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INTRODUCTION
My purpose in this paper is to explicate and examine Satires 1 and 7 of Juvenal. Satires 1 and 7 are particularly significant because of the conjecture that Satires 1-6 portray an indignant satirist, and Satires 7-16 in some way exhibit a change in the indignant character of the satirist. Thus 1 is representative of the first group and 7 is representative of the second group. I do not intend to refute this argument, but only to suggest that there cannot be so strict a dichotomy between 1-6 and 7-16, since the subject matter and technique of both groups are so closely allied. I hope to show that Juvenal's satires are consistent in technique, and in this respect provide an even flow of Juvenalian satire from beginning to end.

In Satire 1 and 7 there are two levels of meaning. On the first level of meaning the satirist-persona portrays society which in all cases is immoral and depraved. In most cases men are engaged in some kind of patron-client relationship in which the client comes out on the bad end of the deal. The client is poor and

---

The satirist-persona is the main character. He is the creation of the author and functions as the author wishes him to. In Latin literature the artist often develops a literary stance which he elaborates through the creation of a persona; e.g., Ovid's development of the character, Helen, in the Heroides, or Propertius' development of the persona as miser, or Horace's development of a satiric persona in the Satires 2.1.
downtrodden. There is very little hope for him and he has only the assurance of poverty in a corrupt society to keep him warm. On the second level of meaning statements are made through the character of the satirist-persona by the artist, Juvenal, which undercut the seriousness of statements made on the first level of meaning. These two levels of meaning are important to the understanding of Juvenalian satire.

2 Undercut refers to the undertone of satiric irony which occurs on the second level of meaning. Undercutting is a term which will be used throughout this paper to technically describe the satiric action on the second level of meaning, which in no way makes the statements of the satirist-persona untrue, but simply reveals that the satirist-persona is himself a human being with human weaknesses.
Satire 1
There are, I suggest, two levels of meaning in Satire 1. The first level deals with the desire of the satirist-persona to write satire. Paralleling level one is the second which satirizes the satirist-persona. Thus Satire 1 is a satire with a two-pronged thrust: the satirizing by one man of a corrupt and greedy society, and the simultaneous satirizing of the satirist-persona. In this way level two, as a satire of the satirist-persona, actually undercuts level one.

On the first level of meaning the satirist-persona attacks with a tone of righteous indignation the immorality of his society. The reaction of the satirist-persona to his society is depicted in two ways: 1) by epigrammatical vignettes illustrative of the reasons for the satirist-persona's repulsion for his society, 2) by the urge to write satire, given his view of contemporary society.

In his commentary on the *Satires* of Juvenal, J.D. Duff includes Nettleship's short synopsis of Satire 1.3

"The first satire is a series of incoherent complaints..., all these are hurried together in no intelligible order, and with the same introductory cum hoc fiat, scribam saturam? Then at 1. 81 the satire seems to open again and promise a description of various vices; but instead of this we have an elaborate complaint,...The ill-proportioned piece concludes with a promise to write against the dead."

Obviously Nettleship is describing and reacting to the first level of satire. We learn from Nettleship's comment that Satire 1 appears as a "series of incoherent complaints." Yet it is not unreasonable to hypothesize initially that incoherence is a conscious device of satire. The creation of satire through incoherence and confusion will be explained as the paper progresses.

The second level of meaning is the level of undercutting. Here Juvenal overturns the purpose of the satirist-persona and exposes the satirist-persona for what he really is, pretentious and self-righteous. Juvenal deliberately imposes confusion on the satirist-persona, and thus undercuts him. The incoherence and confusion on the first level are hints that point us in the direction of undercutting and the satirizing of the satirist-persona. Juvenal uses rhetorical devices such as epic bombast, tautology, and anticlimax to pull down the pretentious man and ridicule the very indignation that the satirist-persona so righteously propounds. Thus, Juvenal actually satirizes the poets-asters; i.e. of epic, comedy, elegy, and satire,

---


5 Anderson, 131-148. Anderson is very aware of the inconsistencies that arise in Satire 1, but he does not explore these inconsistencies, and suggests only that they are an end in themselves.
through the methods that the satirist-persona uses. Satire 1 breaks down into three main sections: lines 1-21, lines 22-80, and lines 81-171. Each section represents a thematic unit on both levels of meaning. Lines 1-21 stand primarily as an introduction to the satire, and hint at what will follow. In the first two lines we learn that the satirist-persona is vexatus, because he has been an impatient listener at the Theseid of the ranting Cordus. Lines 3-6 illustrate the irritation that the satirist-persona feels for interminable epics. Lines 7-14 pile up evidence for the satirist-persona's perturbation. Through the first fourteen lines the satirist-persona reveals his dismay at the triteness of present day epic. It would not surprise us if the satirist-persona should then try to write good epic, but as we know the satirist-persona chooses to write satire. Lines 15-17 explain to the reader that the satirist-persona has taken part in declamations. Following this claim, he moves to the conclusion of lines 1-21 by giving his reasons for writing. In lines 17-18 the satirist-persona tells us that he will take pen in hand since paper will be wasted anyhow by the poets one meets at every corner. Lines 19-21 indicate that the satirist-persona is going to follow in the path of the great satirist Lucilius, and he exhorts his audience to listen to reason so that he may tell why he has chosen to run over the same
path Lucilius had taken. This progression of thought takes place on the first level of meaning, and what we encounter is a justification for writing.

On the level of undercutting we see the character of Juvenal emerging. Lines 1-21 have built up the figure of the satirist-persona as vexatus. In lines 7-13 rather than just expressing that he has become bored by all the literary allusions that have been employed in epic, the satirist-persona himself resorts to a long list of epic allusions. Thus the satirist-persona is actually guilty of the crime of which he accused the ranting Cordus. W.S. Anderson in his article "Anger in Juvenal and Seneca" reacts to the opening complaint in the following manner.

Such an openly literary background, such a strong appeal to readers who know poetry well, seems almost to project us into a recitatio ourselves. Now, instead of enduring the poetastry of others, the satirist regales his audience with a display of rhetoric....Trained by rhetoricians...skilled in the typical suasoriae, like that on the question of whether or not Sulla should retire from his dictatorship,...

Anderson is pointing out that the satirist-persona who has appealed very bluntly to our sensibilities is actually a skilled rhetorician. Anderson believes that Juvenal's main point is to reveal the satirist-persona

---

6 Anderson, 131.
as inconsistent, and by this illustration achieve satire. Essentially this is what is happening on the second level of meaning. Thus we begin to recognize the satirist-persona as the butt of satire. Line 21 undercuts the satirist-persona by exposing him as hypocritical. The line is hypocritical because the satirist-persona in the ensuing lines does anything but appeal to the placidity of the reader.

Why, apart from the desire to punctuate the first paragraph and set it off from what follows, did Juvenal assign to his satirist such flagrantly inconsistent words?

To put it in simplest form, I would answer in this way: 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.7

Thus, as Anderson points out, Juvenal does wish us to be aware of two levels of meaning just as his Roman readers were aware in the 1st century A.D.

On the first level of meaning lines 22-80 continue the satirist-persona's justification for writing satire. He describes the corruption and greed of his society through a series of epigrammatical vignettes, which explain why it is difficult not to write satire. Parallel-

7 Anderson, 146-147.
ing the satirist-persona's justification for writing satire is his adoption of *indignatio* as the force which makes his verse. Lines 22-30 stand as the justification for writing satire, which has indignation as its mainspring. These introductory lines provide us with vignettes of a eunuch taking a wife, Mevia bare-breasted hunting boars, and two men once of low station who have gained prominence and wealth. It would seem that the satirist-persona is upset by the disruption of the status quo. It is irritating to the satirist-persona to even think that a eunuch, a woman, and two slaves have taken positions in society that were once held by virile men of noble background. In the satirist-persona's eyes the undermining of the status quo serves to highlight the extreme degeneracy of the society of which he is a part. Thus because of the degeneracy found, *difficile est saturam non scribere* (1. 30).

Lines 30-62 represent the same justification for writing satire again with *indignatio* at the core. Lines 30-50 are examples of the degenerate society: informers, male prostitutes, and the decay of the nobility, all of which make the satirist-persona intolerant and angry. And just as in lines 22-30 where women and half-men have taken the place of real men, so in lines 30-50 corrupt and depraved people have usurped the positions that were once held by the virtuous nobility. It seems
that good and evil have changed places, so that now evil and corrupt deeds are rewarded rather than their opposites. Lines 51-62 again reveal the anger that the satirist-persona feels toward his society, and reiterate the need for exposing its corruption rather than engaging in irrelevant epic. At the end of this second justification we can feel the indignatio building, and at the same time we now understand the satirist-persona's need to write satire in the mode of Lucilius.

The next section, lines 63-80, represent the same justification for writing satire with indignatio at the core as in lines 22-50. The satirist-persona might fill up entire notebooks with the crimes that he sees, crimes such as forgery, murder, and adultery. Society's values have become inverted, instead of rising to prominence in life through virtue, a man must dare to do crimes to become well-known. Thus in lines 79-80 the satirist-persona bursts forth with his declaration si natura negat, facit indignatio versus. Now it is stated, indignation is the force which drives the satirist-persona forward, and it is an angry indignation that will cause the satirist-persona to reveal greed and corruption.

On the second level of meaning, lines 22-80 undercut the straightforward indignation of level one, through the appearance of an inordinate interest in sexual per-
versions, epic bombast, repetition, and anticlimax.

The satirist-persona's interest in sexual corruption may be found in lines 39, 41, 55, 77, and 78. The satirist-persona is too interested in the affairs of the bedroom to be solely concerned with corruption and greed of his society. Rather we observe that the satirist-persona has turned a lecherous gaze upon the sexual misbehavior of his society, and is himself guilty of a prurient interest, a crime worthy of being placed among the debaucheries already enumerated. In exposing the satirist-persona as a lecherous man it becomes increasingly impossible to accept the satirist-persona's statements seriously. 8

nonne libet medio ceras inplere capaces quadrivio, (63-64)

In this line the satirist-persona is revealed, and we now recognize that the satirist-persona is really part of the corrupt society he describes. Thus through the satirist-persona's enjoyment of noting down any misdeed that he may chance to see at the crossroad, the righteous indignation that will somehow reform society is undercut.

The second example of undercutting is epic bombast.

8 Anderson, 135-139.
This occurs in lines 52-54,

haec ego non agitem? sed quid magis? Heracleas
aut Diomedeas aut mugitum labyrinthi
et mare percussum puero fabrumque volantem,

just as in lines 1-13 the satirist-persona employs
a method that he deplores, thereby undercutting his
own honesty and making us suspect his intentions. The
satirist-persona has pledged himself to writing scath­
ing satire, yet he keeps falling into the use of epic
descriptions. Here is another example: where the real
character of the satirist-persona emerges; he accuses
a number of people of some particular misdeed, and then
proceeds to perpetrate the same particular misdeed
himself. Thus on the second level of meaning it is
obvious how Juvenal manipulates the satirist-persona,
so that the satirist-persona falls into the very pit­
falls he has warned us about.

The third example of undercutting is repetition.
This repetition becomes apparent when we examine the
structure of lines 22-80. There is a three part div­
ision: lines 22-30, 30-62, and 63-80. Each part is
essentially a justification for writing scathing satire.
Through the continued repetition of a theme which
should be obvious after eighty lines of explanation,
the real nature of the satirist-persona emerges. What
we find is a man who is not entirely sure of himself,
and so through repetition of his main objective attempts
to gain confidence. The satirist-persona wants to write scathing satire, yet his desire has not yet produced a sustained effort. What we encounter up to line 80 is a series of epigrammatical vignettes that hint at the supposed degeneracy of society, but always fail to make their final point. Thus the formula cum hoc fiat ... difficile est saturam non scribere is constantly repeated with no apparent purpose but to goad the satirist-persona forward in his attempt to write satire. So the repetition of the satirist-persona's desire to write satire, and the repetition of the necessity to write satire because of the degeneracy of society undercuts the straightforward path of righteous indignation by making the satirist-persona appear pretentious and simple-minded, since he cannot seem to remember that he has been making the same point throughout the first eighty lines in one form or another.

In lines 22-80 the fourth example of undercutting is anticlimax. The satirist-persona has supposedly been building to a climax of indignation, si natura negat, facit indignatio versum, yet in reality what occurs is a negative statement that undercuts the indignation that has been building throughout the entire poem. At first glance we encounter a strong statement of purpose, and the crystallization of the ideal of indignatio that the satirist-persona has been expressing,
yet as we read on the above statement of indignation is undercut by the line *qualemcumque potest, quales ego vel Cluvienus*. How can the satirist-persona make such a statement after he has spent almost the entire poem justifying the desire to write satire in such a corrupt place as Rome? We were led to believe that he was going to write scathing satire in the mode of Lucilius, and we thought that this verse would be different from the common run-of-the-mill poetry that the satirist-persona has been subjected to. But now we are not so sure, for if Cluvienus can do the same kind of things that the satirist-persona can do, we must assume the satirist-persona is a common type himself. The interjection of Cluvienus, possibly an unknown or mediocre writer, may be a device employed by Juvenal to show that the satirist-persona is really a very common type, and a Cluvienus might be able to write satire as well as the satirist-persona; all of which reveals that Juvenal realized that all entertaining satire is an attack on well described symptoms, not a vital reforming force in society, thus lest he appear pretentious he satirizes his own pretensions. Anybody could write the kind of satire the satirist-

---

9 G. Hight, Juvenal The Satirist (New York 1961) 289-290, n.5. He insists that Cluvienus cannot be 'anybody at all' but the fact that Cluvienus is nobody at all is exactly the thrust of the passage.
persona wishes to write and the satirist-persona in his own way is as trite and common in railing against his society as the ranting Cordus was in his Theseid.

On the first level of meaning in lines 81-171 the satirist-persona expands the scope of his indignant satire from the degeneracy of his society to include the nature of man and his reaction to corrupt society. The satirist-persona within these lines envisions an idealized struggle between the forces of Pecunia, representing evil, and the forces of Pax, Pides, Victoria, Virtus, and Concordia representing good. This idealized struggle takes place within the continuum of posteritas. The satirist-persona foresees nothing but doom and destruction for generations to come. Thus we see that the satirist-persona is not merely a man who wishes to write satire, but a man with a grave mission.

quidquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas, gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est. (85-86)

The satirist-persona is about to write indignant satire with the actions of men, past, present, and future, as his subject. Yet more importantly, he says that he wishes to make apparent the grave crisis that society faces, and because of this grave crisis points out the need for a man like himself to reveal the precipice of doom over which his entire society is hanging.
Lines 81-86 are the first indication that the scope of the satirist-persona has changed and expanded. The satirist-persona includes what is traditionally, and mythically the beginning of the life of man, and links this occurrence with the happenings of present day society. The subject of the satirist-persona's verse will begin with the mythical creation of man and encompass all that has happened up to the present day. The scale and depth of satire that the satirist-persona envisions is certainly grand.

Lines 87-146 deal with avarice, and the many forms it takes. The satirist-persona shows that the driving force in his society is a desire for wealth, and that the attainment of wealth is the first concern of all people. Avarice is the vice which is corrupting and destroying the values of his society. In lines 87-126 the traditional values are overturned and in their place Pecunia stands. Much as women and half-men usurped the positions of virile men in earlier lines, so now men with money take over the status and position of men such as tribunes who do not have as much money, but do have social status. Money in this society takes precedence over all else. All men are driven and motivated by the desire to acquire wealth: a man wagering 100,000 sesterces at the gaming tables, a freedman, a tribune, and a praetor collecting the dole, the dole
being fraudulently sought so that men add to income already coming in, while the poor dependents go cold and hungry in the streets. The satirist-persona reveals that the rich get richer and poor get poorer.

In lines 127-146 the satirist-persona focuses more specifically on what occurs during an average day in Rome, *ipse dies pulchro distinguitur ordine rerum*. What we see is a society based on the relationship between the patrons and their clients, but the relationship is not healthy and breeds hatred and mistrust. Legacy hunters are common products of an avaricious society. The seeking of wealth is the paramount objective of this corrupt society.

Lines 147-171 bring the satire to a resounding climax. The satirist-persona declares that vice is at its acme, and that posterity will not improve conditions. The satirist-persona seems to be pronouncing the final note of doom over a degenerate, decaying society. Also within these lines the satirist-persona attempts to reaffirm his desire to write scathing satire in the mode of Lucilius (1, 165). Yet this attempt must be explained further on the second level of meaning.

On the second level of meaning lines 81-86 engage in the flagrant use of epic bombast, *ex quo Deucalion ...etc.*, a technique which the satirist-persona abhorred in the *Theseid* of the ranting Cordus, but a technique
which the satirist-persona insists on using. Also the statement *quidquid agunt homines* is an example of extreme exaggeration, for throughout the satire the satirist-persona has ably handled vice in his society, but he has hardly approached the handling of all actions of men. Thus the statements of the satirist-persona are undercut in lines 81-86 through epic bombast and exaggeration.  

Lines 87-146 seem to continue along the lines of exaggeration. Continually the satirist-persona overstates his point. He would like us to believe that everybody is engaged in the frantic pursuit of money. Indeed the satirist-persona is more concerned about the tribune having to wait his turn to collect the dole than the fact that the tribune should even be collecting the dole. Actually the satirist-persona only gives four examples of avarice, while at the same time making it appear that everybody in society is greedy but himself. Lines 119-120 reveal the satirist-persona as envious of the patrons who gather up the money for themselves and do not dispense it to the dependents who are really nothing more than hangers on and leeches.

Gilbert Highet in his book *Juvenal The Satirist*
interestingly explains what angers the satirist-persona in the patron-dependent relation. We must understand that Highet does not necessarily see an inherent difference between the satirist and author of satire, and in this particular book identifies the historical figure of Juvenal and the speaker of satire:

What angers him most is the maldistribution and misuse of money in the patron-dependant relation. Patrons are rich. Their dependants are poor. But patrons will not share their wealth with those whom they call dependants; they dine in luxury alone.11

The satirist-persona is envious, and he is so envious that he is angry, and his envy stems from a desire to partake of the wealth that he can only see but never touch. The satirist-persona once again indulges in an activity which he had heretofore declared off limits. He is as guilty of greediness as those people that he has castigated for being greedy. Thus we see the satirist-persona undercut, and exposed as an extremely envious person who because he cannot take part in the gaining of wealth must stand at a distance and throw stones.

Lines 147-171 contain the final undercutting. What should logically be a climax turns out to be nothing more than anticlimax. Here the satirist-persona

11 Highet, 53.
moves on to a forecast of doom:

nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores, omne in praecipiti vitium stetit. utere velis totos pande sinus. (147-150)

Matters are not going to change in the future, even the grandchildren of the present generation will behave and act the same. All vice stands on the precipice. W.S. Anderson comments on this particular passage in a revealing manner:

It is only natural that, from such a strident outcry, he should immediately proceed to reaffirm his basic indignation. What is far from natural is the manner in which he does so. "Spread your sails," ..."spread them as wide as possible." Any Roman reader would have heard this trite metaphor hundreds of times a year; it crops up again and again in ironically self-conscious passages of Ovid.12

The satirist-persona himself has taken the punch out of his indignation by interjecting a trite statement. Instead of building to a climactic bang, he ends on an empty note, but this is intentional and part of Juvenal's undercutting. Also this empty note prepares us for the final letdown in the last two lines. Throughout lines 150-171, where indignation is supposed to have taken place, abnegation creeps in. Highet has a fine description of what takes place in these lines, which gives insight into the history of the

12 Anderson, 132.
technique that Juvenal is undercutting. Hightet comments on the interruption of the satire by a second character:

But suddenly here an objector appears. He is the imaginary opponent, descended from the interlocutor in Plato's dialogues. He is common in satire and in its ancestor the philosophical propaganda-speech; he is the opposite side of the dialectic; and usually in such a personal form of literature as satire, he is another aspect of the author's own self. Generally he is defeated and converted. Here, unusually, he wins. 13

This objector cautions the satirist-persona against writing scathing satire with the frankness of a Lucilius for the satirist-persona will certainly be punished if he dares to name names. Hightet believes it is unusual that the satirist-persona should back down from his main purpose: to write scathing satire. And in terms of the tradition of Lucilius, Horace, and Persius, it is unusual. But Hightet does not see that the satirist-persona is being satirized by Juvenal; thus the comment by Hightet about the last two lines is easily explained. "Here the satire closes, abruptly and unsatisfyingly." 14 Although Hightet has made good comments about the first level of meaning, he has totally missed the second level, and is left with a

13 Hightet, 54.

14 Hightet, 56.
feeling of dissatisfaction.

To return to the topic at hand, the satirist-persona relinquishes the anger and self-righteousness that have pushed him along throughout the satire. He backs out because he sees that he is putting his personal well-being on the firing line, and this is really not to his benefit. Thus the satirist-persona concludes with the observation:

...experiari quid concedatur in illos
quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina.

(170-171)

The satirist-persona has shown us that he is made primarily of bluff and bluster. What started out as an harangue to society has turned into nothing more than a cautious whisper. Thus the satirist-persona is satirized, and Juvenal has succeeded in creating an elaborate work of art.
Satire 7
Satire 7, like Satire 1, contains two levels of meaning. On the first level the satirist-persona portrays the literary and academic world existing within the mercenary culture of ancient Rome. The satirist-persona complains that poets, historians, lawyers, rhetoricians, and school teachers are all short of cash. This complaint gives impetus to the entire satire. On level one the chief purpose of Satire 7 is to prove that poets, historians, etc. need money. Gilbert Highet ably describes the first level of meaning.

The Seventh Satire,... is made up of a brief introduction and a detailed study of one particular social class. The opening passage praises the emperor as the only active patron of literature. The rest of the poem describes the hopeless depression and poverty into which literature and allied pursuits have sunk, an abyss from which only the monarch's powerful help can save them.\(^{15}\)

As Highet has noted the "opening passage praises the emperor as the only active patron of literature."\(^{16}\)

W.S. Anderson agrees with this point of view but carries it a degree further. Anderson suggests that

\(^{15}\) Highet, 106.

\(^{16}\) Highet, 270, n.1. He notes the dissenting opinion of A. Hartmann "in a closely argued paper Aufbau und Erfindung der siebentem Satire Juvenals (Basel, 1912). Hartmann points out that the satirist's job is not to describe happy futures but grim presents, and that the gloom of the main body of the poem is well summed up in line 1:"

the opening passage indicates a change from the indignant satirist of Satires 1-6 to the rational and hopeful satirist of Satires 7-16.17 Both Higet and Anderson interpret the first level of meaning with precision, but apparently neglect the second level of meaning.

The second level of meaning undercuts the meaning of level one. This undercutting, as in Satire 1, is again accomplished through anticlimax, repetition, and exaggeration. The final effect is satiric irony and absurdity. The second level brings out the ludicrous qualities of Satire 7. Satire 7 is a satiric monologue. The satirist-persona is a stand-up comic extolling the shortcomings and absurdities of the literary and academic society. In Juvenal's satires it is this tension between the literal level of meaning, level one, and the subversion of the literal level, level two, that brings about the creation of that unique and wonderful genre, Juvenalian satire. We must keep in mind at all times that Juvenal is engaged in the art of dissimulatio,18 so that reality can be

17 W.S. Anderson, "The Programs of Juvenal's Later Books," CP 57 (1962) 145-160. As will be shown Anderson is incorrect in this attitude.

distinguished from the satirist-persona's distorted view of reality. Thus in Satire 7, as in Satire 1, we have two levels of meaning: the first which adopts a serious tone and the semblance of harsh reality (poverty); and the second which undercuts the first, and shows the first level to be a distorted and absurd view of reality. Herein lies Juvenal's satiric genius.

Satire 7 is divided into four main sections: the poets, 1-97, the historians, 98-104, the lawyers, 105-149, and the rhetors and grammatici, 150-243. Each section functions on both levels of meaning. Section 1, lines 1-97, concern the poet's relation to his patron, which in almost all cases results in a continuing lack of cash. Section 1 can be further subdivided into lines 1-35, the introduction, lines 36-52, examples of the plight of the poet, and lines 53-97, further examples of the plight of the poet.

On the first level of meaning lines 1-35 begin with a statement which seems to be hopeful and bodes well for the future.

Et spes et ratio studiorum in Caesare tantum; solus enim tristes hac tempestate Camenas respexit, (1-3).

Only Caesar has taken pity on the sorry condition of the learned. Studiorum probably refers to both the

---

19 W.S. Anderson, "The Programs of Juvenal's Later Books," CP 57 (1962) 145-160. This work will be referred to in the footnotes as "Anderson: Programs."
literary and academic people described in the satire, and in this way provides a semblance of unity to the entire poem. Before we move any farther into the explication of Satire 7, it is necessary to address two important questions which affect the interpretation and will aid in the delineation of two levels of meaning: 1) when was the satire written? and 2) to which emperor, Domitian or Hadrian, does the first line refer? The answer to the first question affects the outcome of the second. If we accept the chronology of the Satires as we now have them,20 there is really no reason to assume that Satire 7 was not written soon after Hadrian arrived from the East in August 118 A.D.21 The question, to whom does the first line refer, has caused great consternation, because classical scholars have only examined line 1 on the literal and historical level. As I have mentioned, Satire 7 was probably published in 118, and thus refers obliquely to Hadrian's accession to the throne, but line 1 also works on the figurative

20 Hight, 14. Hight says, "...we can place the publication of Book III between the autumn of 118, when Hadrian arrived in Rome for the first time as emperor and set about winning popularity by many grand generous gestures, and the year 121, when he left for a long tour of inspection in the provinces."

21 Duff, xvii.
level and thus refers to Caesar as a category rather than any emperor in particular, so that the question of whether the emperor was Hadrian or Domitian is not vital to a study of the satire. Caesar is a patron, the learned are clients, and they have the same interests: money. Thus from the very first line, we can see that Juvenal once again will discuss the patron-client relationship, but in this instance, in order to give it greater scope and grandeur, dresses it as the Caesar-learned relationship. Satire 7 thus represents a new twist on an old theme, and as we shall see the client's condition is as pitiable as ever.

Continuing with the interpretation of level one, lines 3-16 provide a list of professions that poets have thought of taking up to supplement their income in the future. The implication here is that poets do not have to go on doing these things, since Caesar has provided hope. Yet where are the effects of Caesar's hope, the satirist-persona does not list them, but chooses to enumerate the undesirable and sordid professions poets thought of taking up. We might assume that the emperor has attached these poets to himself, and is providing them with patronage as we are led to believe, nemo tamen studiis indignum ferre laborem / cogetur posthaec (1. 17-18). But how could the emperor give all poets patronage in Rome? Also in lines 22-26
si qua aliunde putas rerum expectanda tuarum praesidia atque ideo croceae membrana tabellae impletur, lignorum aliquid posce oculis et quae componis dona Veneris, Telesine, marito, aut clude et positos tinea pertunde libellos.

We see that there is no hope except in the emperor, but how is the emperor expected to support all the poets? The emperor cannot support all the poets, and we learn this in line 30, *spes nulla ulterior*; J.D. Duff handles the problem well when he says that although the emperor is a patron of the arts, one swallow does not make a summer.\(^{22}\) Lines 1–16 appear as a hopeful statement of the emperor's patronage of literature, but in the lines that follow this initial hope is undercut, and the despair and misery which actually exist are revealed.

On the first level of interpretation lines 17–35 further elaborate the poet's relation to his one and only satisfactory patron, the Emperor, and introduce the subject of other patrons. Lines 17–21, as in lines 1–3, present the appearance of an extremely hopeful statement.

\[\text{nemo tamen studiis indignum ferre laborem cogetur posthac, nectit quicumque canoris eloquium vocale modis laurumque momordit. hoc agite, o iuvenes. circumpicit et stimulat vos materiamque sibi ducis indulgentia quaeerit.}\]

Helmbold and O'Neill believe that the language of these verses show a derogatory intention.\(^{23}\) They contend that

---

\(^{22}\) Duff, 260.

circumspicit means "be on the lookout," and that stimulat is an unusually strong word. Anderson refutes the arguments of Helmbold and O'Neill by demonstrating that lines 20-21 are conventional lines, being the type of verse an imperial poet of Juvenal's time would address to an emperor. Helmbold and O'Neill are correct in their assumption that lines 17-21 are something besides a glorification of the new era that the emperor is about to usher in, although "derogatory intention" is an unhappy use of words. Anderson is probably precise when he says that the lines are a conventional use of words. What is overlooked is that satire arises from the conventional use of words in a new and different manner. On the surface lines 17-21 appear as conventional and laudatory. Anderson says of lines 17-18:

...the satirist does not here speak with anger, for he describes with pleasure the end of an evil situation: no longer need the writer endure his plight. Caesar will be a patron of the arts, in sharp contrast to the Roman nobility who have long neglected all branches of literature.

But if we observe them in the context of the poem they become satiric. nemo tamen studiis indignum ferre

24 Anderson: Programs, 158, n.17.

laborem / cogetur posthac is an exaggeration of extraordinary magnitude. Also line 21, materiamque sibi ducis indulgentia quaerit, should make us wonder what is the real intention of the emperor in ushering in a new era of spes et ratio. It is not for the good of the poor poets, or for the cultural wealth of Rome, but for his own indulgence. Thus we can see how the spes et ratio of the first level of meaning is undercut by the reality of the second level.

On the first level of meaning lines 22-29 represent the alternatives to indulgentia. These are the things a poet can do if he seeks patronage from any other place but the emperor. The outlook is especially bleak. Anderson believes that lines 24-27

...lignorum aliquid posce oius et quae componis doma Veneris, Telesine, marito, aut clude et positos tinea pertunde libellos. frange miser calamum vigilataque proelia dele,

refer to other poets, lyric, elegiac, and epic; and that the satirist-persona is indirectly saying that he has given up hope. Anderson assumes that these lines and the lines that follow engage in recusatio26 and points to lines 20-21 as the call to epic:

26 Anderson: Programs, 154. "In the standard recusatio the writer of a nonepic form contemplates the possibility of producing an epic in honor of the emperor, then reluctantly abandons the idea, all too aware of his inadequacy."
Youth must produce epic; the older writers will plod along in their familiar ways, the satirist still composing satires, except that now his theme will be *spea et ratio*, the motto of the new Caesar's reign. The satirist does not specify the subjects of the Caesarian epic, but reference to *ducis*, the strong word stimulat and the later comment on *vigilata proelia* (27) probably point to a martial topic.

Anderson interprets the entire passage on the first level of meaning. He fails to understand the despair and resignation of the satirist-persona. While it is possible that the introduction might be a *recusatio*, it is something more. What we really find is that there is no hope of any kind of patronage, as we were led to believe in lines 1-3 and lines 17-21. On the second level of meaning lines 22-29 show that the ideal of the poet is shattered. Those poets who create sublime songs in their shabby apartments in the hope of being worthy of a bust of themselves wreathed with ivy actually have no hope. The satirist-persona urges them to give up in lines 24-27. The satirist-persona

---

27 Anderson: Programs, 154.

28 Anderson: Programs, 154. Anderson takes note of the satirist-persona's suffering. "He has long watched the neglect of the arts, presumably suffered with other poets the insults of the nobility, and now feels like the wretched writers he describes:"
reinforces again the despair of the situation in line 30, *spes nulla ulterior*. The entire satire has already indicated that there is not a hopeful or rational condition prevailing, but in line 30 we find out that there is no hope even beyond that.

On the second level of meaning in lines 30-35 the satirist-persona provides a less bitter and more introspective attitude. In a sad and resigned manner he says, "the greedy patron only admires and praises the eloquent, he does not pay out any money. And while I have been waiting for the favors of a patron, my life has ebbed away, a life that might have endured the sea, the army or farming. My old age curses itself and the Muse, the Muse which afflicted me with a desire to write poetry and so caused me to come to the end of my life penniless." Thus in lines 1-35 a picture of despair predominates, the will to fight is gone. There is no hope, but only the shell of a man once bitten by the desire to create, and now cursing that desire. Lines 30-35 might possibly stand as an anti-climax to the introduction of Satire 7. What began in the opening lines on what appeared to be a note of hope has plummeted into the depths of despair and old age. The sad and introspective is unexpected and in that respect is anticlimactic. Thus in the introduction we have encountered the use of undercutting, repetition,
and anticlimax. These elements will appear throughout Satire 7 as they did throughout Satire 1.

Lines 1-35 have exhibited two levels of meaning: the first level displaying apparent hope for a new and better period of imperial patronage, and the second level subverting the first by showing that there is no cause for hope, but only a stagnant misery. In lines 36-243 the misery of all the learned is an accepted fact, and in that respect becomes the narrative or first level of meaning. Thus the second level of meaning becomes the undercutting of the miserable condition of poets. Juvenal engages in an extremely complex satire, for first he ridicules hope then he ridicules despair.

On the first level of meaning lines 36-52 reiterate essentially the main ideas of lines 1-35. Lines 36-48 provide a closer view of the patron-client relationship, and the mistreatment of the client. The patron is not concerned with the poetic efforts of others, but only with his own; in this respect the patron's concern with himself mirrors the emperor seeking material for his own indulgence. The patron is arrogant, self-centered, and miserly. Now we can see more clearly that the obstacles that stand in the way of the poet are great. And the barriers are magnified since a poet cannot expect anything more than token help from a man of wealth.
Lines 48-52 echo the note of despair in lines 30-35. Yet in these lines the satirist-persona displays the last degree of resignation. He is entirely passive, et aegro in corde senescit, whereas in lines 34-35, tune sequae suamque / Terpsichoren odit facunda et nuda senectus the passion of hate could still flare up. The picture is a dismal one, but possibly the real culprit of lines 1-97 emerges, cacoethes. On the second level of meaning the desire to write underlies the satirist-persona's misery. The desire to write has caused the satirist-persona's poverty. The fact that he was unable to obtain any money was entirely sociological, a fact that he did not have any control over. The affliction of the Muse, the insatiable desire to create, that is the cause of all the misery. But the satirist-persona only hints that cacoethes has anything to do with his misery. He would have us believe that his lack of cash is the one and only cause of his misery.

On the first level of meaning lines 53-97 give specific examples of the terrible treatment that poets receive. Lines 53-65 provide us with a sketch of the vates egregius and on the surface proves that creation of art only takes place when the stomach is full. On the second level of meaning we can see that this is an absurd point, but the apparent seriousness of the satirist-persona, on the first level, tends to mislead the reader. In lines 53-65 undercutting is again an
important element. The satirist-persona undercuts his portrayal of an excellent, ideal poet, when he says:

qualem nequeo monstrare et sentio tantum (l. 56).

This statement placed directly in the middle of a description of an ideal poet does not ring true. The vates that the satirist-persona describes is unreal, a poet that could approximate the satirist-persona's description would be a god. The satirist-persona purposely overstates his point, in order to create an absurd situation. The satirist-persona continues the absurd in lines 59-62 by personifying Poverty and implying that the creative process is a direct result of the fullness of the belly.

neque enim cantare sub antro
Pierio thyrsumque potest contingere maesta paupertas atque aeris inops, quo nocte dieque corpus eget: satur est cum dicit Horatius 'euhoe.'

(59-62)

In lines 63-65 the satirist-persona moves back again to an ideal description of what the creative process is. Again we must wonder if we are to take the statement as serious. The satirist-persona now begins, on the first level of meaning, to give concrete examples of what poets have to do, if and when they are short of cash. These examples occur through lines 66-97.

On the first level of meaning lines 66-71 insinuate that Vergil would have been unable to write the Aeneid, if he had no slave, or shelter, or enough money to live
comfortably.\textsuperscript{29} In lines 71-73 we meet Rubrenus Lappa who had to pawn his Atreus for bits of furniture and clothes. Lines 74-78 discuss Numitor and his pet lion. A pet lion costs less to maintain than a poet, because the lion's belly is not as big as the poet's. Lines 79-81 tell us Lucan is content with glory, but what about the starving Serranus and Saleius? Lines 82-87 indicate that even a popular writer like Statius would starve if he did not sell his plays. Lines 88-92 show the power of the actor, Paris, and imply that the period the satirist-persona is characterizing was decadent. Where else but in a corrupt and depraved society could an actor rise to such power? On the second level of meaning lines 82-92 suggest that the emperor does not support literature that does not suit his own tastes. This again refers us to line 21, and further indicates that the situation being discussed can only be thought of in general terms, without reference to a particular emperor. In lines 93-97 the satirist-persona suggests that the days of Maecenas were better,

\textsuperscript{29} Highet, 270, n.1. "Stegemann [W. Stegemann, De Juvenalis dispositione (Weyda, 1913)] 66-71 has a good analysis, pointing out that Juvenal begins by describing 'inactive' litterateurs like poets and historians, and goes on to the lives of more energetic people like lawyers and teachers. Stegemann also shows that, as we approach the end of the satire, the work of each class described grows harder, their dignity smaller, and their pay more miserable."
and indeed they were. But lines 96-97, on the second level of meaning, undercut the opening lines of the passage concerned with \textit{vates egregius} (53-65).

\begin{quote}
tunc par ingenio pretium, tunc utile multis pallere et vinum toto nescire Decembri. (96-97)
\end{quote}

These lines contradict what the satirist-persona said earlier about the ideal poet; the ideal poet was a man of leisure, tranquillity and a full belly. Now we see what was really a real poet. Talent received as much as it was worth, and poets would put up with hardship, even during the Saturnalia, in order to finish and produce their works of art.

Thus in lines 1-97, on the first level of meaning, the satirist-persona demonstrates the plight of the poet. We see that the problems of poets arise from the fact that they have no cash, and that the conditions of the times are desperate. Satire is generated through repetition of the same ideas in different circumstances; i.e. the satirist-persona never becomes tired of reminding us that poets are always short of cash. Satire is also generated through anticlimax, where we expect some amazing conclusion to take place none does. We also experience satire through undercutting where an exaggerated description of an ideal (a hopeful age of patronage or the ideal poet) is punctured or overturned through contrast and contradiction.

On the first level of meaning lines 98-104 briefly
introduce to us the plight of the historian. The plight of the historian is approximately the same as the poet’s. There are no rewards for the historian, even though he works hard at his labors. Line 103, quae tamen inde seges? terrae quis fructus apertae? echoes lines 48-49, nos tamen hoc agimus tenuique in pulvere sulcos / ducimus et litus sterili versamus aratro. Both the poet and the historian have something in common, there work does not bear fruit in this day and age. On the second level of meaning the irony of the situation pushes through. Both the poet and historian expend huge amounts of energy in their literary pursuits, yet it is the same as ploughing up a sterile field. It is ironic that although they understand the apparent fruitlessness of their labors, they continue anyway.

On the first level of meaning lines 105-149 relate the condition of the lawyers which is not any better than the poets or historians. The lawyers need money not only to live on, but money so that they can appear affluent in order to gain more clients. Lines 105-123 portray the lawyer who works extremely hard and receives very little for his labors. In lines 117-123 some of the rewards are described.

...rumpe miser tensum iecur, ut tibi lasso figantur virides, scalarum gloria, palmae. quod vocis pretium? siccus petasunculus et vas pelamydum aut veteres, Maurorum epimenia, bulbi aut vinum Tiberi de vectum, quince lagonae. si quater egisti, si contigit aures unus, inde cadunt partes ex foedere pragmaticorum.
Aemilius on the other hand receives the full legal fee, although he did not plead as well as the poor lawyer. This occurs because Aemilius keeps up appearances, he has two statues, one a bronze chariot with four beautiful horses, and the other a statue of himself, seated on a fierce steed, ready for battle (124-128). Lines 129-133 draw a picture of extreme degeneracy. Men have lost all they own because they have tried to keep up appearances. Hypocrisy is the order of the day, it is a rule by which men live their lives.

spondet enim Tyrrio stlattaria purpura filo,
[et tamen est illis hoc utile. purpura vendit]
causidicum vendunt amethystina; convenit illi et strepitu et facie maioris vivere census,
sed finem inpensae non servat prodiga Roma. (134-138)

Lines 139-149 echo and repeat the hypocrisy and degeneracy of lawyers in lines 106-138. Through repetition of the same motifs the satirist-persona reinforces his miserable picture of Roman society. Unless Cicero wears a huge ring on this finger, no one in this day and age would give Cicero 200 pennies. A man who needs a lawyer asks first how many slaves and retainers does he have. A man in Rome cannot make a living through his oratory, but must first have the appearance of wealth, so that other people will recognize and admire him. At Rome the world is in flux. A man must go to Gaul or Africa, if he is to make money through oratory. In lines 105-149 the satirist-persona tells us that appearance is king. It does not matter what
a man does or says but only what he wears. Morality has been overturned. The appearance of a man is glorified, and the man of real integrity, although shabbily dressed, is overlooked. The situation, although it contains elements of truth, is absurd. Here we move to the second level of meaning. Once again the satirist-persona produces satiric irony through an exaggeration of the truth. It may have been true that hypocrisy and degeneracy were rife in Rome in the 1st century A.D., but is it possible to assume that the appearance of an individual supplanted the true worth of an individual in Roman morality?  
Thus the satirist-persona takes a bad situation and makes it worse, achieving in the final analysis satire.

On the first level of meaning lines 150-243 concern the miserable condition of the rhetors and grammatici who work very hard, but receive little remuneration. In lines 150-177 the satirist-persona introduces the rhetors who day by day have to listen to the same rhetorical exercises and in return receive little for their labors. The fees that a rhetor receives are so low that there is no reason to continue in that profession. The

poets, historians, and lawyers have been wiped out through lack of funds and now the rhetors join them. We might say that Rome is a cultural disaster area. On the second level of meaning the satirist-persona continues to exaggerate the picture of despair, and in doing so undercuts the serious intent of level one. The satirist-persona portrays the rhetor's job as some grave undertaking which demands a steadfast heart in order to listen to the monotonous lessons of his pupils. The satirist-persona overstates his point in a grand and tragic manner.

declamare doces? o ferrea pectora Vetti, cum perimit saevos classis numerosa tyrannos. nam quaecumque sedens modo legerat, haec eadem stans perferet atque eadem cantabit versibus isdem. occidit miseros crambe repetita magistros. (150-154)

The opening address o ferrea pectora Vetti brings to mind the Aeneid and the many grand addresses of Vergil, e.g. o lux Dardaniae, spes o fidissima Teucrum. The feeling of the satirist-persona's line is epic. Yet nothing notable or grand gives the rhetor misery except crambe repetita. The satirist-persona subtly colors the miserable condition of the rhetor so that we are pulled into the distorted reality of the first level. But in order to fully grasp the satiric technique we must examine exaggeration on the second level of meaning.

On the first level of meaning lines 178-214 depict how the values of society have become inverted, and how
Fortuna mirrors the injustice of society. As in lines 105-149 those that are the least worthy to be rewarded, are rewarded, and those that have good qualities are downtrodden. Lines 178-198 indicate two interesting points which add to the picture of degeneracy and despair in Satire 7. First, the wealthy lord has lost all sense of the value of things. He spends huge amounts on baths, a colonnade, and banquets, yet for the education of his son he puts out a meagre sum. We can see that the man's material possessions have become even more important than his own son. Society in Rome has lost all sense of values. Society is truly degenerate. Second, Fortuna controls the destiny of man from the very minute he is born. It matters not whether a man is bad or good, but only under what star he was born.

si Fortuna volet, fies de rhetore consul;
si volet haec eadem, fiet de consule rhetor.  
(197-198)

Man has absolutely no control over his destiny, everything is ruled by chance. The condition of man is miserable, for not only does he live in a degenerate world, but he does not have the power within himself to change it. Lines 178-198 work on the second level of meaning in that the reversal of morality in society is a continuance of that clever rhetorical argument that we have seen in Satire 1, lines 87-126, where the traditional values are overturned, and Pecunia stands in their place;
and in Satire 7, lines 105-149 where appearance was king. The satirist-persona provides elaborate arguments to build cases that are exaggerated, absurd, and yet contain an element of truth which makes us want to believe him.

In lines 199-202 the satirist-persona gives examples of people that were fortunate, but in the process even undercuts the fortunate: *felix ille tamen corvo quoque rario albo*. A fortunate man is so rare as to be non-existent. And if the fortunate man is non-existent the satirist-persona's previous arguments about Fortuna collapses. Everyone becomes a part of the miserable condition of society. From lines 203-214 the satirist-persona moves back to a discussion of rhetors, showing how unfortunate a task it has become. He reminds us that the place of the teacher is that of a revered parent, as the relationship between Achilles and Chiron indicates. But in this day and age teachers are so despised by their pupils they are beaten.

Lines 215-243 concern the *grammatici*, and their financial plight. The *grammatici* receive even a smaller fee than the rhetors. The elementary school teacher must endure terrible hardship, and be able to answer any question a parent might ask at any time. You parents, he say:

```
   exigite ut mores teneros ceu pollice ducat,
   ut si quis cera voltum facit; exigite ut sit
   et pater ipsius coetus, ne turpia ludant,
   ne faciant vicibus. (237-240)
```
The function of the grammaticus has so deteriorated that not only must he mold minds and characters, but he must watch so that the boys do not masturbate in class, *observare manus oculosque in fine trementis* (241). For all his services he receives a gold coin. The condition of the grammaticus is truly miserable. On the second level of meaning we encounter once again exaggeration and repetition of the same old argument, the need for cash. Hight has an interesting note to his book *Juvenal The Satirist* which points at the second level of meaning, and indicates that the satire is ended in a characteristically Juvenalian manner, anticlimax.

I have sometimes wondered whether a few lines were not missing from the end: something to round off the poem as powerfully as 5. 170-3 or 6. 655-61; but the explanation is probably that this satire was meant to end on an anticlimax, fading away into squalor like 8 and 9.31

Thus concludes Satire 7. Two levels of meaning have provided the distance and tension that is needed for great satire. And Juvenal in his inimitable fashion has provided the material.

31 Hight, 270, n.l.
CONCLUSION
In Satires 1 and 7 Juvenal has employed the same techniques; i.e. the double level of meaning, undercutting, repetition, exaggeration, epic parody, and anticlimax. Juvenal has also employed similar subject matter in these two satires; i.e. the patron-client relationship, morality in a topsy-turvy condition, and poverty which is the result of an avaricious society. Through the similarities in Satires 1 and 7, I have hoped to suggest that a fixed dichotomy between Satires 1-6 and Satires 7-16 cannot be maintained. Juvenal has not changed in his approach to satire, as Anderson might lead us to believe. The satirist-persona has not changed from the indignant satirist of the earlier satires to the rational and hopeful satirist of the later satires. Anderson may be correct in saying that the indignant satirist is gone, but he has not changed into a rational and hopeful satirist.

Thus through a comparison and analysis of Satires 1 and 7, I have hoped to define some of the properties of Juvenalian technique in order to reveal the man behind the mask of the satirist-persona: Juvenal, and show the way he works.

32 Anderson: Programs, 145-160.
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