

Washington University in St. Louis

## Washington University Open Scholarship

---

Arts & Sciences Electronic Theses and  
Dissertations

Arts & Sciences

---

Summer 2022

### “Horatian” Juvenal and “Juvenalian” Horace: A Study of Juvenal Satire 9 and Horace Sermones 2.5

Maurice Gonzales

Follow this and additional works at: [https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art\\_sci\\_etds](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art_sci_etds)



Part of the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Gonzales, Maurice, ““Horatian” Juvenal and “Juvenalian” Horace: A Study of Juvenal Satire 9 and Horace Sermones 2.5” (2022). *Arts & Sciences Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2765.  
[https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art\\_sci\\_etds/2765](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art_sci_etds/2765)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Arts & Sciences at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Arts & Sciences Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact [digital@wumail.wustl.edu](mailto:digital@wumail.wustl.edu).

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS

*Department of Classics*

“Horatian” Juvenal and “Juvenalian” Horace:  
A Study of Juvenal *Satire* 9 and Horace *Sermones* 2.5  
by  
Maurice S. Gonzales

A thesis presented to  
The Graduate School  
of Washington University in  
partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree  
of Master of Arts

August 2022  
St. Louis, Missouri

© 2022, Maurice S. Gonzales

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Note on Texts and Translations.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: The Function of Sexual and Bodily Imagery in Horace <i>Sermones</i> 2.5 and Juvenal <i>Satire</i> 9.....	16
Chapter 2: The <i>Odd-yssey</i> : An Examination of the Ulysses-Imitating Naevolus.....	30
Chapter 3: Ironically Secure and Securely Ironic.....	52
Conclusion.....	62
Bibliography.....	64
Appendix 1: Text and Translation of Juvenal <i>Satire</i> 9.....	68
Appendix 2: Text and Translation of Horace <i>Sermones</i> 2.5.....	77

# Acknowledgements

This thesis is the product of now three years spent on an idea that snowballed from note to conference paper to the study now here. I finish it in debt to many fine individuals—friends, peers, professors, and especially family—whose ears I, like Juvenal, filled full with talk. I would like to give the utmost thanks to Ian Fielding, who fostered this idea at its most embryonic stage, to David Larmour and my peers from Texas Tech University, who with their feedback allowed me to mold it into my first conference paper delivered at the first all-virtual CAMWS, to those readers of mine, who read proto-versions of these chapters, to my incredible committee members, Thomas Keeline and Luis Salas, for their invaluable insight, and especially to committee member and advisor, Catherine Keane, the most constant source of advice and patience for this study. Her comments and revisions in particular for these chapters over the past year, for which I cannot thank her enough, will always be appreciated and treasured.

I am most grateful to Nathan Newberry, who has been with me since the beginning, offered much-needed moral support, and even from afar managed to fill my most despondent days with bright light. Finally, I would like to offer my most heartfelt thanks to all the professors of Classics and my fellow graduate students here at Washington University for their kindnesses this past difficult months.

*matri solem quae videt et patri adempto nobis*

Maurice S. Gonzales, Jr.

*Washington University in St. Louis*

*August 2022*

# **Note on Texts and Translations**

For quotations, I use the Oxford texts of ancient authors (Juvenal and Persius: Clausen, 1992; Horace: Wickham and Garrod, 1912; Homer: Allen, 1917) Translations are my own except where those of others are quoted or adapted, with citations

# Introduction

Juvenal's ninth satire is unique in his corpus. It is his first and only sustained dialogue between the speaker and the interlocutor, Naevolus.<sup>1</sup> This curiosity has been greatly overlooked because of the satire's earthy imagery and frankness. As a result, the satire has been generally overlooked and mentioned in studies only in passing. In this study, I aim to help continue correcting this oversight by examining the satire's metaliterary functions. I shall argue that the interlocutor, Naevolus, represents two important developments in Juvenalian satire: Naevolus serves both as a farewell to Juvenal's prior satirical inspiration, *indignatio*, and methodically disassembles Juvenal's most famous satirical predecessor, Horace. Each of these developments, as we shall see, helps to further distinguish Juvenal and his work as something entirely different, something new, a satirist and kind of satire never before seen.

Juvenal, the latest of the ancient Roman satirists, in the second century CE, reformed the genre in his indignant image when his first speaker famously asked: will I always be just a listener? (*semper ego auditor tantum?*, 1.1).<sup>2</sup> To repay the many ghastly epics, comedies, elegies, and tragedies inflicted upon him by tasteless poetasters, the speaker of *Satire 1* decided to try his hand at writing poetry (1.1-18). With these introductory lines, Juvenal with his *ira* (1.45) and *indignatio* (1.79) shaped the course for his satires. These violent emotions—a result of the many things wrong with Rome (1.22-29)—made it difficult for Juvenal *not* to write satire (*difficile est*

---

<sup>1</sup> Juvenal experimented with dialogue form in earlier satires, but each time the partner was unwilling or unable to respond in turn. Prior to *Satire 9*, the closest Juvenal came to having a sustained dialogue was in *Satire 3*. In this satire, Umbricius, a downtrodden and xenophobic client, rants about upstart Greeks to the speaker for nearly a whole day and never lets his potential dialogue partner speak once he gets going.

<sup>2</sup> Anderson (1984), 293-296, following Kernan (1959), articulates the prevalent *persona* theory in satirical studies. A gross simplification: the voice in that we hear in the satires is *not* the voice of Juvenal, the poet, but rather an adopted mask, hence *persona*. Anderson and Kernan broke with the then traditional conflation of the two. In the greater context of drama, Freudenburg (1993) elucidates Horace's *personae* in the first four satires (so-called diatribe satires) of the first book of *Sermones*.

*saturam non scribere*, 1.30). He positioned himself as the one to put everything and everyone back in its proper place.

There is a problem, however. Juvenal's speaker wanted to satirize his targets by name, just like the genre's *inventor*, the great protégé of Aurunca, Lucilius.<sup>3</sup> Gaius Lucilius, who had written his satires in the second century BCE, became the pinnacle of "Republican *libertas*," free-speech to us, for later satirists. Fragments of Lucilius' thirty books are now few and far between, but from what we do have scholars recognize his aggressive style and attacks on fellow elites of the Republican period. This Lucilian frankness is, as Brian Breed, Elizabeth Keitel, and Rex Wallace quip, "a weight around the necks of his generic successors, their permanent opponent in a battle over what it means to be a satirist, a battle that he won long ago."<sup>4</sup> In short, the later Roman satirists each had to navigate their relationship to Lucilian aggressiveness and frankness—the hallmarks of the genre post-Lucilius.

Generically, this navigation comes in the form of a warning to the satirist by an interlocutor. Horace, Lucilius' successor from the first century BCE, staged a debate between his representative speaker and Trebatius, a famous lawyer of Cicero's time, in *Sermones* 2.1 about whether Horace should continue writing satires. His previous book of satires was allegedly regarded as too bitter and legally transgressive (*nimis acer et ultra / legem*, 2.1.1-2). If this book of satires continued this Lucilian pattern, Trebatius prophesied a short life for the satirist, especially if he should anger any of his well-connected targets (2.1.60-62). Although Horace had not wish to abandon the Lucilian satiric style, he recognized that he must modify his *carmina*

---

<sup>3</sup> Horace, *Serm.* 1.10.47-8, designates Lucilius the former; Juvenal, *Sat.* 1.20 the latter. For Juvenal's embrace of the high style see Bramble (1974), 170: "Juvenal has deliberately reinterpreted the already prejudiced satiric portrait of the Lucilian manner," and Gowers (1993), who argues for Juvenal's patently "anti-Calimachean" poetic practice in stark contrast to his predecessors, Horace and Persius.

<sup>4</sup> Breed, Wallace, Keitel (2018), 1.



such that they faced no legal repercussions and were ultimately approved of by Octavian (2.1.79-84). Therefore, provided that Horace rages only at those who deserve it (*opprobriis dignum latraverit*, 2.1.85), he would get off scot-free. Over a century later, Juvenal, the last generic successor, had a similar encounter.<sup>5</sup> The speaker of *Satire 1* certainly intended to emulate Lucilian aggression (1.19-20, 151-4, 165-8), until a surprise interlocutor had reminded him of the life-threatening consequences of offending the well-connected (1.155-57). This interlocutor admonished the speaker just to write epic—after all, no one is offended by a perforated Achilles (*nulli gravis est percussus Achilles*, 1.163), but the speaker compromised and elected to attack only the dead (1.170-71).

In their own way, each satirist tried their best to have their cake and eat it too; they wanted to write with the freedom and frankness of Lucilius, but circumstance dictated otherwise. Horace and Juvenal each lived in considerably different political times than Lucilius. Horace witnessed the Republic of Lucilius become “the Republic” under Augustus after many civil wars and Juvenal likewise only witnessed Trajan’s stability after 15 years of Domitian’s reign and the almost immediate death of the sickly Nerva. Times have *changed*. Neither satirist could in good conscience write exactly as Lucilius once had without at best significant social consequences or at worst political and life-threatening. Thus, these two poets cleverly excused themselves from satirizing by name in a way that would satisfy the higher-ups, and yet maintained their generic integrity.

Returning now to Juvenal’s promise to attack only the dead, no actual indication what this means was given. The programmatic satire ended there with no further information. On this

---

<sup>5</sup> Persius, the awkward middle child of the Neronian period in an otherwise neat dichotomy, does not have an easily categorizable trait. Scholars either designate him “Horatian” or “Juvenalian” or criticize him for not being enough of either. Cf. Kernan (1959), 29 for the dichotomy; Griffin (1994) 10-28 for Horace, Juvenal, and “slippery Persius.”

subject, Edward Courtney offers a convincing interpretation: “Juvenal cannot mean that he is going to satirise Rome as it used to be...[but] it will be apparent that the present differs from the past in quantity, but not in quality.”<sup>6</sup> Through his use of *exempla* from the past decades of Roman history, Juvenal would allegedly satirize his contemporaries. These contemporaries—some of whom were surely still alive at the time of writing—likely were either of no significance or fell from favor. As long as Juvenal and Horace both picked their targets wisely, neither had anything to fear.

This was certainly the case for Juvenal’s next five satires, where the speakers attacked unimportant categories of transgressive individuals.<sup>7</sup> The speaker of *Satire 2* chided the philosophers of Rome, who in public professed virtue, but in private submitted themselves to passive anal sex; Umbricius in *Satire 3* has had it with foreigners, specifically Greeks, who monopolized all of the work and patrons in Rome; in *Satire 4*, Domitian and his cronies—the actual dead—were subjected to a long overdue tongue-lashing; in *Satire 5* the speaker berated the less powerful Trebius—a substitute for any self-loathing dinner guest—for accepting Virro’s—a substitute for any boorish host—invitation to a disgraceful dinner; finally, in *Satire 6* the speaker attacked Rome’s women and wives in a deranged fantasy world where every street corner had a Clytemnestra. As a result, we come to expect Juvenal’s characteristic anger and fury against those who have stepped out of line in one way or another.

When readers come to Book III, however, there is a marked difference in tone.<sup>8</sup> The speakers of these later satires, whom we would have expected to have a livid reaction to more categories of individuals, instead remain unnervingly calm relative to their predecessors.

---

<sup>6</sup> Courtney (2013), 64.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Freudenburg (2001), 243.

<sup>8</sup> Juvenal’s *Satires* are divided into five books. Book I comprises *Satires* 1-5; Book II *Satire* 6 alone; Book III *Satires* 7-9; Book IV *Satires* 10-12; and Book V *Satires* 13-16.

Students of Juvenal have long noticed this distinction with varying interpretations. E. G. Hardy explains the difference in tone between the earlier and later books by suggesting Juvenal wrote Books I and II “as soon as the gag which silenced him was removed by Domitian’s death.”<sup>9</sup> Hence the *indignatio* and *ira* were freshly released into these earlier satires—Hardy did not acknowledge the gap in time between the assassination of Domitian and Juvenal’s first publication.<sup>10</sup> J. D. Duff boldly asserts that “the later satires of Juvenal [were] not really satires at all...[and] his earlier work discarded almost entirely the peculiarities of meter, treatment, and tone, which had been characteristic of this kind of literature.”<sup>11</sup> In short, Juvenal’s satiric style was too different to count as satire (especially with Horace as precedent). Otto Ribbeck and—almost one-hundred years later—Gilbert Highet both offer perhaps the most audacious interpretations: Ribbeck rejected *Satires* 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15 as forgeries to explain the difference; Highet modifies Ribbeck with the qualification that Juvenal himself wrote those “forgeries”.<sup>12</sup>

Susanna Braund argues strongly for a division between Books I and II and the others: “it is crucial to realise that Juvenal’s angry approach is confined to the first two of his five books. Consequently, while the labelling of Juvenal as an ‘angry satirist’ is fully applicable to Books I and II, another description is needed for the remaining three Books.”<sup>13</sup> Her solution to the speakers’ marked change of tone is irony. In Book III, Juvenal morphs from that unhinged angry man in the street to a more detached and ironic figure, who has “the audience divine the implicit ‘message’ for themselves.”<sup>14</sup> Whereas the indignant Juvenalian speaker would be upfront with

---

<sup>9</sup> Hardy (1883), 1.

<sup>10</sup> See Braund (1992) for a survey of Juvenal’s five books with bibliography and (1996), especially 15-16.

<sup>11</sup> Duff (1898), xxxii

<sup>12</sup> Ribbeck (1865); Highet (1954).

<sup>13</sup> Braund (1988), 1.

<sup>14</sup> Braund (1988), 22-23.

his criticism and message for us all to digest—whether we want it or not—this new brand of speakers from Book III has a more tempered, but still satirical outlook on the troubles of life. It should be said now too that there are *traces* of the old indignation in the later books, but anger no longer drives the satirist.<sup>15</sup> *Satire 7* focused its reduced anger upon the miserly rich patrons in the beginning, but, by the end of the satire, the speaker eagerly satirized the foolish professions that relied on patrons; *Satire 8* posed the more philosophical question: “If you, a noble, live terribly, what good are your pedigrees?” and set its again reduced anger upon the current state of the aristocracy.

The last satire of Book III, *Satire 9*, in a unique way pit the old method of writing Juvenalian satire, *indignatio*, against what will become the new method of writing in Books IV and V, irony. Juvenal accomplished this by setting his speaker, the usual disembodied voice, with an interlocutor, Naevolus; the former represents the new ironic method of writing satire and the latter the old method. As I shall argue, *Satire 9* is where Juvenal through this interlocutor, Naevolus, simultaneously dismantles his famous predecessor, Horace, and bids farewell to the indignation that fueled his previous satires.

But first, I shall turn now to a history of this poem’s reputation, a summary of its contents, and the status of detailed scholarship on this poem. In 1918, G.G. Ramsay edited the first Loeb for Juvenal and Persius—replaced later by Susanna Braund in 2004—and as part of the prefatory pages gave short summaries of Juvenal’s satires. Ramsay’s summary of *Satire 9* is as follows: “The 9<sup>th</sup> Satire deals with a disgusting offence, one of the main sources of corruption in the ancient world.”<sup>16</sup> Ramsay gives a heavily sanitized translation and even censors some lines

---

<sup>15</sup> For anger as left behind see Braund (1988), 22-23; for anger as a nostalgic factor see Keane (2015), 23-25.

<sup>16</sup> Ramsay (1918), lxiv.

(9.34-7, 43-4, 74-5 are all victims).<sup>17</sup> The imagery and the language of the poem were no doubt contributing factors—in addition to the poem’s narrative—for Ramsay’s decision.

*Satire 9* begins with an unnamed and disembodied speaker, a staple of Juvenalian satire thus far, approaching a man named Naevolus, who has seen better days (1-21). We, the eavesdropping audience, learn that Naevolus was not always so disheveled looking, but rather he used to be a man-about-town and well-known gigolo for both women and men (22-26). Naevolus (similarly to Umbricius of *Satire 3*) bemoans the lack of money coming his way from his wealthy patron (27-33); it appears now that he has been entirely cut off financially. As much as Naevolus complains and whines, he is equally angry at his ejection, for he begins to reveal scandalous information about his patron without a second thought in the heat of the moment. Naevolus reveals that he has anally penetrated Virro on multiple occasions (33-38), that Virro is incredibly cheap (39-46), that Virro attended the *Matronalia* and received gifts as though he himself were a woman (46-53), and, perhaps worst of all that Virro, who was either physically incapable or generally unwilling to sleep with his wife, begged Naevolus to impregnate her (70-90).<sup>18</sup> After 64 lines of angry ranting, the speaker returns mid-line to suggest wryly that Naevolus has a good case and to ask what Virro said next (*iusta doloris / Naevolus, causa tui. contra tamen ille quid affert?*, 9.90-91).<sup>19</sup> Naevolus, as if finally realizing just how much information he has forfeited, deflects the question and switches to damage control, begging to the speaker to keep these secrets (92-94). If he does not, Naevolus implies that they both will die unpleasantly (95-101). The speaker does not pledge to keep his secrets; rather, he expounds on

---

<sup>17</sup> See Appendix 1 for a faithfully earthy translation of this satire.

<sup>18</sup> There perhaps here is also an implication of Virro’s hypocritical nature. Earlier, in 9.63, Naevolus reported that Virro told him “it is improper of you to beg” (*improbus es cum poscis*); now here Virro begs and promises gifts to get the gigolo to do this “favor.”

<sup>19</sup> This action should stop further comparison between *Satire 3* and *Satire 9*, for the speaker never returns to speak once Umbricius has wasted the day with his ravings.

the fact that gossip about rich men will always crop up (102-123). A now-despondent Naevolus begins to wax philosophically on old age. The speaker, then, tries to comfort him with the knowledge he will always have a *pathicus amicus* as long as the hills stand (124-134). In a nice ring composition, the satire returns poor Naevolus to his originally dire financial straits; the gigolo pathetically lists all the extravagant items that would for him be sufficient and complains that Fortuna has abandoned him (135-150).

But now what of Naevolus and the poem itself? Scholarship on *Satire 9*—in fact on all of Books III, IV, and V—until relatively recently was sparse, especially when compared to the outpour of work on Juvenal’s first books. The angry man on the street *persona* fascinated more than the new ironic figure of the later books. In the 1980s, scholars began to pay more serious attention to the later books. Edward Courtney provided a comprehensive commentary on all sixteen of Juvenal’s satires; Martin Winkler’s *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal* gave an analysis of *Satires 2, 6, and 9*; but Susana Braund’s *Beyond Anger* was the much-needed catalyst for further studies of Book III.<sup>20</sup>

Braund’s analysis of Book III, as I mentioned above, argues for that distinction between the earlier and later books’ satirical method. In Braund’s reserved opinion, *Satire 9* in particular, “indirectly and obliquely, perhaps...can be seen as an allegory of the procedure of satire.” Furthermore, for Braund, Naevolus has a “position...very similar to that of the archetypal satirist [in that he] has an invective to deliver, but because he is fearful of the consequences, he delivers it not directly to the victim (=the patron) but to a (supposedly) disinterested audience (=the

---

<sup>20</sup> Courtney (2013); Winkler (1983); Braund (1988). Books IV and V are still relatively underexplored; we all eagerly await Catherine Keane’s upcoming commentary for Book V. Courtney’s (2013) and Ferguson’s (1998) commentary for all 16 satires remain staples; Braund (1996) for Juvenal Book I; Watson and Watson (2014) for Book II; Godwin (2022) for Book III, (2016) for Book IV, and (2018) for Book V.

speaker), whom he then attempts to bind to secrecy.”<sup>21</sup> Thus, Juvenal sequestered his *indignatio*, his old method, of previous satires in Naevolus. This dialogue rightly serves as an assessment: which is the better way to write satire? Braund, however, analyzes this assessment on terms of *urbanitas* (“charm, wit”) and *rusticitas* (“lack of education”); the former is the speaker and the latter is Naevolus. Thus, Juvenal in sticking with *urbanitas* and rejecting *rusticitas* prepares to write Books IV and V in a new ironical way. My analysis agrees with Braund in that this satire is an assessment of satirical methods, but not with the terms of analysis. For, as I shall argue, Naevolus is a clever depiction of a learned, and yet failed, satirist—a perfect blend of two extremes.

Nevertheless, since Braund, detailed analyses of *Satire 9* have greatly increased in number and quality. Ralph Rosen’s invaluable *Making Mockery* treats *Satire 9* sublimely; ultimately Rosen concludes that Naevolus, the unsavory character *extraordinaire*, stands in for the Juvenalian satirist himself. In doing so, Juvenal has broken the reader’s moral compass, since the speaker upfront and in your face has said what is right by yelling what is wrong for the past eight satires. “In the end, it becomes almost impossible to decide who is the actual target of blame,” as Rosen observes. With whom do we sympathize, the morally reprehensible gigolo representing the old method of Juvenalian satire or the speaker going against everything we have been conditioned to expect from a Juvenalian speaker?

Franco Bellandi has done *Satire 9* a great service; originally in 1974, Bellandi was among the first not to let the poem’s unsavory qualities stand in the way of a close reading. He rightly argues that *Satire 9*’s has a closer affinity in theme to *Satires 3* and *5*—the plights of the beleaguered *clients*, Umbricius and Trebius. Unlike these two men, who either flee the city or

---

<sup>21</sup> Braund (1988), 170.

continually submit, Naevolus as a client attempts to fight back as both a satirist and, as I shall argue, a *captator*. Bellandi notices as well that the Juvenalian speaker is becoming disillusioned with *indignatio* as early as *Satire 5*. For Bellandi, Trebius’ “facility for self-deception, which in practice lapses into supine moral acquiescence at the time of *Satire 5* still excites Juvenal’s *indignatio*...but we are already moving towards that further stage of pessimism that brings about in the satirist a glimmering of awareness that his outbursts of anger are pointless.” By *Satire 9*, this impending pessimism has reached its acme in what Bellandi calls “the progressive crumbling of every positive value in the satirical discourse.”<sup>22</sup> For in Naevolus, Juvenal has finally added to his long list of satirical targets the very concept of *indignatio* as a source of poetic inspiration.<sup>23</sup> Now we see a speaker return to the roots of Juvenalian satire—that madman to be found on the streets ranting and raving about how far society has fallen. The ironic twist, of course, is that Naevolus, an utterly debased moral reprobate, complains about the breakdown of the patron-client system.

Catherine Keane recognizes this critical entanglement between the ironic speaker and indignant Naevolus; she interprets Naevolus, on the one hand, “as a horrid spectacle, an extreme version of early Juvenal (shouting, scribbling, burning)” and, on the other, as one “allowed, even encouraged, to enjoy the therapy of transgressive speech.” Ultimately, Keane labels Naevolus “a meaningful ancestor for the satirist and for any Roman who would admire free-speaking satire.”<sup>24</sup> To be certain, in a weird way, Naevolus is an heir to Lucilian aggression and *satura onomasti*, but Naevolus not only backpedals, he also does it so artlessly. Like Naevolus, both Horace and Juvenal set out to satirize by name, but concluded that they could not do so without

---

<sup>22</sup> Bellandi (2009), 485-86.

<sup>23</sup> Juvenal’s programmatic speaker boldly asserted that if his talent is lacking, his indignation will make the verse (*si natura negat, facit indignatio versum*, 1.79).

<sup>24</sup> Keane (2015), 114.



consequences. Naevolus unabashedly embraces the transgressive free-speech, but to his ultimate detriment. For Naevolus is foolish enough not to use a pseudonym to attack his patron; rather the gigolo in full frenzy airs Virro's name without hesitation. On the other hand, Horace and Juvenal, who embrace the same free-speech as Naevolus, stage their compromise in such a way to maintain their integrity. Consequently, I think Naevolus fares better (for us) when we see him not as a meaningful ancestor, but rather as that horrid spectacle, an intentional joke.

For James Uden, *Satire 9* has a “programmatically significance...Naevolus is the kind of satirist Juvenal is *not*.” Uden maps Juvenal's and Horace's satiric methods onto the speaker and Naevolus. On the one hand, the speaker consistently remains disembodied, inscrutable, and invisible; “the invisibility of the satirist takes on a sinister cast here; he may know you, but you cannot know him.” On the other hand, “like Horace, [Naevolus] is very eager to tell you about himself. He has a firm and specific target whom he attacks directly, and his personal stakes in the attack are never less than clear.”<sup>25</sup> Uden, however, does not pursue further the implications of Horatian elements in Naevolus, in this self-parody of *indignatio*; rather he furthers his analysis of Juvenal's invisibility. We should then ask: what does Juvenal gain by affixing specifically Horatian qualities to Naevolus' satiric verse?

Tom Geue is the most recent to recognize this competition between satiric creeds. Geue poses two ends of the satiric spectrum: “Naevolan (or Horatian) self-revelation and Juvenalian self-concealment.” In these agonistic terms, Geue stakes his claim on Juvenal's anonymity because “Juvenal's self-betraying competitor [Naevolus] will eventually keel over, whether a victim of an irate patron's vengeance, or a sacrifice to his own misguided prayers.”<sup>26</sup> Extending Geue's reading, I believe that the Naevolus character was designed ultimately either to fail or to

---

<sup>25</sup> Uden (2015), 84; 78; 84.

<sup>26</sup> Geue (2018), 112-13.

“keel over” because his anger hinders rational thought; it hinders his ability to choose his targets wisely. The problem with “angry satire” becomes apparent in this particular fear of Naevolus; unless you are judicious both in your satirical targets and to whom you relate your poetry, you run the risk of harming your listeners and yourself.

Now, in this study, I shall be drawing from these foundations to build my argument that Juvenal anoints himself as the better satirist vis-à-vis his most famous predecessor, Horace. I do believe that Juvenal has set his eyes on Horace. In *Satire 1*, the speaker establishes himself clearly as a learned individual among others with (at least) some higher education (1.15-18). By Juvenal’s time, Horace would have been a classic, taught in the classroom to young boys like him. Quintilian even gives Horace the first place among satirists and confesses an affection for the poet’s satire (*Inst.* 10.1.93). Horace was seen as the satirist *par excellence* of Juvenal’s time! As Anderson concludes, “when Persius and Juvenal decided to write poetic satire they knew all too well that they were competing with a great poet; for, in their thinking, it is amply clear that Horace replaced Lucilius as the standard which all later satiric poets would measure themselves.”<sup>27</sup>

But Horace is also long gone. The speaker of *Satire 1* asks himself whether or not these vices at Rome and abroad are worthy of the Venusian (i.e. Horace’s) lamp (*haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna?*, 1.51). But there is no Horace anymore to view these transgressions; who will pick up the slack? The speaker dares to ask “Well, can’t I have a go at them?” (*haec ego non agitem?*, 1.52) and he does. Juvenal is certainly conscious of his generic predecessor and, more importantly, his reputation. A familiarity with Horace’s works can (and should) be

---

<sup>27</sup> Anderson (1982), 49.

presumed with some ease; this, of course, includes one of Horace's strangest satires, *Sermones* 2.5.

In *Sermones* 2.5, we, as the audience, are treated to an extension of the *nekyia* of *Odyssey* 11; Horace has recorded "the rest of that famous conversation that Homer, for reasons that quickly become obvious, thought it best to leave 'un-narrated.'"<sup>28</sup> We overhear the very last question Ulysses has for Tiresias (2.5.1-3):

hoc quoque, Tiresia, praeter narrata petenti  
responde, quibus amissas reparare queam res  
artibus atque modis.

Oh, one more thing, Tiresias, besides what you have  
already told me, tell me by what ways and means I can  
recover my lost fortune.

Since Penelope's suitors have laid waste to Ulysses' home and fortune, the hero wishes to have wealth again that matches his high birth (*et genus et virtus, nisi cum re, vilior alga est*, 2.5.8).

The dead prophet then enthusiastically teaches Ulysses how to hunt for inheritances from old, rich, and (usually) childless men. Tiresias advises him to dote on and serve the old man in any way possible, and even to offer Penelope's sexual services to him; the hero must also ply the old man with praise until he screams aloud for him to stop (*importunus amat laudari: donec 'ohe, iam!' | ad caelum manibus sublatis dixerit, urge*, 2.5.96-7). After he sets aside any initial reservations—it does not take much convincing—about debasing himself for the sake of inheritance, Ulysses becomes eager to ply his new trade.

At first glance, these two satires do not appear to have much in common, but digging a little deeper we find more. First of all, these two satires have been noted in the past as oddities in their respective *corpora*: *Satire* 9 is Juvenal's only dialogue, *Sermones* 2.5 is Horace's only

---

<sup>28</sup> Freudenburg (2021), 198.

fantasy satire.<sup>29</sup> Next, two particular scholars have used interesting turns of phrase to describe these satires in the pursuit of their larger arguments.<sup>30</sup> Michael Roberts concludes that “the figure of Tiresias, indeed, is one of a series of *doctores inepti* employed by Horace as main speakers in the poems of Book 2, but unlike his counterparts, Tiresias is presented as unambiguously disreputable. The immorality of his advice to Odysseus is indicated by the nature of the poem’s language and imagery. It is this language and imagery which gives the poem its peculiar quality and which can properly be described as Juvenalian. The indignation of 2.5 is Juvenalian, the indirection—Tiresias is not denounced by the satirist, but condemned by his own words—Horatian.”<sup>31</sup> Likewise, Richard LaFleur refers to Juvenal’s ninth Satire as a ‘Horatian dialogue.’<sup>32</sup> With respect to Roberts’ phrasing, it is not logically possible for Horace to do anything Juvenalian, but it is entirely likely that Juvenal is doing something Horatian. We should then ask: what else about *Satire 9* is Horatian and why is it?

Braund in *Beyond Anger* methodically catalogues parallels in Juvenal *Satire 9* to Horace *Sermones 2.5*; she calls them “small-scale echoes of *Serm. 2.5*.” They deserve to be quoted in full:

“Small-scale echoes of *Serm. 2.5* in *Satire 9* include mention of the Lares (Juv. 9.137, cf. Hor. *Serm. 2.5.19-14*); the hunting/fishing metaphor (Juv. 9.139 *figam*; cf. Hor. *Serm. 2.5.23-5 captes, insidiatorem, hamo*); Naevolus’ mention of poverty *quando ego pauper ero?* 147, recalling Tiresias’ words *ergo / pauper eris* Hor. *Serm. 2.5.19-20*; the idea of one’s face revealing joy (Juv. 9.18-20; cf. Hor. *Serm. 2.5.103-4 est | gaudia prodentem voltum celare*); and the mention of legacies (Juv. 9.62, 88; cf. all of Tiresias’ advice). These allusions are consolidated by the two references to the story of Ulysses in *Satire 9*, in a simile (64-5) and at the very end of the poem (149-50), and by the similarity between the situations and characters of Naevolus and Ulysses as he is portrayed in *Serm. 2.5* – both have lost their fortune and anticipate

<sup>29</sup> Freudenburg (2021) 198-202.

<sup>30</sup> See also, W.Y. Sellar (1892), 70, which describes *Sermones 2.5* as most akin to Juvenal; Fraenkel (1957), 144-45, concurs with this sentiment. Rudd (1966), 240-42 and Sallmann (1970) both deny affinity with Juvenal, but note it as “un-Horatian.”

<sup>31</sup> Roberts (1984), 433. For *doctores inepti*, W.S. Anderson (1982), 13-49.

<sup>32</sup> LaFleur (1979), 177; furthermore, for LaFleur, Naevolus in no uncertain terms is an abject figure worthy of only our contempt.

destitution unless a remedy is found; and both are eager, not to say greedy, to restore their wealth.”<sup>33</sup>

Braund, however, stops short of exploring these further. She chooses to pursue the literariness of *Satire 9* instead. I want to show that these small-scale echoes actually add up to something special. In Chapter I, “The Function of the Sexual and Body Imagery in *Sermones 2.5* and *Satire 9*,” I shall analyze both satires through their bodily and sexual imagery, ultimately concluding how this imagery allows Juvenal to demonstrate mastery over the dialogic form for which Horace was so well-known. In Chapter II, “The Odd-yssey: An Examination of the Ulysses-Imitating Naevolus,” I will reveal several key aspects of the satire: first, that Naevolus, as satirist, adopts a *persona* of his own, namely that of Odysseus; second, that Naevolus is no heroic Odysseus, but is rather akin to the slippery, opportunistic, slimy Ulysses of *Sermones 2.5*; third, that this *persona* adoption works as Juvenal’s dismissal of Horace. Finally, Chapter III, “Ironically Secure and Securely Ironic,” expands on the problems with angry satire, namely the fact that continuing down that pathway, the Juvenalian speaker would have ended up in a similar position as Naevolus; this chapter argues that, in order to hinder that progress, Juvenal adopts the ironic detachment from Horace’s *Satires*. In the end, I want to have shown a deeper connection between the otherwise neatly dichotomized satirists, Horace and Juvenal.

---

<sup>33</sup> Braund (1988), 145.

# **Chapter 1: The Function of Sexual and Bodily Imagery in Horace *Sermones* 2.5 and Juvenal *Satire* 9**

Horace *Sermones* 2.5 and Juvenal *Satire* 9 treat the satiric literary *topos* of *captatio*, inheritance-hunting, in dialogic form.<sup>34</sup> For the former poet, the dialogue form was a frequent method of writing satire; but for the latter, this poem is quite special because Juvenal’s corpus has only this single dialogue.<sup>35</sup> Since *Satire* 9 occupies a transitional space in the larger corpus, whereby the satirist formerly known for *indignatio* turns to a more detached and ironic viewpoint, there are large shoes to fill. Horace’s satiric dialogues were well-known for their ironic nature. Now in competition with Horatian dialogue, Juvenal must demonstrate a mastery of—if not his superiority in—the dialogue form. For this mission, I think that Juvenal has reappropriated the bodily and sexual imagery that Horace originally associated with *captatio*.<sup>36</sup>

It behooves us first to explore what exactly *captatio* is and why Horace associated bodily and sexual imagery with it. Heather Woods in her dissertation on the subject defined *captatio* as a “nebulous medial area on the spectrum of friendship, somewhere between devotion and exploitation.”<sup>37</sup> Typically, within the context of the patron-client system in ancient Rome, a poorer individual—a potential client (*cliens*)—would approach a rich man or woman—a potential patron (*patronus*)—and offer their services as an *amicus* (friend/“friend”).<sup>38</sup> The

---

<sup>34</sup> I shall not treat the issue of whether inheritance-hunting truly occurred as an ever-present phenomenon in ancient Rome, but Mansbach (1982, Princeton diss.), Champlin (1989), and Woods (2012, University of Minnesota, diss.) very persuasively argue that captation was firmly a societal problem only in “literary Rome”; for the theme of *captatio* see the commentary on this poem in Freudenburg (2021), especially on *Sermones* 2.5.23.

<sup>35</sup> *Satire* 3 appears to begin as a dialogue, but then Umbricius takes over the speech and talks the whole day.

<sup>36</sup> This chapter discusses the how; chapter III will discuss a potential why.

<sup>37</sup> Woods (2012), 14-15.

<sup>38</sup> *amicus*, especially in this satirical context, does not translate well. The friendship scale in ancient Rome as detailed below was slippery. A Roman would consider both the genuine friend and the scheming opportunist an

perverse nature arises from exploitation, whether that be the *cliens* exploiting the *patronus* or vice-versa. For the irreverent *captator* (one who engages in *captatio*) will perform whatever service necessary to enter into and ultimately gain an inheritance from the rich man's will; the *patronus* similarly, if they are intelligent, will realize the machinations of the *captator* and strive to have the last laugh or invite the *cliens* to a terrible dinner, where they are the entertainment.<sup>39</sup> The uneasy truth of *captatio* that Woods captures with her definition is the fact that we in the modern age draw a sharp distinction between "friendship" and "exploitation," but the Romans would only speak in terms of *amicitia*. It is, however, far easier to capture *captatio* in literature because the author will imply or directly state whether the intentions of the client or the patron are pure or malicious; in the "real world" of ancient Rome, one would likely be hard-pressed to identify inheritance-hunters from devoted friends.

At this point it is crucial to explain the significant influence that *Sermones* 2.5 had on the satiric literary *topos*, *captatio*. Although the phenomenon of inheritance-hunting as a real affair in the Roman world has some debate, its frequency in literature before Horace as a *topos* is more securely limited to once in Plautus and several times in Cicero.<sup>40</sup> In her study of the comic parasite, Cynthia Damon traces the development of the parasite figure across time and several genres (especially comedy and satire). She points out that "Horace, with the help of the comic parasite, defined the [*captator*] for subsequent generations."<sup>41</sup> Edward Champlin also picks up on the novelty of inheritance hunting with respect to *Sermones* 2.5: "All of the elements of captation turn up in earlier republican literature, indeed most are present in the *Miles Gloriosus* (around

---

*amicus*. For no one but the *amicus* truly knows his intentions toward the rich patron. In the satirical world, however, it is far easier to determine the gladhanding schemer from the genuine friend because the satirist will always tell us.

<sup>39</sup> For the *patronus* who gets the last laugh, see Horace *Sermones* 2.5.55-69 and 84-88; for the terrible dinner, see Juvenal *Satire* 5.

<sup>40</sup> Hopkins (1983) for arguments of the factual reality of captation; Damon (1997)

<sup>41</sup> Damon (1997), 121.

200 B.C.), but the terminology was first coined by Horace in the 30s B.C. with the phrase *captare testamenta* and the noun *captator*.<sup>42</sup> To quote Kirk Freudenburg, “the rich tradition of slippery and salacious *captatores* found in Seneca, Petronius, Juvenal and many others...looks back to this poem, whether directly or indirectly, as its principal source.”<sup>43</sup> In short Juvenal, an heir to the satiric genre, *must* look back to Horace’s captation satire, *Sermones* 2.5.

*Satire* 9 treats *captatio* from the perspective of a client who provided exemplary sexual services to his patron and was subsequently shafted by his patron.<sup>44</sup> In this satire, the unnamed speaker approaches his fellow interlocutor, Naevolus. The impetus of the dialogue is the speaker’s desire to know why Naevolus looks so ugly now. We learn early in the satire that Naevolus was once a charming and lively man about town (*certe modico contentus agebas / vernam equitem, conviva ioco mordente facetus / et salibus vehemens intra pomeria natis*, 9.9-11), but was also a notorious bisexual adulterer (*ipsos etiam inclinare maritos*, 9.26). For as *cliens*, Naevolus with his huge penis (*longi mensura incognita nervi*, 9.34) has been satisfying the pathetic desires of his current patron, Virro, and has also impregnated Virro’s wife twice. After the gigolo realizes that he has spilled many family secrets in a fit of rage, he pitifully begs the speaker not to repeat them lest they both receive a beating. Avoiding the question, the speaker pontificates about the futility of silence in a rich man’s home. Someone in the home—likely slaves avenging their beatings—will always talk. The speaker concludes that avoiding salacious gossip of slaves is the true reason to live virtuously: “You should live rightly both for many reasons and especially so that you can dismiss your slaves’ tongues, for the worst part of a wicked slave is the tongue” (*vivendum recte, cum propter plurima, tum est his |*

---

<sup>42</sup> Champlin (1991), 87: *Sermo* 2.5.23-24, 57

<sup>43</sup> Freudenburg (2021), 201.

<sup>44</sup> Notably, although Champlin’s (1991) Appendix 4: *Captatio* and Related Improperities does include Juvenal, it entirely disregards *Satires* 9 as a source for the existence of captation in the Roman world.



*praecipue causis, ut linguas mancipiorum / contemnas, nam lingua mali pars pessima servi,*  
9.119-121).<sup>45</sup>

Naevolus' version of *captatio* simultaneously exaggerates Tiresias' instructions and fails to heed them. Naevolus performs an emphatically sexual version of the toadying duties that Tiresias described—namely tending to the patron's bodily needs—but he also breaks a key tenet of inheritance-hunting: he has given children to the previously childless Virro. Now, Naevolus cannot hope to enter the will himself, but he expects nevertheless that in return for this extraordinary service he will be gifted swaths of farmland. He mentions these prizes in an indignant apostrophe to Virro, asking for whom he is saving all those hills, farms, and fields (*dic, passer, cui tot montis, tot praedia servas / Apula, tot miluos intra tua pascua lassas?*, 9.55-6).<sup>46</sup> In fact, however, Naevolus is feeling the pain of a life without rewards and has become so disheveled and unkempt that he appears to have changed his life entirely (*igitur flexisse uideris | propositum et uitae contrarius ire priori*, 9.20-1).

### Part I: Hypersexual Satire

The pair of satires' bodily imagery elucidates the sexual underpinnings of the patron-client system. Ellen Oliensis maintains that “any asymmetrical relation between Roman men is conceivably a sexual relation, in which the superior (more powerful, more eminent, older, wealthier) takes pleasure from the inferior. The *obsequium* of a freeborn client can always be maliciously misconstrued as a readiness to perform any service including sexual service.”<sup>47</sup> We

---

<sup>45</sup> These lines are A.E. Housman's restoration. Courtney (2013), 386: “119 and 120-121 are variants which cannot co-exist.”

<sup>46</sup> Braund (2004), 355: “A proverbial expression denoting a huge distance because birds of prey like the kite are strong fliers.”

<sup>47</sup> Oliensis (1997), 155.

can see Horace ostensibly attaching this sexual undertone and subordination to this satiric *topos*, when Tiresias explains to Ulysses the fundamentals of inheritance hunting (2.5.10-20):

“accipe qua ratione queas ditescere. turdus  
sive aliud privum dabitur tibi, devolet illuc  
res ubi magna nitet domino sene; dulcia poma  
et quoscumque feret cultus tibi fundus honores  
ante Larem gustet venerabilior Lare dives;  
qui quamvis periurus erit, sine gente, cruentus  
sanguine fraterno, fugitivus, ne tamen illi  
tu comes exterior si postulet ire recuses.”  
“utne tegam spurco Damae latus? haud ita Troiae  
me gessi certans semper melioribus.” “ergo  
pauper eris.” “fortem hoc animum tolerare iubebo.”

“Learn the method by which you shall grow rich. If a thrush  
or something else your very own will be given to you, let them fly  
thither where great wealth flourishes with its old master; let the rich man,  
who is more venerable than the Lar, taste the sweet fruits  
and whatever splendors your cultivated land produces before the Lar does;  
however much a liar, lowborn, polluted by his brother’s blood,  
a runaway slave he is, still do not be reluctant to, if he asks, to walk as his  
streetside escort.” “What, am I to protect the side of some foul Dama? Not even  
at Troy did I bear myself when I was contending with my betters.” “You will  
therefore be poor.” “I shall command my heart to be brave and to endure it.”

Tiresias’ phrasing has several erotic tinges to it. The thrush (*turdus*), a small passerine bird, introduces a new branch to the rich tradition of avian largesse, by which one curries favor from either a lover or here a rich victim. Whereas sparrows are given as pets, thrushes are primarily gifted for their taste. Thus, Horace adds a gustatory element to this avian tradition. This Horatian influence certainly lasted into Juvenal’s time. For his older contemporary, Martial, the thrush was a prime delicacy (*mattea prima*, 13.92) and an expensive gift (cf. 9.54 and 9.55). For this reason, Martial’s conniving Tongilius fakes a fatal fever. Tongilius then begins receiving thrushes as gifts from his inheritance-hunting subordinates.<sup>48</sup> They hunt these thrushes to hunt

---

<sup>48</sup> Mart. 2.40 *uri Tongilius male dicitur hemitritaeo. | novi hominis fraudes: esurit atque sitit. | subdola tenduntur crassis nunc retia turdis, | hamus et in mullum mittitur atque lupum.*

the legacies from Tongillius.<sup>49</sup> The satirist, Persius, who wrote under the reign of Nero, reminds us that eating thrushes and the ability to differentiate between the males and females was a mark of sophistication (6.24). With a thrush as well as the *dulcia poma* mentioned a little later, Ulysses would set himself apart from the rest of the inheritance-hunters; for he gifts Dama both a status symbol and a pleasurable meal at the same time.<sup>50</sup> Ulysses now has become a purveyor of pleasure for Dama.

Tiresias' next pieces of advice contain sexual elements. First, Tiresias advises Ulysses to take the streetside walking position if Dama asks for it (*ne tamen illi / tu comes exterior, si postulet, ire recuses*, 2.5.16-17). The brief conditional statement exposes the difference in the power dynamic between the two men.<sup>51</sup> Dama would only need to ask for Ulysses to do something and the slippery hero would do it immediately. It becomes clear, however, that predicting the patron's needs is far better than just supplying his demands. As the satire reaches its crescendo, Tiresias advises Ulysses to hand over Penelope to Dama before he even asks (*scortator erit: cave te roget; ultro / Penelopam facilis potiori trade*, 2.5.75-6). Although Ulysses himself will not perform the debauched sexual acts, he will play the pimp for his wife to secure the return of his fortune. *Sermones* 2.5, then, has greatly associated sexual imagery with *captatio*. While it does shy from the explicit (and same-sex) sexual imagery that we shall see in *Satire* 9, the influence of this poem's hypersexual imagery cannot be denied.

*Satire* 9, again, centers around the *captator*, Naevolus. Unlike Ulysses, he already has a patron "on the hook", he already is in deep with Virro, his patron. The sexual imagery in this satire has by far a more pronounced role than it did in *Sermones* 2.5. After the speaker reveals

---

<sup>49</sup> Poets commonly use hunting as a metaphor for *captatio*. Cf. Martial 4.56, also Hor. 2.5.25.

<sup>50</sup> I would add that its proximity to the sweet fruits in the poem just might imply an aphrodisiac nature to the bird as well. Birds receive general treatment in Adams (1982), p. 31-33.

<sup>51</sup> See fn.12.

that Naevolus has sex with men and women, Naevolus laments his utter destitution and bemoans aloud the shabby gifts that he *does* receive for his so-called “labors” (9.27-37):

utile et hoc multis vitae genus, at mihi nullum  
inde operae pretium. Pingues aliquando lacernas,  
[munimenta togae, duri, crassique coloris]  
et male percussas textoris pectine Galli  
accipimus, tenue argumentum venaeque secundae.  
fata regunt homines, fatum est et partibus illis  
quas sinus abscondit. Nam si tibi sidera cessant,  
nil faciet longi mensura incognita nervi,  
quamvis te nudum spumanti Virro labello  
viderit et blandae asdisue densaeque tabellae  
sollicitent, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναϊδος.

This type of life is profitable for many people, but I get no reward for my effort. Sometimes I get a coarse overcloak of a harsh and rough quality [to protect my toga], badly formed by a Gallic weaver’s comb, a thin silver plate of inferior quality. Fate rules humans, there is even a fate for those parts which clothing covers. For if the stars forsake you, the unprecedented length of your cock will accomplish nothing, even though Virro has seen you naked with foaming lips and the coaxing love letters assail you nonstop, “for the man cannot help being attracted by...the pathic.”

The mercantile and sexual “friendship” between Naevolus and Virro soon becomes even more apparent. The pair of them cannot separate sex from patronage because in their arrangement the two are one in the same. Virro tallies up his bill to pay while performing a lascivious action and Naevolus fully believes that his job is not only legitimate but also strenuous (9.39-44):

“haec tribui, deinde illa dedi, mox plura tulisti.”  
computat et cevet. ponatur calculus, adsint  
cum tabula pueri; numera sestertia quinque  
omnibus in rebus, numerentur deinde labores.  
an facile et pronum est agere intra viscera penem  
legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae?

“I paid you this, then I gave you that, soon you took even more.”  
He tallies up and gyrates. Let’s get the calculator out, and the slave boys with their record; count five thousand sesterces in total, then add my labors. Or is it easy and simple to drive a legitimate penis into your guts to meet yesterday’s dinner?

The technical term *ceveo* refers to the motions that the pathic male performs during intercourse.<sup>52</sup> Here Virro gyrates seemingly to distract Naevolus with the prospect of sex while he tallies up the bill. Naevolus quite literally tries to give legitimacy to his “job” by calling his penis legitimate. Franco Bellandi interprets the adjective as “a cool assertion of professionalism on Naevolus’ part: he has always given his ‘employer’ his full commitment (the *penis* is *legitimus*...the adjective is emphasized by enjambment).”<sup>53</sup>

In short, the self-designated legitimate status and cool attitude with which Naevolus approaches his sexual acts reflects the nonchalant attitude that Tiresias and Ulysses bring to the school of *ars captandi*. Ulysses will offer Penelope to Dama to secure his fortune and Naevolus without a wife to pimp takes up the role himself to (try to) secure his. The sexual imagery as well aligns with an imbalance in the power dynamics.

## Part II: Bodies of Work and Working Bodies

Since Horace’s and Juvenal’s satires have both used sex to define *captatio*, we should further examine their use of bodily imagery—you cannot have the former without the latter. Through this analysis, it will become clear how Juvenal has appropriated Horace’s bodily roles for *captator* and *patronus* to demonstrate how he has mastered Horatian dialogue. I shall, therefore, begin with Horace because of his secure status as the progenitor of this satiric *topos*.

Although the body imagery will soon revolve primarily around the rich, old man, Ulysses’ body first appears on the scene. When the hero beseeches Tiresias (2.5.5-8):

...“o nulli quicquam mentite, vides ut  
nudus inopsque domum redeam te vate, neque illic  
aut apotheca procis intacta est aut pecus: atqui  
et genus et virtus, nisi cum re, vilior alga est.”

---

<sup>52</sup> Adams 1982, p. 136-7; a certain Naevolus also appears in Mart. 3.95 who also performs the lascivious action: *sed pedicaris, sed pulchre, Naevole, ceves*.

<sup>53</sup> Bellandi (2009), 473.

...oh you who have never lied to anyone, you as prophet  
see how I am to return back home—naked and destitute—  
and there the suitors have ruined my storeroom and flocks.  
And yet lineage and virtue without cash are cheaper than seaweed.<sup>54</sup>

he indicates his primary bodily fear. Since the suitors have left neither storeroom nor livestock untouched, Ulysses remains liable to return broke to a barren home. The choice of adjectives makes this significant; he initially describes himself as *nudus* and *inops*, naked and destitute. Although *nudus* can be a figurative synonym for *inops* (broke and poor), it should be taken both figuratively and literally. Odysseus washes ashore nude on the isle of the Phaeacians in *Odyssey* 6; when he returns to Ithaca, Athena disguises him as a poor beggar in *Odyssey* 13-15. With this context, these two adjectives in conjunction with the implied sexual nature of the patron-client system create a Ulysses primed for whatever (sexual) action a wealthy man will ask of him. He himself is either nude and poor, which means he could prostitute himself (a la Naevolus) or broke and poor, which means he will do whatever he can to get money.

Although Ulysses himself will not perform any sexual actions—rather, he will hand over Penelope—his nudity and destitution further indicate the *highly* imbalanced power dynamic. Ulysses' nudity contrasts strongly with the clothed old man, especially when Tiresias advises the stouthearted hero to warn the old man to cover up if a strong breeze threatens his precious head (*mone, si increbruit aura, | cautus uti velet carum caput* 9.93-4). A nude hero ensuring his patron has more clothes adds to the ironic humor and further widens the power gap by bundling the rich man with more of what Ulysses does not have: clothing.

Furthermore, the power of the old man, however, in Tiresias' view is little more than nominal (2.5.32-38):

---

<sup>54</sup> *alga* amuses the reader who remembers how familiar the oft-shipwrecked Odysseus was with seaweed.

‘Quinte’ puta aut ‘Publi’ (gaudent praenomine molles  
auriculae) ‘tibi me virtus tua fecit amicum.  
ius anceps novi, causas defendere possum;  
eripiet quivis oculos citius mihi quam te  
contemptum cassa nuce pauperet; haec mea cura est,  
ne quid tu perdas neu sis iocus.’ ire domum atque  
pelliculam curare iube...

‘Quintus’ or suppose for example ‘Publius’ (their soft little ears  
like the first name) ‘your virtue has made me your friend.  
I know the ambiguous law; I can plead your cases.  
He’ll be quicker to rip out my eyes than to deprive you  
of a nutshell like a nobody. This is my care:  
that you do not lose anything nor become a laughing-stock.’  
Have him go home and take care of his skin...

As Michael Roberts says, “in Tiresias’ eyes the victim has no individuality; he is reduced to a set of physical attributes and susceptibilities the *captator* must exploit. Nor is Tiresias wrong in his assessment. It is just this appeal to blind self-esteem that works most effectively on the unreflecting sense of the legator.”<sup>55</sup> The patron’s body in *Sermones* 2.5 becomes completely dependent on the client, who willingly performs any duty asked of him—even the duties not yet requested! In this way, the patron’s body becomes usefully malleable and utterly passive; it has parts through which the overwhelmingly active *captator* can finagle his prize provided that he pushes the right buttons.

*Satire* 9, on the other hand, presents the inverse—the powerful individual exploits the less powerful. The client in this poem has been financially cut off; the patron meanwhile has reaped several benefits from the client’s services. The unnamed speaker who approaches Naevolus in *Satire* 9 catalogues Naevolus’ body and its then-decrepit state. Notably, unlike Tiresias who shrunk the patron into a collection of body parts, the speaker shrinks the personhood of the client, Naevolus, down to a mere collection of body parts (9.1-15):

---

<sup>55</sup> Roberts (1984), 428.

Scire uelim quare totiens mihi, Naeuole, tristis  
occurras fronte obducta ceu Marsya uictus.  
quid tibi cum uultu, qualem deprensus habebat  
Rauola dum Rhodopes uda terit inguina barba?  
[nos colaphum incutimus lambenti crustula seruo.]  
non erit hac facie miserabilior Crepereius  
Pollio, qui triplicem usuram praestare paratus  
circumit et fatuos non inuenit. unde repente  
tot rugae? certe modico contentus agebas  
uernam equitem, conuiua ioco mordente facetus  
et salibus uehemens intra pomeria natis.  
omnia nunc contra, uultus grauis, horrida siccae  
silua comae, nullus tota nitor in cute, qualem  
Bruttia praestabat calidi tibi fascia uisci,  
sed fruticante pilo neglecta et squalida crura.

I would like to know, Naeuolus, why I run into you  
so many times looking sad with an overcast scowl like  
a beaten Marsyas. Why is your face like the one that  
Rauola had when he was caught rubbing Rhodope's crotch  
with a wet beard? I mean, we beat a slave who licks the pastries.  
Your face is more miserable than Crepereius Pollio, who  
goes around prepared to offer triple the interest rate and  
finds no idiots. Where did those wrinkles come from? Certainly,  
you used to live as the homebred knight, living with little,  
the elegant dinner guest with a biting joke and wit born within the city.  
Now everything is reverse; your face is grave, your dry hair is  
a bristling forest, there is no shine in your skin, which you used to get  
from strips soaked with hot Bruttian pitch, but your legs are squalid  
and neglected with sprouting hairs.

Naeuolus' body remains entirely subjected to the whims (and payments) of his superior. He blames his destitution and his disfigurements on Virro paying him too little for his services (9.27-8). After all, Bruttian pitch is not a cheap product.<sup>56</sup> His most valuable body part, his sizeable penis, remains unchanged, but the grotesque amalgamation of body parts in the introductory lines (his grim face, dry hair, rough skin, and shaggy legs) is a direct result of Virro's financial embargo.

---

<sup>56</sup> Courtney (2013), *ad loc.*



If we follow this line of inversion, one should rightly expect Virro to have full autonomy as the patron, but this is strangely not the case. The clearest example is that Virro willingly takes the passive position in sex (9.43-44). More obliquely, without Naevolus' impressive virility, Virro would not have received so very many benefits (9.70-83):

verum, ut dissimules, ut mittas cetera, quanto  
metiris pretio quod, ni tibi deditus essem  
devotusque cliens, uxor tua virgo maneret?  
scis certe quibus ista modis, quam saepe rogaris  
et quae pollicitus. fugientem nempe puellam  
amplexui rapui; tabulas quoque ruperat et iam  
signabat; tota vix hoc ego nocte redemi,  
te plorante foris. testis mihi lectulus et tu  
ad quem pervenit lecti sonus et dominae vox.  
instabile ac dirimi coeptum et iam paene solutum  
coniugium in multis domibus servavit adulter.  
quo te circumagas? Quae prima aut ultima ponas?  
nullum ergo meritum est, ingratus ac perfide, nullum  
quod tibi filiulus, quod filia nascitur ex me?

Although you ignore and disregard my other services, how much do you value the fact that, if I had not been your devoted client, your wife would have remained a virgin? Surely you know with what means, and how often you asked, and what you promised. I seized and embraced her as she was walking out; she also had ripped up the contract and was already signing a new one; I spent the whole night on this, while you cried at the doors. My witnesses are the little couch and you, to whom the sound of the couch and voice of the lady came. An adulterer in many homes has saved shaky marriages, or ones beginning to fall apart or already dissolved. Where can you turn? What do you value the most? It is no service, you ungrateful liar, that you have a son, that you have a daughter by me?

By the same token, that virility that we typically associate with “men of action” shows that Naevolus does have some form of autonomy in this confused relationship. After all, in order to get children, Virro had to beg and bribe Naevolus with extravagant promises to impregnate his wife. Virro in the end receives all the benefits of children, a wife, and the presentation of a stable

marriage; Naevolus conversely has nothing. Juvenal appears to have confused the roles that Horace established with his satire for the captator and the patron. There the captator, Ulysses, was in control of the situation. He could defend or protect the patron; he could even supply him with pleasure—both bodily and gustatory. The patron, however, should be firmly in the grasp of the *captator* with little to no personhood. What then are we to make of Naevolus' and Virro's weird relationship in the context of the satires?

### Part III: Dialogic Mastery

To explain the confused roles of *Satire 9* with respect to the original arrangement from *Sermones 2.5*, we should examine the satire's structure. On a structural level, *Satire 9* and *Sermones 2.5* are each a masterfully crafted dialogue—and again *Satire 9* Juvenal's only one. Catherine Keane's "amoral" metaliterary reading of the dialogue notes that "the prominence of Naevolus recalls the way Horace farms out the work of mockery and moralizing to other characters in his second book."<sup>57</sup> Especially with Juvenal, the satirist who has spent eight satires bluntly yelling his morality, this new method should give the reader pause. This dialogue form inherently obfuscates the overall "message" of the satire. Where is our moral compass? How much do we trust Naevolus or the speaker? Should we even trust the moral hypocrite, Naevolus, or the shady disembodied speaker, about whom we know nothing?

*Satire 9*, however, does not stop there. The satire further muddies the water when it inverts and confuses the original Horatian bodily roles of *captator* and *patronus*. On the surface level of this dialogue, the speaker first hears a first-hand account of Naevolus' travails with Virro. Beneath that surface, Naevolus reports to the speaker what Virro has said to Naevolus (9.39, 63, 73-74). It is at this level that Naevolus adds Horace's original powerlessness of the

---

<sup>57</sup> Keane (2015), 110; also, Keane (2006), 116-19.

*patronus* to Virro—the man is not only diseased (*morbo*, 9.49), he has to beg Naevolus for this favor (9.73-74). Everything else Naevolus says in the satire concerns his own powerlessness as a *cliens* and *captator*. As *cliens*, Naevolus has been financially cut off by Virro and, as *captator*, Naevolus foolishly gave his patron not one, but two children.

I submit, therefore, that this obscurity is Juvenal's declaration: he has mastered Horatian dialogue. The body in *Sermones* 2.5 was how Ulysses was to take control of the patron—coo his soft ears with his first name, order him to stay at home and manage his skin, while Ulysses took care of the legalities, and cover his head when too strong a breeze appears. The patron is not a person, but a body to be controlled and manipulated. Naevolus, therefore, should be the one in control of Virro's body. In some respects, he does have control as the active sexual participant, but Virro is not entirely under Naevolus' control; he still has autonomy enough to kick Naevolus out. In short, he who controls the body, controls the dialogue.

The only time in *Satire* 9 that we see a body under another's *complete* control is the speaker cataloguing Naevolus' grotesque and deteriorating one. The speaker tells us right away how to view Naevolus, the speaker forms how we, the audience, see Naevolus and hints at his moral reprehensibility. Naevolus, angry at the world and upset over his discharge, supplies the facts and examples. Juvenal's speaker gets him talking and by the end Juvenal's speaker has Naevolus wrapped around his finger. Early on, he let Naevolus hang himself. Now the speaker holds all the power in this dialogue, just as Juvenal now holds mastery of the dialogic form.

## Chapter 2: The *Odd-yssey*: An examination of the Ulysses-imitating Naevolus

The construction of Naevolus evokes the essence of Juvenalian satire as defined at the end of *Satire 1* (l.153-171). Here the speaker, who stands poised to take up the sword of Lucilius, unafraid to embrace the *libertas* of free-speech, and ready to chide the powerful with all the bluster and huffing of a (self-righteous) moralist with a mission, gets an unexpected dose of reality from a surprise interlocutor (l.150-171):

.....“dices hic forsitan, ‘unde ingenium par materiae? unde illa priorum scribendi quodcumque animo flagrante liberet simplicitas?’ cuius non audeo dicere nomen? quid refert dictis ignoscat Mucius an non?”  
“pone Tigillinum, taeda lucebis in illa qua stantes ardent qui fixo gutture fumant, et latum media sulcum deducit harena.”  
“qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita, uehatur pensilibus plumis atque illinc despiciat nos?”  
“cum ueniet contra, digito compesce labellum: accusator erit qui uerbum dixerit ‘hic est.’ securus licet Aenean Rutulumque ferocem committas, nulli grauis est percussus Achilles aut multum quaesitus Hylas urnamque secutus: ense uelut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens est criminibus, tacita sudant praecordia culpa. inde ira et lacrimae. tecum prius ergo uoluta haec animo ante tubas: galeatum sero duelli paenitet.” “experiar quid concedatur in illos quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina.”

.....“Perhaps you will say here, ‘where will talent equal to the material come from? Where will that frankness for writing whatever their blazing mind chose come from?’ Whose name do I dare not name? What does it matter whether Mucius forgives my words or not?”  
“If you describe Tigillinus, you’ll blaze on that pine, where men stand burning and smoking with their throats fastened,

<until your corpse> traces a broad furrow in the middle of the arena.”  
“Even when a man who has given aconite to three of his uncles  
is carried by on feather cushions and looks down his nose at us?”  
“When he comes by, bite your tongue! Anyone who says the phrase ‘that’s him!’  
will be an informer. It’s safe for you to pit Aeneas against fierce Rutulian;  
no one gives a damn about a perforated Achilles or Hylas much sought when he chased  
his pitcher. But whenever blazing Lucilius roars as if with a drawn sword, his listener  
whose mind is cold with crimes, goes red and his heart sweats with tacit guilt.  
From there come anger and tears. Turn this over in your mind before you sound off:  
The slow warrior regrets putting on his helmet.” “I’ll see what is allowed against  
those whose ashes are covered by the Flaminian and Latin ways.”

The programmatic poem plays with the traditional *recusatio* for those poets who chose to write in a genre different than epic.<sup>58</sup> The surprise interlocutor arrives and encourages the speaker to write epic instead since no one will fume over (yet) another depiction of the ancient heroes. If the speaker, however, chooses to continue down the path of Lucilius, he runs the risk of a violent punishment.<sup>59</sup> The speaker’s solution is to resign himself to attacking the dead. This, however, has been for many scholars entirely unsatisfactory. What are we to make of a swaggering speaker, who would so easily, so suddenly change his plan?

Scholars do generally agree that the speaker of *Satire* 1 was never as big a shot as he thought. Maria Plaza concludes that “this programme joke opens up for humour directed at the persona in the satiric opus to follow.”<sup>60</sup> Kirk Freudenburg points out that “the abrupt change of satiric targets from the poet’s Mucius to the cautious friend’s Tigillinus brings with it a strong sense of the passing of time, and Juvenal’s being hopelessly out of date and naïve.”<sup>61</sup> Susanna Braund both slams the speaker of *Satire* 1 in no uncertain terms as “no paragon of virtue (though he clearly casts himself in this role), but a spineless and petty bigot.”<sup>62</sup> Braund also argues that

---

<sup>58</sup> Courtney (2013), 66.

<sup>59</sup> This theme is revisited in *Satire* 9 when Naevolus realizes that he has spilled the beans. In order to save his own skin, he has to beg the speaker to keep his secrets. See Chapter III for further discussion.

<sup>60</sup> Plaza (2006), 48.

<sup>61</sup> Freudenburg (2001), 243.

<sup>62</sup> Braund (1996), 120.

“by adopting this grand style for his *indignatio* the speaker believes he dignifies the subject-matter and elevates it to the level of epic [but] the fact that it actually falls laughably short of epic dignity together with the speaker’s inconsistency at the end in his declared intent to attack only the dead (170-1) actually constitutes part of the unwitting self-revelation...which enables us to see his flaws and laugh at him.”<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, Edward Courtney with a more reserved *apologia* explains away the speaker’s choice by way of generic conceit, saying that classical poets were “eager to place themselves in a tradition, to present themselves in the line of descent from the *πρῶτος εὐρετής* of their genre [which] to the satirist gave the awkward inheritance of Lucilian aggressiveness which was no longer historically possible for them.”<sup>64</sup> Catherine Keane with her glass half-full approach examines the outcome of the choice to attack the dead, since it “breaks new and interesting ground for satire, which previously concentrated on the (fictional or real) present...Juvenal’s subjects may not be as high-stakes as Lucilius’s but he poses—to compensate?—as a staunch traditionalist on the matter of satire’s proper tone.”<sup>65</sup>

I think, however, my interpretation will have a satisfactory middle ground between these two poles: Juvenal’s speaker can be both an abject object of laughter and generically innovative. We should view the speaker of *Satire* 1 as an object worthy of some laughter since the precipitous and abrupt fall from such a lofty and fiery promise into such a lukewarm reality paints the speaker in an unflattering—but humorous—light. We never receive the epic satire that Juvenal had promised with such ambitious and epic language. Over the course of the succeeding eight satires, the speaker retains the same indignation that he had wanted to use to attack the powerful dynasts of his age, but the relative unimportance of the targets of his one-sided satirical

---

<sup>63</sup> Braund (1988), 8.

<sup>64</sup> Courtney (2013), 66. Reservations or not, Courtney stands in concord with the others who did not believe that the speaker of Juvenal 1 should be taken seriously.

<sup>65</sup> Keane (2015), 42.

lecture-ravings implies an effectively neutered speaker.<sup>66</sup> The speaker of *Satire 2* chides hypocritically pathetic philosophers of Rome; Umbricius in *Satire 3* the Greeks who have monopolized all of the work and patrons in Rome; in *Satire 4* Domitian and his cronies are subjected to a long overdue tongue-lashing—but still too late; in *Satire 5* the speaker rather than attack the nasty dinner host, Virro, himself lays into the significantly less powerful Trebius; in *Satire 6* the speaker attacks women, one of the most marginalized groups of the ancient world—revealing in the process his own masculine fragility; while *Satire 7* focuses its anger upon the miserly rich in the beginning, the speaker eagerly satirizes other poorly paid categories of profession; *Satire 8* poses the philosophical question: “If you, a noble, live terribly, what good are your pedigrees?” and yet, rather than attack living individuals, once again complains only generally about the current state of the aristocracy.

It is in *Satire 9* where the angry satirist flexes those generically innovative skills. By introducing—subjecting?—the audience to his flaccid speaker, Juvenal can now perform self-mockery in an entirely new way. In Naevolus, we find a mimesis of that original fall from the public Lucilian satire to the intensely private sphere of Juvenalian satire.<sup>67</sup> Like the promised Lucilian satire, Naevolus too once looked like an attractive option, but now in front of the speaker Naevolus is merely of a shadow of what used to be. *Satire 9*, furthermore, employs what I shall call deflated epic to magnify this self-mockery.<sup>68</sup> For Naevolus tries to construct his satiric persona in the way of a *Ulysses redux*, but, like the speaker of the previous eight satires, he fails to recognize how full of himself he is and how utterly laughable too. In sum, Naevolus fulfills

---

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Freudenburg (2001), 243, above.

<sup>67</sup> Freudenburg (2001), 247 states that Juvenal “fixes his eyes on what happens at street-level in Rome, in the brothels, taverns and alleyways where no satirist has taken us before, and he describes what he sees there in the fulsome tones and tropes of Rome’s grandest poetic enterprise, as if the two could really be made to work together.” Hopefully, this chapter can help build that bridge between satire and epic.

<sup>68</sup> I will use the term “deflated epic” to describe Juvenal’s humorous appropriation/debasement of the epic genre as an analogue for writing satire itself.

the promised epic satire of *Satire 1*, but not in any predictable way. In Part I of this chapter, my close reading of representative sections of *Satire 9* will demonstrate the use of deflated epic and how Naevolus serves as a mimetic stand-in for writing Juvenalian satire. In Part II, I will explore the wider connections between *Satire 9* and its potential source of inspiration—the wider theme of this thesis—Horace *Sermones 2.5*. Ultimately, I will show that Juvenal has paralleled *Sermones 2.5* in order to expand Horace’s already outrageous satirical material.

### Part I: Naevolus πολύτροπος

*Satire 9* begins with the speaker coming upon Naevolus, his old “friend”, and likening his depressed and grim expression to three particular individuals, who each represent a different aspect of Naevolus’ occupation (9.1-8):

Scire uelim quare totiens mihi, Naeuole, tristis  
occurras fronte obducta ceu Marsya uictus.  
quid tibi cum uultu, qualem deprensus habebat  
Rauola dum Rhodopes uda terit inguina barba?  
non erit hac facie miserabilior Crepereius  
Pollio, qui triplicem usuram praestare paratus  
circumit et fatuos non inuenit.

Naevolus, I would like to know why lately you look  
so gloomy with a brow like the beaten Marsyas.  
What’s with your face? It’s like the one Ravola had when  
he was caught, damp-bearded, eating out Rhodope?  
Not even Crepereius Pollio who can’t find anyone dumb  
enough to accept his triple interest rates looks as bad as you.

*Marsya victus* immediately takes the reader in the realm of the mythological past, but in a notably sour way. The fact that Marsyas was a satyr both hints at Naevolus’ most defining feature in the satire, his sizeable phallus, and alludes to the gigolo’s oversexed nature.<sup>69</sup> The Ravola vignette communicates the unsavory sexual content of Naevolus’ life. His occupation as

---

<sup>69</sup> For the intriguing possibility that this is a direct reference to the statue of Marsyas in the Forum, see Larmour (2016), 127-28. Rosen (2007), 226-27, parallels Marsyas and Naevolus as “defeated performers” and “harried poets.”



a prostitute after all requires him to perform actions that are widely considered shameful in the ancient world. Our suspicions will soon be confirmed when the speaker reveals Naevolus' (bi)sexual promiscuity. Finally, the banker prefigures Naevolus' obsession with material wealth. For Naevolus too cannot find anyone willing to pay him what—he believes—his service is worth. These three individuals coalesce to form the current state of Naevolus: a man who is extraordinarily oversexed, performs unsavory sexual practices, and obsesses over his material gain.

The speaker immediately follows these extended similes with exposition that Naevolus was once upon a time a witty socialite; this knowledge that we, the reader, gain initiates the mimesis (9.8-11):

.....unde repente  
tot rugae? certe modico contentus agebas  
uernam equitem, conuiuia ioco mordente facetus  
et salibus uehemens intra pomeria natis.

Where'd all these wrinkles come from?  
You used to live comfortably with little  
playing the homebred knight, an elegant dinner  
guest with a biting humor and forceful wit  
bred within the city limits.

The speaker's choice of words is potentially indicative of the (old) 'Horatian' model for writing satire. Naevolus used to be content with little playing the role of a homebred knight. Braund contends that "the speaker makes it clear that Naevolus *used to be urbanus*...lays the preparation for [Naevolus as *urbanus*] in the striking phrase *uernam equitem*, 'a home-bred knight' or 'a jester knight'. The associations of *uerna* suggest that Naevolus is both a native of Rome and as witty as a jester or buffoon, features which are sometimes contrasted but which here complement one another."<sup>70</sup> Rosen's interpretation, on the other hand, says that "the mention of public

---

<sup>70</sup> Braund (1988), 158.

activity that included a moderate outlook on life, and a biting and risqué wit, tempered by charm, is reminiscent of the ways in which Horace describes his own satiric project in the *Sermones*, especially as he works through it in *Sermones* 2.1, where he settles for a somewhat genteel Lucilian approach.” Rosen, however, also does not want to “overemphasize the contrast” between Horatian and Juvenalian satire because “Horace may project a more outwardly genial speaking voice than Juvenal, and he may be less openly ‘angry,’ but his model still remains the famously vituperative Lucilius and...as Horace implies, he would be as fiery as Juvenal if he only thought he could have gotten away with it himself.”<sup>71</sup>

For now, I would like to focus on Naevolus’ former life as that urbane dinner guest who now stands a disheveled and haggard shadow of his former self. The speaker of *Satire* 1 presented himself as the righteous authority that stands poised and ready to attack all the vice in Rome, but by the end of the satire he had fallen to a new low, rooting around in graveyards looking for fresh victims, like a more perverse Dr. Frankenstein. In my view, if we equate the urbane with epic, Naevolus becomes a mimesis for the deflated epic Juvenalian satire that we have been reading for eight satires. For then we can better understand Naevolus’ new state: he like the speaker of *Satire* 1 should be regarded as a disgraced epic hero. This interpretation connects the references to the *Odyssey* in *Satire* 9, which others have seen as disparate, as well as explains why Naevolus models himself after the most famously (and outrageously) disgraced epic hero, Ulysses.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Rosen (2007), 227, footnote 21.

<sup>72</sup> Rosen (2007), 235, footnote 34: “Although it is difficult to say whether the two Homeric references in the poem were closely connected in Juvenal’s mind, it is undeniable that Naevolus is made in each case to portray Ulysses as a legitimate target of complaint, and himself as unfairly oppressed.” Rosen curiously does not count the direct quotation from the *Odyssey* at l. 37 as a reference to the *Odyssey*. He limits his observation to the Polyphemus allusion and the sirens.

If we re-examine the opening lines of *Satire 9*, we can begin observing the epic echoes of Odysseus that surround Naevolus. Like Odysseus, Naevolus is found in circumstances contrary to his usual way of life. As we have already seen, the speaker of *Satire 9* depicts Naevolus' face in unflattering ways, but he does not stop there. After reminding the down-and-out gigolo that he used to be an attractive raconteur, the speaker details Naevolus' body (9.12-17):

omnia nunc contra, uultus grauis, horrida siccae  
silua comae, nullus tota nitor in cute, qualem  
Bruttia praestabat calidi tibi fascia uisci,  
sed fruticante pilo neglecta et squalida crura.  
quid macies aegri ueteris, quem tempore longo  
torret quarta dies olimque domestica febris?

Everything's opposite now, your expression is grave, your  
uncoiled hair a bristling forest, there is no shine to your skin,  
which you got from the strips soaked with hot Bruttian pitch,  
but your legs are neglected and squalid with sprouting hairs.  
What emaciation, like a chronic invalid's, tormented for ages by a  
Fever that comes every third day and that long ago  
became a member of the household?

In a similar way, when Odysseus awakes on the isle of the Phaeacians, his ugly appearance has a pivotal role to play in the text. When he first approaches the Phaeacian women, they run away because he appears frightful and caked with brine (σμερδαλέος...κεκακωμένος ἄλμη, 6.137). It is significant too that the naked Ulysses, although downtrodden and in horrendous circumstances, still strives to preserve some modesty by covering his genitals (ἐκ πυκινῆς δ'ὔλης πτόρθον κλάσε χειρὶ παχεῖη | φύλλων, ὡς ῥύσαιτο περὶ χροῖ μήδεα φωτός, 6.128-9). Naevolus on the other hand not only flaunts his sizeable phallus, but treats it as a casual topic of conversation with his interlocutor (9.33-4). In fact, as Naevolus begins to speak more and more, we find that Rosen and Braund are correct in viewing Naevolus as a Juvenalian satirist; he is full of vitriol, he has the *indignatio*, and he performs for an indifferent audience, who does not take him all that seriously. In their own minds, Naevolus and the speaker of *Satire 1* were epic heroes,

but each have now fallen to new squalid lows. The ironic gap between these two characters as well will deepen when we understand that by the end of Book 6 Odysseus will have regained his royal dignity with the help of Athena and a bath; Naevolus, however, by the end of the satire will look even worse than he already does. Naevolus is not the Odysseus he thinks he is, but rather he is a failed Ulysses with more in common with *Sermones* 2.5 than any of the *Odyssey*.

Naevolus begins to build his Odysseus *persona* the moment he begins to speak; to answer his interlocutor's earlier question, Naevolus concocts a tale for his audience—similar to Odysseus' performance in Alcinoös' court. Naevolus too is a victim of fortune—by which I mean both chance and destitution—and divine neglect. Let us first examine the three explicit references to the *Odyssey* (9.27-38):

utile et hoc multis vitae genus; at mihi nullum  
inde operae pretium. pingues aliquando lacernas  
[munimenta togae duri crassique coloris]  
et male percussas textoris pectine Galli  
accipimus, tenue argentum venaeque secundae.  
fata regunt homines; fatum est et partibus illis  
quas sinus abscondit; nam si tibi sidera cessant,  
nil faciet longi mensura incognita nervi,  
quamvis te nudum spumanti Virro labello  
viderit, et blandae assidue densaeque tabellae  
sollicitent; αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναϊδος.  
quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis avarus?

Sure, this way of life is useful for many; but for me there's no reward for my work. Sometimes I get a thick cloak [the defense of my toga of a rough and harsh quality] coarsely woven by the by the comb of a Gallic weaver, some slender silver of second-rate quality. Fate rules men; Fate even affects those parts which your clothes cover; for if the stars abandon you, the unprecedented size of your long cock will do nothing, however much Virro with foaming lip has seen you naked and his flattering and dense letters unceasingly assail you; for the man cannot help being drawn to the *kinaidos*. Yet what monstrosity is worse than a greedy pansy?

As we see in line 37, Naevolus composes an amusing *paraprosdokian* when he replaces the original σίδηρος with κίναϊδος. This particular quotation appears twice in the *Odyssey*: 16.294 and 19.13. The former is part of Odysseus' instructions to Telemachus to remove the weaponry from the dining hall; the latter is Telemachus delivering the line to the suitors who wonder why he is removing the weaponry.

There is a pressing issue at this point, namely who exactly is the κίναϊδος? Virro or Naevolus? Syntactically, the κίναϊδος should be Naevolus because of the explanatory γάρ in line 37; the γάρ particle informs the reader that what follows is a direct result of the previous statement.<sup>73</sup> Furthermore, like the iron that Telemachus removes from the dining hall, Naevolus' prodigious phallus exerts a magnetic attraction for men like Virro—for the man cannot help being drawn to the *kinaidos* (9.37). But Virro is, in fact, the *kinaidos*. Virro has the tell-tale signs of *kinaidoi*, as represented in Roman literature: 1. Virro is the penetrated party in this sexual liaison; 2. the pathic patron earlier in the satire performed an action reserved for *kinaidoi* performers: *cevet* (9.40);<sup>74</sup> 3. Virro fits the definition of *kinaidos*, as Parker and later Kamen and Levin-Richardson define: an anally penetrated male, who may or may not actively seek out penetration.<sup>75</sup> As we have seen in this satire, Virro quite enthusiastically sought his own penetration. Furthermore, nothing about Naevolus' sexuality, such as it is presented, suggests

---

<sup>73</sup> See Sapsford (2022) for the intriguing notion that the modified *Odyssey* quotation is actually a quotation from one of Virro's own assailing love-letters to Naevolus. This solves the explanatory γάρ issue, but also places the authorship of the quotation at Virro's hands, not Naevolus'. Given the other *Odyssean* references that are objectively Naevolus' own creations, I am hesitant now to give Virro the credit and am of the opinion that this is a parenthetical aside from Naevolus, removed from the surrounding grammar.

<sup>74</sup> For the Sotadic turn of "pornographing" epic poetry and *cevet* as "one of the *kinaidos*' signature kinetic moves", see Sapsford (2022) Chapter 2.

<sup>75</sup> Kamen and Levin-Richardson (2015) offer the most up to date paradigm for the "Penetration-agency model for male sexuality" by accounting for the potentially active status of the penetrated male (i.e., he makes the first move in choosing his top), cf. the *kinaidos* who molests with *extortis clunibus* Encolpius in Petronius' *Satyricon* 21; see Sapsford (2022), 138-139. According to their grid, the *kinaidos* is an "active male penetrated via the anus." Their grid has improved Parker's (1997) original 'teratogenic grid' of penetrability for women and men, which did not account for the penetrated male's desire to be penetrated, but did the female's desire to penetrate or be penetrated.

that he offers himself to be or is ever physically penetrated. Borrowing modern gay vernacular, Naevolus is a “strict-top” for both women and men—he is for all intents and purposes *vir* personified.<sup>76</sup> We should, therefore, view this quotation as a parenthetical aside, removed from the surrounding grammar, and Virro as the κίνοιδος and Naevolus as the ἀνήρ.

By playing with sexual positions in this way, Juvenal heightens the ironic nature of this relationship. One would presume naturally that in ancient Rome *Vir-ro* would hold the status of *vir*, the penetrating man’s man, in this sexual relationship. He is, however, not only a pathic, but also, according to Naevolus, the worst kind of pathic: a rich one. Through his financial means and penny-pinching ways, Virro dominates his penetrator; Virro maintains a financial power over his sexually powerful client.

When Naevolus is cut off financially and falls into destitution, he becomes the ἄνδρα of which this *Odd-yssey* sings. It is in this way that Naevolus further connects himself to the epic hero, the ἄνδρα of the *Odyssey*. If we return briefly to the beginning of *Satire 9*, before Naevolus speaks, the speaker exposes a (poorly kept) secret of Naevolus (9.18-26):

Deprendas animi tormenta latentis in aegro  
corpore; deprendas et gaudia: sumit utrumque  
inde habitum facies. igitur flexisse videris  
propositum et vitae contrarius ire priori.  
nuper enim, ut repeto, fanum Isidis et Ganymedem,  
Pacis et advectae secreta palatia Matris  
et Cererem (nam quo non prostat femina templo?)  
notior Aufidio moechus celebrare solebas,  
quoque taces, ipsos etiam inclinare maritos.

You can tell the anguishes of the soul as it lies in  
a sick body; you can also tell the joys: from there  
the face derives both moods. You seem, therefore,  
to have changed your life plan and to be living  
opposite to your old life. For recently, as I recall,  
you, an adulterer more well-known than Aufidius,

---

<sup>76</sup> See the “teratogenic grid” of Parker (1997) and the “Penetration-agency model for male sexuality” of Kamen and Levin-Richardson (2015) again for the *vir* as a “superstud” with license to penetrate his inferiors.

used to frequent the shrine of Isis and Ganymede<sup>77</sup>  
in the temple of Peace and the secret palace of the  
imported Mother and Ceres' temple (is there *anywhere*  
a woman won't prostitute herself?) and—something you  
keep quiet—used to bend over their husbands.

There are significant implications for the fact that Naevolus sexually satisfies both men and women and that it is not a true secret either. Naevolus, as a sexually indiscriminate *άνήρ*, has a sexual versatility that resonates strongly with Odysseus' versatility.<sup>78</sup> For both men are *πολύτροποι*! Both Naevolus and Odysseus “change their life plans” and “bend” others over for their own advancement. Homer celebrates and immortalizes the *άνδρα πολύτροπον* for his stoutheartedness and quick thinking, which left him the only survivor of his doomed return. Juvenal's speaker similarly very casually references an individual, Aufidius, who was an already well-known adulterer, but Naevolus is a step above that. Naevolus is a *moechus* more well-known than Aufidius because of that poorly kept secret, namely that he sleeps with married men and married women. In this way, Naevolus and Odysseus are thematically connected.

Returning to the explicit references to the *Odyssey* in *Satire* 9, we do find an allusion to the famous Odysseus and Polyphemus story; this literary reference, however, betrays Naevolus' inferior *persona*. In a furious apostrophe to the absent Virro, Naevolus says (9.54-65):

dic, passer, cui tot montes, tot praedia servas  
Apula, tot milvos intra tua pascua lassas?  
te Trifolinus ager fecundis vitibus implet  
suspectumque iugum Cumis et Gaurus inanis  
(nam quis plura linit victuro dolia musto?),  
quantum erat exhausti lumbos donare clientis  
iugeribus paucis? melius nunc rusticus infans  
cum matre et casulis et collusore catello  
cymbala pulsantis legatum fiet amici?  
“improbus es cum poscis,” ait; sed pensio clamat

---

<sup>77</sup> The scholia (ad. loc.) relate that these were statues at which notably also *kinaidoi* congregated: *statae, ad quas conveniebant cin<a>edi*.

<sup>78</sup> Although Odysseus ostensibly does not seduce men in the *Odyssey*, he is quite sexually promiscuous—in contrast to Penelope. Naevolus merely has taken it a step further by adding men to his repertoire.

“posce,” sed appellat puer unicus ut Polyphemi  
lata acies, per quam sollers evasit Ulixes.

Tell me, sweetie, for whom are you saving so many  
hills, so many Apulian farms, so many kites made tired  
with your pastures? Your Trifoline field with its fertile vines,  
your ridge overlooking Cumae, and hollow Gaurus  
keep you well supplied (for who seals so many vats  
with wine that’ll last?) is it so hard to give your client’s  
exhausted limbs a few acres of land? Is it better for that  
rustic slave with his mother and small houses and puppy  
playmate become the inheritance for your friend  
who plays the cymbals? He says “It’s inappropriate for you  
to beg.” But my rent shouts “beg!” and my slave, as  
single as the broad eye of Polyphemus, through which  
clever Ulysses escaped, makes his demands.

The opulence and splendor of Virro’s belongings and properties drive Naevolus mad, but also provide a useful foil for the upcoming reference to the *Odyssey*. This time around Naevolus—we presume—would cast himself in the role of Odysseus within the allusion, but this is not the case. Rather Naevolus has the ‘one slave, as single the broad eye of Polyphemus.’ Naevolus bungles the comparison. One might presume that Virro with his swathes of estates and fertile lands would be an excellent substitute for the miserly Polyphemus, who was famously unwilling to share his spoils with a guest.<sup>79</sup> Conversely, one can read Naevolus as an unwelcomed guest in Virro’s home now that his duties have been performed. Unlike Odysseus, who escaped and never returned, Naevolus, who—rather than escaped—was jettisoned from Virro’s home, the monster’s cave (cf. l. 38), now either wishes to reenter and rejoin Virro’s good graces or at least get the monster to pay him. What then are we to make of Naevolus’ half of the bungled simile? We can read this as a flaw in the persona. Naevolus wants to portray himself as a stouthearted Odysseus, but he is a slave to his material passions, like Polyphemus. Naevolus’ turn at the satirical helm

---

<sup>79</sup> *Od.* 9.259-271 – Odysseus expects the guest-friend gift and threatens the clearly stronger Cyclops. See Levy (1963) and Scott (1982) for the theme of *xenia* in the *Odyssey*.



has hit unsafe waters. Instead of presenting his patron as the monster, Naevolus now has given his audience (the speaker and us) another reason to snicker at his indignation. Naevolus remains blithely unaware of his slip-up and continues to rant and rave against the absent patron to the audience (further amused at Naevolus' expense).

The final reference to the *Odyssey* coincides with the end of the poem, and not unintentionally the end of Naevolus (9.147-150):

quando ego pauper ero? Votum miserabile, nec spes  
his saltem; nam cum pro me Fortuna rogatur,  
affigit ceras illa de nave petitas  
quae Siculos cantus effugit remige surdo.

When will I be poor? It's a wretched prayer, there's  
no hope anyhow; for whenever Fortuna is called  
on my behalf, she has fixed wax pilfered from that ship  
which escaped the Sicilian songs with its deaf crew.

In his analysis of this oblique reference to the *Odyssey*, Rosen contends that "Naevolus...plays the role of the dangerous Homeric Sirens whose song (*Siculos cantus*) can only bring trouble to anyone who hears them [and] in equating Naevolus with the Sirens in these lines, then, Juvenal equates Naevolus's *miserabile votum* with a *poetic* form (the Sirens' "*votum*" for Odysseus to stay with them forever, articulated to him in seductive song) that is generally perceived to be pernicious to its intended audience."<sup>80</sup> Naevolus-as-Siren works, but it does not account for the curious role of Odysseus we have seen through this chapter. What then does Odysseus do in this oblique reference to the *Odyssey*? The hero of the epic freely listens to the Sirens' song, but has been tied firmly enough not to venture to his demise. If anything, Odysseus may be the ideal listener of satire; he is someone who can enjoy, but not succumb to, the poem's rhetoric. If one were to give into the angry satirist's rhetoric, then one runs the risk, as Freudenburg says, of

---

<sup>80</sup> Rosen (2007), 228.

“admit[ting] that we are still hungry, and not at all pleased, enraged at what [he] has fobbed off on us in the course(s) of this sham-epic book and deigned to name ‘satire’...[of] becoming *Juvenal!*”<sup>81</sup> But Naevolus’ *miserabile votum* does not even stand a chance to accomplish that. He is reciting it to the wrong audience. Instead of delivering the *votum* to Fortuna-as-Odysseus, he delivers the prayer to Fortuna-as-crewmember, someone who will not even listen to his prayer.<sup>82</sup> Naevolus has driven his audience (i.e., Fortuna and the already indifferent speaker) to the point of ignoring his work. For the speaker does not even bother to respond to Naevolus’ concluding words and has already departed the scene. In short, Naevolus would do well to learn a new trick, a new way to deliver his satire such that people might listen.<sup>83</sup>

#### Part II: Naevolus and Ulysses: A Match made in Hades

Naevolus does not have much in common with the original Odysseus of Homer; he does, however, have an antecedent with Ulysses from *Sermones* 2.5.<sup>84</sup> In this part of the chapter, I shall zoom out to focus on the intriguing and numerous thematic parallels between these satires. Susanna Braund in *Beyond Anger* identifies and catalogues the parallels. Yet Braund uses these parallels as a springboard in a larger discussion about Juvenal’s use of “Socratic irony.” I think that there is more to say about these, as Braund calls them, “small-scale parallels” and, in fact, there are more parallels to add. I shall demonstrate furthermore why these parallels indicate a stronger intertextual relationship between these two satires.

---

<sup>81</sup> Freudenburg (2001), 276. Any scholar of Juvenal has fully given into the rhetoric of the satirist; it is why we keep returning to this otherwise abhorrent persona. We cannot get enough!

<sup>82</sup> Rosen (2007), 228 has incorrectly assigned Odysseus earplugs; only the crewmates of Odysseus had their ears plugged. This raises minor problems with his mapping out of the oblique reference, which I hope to have mended with my interpretation.

<sup>83</sup> To be discussed further in Chapter III.

<sup>84</sup> The tradition of Odysseus/Ulysses being particularly corrupt and nasty is rich; see Montiglio (2011), who handily traces the journey of this cunning hero of Homeric epic and villain of Attic tragedy (cf. Sophocles’ *Philoctetes*) to the paradigm of a wise man.

When we examine Naevolus' words and actions in *Satire 9*, we find that they are strongly reminiscent of the instructions that Tiresias gave to Ulysses in *Sermones 2.5*. The seer instructs the destitute hero to ingratiate himself into an old man's home by gifting several gifts to the (already) rich man (2.5.9-17):

quando pauperiem missis ambagibus horres,  
accipe qua ratione queas ditescere. Turdus  
sive aliud privum dabitur tibi, devolet illuc  
res ubi magna nitet domino sene; dulcia poma  
et quoscumque feret cultus tibi fundus honores  
ante Larem gustet venerabilior Lare dives;  
qui quamvis periurus erit, sine gente, cruentus  
sanguine fraterno, fugitivus, ne tamen illi  
tu comes exterior si postulet ire rescuses.

In plain terms, since you're afraid of poverty, learn the method by which you shall grow rich. If a thrush or something else your very own will be given to you, let it fly thither where great wealth flourishes with its old master; let the rich man, who is more venerable than the Lar, taste the sweet fruits and whatever splendors your cultivated land produces before the Lar does; however much a liar, lowborn, polluted by his brother's blood, a runaway slave he might be, still do not be reluctant, if he asks, to walk as his streetside escort.

Although Naevolus does not explicitly brand Virro with the label *senex*, he does hint at this.

Naevolus indignantly apostrophizes to the absent Virro: "But you clearly used to think that you were a soft and beautiful boy worthy of the cup and heaven!" (*sed tu sane tenerum et puerum te / et pulchrum et dignum cyatho caeloque putabas*, 46-7).<sup>85</sup> Courtney takes this as an assured

---

<sup>85</sup> Different scholars have assigned these lines to different speakers. Courtney (2013), 380 believes them to be Naevolus' indictment against Virro; Braund (2004), 255 places them in the speaker's mouth as an interjection; Peter Green (1967), 72 incredibly gives them to Naevolus reporting them as Virro's criticism of Naevolus himself. I agree with Courtney's suggestion—same page as above—because as he says "the proximity of *tu* in 46 and 50 with different references would be intolerable, and there is a contrast between the presents not received by the client (48-9) and those sent by him (50 sqq.)." This version gives more emphasis to when the speaker of *Satire 9* indubitably does finally speak in l. 90-1. It is here that the speaker names Naevolus again, mirroring the first line that begun the satire and dialogue. Naevolus' word choice as well—*tener*, *pulcher*—is certainly reminiscent of the underlying sexual tensions present in Tiresias' advice to Ulysses here; albeit Naevolus' and Virro's sexual tension is heightened rather than left understated.

indictment concerning Virro's old age: "he thought himself a Ganymede...though he was old and ugly."<sup>86</sup>Not only would the perversity of Virro's pathic nature (his *morbus*) increase—his name after all contains *vir*—but an old man also makes the perfect pigeon for a hungry inheritance-hunter to flatter. Whatever the case, by the time the satire begins, Naevolus has successfully ingratiated himself into this rich man's home. It is when we analyze how Naevolus accomplished this feat, that we find Naevolus following Tiresias' advice very carefully. He voluntarily proffered several gifts to the already demonstrably rich Virro (9.48-53):

vos humili asseculae, vos indulgebitis umquam  
cultori, iam nec morbo donare parati?  
en cui tu viridem umbellam, cui sucina mittas  
grandia, natalis quoties redit aut madidum ver  
incipit et strata positus longaue cathedra  
munera femineis tractat secreta Kalendis.

Will you, rich guys, who are not even ready to pay for your sickness now, ever gratify your humble hanger-on, your follower? Lo, look at this guy that I, Naevolus, sent a green umbrella to, that I sent large amber balls to, whenever his birthday came around or when wet spring began, and there he goes lounging on his soft chaise longue, fondling his secret gifts from the Matronalia.

Since the green umbrella, the large amber balls, and the chaise lounge are all markers of effeminacy, they by extension are also markers of luxury. Pliny Maior says in particular of amber in the *Natural Histories* that it is so highly valued that an effigy of a person—however small—exceeds the price of living and stout men (*taxatio in deliciis tanta, ut hominis quamvis parva effigies vivorum hominum vigentiumque pretia exsuperet*, 37.49). The shade itself has a unique dye. Hugo Blümner points out that green itself is an unusual color for a Roman garment:

---

<sup>86</sup> Courtney (2013), 380.

“Von grüngefärbten Geweben ist nicht häufig die Rede.”<sup>87</sup> Pliny Maior in the process of explaining how one dyes to obtain Tyrian purple, indicates that the color *viridis* was obtained by interrupting that process halfway.<sup>88</sup> The curious nature of this color, therefore, I think rescues the color green from being only “a marker of bad taste and sexual deviance when worn by men,” as Marianne Hopman argues.<sup>89</sup> We should not wholly discount the expense behind this garment that nearly completed the process of Tyrian purple.

These expensive gifts that Naevolus sent to Virro align well with the sort of gifts that Tiresias instructed Ulysses to send. These gifts are all expensive gifts (hard-earned fruits of labor) that were given to the rich man before the Lar. We learn that Naevolus supplicates his Lares with the bare minimum (9.135-140):

..... at mea Clotho  
 et Lachesis gaudent, si pascitur inguine venter.  
 o parvi nostrique Lares, quos ture minute  
 aut farre et tenui soleo exorare corona,  
 quando ego figam aliquid quo sit mihi tuta senectus  
 a tegete et baculo?

..... but my Clotho  
 and Lachesis rejoice, if my cock feeds my belly.  
 O' little Lares of mine, whom I'm wont to  
 entreat with grains of incense or meal  
 or a slender garland, when will I make a catch  
 that will save my old age from the begger's mat and stick?

Although Naevolus makes offerings to his Lares appropriately with incense and a thin garland, the passage is nonetheless thick with irony. As Naevolus performs this ritual offering in a traditional manner, there is evidence to believe that the gigolo does believe these offerings are pathetic. Of particular interest is the use of *far* (“coarse meal”) since Juvenal has notably used it

---

<sup>87</sup> Blümner (1892), 215.

<sup>88</sup> Plin. *HN* 9.135 – first *murex pelagium* dyed the wool green, then the wool is immersed in a vat of the *murex bucinum*. The overlay of purple on green produced the gleaming and brilliant scarlet of double-dyed Tyrian purple.

<sup>89</sup> Hopman (2003), 469.

twice before in *Satires* 1 and 5. The etymologically connected *farrago* appears in the programmatic satire as the “mash” with which Juvenal composes these satires (1.86) and in *Satire* 5 Trebius, the downtrodden dinner guest, would be given *far* suitable for dogs (*farris...canini*, 5.11). Thus, we can glean a metapoetic connection in Naevolus’ offer of *far* to the Lares. For Juvenal, *far(rago)* has been both satiric material and dog’s food. Thus, the *far* that Naevolus gives to his Lares mirrors the *votum miserabile* (“wretched prayer”) that he offers to the deaf goddess Fortuna. The *votum* and *far* are both a poetic form and a pernicious offering to the disinterested party—for neither improves Naevolus’ fortunes. For this reason, it is likely that Naevolus does not think much of the “traditional” offerings to give to Lares, especially if he considers incense and a slender garland on equal standing to pernicious poetry and dog-food.

Let us turn now to Naevolus’ gifts to his rich patron and, more importantly, how Naevolus earned those items in the first place. In order to earn the items that he would inevitably send to Virro, Naevolus had to “work” for them; these items are the “fruits of his labor.” According to Naevolus, his *labores*—his sexual exertions in this case—are just another run-of-the-mill job for which he expects payment (9.27-8). Furthermore, as we saw above, Naevolus directly associates his cock as a means to feed himself. Naevolus has likened himself to a farming slave, but he does not plough fields, just his master (*servus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum / quam dominum*, 9.45-6). This is highly significant because the effort and labor that Naevolus is putting into Virro—in this context, a perverse farmland himself—should yield the *dulcia poma* necessary to garner the attention and affections of another rich old man. As Ulysses must send whatever fruits his farmland produces to the rich old man, so Naevolus gives his previous “fruits” to Virro and—had he received any from Virro—the “fruits” from Virro would go to another old man. This chain of events befits another piece of Tiresias’ advice to

Ulysses at the end of *Sermones* 2.5: the crafty hero, after Dama dies and he inherits one-quarter of Dama's estate, should immediately look to his older co-heirs for his next target on whom he can ply his new trade (2.5.106-109):

.....si quis  
forte coheredum senior male tussiet, huic tu  
dic, ex parte tua seu fundi sive domus sit  
emptor, gaudentem nummo te addicere.

If perchance one of the elder coheirs has a bad cough,  
tell him that, if he should want to buy land or  
a house from your share, you would gladly  
sell it for a cent.

The gifts that Virro gave to Naevolus, the course cloak and second-rate silver (9.28-31), will make perfunctory gifts for his next victim.

There is also a sexual parallel between these satires. Tiresias' most shocking advice to Ulysses is that he should give Penelope herself to the dirty Dama before he even asks (*scortator erit: cave te roget; ultro Penelopam facilis potiori trade, Sermones* 2.5.75-6). Tiresias further predicts that in collusion with her husband, once she gains a taste of the profit, Penelope will be like a dog who cannot separate itself from an oily corpse.<sup>90</sup> In *Satire* 9, a similar transaction occurs except Juvenal has expanded it. Whereas Ulysses himself never sacrifices his bodily integrity for profit, but does surrender Penelope, Naevolus must take up the (bi)sexual duties to his patron. Ulysses offers Penelope to Dama without hesitation, but Virro has to beg Naevolus to impregnate his otherwise virgin wife (9.70-80)

verum, ut dissimules, ut mittas cetera, quanto  
metiris pretio quod, ni tibi deditus essem  
devotusque cliens, uxor tua virgo maneret?  
scis certe quibus ista modis, quam saepe rogaris  
et quae pollicitus. fugientem nempe puellam

---

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Chapter I for the bodily imagery.

amplexus rapui: tabulas quoque ruperat et iam  
migrabat; tota vix hoc ego nocte redemi,  
te plorante foris. testis mihi lectulus et tu  
ad quem pervenit lecti sonus et dominae vox.  
instabile ac dirimi coeptum et iam paene solutum  
coniugium in multis domibus servavit adulter.

But though you ignore and disregard my other services,  
how much do you value that if I had not been your devoted  
client, your wife would have remained a virgin?  
You certainly know with what means, how often you asked,  
and the promises you made. I grabbed her right as she  
was leaving: she had ripped up the contract and was already  
making a new arrangement; I just barely recovered the situation  
that whole night, when you were crying at the door. My witnesses  
are the couch and you to whom the sound of the bed and mistress' voice  
came. An affair has saved an unstable, shaky, and nearly dissolved  
marriage in many houses.<sup>91</sup>

Naevolus attempted to adopt the *persona* of Odysseus, who in Homer strives to maintain his sexual distance unless he is under duress, but has come to represent a mix of the avaricious Ulysses and opportunistic Penelope.<sup>92</sup> It is as if Naevolus has not read the *Odyssey*, but rather he emulates Ulysses studying at the feet of Tiresias.

A reasonable question now would be: what makes these parallels more significant than just typical *topoi* of inheritance-hunters? Why should we put so much stock in these “small-scale” parallels between two poems so far removed from one another? Most importantly, why should we think that Juvenal looks back at Horace? I think the answer lies in the *corpora*. When we take a step back and look at these two satires as individual trees among the forest, they too share striking similarities. They are both oddities in their own right. *Satire 9* is the Juvenal's only

---

<sup>91</sup> This faux-moralizing sententia at the end of the apostrophe reminds us that Naevolus is trying to be a satirist here.

<sup>92</sup> This apostrophe to Virro too serves well as an example of the Juvenalian satire foreshadowed in Juvenal 1. The epic Lucilian satire belongs to the public sphere, but now here we have reached not only the domestic, not only the intimate, but the most private sphere imaginable: the marriage bed. The satirist Naevolus, who was in the bedroom himself, has certainly taken the audience somewhere never before in Roman satire (cf. Freudenburg (2001), 247). He has penetrated the very halls to which the Juvenalian speaker could not gain access—his satire was written in the crossroads after all.



sustained dialogue; *Sermones* 2.5 was Horace's only fantasy satire. Juvenal adopts the characteristically Horatian method of dialogue—"Socratic irony" as Braund puts it—to demonstrate a new method of writing satire.<sup>93</sup> I hope to have shown convincingly that these small-scale parallels do in fact add up to something quite remarkable: Juvenal's Naevolus mimetically embodies not only the previous eight of Juvenal's satires as a deflated epic hero, but he even absorbs the work of another satirist, Horace. The question now becomes not "are these satires related?", but rather "what, if anything, does Juvenal accomplish through this engagement?"

---

<sup>93</sup> Braund (1988), Chapter 3 passim, esp. p. 170-77.

## Chapter 3: Ironically Secure and Securely Ironic

Naevolus' mimetic function in *Satire 9* serves a poetic purpose as we have seen in Chapter II, but now I will explore how he and the speaker of *Satire 9* function as transitional figures in the larger corpus of Juvenal's satires. Naevolus proves his *indignatio* throughout *Satire 9*, but in the middle of his ranting and raving he seemingly accidentally stumbles onto the (perhaps) inevitable result of "angry satire." For, after the pugnacious gigolo reveals casually that he has in fact sired his patron's children, Naevolus immediately switches to damage control (9.93-101):

haec soli commissa tibi celare memento  
et tacitus nostras intra te fige querellas;  
nam res mortifera est inimicus pumice leuis.  
qui modo secretum commiserat, ardet et odit,  
tamquam prodiderim quidquid scio. sumere ferrum,  
fuste aperire caput, candelam adponere ualuis  
non dubitat. nec contemnas aut despicias quod  
his opibus numquam cara est annona ueneni.  
ergo occulta teges ut curia Martis Athenis.

Remember to keep silent about these things I entrusted to you  
and lock my complaints within your silent self;  
for an enemy made smooth by pumice is a deadly thing.  
The man who had just entrusted a secret blazes and hates,  
as if I had surrendered everything I know. He will not hesitate  
to take up a sword, to crack open heads with a cudgel,  
to place a candle at the door. You should not scorn nor disdain  
the fact that the cost of poison is never high.  
So keep my secrets hidden like the court of Mars at Athens.

In order to mitigate his miscalculation, Naevolus begs the speaker to keep quiet lest he, the speaker, receive a brutal death (*fuste aperire caput*). This is not an altruistic act on Naevolus' part. Almost entirely unprovoked, Naevolus first spilled this information to the speaker who just

wanted to know why Naevolus looks so different now (9.1) The beating that he promises the rich man will inflict upon the speaker will inevitably find its way to Naevolus too.

### Part I: The Problem with Angry Satire

The ultimate conclusion of “angry satire” then is exactly this sort of beating. In the middle of ranting and raving about the foibles and vices of the dirty city, the satirist will eventually offend a well-connected individual. Unlike the speaker of *Satire 1*, who promised to test the limits of attacking the dead (*experiar quid concedatur in illos quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina*, 1.170), Naevolus makes a critical error in judgement. Naevolus not only attacks a living person, but also appears to be using his patron’s real name. If Naevolus had been more judicious, he would have used an appropriate pseudonym to attack his patron and would have no reason to fear such a violent assault. As a result, Naevolus stands in contrast with the speaker of *Satire 5*; there the speaker likely was using “Virro” as a label for any bad host at dinner and clearly did not fear retribution. In his indignant state—and presumably because it is just the two of them on the street—Naevolus has revealed the melodramatic events of Virro’s house. Accordingly, circumstance once again orders Naevolus to beg someone in a better position to solve (t)his problem for him.

The speaker of *Satire 9*, on the other hand, has no reason to keep quiet nor desire to follow Naevolus’ wishes. In fact, the speaker ominously suggests that, even if he does keep quiet—although notably he does not give any assurance or hint that he will—this sort of information just has a way of getting out to the public (9.102-120):

o Corydon, Corydon, secretum diuitis ullum  
esse putas? serui ut taceant, iumenta loquentur  
et canis et postes et marmora. claude fenestras,  
uela tegant rimas, iunge ostia, tollite lumen,  
e medio fac eant omnes, prope nemo recumbat;  
quod tamen ad cantum galli facit ille secundi

proximus ante diem caupo sciet, audiet et quae  
finxerunt pariter libarius, archimagiri,  
carptores. quod enim dubitant componere crimen  
in dominos, quotiens rumoribus ulciscuntur  
baltea? nec derit qui te per compita quaerat  
nolentem et miseram uinosus inebriet aurem.  
illos ergo roges quidquid paulo ante petebas  
a nobis, taceant illi. sed prodere malunt  
arcanum quam subrepti potare Falerni  
pro populo faciens quantum Saufeia bibebat.  
[uiuendum recte, cum propter plurima, tum est his  
praecipue causis, ut linguas mancipiorum  
contemnas; nam lingua mali pars pessima serui.

O Corydon, Corydon! Do you think a rich man can ever have a secret? Even if his slaves keep quiet, his burden beasts, his dog, his doorposts, and his marble will all talk. Close the shutters, put curtains across the chinks, fasten the doors, turn out the light, make everyone leave, don't let anyone sleep close by—all the same, what the master does at the second cock-crow will be known to the nearest shopkeeper before dawn, along with all the fictions of the pastry cook, the head chefs, and the carvers. After all, is there any allegation they refrain from concocting against their masters? Rumors are their revenge for their beats. There will always be some drunk at the crossroads complaining and filling your wretched unwilling ears. So you need to ask them what you asked me a little while ago, to stay silent. But they actually like betraying secrets better than drinking stolen Falernian wine in the quantities that Saufeia used to down when she was carrying out a public sacrifice. Live rightly, both for many other reasons and especially for these: so that you can dismiss the tongues of your slaves. For the tongue is the worst part of a wicked slave.

The speaker understands that the leering look into Virro's household that Naevolus provided was neither original nor even fresh information. The speaker in these lines even minimizes much of Naevolus' satiric claim to fame. His project of exposure may have taken us into the most private sphere of everyday life, the bedroom and marriage bed, but it appears that anyone can do that. If the slaves (e.g. Naevolus) do not do it, the work-beasts, the dog, the posts, and marble will spill the goings-on of the house. The speaker further minimizes the tawdry activities of the rich man's home when he confesses that these may all just be entirely fictitious (*quae finxerunt*) stories

avenging beatings (*rumoribus ulciscuntur*). In doing so, he also minimizes Naevolus' reasons for being angry—the very core of his satire! At last, the speaker finally wraps up his dismissal of “angry satire” with an allusion to *Satire* 1. The speaker there began the work with a great promise to fill his notebooks to the brim with satires at the crossroads (*nonne libet medio ceras implere capaces quadriuo*, 1.63-4) with whatever people did (*quidquid agunt homines*, 1.85). Now the speaker of *Satire* 9 denigrates that mission by equating that original mission to drunken ramblings at a crossroads and himself to an unwilling hostage to the drunkard (*nec derit qui te per compita quaerat nolentem et miseram uinosus inebriet aurem*, 9.111-12)!

In the larger corpus of Juvenal's *Satires*, *Satire* 9 marks this significant departure from the *indignatio* that has served the speakers hitherto so well. The speaker of *Satire* 9 recognizes the risk of this kind of satire. After all, no one (willingly) wants to listen to angry drunk complain; what is more, such ranting also carries significant peril for both the drunk and the listener.<sup>94</sup> Fortuna had to plug her ears to get away from Naevolus! To get his message to his audience Juvenal must change tactics. Franco Bellandi notes an “emptiness at the core of his *indignatio*...that explains how [Juvenal] could arrive at...‘self-parody.’”<sup>95</sup> Anger cannot successfully accomplish anything further. While *Satire* 9 ends Book 3, in many ways it foreshadows how the rest of the satires will proceed. By no means will anger be absent (e.g. Naevolus), but the speakers do not fuel their satire with anger anymore.<sup>96</sup> The speakers prove themselves to be detached from the situation; the satires to come (except the oddly personal *Satires* 11 and 12) are no longer personal to the speaker. Naevolus' situation has nothing to do

---

<sup>94</sup> Each of our post-Lucilius satirists have a moment when an interlocutor addresses them/their speaker and informs them they could be gambling with more than just their social position. If they offend the wrong person, it could be even more disastrous. Cf. Juvenal 1.150-170, Horace *Sermones* 2.1.60-86, Persius 1.107-110.

<sup>95</sup> Bellandi (2009), 486.

<sup>96</sup> Keane (2015), 115, very interestingly posits that these flare ups serve as possible reminders of how good *indignatio* felt once upon a time.

with the speaker, save for the very tenuous fact that Naevolus and the speaker could be “friends.” This ironic detachment in dialogue form was the method of satire that Horace employed over a century earlier in his second Book of *Satires*—a time of great political unease as Augustus solidified his reign after Actium. Looking back to Horace, Juvenal’s speakers embrace the detached irony.

As I have shown in the previous chapters, *Satire 9* looks back to *Sermones 2.5* for imagery and treatment of Odysseus/Ulysses. Now I will show in particular that it is also true for its ironic values. The two satires share the detached irony element. The wholly unsympathetic character expounding preposterous values with a straight face pervades Horace’s *Sermones*, especially Book II. *Sermones 2.5* has two such characters, Tiresias and Ulysses. Between the two of them, the humor comes primarily from their straight-faced delivery of these sordid lines and ideas—everyone hunts inheritances these days, but here’s how to do it right! Similarly in *Satire 9* Naevolus casually talks about the nasty things he has done in the pursuit of material wealth as if everyone does it; the speaker of *Satire 9*, although he does not talk very much, should be viewed with a skeptical eye. As James Uden says, “the invisibility of the satirist takes on a sinister cast...he may know you, but you cannot know him” and consequently cannot hurt him.<sup>97</sup> The ironic dialogue between the two pairs plays out masterfully as each character slowly reveals how vile or sinister they can be.

## Part II: Naevolus and Horace

Naevolus serves a function greater than just dialogue partner. He is after all Juvenal’s match.<sup>98</sup> Through Naevolus, as Uden says, “[Juvenal] deliberately complicates his poem’s moral

---

<sup>97</sup> Uden (2015), 78.

<sup>98</sup> Henderson (1999), 200: “Naevolus is the only one who deserves to share a whole poem in dialogue with J. Faced with Naevolus the ‘Superstud’, *Egito* meets his match, the Man with (too much of) everything...For here is a Male who has taken as seriously as can bet that ‘healthy’ simplicity of a ‘Penetrate-All’ male sexuality. *Naevolus*...is its

drive through an ironic dialogue with his own voice.”<sup>99</sup> Bellandi regards the poem as a result as a kind of “self-parody, emphasizing Juvenal’s extreme isolation.”<sup>100</sup> Braund argues that this poem is an “allegory of the procedure of satire.”<sup>101</sup> Now, as I have shown in the previous chapter, Naevolus mimetically represents writing Juvenalian satire. He also represents Juvenal’s mastery and ultimate rebuttal of Horace’s satire.<sup>102</sup> In dismissing Naevolus, Juvenal not only dispatches his old indignant method of writing satire, he simultaneously appropriates and repackages Horace’s ironic method in one fell swoop.

Early in *Satire 9*, when the speaker began introducing Naevolus to the audience, he uses a conspicuous turn of phrase: “Certainly, you used to live the content life of a homebred knight without much, an elegant dinner guest with biting humor and forceful witticisms bred within the city limits (*certe modico contentus agebas / vernam equitem, conviva ioco mordente facetus / et salibus vehemens intra pomeria natis*, 9.9-11). This coy comparison should raise eyebrows because Naevolus shares this description with Horatian satire. Horatian satire has *contentus* and its derivatives in abundance.<sup>103</sup> Maria Plaza uncovers a connection between Naevolus and Horace with three key aspects: a) their shared status as a content dinner guest (*contentus conviva*), b) their mutual arsenal of jokes, and c) the fact that they are both in one way or another *vernae equites*.<sup>104</sup> The last of these, I think, has the most weight to it. Horace and Naevolus are both walking paradoxes in this poem, knightly house-slaves. Had Horace’s freedman father not

---

logical conclusion, Priapus-as-*homo*; Bellandi (1974) and Rosen (2007) for the self-parodic function of Naevolus as satirist.”

<sup>99</sup> Uden (2015), 76.

<sup>100</sup> Bellandi (1974), 291.

<sup>101</sup> Braund (1988), 170.

<sup>102</sup> Rosen (2007), 227, n21 raises the possibility of this, but Rosen does not want to “overemphasize the contrast” between the two strains of satire. I respectfully disagree.

<sup>103</sup> The word appears 11 times throughout his corpus, 10 of which are found in the *Sermones* themselves. In particular, *S.* 1.4.108, 1.6.96, 1.10.74, 2.2.110 all refer to individuals content with little or few things.

<sup>104</sup> Plaza (2006), 165.

been freed before Horace's birth, the poet would have actually been a home-bred slave. It should be noted that Naevolus is not an actual slave, but rather an (underpaid) "employee" of Virro; nevertheless, this fact does not stop Naevolus from comparing himself to one. "The slave who ploughs the field will be less miserable than the one who plows his master," as he says (*servus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum / quam dominum*, 9.45-6).<sup>105</sup> Horace's rise to prominence, however, after Philippi perhaps saved him from similar duties.

Plaza cites Horace *Sermones* 1.1 as a "parallel that should be particularly emphasized" between Naevolus and Horace.<sup>106</sup> There, for Horace, the ideal type of man was one who steps out of life as a content dinner guest (*qui...exacto contentus tempore vita | cedat, uti conviva satur*, 1.1.117-19), but that content dinner guest was "past Naevolus." Now, he is neither *contentus* nor *satur*, but avaricious and hungry for more (9.139-47):

quando ego figam aliquid quo sit mihi tuta senectus  
a tegete et baculo? uiginti milia fenus  
pigneribus positis, argenti uascula puri,  
sed quae Fabricius censor notet, et duo fortes  
de grege Moesorum, qui me ceruice locata  
securum iubeant clamoso insistere Circo;  
sit mihi praeterea curuus caelator, et alter  
qui multas facies pingit cito; sufficiunt haec.  
quando ego pauper ero?

When will I make a catch that will save my old age  
from the beggar's mat and stick? Let me have an income  
of twenty thousand from mortgages, silver cups, plain,  
but which Fabricius the censor would notice, and two strong  
Moesians, who would enable me to take my place  
safely in my hired litter at the noisy Circus;  
also an old engraver and another who quickly  
makes many portraits; these things are sufficient.  
When will I be poor?

---

<sup>105</sup> I have chosen deliberately these two different spellings for the word to attempt to capture the pun. 'Plough' retains its agricultural meaning in colloquial English, but 'plow' spelled specifically has taken on a vulgar sexual definition.

<sup>106</sup> Plaza (2006), 165.



No longer does Naevolus play the “homebred knight”; that image that conjured the most famously content satirist is now associated with this greedy and pathetic character.

There are further connections between Naevolus and Horace that Plaza does not recognize; for one lies in the larger corpus of Horace and the other is oblique. The placement of *Satire 9*, as shown above, has transitional significance, but so does the placement of *Sermones 2.5*. The Horatian satire plays with inheritance hunting, but also in general with the idea of social climbers, men who will do literally anything to (re)gain their fortune and (re)enter the upper echelons of society. Horace, a self-advertised son of a freedman himself, who found himself on the losing side at Philippi, returns to Rome only through clemency. That is until Maecenas enters the picture. After Maecenas gets Horace a position as a *scriba* and Horace delivers the *Sermones* and *Epodes*, Maecenas will gift Horace with estates. Horace gives his thanks to Maecenas in the next poem, *Sermones 2.6*.

This is, nevertheless, a most delicate situation in which to find oneself. Horace has to navigate the minefield of giving proper thanks to Maecenas without appearing like a (metaphorical) prostitute. Ellen Oliensis talks of Horace’s “rhetoric of authority”—the rhetorical arts by which he fashioned his own authority to represent his dealings with more powerful men in his poetry, like Maecenas and Augustus.<sup>107</sup> Naevolus—especially with his list of demands—does come to represent a social climber himself by the end of the satire. Christopher Nappa, in particular, notes this social climbing element: “Naevolus wants not only a stable income, but in fact the four hundred thousand sesterces of the equestrian census [in annual interest]...Naevolus wants both wealth and a jump in social status.”<sup>108</sup> It is through his rhetoric then that Horace saves “face” and can give thanks to Maecenas without sacrificing any self-worth and appearing the

---

<sup>107</sup> Oliensis (1998).

<sup>108</sup> Nappa (2018), 181.

modest man we know. In stark contrast to this, Juvenal gives us Naevolus, an opportunistic social climber, a captious satirist and greedy man, as an Horatian substitute. In this way, Juvenal undoes the carefully crafted “face” Horace created so long ago, replacing it with the *vultus gravis* of Naevolus (an actual prostitute).<sup>109</sup>

In equating Naevolus to Horace, Juvenal can simultaneously demonstrate his own ability at self-mockery (cf. Chapter II) and dismiss another satirist, from whom he draws inspiration so heavily. The dialogue form that we find so often in Horace is a novelty in *Satire 9*. This significant shift of perspective and method begs the reader to pause and reflect to discover what the previously angry moralist wants to say. The dialogue form allows the poet to disguise their views and perhaps have fun with those who try to find their views in the first place. This, in my opinion, shows Juvenal’s mastery of Horatian satire in one fell swoop. By benefit of birth in the second century CE, Juvenal knows (a version of) Horace’s story; both his highs and his lows. Juvenal accentuates the unsavory qualities attached to Horace through Naevolus—the veneer of a *captator*, a close relationship with his patron, and especially the fear of destitution and ruin—while appropriating his satiric method. sends Horace, just like *indignatio*-fueled satire, off into retirement.

Juvenal will in Books 4 and 5 seamlessly blend anger and irony together. He will parade the (deflated) sword of Lucilius in one hand and the Venusian lamp in the other as he marches forward in his mission. *Satire 10* will explore the folly of prayers, presented in a form like Horace’s diatribe satires of Book 1. It is not a dialogue, but the vitriol of the earlier poems has

---

<sup>109</sup> The connection becomes even clearer when Naevolus vitriolically interrogates an absent Virro. He wants to know for whom his sparrow is holding onto such swathes of rich, fertile estates (*dic, passer, cui tot montis, tot praedia seruas / Apula, tot miluos intra tua pascua lassas?*, 9.54-55). Horace’s native land, Venusia, and his father’s estate—confiscated by Octavian for veteran settlement—was in the Apulian region. Insubstantial, but remains an interesting point of connection.

been tempered. *Satire* 10 amusingly ends with a knock against Fortuna, who was deaf to the old angry satire; now the speaker recognizes that we give her power, “we make her a god, we give her a place in the sky” (*nullum numen habes, si sit prudentia: nos te / nos facimus, Fortuna, deam caeloque locamus*, 10.365-6). *Satire* 11 will lift the epistolary form from Horace when he invites a certain Persicus to dinner; a much less angry dinner party satire than *Satire* 5. *Satire* 12 will treat inheritance hunters properly in the back half of the poem, a favorite theme of Horace, especially *Sermones* 2.5. The irony present in Book 5 is the strongest example of Horatian appropriation. *Satire* 13 once again takes a moral failing (perjury in this case) as the standard for respectable people, as the speaker consoles Calvinus about his lost sum of money. *Satire* 14 discusses how parents are responsible for their children’s bad actions through improper living. This satire seems to me to be the least angry of all Juvenal’s complete satires; it does have the *sermo* style of Horace’s first book of satires. *Satire* 15, a novelty in its own right with respect to its content, condemns—of all things—anger. The tragically damaged *Satire* 16 precludes any full analysis, but the available 60 lines do speak for a detached inspection of the army and its many—perhaps unnecessary—privileges.

In these later satires, the speaker absolves himself from any potential beatings by saying the wrong thing to the wrong person. Rather than rant and rave against the less powerful on the street, the speaker approaches the elite in terms they *should* be able to understand. In especially *Satires* 14, 15, and 16, the addressees all sound like fellow elites, but they serve only as addressees, and then they are swiftly left behind. The speakers have a new way of addressing their audiences. The satirist over the course of these five books has shown why his satire continues to draw people in and why we, as scholars, should consider his works holistically as part of the grand satirical tradition.

# Conclusion

These chapters have aimed to argue that *Satire 9* and Horace *Sermones 2.5* have a stronger link than previously argued. Previous scholars have noted that the two satires are closely related, but none took the next logical step to connect the disparate dots. The fact that over one hundred years do separate the two authors and poems themselves has certainly contributed greatly to that hesitation. I have, however, attempted here in this thesis to connect the two satires through their mutual imagery, their debasement of the Odysseus figure, and *Satire 9*'s Horatian subtext. My close readings of these two satires have provided another link between Horace and Juvenal, who are often treated entirely separate of each other save for occasional cross-references or similarity of topics.

I hope this work contributes to a longer discussion of how our representative satirists transformed the genre with their own hands. Although we have no doubt lost more satirical works of other less-known authors, we can see the generic influence exerted by Juvenal after his death on later works. Juvenal—true to his name—the (relatively) youngest of our four Roman satirists formed the genre beyond Lucilius, Horace, and even Persius into an all-consuming, pugnacious, and intrusive. Then, to show that he could the satirist changed halfway through. No longer concerned with vitriol, the speakers embraced irony and detached their personal feelings to make calmer satire. In this way, satire would perhaps not anger the people that it claims to want to help. At the very least no one is accosted by a madman in the streets, even if he is a comical figure from time to time.

The bodily imagery in both satires contribute to their distinctive natures. For Horace, such grotesque bodily and sexual imagery was unprecedented and unparalleled in the rest of the corpus; for Juvenal, the bodies in *Satire 9* confused the roles that Horace laid out in his original

satire. Furthermore, while Tiresias instructed the unscrupulous Ulysses to break down the would-be patron into body parts by which he would secure his fortune, Naevolus had already accepted that his one large body part might secure his. The strong sexual imagery associated with the body imagery remains centered in the two patron-client relationships, the asymmetrical power-relations.

That sexual content revolves heavily around Ulysses and Naevolus. The two men pride themselves on their versatility. These *polytropoi* frequently used their bodies to rectify issues. Ulysses in Horace did not provide Dama with sexual services, but Penelope would; Naevolus certainly satisfies Virro and his wife. They both do this in order to secure their fortunes. The original Odysseus, their predecessor, as well would consummate relationships with goddesses to save a situation—the most notable example would be Circe in Book X. But functionally Naevolus is more than just a large phallus. He also represented the intricate process of writing Juvenalian satire. Naevolus is a complicated amalgamation of Juvenal's predecessor Horace, a dismissal of his own angry persona, and a demonstration of his ability to self-mock.

In particular, the Horatian connection between Naevolus himself and the satirists' respective corpus provides a much-needed holistic view of the satirists' works. Horace's legacy as a satirist dominated the genre with his ironic dialogues and diatribes (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.94). Juvenal, however, found the one time that Horace strayed from that satiric pattern. The "most Juvenalian of Horace's satires" inspired the "most Horatian of Juvenal's satires." That inspiration gives rise to replacement Juvenal uses Naevolus to retire Horace's satire and replaces it with his own anger-cum-irony mixture in Books 4 and 5. The genre forever changed from its contact with Juvenal's *farrago*.

# Bibliography

- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Duckworth.
- Anderson, W. S. 1982. "Anger in Juvenal and Seneca." In *Essays on Roman Satire*, by William S. Anderson, 293-296. Princeton.
- . 1982. *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton.
- Bellandi, F. 1974. "Naevolus *cliens*." *Maia* 4: 279-99. [= 2009. "Naevolus *cliens*" (trans. L. Hollford-Strevens). In M. Plaza (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Persius and Juvenal*. 469-505. Oxford].
- Blümner, H. 1892. "Die Farbenbezeichnungen bei den römischen Dichtern." *Berliner Studien* 12 (3): 1-231.
- Bramble, J. C. 1974. *Persius and the Programmatic Satire: A Study in Form and Imagery*. Cambridge.
- Braund, S. H. 1988. *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*. Cambridge.
- . 2004. *Juvenal and Persius*. Cambridge.
- . 1996. *Juvenal: Satires Book I*. Cambridge.
- . 1992. *Roman Verse Satire*. Oxford.
- Breed, B. W., Keitel, E., Wallace, R., ed. 2018. *Lucilius and Satire in Second-Century Rome*. Cambridge.
- Champlin, E. 1991. *Final Judgements: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 BC - AD 250*. University of California Press.
- Courtney, E. 2013. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. California Classical Studies.
- Damon, C. 1997. *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage*. University of Michigan Press.
- Duff, J.D. 1898. *Fourteen Satires of Juvenal*. Cambridge.
- Ferguson, John, ed. 1998. *Juvenal: The Satires*. Bristol.
- Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.
- Freudenburg, K. 2021. *Horace: Satires Book II*. Cambridge.

- . 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge.
- . 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton.
- Geue, T. 2018. *Juvenal and the Poetics of Anonymity*. Cambridge.
- Godwin, J. 2016. *Juvenal: Satires Book IV*. Liverpool University Press.
- . 2020. *Juvenal: Satires Book V*. Liverpool University Press.
- . 2022. *Juvenal: Satires Book III*. Liverpool University Press.
- Gowers, E. 1993. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Oxford.
- Green, P. 1967. *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires*. Penguin.
- Griffin, D. H. 1994. *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. University Press of Kentucky.
- Hallett, J. P., and Skinner, M. B. 1997. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton.
- Hardy, E.G. 1883. *The Satires of Juvenal*. London.
- Henderson, J. 1999. *Writing down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and other Offences in Latin Poetry*. Oxford.
- Hight, G. 1954. *Juvenal the Satirist*. Oxford.
- Hopkins, K. 1983. *Death and Renewal*. Cambridge.
- Hopkins, K. 1983. "Wills and Legacy Hunters." In *Death and Renewal*, 235-47. Cambridge.
- Hopman, M. 2003. "Satire in Green: Marked Clothing and the Technique of Indignatio at Juvenal 5.141-45." *AJPh* 124 (4): 557-574.
- Kamen, D., and Levin-Richardson, S. 2015. "Revisiting Roman Sexuality: Agency and the Conceptualization of Penetrated Males." In *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, by M. Masterson, N. S. Rabinowitz and J. Robson, 449-460. Routledge.
- Keane, C. 2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. Oxford.
- . 2015. *Juvenal and the Satiric Emotions*. Oxford.
- Kernan, A. B. 1959. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*. Yale.

- LaFleur, R. A. 1979. "Amicitia and the Unity of Juvenal's First Book." *ICS* 4: 158-177.
- Larmour, D. H. J. 2016. *The Arena of Satire: Juvenal's Search for Rome*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Levy, H. L. 1963. "The Odyssean Sutors and the Host-Guest Relationship." *TAPhA* 94: 145-153.
- Mansbach, A. R. 1982. "Captatio, Myth and Reality." PhD diss.: Princeton.
- Masterson, M., N. S. Rabinowitz, and J. Robson. 2015. *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*. Routledge.
- Montiglio, S. 2011. *From Villain to Hero: Odysseus in Ancient Thought*. University of Michigan Press.
- Nappa, C. 2018. *Making Men Ridiculous: Juvenal and the Anxieties of the Individual*. University of Michigan Press.
- Oliensis, E. 1988. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Oxford.
- Oliensis, E. 1997. "The Erotics of amicitia: Readings in Tibullus, Propertius, and Horace." In *Roman Sexualities*, by J. P. Hallett and M. B Skinner, 151-171. Princeton.
- Parker, H. N. 1997. "The Teratogenic Grid." In *Roman Sexualities*, by J. P. Hallett and M. B. Skinner, 47-65. Princeton.
- Plaza, Maria. 2009. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Persius and Juvenal*. Oxford.
- . 2006. *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying*. Oxford.
- Ramsay, G. G., trans. 1918. *Juvenal and Persius*. Cambridge.
- Ribbeck, O. 1865. *Der Echte und der unechte Juvenal: Eine kritische Untersuchung*. Berlin.
- Roberts, M. 1984. "Horace Satires 2.5: Restrained Indignation." *AJP* 105: 426-433.
- Rosen, R. 2007. *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford.
- Rudd, N. 1966. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge.
- Sallmann, K. 1970. "Satirische Technik in Horaz' Erbschleichersatire (S. 2.5)." *Hermes* 98: 178-203.
- Sapsford, T. 2022. *Performing the Kinaidos*. Oxford.
- Scott, M. 1982. "Philos, Philotes, and Xenia." *AClass* 25: 1-19.



Sellar, W. Y. 1892. *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegaic Poets*. Oxford.

Uden, J. 2015. *The Invisible Satirist*. Oxford.

Watson, L. and Watson P. 2014. *Juvenal: Satire 6*. Cambridge.

Winkler, M. M. 1983. *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal*. New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

Woods, H. A. 2012. *Hunting Literary Legacies: Captatio in Roman Satire*. (PhD diss.): University of Minnesota.

## Text and Translation of Juvenal *Satire 9*

“Scire uelim quare totiens mihi, Naeuole, tristis occurras fronte obducta ceu Marsya uictus. quid tibi cum uultu, qualem deprensus habebat Rauola dum Rhodopes uda terit inguina barba? [nos colaphum incutimus lambenti crustula seruo.]	5
non erit hac facie miserabilior Crepereius Pollio, qui triplicem usuram praestare paratus circumit et fatuos non invenit. unde repente tot rugae? certe modico contentus agebas uernam equitem, conuiuia ioco mordente facetus et salibus vehemens intra pomeria natis.	10
omnia nunc contra, uultus gravis, horrida siccae silva comae, nullus tota nitor in cute, qualem Bruttia praestabat calidi tibi fascia uisci, sed fruticante pilo neglecta et squalida crura.	15
quid macies aegri ueteris, quem tempore longo torret quarta dies olimque domestica febris? deprendas animi tormenta latentis in aegro corpore, deprendas et gaudia; sumit utrumque inde habitum facies. igitur flexisse uideris	20
propositum et uitae contrarius ire priori. nuper enim, ut repeto, fanum Isidis et Ganymedem Pacis et aduectae secreta Palatia matris et Cererem (nam quo non prostat femina templo?) notior Aufidio moechus celebrare solebas,	25
quodque taces, ipsos etiam inclinare maritos.” “utile et hoc multis uitae genus, at mihi nullum inde operae pretium. pingues aliquando lacernas, munimenta togae, duri crassique coloris et male percussas textoris pectine Galli	30
accipimus, tenue argentum uenaeque secundae. fata regunt homines, fatum est et partibus illis quas sinus abscondit. nam si tibi sidera cessant, nil faciet longi mensura incognita nerui, quamuis te nudum spumanti Virro labello	35

uiderit et blandae adsidue densaeque tabellae  
 sollicitent, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναϊδος,  
 quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis auarus?  
 ‘haec tribui, deinde illa dedi, mox plura tulisti.’  
 computat et ceuet. ponatur calculus, adsint 40  
 cum tabula pueri; numera sestertia quinque  
 omnibus in rebus, numerentur deinde labores.  
 an facile et pronum est agere intra uiscera penem  
 legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae?  
 seruus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum 45  
 quam dominum. sed tu sane tenerum et puerum te  
 et pulchrum et dignum cyatho caeloque putabas.  
 uos humili adseculae, uos indulgebitis umquam  
 cultori, iam nec morbo donare parati?  
 en cui tu uiridem umbellam, cui sucina mittas 50  
 grandia, natalis quotiens redit aut madidum uer  
 incipit et strata positus longaue cathedra  
 munera femineis tractat secreta kalendis.  
 dic, passer, cui tot montis, tot praedia seruas  
 Apula, tot miluos intra tua pascua lassas? 55  
 te Trifolinus ager fecundis uitibus implet  
 suspectumque iugum Cumis et Gaurus inanis—  
 nam quis plura linit uicturo dolia musto?—  
 quantum erat exhausti lumbos donare clientis  
 iugeribus paucis! meliusne hic rusticus infans 60  
 cum matre et casulis et conlusore catello  
 cymbala pulsantis legatum fiet amici?  
 ‘improbus es cum poscis’ ait. sed pensio clamat  
 ‘posce,’ sed appellat puer unicus ut Polyphemi  
 lata acies per quam sollers euasit Vlixes. 65  
 alter emendus erit, namque hic non sufficit, ambo  
 pascendi. quid agam bruma spirante? quid, oro,  
 quid dicam scapulis puerorum aquilone Decembri  
 et pedibus? ‘durate atque expectate cicadas’?  
 uerum, ut dissimules, ut mittas cetera, quanto 70  
 metiris pretio quod, ni tibi deditus essem  
 deuotusque cliens, uxor tua uirgo maneret?

scis certe quibus ista modis, quam saepe rogaris  
 et quae pollicitus. fugientem saepe puellam  
 amplexu rapui; tabulas quoque ruperat et iam 75  
 signabat; tota uix hoc ego nocte redemi  
 te plorante foris. testis mihi lectulus et tu,  
 ad quem peruenit lecti sonus et dominae uox.  
 instabile ac dirimi coeptum et iam paene solutum  
 coniugium in multis domibus seruauit adulter. 80  
 quo te circumagas? quae prima aut ultima ponas?  
 nullum ergo meritum est, ingrata ac perfide, nullum  
 quod tibi filiulus uel filia nascitur ex me?  
 tollis enim et libris actorum spargere gaudes  
 argumenta uiri. foribus suspende coronas: 85  
 iam pater es, dedimus quod famae opponere possis.  
 iura parentis habes, propter me scriberis heres,  
 legatum omne capis nec non et dulce caducum.  
 commoda praeterea iungentur multa caducis,  
 si numerum, si tres impleuero.” “iusta doloris, 90  
 Naeuole, causa tui; contra tamen ille quid adfert?”  
 “neglegit atque alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum.  
 haec soli commissa tibi celare memento  
 et tacitus nostras intra te fige querellas;  
 nam res mortifera est inimicus pumice leuis. 95  
 qui modo secretum commiserat, ardet et odit,  
 tamquam prodiderim quidquid scio. sumere ferrum,  
 fuste aperire caput, candelam adponere ualuis  
 non dubitat. nec contemnas aut despicias quod  
 his opibus numquam cara est annona ueneni. 100  
 ergo occulta teges ut curia Martis Athenis.”  
 “o Corydon, Corydon, secretum diuitis ullum  
 esse putas? serui ut taceant, iumenta loquentur  
 et canis et postes et marmora. claude fenestras,  
 uela tegant rimas, iunge ostia, tollite lumen, 105  
 e medio fac eant omnes, prope nemo recumbat;  
 quod tamen ad cantum galli facit ille secundi  
 proximus ante diem caupo sciet, audiet et quae  
 finxerunt pariter libarius, archimagiri,

carptores. quod enim dubitant componere crimen 110  
 in dominos, quotiens rumoribus ulciscuntur  
 baltea? nec derit qui te per compita quaerat  
 nolentem et miseram uinosus inebriet aurem.  
 illos ergo roges quidquid paulo ante petebas  
 a nobis, taceant illi. sed prodere malunt 115  
 arcanum quam subrepti potare Falerni  
 pro populo faciens quantum Saufeia bibebat.  
 uiuendum recte, cum propter plurima, tum est his  
 [idcirco ut possis linguam contemnere serui.]  
 praecipue causis, ut linguas mancipiorum 120  
 contemnas; nam lingua mali pars pessima serui.  
 [deterior tamen hic qui liber non erit illis  
 quorum animas et farre suo custodit et aere.]”  
 “utile consilium modo, sed commune, dedisti.  
 nunc mihi quid suades post damnum temporis et spes 125  
 deceptas? festinat enim decurrere uelox  
 flosculus angustae miseraeque breuissima uitae  
 portio; dum bibimus, dum sarta, unguenta, puellas  
 poscimus, obrepat non intellecta senectus.”  
 “ne trepida, numquam pathicus tibi derit amicus 130  
 stantibus et saluis his collibus; undique ad illos  
 conuenient et carpentis et nauibus omnes  
 qui digito scalpunt uno caput. altera maior  
 spes superest, tu tantum erucis inprime dentem.  
 [gratus eris, tu tantum erucis inprime dentem.]” 134a  
 “haec exempla para felicibus; at mea Clotho  
 et Lachesis gaudent, si pascitur inguine uenter.  
 o parui nostrique Lares, quos ture minuto  
 aut farre et tenui soleo exorare corona,  
 quando ego figam aliquid quo sit mihi tuta senectus  
 a tegete et baculo? uiginti milia fenus 140  
 pigneribus positis, argenti uascula puri,  
 sed quae Fabricius censor notet, et duo fortes  
 de grege Moesorum, qui me ceruice locata  
 securum iubeant clamoso insistere circo;  
 sit mihi praeterea curuus caelator, et alter 145

qui multas facies pingit cito; sufficiunt haec.  
quando ego pauper ero? uotum miserabile, nec spes  
his saltem; nam cum pro me Fortuna uocatur,  
adfixit ceras illa de naue petitas  
quae Siculos cantus effugit remige surdo.”

150

“Naevolus, I would like to know why so often I run into you looking sad, with a knitted brow like Marsyas had after he lost. What’s with this face, like the one Ravola had when he was caught with a wet beard from eating Rhodope out?<sup>110</sup> Not even Crepereius Pollio, who goes around prepared to offer triple the interest rate and doesn’t find anyone that stupid, will have a face more miserable than yours. Where did so many wrinkles come from? Certainly, you used to live contently the life of a homebred knight, a humorous dinner-guest with a biting joke and strong with the sorts of witticisms born in the city. But now everything is reversed, your expression is grave, your hair a dry and bristly forest, your skin lacks the luster that you get from a band of warm, Bruttian pitch, rather your legs are squalid and neglected with hairs sprouting up. Why are you emaciated like a sick invalid, whom the quartan fever has been torturing for so long that it’s now a member of the house? You can divine torments of the mind in a sick body, as well as its joys; from both the face takes up its mood. You seem, therefore, to have changed your way life and to be living contrarily to your old life. Not long ago you, an adulterer more notorious than Aufidius, used to frequent the temple of Isis, the statue of Ganymede at the temple of Peace, the secret palace of the imported Mother, and Ceres (I mean, is there any temple a woman won’t prostitute herself?), as I recall, and also—something you keep quiet—that you bent their husbands over too.”

“This way of life is useful for many, but I don’t get any rewards for my work. Sure, sometimes I’ll get a coarse overcloak—

---

<sup>110</sup> Line 5: “We give a beating to the slave who licks the pastries.”

the shield of my toga—of a harsh and rough quality, badly made by a Gallic weaver’s comb, and some thin, second-rate silver. Fate rules men, there’s even a fate for those parts which clothing hides. I mean, if the stars turn their backs on you, the unparalleled girth of your long cock will accomplish nothing, even though Virro with foaming lip has seen you naked and his fawning love-letters harass you constantly—for the *kinaidos* himself attracts the man. But what else is more monstrous than a soft pansy? ‘I gave you this, I gave you that, and later you got even more.’ He calculates and wiggles his ass. Let the calculator be brought out and the slaves with the record; let five thousand sesterces in total be counted up, then add my labors. Or is it easy to drive and straightforward to shove a legitimate penis in your guts and find yesterday’s dinner there? The slave who ploughs the field will be less miserable than the slave who plows his master. But you, Virro, clearly used to think that you were a soft and beautiful boy worthy of the cup and the heavens. Will you rich men, who won’t even spend for your disease, ever indulge your humble hanger-on or your follower? Naevolus, behold the man, to whom you gave a green umbrella and those large amber balls, whenever his birthday or wet spring came around, sprawled out on his chaise lounge he fondles those secret Ladies’ Day gifts. Tell me, sweetie, for whom are you saving so many hills, so many Apulian farms, so many kites made tired with your pastures? Your Trifoline field with its fertile vines, your ridge overlooking Cumae, and hollow Gaurus keep you well supplied (for who seals so many vats with wine that’ll last?). Is it so hard to give your client’s exhausted limbs a few acres of land? Is it better for that rustic slave with his mother and small houses and puppy playmate to become the inheritance for your friend who plays the cymbals? He says ‘It’s inappropriate for you to beg.’ But my rent shouts ‘beg!’ and my slave, as single as the broad eye of Polyphemus, through which clever Ulysses escaped, makes his demands. I’ll have to buy another, I mean this *one* isn’t enough, both will have to eat.

What will I do when winter begins blowing? What, please, what shall I say to my slaves' backs and feet in the dead of winter? 'Bear down and wait for the cicadas'?

But though you ignore and disregard my other services, how much do you value that if I had not been your devoted client, your wife would still be a virgin? You certainly know with what means, how often you asked, and the promises you made. I grabbed her right as she was leaving: she had ripped up the contract and was already making a new arrangement; I just barely recovered the situation that whole night, when you were crying at the door. My witnesses are the couch and you to whom the sound of the bed and mistress' voice came. An affair has saved an unstable, shaky, and nearly dissolved marriage in many houses. Where can you turn? What do you value the most? It is no service, you ungrateful liar, that you have a little son, that you have a daughter by me? I mean, you acknowledge them and are happy to scatter the proofs of your manhood all over the gazettes. Hang the garlands on the doors: you're a dad now after all—but I gave you something to oppose the rumors. Because of me, you have the rights of a parent, you can be an heir, you can take the whole inheritance and even unowned property. Additionally, more gifts will be added to those properties, if I fill that number up to three!"

"Naevolus, you've got a good case for your pain; but what does he say in return?"

"He doesn't and is searching for another two-legged donkey. Remember to keep silent about these things I entrusted to you and lock my complaints within your silent self; for an enemy made smooth by pumice is a deadly thing. The man who had just entrusted a secret blazes and hates, as if I had surrendered everything I know. He will not hesitate to take up a sword, to crack open heads with a cudgel, to place a candle at the door. You should not scorn nor disdain the fact that for the wealthy the cost of poison is never high.



So keep my secrets hidden like the court of Mars at Athens.”

“O Corydon, Corydon! Do you think a rich man can ever have a secret? Even if his slaves keep quiet, his burden beasts, his dog, his doorposts, and his marble will all talk. Close the shutters, put curtains across the chinks, fasten the doors, turn out the light, make everyone leave, don’t let anyone sleep close by— all the same, what the master does at the second cock-crow will be known to the nearest shopkeeper before dawn, along with all the fictions of the pastry cook, the head chefs, and the carvers. After all, is there any allegation they refrain from concocting against their masters? Rumors are their revenge for their beatings. There will always be some drunk at the crossroads complaining and filling your wretched unwilling ears. So you need to ask them what you asked me a little while ago, to stay silent. But they actually like betraying secrets better than drinking stolen Falernian wine in the quantities that Saufeia used to down when she was carrying out a public sacrifice.<sup>111</sup> Live rightly, both for many other reasons and especially for this one: so that you can dismiss the tongues of your slaves. For the tongue is the worst part of a wicked slave.”<sup>112</sup>

“The advice you gave just now is useful, but too general. What do you recommend now after my lost time and cheated hopes? You know, the bloom of youth, the fleeting and shortest part of our limited and wretched life, is hurrying to its end. While we drink, while we call for wreaths, perfumes, and girls, old age unseen creeps forth.”

“Don’t fret, as long as these hills are standing safe, you will never lack a pathic friend; they all come here, they who scratch their heads with one finger, in their carriages and ships. There is still another better hope, just keep chewing that aphrodisiac.”

“These examples are for the fortunate; by my Clotho and

---

<sup>111</sup> Line 119: “for that reason, so you can ignore the tongue of your slave.” A repetition of line 121.

<sup>112</sup> Lines 122-3: “Yet worse still is the situation of the man who cannot be free of those whose lives he sustains with his bread and cash.”

Lachesis rejoice if my cock can feed my belly.  
O' little Lares of mine, whom I'm wont to entreat with grains  
of incense or meal or a slender garland, when will I make  
a catch that will save my old age from the beggar's mat  
and stick? Let me have an income of twenty thousand from  
mortgages, and silver cups, plain, but which Fabricius the censor  
would notice, and two strong Moesians, who would enable me  
to take my place safely in my hired litter at the noisy Circus;  
also an old engraver and another who quickly makes many portraits;  
these things are sufficient. When will I be poor? It's a wretched  
prayer, there's no hope anyhow; for whenever Fortuna is called  
on my behalf, she has fixed wax pilfered from that ship  
which escaped the Sicilian songs with its deaf crew.

## Text and Translation of Horace *Sermones* 2.5

“Hoc quoque, Tiresia, praeter narrata petenti responde, quibus amissas reparare queam res artibus atque modis. quid rides?” “iamne doloso non satis est Ithacam revehi patriosque penatis adspicere?” “o nulli quicquam mentite, vides ut nudus inopsque domum redeam te vate, neque illic aut apotheca procis intacta est aut pecus: atqui et genus et virtus, nisi cum re, vilior alga est.”	5
“quando pauperiem missis ambagibus horres, accipe qua ratione queas ditescere. turdus sive aliud privum dabitur tibi, devolet illuc, res ubi magna nitet domino sene; dulcia poma et quoscumque feret cultus tibi fundus honores ante Larem gustet venerabilior Lare dives. qui quamvis periurus erit, sine gente, cruentus sanguine fraterno, fugitivus, ne tamen illi tu comes exterior, si postulet, ire recuses.”	10
“utne tegam spurco Damae latus? haud ita Troiae me gessi, certans semper melioribus.” “ergo pauper eris.” “fortem hoc animum tolerare iubebo; et quondam maiora tuli. tu protinus, unde divitias aerisque ruam, dic, augur, acervos.”	15
“dixi equidem et dico: captes astutus ubique testamenta senum neu, si vafer unus et alter insidiatorem praeroso fugerit hamo, aut spem deponas aut artem inlusus omittas. magna minorve foro si res certabitur olim, vivet uter locuples sine gnatis, improbus, ultro qui meliorem audax vocet in ius, illius esto defensor; fama civem causaque priorem sperne, domi si gnatus erit fecundave coniux.	20
‘Quinte’ puta aut ‘Publi’—gaudent praenomine molles auriculae—‘tibi me virtus tua fecit amicum. ius anceps novi, causas defendere possum; eripiet quivis oculos citius mihi quam te	25
	30
	35

contemptum cassa nuce pauperet; haec mea cura est,  
 nequid tu perdas neu sis iocus.' ire domum atque  
 pelliculam curare iube; fi cognitor ipse,  
 persta atque obdura: seu rubra Canicula findet  
 infantis statuas, seu pingui tentus omaso 40  
 Furius hibernas cana nive conspuet Alpīs.  
 'nonne vides' aliquis cubito stantem prope tangens  
 inquiet, 'ut patiens, ut amicis aptus, ut acer?'  
 plures adnabunt thynni et cetaria crescent.  
 sicui praeterea validus male filius in re 45  
 praeclara sublatus aletur, ne manifestum  
 caelibis obsequium nudet te, leniter in spem  
 adrepe officiosus, ut et scribare secundus  
 heres et, siquis casus puerum egerit Orco,  
 in vacuum venias: perraro haec alea fallit. 50  
 qui testamentum tradet tibi cumque legendum,  
 abnuere et tabulas a te remove memento,  
 sic tamen, ut limis rapias, quid prima secundo  
 cera velit versu; solus multisne coheres,  
 veloci percurre oculo. plerumque recoctus 55  
 scriba ex quinqueviro corvum deludet hiantem  
 captatorque dabit risus Nasica Corano."  
 "num furis? an prudens ludis me obscura canendo?"  
 "o Laertiade, quidquid dicam, aut erit aut non:  
 divinare etenim magnus mihi donat Apollo." 60  
 "quid tamen ista velit sibi fabula, si licet, ede."  
 "tempore quo iuvenis Parthis horrendus, ab alto  
 demissum genus Aenea, tellure marique  
 magnus erit, forti nubet procera Corano  
 filia Nasicae, metuentis reddere soldum. 65  
 tum gener hoc faciet: tabulas socero dabit atque  
 ut legat orabit; multum Nasica negatas  
 accipiet tandem et tacitus leget invenietque  
 nil sibi legatum praeter plorare suisque.  
 illud ad haec iubeo: mulier si forte dolosa 70  
 libertusve senem delirum temperet, illis  
 accedas socius: laudes, lauderis ut absens.

adiuvat hoc quoque, sed vincit longe prius ipsum  
 expugnare caput. scribet mala carmina vecors:  
 laudato. scortator erit: cave te roget; ultro 75  
 Penelopam facilis potiori trade.” “putasne  
 perduci poterit tam frugi tamque pudica,  
 quam nequiere proci recto depellere cursu?”  
 “venit enim magnum donandi parca iuventus  
 nec tantum veneris quantum studiosa culinae. 80  
 sic tibi Penelope frugi est; quae si semel uno  
 de sene gustarit tecum partita lucellum,  
 ut canis a corio numquam absterrebitur uncto.  
 me sene quod dicam factum est. anus inproba Thebis  
 ex testamento sic est elata: cadaver 85  
 unctum oleo largo nudis umeris tulit heres,  
 scilicet elabi si posset mortua; credo,  
 quod nimium institerat viventi. cautus adito  
 neu desis operae neve immoderatus abundes.  
 difficilem et morosum offendet garrulus: ultra 90  
 ‘non,’ ‘etiam’ sileas; Davus sis comicus atque  
 stes capite obstipo, multum similis metuenti.  
 obsequio grassare; mone, si increbruit aura,  
 cautus uti velet carum caput; extrahe turba  
 oppositis umeris; aurem substringe loquaci. 95  
 importunus amat laudari: donec ‘ohe iam’  
 ad caelum manibus sublatis dixerit, urge:  
 crescentem tumidis infla sermonibus utrem.  
 cum te servitio longo curaue levarit,  
 et certum vigilans ‘quartae sit partis Ulixes’ 100  
 audieris ‘heres’: ‘ergo nunc Dama sodalis  
 nusquam est? unde mihi tam fortem tamque fidelem?’  
 sparge subinde et, si paulum potes inlacrimare, est  
 gaudia prodentem voltum celare. sepulcrum  
 permissum arbitrio sine sordibus exstrue: funus 105  
 egregie factum laudet vicinia. siquis  
 forte coheredum senior male tussiet, huic tu  
 dic, ex parte tua seu fundi sive domus sit

emptor, gaudentem nummo te addicere. sed me  
imperiosa trahit Proserpina: vive valeque.”

110

“Oh, one more thing, Tiresias, besides what you  
have already told me, tell me by what ways and  
means I can recover my lost fortune. Why are  
you laughing?”

“Is it not enough for the wily man to return to Ithaca  
and to see his ancestral home?”

“O’ you who has never lied to anyone, you, yourself  
a prophet, see how I am to return back home—naked  
and destitute—and there the suitors have ruined  
my storeroom and flocks. And yet lineage and virtue  
without cash are cheaper than seaweed.”

“In plain terms, since you’re afraid of poverty, learn  
the method by which you shall grow rich. If a thrush  
or something else your very own will be given to you,  
let it fly thither where great wealth flourishes with its  
old master; let the rich man, who is more venerable  
than the Lar, taste the sweet fruits and whatever splendors  
your cultivated land produces before the Lar does;  
however much a liar, lowborn, polluted by his brother’s  
blood, a runaway slave he might be, still do not be reluctant,  
if he asks, to walk as his streetside escort.”

“What, am I to protect the side of some foul Dama?  
Not even at Troy did I bear myself when I was contending  
with my betters.”

“Then you will be poor.”

“I shall command my heart to be brave and to endure it.  
And I’ve endured more before. Now, augur, tell me

whence I shall dig up wealth and heaps of cash.”

“I have, indeed, told you and I am telling you:  
Sneaky you will capture the wills of old men  
anywhere and, if a clever few flee your trap  
after nibbling on the hook, though mocked,  
don’t worry or set aside your craft. If one day  
a case, big or small, is being contested in the  
forum, whichever of them is rich and childless,  
even if he is wicked and audaciously summons  
a better man to court, be his advocate. Turn away  
the man with the better reputation and case, if  
he has a child or fertile wife at home. ‘Quintus’  
or suppose for example ‘Publius’ (their soft little ears  
like the first name) ‘your virtue has made me your  
friend. I know the ambiguous law; I can plead your  
cases. He’ll be quicker to rip out my eyes than to deprive  
you of a nutshell like a nobody. This is my care:  
that you neither lose anything nor become a laughing-stock.’  
Have him go home and take care of his skin; be his  
Counsel, stick at it and endure whether blazing  
Canicula splits the unspeaking statues or, as Furius,  
stuffed with rich tripe, spits upon the wintry Alps  
with white snow. “Don’t you see,” someone says  
nudging their neighbor with their elbow, “how  
steady, how helpful to his friends, how keen, he is?”  
More tunnies will swim up and your fish pond  
will swell up. Moreover, if someone has raised a  
sickly son in fabulous wealth, lest flagrant  
kowtowing to an unmarried man betray you,  
zealously and gently creep your way toward the hope  
that you be written in as the second heir, and  
if some accident has driven the boy to Orcus,  
you would take the empty space: this game  
almost never fails. You must remember to refuse  
and send away from you the will of whoever  
gave it to you to read, and yet in such a way

that you catch with a sideways glance what the first wax wants with its second verse. With your swift eye, check whether you are the only heir or a coheir with many others. More often than not a scribe rehashed from a staff assistant will dupe the gaping raven, and Nasica the inheritance-hunter will give a laugh to Coranus.”

“Are you mad or are you intentionally ridiculing me with your dim oracle?”

“O’ son of Laertes, whatever I say either will or will not be. For great Apollo bestowed on me the gift of prophecy.”

“But tell me what that story means, if you please.”

“In a time when a young man, the dread of the Parthians, a descendent from lofty Aeneas, great across land and sea, the towering daughter of Nasica, who fears repaying all his debt, will marry brave Coranus. Then the father-in-law will do it: He will give the will to his son-in-law and ask that he read it; Nasica will take the tablets, after much refusal, at last and quietly read them, and he will find that nothing is left to him nor is his, except to whine. In addition to these things, I will add another: if perchance some crafty woman or freedman is controlling a deranged old man, you should ally yourself with them. May you praise that you are praised in absentia. This also helps. But storming the citadel itself is by far the better way to victory. Does he write bad verse? Praise it! Is he a whoremonger? Take care he doesn’t ask you, compliantly hand over Penelope to your better.”

“Do you think that she so honest, so chaste, whom the suitors could not stray from the right course, could be lured over?”

“Those young men came especially cheap in gifts,



not concerned so much with sex, as with food. Thus, your Penelope is virtuous; if as your partner she tastes just a little profit from one old man just once, she, like a dog, will never leave behind a greasy rich hide. I will tell you something that happened when I was old: an horrid old woman was buried at Thebes in accordance with her will: her heir lifted her oily corpse on his bare shoulders, obviously to see whether dead she could give him the slip. I think that he was too overbearing when she was alive. Approach cautiously. Do not come up short nor be immoderately excessive. A chatterbox will offend the peevish and difficult; but don't be overly silent either. Play the Davus from comedy and stand with head bowed, like one in much awe. Press on with your flattery; warn him, if the wind kicks up, carefully cover his precious head; save him from a crowd with your shoulders; draw your ear in close when he's talking. Is he demanding with his love of praise? Ply him with it until he lifts his hands up to the sky and shouts "Enough already!"; fill the swelling bladder with overweening words. When he sets you free from your long care and servitude, and wide awake you hear "Let Ulysses be heir to one-fourth," sprinkle forth "Now is my friend, Dama, no more? Where will I find another so strong, so faithful?" and, if you can, cry a little. It is possible to hide the joy that your face betrays. Build the tomb in style if it is left to your discretion; let the neighbors praise the funeral done well. If, perchance, one of the elder coheirs has a bad cough, tell him that, if he should want to buy land or a house from your share, you would gladly sell it for a cent. But bossy Proserpina is demanding me back; live and fare well!"