lines 180 and 182 with hic (Orat. 85 init.); no interlocking set of clauses but distinct and not isometric cola (Orat. 84, 85): no line, in fact, much at all like another nearby but distinctive throughout and free of homoioteleuton, or jingling phrases, especially at line- or clause-ends (Orat. 84).

The richness of these lines, with their purpose of showing the calm order of ordinary life in a small town, is rarely found elsewhere in the work. For example, only lines 176 (infans) and 178 (honoris//sufficiunt) are fully endstopped,
three end in long vowels or diphthongs (171, 173, and 179), one is closed but not fully stopped (177), and three end in forced hiatus (179, 174, and 175). Line 175 has no cesura in the third foot, and 174 exhibits a contracted perfect, perhaps meant as an archaism (redit). These metrical feats, while plentiful, are yet unobtrusive and show non ingratam neglegentiam de re hominis magis quam de verbis laborantis (Cic. Orat. 77 fin.).

It may seem paradoxical that the point of noticing all this is, after all, not to notice it. Yet these examples from the rural fantasy show how the seams in art tend to disappear into the fabric itself. Umbricius, in his role as priest to the initiate, defines as fully as need be a poetic style for satire without the falling city. In effect, he gives pudor a home in rustic virtue. But because this virtue depends on morally sound public uses of otium, Juvenal cannot mean his reader to stop here, for the comparison to the Greek actors in U.9 is more than explicit: the motif of dress in each theatrical scene demands an accounting in style.

Even the most superficial such account must notice in lines 95-96 the two pairs of half-lines with virtually identical scansion (95a=96a; 95b=96b). Likewise, the numerous words that end in an a-sound in lines 93b-97 create an inane chattering which is hard to counteract. True, there is hiatus at 93-94 cum//uxorem, but this comes so quickly upon the feminine caesura in 94 comoedus\agit that we must think that
Juvenal has some deleterious effect in mind: probably this is choppiness, which achieves full effect in lines 95b-97. Here not even four elisions help matters, whereas in line 171, elisions and apohaeresis of est help to smooth the interrupted sentence. The conclusion seems inescapable, that Juvenal wished the two passages, which share both a significant vocabulary item in persona and a similar, theatrical context, to sound as distinct as possible. The behaviors portrayed in them are, after all, as different as they could possibly be: the artless reaction of the rustic child in its mother's bosom is far—in something other than miles—-from the calculated posturings of a 'Doris' or 'Thais' in Rome.

The use of the term, persona, tells its own tale. In U.9, the term is metaphorical and pejorative, as the application of feminine names to Greek male actors suggests; in U.16, persona has its proper meaning and denotes a mask worn by actors, and not an impression created by their costume. The latter occurrence is, as far as I can see, the only one in which Juvenal does not use persona derisively. The reason for this is not far to seek. Just as it is the function of the exodium to provide relief from the pathe of serious drama, so the mask causes the child to act out his or her fear. So far is this reaction from the proverbially inappropriate one, that Duff reminds the reader of Astyanax's similar reaction to Hector's helmet (II. VI.467-468): the child's reaction is genuine and meaningful in both texts, because it
fulfills the terrifying function of each headpiece.

At this pause on infans, the Roman reader of Satire III has absorbed the pattern of the clause ending with the grammatical subject and is poised to receive the point of all the suspense. Juvenal does not disappoint: he turns the spear on its butt, as it were, and puts the subject near the start of the main clause, thus inverting the pattern of the subordinate clauses. The predicate, aequales, here meaning 'not exhibiting distinctions (of rank or wealth)', sets the moral tone anticipated by the child's artlessness and is itself amplified by similes. . .orchestram et populum.

Almost anyone would have thought this enough—we already have bemused Horatian irony in Persius's favorite setting. But Juvenal's originality forced upon him artistic honesty of a kind that acknowledged not only the traditional satiric fabula but also distinguished it from his own fabella. There seems to be no other way to account for the next line and one half, since these amount to the traditional ironic comment at the end of the Horatian fabula but add little besides the color of rural holiday vestments. What, then, can be transpiring in lines 178b-179?

This line and a half demonstrate that Umbricius is once more suggesting, instead of shouting, the moral vision that he has of what Romans could be. They are creatures of a rare beauty, and capable of genuine love within the family and of real peace in their communities. The symbol, for the émigré,
of these things is the light on the tunicae albae. This image, on the other hand, is meant to recall the dusky clothing worn at the funeral implied by the maxim-like nemo togam sum-it nisi mortuus. In the countryside, Umbricius may search the external man—in his clothing—for signs of honesty. In Rome this is impossible, but so is the plain talk of a Diogenes. Loci de luxurias fall on deaf ears, but Umbricius, like the Country Mouse, can shame urban attachment to luxury by professing to see sufficiency in simple dress.

His sentences, moreover, on the rural maiestas are plain in style like those, perhaps, of Lysias, who wrote very much in the character of the one who would have to speak what he had written. This style suggests that the term, persona, here approaches its legal meaning of a citizen’s good standing. The mask, after all, does serve a civic function: it is the focus of the release of passion, so that otium is possible; the dramatic, masked ceremony levels social distinctions and relieves tensions between humans who are in the eyes of the gods nearly indistinguishable. Umbricius’s search for the source of the fides being destroyed in court terminates in the discovery of the mask in its ceremonial aspect.¹¹⁹

This makes it clearer than ever why Juvenal became almost an historian of satire in this work. In making Umbricius search his city for an honest man, the poet rendered the negative results in the old fabula on the rus. This he set
in the longest fabella at the end of a chain of almost totally ironical and certainly dissimulative fabellae. For the sake of realism, Umbricius submits a view of Rome from the standpoint of a provincial who cannot know his own destructiveness in full, nor fail to feel the power lying hidden in the rustic heart when it is angered. With this asserted, he can indeed pretend, as at the end of U.16, not to understand this Babel. It is a harmless pretence, employed to seal off a poison. Worse harm, as we come to see in succeeding fabellae, is that done by Romans to each other. By line 189, Umbricius stands in a gateway from which he can see across both urbs and rus, across all classes and occupations, and as it turns out virtually across all history to a legendary period when choice of action rather than words determined the morality of man.
FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER IV

1 On these two styles of wit and humor, see Cic. de Or. II.54,218.

2 As Courtney 1980, 151, observes.

3 Cervius's ex re fabella, the fable of the country mouse and the city mouse, is just over 38 lines long, Mor. S. II.6, 79b-117.


5 Mayor 1880, 173, "climax"; Romano, 1979, 88, overstatement in the form of an anticlimax; Courtney 1980, 156, "comic (anti-)climax"; Ferguson 1979, 136, "humorous, bathetic climax"; Colton 1966, 404, sees line 9 as para prosdokian; so LaFleur 1976, 407-408, with Mason 1963, 126-127, who sees principally "the pleasure of verbal play"; Martyn argues most cogently (221-222) for inclusion of lines 6-9 in para prosdokian (227-228). The consensus is that this is verbal wit.

6 See Courtney 1980, 156, on 7 incendia, etc. In addition to the sources he cites, see Vitruvius II.9,6 on the flammability of firwood, a most useful type for trussing and frameworks; II.8,20, on the flammability of wattle-and-daub used in upper-story partitions to reduce weight and expense.

7 This is quite clear in Just. Dig. 48.22,7, sentence 22 (Ulpian), which forbids those relegated to hold high office but yet does not excuse them from public munera. Apparently, Trajan rescinded confiscation in relegatio (Dig. 48.22,1). See also Millar 1977, 170, with notes; cf. Garnsey 1970, 117-121, who argues from historical sources that relegatio was occasionally applied to humiliores. Marache 1964, 476-477, argues that the choice between Prochyta and Subura is hyperbolical to the point of paradox but ignores the contrast between rich and poor implicit in these two locales.

8 See Cic. de Or. II.70,281 init., who classes this sort of wit under urbana dissimulatio, beginning at 67,269.
The allusion to Ovid's relegation in 5 Procytan is inescapable in the context but is not dwelt on in fabellae E.1-2. Nor does Umbricius pursue the point here but instead allows this allusion to linger in U.1 until he brings forward the Daedalus legend in line 25.

On the change (in Sat. III) in fides from a personal and social obligation to a monetary one, see Fredericks 1973, 64-65; cf. Courtney 1980, 26-27.

This adjective, usually applied to wild animals, begins the series of animal imagery.

Except for the name, and perhaps the direction of movement, this definition of revulsion resembles Caesar Strabo's definition of laughter, Cic. de Or. II.58,235: quo modo exsistat atque ita repente erumpat, ut eum cupientes tenere nequeamus, et quo modo simul latera, os, venas, oculos, vultum occupet, viderit Democritus.

Anderson 1982c, 232, sees these adjectives as classes of experience treated in lines 21-189 and 190-314, respectively.

Cf. Cic. de Or. II.58,237 fin.

Suet. Nero 23.2, also lists childbirth and men leaping from the tops of temporary barricades (oppida) as frequent occurrences at Nero's numerous and tedious recitals.

Ehrenpreis 1974, 52, 57, feels that the ironic persona must trick the correspondent but shifts his ground to a more general purpose of tricking the reader.

Cairns 1972, 39.

Cairns 1972, 48.

Cf. Cic. de Or II.71,287 init.

Scott 1927, 93-94, interestingly compares Juv. III.17-20 to Ov. Met. III.157-165, and terms the former an imitation of the latter. The passage in Ovid introduces the story of Actaeon, who may be described as a naif.


Van Rooy 1966, 16-20. It is tempting, in light of the religious events, personalities, and deities sprinkled about
Satire III, to speculate with Van Rooy here that Juvenal thought the word *satura* reached back to regal times and indicated a *lanx* stacked with *primitiae*.

23 See, for instance, Lucil. 844 W=794 M, 990 W=965 M, 1162 W=1272 M, 1225 W=1208 M, all according to Warmington 1967 *ad loc.* from the early books or unassigned fragments.

24 *Locus* has to do with *dignitas*, particularly that bestowed by birth, but in Umbricius's expression, 21 *artibus honestis, locus* must mean literally, 'opportunity'. Green's translation (1974, 87 and n. 4), "room...for the decent professions," nicely anticipates the upcoming labor, but his note presses too hard on the distinction between work which a free citizen would undertake and the so-called 'sordid' occupations. Umbricius nowhere derides honest work. *Emolumentum* appears elsewhere in Juvenal only once, where it is attached to legal proceedings and means, 'perquisite' or 'benefit of privilege', XVI.35. The implication in XVI, as in III, is that without *emolumenta* one's *res* will be adversely affected (XVI.48-50) because of costly delays in legal, business, and perhaps even social affairs.

25 Jensen 1986, 185-186, considers Umbricius's *sermo* a "lengthy and solemn self-justification" that gradually becomes "a self-revelation that is not quite as rosy, in moral terms, as he wants to persuade" the *ego*.

26 Verg. *Aen.* VI.14-33a. The labyrinth in Vergil is the one in Crete; for discussion of the Sibyl's cave in the lower town of Cumae, see Austin 1977, 48-58, with bibliography. There was an *antrum* of initiation at Baiae.

27 Cf. Cic. *de Or.* II.66,266, on *deformitas* or the *vitium corporis*. See now Perl 1982, 67-69, on Cicero's meaning in the comparison of Helvius Mancia to the Medusa-like face on the Cimbrian shield: the *buccae fluentes* indicate boastfulness, which suits the meaning well in U.2. The wit in U.1 has less mockery in it.

28 Newman 1967, 44, notes that the only reference in Horace's *Sermones* to the *vates* is at II.5,6, where this is Teiresias. It is significant that Teiresias indulges in mock epic in lines 62-65 (the marriage of Coranus to Nasica's daughter) in response to Odysseus's urging (61) to get to the point of the *fabula*.

29 Cf. Jessen's evidence on 46 *mancus*, 1889, 327. Juvenal's *nullo dextram* may imitate Catull. 47.1 *duae sinistrae*.

30 Keats's meaning has been much discussed, as he seems to have anticipated it would in his letter to his brothers,
written near Christmas, 1817: "I mean Negative Capability, that is when man is capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact & reason—Coleridge, for instance, would let go by a fine iso-
lated verisimilitude caught from the Penetratio of mystery, from being incapable of remaining content with half know-
ledge" (Abrams et al. 1962, 1275, with original emphasis). Keats clarified this further, apparently, in a letter written less than two months later (3 February 1818) to John Hamilton Reynolds: "We hate poetry that has a palpable design upon us. . . . Poetry should be great & unobtrusive, a thing which enters into one's soul, and does not startle or amaze it with itself but with its subject" (Abrams et al. 1962, 1276). As a practical matter in poetry, negative capability might be thought to boil down to a habit or conscious technique of re-
jection of easy solutions to uncertainties, as with the opening of Keats's "Ode on Melancholy" (1820) or in the fifth canto of his "Ode to a Nightingale" (1819, 1820). In Satire III, the nullus series, which culminates in Umbricius's hu-
morous point about himself—not a seer, not broken by age--
unobtrusively presents his honesty without apparent designs on his audience's admiration.

31Cic. de Or. II.66, 264, defines the narrative class of jokes as possessing verisimilitude via enargeia combined with the grotesque (suburpria). Comic narrationes lack the sur-
prise ending that irony often requires but instead appear to grow out of details of narrative, as Cicero's examples show: de Or. II.66, 265-268, with 59,240-241.

32Quintilian IV.2,30 notes the occasional substitution of a brief propositio for the full narratio by the school rhetoricians, and he devotes thereafter some space to the need for lucidity, brevity, and plausibility in narratio (VI. 2,31-60) and to the more common case in which the probatio is headed by the propositio (IV.4). We should note Quintilian's comment on one case in which the propositio is especially useful (IV.4.3): Nonnunquam vero valde est utilis, ubi res defendi non potest.

33The resumptive propositum is not to be confused with rhetorical propositio, instances of which De Decker 1913, 104-105 and n. 1, has listed for Satire III, beginning at line 41. Propositiones indicated contested issues of an ac-
tion, not the action itself.

34The continuous absence of this feature of the fabella in Juv. III.41-314 prevents too frequent allusion to occa-
sion, which would make the speaker sound uninformed or stu-
pid, or both. Here satire and oratory diverge in their humor from comedy: in neither of the first two is regular misap-
prehension of occasion expected. This is essentially the
argument that Scott 1927, 20-21, advances on enargeia in oratory and poetry.

For sources illustrating Roman condescension to the 'lower' occupations, see Courtney 1980, 153-154, and ad loc., 160-162, with Duff and Mayor. Courtney focusses on the gladiatorial aspects of the municipal origins of Artorius and Catulus, but it seems clear to me that their moral degeneracy stems more from their mobility in the census and the illegal means of their fortuna. Umbricius uses terms which hark back to the good old days for damnatory power, to a time when the census had meaning, when cornicines were assessed in the fifth class just above the urban poor (Liv. I.43,7-8), and when all municipales owed whatever limited civic rights they had to Roman generosity. Imperial changes in the census law, however, reduced it to a record-keeping procedure, as Nicolet 1980, 65-67, graphically illustrates: gone were the moral sanctions, which permitted the censor to remove a man from the rolls, and the distinctions between occupations, which could determine one's class (Nicolet 1980, 73-86).

Moeller 1969, 386-388, discusses lines 29b-40 in some detail and arrives at the same finding as I, that Artorius and Catulus are, once and forever, killers. But his reasoning requires that line 33 makes them a pair of praecones who were once cornicines (cf. Cic. ad Fam. VI.12,8). Cf. Romano 1979, 89, with whose assessment I generally agree.

Millar 1977, 293-294, shows that Vespasian and Titus, in acting as censors in 73/4, directly adlected equites into the Senate inter praetorios and in one instance created an aedilicus. Longer established, and probably less discriminatory in practice (to judge from Claudius's attempts to restrict its grant to third-generation Romans), was bestowal of the latus clavus, which simply gave the right to seek senatorial office (Millar 1977, 290-293). Claudius promulgated a measure (rescinded by Nero but reinstated by Domitian) which required of nominees to the quaestorship the production of gladiatorial contests. Private individuals might, with imperial permission, also produce gladiatorial contests, but by and large responsibility for games at Rome was restricted to the praetorian collegium. A brief history of these developments is to be found in Balsdon 1969, 261-264.

Mayor 1880, 185, ad loc., links the 'black-into-white' image to the thief Autolycus and traces its moral equivalent from Terence to Persius. But the image of nigrum in candida also recalls the sack of Troy in Aeneid II, where similar imagery plays a significant role. Sinon (in one tradition the grandson of Autolycus) is seen scattering firebrands (II.329-330) while the Trojans fight in the dark (335 caeco Marte). There are many such images in Aen. II, but probably the most
striking are the appearance of Venus to Aeneas (588-591) and her disappearance (620-625); each involves the contrast of light and dark, and each is directly relevant to the sack of the city. There may be allusions to Ovid, too, in this passage. Kenney 1982b, 452, n. 1, points out that Ovid imitated Aeneid II in Trist. I.3 by comparing his own last night in Rome to that of Aeneas in Troy; Kenney (1982b, 444-445) notes that lightning and the Phaethon legend in Trist. I.1, 71-74 and 79-82 are metaphors of Ovid's exile; similarly, Kenney notes (1982b, 449-452) Ovid's masterly expression of the topos of old age in the imagery of the swan in Trist. IV.8,1-4. I would only add to these observations that Ovid's yearning in Trist. IV.8,5-14, is directed at 7 otia and his 10 rura paterna.

39 Juvenal's wording has caused difficulties, the solutions of which Courtney 1980, 160-161 on line 33, has recorded. One feature of bankruptcy, which Mayor 1880, 185 ad loc., observes, is that infamia resulted from this action; this required the bankrupt to sell all his res and to foro cedere. Apparently, however, in Juvenal's time the latter debility meant very little, as Sat. XI.46-51 shows. Jolowicz 1952, 225-226, records that as early as Augustus's reign the cessio bonorum freed the debtor from the infamia of a forced sale and forever eliminated the danger of imprisonment for his debt; these provisions did not apply—in the best guess—to those whose insolvency was their own fault or who had no property of any value to their creditors.

40 Romano 1979, 26, discusses this interesting type of irony but does not trace its appearance in Juv. III. But see also her 1979, 89 and n. 15, and Worcester's 1940, 128-129, remarks: "Satire has always been a powerful agent in the secularization of thought, for it directs men's attention to their own conduct and teaches them that their faults lie in themselves, not in their stars. . . . Cosmic irony is the satire of frustration, uttered by men who believe that however high man's aspirations may reach, there is always a still higher, unattainable level of knowledge, in the light of which those aspirations and calculations must become stultified and abortive. Action loses all value. . . ." If he is right on this last point, then Umbricius is not a cosmic ironist but merely serves this attitude up as a genial deception: it is, in fact, a mistake in thinking.

41 Cf. Cic. de Or. II.71,286 fin., on speaking ridiculous things sententiously, as if they made perfect sense.

42 Berger 1953, 461, sub excusationes a muneribus, notes that poverty was an admissible reason for excuse from burdensome public duties; elsewhere, he notes (1953, 589), sub munera, that physical weakness and poverty were each adequate.
Courtney 1980, 163, ad loc.


Cic. de Or. II.59,239 on Roman tolerance of joking on bodily defects. Cf. on dignitas especially de Or. II.56,229. See also Perl's discussion, 1982, 59-60.

See the scholiast on Juv. III.11.

Jessen 1889, 327, noted that the point of Sat. III.46-48 was likely based on the Roman ascription of thieving ability to the left hand. The allusion in these lines to Catullus 47.1 duae sinistreae lifts the gloom of Juvenal's rather grim metaphor in mancus and allows the laughable if indirect inference to be drawn, that the Romans who are "getting ahead" haven't a trusty right hand amongst them.

Cf. Cic. de Or. II.70,281 fin.

Scarcely a page of Seneca's de Ira goes by but that some exhortation is addressed to an imaginary tu or nos, as at III.13,1 and 4. This stylistic habit was frequent in the rhetorical schools, since the subjects posed for students were often imaginary, e.g., Sen. Contr. III.4, or number 258 of the so-called Declamationes Quintilianae.

Quintilian's famous denunciation of Seneca's style, at X.1,129-130, nevertheless selects some aspects of it for praise—egregius tamen vitiorum insectator fuit. Perhaps Juvenal's avoidance of revelation of the occultum prevented adoption of the sounder aspects of Senecan style.

See, e.g., Chapter II, p. 89.

The loss of sleep (56 ut somno careas) later, at line 232, plays a part in the aetiology of illness, but here it may suggest that the guilty client fears being murdered at the order of his patron. This is certainly an implication of ponenda praemia; there is no way in which the patron can cease to fear you (57 semper timearis) short of his own or your death.

See Ovid Fast. II,607-610, where Jove tears out Juturna's tongue and sends her to the Underworld, locus ille silentibus aptus; cf. also Fast. II.533-570 where Ovid explains the rites of Feralia for placating the wandering manes, whose hunger and unhappiness are evident at every turn.

The umbra in Hor. Carm. I.32,1 is that associated with relaxation from hard work; see Newman 1967, 11, on shade as symbol of leisure and relaxation. Cf. 9 mense Augusto.
55 Liebeschuetz 1979, 41 and n. 6.

56 Cicero constantly implies that an ethos of moral reliability is essential to an orator who uses wit or humor: de Or. II.54.221; 56.229; and especially 58.237. Cf. Quint. VI. 3,35 init.: ea quae dicet vir bonus omnia salva dignitate ac verecundia dicet. Nimium enim risus pretium est, si probitatis impendio constat.

57 Hereafter, whenever I refer to Umbricius's use of the term, 'persona', it will appear italicized; the modern literary term will continue to appear in Roman face.

58 See Lucilius's take-off on such effects, 990 W=965 M.

59 Courtney 1980, 52, does not list this cesura, nor does he include it among his "pauses in unusual places" (1980, 53-54). Of the latter, he says satirists create such pauses to "give an air of greater informality" to the epic hexameter.

60 The scholiast on line 175 discusses the function of exodias to remove the passions of tragedy and rather acutely cites Lucilius (414-415 W=1264-1265 M), who also had some revealing comments on how children reacted to scarecrows, statues, and like representations of the human face (524-529 W=484-489 M). Ferguson 1979, 148, on 175 pallentis, thinks the mask may have portrayed a Lamia, a sort of spook; Mayor 1880, 200, may be more on target to term the figure a manducus, as do Courtney 1980, 178, and Friedlaender 1895, 214. Juvenal's moral point may derive from Livy's complaint about the great expense and lavishness of current dramatic productions, 7.2, 13: quam ab sano initio res in hanc vix opulentis regnis tolerabilem insaniat venerit.

61 Really only Watts 1976, 102, has noted that Juvenal imposed limits on prejudice against Greeks, excepting only Satire III (1976, 99).

62 See Cicero's very brief discussion of the stomachosa et quasi submorosa ridicula, de Or. II.69,279.

63 Mayor 1880, 187, and Ferguson 1979, 139, note the irony in the term the Romans used of themselves as a people; Courtney 1980, 164, and Ferguson 1979, 140, claim this contrasts sharply with 61 Graecam. Duff 1970, 133, cites variant texts of the scholiast on a cry of street porters, porro Quirites, which Wessner 1967, 33, with app. crit., has altered to (exclamatio) pro 'o Quirites'. The idea that this was typically shouted probably derives from Varro's quaint etymology (L. L. 6.68), cited in Ernout-Meillet sub quirito: quiritare dicitur qui quiritium fidem clamans imploret. Perhaps there is some such appeal to social solidarity, a thing which is typical of satire; perhaps also Umbricius means to
hint, with the Imperial usage of Quirites to designate and reproach the Roman soldier, as Ernout-Meillet sub quiris suggests. For the suggestion of the military motif in the invective against the Greeks, see below on U.11.

64Balsdon 1979, 52-53.
65Cic. de Or. II.69,278.
66Courtney 1980, 164 ad loc.

67The early appearance of mitra in Greek literature is surely evidence of its Ionic origins; the Herodotean citations in LSJ s.v. II.4 and sub Mitra (Aphrodite) point also to an eastern, perhaps Persian, origin. Perhaps uncertainty on this point kept Serafini from listing (1957, 365-378) this line in his chapter, "La Grecia nella lingua di Giovenale"; Watts 1976, 84-86, sees the locus communis of "physique, language, and customs" of foreigners as instrumental in whatever xenophobia Juvenal may have felt; in this, Watts lumps dress and physical traits together. On Syrians in the late Republic and early Empire, see Balsdon 1979, 67 with notes, and Mayor 1880, 137-138, on Juv. I.104.

68Ferguson 1979, 140 ad loc.
69Including Green 1974, 89.

70This is precisely the point of Hor. S. II.10,20-24; note also that Horace ends this discussion of the Old Comedy with an appearance by Quirinus, lines 31-35.

71See the discussion above in Chapter III on Scaevola's reply to Albucius (84-86 W,M), pp. 122-123. Cf. also Cic. de Or. II.68,277.

72Race 1982, 19, says that the logical priamel, which is quite frequent in Homer, is illustrative rather than strictly logical; it is a sort of poetic proof. For the form here, see Race 1982, 27, who considers the arousal of expectation, in the parallelisms accompanied by anaphora, to have been abused by Augustan and later Roman authors. Race 1982, 156, cites only two priamels in Juvenal, both in Sat. X (12-13a and 232b-233), and finds in these simply "a transitional device to introduce a new subject for expansion." Here in III. 79-80, the effect of the priamel is climactic and repays in kind the insult in lines 67-68.

73The tone is reminiscent of Sat. V's approach to the food at the banquet, in the allusion to the quality of the dishes set before the villibus amicis--Juv. V.146-155.
In the invective, laudare appears in lines 86, 92, and 106; in E.1, in line 2; in Umbricius's inability to praise a bad book, line 42.

So termed by Caesar Strabo at Cic. de Or. II.71, 288.

Cic. Off. I.26, 92 briefly discusses activities worthy of those who live in retirement from public affairs but even in this short space conveys a sizeable list of duties to perform and vices to avoid. Further on, in 103–104, Cicero prefaces a discussion of leisure amusements, such as joking and sport, with these words: Neque enim ita generati a natura sumus, ut ad ludum et iocum facti esse videamur, ad severitatem potius et ad quaedam studia graviora atque maiora.

Cf. Cic. de Or. II.69, 280 init., on the stultitiae salsa reprehensio.

Juvenal has even gone so far as to cause his words, like those of Horace, to form the cesura.

Disagreement on the meaning of line 108 has extended from ancient times, as the scholiast shows, and Valla's interpretation. My suggestion is that crepitum is so general in significance that Juvenal is indeed bringing the series beginning in line 107 to a banal climax, which cannot exclude an allusion to the Greek game of cotta. See Martyn 1985, 394–395 for the many modern interpretations of line 108 and his suggestion that the patron is passing wind. See now Eden 1985, 335–336, who extends this debate in no new direction.

Martyn 1974, 343–344.

Sen. de Ira I.12, 1–5, is especially insightful on the subject of, among other grave offenses against the family, the outrage of the mother (si rapi matrem). Vengeance for such acts grows out of the sense of duty rather than anger.

Courtney 1980, 171 on line 113, apparently sees the line as cobbled together out of materials in lines 52 and 57, and Ferguson 1979, 144 ad loc., calls 113 a "weak gloss" while noting scholarly disagreement over the genuineness of the next five lines. Duff and Friedlaender are silent on this, but Green 1974, 101 n. 15, defends 113 and posits a lost line after 112 to the effect that "such creatures do not even desire sexual pleasure for its own sake." My solution is simpler than either excision or emendation by lost lines, in that fewer assumptions are needed to see 112 as effective after 113.

Cf. Cic. de Or. II.67, 274, on subabsurda.
I here collate the sources mentioned by the commentators on Roman prejudice against the gymnasia: Plin. Ep. I. 22,6, X.40.2; Plut. Quaest. Rom. 40; Tac. Ann. XIV.20.4; Sen. Brev. Vit. 12,2. A major objection was nudity.

As Ferguson 1979, 144, ad loc., and Courtney 1980, 171, ad loc., aver.

See Verg. Aen. VI.535-558, for a description of the Palace of Dis, climaxing in groans, the sound of whips, and stridor ferri tractaeque catenae.

The noise issuing from the Palace of Dis is associated from the first with crime: Verg. Aen. VI.559-561. Aeneas here terms the offenses of the dead scelera in line 560, and Rhadamanthus audit dolos in line 566; a long catalogue of the great offenders of god and man follow in lines 580-625. Minos was the brother of Rhadamanthus and is sometimes (Plat. Gorg. 524a) portrayed as a judge in the Underworld.

See Morford and Lenardon's conclusions (1977, 422) about the Findaric version of Bellerophon's legend (Ol. 13. 63-92; Isth. 7.60-68). It is noteworthy that both Egnatius and Bellerophon must be inferred from allusions in Juv. III.

Green 1974, 91: "Where can a hanger-on be ditched with less fuss than in Rome?" Duff 1970, 141, paraphrasing: "At Rome, more than elsewhere, no one thinks twice of a dependent." Scholiast, paraphrasing: "<minus> nusquam damnum est in cliente perdendo, quam <si> propter Graecum excudit<tur>"; the second hand in the scholia: "factura: damnum" (Wessner 1967, 38). Ferguson 1979, 145: "Nowhere is a dependent dropped with less to-do."

Cf. Cic. de Or. II.70,232, on friendly admonition by way of witty advice.

De Decker 1913, 50 and n. 1, asserts that in numerous loci de divitiis, Juvenal takes his reader "loin de l'atmosphère des auditoria," which to me implies that such loci had a cool reception outside the classroom.

See Cicero's praise of such a mixture, de Or. II.55, 222-223.

Cf. Cic. de Or II.66,265 fin., where the extent of comparison is very brief.

Green's translation, 1974, 91.


This coincides with Bellandi, 49-51 (cited by Brown 1983, 278, n. 37), who shows that Juvenal's focus on the contrast between rich and poor distinguishes his treatment of the traffic motif from those of other satirists: F. Bellandi, Etica diatribica e protesta sociale nelle satire di GIOvenale, Bologna, 1980. I have been unable to obtain this monograph.

In Petr. 34,2, the dropping of a paropsis is the occasion for both a tumultus and the reproof (obiurgari) of the slave responsible.

Cic. de Or. II.65,262 fin.: dixi enim dudum rationem aliam esse loci, aliam severitatis, gravium autem et iocorum unam esse materiam. . . .


On the poet's pretension to poverty, a stock literary persona, see Townend 1973, 149.

Courtney 1980, 175, ad loc.


Krenkel 1970, 381.

At Aen. VI.450, Dido is recens a volnere; VI.494-495, Delphobus is laniatum corpore toto and lacerum crudeliter ora. See also Plato Gorg. 524b-d.

See Suet. Tib. 51,1, on this Emperor's reluctance to appoint to the decuria a man civitate donatus; Duff 1970, on Juv. VII.14, mentions a Tiberian law restoring the three generations of free birth traditionally required for ingenuitas. This must have been the lex Visellia of 24, the details of which rest on a senatus consultum of the previous year: Levick 1976, 116. Cf. also the Domitianic s. c. Minnianum de collusione detegenda, which punished conspiring to declare a freedman freeborn (Iust. Dig. 40.16,1).

This appears to be the prosopopeia addressed by Romano 1979, 93, no. 18; she terms this irony by self-betrayal but does not locate this passage under that heading in her tally chart for Satire III. Corbett 1986, 59-60, defines the amateur scura as petulans and inprobus and terms his mockery dicacias. It is, from Corbett's (1986, 43-47) view point, significant that Juvenal twice calls these scurrae, iuvenes, and has them insist on their free status.

109 See Millar 1977, 279-284, for a sound discussion of the varied sources down to Hadrian.

110 See Caius Sextius's reply to Appius's scurrilous joke on his being blind in one eye, Cic. de Or. II.60,246, with the surrounding discussion on scurrility in joking, 245, 247.

111 This is certainly the position as summarized by Antonius, and Caesar does not object: Cic. de Or II.56,230: Om-nino probabiliora sunt, quae lacesistici dicimus quam quae pri-ores, nam et ingenii celeritas maior est, quae appareit in respon-dendo, et humanitatis est responsio.

112 Ferguson 1979, 149 ad loc.

113 Courtney 1980, 180 ad loc.

114 Duff 1970, 148-149 ad loc.

115 Cf. Cic. de Or II.68,275-276, on jokes based on pretending not to understand what one has just heard.

116 On the risible aspects of much the same situation as this at the end of U.16, see Sen. de Const. 14,1-2: o quantus risus inter ista tollendus est! quanta voluptate implendus animus ex alienorum errorum tumultu contemptanti quietem suam! "quid ergo? sapiens non accedet ad fores, quas durus ianitor obsidet?" ille vero, si res necessaria vocabit, experietur et illum, quisquis erit, tanquam canem acerum obiecto cibo leniet nec indignabitur aliquid impendere, ut limen transeat, cogitans et in pontibus quibusdam pro transitu dari. itaque illi quoque, quisquis erit, qui hoc salutationem publicum exercet, donabit; scit emi aere venal-ia. Ille pusilli animi est, qui sibi placet, quod ostiario libre respondit; quod virgam eius fregit, quod ad dominum accessit et petit corium. This last is a good argument for Umbricius's silence, except to his friend the ego, on the behavior of the servus, and Seneca makes clear, on the whole, the opening for humor in this situation.

117 The phrasing of line 169b to recall Verg. Geo. II.167 is noted by all modern commentators since Friedlaender. Ju-venal's outright imitation of this half-line surely indicates that, with Vergil, he believes that Rome's very health and sanity depend on observance of her rural virtues. But he al-so sets the scene for the later Fable of the City Mice (U.17, lines 190-211) by moralizing here on rural dress and dining. The poet thus frees himself to concentrate on U.17's urban content.
Miner, in his article that takes Juvenal III as its starting point, "In Satire's Falling City," says of panegyric in satire: "Satire moves from its implied ideal city or ideal person, or from the real city and historical man, to a foolish, evil counterpart. . . . [S]atire possesses extraordinary force by bearing upon us our sense of loss and an unrelieved conviction that the degeneration should not be so" (1972, 25).

Mauss 1979, 78-82, points out that the legal and religious aspects of persona are the most essentially Roman and that the falsity of role-playing denoted by this term seems to have come from its use as a translation of prosopon. This is clearly Juvenal's meaning with Greek theatrical costuming as against the Roman mask in the old exodia. Mauss also notes that the cognomen, as a designation of the civic persona, was regularly linked with the imagines of dead ancestors.
CHAPTER V

The Depersonalization of the Victim of the Saeva Urbs

This chapter begins its discussion of Juvenal III at the modern breakpoint specified by Hightet rather than at any other because it seems clear to me that a pause is indicated after so long a fabella as that ending in line 189. U.16, 30 lines long, is the centerpiece framing the rural fantasy of lines 168-179. This fantasy in turn lies almost at the exact center of all Umbricius has to say and would appear, in being cast as an egressio, to underscore the conversational tendency to wander from topic to topic without a plan. The decision, therefore, to break the discussion of Umbricius's 302 lines into two chapters flows not from a wish to impose yet once more an artificial, gross structure upon this satire but from an unwritten rule that conversation must sometimes pause and the participants collect themselves to finish what they have begun.

In the lines (190-314) remaining to be discussed in this dissertation, most critics see two or more parts. The first of these begins at 190 and runs to 267 and deals with the ego's list of urban dangers--collapse and fire--to which Umbricius adds dangers to be endured in crowds and traffic. In
the second section, we find the sequence of nighttime accident and attack which I claim climaxes in the death of the citizen in line 305. The stylistic differences between these two parts are manifold, but the first feature to strike the student of Juvenal's wit and humor is that, of the six fabellae making up the first section, five (U.17-18 and 20-22) are comic narrationes; the second section consists entirely of ironical fabellae in which, however, the narrative tendency remains strong. For these reasons, I see no rationale for introducing any division of lines 190-314 other than that imposed by the fabellae. This is particularly important to understanding the abrupt turn which Umbricius executes at line 315, where occasion returns to acknowledgement of dramatic proprieties and ceases to perform merely as a surrogate for the introduction of new topics.

One would expect that the first fabella of this shift into the narrative mode would bear the marks of considerable use of enargeia,¹ and indeed we find elaborate and detailed scene-setting in the story of Cordus (U.17). But perhaps the most pleasant surprise is that Umbricius stages this story as a fable or apologus, which I call the Fable of the City Mice.

U.17, lines 190-211

\[
\text{quis timet aut timuit gelida Praeneste ruinam aut positis nemorosa inter iuga Volsiniis aut simplicibus Gabiis aut proni Tiburis arce? nos urbem colimus tenui tibicine fultam magna parte sui; nam sic labentibus obstat vilicus et, veteris rimaec cum texit hiatum, securos pendente iubet dormire ruina. vivendum est illic, ubi nulla incendia, nulli}
\]
nocte metus. iam poscit aquam, iam frivola transfert
Ucalegon, tabulata tibi iam tertia fumant:
tu nescis; nam si gradibus trepidatur ab imis,
ultimus ardebit quem tegula sola tuetur
a pluvia, molles ubi reddunt ova columbae.
lectus erat Cordo Procula minor, urceoli sex
ornamentum abaci, nec non et parvulus infra
cantharus et recubans sub eodem marmore Chiron,
iamque vetus Graecos servabat cista libellos
et divina opici rodebant carmina mures.
nil habuit Cordus, quis enim negat? et tamen illud
perdidit infelix totum nihil. ultimus autem
aerumnae cumulus, quod nudum et frusta rogantem
nemo cibo, nemo hospitio tectoque iuvabit.

There comes a point in literary allusion which, when
passed, amounts to aemulatio, and surely we have imitation
here. Allusions to distinct features of Horace's Fable of
the Country Mouse and the City Mouse, which concludes his S.
II.6, are, as we shall soon see, at least ten in number. But
certain elements of Horace's satire--particularly those which
establish it as urban complaint cum praise of countryside--
reappear both here and elsewhere in Juvenal III. An outline
or sketch of these will, with the more detailed allusions of
one version of the fable to another, provide a stimulating
insight into Juvenal's artistic ability.

The overall resemblance of Juvenal III to Horace S. II.6
is striking, once the difference in the narrative premises is
established. The difference principally amounts to this:
Horace's ego is speaking from his villa and reflecting on the
frustrations and dangers that he has left behind in Rome,
while Umbricius, of course, is on the point of leaving for
his little farm. Juvenal may have thought that the role of
Horace's Cervius-figure, whose fable dominates the second
half of II.6 (lines 77-117), could be expanded to include all but the introductory lines, which could still be assigned to the ego. The alterations to Horace's structure would therefore look something like this:

Table 4

Parallel Structure of Horace Sermo II.6 and Juvenal III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horace S. II.6</th>
<th>Juvenal Sat. III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Function</td>
<td>Structural Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>1-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction by ego, consultation of muse</td>
<td>Introduction by ego, invocation of muse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-76</td>
<td>21-189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocation of god, urban complaint by ego</td>
<td>Urban complaint by Umbricius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-117</td>
<td>190-314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fable by Cervius (78 ex re fabellae)</td>
<td>Multiple fabellae by Umbricius, beginning with a fable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315-322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brief conclusion by Umbricius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The slight rearrangement of Horace's structure is apparent from Table 4. First, the ego's (unsuccessful) invocation of the muse has been collapsed into that of the god and moved up into the introductory section. Next, Juvenal has set the fable near the center of perpetuae facetiae, making it the 17th of Umbricius's 26 fabellae; 169 lines precede U.17 and 111 lines follow it, not counting the ego's lines. But the important similarity is that Juvenal begins the second major section of his work, like Horace, with a fable. Finally,
Umbricius's brief conclusion seems but a small matter in light of the fact that Juvenal III is about three times as long as Horace's satire; in it, Umbricius includes the significant promise to visit the ego in the country to listen to the latter's satarae.

Certain other features of Horace's poem appear to have been the object of Juvenal's aemulatio. One could point to a number of details resembling or duplicating subjects which Umbricius or the ego of Juvenal III take up, but it would be scarcely in keeping with artistic freedom to insist that Juvenal retained them because Horace had them. Rather, I would point to such things as Juvenal's expansion on Horace's imagery of the city as the Underworld along with his contraction of brief dialogue into monologue with impersonation. Juvenal has also kept Horace's themes of the moral conflict between wealth and virtue and of whether convenience or what is right ought to guide one in his friendships. And the relaxation of strict observance of distinctions between the 'I' and 'you' in verbs was perhaps a standard of conversation which Horace had set for satire because such flexibility was needed for verisimilitude; in Juvenal, such observances have relaxed very far, with the aim, as I have said, of making Umbricius fade into the background. Perhaps also Juvenal saw the usefulness of rendering his urbanite's day from early morning till late night, much as Horace did. Finally, Juvenal seems to have kept Horace's rural reprise (S. II.6,
60-76) as an introduction to the fable of the mice but to have altered it (III.168-179) substantially, while still retaining Horace's fercula (S. II.6,104) in 168 fictilibus as a lead-in to the festive occasion. This last example indicates plainly enough how far Juvenal meant to retain the detail in Horace's work: he kept what suited his purpose—moral and artistic results of each fabella—and discarded what did not.

The tale of Cordus's misfortune resembles Cervius's tale in important themes. U.17 alludes to wealth in Cordus's lack (lines 208-209) and to amicitia in his failure to receive hospitium (210b-211). Horace is more complex on the summum bonum than Juvenal, as the country mouse pronounces his new wisdom (S. II.6,115b-117); the city mice, as we shall see, do this for Cordus. Juvenal Leaves Ucalegon, the 'bad neighbor', safe with his frivola on the street outside, while the unaware resident burns above. Part of the elaborate scene setting—the 202 ova columbae—becomes a pathetic symbol of the loss of life and refers almost offhandedly to the myth of Daedalus: if only the Bohème could have sprouted wings, he'd have survived. But clearly both satirists agree that homo beatus must count among his blessings escape from danger.

Juvenal's version of the fable also shares many narrative devices with Horace's. Each contains a rhetorical question or questions expressing dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs; each has a moral at the end; each exhibits the activity of mice in a place where they do not belong,
namely, the houses of men; human occupancy is evoked by narration of furnishings; other animals appear on the scene; the urban scene is set at night; there is a humble home belonging to a pauper; a hilly, sylvan setting is evoked; and there is a journey proposed in each. Despite these ten points of resemblance, Juvenal's fabella does not sound like a fable, and that is because the Oxford text, as it stands, does not permit the reader to infer that animals are talking at any point.

But surely there is no great impediment to assigning lines 208-211 in U.17 to the opici mures. First, in lines 190-202, thoughts and events are narrated in good order in relation to the present, which is the dominant tense, and no real question arises as to the identity of the narrator, who is Umbricius. But then, in lines 203-207, verbs shift into the imperfect and render a post ignem viewpoint. Finally, the mix of verb tenses in lines 208-211 resembles narration more of conversation than of events, and 208 nil habuit Cordus, quis enim negat supplies a verb of saying, now rendering conversation in the perfect tense. The shifts in verb tenses at these two places following line 202 strongly indicate a change of viewpoint to one more directly involved in the fire than Ucalegon. The mice seem, in a fabulous way, good candidates for the part: they have eaten their Homer, and 207 opici can be taken to mean that they speak something --just not Greek. Since, for the purpose of assigning a
character to speak these lines, the choice lies between Ucal-
egon, who only poscit aquam, and the mice, who have a verb of
saying in a conversational mode, impersonation of the city
mice by Umbricius in lines 208-211 is plausible.

But the clinching argument that the mice speak in line
208 lies, as it seems to me, in the style. For who but mice
are obsessed with food? All the mice in the Batrachomyoma-
chia are named after foods or acts of eating; Horace's mice
first enjoy a simple cena of frusta (S.II.6.83b-87) but then
dig into a real dapes (S.II.6.100b-111a); in a comic rever-
sal, Juvenal's mice see Cordus begging for food--for mere
frusta in the streets, but he never did have anything anyway,
did he? Moreover, the opici mice speak with a pure Latinity
which contrasts sharply with the language just preceding line
208, with its loan-words, cantharus, cista, urceolus, abacus,
and the insulting epithet opicus. The departure into impers-
sonation at 208 seems secure on this evidence.

If this idea, that the mice speak the moral, completes
all essential aspects of the apologus, and makes clear that
even the evocation of the hilly, wooded setting at the begin-
nning of U.17 is a part of the allusion to Horace, then what
of this insulting tone in lines 203-207? It is virtually in-
conceivable that Umbricius's pudor would permit him this gra-
tuitous injury to a fellow pauper. The logical candidate for
the bitterness formulated in this catalogue of Cordus's pos-
sessions is the one who is heroically standing among his own:
Ucalegon. Juvenal's Ucalegon, like Homer's, is concerned with the bedroom (II. III.146-160), even naming a woman; like Vergil's, his home is burning (Aen. II.311-312). Perhaps it is going too far to insist that lines 203-207 also be enclosed in quotation marks and attributed to Ucalegon—as we shall see, fires draw a crowd in U.18—but an urbanite may utter or think them, and that is sufficient to discover in 203-207 the attitudes of Horace's city mouse. Self-indulgence and polite greed substitute for amicitia when most needed: in disaster. Cordus is, in this sense of the morality which Umbricius explores, indeed nudus.

This exact and unencouraging description of the pauper in his brush with death naturally raises the question of whether, in the comic mode, he has survived at all. Perhaps the mice see Cordus as hungry because that is the continual state of all ghosts. In the Odyssey (11.48-50, 95-99, 152-154), the thirst of the dead for sacrificial blood is proverbial; in Roman rites of the Parentalia, the funeral meal buried with the dead was renewed, and in the Lemuria, beans were employed to lure ghosts of the untimely dead forth from one's home. Certainly the pauper, insensible to the fire in his garret, falls into this category. The gloom here, coupled with that of referring to Cordus (203 erat Cordo, 208 nil habuit Cordus, 209 perdidit infelix) in the past tenses, does not encourage the reader to think that the Bohème has been saved by some miracle. Rather, the reiteration of nemo in
the last line of this *fabella* is almost open acknowledgement
that someone perished in the blaze.

There is no need, finally, to build an elaborate case,
based on the scholiasts' identification of Cordus with the
poetaster Codrus of Juvenal I, that these lines conceal an
Umbricius, or *ego*, or even Juvenal himself.¹⁶ Identifica-
tions of speakers, from Umbricius *in propria persona* to the
mice, are clear enough for Roman readers to understand the
allusion to Horace S. II.6 and permit appreciation of Juve-
nal's *aemulatio* of this work. The extreme compression of po-
etic materials found in Horace and the traditional *apologus*
has not made interpretation of U.17 easy, nor is every last
detail of this *fabella* yet fully comprehensible. But at
least it is possible to see, from assignment of lines 208-211
to the sympathetic mice on the basis of style and content, a
comic reversal of Horace's fable. For the city mice have the
last word: the *pauper* in Rome is worse off than they, who
never lack for clothing and can always find food by slipping
through the inevitable *rimae* of jerry-built tenements.¹⁷

The next *fabella*, U.18, is marked not only by the moral
*auxesis* of Asturicus's fire, which is unfavorably compared to
the accidental one burning Cordus out, but also by rumor.
Like U.2, U.18 taps the deep well of *fama*, of stories going
the rounds, to reveal the skeleton which Asturicus must keep
in his closet.¹⁸
si magna Asturici cecidit domus, horrida mater, pullati proceres, differt vadimonia praetor. tum gemimus casus urbis, tunc odimus ignem. ardet adhuc, et iam accurrit qui marmora donet, conferat inpenas; hic nuda et candida signa, hic alicquid praecellarum Euphranoris et Polycliti, haec Asianorum vetera ornamenta deorum, hic libros dabit et forulos mediamque Minervam, hic modium argenti. meliora ac plura reponit Persicus orborum lautissimus et merito iam suspectus tamquam ipse suas incenderit aedes.

Two items in line 221 require explanation. First, I take, with the scholiast, Persicus to be roughly equivalent to Terence's Babylo at Adelphoe 915: "the rich man, our fine man," or the like ironical expression. In the play, Babylo indicates Micio; similarly, Persicus is here an informal epithet of Asturicus, a mockery that fits well with the luxuries he has managed to acquire after his "housewarming."

The point of this epithet is to be found in merito: no charge of arson will be lodged against this orbus, because 213b differt vadimonia praetor. Indeed, in a courtroom, such behavior could only be hinted at; in satire, its anecdotal form may remain intact as the rumor of lines 220b-222.

One effect of this reading of Persicus as an epithet is to take interpretive pressure off lautissimus, also in line 221. Since there is now no need to require the latter to connote what the former already implies—a cultured, even fastidious man—lautissimus may retain a good deal more of its literal meaning of 'very well washed'. This would allude nicely to both the extinguishing of the fire and Asturicus's
jurdically clean hands.\textsuperscript{21}

Perhaps no satisfactory unravelling of the difficulties in lines 216-218 exists, but I would propose that this reading of *lautissimus*—in the sense of ablution—supply a last link in the allusion to the fall of Troy. If Asturicus, the 'city-burner', and Persicus, the 'destroyer', do not suggest Vergil's source in the *Iliupersis*, then 212b-213a *cecidit domus, horrida mater, pullati proceres* would surely recall what Aeneas sees just before the shade of Creusa appears to him (*Aen*. II.758-767):

> illicit ignis edax summa ad fastigia vento
> volvitur; exsuperant flammae, furit aestus ad auras.
> procedo et Priami sedes arcemque reviso:
> et iam porticibus vacuis Iunonis asylo
> custodes lecti Phoenix et dirus Ulixes
> praedam adservabant. huc undique Troia gaza
> incensis erepta adytis, mensaeque deorum
> crateresque auro solidi, captivaque vestis
> congeritur. pueri et pavidae longo ordine matres
> stant circum.

Juvenal has preserved the series, *sedes, pueri, matres*, if not in the precise order—*domus, mater, proceres*—and he has kept the Roman attentiveness to furnishings of buildings with about the same proportions. What is strange in Vergil is the emptiness of the buildings, chiefly the temples: all in them is *Troia gaza*, which may have suggested Persicus to Juvenal. For Asturicus, this state of affairs lasts hardly a moment before adulators of this *orbus* heap treasure on him.

The connection with *lautissimus* is, to resume, found in a scene just before Aeneas retracts his steps to Troy:
tu, genitor, cape sacra manu patriosque penatis;
me bello e tanto digressum et caede recenti
attrectare nefas, donec me flumine vivo
abluero' (Verg. Aen. II.717-720).

From this it is clear that the later passage from Aeneid II
presents Aeneas's despair at ever returning to Troy: pietas
has been too deeply offended by the sack of the temples; the
only gods safe to keep in company are the household gods.
These, I submit, are what Juvenal refers to in 218 Asianorum
vetera ornamenta deorum, and since they were small enough for
an old man to carry, surely 218 haec could refer to mater in
line 212. The earlier passage from the Aeneid, cited just
above, is the reference for 221 lautissimus: what Asturicus
requires is removal of pollution. Unlike L. Caecilius Metel-
lus Caecus, Asturicus did not rescue the statues of his lares
from the flames but let them perish with all else. Also, the
series in U.18 which focusses on statues and culminates in
219 Minervam points to this historical exemplum, and arson
doubly stains his soul. Presumably, also, the forced hiatus
at line-end, which run from line 214 to 219/220 (interrupted
only at 215-216 done, //conferat), is meant to emphasize this
dangerous amorality: nothing in this is concluded until the
gods are satisfied.

Little, the reader is led to expect, will happen to As-
turicus but what fama will do to him. He will rebuild his
house all in the latest fashion: 220 meliora ac plura repon-
it. No bad odor will cling to this lautissimus. But now he,
too, has an occultum semper tacendum--at least he can never
talk about it, but everyone else can! Someday, one surmises, our fine Persicus will have to leave town.

U.19, lines 223-231

si potes avelli circensibus, optima Soriae aut Fabritieriae domus aut Frusinone paratur quanti nunc tenebras unum conducis in annum. hortulus hic puteusque brevis nec reste movendus in tenuis plantas facili diffunditur haustu. vive bidentis amans et culti vilicus horti unde epulum possis centum dare Pythagoreis. est aliquid, quocumque loco, quocumque recessu, unius sese dominum fecisse lacertae.

In this reprise of the rural fantasy, Umbricius sets an ironical tone from the beginning: if it has not till this point become clear that the 'you' implicit in the majority of second-person singular verbs is homo urbanus cast as the adversarius of satire, U.19 resolves any such discrepancy. The style, with short sentences and frequent, full end-stopping, contributes to the lessons to be learnt by ordinary common sense. Simple mathematics, for instance, will tell the urbanus that ownership in the country is no dearer than rental in Rome; the other necessities, food and water, almost supply themselves and, when increased by hard work, can seem a kind of wealth--by Pythagorean standards, at any rate. Finally, in a brief allusion to the contentious style of city life (line 230), Umbricius makes what is humble a criticism of the proud: from his hidey-hole, the lizard acknowledges his master, the refugee from the urbs.

Once more, also, Juvenal's reader finds, among all this evidence of good sense, reminders that this is poetry and
that poetry must deal with the passions. In line with the earlier rural fantasy in lines 168-179, the bucolic diaeresis of line 223, optima Sorae, at once establishes a poetic tone of apparent simplicity. But this allusion to the Vergilian bucolic is only completed by the quiet presence of those things which make up the dark side of life. Certainly the most persistent of these in Juvenal III is the animal motif, which culminates in 303b tamquam ad vivaria currunt. In U.19, the phrase, 231 dominum lacertae, wittily suggests that ownership in the country, however ridiculously minuscule, is preferable to the illusion of control of one's life in Rome. This phrase therefore suggests the opposite of what it says, and as verbal wit seems tailored to the expectations of homo urbanus: if he can own, why rent a lizard's cage?

But Umbricius believes his adversary in homo urbanus wishes to attribute a lack of realism to him as detraction.\textsuperscript{22} The punch line (230-231) contains the implied charge: 231 unius sese dominum fecisse lacertae. Dominum alludes, if the context is the original one of the Circus and its races, to victory in these races. But in terms of the use of otium, which is here the point of 230 recessu, to imagine that the spectator at the races is dominus of anything, least of all the team he has bet on, or the money he has put down, or his peace of mind, is delusion. By such a standard, the Circus goer loses even if his horses come in, and he is worse off than Umbricius, master of a single lizard. If Juvenal here
took Mart. XI.18 as his starting point, as Mayor implies, the humor of the epigrammatist has been altered into a type less pointed but subtler: the rural life is not ridiculous oversimplification to the point of starvation but a reunification of the self (231 unius) in nature (lacertae), in the garden, and is aliquid, not nothing.

The coupling of this theme with that of worry about money (lines 223b-225) is, however, one more allusion to Hor. S. II.6 (1-15). Certainly the mention of the Pythagorean feast recalls lines 63-64 of Horace's satire, where he has been pushed by the day's annoyances to fantasize on getting away to the countryside. But Umbricius stresses, perhaps even in the place-names of Fabrateriae and Frusinone, the love of work which must accompany the pauper into the rus. One gets a trade-off: for a year's rent in some hole-in-the-corner walkup in Rome, he owns outright in the country, where his work converts directly into food and shelter, and perhaps clothing. This is scarcely Horace's wide-awake dreaming but is a careful plan for retirement. It may not allow for every pitfall in agriculture, but it is not the ingénu speaking, either. It is, rather, reminiscent of old Cato.

It is because of these interesting and encouraging literary companions that Juvenal's Roman reader would feel free to take such words as 228 vive and 229 dare pretty much at their face value. This relaxation in the tension of Umbricius's language, wherein a genuine vilicus is a pauper truly
bidentis amans and life passes in relative peace in 230 quo-
cumque recessu, is the last, but for the genuinely friendly
U.26, that Juvenal's readers will hear of such straightforward
ness in Satire III. For now the scene shifts for the
last time back to Rome, and Umbricius begins to consider the
possible causes of his own death.

U.20, lines 232-242

plurimus hic aeger moritur vigilando (sed ipsum
languorem peperit cibus imperfectus et haerens
ardenti stomacho); nam quae meritoria somnum
admittunt? magnis opibus dormitur in urbe.
inde caput morbi. raedarum transitus arto
vicorum in flexu et stantis convicia mandrae
eripient somnum Druso vitulisque marinis.
si vocat officium, turba cedente vehetur
dives et ingenti curret super ora Liburna
atque obiter leget aut scribet vel dormiet intus;
namque facit somnum clausa lectica fenestra.

The emphasis in U.20 on the causal connection between
insomnia, illness, and death among inhabitants of meritoria
is matched by a narrative syllogism (242 namque) to the ef-
fact that the rich, even in the dangerous streets, manage to
avoid the slightest disturbance of their tranquillity. The
apparent unlikelihood of the truth of such wit in narratio is
refuted by Pliny, Ep. III.5,16-17, who says that his uncle
was able to finish the 160 books of his commentarii by dint
of application while being carried around Rome in his sel-
la.24 The rumbling, thunderous noise of raedae and mandrae
is precisely what the litter is designed to cushion and what
the walls and foundations of meritoria cannot avoid: the
rich have "shock absorbers" in the strong backs of their
litter bearers. They also have windows which they can close in these litters, to permit, of all things, sleep in the crowded streets! This detail closes Umbricius's narrative of the problem of sleep with a contresens consisting of sub-absurdum: is it not faintly ridiculous that wealth seems only to buy, after all, the power to sleep like a sea cow, whenever the desire strikes? 

Such behavior, Umbricius suggests, is only barely human. But the humorous incongruity of human and animal behavior is not his sole means of demonstrating this idea. The moral significance of 242 clausa fenestra is one that pits the luxuries of the rich against the necessities of the poor. The poor man's only fenestrae are, to judge from U.17, the rimae in the walls of his garret, and, because of the terrific rumbling he gets from passing traffic, it hardly matters if his apartment has walls at all. When the pauper's home does not amount to shelter, illness and death cannot be far off.

As an apologetic argument in the context of Umbricius's larger demonstration of the impossibility of life for the poor in Rome, this moral comparison has considerable force. Yet it is not so straightforward as it seems. Two features of U.20 force the reader to take a broader and deeper view of the conflict in this fabella—first, humor in logic or enthy-meme, and then imagery of the poetic initiation begun in E.2.

For there is a trap set for the unwary and humorless in U.20. Lines 232-236a sound much like the opening of a
logical demonstration, which in turn appears to call for the
namque in 242.\textsuperscript{17} The incongruity of the series on the litter
culminates in the revealing detail of the clausa fenestra,
since sleep wrecks any claim the rich man may make to the ef-
fact that the litter is his peregrine office. In deliberate
contrast to the litter in Satire I.123-126, the lectica here
has windows which can be opened; if we open one as Umbricius
envisions, we are as likely to find a drowsy Drusus as a busy
client on his way to the officium. So far is Umbricius from
an unseemly envy of the rich man in his private car that he
ridicules what it conceals: the sleep that the pauper yearns
to have.

This hypnotic effect of circling back and back to the
desired object of sleep graphically illustrates the rise of
illness: a delirious sort of ring-composition has developed
from what appears to make perfect sense. At the center of
this structure stand the rumbling carts and lowing animals;
on either side of the center are the contrasting figures of
the poor man lacking even his sleep and digestion and of the
rich lacking nothing. Umbricius suggests to the ego that, if
he imagines that he can write when- and wherever he wants, he
had better think carefully about what he can afford in Rome.
For here the muse truly does live in one's wallet, under a
pile of rent receipts.

U.21, lines 243-253

ante tamen veniet: nobis properantibus obstat
unda prior, magno populus premit agmine lumbos
qui sequitur; ferit his cubito, ferit asserere duro
alter, at hic tignum capiti incutit, ille meretram.
pingua crura luto, planta mox undique magna
calcor, et in digito clavus mihi militis haeret.
nonne vides quanto celebretur sportula fumo?
centum convivae, sequitur sua quemque culina.
Corbulo vix ferret tot vasa ingentia, tot res
inpositas capiti, quas recto vertice portat
servulus infelix et cursu ventilat ignem.

It is the vast disparity in scale of U.20--between rich
and pauper, litter and tenement--which Umbricius draws for-
ward and exaggerates in U.21. The exaggeration grows almost
imperceptibly out of the narrative, to which the contresens
(lines 251-253) is a type well known to every student of sat-
ire: illa, quae minuendi aut augendi causa ad incredibilem
admirationem efferuntur. From these words we see that Cicero
(de Or. II.66,267) insists very little on the credibility of
the exaggeration produced; we should instead expect that the
artistry would consist in preparing a suitable narrative con-
text for the wit.

Juvenal has chosen this straightforward approach in
U.21. In 243a, the circumstances of U.20--the journey to the
morning officium--reappear in the abrupt farewell to the rich
man in his litter. Umbricius at once adopts the less exalted
point of view of the pauper who is caught in morning traffic.
These lines (243b-248) recall, particularly in the detail of
the soldier's boot, the tone of Gorgo and Praxinoa's experi-
ence in Alexandria's crowds in Theocritus 15.4-7, 44-76: the
lone individual is overwhelmed from every side. Umbricius
even manages to re-create the effect of his character's being
held up while being jabbed and prodded along at the same
time. Elbows, litter poles, legs, beams, and barrels serve
to keep the agmen on the move; the visual impact, he implies,
resembles nothing so much as that of shipwreck floating in a
wave of humanity.\textsuperscript{28} Even the mud at the bottom of this
swirling mass seems to suggest the magnitude of the storm
which Juno sent against Aeneas:

\begin{center}
\text{his unda dehiscens} 106
\text{terram inter fluctus aperit, furit aetust hareinis.}
\text{(Verg. \textit{Aen.} I.106b-107)}
\end{center}

The postponement of the Lucilian element of mud to this point
in this way results in a dovetailing with an epic allusion.
From this detail, I would suggest, grows the hint of the bur-
lesque of the low and ordinary with epic or 'high' epithets
that contributes markedly to the feeling that this fabella
evokes: a note of wondrous unbelievability.

After this point in U.21, Umbricius's focus narrows to a
part of the officium,\textsuperscript{29} the sportula. This attracts the ped-
estrian's attention in much the same way as the fire that
drove the mice into the street--as a great deal of smoke.
The hundred convivae reappear, surely non-Pythagoreans, and
these help to sustain the humorous tone, perhaps minuendi
\textit{causa}, since one hundred seems too few to produce the effect
sought. At any rate, their kitchens follow them in the dis-
reputable Vitellian manner\textsuperscript{30} and serve to usher in the ulti-
mate exaggeration--the little slave who totes a gigantic oven
on his head and, of all oddities, manages to fan the coals in
it by trotting along at a good pace (lines 251-253); it seems impossible that anyone could carry, without bending his neck to the task and staggering a little (252 recto vertere), more than what a soldier reputed for his strength (251 Corbulo) could scarcely lift. And it passes belief that the poor fellow keeps the fire from going out by running! Just how he dances through the press of bodies and vehicles, Umbricius leaves to the imagination, but clearly tot vasa ingentia, tot res inpositas capiti pose a threat to everyone in the area. Fortunately, however, this threat is comic in force and not meant to be taken seriously.31

The next fabella is yet another example of narrative humor, the allusion to literature, or historia.

U.22, lines 254-267

scinduntur tunicae sartae modo, longa coruscat serraco veniente abies, atque altera pinum plaustra vehunt; nutant alte populoque minantur. nam si procubuit qui saxa Ligustica portat axis et eversum fudit super agmina montem, quid superest de corporibus? quis membra, quis ossa invenit? obtritum volgi perit omne cadaver more animae. domus interea secura patellas iam lavat et bucca foculum excitat et sonat unctis striglibus et pleno componit lintea guto. haec inter pueros varie properantur, at ille iam sedet in ripa taetrumque novicius horret porthmea nec sperat caenosī surgītis alnum infelix nec habet quem porrigat ore trientem.

Umbricius picks up the motif of damage to clothing and quickly expands the excitement of the close call in the street into a full-blown threat to life. A shift from quotidian language (254a scinduntur tunicae sartae modo) into epic vocabulary accompanies this expansion. Epic fullness occurs in the
repeated use of near synonyms (254 coruscat, 256 nutant; 255 serraco, 256 plaustria; 255 abies, pinum), and heavy disyllabic line ends—particularly 264 (at) ille—give this passage a stateliness which defies the ordinariness of the subject. If, however, this were all the allusiveness in U.22, parody might be suspected, or perhaps high burlesque.

Juvenal's readers probably expected after the first few lines of U.22 that they were hearing the full aemulatio of historia. The very situation of this fabella is set forward in the vocabulary of scenes in the Aeneid usually connected with ruin and death. Corusco, for example, is rare in this middle sense of 'be trembling'; coruscus is the more common term for such adjectival expression, as at Aen. XII. 701-703. There Vergil compares Aeneas, who has just spied Turnus stepping out to do single combat, to Father Apennine roaring with his trembling oaks:

quantus Athos aut quantus Eryx aut ipse coruscis 701 cum fremit illicibus quantus gaudetque nivali vertice se attollens pater Appenninus ad auras.
(Verg. Aen. XII.701-703)

In this passage, an allusion to trembling holm-oaks and mountains is followed shortly by a death (Turnus at XII.951-952), and a similar pattern is to be found in the fates of Pandarus and Bitias in Aen. IX. These two, who open the gates of the Trojan camp during the siege, are compared to fir trees on their homeland's hills (IX.674 abietibus iuvenes patriis et montibus aequos), and a little later rise up and nod like two great true-oaks:
consurgunt geminae quercus intonsaque caelo
attollunt capita et sublimi vertice nutant.
(Verg. Aen. IX.681-682)

Turnus's aristeia follows soon upon the brothers' error and both are slain. Furthermore, a few vocabulary items from U.22 appear in the description of the wood cut for the pyre of Pallas, at:

ferro sonat alta bipenni
fraxinus, evertunt actas ad sidera pinus,
robora nec cuneis et olentem scindere cedrum
nec plaustris cessant vectare gementibus ornos.
(Verg. Aen. XI.135b-138)

In addition to the nouns pinus and plastrum, Juvenal has used evertere as a participle; conscindere for scindere; and vehere for vectare. There is, added to this allusion to struggle and hard labor, also the simile which compares all Troy ablaze to an ornus that farmers cut down on the mountain-tops (Aen. II.526-631): the ancient tree first threatens to fall (628 minatur), then its crown foliage nods (629 nutat), and finally overcome by its wounds it gives one last shudder and falls (630-631). Finally, it is this image of the mountain in these allusions which suggests violent death and provides unity: at II. XXIII.114-122, wood for the pyre of Patroclus is cut on Ida. Nearly all the more colorful terms in U.22 have clear epic usages in connection with death and destruction, and this fabella aims at a like goal: to suggest the funeral of the protagonist, dead 261 more animae.

The rest of U.22 continues to allude to historia but in a less systematic way. As noted in Chapter II, lines
257-261a allude to the Gigantomachy, which the pun on 259 ose
sa confirms. And the domus goes about preparations for din
ner (261b-264a) much as Andromache keeps on with her house
hold tasks while Hector is dying (Il. XXII.437b-446). Duff,
on lines 264b-267, gathers specific references on the Under
world scene here, and he includes information on the currency
of the Greek custom of burial, with a coin in the mouth,
among Romans of the first century A. D. The effect of this
diversity of allusions to historia is to prevent the reader
from aligning the pauper with any one hero and thus seeing
this passage as burlesque.

Instead, Umbricius's aim is at once to rouse sympathy
for the dead pauper and to prove how wide-eyed a fool homo
urbanus is when he is aware of the sorts of threats outlined
in U.22--not just occasionally noticing them, as the ego
avers, but conscious of them around the clock. Ridicule of
homo urbanus is the purpose of the mock epic apparatus, and
the strong dose of common words and ordinary tasks is devoted
to the end of specifying his awareness of danger in daily
life. If homo urbanus imagines the domus is secura, he lives
in an illusion. With this, the identification of the dead
pauper with the hero compares the struggles and labores of
the two to maintain and defend the household: just as Hector
ordered Andromache back to her housework before he departed
for the battlefield where he was to die (Il. VI.490-493), so
the pauper's pueri are glimpsed at their duties as he arrives
from his unfortunate officium in Hades without a penny for passage. The pauper's res have indeed dwindled to nothing, no matter how these are measured—property, money, or substance—but yet he must pay, as with the keeper of seedcakes, one more servant for the privilege of utter hopelessness.

The three narrative fabellae, U.20–U.22, portray the pauper's conflict with the physical world as he finds it in the city. The meaning of this theme grows, however, out of the times and places, which are not stated outright but are evoked. This seems especially so of the time: the pauper has been awake all night with his insomnia and poor digestion but still must arise before dawn for the officium. As Romans usually took the large meal of the day after sunset, the dinner of lines 261b–263 suggests that night is falling; similarly, the scene of the sportula evokes midday, as the pauper is going to be late for it. The action begins in the meritoria, the nature of which may be deduced from U.18, the Cordus fabella. Then the pauper is suddenly moving down a street, and the urban scene closes with a glimpse of the domus to which he will not return. Movement from place to place is abrupt and not explained in any detail but simply presented as an expected order of events. In line with such evocation of time and place is the convergence of details of this journey upon the pauper: these convert his ordinary daily excursion—his labores as client—into an epic journey.
Considerable stress is laid on traffic and means of conveyance. The *pauper*, it is implied, goes on foot, and at the outset he may expect to encounter *raedae* and *mandrae* if he leaves before sunup. These are proleptic for his actual exit into the street in line 239. Here the rich man sails overhead in his litter, and whatever he cannot carry within he either stows in his portable *culina* or gives to his slave to carry (U.21). In U.22, the means of transport (255 *serraco*) converts into the means of death (258 *axis*), and this series culminates in the skiff of Charon (266 *alnum*).

Paralleling this vocabulary group is another consisting of words which indicate motion. From these images derives a vivid picture of random violence which eventually overtakes the *pauper*. In U.20, only the *dives* can move along easily (239 *vehetur*); the *pauper’s state* is one of unhealthy languor that is reflected in the herd stalled (237 *stantis*) in the street below. When the latter man goes out, traffic develops blockages (243 *obstat*); in the general hurry (243 *properantis-bus*), those following (245 *sequitur*) press on (244 *premit*) from behind; one is repeatedly struck (245 *ferit bis*, 246 *incutit*), kicked (248 *calcor*), and clawed (248 *haeret*). The rich man will therefore arrive at the *officium* first (243 ante...veniet) since he has his slave to do the running (253 *cursu*) for him, and his *culina* follows (250 *sequitur*). This furious motion eventually focusses on the *pauper*: wagons bear down on him (255 *veniente*), carrying (256 *vehunt*)
enormous freight; a load of stone slides forward (257 procubuit), burying the unsuspecting man (258 fudit) from behind. Movement tapers off in the bustle of the domus (264 properantur), and the pauper is sitting (265 sedet) on the banks of the Styx. All motion ceases for the dead man in 266 gurgitis alnum, his last conveyance and the culmination of the epic abies and pinum in line 255.

Coupled with this transformation of ordinary places and movement into epic ones are several others. The first of these is monitory: indigestion and sleeplessness are fore-runners of serious illness, and they convert into despair at the end of U.22. They are, as Umbricius sees them, harbingers of death. Similarly, the shouting drovers coalesce into the silent porthmea of line 266, a focal point of fear and revulsion (265 horret). Finally, insomnia is recast as the hopeless wakefulness of the soul unable to cross into the Underworld, and indigestion into the soul’s perpetual hunger. This interruption of bodily functions is perhaps symbolized by the pauper’s instant burial.

Despite this extremely busy agenda, Umbricius is able to work into the narrative a number of other vocabulary series. Imagery of the body appears in lines 232-234a; the body is repeatedly the target of assaults in 244b-248; at last it is a cadaver, ironically blotted out more animae in 259-261a. Umbricius also manages to suggest that the pauper fights as much with the elements as with human carelessness: water
appears in all three fabellae, the muddy earth in two, and the early suggestion of fire in 234 ardentis stomacho continues, with the addition of wind, in 249 fumo and 253 cursu ventilat ignem, the whole of this last image being replicated in 262 bucca folum excitat in the dead man's home.

But it is as if Umbricius is not content to let so much signify that Rome is the house of death: he must build it, too. Umbricius sardonically compares the pauper's drafty tenement to the rich man's litter, and here begins a series of synecdoches (242 fenestra, 245 assere) which terminates in the long series of building materials (246 tignum and possibly meretram, 248 clavus, 255 abies and pinum, 257 saxa Ligustica). All the man lacks for his domus is an entry, just as his soul lacks entry to its abode after death. The home functions, as we see from the scenario with the dead man's servants fixing dinner, as a secessus to exclude the turba in the street; morally, the home is a boundary over which should not pass intolerable behaviors, and Umbricius clearly thinks that a home built to exclude intolerable noise is beyond his reach in Rome. Once again ironically, Umbricius turns epic inside out: the Vergilian turba of souls awaiting judgment (Aen. VI.305) becomes a merely careless crowd in its unbearable racket and continual shoving. The punishment of the agmen which ought to have left Rome is burial, like some stupid Giant, under a mountain of stone.
Surely if Juvenal's Roman readers sought a point in Umbricius's initiation of the *ego* into the vatic mysteries, it was in this section that they should have found it. Here, in three successive *fabellae* of narrative humor, is a story line so limited as not to obscure the host of telling details, as the *lanx satura* concept of satire demands, and woven into all this are allusions and images colored and arrayed to illustrate moral themes. This picture is, as Cicero said of *narrationes* in general (*de Or. II.66,264*), as convincing as it is difficult to sustain with humor. This section, then, is a poetic proof which may be considered a test of the *ego*'s perspicacity, knowledge, and poetic grasp.

Umbricius next marks a return to ironical impersonation, which persists through the epilogue. The first *fabella* of the three remaining before his epilogue opens on the note of the Senecan moral essay\(^3\) with 268 *respice nunc* and closes with the night traveller saying a silent prayer as he is drenched by slops thrown from a window.

U.23, lines 268-277

```
respice nunc alia ac diversa pericula noctis:
quod spatium tectis sublimibus unde cerebrum
 testa ferit, quotiens rimosa et curta fenestris
 vasa cadant, quanto percussum pondere signent
 et laedant silicem. possis ignavus haberi
 et subiti casus improvidus, ad cenam si
 intestatus eas: adeo tot fata, quot illa
 nocte patent vigilis te praetereunte fenestrae.
 ergo optes votumque feras miserabile tecom,
 ut sint contentae patulas defundere pelves.
```

This *fabella*, with its crude-sounding wit in line 277, is far more clever than it sounds. But I am going to argue that
characterization of the tu, or homo urbanus, shifts into a new mode in U.23 and begins to take on a tone artistically realized only in the complete depersonalization of the victim in line 305 (agit rem). The early components of this are, first, a firmer characterization of homo urbanus as the evening diner listening to earnest advice and, second, delineation of the city as a nocturnal predator.

We see in U.23 a Roman about to go out for dinner, probably at a friend’s or patron’s house. Umbricius is pretending to warn this person of "the other dangers of the evening, and how unforetellable their quarter of approach (268 diversa)." The ambiguity of 268 diversa is part of a small dissimulation that builds into another: the great height which heavy potsherds may fall to strike one’s head, how unpredictable such worn and cheap pottery may be, how hard it strikes the pavement. This series proceeds more by fear than by reason, but it does serve to focus the tu’s attention upwards, and this is the deception most likely to trip him up.

For the speaker intends to play this personality for all the anxiety he can produce from him: now that he has the tu jittery about every snippet of sound above and around, he suggests that his heirs will rue this unbusinesslike (272 ignavus) approach to dining out. So, he says—with a pun in 274 intestatus on 270 testa that would make anyone grit his teeth in irritation—write your will before dinner! You don’t want to be thought inprovidus of sheer bad luck. In
fact, on this special evening (274-275 illa nocte) you ought perhaps to compose a prayer and, poor fellow, take it along, but silently, silently. . .and pray it's only slops that rain down.

The gradual intensification of the anxieties of homo ur-
banus could not be clearer than from this reading of the ad-
vice to the tu. The character of the friendless money grub-
ber that the Roman social climber had to become to stay
afloat shows itself in his use of his otium: not respect for
probable or inevitable misfortune but fear of every possible
means of dying. The punch line thus plays to such neurasthe-
nia at a sensory level, because the poor fellow will in no
wise be contentus when this water flops into the street, but
more likely will try to jump out of his own skin. Only then
will he realize what a fool he has been to become such a
wreck--man killed in street by wash-water!

Woven into this in a skillful way is the image of the
city as nocturnal predator. The eerie lighting from "wakeful
windows" is enough to recall the eyes of a lurking beast, but
more significant is the sequence of verbs, 270 ferit, 271
cadant, signent, and 272 laedant, as these suggest an animal
striking or leaping from above, dropping on its prey, and
scratching and wounding it, if only by its ponderë. The
refiguration of death by crushing as in U.22 vividly depicts
a new, ferocious side of city life. The enargeia in U.23 is
directed at reinforcement of anxiety, but a rational person
would be hugely embarrassed if he thought anyone could convince him that hungry beasts hid in Rome's dark streets.

If, therefore, it is plain enough that *homo urbanus* only contemplates, at some level of his soul, such terrors, then what makes this humor peculiarly applicable to the speaker? The logic of Umbricius's side of the *sermo* demands that all plausible objections to the case for leaving Rome be met, and here is addressed the man who does not go out by day and thus would not meet the fate of the *pauper* in U.22. He is the dinner-goer cautioned by a clever rascal. It is possible, I suppose, to detect further Stoic remarks in 272 *ignavus* and 273 *inprovidus*, but I prefer, rather than to press such slim evidence, to note that the man impersonated here by Umbricius harps on wills and prayer—and money by indirection. His urging is that of the *captator*.

For who else will be *contentus* if by some implausible happenstance the diner should die en route? Only he who stirred up this improbable mash of terror and seemingly scrupulous forethought. And does this *captator* try to dissuade the diner from going? Scarcely, for he dangles before *homo urbanus* the *patulae pelves* of line 277, the punch line. These are, if Petronius's use of this rare noun is any indication, a sign of a host's generosity when they are heaped with food. Worthy of special notice, then, is the fact that the *captator* presses the Roman intent on dining out to keep these ever in the front of his thoughts. This concern is all
simulated, for even in describing the dangers of falling pottery, the legacy-hunter cannot resist using a form of signare as a lead-in to the context of death and one's testament. Much humor, as it seems to me, lies in discovery of the identity of the butt as captator, and the psychological profile of homo urbanus and habitual diner-out is specific enough to serve as party to joking peculiarly applicable to character.

Our banqueter’s fortunes are not bound to improve if he stays out in the streets of Rome at night, as the succeeding fabella, on the rixa, asserts.

U.24, lines 278-301

ebrius ac petulans, qui nullum forte cecidit, dat poenas, noctem patitur lugentis amicum Pelidae, cubit in faciem, mox deinde supinus: [ergo non aliter poterit dormire; quibusdam] somnum rixa facit. sed quamvis inprobus annis atque mero fervens cavet hunc quem coccina laena vitari iubet et comitum longissimus ordo, multum praeterea flammarum et aenea lampas. me, quem luna solet deducere vel breve lumen candelae, cuius dispenso et tempoer filum, contemnit. misereae cognosce prohoemia rixae, si rixa est, ubi tu pulsas, ego vapulo tantum. stat contra starique iubet. parere necessae est; nam quid agas, cum te furiosus cogatet idem fortior? "unde venis" exclamat, "cuius aceto, cuius conche tumes? quis tecum sectile porrum sutor et elixi vevercis labra comedit? nil mihi respondes? aut dic aut accipe calcem. ede ubi consistas: in qua te quaero proseucha?" dicere si temptes aliquid tacitusve recedas, tantundem est: feriunt pariter, vadimonia deinde irati faciunt. libertas pauperis haec est: pulsatus rogat et pugnis concisus adorat ut liceat paucis cum dentibus inde reverti.

Some strong, young Achilles, somewhere in Rome, is grieving over some wrong, real or imagined, and cannot sleep without killing someone, or making the attempt. But this is as far
as the comparison to Achilles can be pressed. For in the deed, he is as cautious as any Diomedes or Odysseus on a night raid in stalking and trapping his Dolon.\textsuperscript{90} He avoids the light and anyone (283b–284a hunc quemoccina laena vitari iubet) or any group (284b et comitum longissimus ordo) who look as if they could put up a strong defense. Instead, he attacks the lone traveller——Umbricius himself, as it turns out——with his contemptible little lamp and lone companion, the moon.

The rixa, thus prefaced with an account of its origin, is dramatized in three parts with epilogue: (a) the prohoe-
mia, in which the mugger corners his Dolon\textsuperscript{51} (lines 290–292a); (b) the inquisition, which is insultingly overpartic-
ular\textsuperscript{52} (lines 292b–296); (c) the conclusion in the beating administered to the pauper whether he answers the questions or not\textsuperscript{53} (lines 297–298a). The (d) epilogue is that the mug-
ger swears out a complaint against his victim! The punch line is the calm answer to those who ask teasing questions:\textsuperscript{54} "May I be allowed to get out of this with a few teeth?"

In one sense, Umbricius does not fail to communicate an almost refreshing openness in this young fool's verbal ag-
gressiveness, for the captator of U.23, who desires also the death of his victim, is too craven to allow this inference to be drawn. If Umbricius must give his name and address, the captator seeks his victim's signature, and the appearance bond reconfigures the will but is less dishonestly obtained.
It seems obvious that Umbricius would not complain about this if only he had not been put in the position of the defendant. For this involves a loss of libertas, of freedom to speak in one’s standing as a Roman of free birth. He feels that, com-
ic though the situation was (289 si rixa est, ubi tu pulsas, ego vapulo), and silly as the mugger’s misidentifications of him were (lines 292b–294, 296), his loss of freedom as defend-
dant has almost vaporized sympathy for him as the victim of an unprovoked attack.

The point of these references to comedy is to indicate
the ordinariness of the manipulation inherent in depersonal-
ization of the victim of crime or accident. Generally, such
manipulation takes the following course: first, the victim
is portrayed as having been warned of dangers lurking around
every bend in the road of life; next, the victim refuses to
accept the warnings, to much head-wagging; finally, some
event completely unrelated to all previous warnings belays
the traveller, and from a safe distance comes a chorus bray-
ing about the victim’s lack of foresight—-if only he hadn’t
been where he was, this disaster wouldn’t have happened; it’s
almost criminal the way he ignores good advice; he can blame
no one but himself.

This banal tendency to blame the victim, which here
takes the form of an appearance bond brought by the mugger,
typifies a Rome corrupted by laziness in government. One now
recalls the praetor of U.18 who 213 differt vadimonia to
honor the "mourning" in the ashes of Asturicus's mansion. A similarly lazy attitude shows up in the praetor of U.24. The reader is asked to consider whether an official with such work habits is more prone to listen to an aggressive, mendacious lout who is sure to cause trouble if he does not have his way, or to sympathize with a quiet and well behaved nobody like Umbricius. The choice, given the three characters, is obvious: pudor posts bond. As true to comedy as this may be, Juvenal seeks a sympathetic audience for satire: the understanding, therefore, which any educated Roman might be prepared to extend to a young man frustrated of good company is erased in one word—299 irati.55 In Seneca's model, anger is scarcely a single stride from the willingness to murder, itself ultimate depersonalization of the victim.

A few final comments on this fabella will serve to put at rest certain doubts about the character of Umbricius. If one wonders why the case for Umbricius as an ingénu, or unreliable narrator-cum-ironist, fails to convince, no further search than U.24 is needed. Here for the last time in this long litany of Rome's ills the reader hears Umbricius mention himself: in lines 286-289, he is the ego, and in 292b-296 he is the te addressed. This is, on the imagistic reading of Satire III presented in Chapter II, just moments before his death at the hands of a faceless grassator. Surely this was a time for truthfulness and not for dissembling, and it passes credibility, in my opinion, that modern critics of this
work would see in Umbricius a satirist who "rejects his fellow human beings, and himself borders on inhumanity." In U.24, Umbricius all but asserts that anger destroys libertas. How, then, is he the angry ingénus in this? The anger is hardly evident, and the naïveté is not that of the ingénus but of the shade unaware of his own death.

Just as in virtually every fabella the audience must review at the end of the anecdotal material the information supplied at the beginning, so Umbricius's last fabella on Rome demands a casting back over its own substance. But U.25 also ties off the Doloneia series of U.24 and clarifies the actual starting point of this series. Nor is this all: for this section closes off the imagistic series of Rome as a charnel house by identifying the city as a prison with only one exit: that of death.

U.25, lines 302-314

nec tamen haec tantum metuas; nam qui spoliet te non derit clausis domibus postquam omnis ubique fixa catenatae siluit compago tabernae. interdum et ferro subitus grassator agit rem: armato quotiens tutae custode tenetur et Pompitina palus et Gallinaria pinus, sic inde huc omnes tamquam ad vivaria currunt. qua fornace graves, qua non incude catenae? maximus in vinclis ferri modus, ut timeas ne vomer deficiat, ne marra et sarcula desint. felices proavorum atavos, felicia dicas saecula quae quondam sub regibus atque tribunis viderunt uno contentam carcere Roman.

The last act in the motif of the Doloneia—the murder and plundering of the victim—opens this fabella. Buildings and shops offer no protection from the grassator or the
cotpurse since they are locked tight; the pauper might as well be outside the walls, like Hector and his council at the tomb of Ilus. In the two criminal types here presented, the reader may discover Odysseus the despoiler (302 qui spo-liet) and Diomedes of the quick dispatch (305 ferro subitus grassator agit rem). Since this is a satiric inversion of the epic order of killing first and despoliation afterwards, the reader is encouraged to ask who advised, for or against, this plan of night travel? He must search, therefore, not only as far back as U.23, where the captator seems to advise against going out to dinner, but also in Iliad X.203-217, where Nestor first proposes the plan, and offers the gift of a black ewe and suckling lamb, along with a lifetime pass to royal banquets and drinking-parties, to the hero who would undertake the mission of night spying and return unscathed. But for two-minded timorousness, Agamemnon's attempt to excuse either himself or his brother from this act of derring do has few satiric equals outside the captator of U.23.

In a development of the detail of chains on the closed tabernae, Umbricius moves into an explanation of the rate of crime in the Rome of his day (305-311). The grassator, who agit rem without preamble and as it were with a single swift motion (305 ferro|subitus), heads up a catalogue of locales which begins in the Pomptine marshes and ends in the forges of the city. The allusion to Cumae and its entrance to the Underworld, 307 Gallinarum pinus, ties off the epic series of
tree names in U.22, and 308 vivaria, which are now ready for occupancy, form the end of the construction imagery. The criminals driven out of the countryside are compared to animals, which run, as it were, to the holding pens (308b tamquam ad vivaria currunt). By a slight leap of logic, Umbricius vividly pictures the chains awaiting the "animals," and then the entire workshop which I have termed that of the Cyclopes in the Underworld. The purpose of all this is rhetorically to show that punishment, as dire as it was, has had no effect on the rising tide of crime in the city.

Several developments in U.25 support this conclusion. Umbricius overtly states at the beginning that the pauper's fears for his own safety do not end with assault on the streets at night (302 nec tamen haec tantum metuas). Yet enforcement of the laws, even with an armato custode (line 306) comparable to the comitum longissimus ordo (284), only issues in ironic anxiety: a shortage of metal for farm implements (310b-311). The close association of verbs of fearing (302 metuas, 310 timeas) with forms of deesse (303 non derit, 311 desint) strongly colors the imagery of fullness and emptiness, lack and plenty, developed in this fabella. If the city is full of fear and its causes, the countryside lacks the tools for taking wealth from the land. This irony is a small one, however, in comparison with that evoked by the imagery of motion: if criminals flee like a herd (308 omnes currunt) to the city, they only do so to end in a place
of death named for life—*the vivarium*. The wit in these developments puts responsibility for a solution to the problem of rampant crime in the hands of *homo urbanus* and implies that the time-honored solutions of imprisonment and execution have failed.

This indirect call for a new dispensation on crime—find the true causes, Umbricius appears to say, and solutions will suggest themselves—ends with a typically Roman tag: the historical *exemplum* in lines 312–314. The kings had built the Tullianum and the carcer Mamertinus in the middle of the old city hanging above the Forum also to stimulate fear in a rising tide of violence. To some extent, that violence was attributable to a sudden increase in the population, but this last was small by Imperial standards, and after the fall of the kings, the *atavi* saw no need to add to an already sufficient warning to criminals. That these remotest of ancestors made up a Rome satisfied with a single prison is a reproach of Umbricius’s Rome and thus of *homo urbanus*: it designates a dishonorable thing—Imperial Rome aswarm with criminals—by a venerable term, *uno contentam carcere Romam*.

Perhaps as in no other part of this satire is the persona of Umbricius so apparently ambiguous. Cognitive dissonance is the only term that comes close to describing the mix of effects achieved in U.23 through U.25. For example, he opens in U.23 by impersonating a *captator* but yet does not
acknowledge this slight deception; in U.24, he dissembles on the anger he ought to be feeling by replying calmly to the apache's teasing; by the end of U.25, he has again wrapped himself in the mantle of Anchises by reviewing the generations of Romans. But my identification of each of these three *fabellae* as forms of ironical impersonation explains one feature which unites them all: if one intends to persist in such dissimulation, he cannot drop the pretense without ruining the irony. It seems clear to me that persistence in dissimulation without acknowledging it actually improves the artistic results.

An example of such improvement is to be found in U.23. For if, as I have already said, much of the point lies in discovering that the diner is being cautioned over and over--dramatically tugged back to safety--the audience of this phony concern must perforce take greater delight in deducing that it is a captator who is at the same time pushing the dinner-goer out the door. Cicero never specified, except by example, just to whose character such wit was to be peculiarly applicable, but Juvenal's readers by this point in *Satire* III have already met several figures whose own words condemn them. Open acknowledgement of this irony would not entirely ruin the wit here, but it would damage it and create a dramatic conflict. If Umbricius had acknowledged the votum as ironical, he would have been very near recognition of his status as shade.
In making Umbricius a master of the pithy epigram, Juvenal avoided the pitfall of acknowledging dissimulation in U.24. Umbricius is silent on the outcome of the legal action that must have issued from the *vadimonium* which the mugger filed against him. The only logical conclusion is that it came to nothing. From this, the reader is free to conclude that it, too, was just another form of teasing and, as the language indicates, one more comic brutality which Fortune will have before she is done with him. But sympathy for Umbricius develops in this *fabella* not only from the stature of his reply in lines 299b-301; the fact that his attacker mistakes Umbricius for a Jew also helps to clear him of any odor of racial or ethnic bias. Umbricius's rebuke of the *ego*'s distress in finding Jews with their Sabbath hay-boxes in a Roman shrine frees the comic language of its braying note in U.24 and introduces an almost Terentian calm about the figure of this man getting on in years. And this fits well with earlier observations on Umbricius's impersonation of the querulous old man in U.5.

So, open acknowledgement of both dissimulation and irony had to be avoided if U.25 was ever to work properly. This *fabella* is as close as Umbricius comes to wholesale condemnation of Rome, but he only names its dishonorable state with an honorable term. Still, it would have been received as a *iocus frigidus* if his own moral slate were not very clean. Dramatically, Umbricius cannot ignore any charge which the
ego has made, least of all any ironical alarm at the least of Rome’s inhabitants, simply because the ego regards him as an amicus. A true friend will not let prejudice pass in his companion, as that would be to associate oneself with prejudice and to seem to tolerate it. Least of all could he pretend to caution his friend on choosing associates under such an onus. In this regard, it strikes me as choice diction that the tamen in 302 nec tamen haec tantum metuas could refer to the same word, in about the same line-position, in 2 laudo tamen.

Similarly, Umbricius cannot acknowledge the full extent of the irony in his treatment of crime and punishment, for that would result in the utter failure of his analogy between Rome and the Underworld and imperil his status as shade and Anchises-figure. Much of the freight in this respect rests on the synecdoche of iron, which rather implausibly—and wittily in a not over-educated way—slides from shutter-chains, to stiletto, back to chains on an anvil, to manacles, to plows, hoes, mattocks, and finally, by implication, to the place where such chains figure forth as a building—the carcer above the Forum. The gloomy tone of U.25 also partly results from a narrowing of the cast of characters to criminals and victims. The man in the 283 coccina laena and his troop are but a faint glimmer in the distance and of no more use than the remoter longissimus ordo. The man, whose sole companion in 286a was the moon, is alone with the sounds of
late-night Rome. These, however, are not the rumble of the heavy cartage of which he complained in 236b-238 but of hammer on anvil and air in bellows. He encourages Roman readers to hear once more Vergil's Underworld:

hinc exaudiri gemitus et saeva sonare
verbera, tum stridor ferri tractaeque catenae.
(Verg. Aen. VI.557-558)

Literary allusion and imagistic series thus help to preserve an irony which issues in a moral condemnation of Rome, itself most modestly asserted.

The last thing of importance which these three fabellae accomplish is to represent to the Roman reader the defeat of the pauper. If in U.20-U.22 the officium had ended surprisingly on the banks of the Styx, there was no opprobrium attached to the accident. But in the last section this is not the case, for each fabella represents a loss in dubious circumstances: at the hands of a captator, in the court of the praetor, on a dagger in a lonely street. A bad fama will ensue, and any one of these is enough to ruin the household of Umbricius, who has already condemned Romans for being fools about their wills, praetors for being feckless captatores and fire-engine chasers, Artorius and Catulus for losing caput, and deadly Greeks all round. Even the revival of the rural dream in lines 306-307 is but a faint ray soon extinguished in the search for the causes of crime. From the standpoint of his prospects, Umbricius has, if only half humorously, begun to doubt if he can purchase the tools he will need to
work his land. This may be just what it seems--mild humor--but it contains a truth that has been circling overhead, as it were, since the first line: the satiric hero's prospects have narrowed to retirement in reduced circumstances because he has stayed too long and seen too much in Rome.

Juvenal does, as it appears from the foregoing, open the door to his subject in Satire III wide, and it may seem plain to some that he attempts to speak through Umbricius and the ego on everything (and thus to say nothing or very little). But objections like this assume, and must posit, Umbricius as a 'puppet', or 'two-dimensional character', and the continual falsity of his moral stance. These retrograde routes back to literalism, however, offer little on the dramatic aspects of the meeting between the two personae, on which Juvenal shows no little poetic adeptness; skimpy as this tiny drama may seem, its elements are decisive for interpretation, and the depth of Umbricius's moral understanding is revealed in the last fabella. In the last eight lines of Satire III, Umbricius revives his awareness that the ego is listening to him and attempts to restore a sense of proportion--that of the human scale--to what he has just said.

U.26, lines 315-322
his alias poteram et pluris subnectere causas,
sed iumenta vocant et sol inclinat. eundum est;
nam mihi commota iam nudum mulio virga
adnuit. ergo vale nostri memor, et quotiens te
Roma tuo refici properantem reddet Aquino,
me quoque ad Helvinam Cererem vestramque Dianam
converte a Cumis. saturarum ego, ni pudet illas,
auditor gelidos veniam caligatus in agros.'
This fabella resembles what Horace seems to have meant by his fabula de te. The joke type, cum ex alterius oratione aliud excipias atque ille vult,⁶⁸ is not, however, to be understood as the sole means of satirical fabulae de te: the one just suits the other well. It remains to be seen how this is so. Umbricius ostensibly leaves his subject in line 315 and returns (316-318a) to the dramatic present, the occasion of lines 1-20, at a later point, perhaps in the evening. He specifies again the participants in this sermo (318b nostrī...te), and in 319 he sketches in one detail of the situation of the ego as homo urbanus and characterizes him as a man harried by the city to his rural retreat.

It is at this point that Horace would have urged caution on a prospective satirist. For the humor that Umbricius is developing in lines 320-322 grows out of an item of his knowledge of the ego which we as readers have not yet heard but would usually assume about homo urbanus, namely, that he vacates Rome when it becomes too much for him and returns home to cultivate the local deities of some Aquinum. Umbricius then exploits this humbling of urban pretensions by wangling an invitation to the poet's ranch and by offering to be an appreciative audience of one for the other's satires. The humor chiefly lies in the comic forwardness (320 me quoque) of the umbra, or uninvited guest.⁶⁹ This development in the context of Umbricius's remarks in lines 320-322 nominates him the butt of the humor, whereas it appeared that the joke was
going to be on the *ego*.

In this sense, U.26 sabotages Horace's *fabula de te*, and to this end the detail of Umbricius's new mode of dress, the comic 322 *caligatus*, is devoted. But in the larger sense which includes Umbricius's morality, the joke develops at the expense of the *ego* because the satirist cannot permit in himself a fastidiousness over muddy clodhoppers. The point of 321 *ni pudet illas* is that rustic dress cannot be employed as an excuse to refuse to invite Umbricius. Roman satire was not, as Persius avers (I.32), meant for hyacinthine robes but for the ears of ordinary men. If you love me, Umbricius implies, you love my dirty boots, and spare me your empty praise. The punch line thus developed is, I would assert, consistent with the joke of taking another's words in a sense not intended (principally 2 *laudo*), while it presents Umbricius as the *te* of Horace's *fabula de te*.

This is, indeed, a tangled web, for Juvenal has taken the harsh directness out of Horace's *de te*. For instance, 322 *gelidos* . . . *agros* implies that Umbricius believes it when the *ego* disparages sweltering recitals in Rome. And the effect on the dramatic proprieties is a little astonishing, since one of the characters introduces a number of new facts about the other at the end of the work. These lend an informal air to the last eight lines and reinforce the naturalness of termination by lowing oxen and bored drover. U.26 thus suffers no serious flaw as poetic closure, as we saw when we
examined its imagery. This illustrates how great a mistake it can be to impose every dramatic propriety on satire, even when there seems to be more action than *Satire III* has. The alternative for criticism is to consider the complex vagaries of everyday conversation—how, for instance, wit and humor emerge from assumptions about others, from taking their words in a way different than they intended, from the urge to stereotype, or to be familiar with a good humor but without offense rather than to be estranged.
FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER V

1 I find more enargeia than Scott 1927, 22, who sees it only in line 198. Cf. lines 194b-196, 199-202, and the minute details of Cordus's possessions in 203-207.

2 Hor. S. II.6,18-19; the utterly cold weather, 25-26; the atrae Esquiliae, 32-34; the frigidus rumor, 50.

3 Hor. S. II.6,71b-76.

4 Hor. S. II.6,39a dixeris: 'experiari'.

5 Cf. Hor. S. II.6,20 matutine pater; 65 o noctes cenas-que deum; 99-101a, the mice's night journey to the city; 104-105 the extreme lateness of the mice's meal.

6 Juv. III.190-192; Hor. S. II.6,60-64, 90b-92.

7 III.203b-206; S. II.6,102b-105.

8 III.202b; S. II.6,114b-115a.

9 III.193-196, 200-207; S. II.6,80-89.

10 III.208-209a; S. II.6,80-81a.

11 III.190-191; S. II.6,91-92.

12 III.190-192, 210b; S. II.6,92-95a.

13 Horace is more explicit with conventions of speech: S. II.6,90 inquit; 97 haec ubi dicta; 115-116 tum rusticus ait.


15 Ogilvie 1969, 75-76, 85-86.

16 Wessner 1967, 43 ad loc., with the app. crit.; LaFleur 1976, 409, n. 89, reviews the evidence on Cordus as against Codrus. See also the clinching arguments in Griffith 1951, 138-139.
Vitruvius II.8 on the Augustan practice of erecting, from wattle and stucco, what must be the garret story of the typical Roman apartment building; there is support for this in lines 193-196, 199, and 201-202. Cf. Hudson-Williams 1977, 29 and 30, n. 2

Cf. the *res obscura et latens* in Cic. *de Or.* II.66, 268. The examples here involve face-to-face confrontation and an exchange of unpleasant if witty remarks upon moral character.

Courtney 1980, 182 *ad loc.*, offers this reading as the second among three. The others are (1) that the house was called the *domus Asturici* after a previous owner, a possibility which appears to have little point; (3) that Persicus is "an entirely unconnected new example," which requires an agnosticism of large proportions. Ferguson 1979, 151 *ad loc.*, leans towards Asturicus Persicus as denoting one person.

But see Juv. I.69-74a; cf. the *occultis animus semper-que tacendis* of III.50.

This meaning of *lautus*, though rare, is supported by Plaut. *Stich.* 744-745: *bene quom lauta tersa ornata fictast, infectast tamen*. Cic. *Cael.* 28,67, alludes to the *lautos iuvenes* of Clodia with a play on the word, since they lurked in ambush in the baths.


There is a typographical error in Mayor's note, 1880, 207, on line 231, which refers his reader to Mart. XI.8.

Duff 1970, 156, on line 241, cites Pliny the Younger on his uncle's diligence.

See Cic. *de Or* II.66,264.

I find Courtney's 1980, 187 *ad loc.*, interpretation of *Druso* as Claudius more reasonable than Duff's ambivalence: to think this Drusus any other than history's most famous sleeper would destroy the wit of *vitulis marinis*. For a balanced account of Claudius's somnolence after meals and his insomnia at night, see Trimble 1912, 31-34.

I cannot agree with Courtney 1980, 187, on line 241, when he encloses 242 in parentheses and subordinates it to what follows; 242 *namque* has much more obvious force as a concluding logical particle, comparable to *kai gar*.

See Harrison 1960, 100-101. The maritime imagery begins in U.20 (238 vitulis marinis), and may include 240
Liburna, scil. navis, which would be very strong hyperbole.

29 This is probably the function of the enargeia which Scott 1927, 22, sees in lines 249-250.

30 See Tac. Hist. III,84-86, for a highly colored picture of Vitellius; Suet. Vitel. 8 for the omen of the stove that set the dining-quarters afire in Vitellius's German camp; 15, for his uniquely ghoulish banquet entertainment of watching Sabinus and his Flavian relatives burn to death in the T. Iuppiter Optimus Maximus; 16, on his attempt to flee Rome with his pastry-cook and chef.

31 Lucilius's advice (751-752 W), that one should go gently in a crowd lest he hurt another, is moderate compared to Juvenal's lines. Perhaps Lucilius's crowds were not so large as those facing Umbricius.

32 Cf. Cic. de Or. II.66,265.

33 Cf. Verg. Geo. IV.73, of bees' wings.

34 Turnus's aristeia outside the Trojan camp concludes in the fall of Bitias (Verg. Aen. IX.691-716), with allusions to Baiae, Cumae, Frochyla, and Ischia; with this last, Zeus buried Typhoeus. Pandarus later (Aen. IX.735b-755) confronts Turnus within the camp.

35 Cf. the collapse of the dryad-oak which Erysichthon felled in Ov. Met. VIII.771-774.

36 See Ch. II, p. 87 on the Gigantomachy.

37 Duff 1970, 158.

38 Magnini 1982, 16-18, argues convincingly that 266 porthmea, the grecism in Juv. III.264-267, is not put in the midst of this passage to parody Vergil, nor was it necessarily lifted from Petronius, nor is there any identifiable aggressive intent in the lines, but that it is a poetic innovation: that of making the ferryman's character seem as sterile as his environment. Romano 1979, 96, agrees in this assessment of the lack of parody.

39 Nutting's (1928, 258) comparison of Juv III.261b-263 to Verg. Aen. I.637-638 is tenuous, and perhaps depends more on the irony in domus than on details for wit.

40 Hight 1962, 21, also seems to see grim humor in the ending of this fabella.
Line 237 marinis at least suggests water, perhaps to be found in Rome's vivaria; 244 unda is a metaphor for the crowd; 266 gurgitis denotes the Underworld rivers. Does Juvenal refer to Lucilius 805-811 W, where Lupus is made to seem capable of depriving a man of all four elements in court?

Lines 247 luto and 267 caenosi.

See, for instance, Sen. de Ira II.9,4 adde nunc. To some extent, Umbricius's occasional quid quod reproduces the similar Senecan device, de Ira, II.10,6-8: Quare?. . .Quid enim. . .Quid. . .Numquid. . . . Even Seneca's de Clementia, addressed to Nero, uses the convention of the second singular imperative: I.2,1 ad fin., Adice; I.8,6 Adice nunc; I.9,6 Fac.

There is some disagreement on the meaning of diversa; the best understanding being that of Duff 1970, 159 ad loc., with whom Courtney 1980, 190, does not disagree; cf. Green 1974, 96, "of various sorts."

Ferguson 1979, 153 ad loc., notes this pun without comment. Crook 1973, 42-44, argues convincingly that Romans capable of testacy were anxious not to be left intestate.

Ferio, especially of animals that attack with the jaws or head; signo, which often in poetry means to mark the soil as with tracks; laedo, to wound a part of the body by striking, here by weight and velocity.

Cf. Cic. de Or. II.70,283.

Petr. 70,9.

Commentators since Housman 1931, xxxiii, have thought line 281 spurious.

See Diomedes's cautions to Odysseus in II. X.338-348. Dolon is probably visible against the allies' many fires, which have so depressed Agamemnon, X.11-16, that he devises the plan to send out the night raiding party, X.17-20; cf. also Nestor's tactics, X.204-210.

Cf. II. X.349-377a.

Note how Odysseus toys with Dolon, II. X.381-389, 400-411, and 423-425.

Diomedes slays Dolon before he can appeal to the Greek's pity, II. X.446-457. It is clear from Diomedes's words that there can be no other outcome.
54 Cf. Cic. de Or. II.71,287 fin.

55 The scurrility of this hooligan's words can scarcely be doubted. The allusion in the foods (lines 292-294) may be to Hor. Ep. I.17,11-24, where Aristippus, a sort of semiprofessional, but decent scurra, rebukes a shameless Diogenes who seems unable to use the officium to earn his holus. On this type of scurra, see Corbett 1986, 64-66.

56 Anderson 1982b, 331.

57 II. X.458-468.

58 II. X.413-422; the troublesome 418 escharai—are they the watchfires in the Trojan camp or simply the hearths in the city?—may be thought of as a weak attempt to mislead. Hector's orders, at II. VIII.517-522, were that fires be lit in the homes and that the males in Troy should keep watch from the walls. This presumably would leave the streets empty.

59 Odysseus steals the Thracian horses, II. X.497-502, 513b-514, and he dresses the part of a thief, having donned the boar's-tooth helmet which long ago Autolycus had stolen, X.260-271. Odysseus alone dedicates the spoils of Dolon, X.462-463. Like Dolon, the pauper has no chance to beg for his life (lissesthai), X.454-456.

60 II. X.233-239.

61 So Duff 1970, 162, on line 314, cites Liv. 1.33,8.

62 Liv. 1.33,5: Apparently, at this early stage, the Romans, in order to replenish their population, transported the Medullians and perhaps other Latins to Rome. Livy is especially emphatic on this sudden increase in population leading to crime (1.33,8: Ingenti incremento rebus auctis, cum in multitudine hominum. . . facinora clandestina fient, etc.).

63 The first instance of crime, after Rome's liberation, was political in nature: the brothers Vitellii and Aquilii were imprisoned (Liv. 2.4,7) and later executed (2.5,8) for treason. Common criminals may have been kept in arcae robustae, or hardwood cells, until the Robus was constructed (Fest. 325); see Liv. 38.59,10 on the death of L. Scipio inter fures nocturnos et latrones. . . in Robora in 187 B.C.

64 This corresponds to a type of ironical dissimulation to which Cicero draws special attention, de Or. II.67,272.

65 See de Or. II.70,183: by chance it turned out to be Scaurus, who was not technically a captator, as the man whose
wealth he got died intestate.

66 Watts 1976, 103, admits that we cannot be sure of Juvenal's attitude towards conversion to Judaism among Romans from *Sat. III.*296. But Watts, in the surrounding material, 1976, 102-104, paints a highly colored picture of Juvenal's prejudice, which he claims derived from lack of understanding of customs and rituals.

67 The *laena* was a heavy cloak, short in length, and of double weight in cloth, and was probably originally a vestment of priests (*TLL* s.v. 1) but became fashionable outer wear in the Empire (*TLL* s.v. 2). Mart. XIV.138 (=XIV.136 in *TLL*) makes the latter point clear, adding that it was considered winter clothing. Petronius 32,2 has Trimalchio wearing a *pallium coccineum*, over which is draped a "laticlave" napkin; Trimalchio's entrance "forced a laugh from the unwary." The allusiveness of clothing to wealth and power here and in Juvenal is much the same: see *Juv. III.*272b-274a *improvidus*, etc. Smith 1975 on Petr. 32,2, misreads the ultra-virile opinions of the *vir mollis* at Mart. I.96,6-7 (cf. 10-13); the imputation of effeminacy, via Pers. I.32 *hyacinthina laena*, is not relevant.


69 LaFleur 1976, 390-391 and especially the materials in his nn. 25 and 28, associates the comic and the funereal meanings of *umbra*. But his view—that Umbricius's name is an allusion to the pastoral *umbra*—is never associated with 54 *opaci* and the Horatian allusion there. Juvenal's diction in 54 dissociates Umbricius from such ease, and *opaci* seems to me, therefore, ironical in this regard.
CHAPTER VI

Conclusions

Within limitations, the great utility of the satirical persona is obvious: the persona develops little dramatically but exhibits some critical ability and no little moral depth. This clearing of the stage, as it were, expands the satirist's options with the persona in wit and humor, especially since it is the nature of these to attack the reprehensible and deformed. Action is kept at a remove, as in a conversation; fully developed dialogue, in which two or more have roughly equal parts, is scarce because presumably such an arrangement could serve as a prelude to action. Exploitation of the genre along philosophical lines was not Juvenal's aim even at his most reflective. The art, therefore, with which Juvenal chose to imbue Roman satire was more limited than that of Horace and Persius, but it was also more concentrated and wittier. In Satire III, Juvenal used fictional personae, or masks that conceal (Sat. I.171 tegitur) the real agents and reveal what is appropriate to their natures (I.170 experiar quid concedatur in illos) by means of imagined or remembered experiences.
Juvenal apparently thought, to judge from the funereal context of these comments on the genre in Satire I and from the ending of Satire III, that satire's epitaphic potential was ripe for exploitation. Work in poetry along this line could not, however, proceed exclusively in the format of the traditional fabula because this form of anecdote entailed an explicit moral and thus forced the irony it possessed to be straightforward—to a degree in propria persona—rather than dissimulated. Horace and Persius address fabulae either to an audience or to one who has a part in a dialogue, but Juvenal imagines this audience more fully in two ways. First, the ego of Satire III exhibits a wide range of feelings that are summarized in 1 confusus and, second, homo urbanus appears under a wide variety of satiric types.

From the start the reader's expectations must shift to accommodate these developments. Umbricius's unfailing politeness towards the ego and his perceptiveness in dealing with the unspoken cares of the aspiring poet help to explain the absence of dialogue which may be attributed to the ego: he is simply too upset to express himself well, so he says nothing at all after line 21. This parallel between the ego and a mourner probably suggested the means by which the memory of the dead could be evoked: anecdotes or brief tales concerning the deceased, which resemble in continuity those told by the Sibyl at Aen. VI.562-627. The new fabella offered considerably more scope for Juvenal's aims than the
fabulae used by Horace and Persius, because its two basic types—narrative and dissimulative—could sustain humor or wit in deadly situations and thus appropriately without ob-jurgative tone. Humor would emerge from the simple telling of a ridiculum, and wit would strike from the unexpected insights which dissimulation or chiefly impersonation offered.

As a consequence, the satirical poet was freed of a universal obligation of humorists, which is to assert they mean no harm and are, in fact, genial and good-hearted fellow men. Narrative humor and ironical dissimulation offer sufficient identification of the parties to a narrated situation, enough detail of story line and characterization of the butt of the humor, to sustain the fiction of sermo over a seemingly endless array of subjects (Juv. III.315). The range of tones, from the fabulous to the quotidian, and portrayal of satiric types—without scurrility—thus could expand enormously.

It seems to me clear from these observations that Juvenal succeeded in converting the fabella from rhetorical uses and comic fable to narrative linchpin in satire. There ensues from this development one matter, and this is the idea which I originally set out to examine in this dissertation.

Juvenal's artistic subtlety stems in Satire III from the controlling idea that the personae are more than they seem and are involved in a situation the true meaning of which they do not appear to comprehend. The degree of subtlety with which Juvenal is able, in lines 1-57, to suggest his
subject and his themes upon it is not merely a function of the literal proposals of the ego in lines 1-20. This much is, I hope, clear from the Verres fabella, U.4, which examines a provincial career unconsidered by the ego. The ego's awareness, too, of his initiation into the vatic rites can only be said to exist at the sensory level, which certain imagery makes plain. And Umbricius's lack of knowledge about his status as shade can be deduced from another series of imagery, which is consistently attached to the activities of daily life and their consequences.

While it is the purpose of such art to provide the audience with a dramatic dia-noia which the characters lack, the wit and humor serve quite different purposes. Juvenal's version of the fabula de te in the last eight lines of Satire III is, with its potential for comic characterization and misdirection, an exact correlative of the feeling expressed in lines 21-28: the ego should not grieve overmuch for Umbricius, as nothing prevents later visitation. Viewed as epitaph, the irony is complete, since the shade was considered to be fixed to the spot where the cenotaph was erected.¹

Juvenal's readers can hardly claim that they were misled as to Umbricius. His first words, in the narrative fabella employing bodily representations in U.1, send a definite message as to his ethereality; at the same time, these lines pose the problem of the extent of the reader's dia-noia by addressing themselves to the ego's feeling, or pathos. By
continuing in this mode in the fabella (U.2) expressing a cool and patient sense of humor, that is, by persisting in address of the ego and not of the audience, Umbricius becomes a character, like the ego, with his own ethos, his own view of things, his own sense of the serious and the ridiculous. The sententiousness which Umbricius impersonates in the consular of the punch line of U.3 posits an audience who see the moral point in the humiliation of an honest citizen, so that they would now be forced to examine their own participation in laughter at the vicious and absurd.

The sophistication of this audience is not, however, to be underestimated: they are familiarly reproved in U.4 as if they erroneously believed in escape from how the city affects them, clever men and all. Umbricius shows that his present situation was inevitable in language appropriate to the afterlife, while certain elements of U.4 apply to the mysteries of the initiation of the poet and constitute Juvenal's claim on the wisdom derived from broad experience, as backed by such mystical knowledge as might be considered a poet's.

We should have to say, then, that Juvenal laid down in lines 1-57 a firm basis upon which to erect the massive irony of Umbricius's life. He does not do this like Horace or Persius, who usually involved the audience of satire from the beginning, but delays addressing his audience until he has established his personae conversationally. It is reasonable to conclude from the imagery and emotional language of E.1-2
and U.1-4 that the ground is being prepared for the epitaphic
U.26, with its gentle but thorough irony. We see, in fact,
that all Juvenal needs is the narrative that will sustain the
insights into the rightness of Umbricius's decision to leave
Rome: insights which show that he is a good man and fellow
Roman enough to share a hearty laugh without impudence, and
is therefore worthy of remembrance.

Juvenal, like any great artist, has erected his art
within the work without calling undue attention to it. This
chiefly consists of a Horatian ideal: the true poetry of
formal satire is the drama, however small, and its unfolding.
This feature equates roughly to Friedlaender's frame of lines
1-20 and 315-322. Extension of this drama into Umbricius's
bill of complaint transforms the fabella's allusions to occa-
sion into narrated situations which develop verisimilitude by
means of Umbricius's status as shade and by humorous compari-
son of the saeva urbs to both a predator and an Underworld.

But a truly sophisticated artist also provides his audi-
ence with a means to detect elaboration in his art. The cor-
relative of this is Umbricius's persistent effort to search
out and identify his killer: the grassator, who can only
survive in the city. Umbricius's failure to identify this
man either by name or by social class is, however, best read
as the anonymity which the persona as social mask preserves.
Criticism of the social persona begins with the demise of the
secretum honestum and its replacement by a guilty conscience
symbolized in the acted persona of Greek mimes. Into this arena, which touches art but is actually a debased theater, Umbricius injects a sizeable number of impersonations of destructive satiric types, such as those of the iuvenes in the theater and the inquisitor de moribus in the courtroom. Juvenal thus signals to his readers that an understanding of ironical impersonation in the fabella is essential to appreciation of his satiric art, and he extends this principle to comic narrationes by impersonating the harmless opici mures in a traditional apologus.

From this last arises an important insight into thematic argument in Umbricius's bill of complaint against Rome. He aligns the impersonation of harmless voices with the ceremonial persona that is still to be found in the rural maiestas. This mask is intended to reveal rather than conceal, and its purpose is katharsis, or the release of the audience from pity and fear. The lines (168-179) in which these insights appear resemble, however, the traditional fabula, with its early and prominent moral. Incorporation of these lines into the longest fabella of Satire III reveals Juvenal's artistic decision on the older means of Roman satire: the genre is now better propagated by the new fabella, with its story-like suspense, than by the older fabula, with its early or prominent moral, illustrations, and ironic after-comment.

The stylistic consequences of Juvenal's decision chiefly amount to a reduction in the role of the satiric ego and to
dispensing with verisimilitude in the poet's speaking *in propria persona*. These in turn result in a comic reversal of roles, so that the *ego* becomes the respondent, or *viva vox*, while a fictional persona like Umbricius assumes the role of satirist. Corresponding to these changes is a significant alteration to satirical irony: as irony now depends less on direct moralistic exploitation of the *res*, so the overall narrative sophistication increases.

In the case of Umbricius, this requires that the burden of being the *ingénu* shift from him to another figure in the poem. The first candidate for this role is the *ego*, but as his eyes open to the moral meaning of choosing to remain in Rome, other figures, at a varied pace, become the butts of Umbricius's joking. They condemn themselves with their own words and acts often enough to qualify *homo urbanus* as naïf. It is not without meaning that Umbricius concludes the *sermo* with a twist on the Horatian *fabula de te*.

In addressing the aristocracy, Umbricius presents his claim on sympathy: *pudor* and *honestae artes*. His *pudor* is always implicit and never literally asserted, and it encompasses two elements: (1) social *pudor*, which forbids him, angry as he may become, to offend any Roman of standing; (2) sexual *pudor*, proof of which is offered as counting his coins before accosting a Chione, harmless enough compared to foreign sexual excesses or to a tribune's tryst with an heirless old maid. The synthesis of these two types of *pudor* is found
in an audience-scene, when the pauper is tossed out of his theater seat--for his impudence!--by the sons of pimps and whores.

But the requirement of honestae artes in himself is not the full extent of Umbricius's appeal to upper-class Romans. He warns aristocrats to have a care for their self-respect in dealings with foreigners, especially Greeks. Special attention bears on the moment when the Roman feels the urge to admire or laugh at their antics--watch your wallet and barricade the bedroom! For the closer one looks, the less will seem awry, unless one is very clear on what he will or will not tolerate in his home. The foolishness tolerated in public or at the theater is deadly once within the domus. Remember Barea. The fides which he misplaced in his pet Stoic hurt every Roman by making the officium into a sham of occultaque semper tacenda and a step toward servitude and death.

For the safeguarding of the pauper's social persona, Umbricius provides a humble gift: if the native cannot help being shoved aside in the street (U.13), he can at least defend himself in court and on other occasions with wit or humor that disables the worst attacks (U.14-15). His chances, however, of enjoying urban life are small because everything has its price, from dinnerplates to clothes to seedcakes: only rural otium still retains its dignity, and with it one's own (U.16).
With this rural translation, Umbricius turns to the concerns of his audience of *pauperes*. He immediately addresses the basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter in the fable of the City Mice (U.17): Cordus's fire leaves him worse off than the mice who eat his books. This comic treatment of a most serious situation shades into a knowing look at the housewarming of Asturicus *laudissimus* (U.18), and then into a last glance at rural peace (U.19), presented as a solution to Cordus's problem. This angling for perspective on the urban pauper, through comparatively mild humor and wit, leads back to Rome, delirium, and death and to the search for Umbricius's killer.

The caution to the poet-pauper in the symbol of the litter—not to expect the leisure real wealth will bring—in U.20, and the exaggeration in U.21 of the strength needed to escape injury in crowds, set the scene for the obliteration of the pauper in U.22, with tones of high burlesque. All three of these *fabellae*, taken together, are something of a poetic *tour de force*: the humor is quite deft and lighthand-ed for such serious subjects. But they also complete the search, begun in the indictment of Greeks and the novi, for Umbricius's killer.

For one does not blame the stone that kills. Is it then the captator who urges one out into the dangers of the night while using fear as a weapon (U.23)? Or is it the ruffian who, worse even than Ulysses or Diomedes against their Dolon,
lodges charges against the *pauper* he has beaten up and thus deprives his victim also of *libertas* and reputation at one stroke (U.24)? Either way, Umbricius seems to say, it hardly matters, if one ends up another notch on an Apache's knife (U.25). The resignation and weak irony in these *fabellae* I have taken as a sign that Juvenal cannot allow Umbricius to identify his killer. Instead, treatment of Rome as the Underworld and as the Cyclopean forge there, like treatment of the *urbs saeva* as something of a wild animal, an exitless house, and a prison, configures this frustrated search as the maze of death. Rome, not Cumae, is Daedalic.

The *ego's* creeping sensation that Umbricius is a shade is, however, only cemented in the last eight lines where, like the comic *umbra*, the latter invites himself to the *ego's* country home at some future date. The potential of Roman satire as epitaph finally correlates to the irony of Umbricius's proposed but impossible journey in his clodhoppers to hear satires still to be written. *Satire* III explores gallows humor in which Umbricius can never be allowed to become aware of his own death and must fade as the brief period of his return expires. In this manner, Juvenal reveals the initiation of the satiric poet to be one not merely of setting but of vision.
FOOTNOTE

CHAPTER VI

1 Ogilvie 1969, 75-76.
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