

INTRODUCTION

1 JUVENAL: LIFE AND WORK

Almost nothing is known about J.'s life. Whereas his main predecessors in satire, Lucilius, Horace and, to a lesser degree, Persius, had incorporated personal information and confidences in their poems,¹ as one element in the fashioning of the intimate, confessional and conversational tone which characterised their works,² J. – particularly in his first two books (*Sat.* 1–6) – adopts a hectoring, declamatory voice which precludes the vouchsafing of intimacies and is, it is generally agreed, a rhetorical creation having limited connection with the historical Juvenal.³ Furthermore, even the best of the various biographies attached to the MSS of J.⁴ seemingly represents no more than a tissue of extrapolations from the poems themselves. Nor can a now lost inscription from Aquinum (*CIL* x 5382), which speaks of a *Iuuenalis* as tribune of a cohort of Dalmatians and *flamen* of the deified Vespasian, be reliably associated with our Juvenal,⁵ for all that the latter had a demonstrable association with the place (*Sat.* 3.319 *tuo... Aquino*). Arguably the most concrete and salient information about J. comes from his older contemporary Martial, who, addressing him as a friend in three epigrams,⁶ describes him traipsing round the city to attend on wealthy patrons (12.18.1–6: cf. *Sat.* 1.99–101), and as *facundus*, possessing oratorical skill (7.91.1).⁷ Interestingly, there is no mention of poetic activities on J.'s part in even the last of the epigrams, which dates to the very beginning of the second century AD, but *facundus* connects with the satirist's remark that he received the conventional rhetorical education of any well-to-do Roman (*Sat.* 1.15–17) and with the pervasive influence of rhetoric in his Satires, discussed below.

¹ For Lucilius see the remarks of Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.30–4; for Horace, *Satires* 1.4–7, 1.9–10, 2.1 and 2.6–7 in particular; for Persius, *Satires* 3 and 5 especially. It is not of course to be supposed that such supposedly autobiographical detail represents the literal truth. Rather, it is one facet in the construction of a poetic 'I' which the author wishes to project. It is, for example, most unlikely that Horace's father was a one-time slave, as he claims (*Sat.* 1.6.6, 45–6): see Watson 2003: 1, with bibliography.

² It is no accident that Horace (similarly Lucilius) refers to his Satires as *sermones*, conversation pieces; cf. Coffey 1976: 68–9, Rudd 1986: 85.

³ See intro. § 5.

⁴ Attributed by Valla to 'Probus' in his 1486 edition. A text is printed in Clausen's *OCT* of J., p. 179.

⁵ Cf. Braund 1996: 16. ⁶ 7.24, 7.91 and 12.18.

⁷ The meagre tranche of additional facts about J. which can be gleaned from his Satires, none significant for the understanding of his poetry, is assembled by Coffey 1976: 119–23.

Given the paucity of internal data and the lack of reliable *testimonia* on the author,⁸ it is difficult to establish J.'s literary chronology with any precision.⁹ An allusion in *Sat.* 1.49–50 to the condemnation of Marius Priscus (AD 100) and a seeming reference in *Sat.* 2.102–3 to Tacitus' *Historiae*, composed approximately between AD 105–110,¹⁰ possibly also to his *Annals*,¹¹ has led to the conclusion that book 1 (*Sat.* 1–5) cannot have appeared much before AD 115.¹² These passages, in combination with *Sat.* 1.25, where the satiric speaker looks back to an earlier phase of his life when as a young man (*iuuenis*) he still sported a beard – Romans wore a beard until the age of 40¹³ – have in turn suggested that J. was born some time in the 60s AD. A dense series of allusions in *Sat.* 6.407–11 to events of AD 113–17¹⁴ establishes 117 as a *terminus post quem* for *Satire* 6 (book 2); it may have been published along with book 1.¹⁵ It is generally accepted that the emperor addressed in flattering terms at the opening of *Satire* 7 is Hadrian, who succeeded Trajan upon the latter's death in 117 and arrived in Rome in the middle of the following year. Book 4 (*Sat.* 10–12) contains no internal chronological markers, but there are two references in book 5 (*Sat.* 13–15 and the unfinished¹⁶ 16) to the year 127. The poet died at some undeterminable time thereafter. J. appears to have been little read in the two hundred years following his death, but in the latter half of the fourth century came back into vogue.¹⁷

The defining characteristic of J.'s *Satires* has always been viewed as *saeva indignatio*, fierce outrage at a world in which moral debasement can go no further.¹⁸ This impression J. cultivates in *Satire* 1 by punctuating his text with angry outbursts, as instances of the rich and vicious pass before the satirist's offended gaze.¹⁹ That impression is additionally

⁸ J. lived too late to be included in Suetonius' *De uiris illustribus*, which contains a partially preserved *De poetis*.

⁹ See Duff xiv–xxiii, Highet 1954: 4–19, Coffey 1976: 119–23, Braund 1996: 15–16 for more detailed accounts than can be offered here.

¹⁰ *Res memoranda nouis annalibus atque recenti | historia*, referring to the reign of Otto, dealt with in Tacitus, *Historiae* 1–2.

¹¹ Two passages in the early books, 2.56.1 and 4.5.2, look to be datable to AD 114 and 115 respectively.

¹² Relevant here is the oft-quoted opinion of Syme 1984: 1143 (cf. 1156) 'there is no sign, let alone proof, that Juvenal published or even wrote anything before 115, or indeed before 117'.

¹³ See commentary on 105–6. ¹⁴ See *ad loc.*

¹⁵ Much as Horace's *Carmina* 1–3 were issued together in 23 BC.

¹⁶ Or 'mutilated by an accident of transmission' (Coffey 1976: 135). Similarly Highet 1954: 156–8 and Parker 2012: 149.

¹⁷ Highet 1954: 180–90.

¹⁸ *Sat.* 1.147–9 *nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat | posteritas. eadem facient cupientque minores, | omne in praecipiti uitium stetit*; 13.28–30.

¹⁹ Notably 30–1 *difficile est saturam non scribere. nam quis iniquae | tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus, ut teneat se?* and 63–4 *nonne libet medio ceras implere capaces | quadriui?* in

underscored when J. plays up the pugnacity of the poets whom he names as his inspiration for writing satire, Lucilius and Horace. The former is represented as an epic warrior, blazing with anger and laying about sundry corrupt and criminal personages with satirical sword:²⁰ a tendentiously one-dimensional picture of Lucilius' poetry.²¹ The latter is the subject of the indignant rhetorical questions *haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna? | haec ego non agitem?* (51–2): again a wilfully reductive account, which ignores the elusive, shifting perspectives of Horace's *Satires* and elides their kaleidoscopic variety of theme. The sense of one whose outrage at contemporary vice knows no bounds is further enhanced by J.'s making his speaker parade in *Satires* 1–6 the stylistic features – angry exclamations, short, punchy sentences and the like – associated in the rhetorical tradition with *indignatio*, and likewise harness the topics and sentiments which, according to the specialist handbooks of oratory, best afforded opportunities for stimulating and articulating indignation.²²

The above is not the full story, however. After *Satire* 6 a change comes over J.'s speaker, who no longer bellows at the top of his voice, but modulates into a more rational, restrained tone which melds sympathy for the victims of Rome's corrupt *mores* with an irony that casts a disquieting pall over those expressions of sympathy.²³ Nor does such a description cover all the modalities of J.'s later *Satires*.²⁴ The much admired *Satire* 10, for example, is a disenchanting exposé of the follies and self-destructive tendencies of human aspirations, 13 a mock-*consolatio*²⁵ with a distinctly platitudinous and moralising overlay, 15 a gruesome, at times tongue-in-cheek, narrative of a cannibalistic orgy in Egypt.

As Kenney demonstrated,²⁶ a satiric convention arose whereby, in a programmatic piece, the poet would issue an *apologia* for the writing of satire and defend himself against an interlocutor who pointed out the disadvantages and risks attendant upon the penning of verses attacking individuals. In answer, the satirist would conclude with a deliberately flip-pant evasion of the objections raised by his opponent. J.'s variation on this theme involves an abrupt and startling climb-down after the threats, trumpeted throughout *Sat.* 1, of attacks on contemporaries: namely that he will assault only those whose ashes are covered by the Flaminian way, that is,

the face of Rome's monsters of vice. Cf. also 45–8 *quid referam quanta siccum iecur ardeat ira, cum...?* etc.

²⁰ *Sat.* 1.165–7 *ense uelut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens | infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens est | criminibus, tacita sudant praecordia culpa.*

²¹ A balanced account can be found in Rudd 1986.

²² See further intro. 7–8, 36–7, 49, 51.

²³ For this approach see particularly Anderson 1962 = 1982: 277–92 and Braund 1988. For criticisms of it as inadequate see Plaza 2006: 249–53 and Gold 2012.

²⁴ See conveniently Braund 1988: 178–98.

²⁵ Braund 1988: 190. ²⁶ Kenney 1962.

the dead (170–1). This notorious evasion has elicited a variety of scholarly responses: that J.'s targets represent type-figures embodying vices belonging to the here and now (to put it another way, the living are assailed under cover of the dead);²⁷ that this is merely the last and most stark of a number of intimations in *Sat.* 1 that the Speaker is a flawed, fallible construct characterised by self-interest and hypocrisy;²⁸ that lines 170–1 are not so much an evasion as a rational recognition of the fact that to utter public criticisms of prominent individuals or voice dissent, even by implication, against the current regime continued to be almost as dangerous as it had been for much of the first century AD.²⁹ The advent of Trajan did not necessarily mean that *carte blanche* was suddenly given to *libertas*, frank speech.³⁰

All this is of relevance to *Satire* 6. Just as, for example, J. devotes almost a whole poem to attacking the long-dead Domitian and his imperial *consilium* (*Sat.* 4), or pillories Nero as parricide and *flaneur* who prostituted his regal dignity on the public stage (*Sat.* 8.211–30), so in *Satire* 6 two of the most lurid episodes involve figures from the Domitianic and Claudian eras respectively, Eppia and Messalina (82–113, 114–32). A number too of the aristocratic women named in the *Satire* as emblematic of one vice or another belong to long-extinct families, while many other targets are simply designated by an essentialising 'she' or 'they'. There is a curious impersonality to all this, almost as though the Speaker were dealing in generic rage.

When Horace sought to distinguish his satiric hexameters from more dignified types of verse, he appealed to their conversational quality, labelling them *sermoni propiora* and *sermones... | repentes per humum*.³¹ J. by contrast has traditionally been located at the opposite end of the stylistic spectrum, held to embody the so-called 'grand style',³² whose exponent, as Cicero put it,³³ was *amplus, copiosus, grauis, ornatus*, 'elaborate, abundant, impressive and ornate', possessed of *uis*, rhetorical power, and well fitted *ad permouendos et conuertendos animos*. But in a revisionary paper Jonathan Powell³⁴ persuasively³⁵ argued that J.'s use of the high style is sporadic rather than sustained, that occurrences are invariably harnessed

²⁷ Thus e.g. Coffey 1976: 125 and 138. ²⁸ Braund 1996: 116–21.

²⁹ Rudd 1986: 62–6, 71–4. Further approaches to the vexed conclusion of *Satire* 1 are noted by Plaza 2006: 48–9.

³⁰ Coffey 1976: 136–7, Rudd 1986: 80–1. Waters 1969 showed that the autocratic tendencies of Domitian were maintained by Trajan, who also employed many of the same *amici*, some decidedly dubious.

³¹ *Sat.* 1.4.42, *Epist.* 2.1.250–1. Cf. also *Sat.* 2.6.17 *satiris musaque pedestri*.

³² See particularly Scott 1927 and Bramble 1974: 164–73; also Rudd 1986: 107–9.

³³ *Orat.* 90, 20. ³⁴ Powell 1999.

³⁵ See Jones 2007b, Morgan 2010: 345 n. 210 (Powell's view is 'self-evident'), Kenney 2012: 125.

to effects of parody or mockery, and that when the satirist does appropriate the high style, he regularly brings it crashing down to earth by the juxtaposition of a word of low register, as with the intrusively prosaic *ser-raca* at *Sat.* 5.22–3 *illo tempore quo se | frigida circumagunt pigri serraca Bootae*. These views seem essentially correct, if perhaps in need of minor modification.³⁶ At other times, his verse can by design give, in Powell's words, 'the impression of a chaotic mixture of stylistic levels', as in the comic account of the fatal street accident at 3.257–67.³⁷ Above all, Powell notes, it is vital to read in context certain passages which have too often been construed as programmatic announcements that J. is adopting the elevated manner associated with epic or tragedy or, a related claim, that the viciousness of contemporary Rome is such that satire has by necessity become heroicised, supplanting the played-out epic genre.³⁸ Accordingly, the ringing epicisms of *Sat.* 1.168–70 *tecum prius ergo uoluta | haec animo ante tubas: galeatum sero duelli | paenitet* are no advertisement of a new epic-satiric mode, but a necessary set-up for the humiliating, deflationary climb-down which immediately follows.³⁹ And when, in *Sat.* 6.634–7, J. meets the objection of an imaginary interlocutor with the words *fungimus haec altum satura sumente coturnum | scilicet, et finem egressi legemque priorum | grande Sophocleo carmen bacchamur hiatu, | montibus ignotum Rutulis caeloque Latino?*, he is not making a proclamation about his preferred style, as is often assumed.⁴⁰ Rather, he is expropriating the stylistic modalities of the *genera grandia*, tragedy and epic, in order to underpin linguistically the (indubitably hyperbolic) claim which constitutes the climax of *Satire* 6, that the monstrous crimes previously associated with the impassioned females of Greek tragedy have become a reality in contemporary Rome, indeed that the cold-blooded criminality of Roman wives overtops that of the tragic paradigms.

In his *Themes in Roman satire*, Niall Rudd observes that satire operates within a triangle of which the apices are attack, entertainment and preaching.⁴¹ For many centuries critical opinion on J. emphasised the last

³⁶ As James Uden points out to us *per litteras*, J.'s controlled and striking modulation between different linguistic registers attests the highly wrought literariness of his style; hence Powell's characterisation (1999: 316) of J.'s predominant mode as 'argumentative conversational discourse' is somewhat reductive. In addition, as Jones 2007b demonstrated (albeit certain of his criteria are too slippery to allow of definite conclusions), J.'s metrical technique is in general closer to that of non-satirical hexameter poets than that of earlier satirists, and in certain respects (separation of noun and adjective within the verse, avoidance of wholesale elision) suggests the deliberate pursuit of stylistic elevation.

³⁷ Powell 1999: 327, with his analysis of the passage, 327–8.

³⁸ Cf. Braund 1996: 21–4. ³⁹ See discussion above.

⁴⁰ Any more than he is at *Sat.* 15.29–31, where he states that the episode of cannibalism among the Egyptians which the *Satire* treats is *cunctis graviora coturnis*.

⁴¹ Rudd 1986: 1 *et passim*.

function: he was seen as an uncompromising censor of morals and castigat-
 or of vice⁴² – notwithstanding the discomfiting relish that he frequently
 takes in depicting the morally repulsive or debauched,⁴³ or the oppor-
 tunistic wit of passages such as 6.10 *et saepe horridior glandem ructante mar-
 ito*.⁴⁴ But in the last fifty years or so a radical change has come over Juvena-
 lian scholarship. Almost all the emphasis since the 1950s has been on the
 element of entertainment, J. being hailed as a supreme master of wit. Of
 especial note here are his favourite technique of a grandiose build-up fol-
 lowed by a banal, ironic or debunking conclusion,⁴⁵ comic hyperbole⁴⁶
 and a humour which deflates the moral outrage which notionally ani-
 mates his verse, e.g. 6.100–1, on the contrasting gastric reactions of wives
 and adulteresses to sea-travel, whereby ‘the woman who goes off with a
 lover has a strong stomach; the other pukes all over her husband (*maritum
 conuomit*)’.

For long, of central importance in approaching J.’s humour has been
 the idea that it is focalised primarily through the persona, a literary
 construct whose fallibilities, fatuities, self-contradictions and self-serving
 hypocrisy deliberately expose him to readerly ridicule and incredulous
 dissent (see further below on this). In recent years, however the terms
 of the debate have shifted somewhat, questioning or modifying persona
 theory, and taking a more global approach to humour in satire. Of partic-
 ular note are two recent works by Rosen and Plaza,⁴⁷ the latter of which,
 informed by theories of humour, offers several observations which make a
 real contribution to analysing J.’s satiric wit, not least in *Satire* 6: first that J.
 typically exalts his targets in order to bring them down to earth by mockery
 and ridicule, a pattern seen in the hyperbolically magnified monsters of
Satires 1 and 6 especially;⁴⁸ next, that J. gets a lot of comic mileage out of
 ‘reverse stereotypes’ such as the female gladiators of *Sat.* 6.246–67, where
 the humour depends upon the outrageous overturning of societal norms
 (in this case patriarchally-coloured notions of feminine physical weakness

⁴² Some examples in Rudd 1986: 28. See also below 36, 37 n. 205.

⁴³ E.g. the titillating lubriciousness of J.’s description of the Bona Dea rite in
Sat. 6.314–45 or the equally suggestive account of the *Gaditanae* at 11.162–75 –
 hardly appropriate to the moralising context. For this tension, intrinsic to the satiric
 persona, see Anderson 1964: 127 = 1982: 293.

⁴⁴ Or 10.191–5, on the afflictions of age, where sympathy might have seemed
 more in order than mockery.

⁴⁵ E.g. 6.502–6, a *matrona* who is an Andromache from the front, a Pygmy
 from the rear. Further instances are discussed by Martyn 1979, with that peculiar
 humourlessness which infects scholars dissecting ancient humour.

⁴⁶ E.g. 6.655–6 *occurent multae tibi Belides atque Eriphylae | mane, Clytemestram nul-
 lus non uicus habebit*.

⁴⁷ Rosen 2007, Plaza 2006. ⁴⁸ Plaza 2006: 105–55.

and sexual modesty);⁴⁹ lastly, the intriguing suggestion that the women of *Satire 6* are so unrepentantly and risibly triumphant in their excesses that the text, contrary to its declared purpose, may be read as subintentionally feminist.⁵⁰

Lastly, a word on rhetoric in J., with which the issue of the persona is closely intertwined.⁵¹ J. has long been seen as rhetorician quite as much as satirist.⁵² In an influential work De Decker usefully classified the influence of rhetoric in J. under three headings,⁵³ subject-matter (*loci de saeculo, de fortuna, de diuitiis* etc.), compositional techniques and stylistic influences (lapidary *sententiae*, apostrophe, anaphora etc.) – although, as has been noted, De Decker might have made it clearer that the imprint of rhetoric was pervasive in the prose and poetry of the first and second centuries AD,⁵⁴ not something peculiar to J. Beyond this, the topics of several Satires seem indebted to the stock theses of the rhetorical schools; for example, one of the springboards for *Satire 6* may have been the rhetorical *progymnasma* on the question of whether one ought to marry,⁵⁵ while *Satire 3* is coloured thematically by the *syntaktikon*, speech of a departing traveller,⁵⁶ but also has intimations of the rhetorical thesis, ‘is life in the city or country preferable?’⁵⁷ Exemplarity, the mustering of parallels from history or mythology in order to bolster an argument, is a key weapon in rhetoric’s armoury and so widespread in J. as to require no discussion here:⁵⁸ it will suffice to refer to *Satire 10*, the best-known instance. Accusations of sexual malfeasance and deviance, the thematic core of *Satires 2, 6* and *9*, were a stock-in-trade of forensic oratory under the Roman republic⁵⁹ and from there passed to its jejune and artificial offshoot, the declamatory rhetoric of the Empire. Here too the influence on J. is palpable: for example, Sen. *Contr.* 1.2, concerning a would-be priestess who had worked in a brothel, evidently influenced the Messalina scene of *Satire 6* both in overall conception and details. Two further manifestations of rhetoric in J., its contribution to the fashioning of a satiric voice seething with indignation, and the expressive possibilities of a satiric idiom flavoured at every turn by rhetoric, are discussed below under persona and style respectively. But enough evidence has hopefully been marshalled here to legitimise the

⁴⁹ Plaza 2006: 136–9. ⁵⁰ Plaza 2006: 127–55.

⁵¹ See intro. § 5 on the persona.

⁵² A useful brief synthesis of the influence of rhetoric on J. is provided by Braund 1996: 18–21.

⁵³ De Decker 1913.

⁵⁴ For the influence of declamatory rhetoric on the literature of the first century AD see Bonner 1969: 149–67.

⁵⁵ Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 2.25, Braund 1992a.

⁵⁶ Cf. Cairns 1972: 47–8. ⁵⁷ Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 2.24.

⁵⁸ See e.g. De Decker 1913: 107–10, Kenney 2012: 130–3.

⁵⁹ Richlin 1992: 96–104, Corbeil 1996: 104–27.

hermeneutics of E. J. Kenney's well-known question: 'Juvenal: satirist or rhetorician?'⁶⁰

2 SATIRE 6: STRUCTURE AND THEMES

In 1954 Highet stated 'With the best will in the world, none of his expositors has ever been able to give a satisfying explanation of the plan of . . . the Sixth [Satire]' and this judgment still holds true.⁶¹ Various problems, perceived or real, relating to the architecture of the poem have been identified by scholars.⁶² These include:

- (1) Lack of overall structure. The Satire begins with an addressee, Postumus, who is considering marriage and whom the Speaker tries to dissuade, largely on the ground that no woman in contemporary Rome is faithful to her husband (*pudica*), so that it is impossible to find a suitable wife. So long as the topic of *impudicitia* is maintained (1–400 approx.), a degree of coherence subsists. But once this theme begins to flag, the poem becomes a general attack on *matronae* through a series of vignettes illustrating a variety of vices attributed to them. Additionally, the ending is somewhat abrupt, with no attempt to return to Postumus (not named since 377), or to draw any sort of moral, the murder of husbands being left to speak for itself.
- (2) Subjects are treated at varying lengths, the treatment being in some cases either disproportionately short (e.g. 242–5) or long (e.g. 512–91 on female superstition).
- (3) Transitions between sections are not always smooth (cf. 133–5, 349–51, 461nn.).
- (4) On occasion a theme is announced without being followed through, e.g. at 474–5 a detailed account of how women pass their entire day is promised, but only part of the day's activities is described.⁶³
- (5) Subject matter is repeated in different parts of the Satire, e.g. stage performers (63–75; 379–97); the husband presented with a son resembling a low-class lover (76–81; 597–601).
- (6) The overall impression, according to many, is of an unstructured rant.

⁶⁰ Kenney 1963.

⁶¹ Highet 1954: 170; for some discussions of the Satire's structure see Highet 1954: 91–103, Anderson 1956 = Anderson 1982: 255–76, Nardo 1973: 11–14, Bond 1979: 438–40, Smith 1980, Winkler 1983: 147–51, Bellandi 1991, Braund 1992a: 75, Bellandi 1995: 48–52.

⁶² For a particularly harsh critique of *Satire 6*'s alleged lack of structure see Friedländer's edn, p. 278.

⁶³ This might, however, be deliberate: see 474–5n.

Some of these difficulties can be explained by the unsatisfactory state of J.'s text, which has suffered from interpolations, transpositions and omissions: this applies especially to 2, 3, and 4 above (see intro. § 7). As to the alleged incoherence of the Satire as a whole (1, 6), various attempts have been made to discern some sort of architectural cohesion.

Most agree that the Satire has a basic structure in the form of two main sections (25–285 and 300–633), the first preceded by a prologue (1–25⁶⁴) introducing the main theme of the section (the absence of *pudicitia* among contemporary Roman women), the second prefaced by a further prologue addressing the origins of moral decline, and rounded off by an epilogue defending the incorporation into the satiric genre of subject matter (murderous *matronae*) which might seem more at home in tragedy.

Many have argued that the Satire is given a degree of unity by an overarching theme or themes. Anderson, for instance, giving prominence to the second prologue (286–300), in which women's moral decline is traced to foreign luxury, divided the Satire into two halves, the first dealing with adultery, the second with *luxuria*.⁶⁵ This approach accounts for Postumus' lack of prominence in the latter part of the poem: since this is not about marriage, he is no longer needed.⁶⁶ But the argument fails on the grounds that some topics which appear in the second half (e.g. the *matrona docta* 434–47) are not concerned with *luxuria*, while passages in the first half (e.g. 149–60 on the acquisitive Bibula) fit better with the theme of *luxuria* than adultery.

According to a more commonly held view, the Satire is an attack on womankind as a whole; the poem is replete with misogynistic topoi going all the way back to Hesiod (see intro. § 4). Proponents of this approach include Ferguson, Tennant⁶⁷ and, adopting a more conceptually sophisticated standpoint, Gold, Johnson and Plaza.⁶⁸

Others have seen the Satire as held together by the theme of misogamy, most notably Highet 1954: 91–103, Bellandi⁶⁹ and, above all, Braund

⁶⁴ Some (e.g. Bellandi 1995: 48–52) take the prologue down to line 37.

⁶⁵ Anderson 1956 = Anderson 1982: 255–76.

⁶⁶ It also confronts the difficulty of themes being repeated, subjects included in both halves being treated from two different viewpoints (adultery and *luxuria*).

⁶⁷ Ferguson 1998: 185–6, Tennant 2002; cf. Anderson 1956 = Anderson 1982: 255–76.

⁶⁸ Gold 1994 (modified in Gold 2012: 108), Johnson 1996, Plaza 2006: 127–55, who sees the Satire as misogynistic (140, 154) but argues that the misogyny is enfeebled by the numerous uproarious vignettes in which women are presented as über-powerful, a patriarchal male's worse nightmare, so that the Satire sows the seeds of its own ineffectuality.

⁶⁹ Bellandi 1995: 13–14, who qualifies this, however, by stating that the poem is also an attack on female nature per se (14) and positing (31) that 'Juvenal's misogyny... might be better characterised as a form of gynaeophobia.'

1992a, who argued that ‘Satire 6 is best understood not as a general diatribe against women but as a dissuasion from marriage, a λόγος ἀποτρεπτικός γάμου, informed by contemporary rhetoric and delivered by a misogynist.’ She pointed out that many of the foibles of women in the second half are described from the viewpoint of their impact on the husband, thus offering disincentives to marrying additional to women’s lack of *pudicitia*. Less convincingly, following Smith 1980, she also sees a ‘story-line’ which provides a general structure: Postumus wants to marry (and thus is figuratively mad); in the middle of the poem he does so (200–5); at the end he is driven literally mad by his wife (610–26) and in the poem’s concluding lines is murdered by her. It is not, however, clear that Postumus actually marries at 200–5,⁷⁰ and if the husband who is murdered at the end is Postumus, rather than husbands in general, he ought to have been named.

We suggest that the above two approaches to the Satire – misogynistic or misogamic – can to some extent be reconciled, since Greek and Roman texts dealing with the male experience of the female make little if any distinction between the categories of ‘woman’ and ‘wife’.⁷¹ The unifying theme of the Satire, then, is the vices of Roman *matronae* – with the focus mainly, but not exclusively, on the upper classes. The opening dialogue in which the Speaker attempts to dissuade the addressee Postumus from his marriage plans is a peg on which to hang an initial attack on *matronae* as lacking *pudicitia* – the paramount virtue of the married woman and thus suitable for special attention. The conversation with Postumus effectively ends when he asks, in exasperation, ‘isn’t there a single woman who lives up to your standards?’ (161); in reply, the Speaker refuses to allow perfection even in a nonpareil like Cornelia – the supreme argument of an arch-misogynist and one that leaves no room for a reply. The Speaker having won his case, he now feels free to elaborate on his theme that there are no satisfactory women in Rome. Postumus, defeated, fades out of the picture⁷² and, as the Speaker warms to his task, the Satire segues into a more general attack on married women.

In addition to the pattern just noted, it can be shown that the poet has exercised more care in composition than has been recognised. Notable

⁷⁰ The future tenses (201, 208, 212 etc.) in particular suggest that this is a warning rather than a description of something that actually happens.

⁷¹ Moreover, in the writings on marriage which influenced J. greatly (see commentary *passim*), misogyny is so deeply interwoven with arguments *pro* and *contra* marriage that the two strands of discourse can hardly be disentangled. For both points see Watson 2008a: 271–5.

⁷² He is not entirely forgotten, however, reappearing at 377 and implicitly addressed via the use of the second person sing. from time to time. But in terms of basic structure, the first part consists of dissuasion, the second description.