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INTRODUCTION

Juvenal is one of those monumental figures in literature who has captured the tenor of his time as well as the nature of humanity. He makes us laugh, weep, and sometimes shudder. He is more than just a satirist; he is a poet and philosopher. In light of this, we, as critics, must allow Juvenal a certain latitude in which to work. We should not criticize him too quickly, for what might appear to be a glaring inconsistency to the critic is merely a function of Juvenal's artistic control and his ability to create satire and humor from absurd situations.¹ If we assume that Juvenal was aware of what he was doing in creating his satires, many new avenues of criticism open up. However, if we assume that Juvenal was basically a misanthrope, many seeds that are capable

of bearing fruit wither and die. In order to explore the possibilities of criticism which arise in the satires, I will assume that Juvenal was an artist in control of his medium. Statements which show indignation, i.e. statements which are scathing, perverse, gross, cruel, outrageous, and generally unbecoming are the comments and opinions of his speaker, the narrator, or as I choose to call him, Juvenal's satiric persona. In other words, indignation is a function of his artistic control and an attitude that he has adopted to achieve satire. Juvenal, through his persona, is able to say one thing and mean another. Juvenalian scholars have long been misled by the persona's straightforward righteous indignation (cf. Sat. 1.79), but this is only an attitude which Juvenal adopts. In order to understand Juvenal's use of this ironic attitude, we must explore the meaning of the term irony. Northrop Frye points the way in his Anatomy of Criticism.

The term irony...indicates a technique of appearing to be less than one is, which in literature becomes most commonly a technique of saying as little and meaning as much as possible, or in a more general way, a pattern of words that turns

---

2 G. Highet, "Masks and Faces in Satire," Hermes 102 (1974), 321-337, believes that writing is a reflection of an author's personality, which indeed it may be. But Highet accepts the statements of Juvenal's satires as autobiographical reflections of the author's character. Highet would have us believe that Juvenal used his writing as an outlet for his own failures and shortcomings, but there is really no hard evidence to justify this assumption.
away from direct statement or its own obvious meaning.³

I would agree with Frye's definition, but would expand it to read: "The term irony indicates a technique of appearing to be either more or less than one is." In other words, irony is saying one thing and meaning another. This may be accomplished by diminishing or magnifying the speaker's words. In Juvenalian satire the persona is always trying to appear greater than he really is. This attempt at enlargement results in irony. In order to understand this unique function of satire and irony, we must perceive the satiric persona of the author in certain cases. Thus, I intend to use the concept of the satiric persona to explore more fully the satire of Juvenal. The satiric persona enables us to be more objective by creating an artificial dichotomy between the author of satire and the author's satiric persona.⁴ Through this dichotomy I would hope to investigate the nature of satire in Juvenal's Fifth Book. But, before I embark upon this task, it is necessary to define the meaning of satiric persona in its relationship to Juvenal's Satires, because

there is a great amount of scholarly controversy sur-
rounding this concept.  Leonard Feinberg comments.

If there were agreement among scholars as to precisely what the persona of a satirist is, the chances of holding a useful discussion would be improved. But inasmuch as both the nature of the persona and the technique of presenting it seem to mean different things to different critics, it is hard to find a common ground for conducting a dialogue.

Feinberg suggests that "the dispute about the satirist's persona can be examined more closely in its extreme forms." One extreme form states that the narrator, speaker, satirist, and author are one and the same. They cannot be easily separated.

Donald Hume takes this position when he goes so far as to say, "My theme is that this man, whom we feel that we know, is a real and living presence in his works, and that his presence in them is what makes them interesting and good."

---

5 "The Concept of the Persona in Satire: A Symposium," Satire Newsletter Vol. 3, No. 2, Spring (1966), 89-159, brings forth various scholarly opinions about what the nature of the satiric persona is; see note 2 above.

6 Feinberg, 109.

7 Feinberg, 109.

8 Feinberg, 109.
The other extreme concept of the satiric persona states that the satirist and his persona are distinct from each other. Maynard Mack, in his article "The Muse of Satire", introduces the dichotomy between the author of satire and his dramatic persona.

My illustrations will be drawn from Pope, especially from his formal satires, such as the "Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot"; and my thesis will be that even in these apparently very personal poems we overlook what is most essential between the historical Alexander Pope and the dramatic Alexander Pope who speaks them.9

There are objections to both hypotheses.

If knowledge of the author's personal beliefs were a prerequisite to appreciating satire, readers would be unable to understand anonymous or pseudonymous satire, such as Gulliver's Travels when it first appeared, or modern satires of communism by "Abraham Tertz," or unsigned satiric pieces. Readers today who know nothing about the authors could not expect to enjoy the satire of Juvenal and Rabelais and Cervantes.10


10 Feinberg, 109-110.
There are also strong objections to the dichotomy between the satirist and persona, for it is impossible to separate the persona from his creator or author.

...the result of the persona's actions and statements is always an attack on what the satirist himself wants attacked and a defense of what the satirist himself wants defended. After all the personae of Swift and Horace and Juvenal and Voltaire and Thackeray do express, in various ways, the same criticism of society which each of these satirists wanted to express. The content of satire is historically identifiable material ——specific individuals, institutions, issues—and it is remarkable how often the effect of the persona's behavior supports the satirist's own position. [11]

The two extreme concepts of the satiric persona appear irreconcilable and inflexible. At the present moment this is where the controversy lies. A reasonable solution is needed. On the one hand we have the believers in the absoluteness of the persona, and on the other we have the believers in the absoluteness of the author. What is overlooked is that the concept of the persona or the author is not an absolute. It is not the job of the critic to impose systems upon the creative work of any writer, but to react to each different work. The concept of the persona enables one to plumb the deeper meanings of literary art, but must be used with caution and respect lest it turn into

the monster of faulty criticism. W.S. Anderson comments on why the persona is a necessary literary critical device, especially in relation to Juvenalian studies.

...the salutary theory of persona has come into existence to deny the overriding value of biographical reading and to direct readers towards the essential heart of all literature: its attempt to interpret reality as acutely as a sensitive intellect and soul can possibly do....

In my own treatment of Roman satire, I have been attempting particularly to grasp the art of Juvenal as accurately as possible. Juvenalian criticism is bedeviled by biographical theories, which start by creating a hypothetical Juvenal, then discussing the Satires in terms of that hypothesis. Thus, Juvenal's anger is a projection of his disoriented state which we must believe has arisen from political, social, economic, and sexual failure. I claim that such interpretation distorts the poetic achievement and intention of Juvenal. In fact, we have no really valid evidence for Juvenal's biography and personality apart from the Satires which we are trying to elucidate. To clear the ground so that we can recognize the art of the poet it is highly convenient to talk of the persona.... It is even strategic to deny that Juvenal is angry at all and claim that it is his "satiric" who rants and raves through the early Satires. I believe that by pressing this argument, one is more likely to enhance an accurate reading of the Satires than to distort the truth. Juvenal may or may not have been outraged with the situation of Rome in his day; in any case, though, he was under complete artistic control, not wildly indignant when he put together his incomparable pictures, masterpieces of rhetoric, detail, and frequently wit, by which he represented decadent Rome. Inasmuch as the concern with Juvenal's personality has led to such incompetent reading of his Satires, a swing in the other direction is highly salutary.
Yet I believe that the Satires do spring, in some inexplicable way, from Juvenal's personality, and I am confident that he does communicate through them a tolerable interpretation of reality.  

Even though Anderson uses the technique of the persona, he still feels that the Satires "do spring, in some inexplicable way, from Juvenal's personality." I believe that this is a sensible approach to satire as well as to the Satires of Juvenal. The concept of the persona can be used, but when it gets in the way of one's understanding of the creative work, it loses its value and must be discarded. The concept of the persona helps to explicate the artistic work, but it does not help us analyze the inner workings of the poet's personality.

J.P. Sullivan, like Anderson, also believes that the theory of the persona can have a salutary effect on the study of ancient literature. Indeed, he points out that the idea of the persona was a part of ancient literary theory.

The notion of the persona was familiar to ancient (sc. literary) theory. At its lowest level, it was a matter of projecting a literary personality. Horace, we are told by Suetonius, was in private life a fat, choleric person—his literary person, as we are constantly reminded by our histories of ancient literature, was candor with a twinkle in

the eye (ridentem dicere verum); Persius was a shy recluse, but the personality in his satires is nothing so consistent, moving as it does between an elaborate earnestness (Sat. 5) and an ironic knowingness (Sat. 1). Juvenal is more consistent, although the consistency is a function of his style, not his personality. His programmatic facit indignatio versum gives full license to the highly rhetorical and pungent language which makes him so quoted an author. One doubts if real indignation would have time for the art he lavishes on each paragraph.13

Both Anderson and Sullivan rightly believe that Juvenal works through a persona. What they do not mention is that Juvenal has several different personae. Through the first six Satires Juvenal's persona remains fairly consistent,14 but as we move into the later satires, Juvenal begins to vary the nature of his speaker. Some critics have thought that this was a function of Juvenal's increasing age,15 but I believe that it was a function of Juvenal's varied artistic control and technique.


14 W.S. Anderson, (see n.1 above), shows the consistency of the persona in Satires 1-6.

I hope to show that Satires 13, 14, 15, and 16 exhibit two different uses of the persona. In Satire 13 Juvenal uses an ironic persona who satirizes and deflates the indignation of Calvinus. M.P.O. Morford makes an interesting comment concerning Juvenal's use of a persona in Satire 13.

Juvenal himself, now preferring irony to indignatio, remains concealed behind the satirist's persona, yet his view of the satirist's role as critic of human weakness is still made clear if we do not allow ourselves to be taken in by the superficial attraction of his commonplace moralizing.

In Satire 14 Juvenal creates a persona who as a moral reformer complains about the vice and avarice in Roman society; however, not only are the flaws of society elucidated, but also the flaws of the persona whom Juvenal satirizes by drawing him as outraged, zealous, and narrow-minded. In Satire 15 Juvenal uses the same type of persona as in Satire 14, but now the persona's indignation is turned against the Egyptians. Here again, the persona is satirized.

---

17 Morford, 36.
In Satire 16 Juvenal creates an ironic persona who exposes the excesses of the army through mock-praise.\textsuperscript{18}

In short, Juvenal uses two types of personae in Book 5: 1) the ironic personae of Satires 13 and 16, and 2) the overly indignant personae of Satires 14 and 15. Recognizing the use of this artistic technique and literary device enables us to separate the historical Juvenal, the author, from the dramatic or rhetorical Juvenal, the persona.\textsuperscript{19} This is an important distinction if we are to understand the Satires of Juvenal more fully.

\textsuperscript{18} Duff, 449.

\textsuperscript{19} see n. 10 above.
SATIRE THIRTEEN

Satire 13 is a parody of a consolatio. The framework of this satire is the consolatio within which Juvenal's persona ironically treats Calvinus' loss, while exposing the obvious moral turpitude and lack of moral standards in Roman society.

The structural techniques Juvenal employs in Satire 13 are those of repetition and false syllogism in which exempla accumulate toward what would seem to be an obvious conclusion; but the obvious conclusion never comes. For example, in Satire 1 exempla are piled up in order to prove that Roman society needs to be severely criticized so that its decadent ways can be reformed. Yet, this is not what happens. At the last moment (Sat. 1.170-171) Juvenal's persona changes his mind and decides to criticize those individuals long dead. In Satire 13, as well as in the

---

remainder of Book 5, Juvenal's use of false syllogism causes the exempla to appear unrelated. If he presents five exempla, A, B, C, D, and E, A is related to B, B is related to C, C is related to D, etc. The confusion occurs when A bears no apparent relationship to D. But Juvenal's satiric pathways do not admit the strictly logical. His purpose is to make each scene vivid and have a relationship to the immediately previous scene, but not necessarily related to a scene which occurred fifty lines before.

In the introduction to Satire 13, he establishes several major points and then repeatedly expounds on them. Lines 1-22 set up the argument of the consolatio: 1) an evil deed causes the doer to be troubled by his conscience, 2) Calvinus' loss is small, 3) Calvinus' misfortune is trivial, 4) his philosophy and experience should have trained him for such a mishap, and 5) in Roman society a man should not expect otherwise, for Roman society is corrupt. Lines 23-70 proceed to examples of how corrupt Roman society is. Lines 71-173 illustrate the lack of moral character in Rome, and Calvinus' own inherent greed and pettiness. Lines 174-249 are the culmination and conclusion to the false consolation. Through these repeated

---

2 Fredericks, 221.
exempla, the vengeance of Calvinus is satirized, and his pettiness and greed ridiculed. But these lines are really nothing more than what was expressed in the opening lines 1-22. Thus, repetition is one of the keys to an understanding of Juvenalian structure. False syllogism is the other. Through false logic Juvenal can arrive at conclusions that are absurd, bombastic, and anticlimactic. In this way he achieves his goal, satire. The artist is in complete control. As we shall see, this type of structure is used in Satires 14, 15, and 16.

In lines 1-18 Juvenal's persona offers several arguments which will console Calvinus. Lines 1-4 suggest that a man who commits a crime will be sufficiently punished by his conscience. Lines 5-10 attempt to console Calvinus, but are more inflammatory than consolatory. The persona suggests that 1) Calvinus can easily afford the loss, and 2) his misfortune is not a rare case, but a common one. Juvenal's persona seems to be aggravating rather than alleviating the situation. In this way Satire 13 becomes a parody of a consolatio, and Calvinus the butt of satire. 3

Lines 11-18 reinforce what has already been pointed out. The persona tells Calvinus to put off undue complaints. Calvinus is angry, because a friend has betrayed a sacred

3 Morford, 26.
trust. But the persona insists that Calvinus, a man of sixty years' experience, should have known better. In fact, Juvenal's persona seems to be saying: "Stop your whining, Calvinus, you knew the risks. Now you must endure the consequences."

Lines 19-22 point out two ways in which a man can learn to endure "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune". The first is through philosophy, the conqueror of fortune; the second is through experience, learning to endure the hardships of life. Calvinus must learn to be wise. This wisdom is gained through everyday experiences.

quae tam festa dies, ut cesset prodere furem, perfidiam, fraudes atque omni ex crimine lucrum quaesitum et partos gladio vel pyxide nummos? (23-25)

Theft, fraud, treachery, and crime are common occurrences. This rhetorical question is the persona's introduction to an elaboration on the depravity of the age. Lines 26-33 present a short description.

rari quippe boni, numera, vix sunt totidem quot Thebarum portae vel divitis ostia Nili. nona aetas agitur peioraque saecula ferri temporibus, quorum sceleri non invent ipsa nomen et a nullo posuit natura metallo. nos hominum divomque fidem clamore ciemus quanto Faesidium laudat vocalis agentem sportula?

In this day and age good men are rare. The world is so base and corrupt that nature has not found an appropriate name for an age of such crime and wickedness. Men summon the loyalty of gods and men with a shout as great as a client praises his patron who is pleading a case. Juvenal’s persona implies that Calvinus cannot expect to have the trust of a man at such a time of wickedness. In lines 33-37 the persona attacks the naivete of Calvinus.

Calvinus may indeed be naive to believe that there is some degree of goodness in the world; but we learn more about the character of Juvenal’s persona than we do about Calvinus. The persona has a cynical and jaded opinion of society. He can see no good in the world. Thus he criticizes Calvinus for being naive. What Juvenal seems to be portraying in Satire 13 is two extreme attitudes, the naive and the cynical. Juvenal allows the distance and tension between the naive and the cynical to achieve the desired

---

5 Juvenal uses a similar technique in Satire 9 where Naevolus (the naive) talks to a man that Naevolus believes is his friend, but whose comments are ironical and show exactly what Naevolus is, a pervert.
effect, satiric irony, in two ways: 1) through the cynical approach of the persona to Roman society, and 2) by the fact that Calvinus is consoled by a false consolation.

Lines 38-59 are a glorification of the past in comparison to the depraved present. The period which the persona describes is so ancient that Saturn still lived on the earth, Juno was a little maid, and Jupiter lived alone in the caves of Mt. Ida. There was no heavenly assembly of gods. There was no monarch of the underworld. The souls of the dead were merry without a king to govern them. In fact, the celebrated wheel, rock, Furies, and vulture did not yet exist. It was a time of serenity and peacefulness. Dishonesty was unheard of, and youths had respect for their elders. Juvenal's persona has indeed contrasted the decadent age of modern Rome with a far-distant idyllic past, but we should not take this glorification of the past too seriously.6

The picture that the persona draws is fanciful and humorous.7 Juno is virguncula, Jupiter is privatus. The

---

6 Pryor, 173.

7 See Sat. 6.1-20 for a similar Juvenalian technique.
shades of the underworld are *hilares* without a king of the infernal regions. The persona continues his exaggeration when he claims, in lines 54-57, that men believed it was *nefas et morte piandum* when a youth did not rise before his elders. Lines 58-59 seem to round off this exaggerated account of Italy's glorious past.

18

"So venerable was it to be older than someone by four years, and so equal to sacred old age was the first down of manhood." The irony is indeed thick. M.P.O. Morford comments on the ironic purpose of lines 38-59, and the naiveté of Calvinus.

Juno is *virguncula*, the Golden Age was morally so simple that it was a capital crime (54) for a child to remain seated in the presence of an adult (53-59). Juvenal's ironical purpose is made absolutely clear when he compares the past with the present (60-70): a good man is a *monstrum* (65); in seven lines, Juvenal introduces seven portents as similes and, in so doing, ridicules the naiveté of a man who faces the present with the moral attitudes of an age long past.8

Juvenal's persona not only has little regard for modern Roman society, but he also makes fun of those, Calvinus

---

8 Morford, 28.
included, who would believe that a past era was any better. Thus, Juvenal reinforces the cynical attitude of the persona and the naivete of Calvinus.

In lines 60-70 the persona returns to his commentary on the depravity of present day Rome. Honesty is so rare that if a man does return a sum of money that has been deposited in his trust, it is deemed a portent worthy of the sacred books of Etruria. Indeed, an honest man in this depraved moral climate is a freak of nature.

egregium sanctumque virum si cerno, bimembri
g hoc monstrum puero et miranti sub aratro
piscibus inventis et fetae comparo mulae,
sollicitus, tamquam lapides effuderit imber
examenque apium longa consederit uva
culmine delubri, tamquam in mare fluxerit amnis
gurgitibus miris et lactis vertice torrens. (64-70)

Juvenal's persona who has just engaged in the exaggeration of a glorified past, now employs exaggeration in his description of the depraved present. It seems that the persona gets caught up in his own ardent locutions. It is never enough for the persona to make one or two comparisons or references. He is a master of the extended allusion,

---

9 Edmunds, 67.

10 Cf, Livy 27.2.5, Vergil, Georg. 4.558, Silius 13.566, Pliny, Nat. Hist. 2.147, for parallel portents and for Juvenal's use of epic allusions.
which we might term epic bombast. This is a technique reminiscent of Satires 1-6 and reminds us of the obviously rhetorical background of the persona.\textsuperscript{11} Tautology, another common technique, is also evident. If it is possible for the persona to make one or two comments, he will not stop there, but from force of habit make five or six. Repetition is an integral part of Juvenalian satire.

Lines 71-85 reveal 1) how small is the loss of Calvinus compared to others' losses, 2) the perjury of the criminal in the face of the gods, and 3) the helplessness of Calvinus since there are no mortal witnesses to the oath that his friend has taken. The persona implies that Calvinus must try to achieve a philosophical attitude in the face of his helplessness. He has to accept his misfortune, then he will be consoled from within. Even though it is easy to disregard the gods and swear falsely, Calvinus must be above such pettiness. Wisdom is the key. As the persona suggested in lines 19-22, sapientia is the conqueror of fortune. Juvenal's persona will expand on this idea as the satire proceeds, but he will also elaborate on this theme in the remainder of Book 5.

Lines 86-119 are probably a parody of a Senecan consolatio.

In Seneca, the recipient of the consolatio is encouraged to trust in God and Fate (as the natural order of things). In Juvenal, the case is far different, for the gods and Fate are deaf to the cry of the victim and blind to the deed of the criminal, who uses them cynically in a magnificently hypocritical oath. The perjurer's cynicism also extends to Fate/nature in the following paragraph (86-119); those who do not believe in God may yet believe in Fortune (86-89) and thus perjure themselves unhesitatingly (89). Their disregard of the gods is as total as that of the deliberate perjurer, who believes in them (91-110) and hypocritically uses them (110: *mimum agit ille*) to outswear his victim. In any event, the victim's gods are dumb and useless, and the criminal, who knows that this is all they are anyway, has turned even his victim's beliefs in God and justice to his own advantage.... Juvenal uses the same consolatory materials as Seneca---dimunition of the scale of the crime, belief in the gods, trust of the natural order---but to produce the contrary effect in his friend, for by this stage of the consolation, Calvinus has lost not only his money but also his belief in the efficacy of the gods and in the justice of the natural order.12

Juvenal's persona once more, instead of consoling Calvinus, shows him that both those who do not believe in the gods and those who do, get away with criminal acts. Indeed this causes Calvinus more pain than consolation.

12 Morford, 28-29.
Lines 120-123 seem to offer another point of view, but in fact do not offer anything different from the previous lines. What is supposed to be consoling is not.

accipe quae contra valeat solacia ferre et qui nec Cynicos nec Stoica dogmata legit a Cynicis tunica distantia, non Epicurum suspicit exigui laetum plantaribus horti.

The new point of view will be neither Cynic, nor Stoic, nor Epicurean, but will be the private opinion of the persona. The persona's argument is: si nullum in terris tam detestabile factum / ostendis, taceo,... (126-127). If Calvinus has the temerity to think that the loss of money is a crime so detestable as to be unparalleled in a perverted and corrupt society, then there is no adequate consolation for such a man.

Lines 127-134 are the persona's sad commentary on a society turned corrupt. Money is held more precious than the death of an immediate relation.

...nec pugnis caedere pectus
  te veto nec plana faciem contundere palma,
  quandoquidem accepto claudenda est ianua damno,
  et maiore domus gemitu, maiore tumultu
  planguntur nummi quam funera; nemo dolorem
  fingeit in hoc casu, vestem diducere summam
  contentus, vexare oculos umore coacto:
  ploratur lacrimis amissa pecunia veris.

The echo of Satire 1 is unmistakable. But these lines also

13 Juv. Sat. 1.112-116.
look forward to Satire 14. Juvenalian satire maintains continuity throughout the corpus. The overriding importance of money never fails to excite Juvenal's persona to scorn and disdain. It is a stock theme that Juvenal employs to show the utter depravity of Roman society. Calvinus, who mourns his loss as if it were a dear relative passed on, is representative of that society.

Lines 135-144 reemphasize the idea that Calvinus' loss is not that uncommon.

sed si cuncta vides simili fora plena querella,  
si deciens lectis diversa parte tabellis  
vana supervacui dicunt chirographa ligni,  
arguit ipsorum quos littera gemmaque princeps  
sardonychum, loculis quae custoditur eburnis,  
ten, o delicias, extra communia censes  
ponendum, quia tu gallinae filius albae,  
nos viles pulli nati infelicibus ovis?  
rem pateris modicam et mediocri bile ferendam,  
si flectas oculos maiora ad crimina.

The loss of Calvinus is common and mundane. It is a loss which must be endured with a moderate amount of anger. If Calvinus will only consider the greater crimes which exist in Roman society, this will be enough to console him for a loss that is at best trivial. In lines 143-144 we have the thesis of the entire satire. This is what the persona has been emphasizing.
Lines 144-161 portray the maiora crimina of which the persona speaks. In comparison to these crimes Calvinus' loss is small.

Juvenal's persona lists several crimes which he considers to be more outrageous than Calvinus' loss. There is robbery, arson, desecration of temples, poisoning, and patricide. These crimes are maiora. The persona continues to minimize Calvinus' misfortune. He suggests that Calvinus listen to cases that Gallicus hears from dawn to dusk; then he will not dare call himself unfortunate.

---

14 Clausen follows J.D. Lewis, but this line seems to make sense as it stands in the text. D.R.S. Bailey, "Seven Emendations," CR 73(1959) 201-202, retains 153 and reads solidum instead of solitus. "The man who scrapes the gilt from a lesser god's thigh would not hesitate to melt down Jupiter himself in solid gold entire---if he had a chance."
Lines 162-173 reiterate the point that Roman society is depraved and corrupt. From the point of view of a Roman citizen, crime and corruption are not a wonder, but a commonplace. The persona gives several examples of things which to a Roman are marvelous, but to the particular people or nation are a commonplace.

quis tumidum guttur miratur in Alpibus aut quis in Meroe crasso maiorem infante mamillam?
caerula quis stupuit Germani lumina, flavam caesariem et madido torquentem cornua cirro?
ad subitas Thracum volucres nubemque sonoram Pygmaeus parvis currit bellator in armis,
mox inpar hosti raptusque per aera curvis unguibus a saeva fertur grue, si vides hoc gentibus in nostris, risu quatiare; sed illic, quamquam eadem adsidue spectentur proelia, ridet nemo, ubi tota cohors pede non est altior uno.

This passage shows that it depends on one's point of view whether a matter is serious or not. The allusion to the Pygmies (lines 167-173) demonstrates clearly how important point of view can be. If a Roman would see the plight of the Pygmies, he would think it hilarious. On the other hand the situation for the Pygmies is a matter of life and death. If we view Calvinus' loss in this context, it is indeed trivial.

In lines 174-175 Calvinus inquires of Juvenal's persona: **Nullane peiuri capitis fraudisque nefandae / poena erit?** Much of what has gone before seems to have fallen
upon deaf ears. Calvinus still seeks revenge. In response to Calvinus' question, the persona hypothetically grants punishment and vengeance to Calvinus.

abrepturn crede hunc graviore catena
protinus et nostro (quid plus velit ira?) necari
arbitrio: manet illa tamen iactura nec umquam
depositum tibi sospes erit, sed corpore truncò
invìdiosa dabit minimus solacia sanguis. (175-179)

If the man responsible for Calvinus' loss is seized, thrown into chains, and summarily killed, what more could anger want? But this will not bring back Calvinus' money. Thus vengeance is pointless, even detrimental. For from this small consolation Calvinus will gain nothing but hatred. The persona clearly shows that revenge for such a trifling loss as Calvinus' is not worthwhile. Thus he advises Calvinus to endure and suffer his loss with a quiet mind.

In line 180 Calvinus replies to the persona's advice:

At vindicta bonum vita iucundius ipsa. The persona has a quick reply:

nempe hoc indocti, quorum praecordia nullis
interdum aut levibus videas flagrantia causis. (181-182)

Only the ignorant whose passionate hearts are ablaze at the slightest cause say that vengeance is more pleasant than life itself. The persona buttresses his argument by invoking
the name of three great philosophers: Chrysippus, Thales, and Socrates. S.C. Fredericks captures the essence of lines 184-191:

Juvenal once again insists the injury was a trivial one and Calvinus merely shows his ignorance of true sapientia such as that demonstrated by the stoic Chrysippus, the gentle Thales, and Socrates (dulcique senex vicinus hymetto, 185). The term senex for Socrates is a direct criticism of Calvinus who is also a senex. The use of the terms dulci for Socrates' Hymettus and mite for Thales' character is in direct contrast to Calvinus' bitterness, which is essentially evident in his delight at the thought of inflicting "bitter punishment" (247). Calvinus is particularly appropriate because he forgave his accusers even though they condemned him to hemlock. Calvinus remains an indoctus (181), another symptom for his simplicitas and lack of sapientia. 

Philosophy is the answer to living a better life. Philosophy teaches what is right and what is wrong. Philosophy does not teach a man to seek vengeance. It is only the weak and petty mind that delights in revenge. Thus the persona castigates rather than consoles Calvinus.

Lines 192-210 restate an idea which was first mentioned in lines 1-6. A man does not escape the

15 Fredericks, 222.
16 see Sat. 14.321.
17 Morford, 33 n.22.
punishment or guilt of his conscience. Not only are evil deeds punished, but those who simply wish to sin are punished, as the example of the unfortunate Spartan depicts (199-207). The gods do take vengeance, even if it be slow. Calvinus will be avenged, but vengeance will come only when the gods are ready. Thus there is really no reason for Calvinus to remain angry. He should be consoled in the knowledge of the criminal's future punishment. Calvinus must be stronger than the man who betrayed him. He must be wise, but he is not.

While lines 192-210 portray the punishment of those who merely think of sinning, lines 211-249 show what happens to a man who actually does commit a crime:

...he [the criminal] will punish himself in very concrete, physical ways....He may reinterpt reality psychosomatically, so that his own diet will go sour on him, and he will be unable to eat (211-216); or psychologically, in his troubled dreams (217-222); or metaphysically, in thinking that thunder and lightning are actually sent by the gods to punish him (223-228); or in psychosomatic illness (229-232).18

The guilty will be punished, but Calvinus will not be able to enjoy his revenge since it will be only within the mind

18 Fredericks, 223.
Thus the consolatio is ironic at its close, for Juvenal cannot provide Calvinus with the virulent satisfaction of his passions that he so desires. He can only tell him to be above it all, to be philosophical and not emotional. At the close of the satire we are offered Juvenal's final irony (247-249):

...poena gaudebis amara
nominis invisii tamdemque fatebere laetus
nec surdum nec Tiresiam quemquam esse deorum.

Calvinus has accepted nothing from the satirist's lesson but indulges his irrational passions to the last, for he still takes delight in the punishment of a man, once his friend, now his enemy. Ironically, only if Calvinus, who is both emotional and materialistic, admits higher values, can there be an effective poena for criminals. Yet if he so admits, he will join the satirist...in being above the trivial problems of wrath and vengeance. So at this close Juvenal dissociates himself from Calvinus' wrath and vengeance-seeking.  

Thus the false consolation is complete. It has ended in an attack on Calvinus' narrow-minded morality, but it is also an indictment of Roman society in general. For not only are the criminals depraved and corrupt, but the victims are also sorely lacking in the dignity of human kindness. Not only does Juvenal skillfully parody the structure of the consolatio, but he also satirizes the

19 Fredericks, 224.

20 Morford, 26.
mechanism of society which dictates the necessity for victims and criminals. There is a higher good, but it is very difficult to reach. Only through sapientia can we reach it. As the persona points out in lines 19-22 and 184-191, sapientia is what Calvinus lacks; thus there can be no consolation for him. In Satires 14 and 15 Juvenal will continue to emphasize the importance of sapientia, indeed, it may be the overriding theme of Book 5.
Satire 14 deals with poor parental guidance and its relationship to vice and avarice in Roman society. Its moral is this: that moderation and common sense should guide one's life and the lust for money should not. The persona that Juvenal adopts is that of the moral reformer who has something positive to contribute to the needs of society. In this respect Satire 14 stands apart from almost all the other satires with the exception of Satires 8 and 10, since it builds toward a positive rather than a negative conclusion. Most of the other satires tell what is wrong with Roman society, but never tell how to rectify matters. Juvenal's persona sermonizes on vice and avarice, and there is nothing to deter him from his straightforward course. Indeed he over-attacks the problem. The persona ardently denounces all the perpetrators of vice and avarice through constant repetition and overstatement. There is a purpose to this exaggeration. The persona's function is to criticize all the vice and avarice.
he surveys. In this way he is able to emphasize the corruption of society. As this criticism of society occurs, there is a parallel criticism of the overzealous, near-sighted moral reformer. Thus in Satire 14 there is not only criticism of society's faults, but also criticism of those who too eagerly find fault with society.

The structure of Satire 14, like that of Satire 13, is based on repetition and false syllogism. Satire 14 falls into three basic parts: lines 1-106, children learn from the example of their parents; lines 107-316, an examination of avarice and its influence on the young; and lines 316-331, what a man can do to combat the pernicious forces of poor parental guidance and avarice. Thus Satire 14 is a loosely unified treatise on the effect of vice on children and more specifically the effect of avarice. In this way Juvenal, through his persona, exposes the innermost moral fibre of Roman society.

Satire 14 is an elaboration of an idea which Juvenal set forth in Satire 1:

\[ \text{nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores, omne in praecipiti vitium stetit.} \]  

All vice stands on the precipice; the younger generation will do and desire the same things that the older generation sought. Posterity will add nothing further to our habits.
and customs. Vice is a recurring evil that afflicts generation after generation. Satire 14.1-3 contains a similar theme.

Plurima sunt, Fuscine, et fama digna sinistra
et nitidis maculam haesuram figentia rebus,
quae monstrant ipsi pueris tranduntque parentes.

Parents demonstrate and hand down to their sons many things that are worthy of notoriety. Like Satire 1, Satire 14 shows that vice is a recurring evil of society that moves from generation to generation, handed down from father to son. This is the initial focus of Satire 14.

Lines 4-30 enumerate many examples which support the contention of lines 1-3 that parents pass on to their children many things worthy of ill-fame.

si damnosa senem iurat alea, ludit et heres
bullatus parvoque eadem movet arma fritillo. (5-6)

If a father has a penchant for gambling, likewise does his son engage in the same pursuits. Lines 6-14 portray the love of luxurious foods that is passed down from father to son.

nec melius de se cuiquam sperare propinquo
concedet iuvenis, qui radere tubera terrae,
boletum condire et eodem iure natantis
mergere ficedulas didicit nebulone parente
et cana monstrante gula, cum septimus annus
transierit puerum, nondum omni dente renato,
barbatos licet admoveas mille inde magistros
hinc totidem, cupiet lauto cenare paratu
semper et a magna non degenerare culina.

If a boy has a gluttonous father who only cares to dine in luxury, how can a young boy grow up to be any better? Juvenal's persona does not find fault with the son nor with the father. It is the nature of things for a son to learn from his father. It is a lamentable circumstance, but Juvenal's persona does not as yet give his audience a remedy. He first wishes to pile up his examples in order to make his case a strong one. Lines 15-24 reveal the cruelty of Rutilus. These lines are extremely interesting since they contain a wealth of epic allusion and seem to hint at a humane view of slavery. 1

Rutilus does not teach his son to have a gentle mind or to offer fair treatment for slight faults. He does not think that the minds and bodies of slaves are made out of the

---

1 Cf. Sat. 6.474-496.
same elements as his own, but he teaches his son to be savage and cruel when he delights in the sound of a harsh flogging, or when as an Antiphates, or Polyphemus, he terrorizes his entire household. He is happy only when he can brand someone with a burning iron for stealing a couple of towels. Rutilus seems to be the very embodiment of cruelty. He ranks with such epic villains as Antiphates, the flesh-eating king of the Laestrygonians, and Polyphemus, the one-eyed monster who devoured several of Ulysses' comrades. The use of mythological allusion is a common Juvenalian technique. Here it is used to increase the stature of Rutilus' cruelty through comparison with epic villains. Indeed, it is a shocking comparison whose brilliance immediately gets our attention and makes Rutilus all the more horrible. In his mythological allusions Juvenal does not use extended comparison, but portrays a familiar mythological scene or character in conjunction with a contemporaneous action or character in order to create a stark and bold image.²

Juvenal's persona leaves this question for us to answer, but the answer is only too clear. Lines 25-30 show how a daughter may turn out if she has a sinful mother.

```
rusticus expectas ut non sit adultera Largae filia, quae nunquam maternos dicere moechos tam cito nec tanto poterit contexere cursu ut non ter deciens respiret? conscia matri virgo fuit, ceras nunc hac dictante pusillas implet et ad moechum dat eisdem ferre cinaedis.
```

Juvenal's persona asks how else is a young girl to turn out who is unable to name the lovers of her mother without taking a breath at least thirty times? There is a wry kind of humor here, for we may chuckle to ourselves at the prolific ability of Larga. There is an obvious pun on the word *larga* which means generous. A young girl is influenced by the activities of her mother, especially if it is a bad influence.

Lines 31-37 are a summation of lines 1-30. Juvenal's persona reiterates and amplifies the idea that children learn from the examples of their parents.

```
sic natura iubet: velocius et citius nos corrumpunt vitiorum exempla domestica, magnis cum subeant animos auctoribus. unus et alter forsitan haec spernant iuvenes, quibus arte benigna et meliore luto finxit praecordia Titan, sed reliquos fugienda patrum vestigia ducunt et monstrata diu veteris trahit orbita culpae.
```
Nature ordains that a child will almost invariably follow the example of a parent. There are rare exceptions to this rule; e.g. a youth may decide to spurn his parents' example, but this is the exception not the rule. The majority of children follow the examples of their parents and so go down the well-worn path of vice. The view of society which Juvenal's persona portrays in lines 1-37 is too simplistic. It is unfair to lay all the blame on the parents, but this provides the persona with a convenient answer for the poor state of Roman morality. Sic natura iubet is an inviting platitude, but one of which we must be wary. In the remainder of Satire 14 the persona reiterates the philosophy of lines 1-37, but does not expound upon it in any greater depth. In lines 256-283 Juvenal's persona changes the emphasis away from sic natura iubet toward moderation in life in which a man can determine his own individual destiny. In this way Juvenal's persona saves Satire 14 from dullness and monotony. Of course, this is part of the persona's make-up as a moral reformer. Juvenal has deliberately created a persona who moralizes endlessly, but we must bear with this in order to understand the larger concept of Satire 14.

Lines 38-106 continue the theme that Juvenal's persona has so extensively developed in lines 1-37. More
examples are adduced, and the persona attempts to set out a few guidelines for moral reform. Lines 38-43 give advice for making sure parents set a good example.

abstineas igitur damnandis. huius enim vel una potens ratio est, ne crimina nostra sequantur ex nobis geniti, quoniam dociles imitandis turpibus ac pravis omnes sumus, et Catilinam quocumque in populo videas, quocumque sub axe, sed nec Brutus erit Bruti nec avunculus usquam.

Parents must abstain from those acts which are undesirable lest their children copy them. In other words, parents must set a good example. It is easy to find a villain such as Catiline among many nations, but where will you find a Brutus or a Cato? A good man and a good Roman is a rare commodity.

Lines 44-49 elaborate on the primary advice which Juvenal's persona has already laid out in line 38 (abstineas igitur damnandis).

Do not allow foul words or sights to come into a house where there is a father. Keep all bad influences far away. The use of procul, a procul in line 45 is particularly apt, since it was a proclamation that occurred before a sacrifice
or at some religious occasion in order to keep away unholy persons and evil spirits. Here we see that the sanctity of the child is paramount. The raising of a child is surrounded with a religious aura. If a man has an evil deed in mind, the persona advises him to let the thought of his infant son stand in the way of the commission of a crime. In other words, consider the consequences and probable effect of a crime or misdeed upon your children. Indeed, children, as the persona suggests, are the lifeblood and resource of Roman society. If they are not raised properly, then there can be no future for the Roman way of life.

In lines 50-58 the disregarding of the persona's advice is brought to its logical conclusion.

nam si quid dignum censoris fecerit ira
quandoque et similem tibi se non corpore tantum
nec vultu dederit, morum quoque filius et qui
omnia deterius tua per vestigia peccet,
corripies nimirum et castigabis acerbo
clamore ac post haec tabulas mutare parabis.
unde tibi frontem libertatemque parentis,
cum facias peiora senex vacuumque cerebro
iam pridem caput hoc ventosa cucurbita quaerat?

Some day possibly a child will follow in the footsteps of his parent and commit a deed worse than any which his parent had committed. Even though ultimately responsible, the

---

3 see Verg. Aen. 6.258, Horace Odes 3.1.1.
parent's reaction will be anger and outrage. But the persona perceptively asks in lines 56-58: "How can a father blame his son when the father is guilty of worse crimes?" The blame rests with the father for setting a bad example. Here we have a reiteration of the major idea of lines 1-106: parents must set a good example for their children, if they expect them to grow up to be responsible citizens who think it is loathsome to commit evil deeds.

Lines 59-69 examine the misplaced emphasis on the external appearance of a Roman household. In these lines the persona is still addressing Fuscinus in particular, but he is also addressing Roman parents in general.

hospite venturo cessabit nemo tuorum. 'verre pavimentum, nitidas ostende columnas, arida cum tota descendat aranea tela, hic leve argentum, vasa aspera tergeat alter.' vox domini furit instantis virgamque tenentis ergo miser trepidas, ne stercore foeda canino atria displiceant oculis venientis amici, ne perfusa luto sit porticus, et tamen uno semodio scobis haec emendat servulus unus: illud non agitas, ut sanctam filius omni aspiciat sine labe domum vitioque carentem?

When a guest is about to visit someone's home, no one in the household is idle. The master makes sure everything is in order and immaculately clean, lest the eyes of the guest may be offended by the sight of dog's filth in the hall, or the portico splashed with mud. Yet while the master of the household is overly concerned with the spotless appearance
of his house, he does not care that his son may live in a home that is filled with moral filth. Appearance is king. This is a Juvenalian theme which is most intensely presented in Satire 7.105-149, where it does not matter what a man does or says but only what he wears. Morality is subverted. The appearance of a man is glorified, and the man of real integrity, although shabbily dressed is overlooked. Indeed the luxurious house is a common metaphor for Roman moral decay.  

...in the late Republic the wealthy often chose to display their wealth in the decoration of their villas and the landscaping of the grounds. This sort of ostentation quickly became the targets of moralists; the luxury of the tyrant's banqueting-hall in Cicero's story of Damocles (T.D. 5.21. 61-2) has more in common with the luxury of Cicero's own contemporaries than of fourth-century Syracuse. For Horace the villas of the wealthy are symbols of decadence and luxury; they conflict with the Stoic precept of living according to Nature (cf. Hor., Ep. I.10.12-25). It is not surprising, then, to find in the Senecan declamations loci communes on wealth which link moral decadence and luxurious houses. 

Satire 14.59-69 contains the same essential idea. Roman society has indeed reached the height of moral turpitude

---

4 Plautus, Mostellaria 91-156.

when the appearance of a man's home is more important than whether or not the people who inhabit it are vice-ridden, evil creatures or clean-living, upstanding Romans.

Lines 70-74 portray the type of Roman citizen which Juvenal's persona would like each parent to raise.

gratum est quod patriae civem populoque dedisti, si facis ut patriae sit idoneus, utilis agris, utilis et bellorum et pacis rebus agendis. plurimum enim intererit quibus artibus et quibus hunc tu moribus instituas....

"It is pleasing that you have given a citizen to the fatherland and to the people, if you see to it that he may be fit for his country, worthy and useful for the land, and useful for doing things both in war and peace. For it will make a great difference by what practices and customs you train him." That a man should be suitable for his fatherland, experienced in the fields, and useful for performing deeds in war and peace is a Roman ideal which dates back to the time of Cato the Elder. It is extremely important to Juvenal's persona that a father teach his son to be a worthy and useful member of society. The father in

---

6 See Donald Earl, *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome* (Cornell University Press 1967), 18-19, for further information on a Roman citizen's duty toward the fatherland. This concept was central to the maintenance of the Roman state.
Roman life was the backbone of the family. The political importance of a father teaching his son the Roman way of life was profound. A man could only be suitable to the fatherland if he could speak well and represent himself in political life. Thus a good Roman became synonymous with a Roman that could speak well in public, the orator. Cato the Elder, Cicero, Seneca Rhetor, and Quintilian all proclaim this ideal: orator est vir bonus dicendi peritus. W. S. Anderson suggests that the persona's attitudes can be identified with those of Cato the Elder; i.e. they are both traditional moralists. Yet when Cato the Elder denounced the ills of Roman society around 150 B.C. and offered his conservative view of education, people listened, but when the persona does the same thing in the 2nd century A.D., it is banal. What once may have been weighty statements enunciated by Cato the Elder, Cicero, Seneca Rhetor, and Quintilian are now nothing more than hackneyed aphorisms offered by a narrow-minded moral reformer.

Lines 74-85 continue the persona's use of sic natura iubet. The natural order of things is for the young to

follow in the footsteps of their parents. He, Juvenal's persona, shows how the natural order of things in the animal world follows a logical pattern.

The stork nourishes her young upon lizards which she finds in the wilds. The young storks seek the same animals when they have learned how to fly. The vulture carries to her young the remains of dead cattle, dogs, and crucified men. When the young vulture grows up, this is the type of food he eats, the remains of dead animals. The eagle, the noble bird of Jove, is no different. The young eagles, when full-grown, eat the same things which they first tasted when they broke the shell. Yet what is the point of this extended comparison? Juvenal's persona is showing that no matter where you go in the bird kingdom, whether it be from the noble eagle to the vulture, Nature has made them similar in one aspect: they follow the example of their parents. The
storks feed on lizards, the vultures feed on carrion, and the lordly eagles feed on hare and roe. The persona would have us believe that it is no different for human-kind. He says that a man will most likely follow the example of his parents; but sic natura iubet does not necessarily hold true as we have already seen. The comparison of the animal kingdom to humankind is a false analogy. Animals function instinctively repeating their daily pattern as their parents, while man through reason may alter his customs and habits. These lines attempt to be profound, but are nothing more than specious.

Lines 86-95 continue the paradigm of sic natura iubet and extend it. Not only do children follow the example of their parents, but the sins of the father are increased by the sins of the son. Caetronius was a builder, who raised magnificent structures which diminished his wealth and broke up his resources. His son was made in the mold of his father, but was a degree worse. He built magnificent buildings of still costlier marble and squandered his fortune. In this way Juvenal's persona expands the building metaphor which has already been shown to be a declamatory commonplace.9

9 J.D. Duff, 413 n.86. Satirization of the mania for building occurs in Hor. Carm. II.18.17-22, III.1.35-6; Epp. I.1.83-7: cf. also Juv. I.94 and Mart. IX.46.1. The mania for building indicates the decadence of Roman society.
Lines 96-106 show what happens to the son of a man who reveres the Sabbath, i.e. follows Jewish ritual.

If a father happens to revere the Sabbath, worship nothing except the clouds, abstain from pork, and be circumcised, his son cannot help but follow in his footsteps. The persona would have us believe that this is bad. He says the father is entirely to blame. A son grows up to learn and revere the Jewish law and flout the laws of Rome. It is a false assumption to say that a man who would revere the Jewish law would naturally flout the laws of Rome. The persona seems to undermine his own argument by criticizing the one example of reverence he has offered so far. We discover that the persona who has been completely self-righteous, up to this point in the satire, is a bigot. He would have us believe a good Roman is not a Jewish Roman.

The major point of lines 1-106 is that a son will follow the example of his father, and in so doing will multiply his father's good or bad qualities.

The first part of the poem, then, illustrates the failure of Roman conventions and values because of the indifference and careless indulgence of parents.\footnote{J.P. Stein, "The unity and scope of Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire," \textit{CP} 65(1970), 35.}

Also in these lines the character of the persona begins to become more clearly delineated. We learn that the persona is presumptuous, near-sighted, and prejudiced. Generally, he is a poor example of a moral reformer. Through this portrayal of the persona, Juvenal is actually criticizing the complainers and malcontents who only point out the faults and shortcomings of society.

In lines 107-316 the emphasis shifts from a general discussion of all vices to the specific examination of avaritia. In lines 107-118 we learn that the young imitate all vices of their own free will except one, avarice. Here again the persona makes a statement which is not necessarily true. Why, we might ask, would a young person be more unwilling to imitate avarice than any other vice? The persona makes a false statement in order to lend credence to his argument.
Sponte tamen iuvenes imitantur cetera, solam inviti quoque avaritiam exercere iubentur. fallit enim vitium specie virtutis et umbra, cum sit triste habitu vultuque et veste severum, nec dubie tamquam frugi laudetur avarus, tamquam parcus homo et rerum tutela suarum certa magis quam si fortunas servet easdem Hesperidum serpens aut Ponticus. adde quod hunc de quo loquor egregium populus putat adquirendi artificem; quippe his crescunt patrimonia fabris. incude adsidua semperque ardente camino.

The persona would have us believe that the young are forced to practice avarice as if it were a virtue. Avarice is particularly insidious because it has the appearance and semblance of virtue. Things are not what they seem to be. This point was made earlier at lines 59-69. The persona chooses the miser as his example of avarice. Some people praise the miser for his thrift. Others praise him, because he is skilled in the art of money-making. These would be good qualities in an average person, but in the miser they are accentuated. He guards his fortune more carefully than if it were watched by the dragon of the Hesperides or Colchis. Again the persona uses a mythological allusion to magnify the importance of the vice being described, as he did in the description of Rutilus. The miser's accumulation of money is a never-ceasing obsession. The miser is truly a warped individual. He appears to have
some good qualities, but in reality is a sick person. In lines 120-134 the father presents the examples of
the miser as a fortunate man.

qui miratur opes, qui nulla exempla beati
pauperis esse putat, iuvenes hortatur ut illa
ire via pergant et eidem incumbere sectae.
sunt quaedam vitiorum elementa, his protinus illos
inbuit et cogit minimas ediscere sordes;
mox adquirendi docet insatiabile votum.
servorum ventres modio castigat iniquo
ipse quoque esuriens, neque enim omnia sustinet umquam
mucida caerulei panis consumere frusta,
hesternum solitus medio servare minutal
Septembri nec non differe in tempora cene
alterius conchem aestivam cum parte lacerti
signatam vel dimidio putrique siluro
filaque sectivi numerata includere porri.
invitatus ad haec aliquis de ponte negabit.

The father copies the miser. He starves his slaves in the
name of thrift and causes himself to go hungry. A meal
is described which could turn any sensible man's stomach.
Not even a beggar would accept an invitation to such a meal.
Lines 135-137 make a telling point concerning the miser's
behavior.

sed quo divitias haec per tormenta coactas,
cum furor haut dubius, cum sit manifesta phrenesis,
ut locuples moriaris, egentis vivere fato?

To what end does a man pile up riches through such torments,

12 Cf. Juv. Sat. 2.1-22, Sat. 3.116 and Persius, Sat.
3.107-118 for the use of a similar theme.
13 Cf. Sat. 1.93.
when it is plain madness and sheer lunacy to live in want so that you may die wealthy; this is a theme which the persona will reiterate for the rest of the satire and out of which will come the philosophy of moderation. The persona's attitude seems to be changing from one of attack to what ultimately will be a positive attitude.

Lines 138-151 give further examples of the outrages the miser will commit in order to gain more and more property. The miser is not content with what he has, but he covets his neighbor's property. His love of gain grows in proportion to the money he has. The more he accumulates the more he wants. Even the ugly head of rumor does not deter the miser (152-155). He is unconcerned about what people will think of him, if only he is able to keep his farm and land for himself. Juvenal's persona satirizes this warped and miserly point of view in lines 156-160.

scilicet et morbis et debilitate carebis et luctum et curam effugies, et tempora vitae longa tibi posthac fato meliore dabuntur, si tantum culti solus possederis agri quantum sub Tatio populus Romanus arabat.14

The persona sarcastically states that the miser will live a happy, trouble-free life if only he is the sole possessor

14 J.D. Duff, 420 n. 159, 160, says that "The accumulation of immense landed properties in single hands was, in Pliny's judgment, the ruin of Italy: cf. Nat. Hist. xviii. 35." Economics played a very important role in the increase of corruption and immorality.
of as many acres of land as the Roman people tilled in the
days of Tatius. The miser is so greedy he wants everything.

In lines 161-172 the persona contrasts the greed of
the miser with the gratitude of the ancient Romans who re-
ceived very little for their services in the Punic and
Pyrrhic wars. These early Romans were thankful for what
little recompense they received. Two acres were sufficient
for their needs. Yet today, the persona says, we would not
think two acres big enough for our garden (172). Through
the juxtaposition of the pristine virtues of the early Ro-
mans with the blatant avariciousness of present day Rome,
Juvenal's persona highlights corruption and decadence.
In other words the average Roman citizen in the day of Ju-
venal was indeed a pitiful creature when compared with his
rugged and hearty ancestors. It is a common Juvenalian
technique to glorify the past and belittle the present.

15 Anderson, YCS 17(1961), 79 remarks that Juvenal ex-
exploits several standard moral antitheses which became pop-
ular with rhetoricians long before his time, especially
the opposition of present to past.

16 Sallust Hist. frag. 11.12; Bellum Catilinae 10.11;
Bellum Iugurthinae 41.1 Sallust also points to a period
before the second Punic War when the early Romans were
more virtuous than the Romans who followed.

17 J. De Decker, Juvenalis Declamans (Ghent 1913), 34-35,
gives further examples of this common Juvenalian technique.
However, this is a false assumption. Juvenal usually draws this contrast in order to show that the past was not so glorious, but only a fantasy which exists in the mind of the persona. Juvenal does this by making the past ludicrous (cf. 13.38-59) or by portraying ancient Italians simplistically (cf. 6.1-20). In this case Juvenal's persona chooses to ignore the tremendous conflicts between the rugged republican soldiers and their patrician masters in order to make his false assertion.

In lines 173-188 the connection between the desire for wealth and crime is made. The persona suggests that the lust for money causes outrageous deeds.

Lust for money is the root of all evil. There is no human passion which has mingled more poison-bowls, none has more often wielded the murderous dagger. In days of old the Marsian, Hernican, or Vestinian father gave solid and worthwhile advice to his sons: "Live content with these
cottages and those hills. Let us seek bread with the plough, which is enough for our table....The man who is not ashamed to protect himself against the cold and wind with the skins of animals will not be likely to commit a crime. It is the desire for purple raiment that leads a man to crime and wickedness." The persona again presents ancient Roman simplicity and ruggedness as a standard towards which all good Romans should strive. We might term this technique "the good old days motif." It is very inviting, but we should know better, for one can never return to the way it was.

Lines 189-209 continue the contrasting of simple ancient virtues with modern examples of deceit and wickedness. The maxim of the father of ancient times (179-188) is compared to that of the father of modern Roman times in line 207.

unde habeas quaerit nemo, sed oportet habere.

At all costs a man must have money. Juvenal's persona is disgusted by the shallowness and greed of the father who urges his son to get money at any cost.

In lines 210-255 the persona addresses fathers in general and predicts what will happen to them and their sons in the future. The persona warns fathers that the morality of money is a short-sighted rule by which to live one's life.
Talibus instantem monitis quemcumque parentem sic possem adfari; "dic, o vanissime, quis te festinare iubet? meliorem praesto magistro discipulum, securus abi: vinceris, ut Ajax praeteriit Telamonem, ut Pelea vicit Achilles." (210-214)

The persona inquires of the father: "Who orders you to hurry, 0 emptiest of men. Your son will surpass you just as the disciple outstrips his master. Be sure that you will be surpassed in ability and deeds as Telamon was outdone by Ajax, and as Peleus was outdone by Achilles."

Again the persona uses a mythological comparison to increase the importance of the point he is making, but lines 210-214 are also a reappearance of the original motif: a son will follow the example of his father. In lines 215-224 the persona continues to address the fathers. He gives advice and shows what is the consequence of ignoring that advice. He says that the young must not be harmed. This is basically the same advice which was given in line 47 (maxima debetur puero reverentia). Mature iniquity does not fill up their bones. Yet as soon as a boy begins to comb a beard, he will swear falsely. The son will kill his wife for her dowry. The wealth which a father thinks should be found over land and sea, a son will acquire by a shorter road. Great crimes demand no labor. Juvenal's persona warns the father to be careful of the advice he gives, but the father does not heed his warning.
In lines 224-234 the persona continues his explanation of what will happen to a man's son because of the poor advice his father gave him. The father will deny that he taught his son to lie and cheat in order to gain wealth. And while this may be true, the persona insists that the father is the cause and origin of his son's evil mind. The father who teaches the love of wealth turns his sons into misers. When he shows him how to double his patrimony by fraud he gives his son free rein. It is useless to try to undo the harm already accomplished.

Lines 235-255 deal with the ultimate consequences of a father's ill-conceived advice. When a father tells a youth that a man is a fool who makes a present to a friend, or relieves the poverty of a kinsman, he teaches his son to plunder, cheat, and commit any kind of crime for money's sake. The father will see his son grow up to challenge his authority. The picture that the persona paints is extremely dismal. Lines 210-255 do not really offer anything new. The persona monotonously harps upon the same tired platitudes. We are beginning to weary of the persona's constant reiteration.

In lines 256-264 there is a shift in emphasis from the attack on avarice to a philosophical overview of life. Juvenal directs the persona away from trite commentary on
avarice toward something more profound, a satiric view of Roman society.

monstro voluptatem egregiam, cui nulla theatra,
nulla aequare queas praetoris pulpita lauti,
si spectes quanto capitis discrimine constant
incrementa domus, aerata multus in arca
fiscus et ad vigilem ponendi Castora nummi,
ex quo Mars Ultor galeam quoque perdidit et res
non potuit servare suas. ergo omnia Florae
et Ceres licet et Cybeles aulaeae relinquis:
tanto maiores humana negotia ludi.

In these lines the persona reveals the delight which he gets from observing the strange and magnificent excesses of Roman society. No theatre, no stage of a lavish praetor can compare. The games of human life wherein men risk their lives to increase their fortunes are far more interesting than the stage-curtains of Flora, Ceres, and Cybele. The persona in Satire 1.22-80 also takes great delight in observing the foibles of Roman society.

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

Is it not pleasing to fill up spacious notebooks at the crossroads when we see corruption and depravity all around? This delight is characteristic of Juvenalian satire. The question which must be answered is how ironic is this Juvenalian delight? I would suggest that it is part of the satiric mask which Juvenal adopts throughout his satires.
In lines 265-275 Juvenal's persona addresses a man who risks his life for wealth and mansions.

This man is like a tight-rope walker, for he risks his life. But there is one difference. The tight-rope walker earns his livelihood from tight-rope walking, while the merchant gambles his life for a 1000 talents or a hundred mansions. These men are indeed fools for risking their lives merely for the sake of increasing their wealth. The delight of the persona is almost spiteful, yet there is a certain positive quality which can be drawn from these lines. If men will take to heart what Juvenal's persona is saying, then maybe men will see the error of their ways and change their lives. Of course, it is easy to tell someone to change, but it is difficult to tell them how. This is where the persona falls down. He gives his audience many prohibitions, but does not tell us how to be moderate.

Lines 275-283 continue to describe the folly of mankind. Many men are interested in making vast sums of money.
The ports and the seas are crowded with big ships in the hope of gain. The persona ironically comments that it is worthwhile to have seen the monsters of Ocean and the young mermen, so that you may return home with a stuffed purse, and rejoice in a swollen money-bag. The folly of the men described is enormous. They are never satisfied. The lust for gain and the want of more incites them to the point of foolhardiness. The persona is saying men should be content with less.

In lines 284-302 Juvenal's persona describes how the lust and love of gain for the sake of accumulation is a form of madness. A similar usage occurs in Satire 1.92 (simplexne furor). Furor is a product of this depraved age (nona aetas, 13.28). In this comparison we see that Juvenal's persona has remained consistent in his attack on Roman society from Satire 1. The same motifs and themes are still being employed. In Satire 14 madness may take different forms. It affects the mind of a man in various ways. One man is terrified of the furies even as Orestes was terrified by the furies after the murder of Clytemnestra. Another man strikes down an ox believing it to be Agamemnon or Ulysses, even as Ajax slew a flock of sheep in the belief that he was killing Agamemnon and Ulysses. But the man who is indeed in need of a keeper is the merchant who loads his ship to the gunwales in the
mad search for money. The untiring efforts of the merchant
symbolize the full range of irrelevance and
destruction that avaritia imposes on one's
life. To import raisin wine from Crete in
jars of local pottery, to travel far, to
risk one's life and one's property, all with
the hope of gain, is the height of folly. His
spes lucri (278) will ultimately leave the
mercator destitute in a shipwreck or lead to
paranoia if he becomes wealthy. 18

Lines 303-316 comment on the misery and woe which
accompany the attainment of such wealth which the merchant
seeks. It is better to have nothing with no worries than
great wealth with tremendous anxiety.

tantis parta malis cura maiore metuque
servantur: misera est magni custodia census.
dispositis praedives amis vigilare cohortem
servorum noctu Licinus iubet, attonitus pro
electro signisque suis Phrygiaeque columna
atque ebore et lata testudine. dolia nudi
non ardent Cynici; si fregeris, altera fiet
cras domus atque eadem plumbo commissa manebit.
sensit Alexander, testa cum vidit in illa
magnum habitatorem, quanto felicior hic qui
nil cuperet quam qui totum sibi posceret orbem
passurus gestis aequanda pericula rebus.
nullum numen habes, si sit prudentia: nos te,
nos facimus, Fortuna, deam.

The millionaire Licinus orders a troop of slaves to stand
guard in his house with buckets of water in case of fire,

18 Stein, 36.
because he is worried about all his valuable possessions.\footnote{De Decker, 37, compares these lines to Sen. Rhet., Contr., II, 1, 12-13 to show the influence of the declamators on Juvenal's work.}

On the other hand the nude Cynic Diogenes does not fear that fire will consume his tub. In fact if his tub is broken, it can be repaired quickly, or a new home can be found immediately. The persona observes that when Alexander the Great saw Diogenes in his tub, he realized how much happier a man was who had no desires than he who claimed the entire world for himself. The persona's concluding comment of this section sums up his point. "Had we but wisdom, you would have no divinity, O Fortune; it is we that make you into a goddess."\footnote{See Satire 7.190-198 and 10.51-58 for Fortune's effect upon the lives of men.} Juvenal's persona uses the exact same words at the end of Satire 10.365-366. These two lines in Satire 14, as well as those in Satire 10, point to a central theme in Juvenal's satires. It is man in all his folly that makes Fortune a goddess. It is not Fortune which causes misfortune...
or happiness, it is man himself. Juvenal suggests that if man could be wise and sensible then the troubles which he so marvelously portrays in his satires would cease, but he knows this is not possible. Thus at the close of Satire 14 Juvenal has his persona offer the last advice, advice replete with irony.

Moderation is the key to living. The persona attempts to define moderation by showing what measure of wealth is sufficient for a man to live. The measure of wealth which is sufficient for man is "as much as thirst and hunger and cold demand, as much as sustained Epicurus in his little garden, as much as the followers of Socrates had in their homes." Both Nature and Wisdom agree upon the course of action one's life should take. Sufficiency for the persona is all that is necessary for the sustaining of life. Juvenal's persona now goes on to address those people who are
not satisfied with what he has just offered them. He says: "Do I seem to enclose you within sharp limits?" If this is so, the persona suggests that the person mix in something from their own customs, or manners, and make up a sum as big as that worthy of an eques, i.e. 400,000 sesterces. And finally if this is not sufficient, then the wealth of Croesus, the Persian kings, and Narcissus will not be enough for you. At this point Juvenal's persona links mythological to Roman allusion. This is a technique reminiscent of Satire 6.643-661. Through choosing a mythological character or situation and then relating it to a Roman situation, Juvenal's persona again is able to highlight the enormity of crime, greed, depravity, etc., which exists in Roman society. Through the implied comparison of Croesus to Narcissus the scope of satire is enlarged, and the importance of what is being said with regard to Roman society and the scale of its vices is enlarged. But the reference to Narcissus, a Greek freedman, is significant by itself, for it points to the ultimate corruption of the Roman state, when a Greek can rise to such wealth and power. The persona's aversion for Greeks is well-known. In Satire 3 the multitude of Greeks in Rome was one of the reasons for Umbricius' departure from the city (cf. 3.60-61). In the eyes of the
persona it is the height of decadence for Narcissus, formerly a Greek slave, to be in a position of such wealth and power.

In lines 316-331 we have the same motif which Juvenal used in 138-151 where the miser's love of gain grew in proportion to how much money he had. The more money he got, the more money he wanted. Juvenal's persona points out the ultimate irony of avarice. Nothing is ever enough. No amount of money, no matter how large, is ever enough.

Satire 14 offers constructive advice for all people. Moderation is the key to living, but this moderation must come from within the individual by the use of wisdom and nature. This mundane and simple conclusion emphasizes the predicament of the persona. He has over-attacked, over-emphasized, and over-dramatized the situation. Through constant reiteration he reduces the effect of a profound philosophy to nothing more than a whimper. The last lines are an anticlimax, because they continue to emphasize what was already put so eloquently in lines 315-316. This is the persona's failing. He does not know when to leave well enough alone.

Satire 14 is a frontal attack on vice and avarice in Roman society, but it also offers some constructive philosophic advice, moderation. The persona of Satire 14 stands in close conjunction with the persona of Satire 1, for they
both attack the lust for money which causes the subversion of traditional Roman morality. In Rome Pecunia is a goddess and furor grips the minds of men. But Satire 14 also has another dimension, for Juvenal not only criticizes society through the mechanism of the persona, but he also chooses to criticize his persona by making him an exaggerator, an alarmist, a zealot, a poor logician, and a repeater. Of course, all of this criticism still does not diminish the philosophy Juvenal offers in lines 315-316:

nullum numen habes, si sit prudentia: nos te, nos facimus, Fortuna, deam.

Man must learn to stand on his own two feet and think. Fortune, Fate and the Gods will not do him any good if he cannot reason. A Juvenalian philosophy seems to be evolving; a philosophy which stands apart from all the rhetoric and satire. Maybe Juvenal is a humanist. We will explore this idea as Satire 15 and 16 are discussed.
Satire 15 treats generally the inhumanity of man and focuses specifically upon the monstrous events of 127 A.D. In this satire Juvenal adopts an attitude of outrage mixed with self-righteousness. Through this attitude of outraged self-righteousness, Juvenal's persona attacks Egyptian society. The example of Egyptian cannibalism acts as a trigger for the persona's anger. From this single act of cruelty the persona magnificently concludes that the world has come to a dismal state where serpents are more friendly to one another than human beings.

But we must ask why does Juvenal choose such a small and insignificant occurrence in the history of the world in order to dramatize his point? Juvenal might have chosen topics that would have struck closer to home, such as

---

1 Juvenal's Satire 15.25 indicates that the riot between Ombi and Tentura occurred in the consulship of Juncus; Duff, 438, says that an inscription proves that Aemilius Juncus and Julius Severus were consuls in the year 127 A.D. (CIL III p. 874 no. xxxi).

2 Juv. 15.159 Sed iam serpentum maior concordia.
Caesar's treatment of the Germans, \(^3\) Nero's murderous propensities, \(^4\) or Domitian's cruelty. \(^5\) Why does he elevate an occurrence that probably had very little significance for a Roman audience at the time to a position of such importance? Highet asks the same question:

But why does he speak of this single incident in Egypt, without citing any parallels? There is only one likely reason. As we have seen in his old age he was turning more and more away from the outside world, and paying less and less attention to contemporary events. Probably he had not even heard of the revolts in Cyrene and similar barbarities elsewhere. But this atrocity happened in Egypt. In Egypt, that loathsome country— the land he hated far more than any other Roman who has left a record, perhaps the land of his early exile. At once when he heard the story, his old loathing revived, and he wrote a satire which was not simply a general discourse on man's inhumanity to man, but also a particular attack on the barbarism of the Egyptian nation. \(^6\)

But it is really not necessary to look for an explanation

\(^3\) Caesar, De Bello Gallico 3.16 4.14-15; cf. H.H. Scullard, From the Gracchi to Nero (London 1972), 134-135; E. Badian, Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic (University of South Africa 1967), 75.

\(^4\) Tacitus, Annals 14.1-10, 64-65; Suetonius, Nero 33-37.

\(^5\) Suetonius, Domitian 10-11; for further exempla on cruelty see Val. Max. 9.2.

\(^6\) There is no proof for this statement.

\(^7\) G. Highet, Juvenal The Satirist (Oxford 1954), 151.
of Juvenal's supposed loathing for Egypt within the framework of his biography. We must look at the text and study the attitudes represented by Juvenal's persona in order to understand why Juvenal chose to elaborate on such a small and insignificant occurrence as the riot between Ombi and Tentura.8 We do not really know that Juvenal was turning more and more away from the outside world and paying less and less attention to contemporary events. Whether Juvenal hated or did not hate the Egyptians is really not the issue. We are dealing with the persona's abhorrence of the Egyptians (an attitude created by Juvenal for the persona). We are not dealing with Juvenal's hatred of the Egyptians. The persona is basically the same indignant satirist of Satires 1-6.9 In Satire 15 the persona uses a standard Juvenalian technique which was employed heavily in Satires 1-6. Juvenal has the persona pick one limited example (the Egyptian atrocity) and declaim upon it for a hundred or several hundred lines. That Juvenal was becoming old and turning away from the outside world seems to be a lame excuse for a misunderstanding of the intricacies of Satire 15.

---

8 See Satire 4, "The Big-Fish", for a similar technique.

The main issue of Satire 15 is man's inhumanity to man. But there are several ramifications of this primary topic: religious intolerance, xenophobia, hypocrisy, cruelty, savagery, etc. Juvenal, through Satire 15, exposes all these factors in Egyptian society, and by inference, in his own Roman society. He makes us look in a mirror and see a reflection of ourselves. By using the persona (a literary creation controlled at all times by Juvenal) Juvenal dissociates himself from some of the more harsh and caustic attitudes which he wishes to satirize. He wants to remain aloof from hypocrisy and religious intolerance. At the same time he challenges his audience (a Roman audience) to remain objective and see the real truth; i.e. the fact that Egypt is no worse or better than any other nation. In order to prove that Juvenal is working through a persona and is not simply railing at an Egyptian atrocity, it is necessary to explicate fully Satire 15.

The structure of the Satire is clear and simple. There are four sections: lines 1-32, the introduction; lines 33-92, the story; lines 93-131, comment on the story; and lines 131-174, the moral. Lines 1-32 form the general introduction. The strange religious customs and food taboos of Egypt are examined (lines 1-13). And the persona attempts to establish his veracity and the reality of the story he is about to tell (13-32). Lines 33-92 relate the story of an Egyptian mob who
killed and ate a man. Lines 93-131 depict other comparable deeds of cannibalism, but none which are as horrid as the Egyptian atrocity. Lines 131-174 form the conclusion, which basically states that men are now worse than animals.

Satire 15 opens with a rhetorical question addressed to Bithynian Volusius, Quis nescit, Volusi Bithynice, qualia demens / Aegyptos portenta colat? (1-2). The rhetorical question implies that everyone knows qualia portenta demented Egypt worships: the crocodile, the ibis, the long-tailed monkey, cats, the river-fish, and dogs (2-8). In line 8 the persona comments that no one venerates Diana. This is a sarcastic remark. In effect he is saying, "Look at these stupid Egyptians who worship all the animals of the land, water, and sky, but who do not venerate Diana the goddess responsible for all the animals." The persona's sarcasm is an indication of his narrow-mindedness and intolerance. He is really saying, "Look at these stupid Egyptians, they worship strange creatures that are different from the gods I worship, thus the Egyptians are an inferior and demented nation." The thrust of lines 1-8 is two-fold. We not only learn that the Egyptians worship strange creatures, but that the persona has made a pejorative judgment against the Egyptians' gods simply because they are different, not anthropomorphic. Indeed, animal-worship, which represented a legitimate form of worship to the Egyptians, was commonly
practiced. In Satire 15 the persona compares Egyptian religion and customs, which he paints as strange and grotesque, to Graeco-Roman religions and customs, which he draws as legitimate, in order to degrade and belittle Egypt. But, as we shall see, his argument breaks down.

In lines 9-13 the persona explores the strange eating habits of the Egyptians.

porrum et caepe nefas violare et frangere morsu (o sanctas gentes, quibus haec nascuntur in hortis numina!), lanatis animalibus abstinet omnis mensa, nefas illic fetum iugulare capellae: carnibus humanis vesci licet.

The Egyptians do not eat leeks and onions, they refrain from sheep and the young of goats, but it is permitted to eat the flesh of humans. Nefas and licet make the point quite clearly. It is criminal to eat the flesh of certain animals, while it is legal to eat the flesh of humans. In any event, the circumstances surrounding the eating of human flesh are unexplained for the moment. And it would appear from the statement, carnibus humanis vesci licet, that it was not only legal, but common. It seems that the persona is misleading us purposely in order to strengthen

our abhorrence of the Egyptian culture and society. The Egyptians not only worship strange gods, but they even have strange preferences when it comes to their eating habits.

In lines 13-26 the persona says that when Ulysses related a similar incident of cannibalism, as the persona is about to relate, to the shocked Alcinous, Ulysses, as a lying storyteller, moved some men to wrath and others to laughter. The laughter is indicative of a possible parody.11

attonito cum
tale super cenam facinus narraret Ulixes
Alcinoo, bilem aut risum forteasse quibusdam
moverat ut mendax aretalogus.12 (13-16)

The persona clearly identifies his own cannibalistic tale with that of Ulysses, in line 14, with the words tale facinus. But the persona wishes to show the difference

11 G. Highet, 286 n.8, stumbles upon an interesting idea which he gives little credence to but which might very well be a logical explanation of Satire 15. Highet says: "R. Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Wunderzählungen (Leipzig 1906), 27-29, suggests that this poem is a parody of a type of wonder-tale with a moral (much used by the Stoics) called 'aretalogy'; and that it belongs to the same group as Hor. Serm. I.8. This may be, but the poem sounds too deadly serious to be earnestly classified as parody of any genus whatever." My point would be that the poem is not as deadly serious as Highet wishes to make it. This point will be amplified as I proceed.

between Ulysses' tale and his own. According to the persona, Ulysses' tale is a fabrication; the persona's a reality. In lines 16-23 a Phaeacian man reacts scornfully to the tale of Ulysses.

'in mare nemo
hunc abicit saeva dignum veraque Charybdi,
figentem immanis Laestrygonas et Cyclopas?
nam citius Scyllam vel concurrentia saxa
Cyaneis plenus et tempestatibus utres
crediderim aut tenui percussum verbere Circes
et cum remigibus grunisse Elpenora porcis.
tam vacui capitis populum Phaeaca putavit?'

He asks, "Will not someone throw this liar into the sea who makes up such stories about the Laestrygonians and Cyclopes?" The Phaeacian would sooner believe in Scylla, the Cyanean rocks, a bag full of winds, or Elpenor changed into a pig rather than in man-eating Laestrygonians and Cyclopes. Does Ulysses really think that the Phaeacians are so empty-headed as to believe in this fantastic story? Lines 24-25 seem to verify the stability and sobriety of the outraged Phaeacian.

Line 26, solus enim haec Ithacus nullo sub teste canebat, reinforces the idea that we must suspect Ulysses' tale, since he was the only witness to and sole survivor of his fantastic adventures.
Lines 13-26 are unfortunately not as simple as the persona would have us believe. Since the persona does seem to compare obliquely his own cannibalistic tale with that of Ulysses, we may also attach the tag of mendax aretalogus to the persona; for there is just as little evidence for the persona's tale as there is for Ulysses'.

Juvenal's persona in these lines uses mythological allusion, but, as in other places in the satires, changes the story to support his argument. No one in Phaeacia accused Odysseus of being a liar (cf. Odyssey 11.362 ff.). I believe that they knew he was a storyteller (aoidos), and accepted his tale in that light.\textsuperscript{13} Alcinous' words which seem to be naive are indeed perceptive (Od. 11.362 ff.). He understands Odysseus, but does not castigate him, because Odysseus provides him with so much pleasure. The persona misuses mythological allusion for his own purposes, but what results, is a subversion, instead of a buttressing of the persona's argument. Odysseus does not ask us to believe everything he says, but the persona insists that what he is about to tell us is the truth. His very insistence should

\textsuperscript{13} W.B. Stanford, ed., The Odyssey of Homer Vol. 1 (Macmillan and St. Martin's Press 1971), 395 n. 363, 366, remarks that there is disagreement as to whether Alcinous understood Odysseus to be a great storyteller, given to flights of fancy, or really naively believed everything Odysseus said.
make us suspicious.

That there was religious hatred between Ombi and Tentura is most likely; but that a fight occurred where one man was killed and eaten remains a matter of conjecture.

Jack Lindsay in *Daily Life in Roman Egypt* comments on the evidence for brawls and assaults.

Brawls and fights of all kind are common, but there is very little evidence for killings and above all for premeditated murder.\(^\text{14}\)

Lindsay also questions the veracity of the skirmish or riot which takes place between the Ombi and Tenturites.

Juvenal claims to have seen country-revels, but does not make the same claim about the riot. He may well have confused some of the motives of the tale he heard. Certainly the Roman troops would have been called out to restore order. Plutarch, not long later, reports, "Within our memory, the Oxyrhynchites, on account of the people of Cynopolis presuming to eat their revered fish, in revenge seized on all the dogs, the sacred beasts of their foes, which came their way, offering them in sacrifice and eating their flesh just as they did the flesh of other victims. This brought about a civil war between the two cities, in which both sides after doing each other a great deal of mischief were at last severely punished by the Romans."\(^\text{15}\)

---

14 Jack Lindsay, *Daily Life in Roman Egypt* (London 1963), 116.

15 Lindsay, 116.
Thus we cannot conclusively prove or disprove this incident, just as we cannot conclusively prove or disprove that Ulysses went on a voyage and was attacked by cannibals.

We must also examine the objectivity of the Phaeacian man. An objective, logical man would not more readily believe in Scylla, the Cyanean rocks, a bag full of winds, or Elpenor changed into a pig than in Polyphemus eating some of Ulysses' comrades. The Phaeacian man, who is supposedly in full control of his senses, prefers the fantasy of fairy tales to the reality of cannibalism. Maybe one sip of Corcyraean wine was too much to handle. Maybe Ulysses did think they were empty-headed if they would believe in fantasy before reality. As an objective audience, we must suspect the credibility of the Phaeacian man, Ulysses, and the persona. In satire, no one is above dissimulation. These lines are Juvenal's way of telling his audience to beware lest they become like the Phaeacian man; i.e. more inclined to believe the bizarre than the real. It seems that what we are about to hear is not as straightforward and truthful as we were led to believe. Lines 13-26, which were supposed to reinforce the truthfulness of the persona, have instead undermined his veracity. As a result of the persona's insistence on his own truthfulness and his perversion of the Homeric evidence, we now suspect his intentions.
In lines 27-32 Juvenal's persona establishes the magnitude of the crime that was committed in the consulship of Juncus. It is a crime greater than any atrocity found in the annals of Greek and Roman tragedy; and, moreover, it is a reflection of the barbaric age in which Juvenal lives.

nos miranda quidem sed nuper consule Iunco
gesta super calidae referemus moenia Copti,
nos volgi scelus et cunctis graviora coturnis;
nam scelus, a Pyrrha quamquam omnia syrmata volvas,
nullus apud tragicos populus facit. accipe nostro
dira quod exemplum feritas produxerit aevo.

Lines 29-31 are a grand statement which deteriorate into vagueness and generality. We might wonder what is a crime of the common type which is graver than all tragedy? We can accept these statements as truthful. But the comparison of a real-life atrocity to Greek and Roman tragedy is pedantic and unreal. It is a statement which appears to say a great deal about all of human life, but really says very little. It is a bombastic statement which is easily deflated. The works of Greek and Roman tragedy are only a small part of human experience. Surely there were other atrocities in the annals of human experience that were just as grave as the Egyptian atrocity. The persona attempts to establish the magnitude of the Egyptian atrocity, but seems to declaim in a vague manner.

Lines 1-32 introduce to us the strange religious customs of the Egyptians, and establish the gravity of the
incident about to be related. Yet, there is more to these lines than just a simple narration of the relevant facts. An undertone of irony exists. We learn that the persona is indignant. He is disgusted by Egyptian religious worship and food taboos, but his abhorrence is basically a misunderstanding of Egyptian religious ritual and observance. He hates the Egyptians because they are different. In this way Juvenal manipulates his persona in order to expose the persona's intolerance and blind hate.

An element of parody is also present in these introductory lines, as Richard Reitzenstein has observed.\(^\text{16}\)

There is epic parody or mock-epic in the persona's comparison of his own cannibalistic tale to that of Ulysses'. And there is tragic parody or mock-tragedy\(^\text{17}\) when the

---


17 Cf. Juv. 1.81 and 6.643.
persona says that the Egyptian crime was graver than any Ro-
man or Greek tragedy. As a result of this statement Egyp-
tian atrocity gains a tragic dimension which is subsequently
deflated through various ironic statements. Thus in lines
1-32 we not only have indignation as an operative factor,
but epic parody as well.

Lines 33-92 relate the exact details of the crime
that has so outraged Juvenal's persona and caused him to
write Satire 15. In lines 33-44 the persona gives the back-
ground and reasons for the feud between the neighboring
towns of Ombi and Tentura. Each town hates the other's gods.

\[\text{odit uterque locus, cum solos credat habendos}
\text{esse deos quos ipse colit. (37-38)}\]

Intolerance and prejudice are the motivating factors in the
feud. Thus the men of one of the towns plan to attack the
other town, while a religious festival is occurring. This
is indeed deplorable, but the persona castigates the people
of these towns for an emotion that he himself gives vent to
in lines 1-12. It is curious that a man who wished to rail
against some evil of society should himself indulge in that
evil. It seems as if this is a case of the pot calling the
kettle black.

In lines 44-46 as if we were not already convinced
that Egypt is indeed a barbaric and savage country, the per-
sona interjects another caustic remark about the Egyptians.
horrida sane
Aegyptos, sed luxuria, quantum ipse notavi,
barbara famoso non cedit turba Canopo.

The persona in his attempt to draw Egypt as a hateful nation is becoming overzealous. In the opening paragraphs of the satire, we, as the audience, might have believed that the persona was a logical and objective man who only wished to bring before our eyes a hateful incident indicative of man's inhumanity to man. But we become more aware of the persona's lack of objectivity, as his indignation towards the Egyptians grows.

In lines 47-51 the treachery and hate of the attacking tribe is highlighted. The town that is making the raid is doing so, because they think that victory will be easy against men too drunk to fight. The element of surprise will enable them to defeat their enemy.

In lines 51-83 Juvenal's persona meticulously describes the progression of the battle from the first words of quarreling to the final and gross outcome: the eating of human flesh. The persona portrays all the normal steps of warfare that ultimately lead to death (51-58). His description is vivid and horrifying. It seems to be a lesson on the stupidity and inhumanity of man. First, the quarrels begin. The quarrels serve as a trumpet call to the tribes' burning passions. Then the battle begins with a rush, as the opposing forces clash. But the only weapon
they use is their hands, which do considerable damage. Noses, cheeks, and eyes are bloodied and broken. This is a mock-battle which has all the appearances of an Iliadic struggle. At this juncture the battle seems to have reached a crucial point. Juvenal's persona comments on this very point in lines 59-62.

ludere se credunt ipsi tamen et puerilis exercere acies quod nulla cadavera calcent.
et sane quo tot rixantis milia turbae,
si vivunt omnes?

This is not really a battle but more like a competition or game, because no one has truly felt the full force of war. No one has died. The persona ironically asks what good is it for so many thousands of men to fight if they all live. Thus in lines 62-65 the battle grows fiercer. A new weapon is introduced, stones. The escalation of warfare and introduction of stones give rise to a mythological allusion and a comment on mankind in lines 65-71.

...nec hunc lapidem, qualis et Turnus et Aiax,
vel quo Tydides percussit pondere coxam
Aeneae, sed quem valeant emittere dextrae.
illis dissimiles et nostro tempore natae.
nam genus hoc vivo iam decrescebat Homero,
terra malos homines nunc educat atque pusillos;
ergo deus, quicumque aspexit, ridet et odit.

18 I.G. Scott, "The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal," Smith College Classical Studies 8(1927), 88-89, remarks that Satire 15 is a good example of epic parody. Here Juvenal uses both Homeric and Vergilian reminiscences to create his parody.
Men have grown increasingly weaker since the days of Homer and are not capable of wielding the ponderous weights that Turnus, Ajax, and Diomedes did. Earth now produces men that are wicked and weak, such men that the gods laugh at and hate. Establishing a contrast between the heroes of mythology and puny contemporary human beings is a common Juvenalian technique (cf. 13.167-173). The picture that the persona paints is indeed grim, but what is most noteworthy is the reaction of the god, whoever he may be, who watches the foibles of mankind and is moved to laughter and hatred. This reaction is similar to the reaction of the Phaeacians as they listened to the story of Ulysses. Hatred and laughter is a common reaction to satire.  


20 G. Hightet, Anatomy of Satire (Princeton 1962), 150, suggests that "Hatred which is not simply shocked revulsion but is based on a moral judgment, together with a degree of amusement which may range anywhere between a sour grin at the incongruity of the human condition and a delighted roar of laughter at the exposure of an absurd fraud---such are, in varying proportions, the effects of satire."; Patricia Meyer Spacks, "Some Reflections on Satire," Satire: Modern Essays in Criticism, 363-365, believes that satire creates a certain amount of uneasiness which may develop into laughter or hate.
They both might be viewing a satire. Much as the Phaeacians listen to Ulysses' story, so the god observes the folly of mankind. It would seem that Juvenal has created a subtle tour de force through this comparison. Life is satiric, for it inspires both men and the gods to laughter as well as hate.

In line 72 Juvenal's persona brings us back from the mythological allusion with the words a *deverticulo repetatur fabula*\(^\text{21}\). But the apology in this case is unnecessary, for lines 65-71 do not really digress from the point the persona is trying to make. In Satire 15 the persona is attempting to point out the inhumanity and stupidity of man. The mythological allusions to Turnus, Ajax, and Diomedes with the subsequent comment on how men have deteriorated since that time do so handily.

In lines 72-74 the fighting is further escalated. Swords and arrows now appear in the place of stones.\(^\text{22}\) In Book 5 of *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius deals specifically with the evolution of weapons. Juvenal's persona telescopes the evolution of weapons into a few lines to achieve epic parody. The effect is the same as that achieved in

\(^{21}\) Duff, 441, comments that "the apology is less necessary here than in many other places where it does occur."

\(^{22}\) Luc. 5.1281-1307
Book 5 of Lucretius: the technology of war advances from stage to stage, but man does not learn from this evolution, for war continues. Indeed, the progress of man is nonexistent. Only man's technology moves forward, while his mind remains motivated by the primitive instincts of vengeance and hatred. Again man's stupidity and inhumanity is emphasized.

As the fighting reaches its climax, the people of Tentura turn in flight before the Ombite charge. One unfortunate man trips in his anxiety to get away and the men of Ombi tear him to pieces and eat him raw. The persona dwells on this last point and further comments in lines 80-92 that they (the Ombi) were content to munch on the uncooked corpse without taking the time to start a fire in order to roast or stew the flesh. The distinction between eating raw human flesh or cooked human meat draws attention away from the fact that a man has been murdered. The persona emphasizes cannibalism, while he de-emphasizes the fact that a man has been murdered. The overindignant persona's perspective is out of joint.

In lines 84-92 Juvenal's persona continues to elaborate on the cannibalism of the Ombi. But in lines 84-87 the persona takes a short rest to rejoice that fire was
But this is a direct contradiction of lines 81-83, when he complains that the Ombi did not stop to roast or stew the meat, but ate it raw. He further interjects that he renders congratulations to fire, and he thinks that his audience is also glad that fire was not used. What the persona does here is draw the audience into his web of satire. The persona has gone off on a tangent, i.e. the discussion of cannibalism, and he draws his unsuspecting audience with him. Emphasis is misplaced on the details of the act rather than the lessons we should draw from it. The grossness of what has happened seems to blot out reasoning thought of all else. In lines 87-92 he continues to catalog meticulously what the Ombi did with every scrap of human blood and tissue. There is almost a relish and delight in the way the persona dwells on the description of cannibalism. One would think that the description of lines 81-83 would have sufficed, but now our stomachs begin to turn. In this detailed account the persona exhibits the same vulgarity and grossness for which he criticizes the Ombi. In this way Juvenal effectively dramatizes the shortcomings of the persona. The persona is a man of
extremes lacking any semblance of moderation. Thus instead of exposing the harsh cruelty of the Egyptians, he reveals his own morbid delight by repeating what we already know and do not want to be reminded of.

In lines 93-131 the persona gives further examples of cannibalism and other atrocities in order to show that what the Egyptians did was without a doubt the worst crime any nation or people had ever committed. The persona tells us that the Vascones, a Spanish tribe whose town, Calagurris, was attacked and destroyed by Afranius in 72 B.C., also ate human flesh. But their case was different than the Egyptians, or so the persona says. Unkind fortune had brought them to the ultimate extremity of war, the famine of a long siege. Resorting to cannibalism deserves our pity because they tried every possible alternative before they indulged in human flesh. Not until the pangs of an empty belly drove them did hunger make them tear the limbs of men and make them prepared to eat their very own flesh. This instance is really not any better than what the Egyptians did in the heat of battle. The Vascones instead of surrendering and possibly going into slavery chose to devour the flesh of their own tribesmen. And the Romans who

---

Cf. Quint. *Declamationes* 12; Sallust *Hist.* III.6D; Val. *Max.* VII.6E.
were really the cause of the Vascones' severe famine could only pity them. Juvenal's persona continues to lead us on with a rhetorical question in lines 103-106:

\[
\text{quisnam hominum veniam dare quisve deorum ventribus abnu} \text{eret dira atque imman} \text{ia passis et quibus illorum poterant ignoscere manes quorum corporibus vescebantur?}
\]

"What man, what god would withhold a pardon from bellies which had suffered such dire straits, and which might look to be forgiven by the Manes of those whose bodies they were devouring?" Juvenal's persona seems to be saying it is acceptable to eat human flesh when forced to do it. But were the Vascones really forced to eat human flesh? Did they not do it of their own free will, much as the Ombi did? Lines 106-108 suggest that there were other alternatives, according to the precepts of Zeno.

\[\text{melius nos Zenonis praecepta monent, } \text{nec enim omnia quidam pro vita facienda putant} \] 24 (107-108)

Zeno gives better teaching in dilemmas than cannibalism. He permits some things to be done for the saving of life, but not all things. Even though cannibalism was allowed

\[\text{24 Even though Clausen with Franck deletes this line, the sense of the line is compatible with the point Juvenal is trying to make.}\]
under certain dire conditions in Stoic teachings, Zeno probably would not have allowed cannibalism under circumstances where there were other alternatives. The fact that Zeno seems to counsel against cannibalism seems to contradict what we know about Zeno and the early Stoa. Either Juvenal's persona is mistaken or he has a better understanding of Stoicism than we realize. There is strong ancient evidence to show that cannibalism was permissible. Diogenes Laertius, in his Life of Zeno, describes the sage man and the possibility of the sage man turning to cannibalism.

Zeno, in his Republic, also says that the sage may marry and beget children. The wise man will never be content with mere opinions or assent to anything that is false. He will also adopt the role of the Cynic, since Cynicism is a direct path to virtue, according to Apollodorus in his Ethics. Under great duress, he may even turn cannibal.  

There are no limitations placed on him, for he is morally righteous and good. This point of view assumes the absolute perfection of the sage man. But this is an ideal rather than a reality. It is something to be striven for rather

than reached. We should not assume that Zeno was counseling cannibalism. The idea basically is that if a wise and sage man could be found, and the conditions were right and proper, a wise man could choose to become a cannibal. To counsel cannibalism in theory for a special man, and to carry it out under practical conditions are two extremely different things.

Also with respect to lines 106-108, Gilbert Highet believes that Juvenal has misunderstood Stoic philosophy, because Juvenal thinks Zeno is against cannibalism. Highet says:

> The Stoics did not forbid cannibalism, on the contrary they held it was οὐκ ἔσται ὧδεν and therefore permissible and even recommendable—always, not only in times of famine.26

Although what Highet says is true, he seems to miss the point of lines 106-108. Juvenal's persona is not saying that the Stoics forbade cannibalism, but simply that there were better alternatives.

Ludwig Edelstein in *The Meaning of Stoicism* discusses moral alternatives in relation to Stoicism and sheds some light on how a Stoic man would approach such a dilemma.

---

If one is faced with an issue between good and bad, the problem may be relatively easy; when one good is opposed to another or there is a conflict of duties, the decision straightway becomes difficult. When the good and so-called useful clash, it often seems to be impossible to find a solution. In putting moral alternatives Stoic casuistry celebrated its greatest triumph. The abyss of human nature was explored, and the intricacies of human choice were set forth. Who should be saved in case of shipwreck? Women and children or those who will certainly contribute to the welfare of mankind? If men are near starvation and all their supplies are gone, is it permissible to eat human flesh? These are the famous Cynic paradoxes of the Stoa. They are often quoted in order to prove that in the last analysis Stoic moralism was indifferent to the content of moral action; but nothing could be farther from the truth, for all these paradoxes, which emphasize real situations portray situations that may become real, were meant to show that man must always take responsibility himself, that the choice is his, that he can never find an excuse in external circumstances, and that even in the last extremity of moral action he and his reason must be the sole point of reference.

It is possible that a Stoic man might eat human flesh, but it seems to be a remote possibility. There is another element in Stoic doctrine which would tend to make the

27 L. Edelstein, The Meaning of Stoicism (Martin Classical Lectures, Volume XXI, Published for Oberlin College by Harvard University Press 1966), 89.
possibility of cannibalism that much more remote; i.e. humanitas. Edelstein describes the positive value of humanitas as seen by several noted Stoics.

It presupposes the brotherhood of man. Nature has made all of us one family. Nature has implanted in us mutual love, says Seneca. We are all members of one body, Cicero explains. We are all brothers, Epictetus holds. The interrelatedness of all men follows from the community of mankind, Philo asserts.28

Considering these statements we must agree with what the persona implies in lines 106-108. There were better alternatives than consuming and defiling the bodies of their own tribesmen. Zeno probably did believe that there were better alternatives in a siege than eating your own people. The fact remains that neither the Vascones nor the Egyptians were Stoics. Thus, if we are to pity the Vascones and pardon them, we must do the same for the Egyptians.

Lines 110-112 point to the fact that the world has gained the trappings of culture since the age of Metellus and that such far away places as Britain and Thule have lawyers and education.

nunc totus Graias nostrasque habet orbis Athenas, Gallia causidicos docuit facunda Britannos, de conducendo loquitur iam rhetore Thyle.

28 Edelstein, 90; M. Pohlenz, Die Stoa (Göttingen 1970), 272-275, remarks on humanity in Stoicism.
This is an inconsistent statement since we know from the description of barbarism that has occurred and the portrayal of inhumanity that only the appearance of civilization exists in the world. So we may draw the conclusion that civilization, even at Rome, is only skin deep.

In lines 113-115 the persona attempts to glorify the Vascones and mentions another town which endured similar hardships, the town of Zacynthos, i.e. Saguntum.

nobilis ille tamen populus, quem diximus, et par virtute atque fide sed maior clade Zacynthos tale quid excusat.\(^{29}\)

nobilis populus are strong words for people who ate their own countrymen. We must be horrified when we hear that the persona believes a people noble who were motivated by the pangs of hunger to do something normally outside the limits of moral action, even though other alternatives presented themselves. The point of the passage is to build up and praise the Vascones, so that the Egyptians may be denigrated by comparison. The persona wishes to show that the deed of the Egyptians was much worse than the deed of the Vascones; nevertheless, both acts are cannibalistic. The Vascones really are no better than the Egyptians. The persona does not prove his argument. Indeed, as Satire 15

\(^{29}\) Cf. Livy 21.14-15; Petronius Satyricon 141.
progresses, the persona's argument deteriorates. If we had any doubts as to the truthfulness of the persona, we need not have them any longer. The persona is a self-righteous and disdainful man who is convinced that his own judgment is infallible. But as we have seen and shall see the persona is far from infallible. Of course, this is not to say that the persona is always wrong, he is not. I simply wish to emphasize that Juvenal wants us to see and observe an example of human weakness, ignorance, and hypocrisy.

In lines 115-131 the persona renews his outburst against the Egyptians. At this point it is interesting to note how a specific crime committed by a single tribe in Egypt has become, in the persona's mind, indicative of the whole Egyptian nation. This is a gross exaggeration. The persona hates whatever the Egyptians do. Proof has been given concerning the culpability of the Ombi, but how can he infer that all Egyptians are to blame? In lines 115-119 the persona says that Egypt is more savage than the Maeotid altar, for the Tauric cult of Artemis only sacrificed her victims. The victims had nothing to fear but the slash of the knife. This is again an absurd comparison; for how can being sacrificed be any better than being torn to pieces? The end result is still the same. When people begin to draw the different degrees
of murder, then we have reached the height of absurdity. Savagery and cruelty are everywhere. The Egyptians are really not worse or better than any other nation.

In lines 119-131 the persona's exaggerated indignation and outrage reach a high point. He lashes out with question after question.

His questions seem to be easily answered. No dread calamity or hunger drove these Egyptians to devour a human being. It is the innate cruelty and savagery of the Egyptians that led them to commit this crime. Could the Egyptians take any other action than cannibalism if the Nile were not to rise? Here we seem to be dealing with a misunderstood fertility-ritual. Jack Lindsay explains why the Egyptians might have resorted to cannibalism if the Nile did not rise.
This...suggests a misunderstood fertility-ritual; for the brawlers the mangled and consumed victim might seem just what the drought needed for its ending. The poet is perhaps thinking of the legend of Busiris, who, to avert drought, obeyed a soothsayer and yearly offered up some stranger as a sacrifice, apparently to the Nile; the sacrifice went on till Heracles arrived in Egypt and was seized as a victim; at the altar he slew Busiris, his son and his herald, and ended the custom.  

This custom would indeed be primitive, but certainly does not demand the outrageous response the persona indulges in. The persona goes on to suggest that the Cimbrians, Brittones, Scythians, and Agathyrsians are less savage than the Egyptians who had had an advanced civilization for more than 3,000 years. The persona has reached the height of exaggeration in order to make his point that much stronger. He has reached the end of his diatribe. He says that there is no penalty or punishment worthy of such a crime or of such a people in whose mind rage and hunger are equal things. But we must ask if the Ombi really did believe that rage and hunger were alike? Or is this the supposition of a man blinded by his own particular brand of hatred?

In lines 131-174 the persona suddenly leaves his rage behind and becomes philosophical. The Egyptian atrocity is now a distant rumble, and the inhumanity of man to man

---

Lindsay, 115.
is the subject. The transition between the indignation of lines 119-131 and the cool, rational reflection of lines 131-174 is abrupt. It is hard to believe that the same man is talking. The sentiments expressed in lines 131-133 are profound, beautiful and melodic.

mollisima corda
humano generi dare se natura fatetur,
quae lacrimas dedit. haec nostri pars optima sensus.

Tenderness is the best quality in man. Nature gave tears to mankind and declared that he should weep for the misery of his fellow man. In lines 134-140 there are four examples of misery which make us weep.

plorare ergo iubet causam dicentis amici
squaloremque rei, pupillum ad iura vocantem
circumscriptorem, cuius manantia fletu
ora puellares faciunt incerta capilli.
naturae imperio gemimus, cum funus adultae
virginis occurit vel terra clauditur infans
et minor igne rogi.

We weep for the misery of a friend on trial or when a ward, whose streaming locks raise a doubt as to his sex brings a defrauder into court. We weep as the funeral of a maiden passes, or when an infant is buried who is too young for the funeral pyre.32 The persona portrays the spectrum of pity from sympathy to tragedy.

32 Duff, 446, says, "It was the custom, as still among Hindus, to bury, not to burn, infants."
In lines 140-142 the persona continues his pensive mood with a profound rhetorical question.

quis enim bonus et face dignus
arcana, qualem Cereris volt esse sacerdos,
ulla aliena sibi credit mala?

What good man, who is worthy enough to be initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries, believes that human woes are no concern to him? In lines 142-155 the persona elaborates on this feeling of goodwill towards men. Human woes concern everyone. This separates us from the common herd. We alone have allotted to us a nature worthy of reverence. This separates us from the beasts that grovel with their eyes upon the ground. Man has a soul and this also separates him from the animals.33 Man is endowed with feeling for other men that he might ask and give aid, and gather himself into groups and communities, so that he may live in peace with his neighbor.34

All these sentiments through line 155 are very fine, but right in the middle of line 155 continuing through line 158 the persona shifts emphasis and begins to glorify the actions of war.

33 Luc. 3.258-380 seems to think that all living things have souls. Possibly Juvenal is pointing to man's innate arrogance.

34 Cf. Luc. 5.1011-1027.
protegere armis
lapsum aut ingenti nutantem volnere civem
communi dare signa tuba, defendi eis de turribus atque una portarum clave teneri.

It is crucial here to draw a comparison between line 52 *animis ardentibus haec tuba rixae* and line 157 *communi dare signa tuba*. In line 52 the persona was describing the civil strife between the Ombites and Tenturites, and in what manner they clashed. In line 157 the persona describes how men have come together to defend what is theirs. What is interesting is that the same instrument of calling warriors together is used, the *tuba*. The persona uses the echo deliberately and for contrast. The Egyptians use the trumpet for civil strife, while the Romans use the trumpet for common good. However, are the Egyptians really different from the Romans? The persona points out the contrast, but Juvenal wishes us to see the similarity. Through this similarity Juvenal can reveal the persona's chauvinism. Why should a Roman *tuba* be better than an Egyptian *tuba*? Indeed they perform the same function. Thus if we criticize the use of the Egyptian trumpet, we should also criticize the Romans for the same use.

To continue, in lines 155-158 fellow-feeling leads a man to protect with arms a fallen foe, to help a comrade staggering from a grievous wound, to give battle-signals by a common trumpet, and seek protection inside the same city walls, behind gates fastened by a single key. Nature
proclaimed that man was tender-hearted, but now the persona calls for men to protect one another with actions of war. The persona gives us peace on the one hand and glorified war on the other. The emotions of communal love and the possession of boundary lines and city gates seem to be compatible. But this statement contradicts the persona's attitude towards the Egyptians. The persona never showed love in their case. He deplored the internecine warfare of the Egyptians, but when his own people go to battle he glorifies their struggles. In line 52 he castigates the Ombites and Tenturites for doing battle, but in line 157 he urges his fellow citizens to draw together to protect themselves. Why are not the things that are good for the Romans good for the Egyptians as well? There seems to be a double standard in operation. The persona here seems to be xenophobic and chauvinistic. He is unable to recognize that he is castigating an external group of people for communal unity, and praising his own people for the same thing. We should not forget that it was a Roman army under Afranius in 72 B.C. that caused the Vascones to turn to cannibalism.

In lines 159-174 Juvenal's persona returns from his description of the way, he thinks, life should be led to the way life is being led at the present time. In lines 159-164 he comments on the deplorable state of the world by comparing it to the apparent concord and harmony that exists in the animal kingdom.
sed iam serpentum maior concordia. parcit
cognatis maculis similis fera. quando leoni
fortior eripuit vitam leo? quo nemore umquam
expiravit aper maioris dentibus apri?
Indica tigris agit rabida cum tigride pacem
perpetuam, saevis inter se convenit ursis.

There is more concord among serpents than among men.
Beasts are merciful to beasts spotted like themselves.

Duff comments on the veracity of lines 159-164:

Moralists in all ages have pointed to the behavior of animals to their own kind as an example to man; but the facts are not quite as the moralists have stated them.35

Animals of the same species do not necessarily live in greater harmony with each other than man does. In fact, intra-species conflict is a common and well-documented occurrence.36 But whether the persona is biologically correct or not is really not the point. The persona exaggerates in lines 159-164 to show with greater emphasis the low condition to which humankind has sunk. He wishes to make perfectly clear that mankind is lower than the animals whom the Egyptians worship!

Lines 165-171 return us to the topic of cannibalism. Juvenal's persona now makes one last comment about the Egyptians.

____________
35 Duff, 448.
ast homini ferrum letale incude nefanda
produxisse parum est, cum rastra et sarcula tantum
adsueti coquere et marris ac vomero lassi
nescierint primi gladios extendere fabri.
aspicimus populos quorum non sufficit irae
occidisse aliquem, sed pectora, bracchia, voltum
crediderint genus esse cibi.

Ancient man was content with forging hoes, spades, and
ploughshares, but in this day and age it is not enough
for men to make deadly swords. A people, the Egyptians,
exists whose wrath is not relieved by slaying someone,
but who thinks that a man's breast, arms, and face afford
a kind of food.

In lines 171-174 the persona focuses on the food
prohibitions of Pythagoras.

quid diceret ergo
vel quo non fugeret, si nunc haec monstra videret
Pythagoras, cunctis animalibus abstinuit qui
tamquam homine et ventri indulsit non omne legumen?

What would Pythagoras, who abstained from all animal
meat as if it were human and would not indulge his belly
with every kind of pulse, think if he saw such savageness. It

37 Duff, 448, says that "The statement sounds con-
ventional and untrue when compared with Lucretius' pic-
ture of primitive man: he says that men first fought
with teeth and nails, or stones...pieces of wood, and
then with swords...(v. 1283-96)."

38 Walter Burkert, Lore and Science in Ancient Pyth-
agoreanism trans. Edwin L. Minar Jr. (Harvard 1972), 180-
185, discusses the tradition surrounding Pythagoras'
supposed abstention from animal flesh and various legumes.
is interesting that the persona chooses to praise Pythagoras who was famous for his avoidance of beans and some animal meat. For in the opening lines of Satire 15 the persona deplored the food taboos of the Egyptians (9-12). In fact, the persona uses the exact same language (animalibus abstinet, line 11) to castigate the Egyptians as he does to praise Pythagoras. There is really very little difference between avoiding onions and leeks, or avoiding beans. Each of these taboos probably had its own special significance to the worshippers of the particular religion whether it happened to be Pythagoreanism or some Egyptian cult. The persona is being inconsistent again and establishing a double standard. The persona is still embroiled in the outrage of Egyptian cannibalism. He is unable to draw back from the entire scene, and take an objective view of man's inhumanity to man. He hates the Egyptians beyond reason. Herein lies the main thrust of Satire 15. Juvenal not only wishes to show the hatred of the Egyptians for one another, but he also wishes to expose the opinions of an average Roman, opinions which are less than kind and humanitarian. In doing so, Juvenal convincingly satirizes the hatred of man for man and shows that cruelty and savagery are not an Egyptian monopoly.
CHAPTER IV

SATIRE SIXTEEN

Satire 16 deals with the apparent virtues of being a member of the Roman army. The attitude of Juvenal's persona is one of mock-praise beneath which lies an attack upon the excesses of the Roman army. Line one opens with a rhetorical question which we have come to expect at the beginning of Juvenal's satires. *Quis numerare queat felicis praemia, Galli, / militiae?* It seems that Juvenal's persona is about to discuss the advantages of a Roman military career; but what does occur, in fact, is the debunking of another Roman institution, the army. The persona is seemingly so anxious to become a Roman soldier that he declares:

nam si subeuntur prospera castra
me pavidum excipiat tironem porta secundo
sidere. plus etenim fati valet hora benigni
quam si nos Veneris commendet epistula Marti
et Samia genetrix quae delectatur harena.

If prosperous camps might be entered under a favorable star, then the army gate would receive the persona as a trembling recruit. More faith is put in the hour of fate than in the gods, but even the moment of benign fate is
a rare circumstance. The conditions under which the persona would enter the Roman military service are indeed narrow. *Prospera castra* and *secundum sidus* are conditions which cannot be met, because they are ideals which only exist in the mind and in reality do not exist at all.

The persona does not want to become a Roman soldier. His eagerness is feigned. The statement of lines 1-6 is entirely ironic. The irony which is established in these lines is maintained throughout the fragment. Even though we have only sixty lines the Juvenalian techniques of overstatement, tautology, epic allusion, and irony (saying one thing and meaning another) function as well as they did in any of his previous satires. Duff comments on the characteristic techniques of Satire 16.

...a reader familiar with Juvenal's style would surely pronounce it [*Satire 16*] to be his. The belief in fatalism, the banter at the expense of the gods, the sustained irony which, under a mask of praise, points out the unjust privileges of the soldier over the civilian—all these are characteristic.\(^1\)

Lines 7-60 consider the benefits commonly given to all soldiers. We first learn that no civilian will dare to thrash a soldier (lines 7-34). Indeed, a soldier may beat up anybody he wishes, for the combined strength of the

\(^1\) Duff, 449.
army supports him. If a civilian seeks redress, the case will be tried by a military court which will naturally decide in favor of the army man even if he is guilty. A man must be quite foolish to enter an army camp, because he has no chance of his charge being handled justly.

Indeed, a man must be a very Pylades, the archetypal silent friend, to go inside the rampart, and worthy of the beard and long hair of the Roman ancestors. It would be easier to find a false witness against a civilian than one who will tell the truth against the fortune and honor of a soldier. It is clear that the army is a society which protects its own even in the face of justice and honesty.

In lines 35-50 the second benefit of being in the army is listed. Soldiers are able to have court cases heard whenever they please; on the other hand, civilians must wait for the appointed time. Soldiers do not have to be inconvenienced by what is an inefficient court system.
Here we have an indirect attack on the Roman court system which shows favoritism to special groups and an inability to run the legal system smoothly.

In lines 51-60 we learn that a soldier has the right to make his will during his father's lifetime, thus being able to ignore the normal legal rights of *paterfamilias*. To sum up, in lines 7-60 we learn that a man who joins the army may 1) beat up anybody he pleases, 2) have a court case tried earlier than any civilian, and 3) make his own will during his father's lifetime. It seems that the army provides a way for men to ignore society's laws and work outside the legal system. The army, as described by the persona, is a refuge for cruel and sadistic people who wish to do things socially unacceptable in civilian life, but which will be accepted or ignored in army life. The people in the army seem to be quite undesirable.

In sixty lines the persona presents an attack on the army's elitism, hypocrisy, and injustice. The persona shows us what a corrupt and depraved institution the Roman army is. The people it is supposed to protect and defend are abused. After only sixty lines we can now answer the question of line one which is addressed to Gallius: "Who is able to number the rewards of happy military service?" The answer is clear. No one.
There is unity of subject matter, style, and philosophy in Book 5 of Juvenal's *Satires*. Juvenal through his persona consistently portrays Roman institutions and beliefs as corrupt and depraved. Hyperbole, mythological allusion, and repetition provide the bulwark of Juvenal's technique. It is Juvenal's use of the persona as well as his utilization of irony (saying one thing and meaning another) that ties these rhetorical elements into a cohesive end-product.

In Book 5 there is a dichotomy between the dramatic speaker, the persona, and the author, Juvenal. The persona is drawn as a man deeply upset with the world condition who attempts to do something about it through an ironic attack on individuals (Calvinus), communities (Roman family), and nations (Egyptians). The persona in all of Juvenal's satires is an intense observer of human activity. He is interested in everything he sees, sometimes to his own detriment, thereby exposing his own
frailties; e.g. when he exhibits voyeuristic tendencies in Satire 1, but basically his intentions are honest. He enjoys gathering all the gossip and scandal in order to pen it into satire. We think of the persona as indignant and angry in most of the satires, and certainly 13, 14 and 15 are no exception; yet behind that mask there is a pleasure and enjoyment which enables satire to be created. Of course, there is criticism of society and a desire to better the lot of mankind, but there is also a love of life, a passion for seeing life as it is in all its nakedness, crudeness, sadness, and beauty. It is a love of the quirks, and foibles, and the things which make us laugh and cry. Juvenal is a satirist, but only a man who loved life to its heights and depths could criticize mankind so mercilessly at times. For if he did not care, there would be no satire. Far from being a misanthrope, Juvenal is a humanitarian, a humanist. Juvenal has adopted the mask of *indignatio* to criticize Roman life, but if we look behind this we find a man concerned with the welfare of his fellow-man. If we learn nothing substantive about the life of Juvenal from the text, we do learn about his deep interest in and love for man with all his misery, corruption

---

1 Cf. *Sat.* 1.39, 41, 55, 77-78.
and decadence.\textsuperscript{2} There is something noble about a man who realizes the limitations of society and its members. He knew that the was part of the satiric scene described in Satire 1; indeed, he puts himself onto the stage in the very first line, \textit{semper ego auditor tantum}? He accepts society with all its weaknesses and enjoys it, if we can rightly penetrate the mask in 1.63-64, \textit{nonne libet medio ceras inplere capaces / quadrivio,}....

Juvenal's rhetoric, consisting of hyperbole, mythological allusion, and tautology, leads to a kind of dramatic irony wherein the audience realizes that the satiric scene is the persona's own view of society. Indeed, as W.S. Anderson suggests, "Juvenal expects his Roman readers,...to remain rational throughout the satirist's tirades [and] to distinguish reality from the satirist's [the persona] distorted view of reality."\textsuperscript{3} The persona presents an exaggerated and mythological version of reality. The crimes and misdeeds of society are: either 1) magnified by comparing present day vices with the vices of mythological times; e.g. Satire 6.643-661 which shows that modern Roman crimes are equal to if not greater than ancient crimes; or 2) the persona uses mythological allusions to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
show how much better than corrupt Roman society ancient times were. He diminishes the stature of modern man compared to the epic characters of mythological times; e.g. Achilles, Ulysses, Diomedes etc. Magnification and diminution are both used to show how corrupt Roman society is. Yet, we must remember that this is the persona's own distorted view of reality. A Roman audience surely would have understood what Juvenal was doing, but we who are almost 2000 years removed have a difficult time distinguishing the persona's view of reality from Juvenal's; however, it has been demonstrated that the persona is a creation of Juvenal, so that we can now more clearly discriminate between what Juvenal means as opposed to what the persona says. This is not to say that whatever the persona says is false; quite to the contrary, much of what the persona states is based on truth, even if it is overblown truth. We readily believe him, because he seems to be credible.

In Satire 13 Juvenal creates a persona that is ironically consolatory toward Calvinus. Through this false consolation, Calvinus' own greed and corruption are exposed and attacked. Calvinus, the unwilling victim whose trust is betrayed, is symptomatic of all Roman society. He is motivated by vengeance instead of a sense of justice. Juvenal's persona offers solid advice (13.19-22) which
Calvinus chooses to ignore. Calvinus could overcome his misfortune by learning to accept and endure the hardships of life. In a sense Juvenal's persona urges Calvinus to "turn the other cheek." The guilty will eventually be punished. Calvinus spurns forgiveness and seeks the delight of vengeance. For this, the persona indirectly attacks Calvinus by showing that Calvinus is really no better than the criminal who stole his money. Calvinus is unable to raise himself above the trivial problems of wrath and vengeance. He is human, but this is not enough. Thus, aside from the satirical thrust of Satire 13, Juvenal wishes us to glean a philosophical point. Man must live his life guided by human kindness. Man must strive to be better. And man must live with moderation as the key. If the extremes of wrath and vengeance can be eliminated, then we will all be happier. Of course, Calvinus is Juvenal's example of what not to be. It is a negative lesson that we learn, and, in a way, this is what satire does: it emphasizes the negative with an oblique eye toward the positive.

In Satire 14 Juvenal creates a persona that is a moral reformer with one basic thought reiterated from beginning to end: vice and avarice afflict Roman society. The persona criticizes the morality of Roman life. At the same time the persona shows himself to be an exaggerator, bigot, and zealot; thus, as Juvenal satirizes society, he is satirizing
the persona as well. Also in Satire 14, Juvenal offers two profound philosophical statements, one concerning his art, the other concerning life. For Juvenal satire is based on ironic delight in which fascination and sadness are mixed. There is fascination in the games of life and sadness for the tragic and pitiful results caused by the games (14.256-264). In addition, Juvenal believes that it would be much better if man could learn to be independent and self-sufficient. If we had no gods, or Fate, or Fortune to use as crutches, it would be better (14.315-316).

In Satire 15 Juvenal creates a persona who is incensed about an Egyptian act of cannibalism. From this basic premise, the persona attempts to prove that Egypt is a loathsome and atrocious country, one that is not fit to be ranked among the nations of the world. Through this overzealous attack on the Egyptians, the persona is proved to be a hypocrite, a bigot, and a xenophobe. Juvenal undermines his persona to show that hatred and cruelty are not a strictly Egyptian product, but that the Roman world is also afflicted by the same disease. The world is corrupt and depraved according to Juvenal; yet, here again as in Satires 13 and 14 he holds out a ray of hope amid all the gloom:
mollissima corda
humano generi dare se natura fatetur,
quae lacrimas dedit, haec nostri pars optima sensus.
(15.131-133)

The best quality in man is kindness, but it is submerged. If we could cultivate that, learn to live together, and guide our lives by love and kindness, many of the world's problems could be resolved.

Underlying the satiric vignettes of Satires 13, 14, and 15 is the quality of Roman *humanitas*. In Satire 13 we learn to "turn the other cheek" and "let your conscience be your guide." In Satire 14 we learn to live our lives with moderation and common sense. In Satire 15 kindness is offered as a possible solution to man's miseries. In all of Book 5 there is a concern with the humanitarian aspects of life. Even in Satire 16 Juvenal is concerned with the abuses of the army. All of this points to one fact; Juvenal is not a misanthrope who produced his satires through hatred and bitterness. Even though he observes all life with a jaundiced eye, he is in love with life and celebrates it throughout. Indeed, for Juvenal life is satiric. He, like the gods (*cf. Sat.* 15.71), is moved to wrath and laughter. Herein lies the nature of Juvenalian satire.
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