

Alexanderhistorie im Gefolge des Kleitarch zurückführen<sup>24</sup>) als auf hellenistische Epen, wie es schon K. Ziegler gefordert hatte<sup>25</sup>) und wie es neuerdings auch Skutsch in seinem Ennius-Kommentar zumindest in Erwägung zieht (S. 7 und 644 f.). Die Verwandtschaft grundlegender Züge der Aeneis und der hinter ihr liegenden Geisteshaltung mit der Weltsicht, wie sie in der Monumentalplastik Pergamons Ausdruck gefunden hat, ist jüngst mit guten Gründen von P. R. Hardie verfochten worden<sup>26</sup>).

Bonn

Otto Zwierlein

## JUVENAL'S ATTITUDE TOWARD CICERONIAN POETRY AND RHETORIC

Among the masters of rhetoric at Rome, Cicero ranks as one of the most distinguished examples of the *vir bonus dicendi peritus*, as Cato the Elder has defined the Roman orator (Frg. 14). Among poets, Juvenal is generally acknowledged to be a highly accomplished rhetorician in his own right. Indeed, at the outset of his programmatic first poem the satirist tells us that he received the training of a *rhetor*:

*et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus, et nos  
consilium dedimus Sullae, privatus ut altum  
dormiret.* (1.15–17)

The sarcastic and self-belittling tone in which Juvenal refers to himself is in keeping with his satiric technique (cf. 1.79–80) and need not lead us into doubting the veracity of his statement. Even a cursory reading of his satires proves abundantly that Juvenal

24) Siehe W.-H. Friedrich, Ennius-Erklärungen, Philol. 97, 1948, bes. 297–301.

25) Ziegler (wie Anm. 16) S. 57 ff., siehe bes. S. 75.

26) P. R. Hardie, Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium, Oxford 1986, bes. 120 ff.

possessed great rhetorical skills. Particularly the *genus sublime*, the Grand Style, is one of his chief satiric weapons. The rhetorical nature of Juvenalian satire has rightly received extensive critical attention<sup>1</sup>). In the present essay I shall attempt to illustrate Juvenal's attitude toward Cicero and to show that Juvenal is well aware of Cicero's rhetorical accomplishments, but that, nevertheless, he is not blind to Cicero's poetic shortcomings. Thus, a double perspective in regard to Cicero's writings is to be found in Juvenalian satire. Let us examine first Juvenal's attitude toward Ciceronian poetry.

In Satire 10, Juvenal deals with the futility of prayer; the poet lists power, eloquence, glory, longevity, and beauty as the things which humans desire most. That eloquence appears prominently as the second item on this list attests to its importance in Rome. More often than not, at least according to the satiric perspective found in this poem, the fulfillment of such wishes can lead to destruction, even death. In the case of eloquence, Demosthenes and Cicero are cited as *exempla* for this. Both met their ruin when their speeches incurred the displeasure of a powerful adversary (10.114–32). In a vignette of concise but vivid satiric distortion, Demosthenes is mocked for his modest origins and presented as a sooty pupil packed off to rhetoric school by his father (10.129–32). In the case of Cicero, Juvenal quotes the well-known line from the former's poem *De Consulatu Suo: o fortunatam natam me consule Romam* (10.122), one of the most notorious lines in Roman poetry<sup>2</sup>). Juvenal proceeds to satirize Cicero's poetic inanity in a short statement of epigrammatic force:

---

1) Josué de Decker, *Juvenalis Declamans* (Ghent, 1913); Inez G. Scott, *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal* (Smith College Classical Studies 8; Northampton, Mass., 1927); William S. Anderson, *The Rhetoric of Juvenal* (diss. Yale, 1954), the basis for his important later work on Juvenal; Augusto Serafini, *Studio sulla Satira di Giovenale* (Florence, 1957), ch. 5; E. J. Kenney, *Juvenal: Satirist or Rhetorician?* *Latomus* 22 (1963) 704–20; R. Marache, *Rhétorique et Humour chez Juvénal*, in *Hommages à Jean Bayet*, ed. Marcel Renard and Robert Schilling (Collection Latomus 70 [Brussels, 1964]) 474–78; J. C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (Cambridge, 1974) 164–73; Michael Coffey, *Roman Satire* (London, 1976) 123–24 and 142–44; E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London, 1980), hereafter cited as Courtney, 36–48 and 87 (on Sat. 1.15). See now also Niall Rudd, *Themes in Roman Satire* (London, 1986) 106–16.

2) Quint., *Inst.* 9.4.41, disapproves of the excessive assonance (ὁμοιόπτωτον, *Rhet. Her.* 4.20.28) in Cicero's line.

*Antoni gladios potuit contemnere si sic  
omnia dixisset.* (10.123–24)

This is not only a mocking reference to the well-known boast from Cicero's Second Philippic (*contempsi Catilinae gladios, non pertimescam tuos*; Phil. 2.118), but also slyly satirizes the overwrought assonance in Cicero's poetic endeavor through its own assonance in *si sic*<sup>3</sup>): the implication is that, if his oratory had been as bad as his poetry, Cicero would not have come to a sticky end. The grandiose praise of Cicero's Philippic in the apostrophe at line 125 – *te, conspicuae divina Philippica famae* – is subverted in the next line by a deliberately tortuous periphrasis (*volveris a prima quae proxima* for a simple *secunda*)<sup>4</sup>). Juvenal here applies his standard technique of inflation and deflation to good effect, implying that Cicero's vanity in praising his own consulship is as ridiculous as are his *ridenda poemata* (10.124).

Elsewhere, Juvenal is not quite as devastating to Cicero. In Satire 7, the quandary of, among others, forensic orators is placed in opposition to the better days which Cicero once saw (7.105–49); later in this poem, satire of Cicero is indirect and rather mild: the *rhetor* Rufus is called a Gallic, i. e. backwoods, Cicero (7.213–14)<sup>5</sup>). Satire 8, in which Juvenal takes the insignificance of old nobility as his target (*Stemmata quid faciunt?* 8.1), conversely praises the achievements of *homines novi* such as Marius and Cicero. In contrast to the degeneracy of the nobles as exemplified by Catiline and Cethegus (8.231–35), Juvenal at first glance appears to laud extensively Cicero's circumspection in handling the crisis of 63 B.C.:

*sed vigilat consul vexillaque vestra coerct.  
hic novus Arpinas, ignobilis et modo Romae  
municipalis eques, galeatum ponit ubique  
praesidium attonitis et in omni monte laborat.*

3) F.J. Lelièvre, Juvenal: Two Possible Examples of Wordplay, CP 53 (1958) 242; see also Courtney ad loc. Gilbert Highet, Juvenal's Bookcase, AJP 72 (1951) 376, considers these lines to be a parody of Cicero, but does not examine them in detail; see, however, H. A. Mason, Is Juvenal a Classic? in Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire, ed. J. P. Sullivan (London, 1963) 122. Mason's essay first appeared in Arion 1 (1962), no. 1, 8–44, and no. 2, 39–79.

4) For similarly grandiose periphrases in Juvenal see Sat. 3.117–18, 4.39, 5.45, and 10.112–13.

5) On these passages see John R. C. Martyn, Juvenal on Latin Oratory, Hermes 92 (1964) 121–23.

*tantum igitur muros intra toga contulit illi  
 nominis ac tituli, quantum finit Leucade, quantum  
 Thessaliae campis Octavius abstulit udo  
 caedibus adsiduis gladio; sed Roma parentem,  
 Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit.* (8.236–44)

Closer scrutiny, however, reveals that Cicero's greatness is subtly being undermined. The *ignobilis* from the country appears to have cut an awkward figure in elegant Rome; the phrase *in omni monte laborat* with its overtone of rusticity also hints at Cicero's feverish hustling and bustling to thwart the conspirators' plans<sup>6</sup>). More directly satirical are the two allusions in this passage to Ciceronian poetry: the *toga* alludes to Cicero's much-lambasted line, *cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi*<sup>7</sup>), while at 243–44 we find another sarcastic shot fired at Cicero's ill-fated poem on his consulate. That the latter two lines cannot be taken at face value becomes evident when we consider their intentionally clumsy wording: *parentem* – *patrem* – *Ciceronem* mocks the assonance of *o fortunatam natam me consule Romam*, while the alliteration in *parentem* – *patrem patriae* is decidedly too much of a good thing<sup>8</sup>). In addition, there are superfluous repetitions (*Roma* occurs twice within two lines, *pater* and *parens* are synonyms) and a purposely cumbersome parallelism-plus-anadiplosis (*Roma parentem* – *Roma patrem*). All this serves to show that Cicero, as great as he was, cannot escape the sharpness of Juvenal's wit. Cicero may have despised the swords of Catiline and Antony, but he falls victim to the double-edged sword of the satirist<sup>9</sup>).

6) Juvenal's phrase *et in omni monte laborat* seems to be modelled upon Horace's *ut omni parte laboret* at Serm. 1.2.38. While *in omni monte* = *in omnibus collibus*, sc. *Romae* (thus Ludwig Friedländer, D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturarum Libri V, vol. 2 [Leipzig, 1895], ad loc.), the change from *parte* to *monte* contains a subtle satirization if we consider the overtone of rusticity inherent in words such as *mons*, *montanus*, etc.; cf. Juv., Sat. 2.74 (*montanum . . . vulgus*), 6.5 (the *montana uxor* of prehistory), and 11.89; see Courtney on 2.74, with additional references. Highet, Juvenal's Bookcase 389 and Juvenal the Satirist (Oxford, 1954) 38 and 115, misses all irony and satire of Cicero in this passage.

7) Pis. 72–74, Off. 1.77, Phil. 2.20; on the reading *linguae for laudi* see L. P. Wilkinson, Golden Latin Artistry (Cambridge, 1963; rpt. 1985) 29 (note). On Cicero's line see (ps.-)Sall., In Cic. 3.6; (ps.-)Cic., In Sall. 2.7; Sen., Brev. Vit. 5.1; Quint., Inst. 11.1.24; Servius on Aen. 1.1, and Plut., comp. Dem. and Cic. 2.

8) Cf. Robert J. Iorillo, A Juvenalian Twit? CW 67 (1973–74) 177.

9) J. D. Duff, D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae XIV (Cambridge, 1898), on 8.240, misses the satiric point; more recently, S. C. Fredericks, Rhetoric and Morality in Juvenal's 8th Satire, TAPA 102 (1971) 116 and 129–30, sees no satire of Cicero in this passage.

In his important article on Satire 7, David S. Wiesen has shown that Juvenal's satiric technique (cf. 1.45: *quid referam quanta siccum iecur ardeat ira*) consists, at least to a large part, in the poet refraining from direct praise of anybody or anything<sup>10</sup>). When Juvenal expresses positive views, he does so through indirection. For example, Juvenal only covertly – and somewhat mockingly – acknowledges the literary influence of Lucilius and Horace on his own satires (1.19–20, 51, and 165–66)<sup>11</sup>). In the case of Cicero, it is only when he does not explicitly mention him that Juvenal praises him without undercutting. Such indirect praise of Cicero seems to lie behind the list of names from later republican history which appears in Satire 2:

*quis caelum terris non misceat et mare caelo  
si fur displiceat Verri, homicida Miloni,  
Clodius accuset moechos, Catilina Cethegum,  
in tabulam Sullae si dicant discipuli tres?* (2.25–28)

Every person who appears in these lines, whether named or referred to indirectly (the *discipuli* are Octavian, Antony, and Lepidus), is inextricably linked to Cicero's personal and political affairs, his triumphs and defeats, his rise and fall. Moreover, practically all of them are subjects of speeches of Cicero. These names represent not merely a random list, but rather have been carefully selected with Cicero as the common element connecting them. Juvenal the satirist here apparently allies himself with Cicero the orator and statesman. In a manner of speaking, Juvenal's satires are contemporary Philippics against the rising flood of vice and hypocrisy. Just as Cicero could not stem the tide of Rome's political decline, Juvenal seems to be aware that he too is fighting a lost battle against Rome's moral deterioration:

*nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat  
posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores,  
omne in praecipiti vitium stetit.* (1.147–49)

As we can see, Juvenal imitates without open acknowledgment of this fact. In regard to Cicero, the best example of this is found in Satire 14. The link between Ciceronian rhetoric and Juvenal's

10) David S. Wiesen, Juvenal and the Intellectuals, *Hermes* 101 (1973) 464–83.

11) See, e.g., Anderson, *Venusina Lucerna: The Horatian Model for Juvenal*, *TAPA* 92 (1961) 1–12.



covert tribute to it is provided by Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*<sup>12</sup>). The influence of Quintilian, the most prominent *rhetor* during Juvenal's early years, upon the future satirist can be taken for granted<sup>13</sup>).

Prominent among the rhetorical devices discussed in the *Institutio* is that of *prosopopoiia*. Quintilian describes its technique at 9.2.29–31:

*Illa adhuc audaciora et maiorum, ut Cicero existimat, laterum fictiones personarum, quae προσωποποιίαι dicuntur: mire namque cum variant orationem tum excitant. his et adversariorum cogitationes velut secum loquentium protrahimus (qui tamen ita demum a fide non abhorreant, si ea locutos finxerimus, quae cogitasse eos non sit absurdum), et nostros cum aliis sermones et aliorum inter se credibiliter introducimus, et suadendo, obiurgando, querendo, laudando, miserando personas idoneas damus. quin deducere deos in hoc genere dicendi et inferos excitare concessum est*<sup>14</sup>).

On the following pages, one of Cicero's most famous *prosopopoiiae* will be examined and will be related to a parallel passage in Juvenal's fourteenth satire.

On more than one occasion Quintilian praises Cicero for his clever and funny uses of *prosopopoiia* in his speech *Pro Caelio*<sup>15</sup>).

12) As is to be expected, Juvenal does not allow Quintilian to escape the barbs of his wit unscathed, but finds occasion to fire some passing shots at him. In Satire 6 Juvenal contrasts Quintilian with actors and singers who, from a satiric point of view, are much preferable as sex objects to women than the elderly intellectual could be (6.71–75); later in the poem the great orator is found speechless when faced with the infidelities of a wife as scheming as she is bold (6.279–81). Added irony here lies in the fact that the aging Quintilian was himself married to a young wife and potentially subject to just such a fate (Inst. 6 pr. 4–5; see W. C. Helmbold and E. N. O'Neil, *The Form and Purpose of Juvenal's Seventh Satire*, CP 54 [1959] 104, and Courtney on Sat. 6.75). In Satire 7 the wealth of Quintilian is contrasted with the generally dire straits in which less fortunate and less famous orators find themselves (7.184–94; see Anderson, *Juvenal and Quintilian*, YCS 17 [1961] 3–93, especially 4–11, and Wiesen [above, note 10] 481). From these passages we may deduce that Juvenal was more than superficially familiar with Quintilian and with the *Institutio*.

13) However, we need not go as far as some scholars have done and assume that Juvenal actually studied rhetoric under Quintilian; this question has been answered conclusively by Anderson (above, note 12) 11–21 (with further references).

14) See also Inst. 3.8.49–54, and Cic., *de Or.* 3.205, *Brut.* 322, and *Top.* 45.

15) Inst. 3.8.54 and 12.10.61. See also R. G. Austin, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro M. Caelio Oratio*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1960) 90–91. References to and quotations from the *Pro Caelio* are according to paragraph and line in this edition, hereafter cited as Austin.

This rhetorical trick, among others, admirably suits Cicero's purpose of making the weak case strong. Thus Quintilian admires the opening of the speech which presents a complete stranger wondering about the apparent weightiness of a trial being held during the *Ludi Megalenses*<sup>16</sup>). Cicero's strategy in the *Pro Caelio* is to play down the seriousness of the charges brought against his client by infusing the proceedings with humor and comedy and, since attack is the best defense, to shift the court's attention away from Caelius and on to Clodia, the *Palatina Medea* (Cael. 18.6) whom Cicero represents as being responsible for the charges<sup>17</sup>). In dealing with Clodia, Cicero makes strategic use of *prosopopoiia* in a spectacular and most effective manner. Cicero's *prosopopoiia* of Appius Claudius Caecus, as I will show next, is not to be taken completely seriously; it is rather imbued with irony and, indeed, satire.

Cicero sets the stage for this *prosopopoiia* in the two paragraphs preceding it (Cael. 31–32). Irony is clearly present when Cicero addresses the infamous Clodia as *matrem familias* and then mentions *matronarum sanctitas*, but pejoratively calls her *ista mulier* immediately afterwards (32.10–11). He does so not only once, but twice, the second mention of *mulier* leading to his famous "Freudian slip" with which he implies that Clodia has committed incest with her brother: *cum istius mulieris viro – fratre volui dicere. semper hic erro* (32.16–17)<sup>18</sup>). This wholly intentional "slip" of the tongue destroys what little *sanctitas* Clodia may have preserved for herself despite her reputation and leaves Cicero's audience eagerly waiting for more. Their expectations will not be disappointed. Cicero calls upon Clodia's ancestor Appius Claudius to lecture his wanton descendant on the *mores maiorum* which he himself so admirably embodies. Appius, one of the most

16) Inst. 4.1.31 and 39, 9.2.39.

17) Auguste Haury, *L'Ironie et l'Humour chez Cicéron* (Leiden, 1955) 146–47; Katherine A. Geffcken, *Comedy in the Pro Caelio*, with an Appendix on the In Clodium et Curionem (Mnemosyne suppl. 30; Leiden, 1973), hereafter cited as Geffcken. Cf. Cic., de Or. 2.236: *est plane oratoris movere risum*. Recent studies of the *Pro Caelio*, with extensive bibliographies, are by C. Joachim Classen, *Ciceros Rede für Caelius*, ANRW 1.3 (1973) 60–94, and Wilfried Stroh, *Taxis und Taktik: Die advokatische Dispositionskunst in Ciceros Gerichtsreden* (Stuttgart, 1975) 243–303. See also Jules Marouzeau, *Introduction au Latin*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1954) 170–78, and E. de Saint-Denis, *Le plus spirituel des discours cicéroniens: Le 'Pro Caelio'*, *L'Information Littéraire* 10 (1958) 105–13. In all likelihood Clodia was not behind the charges brought against Caelius; see Stroh 246 note 21. Stroh 263–86 and 296–98 makes a good case for his view that the love affair of Caelius and Clodia was Cicero's invention.

18) On the textual readings *fratrem* and *fratre* see Austin on 32.16.

splendid examples of republican Roman *auctoritas* – he was censor, consul, and dictator<sup>19</sup>) – however finds most of his *dignitas* undermined by Cicero's wit. When Cicero announces that the wicked Clodia is now to be dealt with *severe et graviter et prisce* and *illo austero more ac modo* rather than *remisse et leniter et urbane* (33.23–24), then we begin to suspect a lack of reverence on Cicero's part toward that old Roman in this unnecessary repetition of terms which are, after all, virtually synonymous. The third member of the first triad, *prisce*, contrasts by its position with *urbane* in the subsequent one; in this way *urbanitas*, that refinement cherished by sophisticated Romans at the time of Cicero and Catullus, is denied the old man<sup>20</sup>). Instead, *rusticitas* is slyly attributed to him. Appius' physical appearance reinforces his old-fashioned qualities; Cicero calls particular attention to Appius' full beard, *illa horrida* (sc. *barba*), which contrasts with the *barbula* of current fashion (33.25–26)<sup>21</sup>). Thirdly, it is Appius' blindness which makes him most suitable to face Clodia, for *minimum enim dolorem capiet qui istam non videbit* (33.3). This sarcastic remark cuts both ways: it ridicules Appius and simultaneously turns Clodia into a Medusa of sorts – it is far better not to have to look her in the face!

The satiric power built up in this introduction of Appius Claudius is released in the *prosopopoiia* proper, where Cicero manages to kill two birds with one stone<sup>22</sup>). Not only is Appius' speech a devastating scolding of Clodia (*mulier* is, appropriately, the censor's first word; 33.4), but it also characterizes the speaker himself as boorish and unrefined in his rhetoric. He is, in short, denied *urbanitas* again. His lack of oratorical skills, at least by Ciceronian standards, reveals itself in several ways. For one, in the gallery of Clodia's ancestors, there is a heady and hyperbolic mixture of rhetorical devices; anaphora, asyndeta, alliteration, parallelism, and homoioteleuton occur practically simultaneously:

19) On Appius see PW 3 (1899) coll. 2681–85.

20) See Austin ad loc. on *prisce*, and cf. Cic., Clod., frg. 20: *homo durus ac priscus, homine tam tristi ac severo, tam austerum et tam vehementem magistrum*; on frgs. 20–24 of this speech see Geffcken 71–79; cf. also Sen., Ep. 114.13. On *urbanitas* see Austin 53, quoting Quint., Inst. 6.3.17 and 107.

21) On *barba* – *barbula* see Austin on 33.25; cf. also Juv., Sat. 16.31–32, on which see John E. B. Mayor, *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*, vol. 2 (London, 1877–78).

22) On the *prosopopoiia* of Appius see Marouzeau (above, note 17) 175–77, Haury (above, note 17) 147, Austin 90–91, and Classen (above, note 17) 79–80. Stroh (above, note 17) 280–82, following Geffcken 18–19, views Appius as a figure of irony; differently Saint-Denis (above, note 17) 110.



*Non patrem tuum videras, non patruum, non avum, non proavum, non abavum, non atavum audieras consules fuisse* (33.7–9)<sup>23</sup>. Furthermore, there is an unrestrained barrage of superlatives – *clarissimi ac fortissimi viri patriaeque amantissimi* (34.11), *cum ex amplissimo genere in familiam clarissimam nupsisses* (34.13–14) – whose constantly recurring *i*'s and *s*'s, reinforced in the verb *nupsisses*, positively make the listener's head reel. Such hyperbole must needs collapse into meaninglessness and, indeed, ludicrousness. The long sentence beginning *Nonne te ...* (34.16–21) is, in Austin's polite words, "rather awkward"<sup>24</sup>, but well serves its purpose to emphasize the speaker's own clumsiness. Lastly, Appius' self-aggrandizement in enumerating his most spectacular achievements (*Ideone ego ...*; 34.24–27)<sup>25</sup> is undercut by the ridiculous contrast to Clodia's preoccupations: she parades on the Via Appia in the company of her adulterous lovers and uses the water from the Aqua Appia presumably for her post-coital ablutions (*inceste uterere*; 34.26)<sup>26</sup>. Appius' *indignatio* foreshadows that of Umbricius in Juvenal's third satire; Cicero punctures Appius' pretensions in as easy and elegant a manner as Juvenal will later do with *his* satiric victims. Cicero's last reference to Appius gives away what game he has been playing with the old ancestor, if indeed this clue is still necessary; he calls him *illum senem durum ac paene agrestem* (36.17)<sup>27</sup>. The phrase *paene agrestis* proves the satiric intention: the adverb is clearly meant as a sarcastic understatement, and the adjective is framed by and contrasted with *urbanius* in the preceding and *urbanissimus* in the following sentence (36.16–19). Appius is a *gravis persona* (35.28) only on the surface: *frontis nulla fides*, as Juvenal will later say (Sat. 2.8). By the standards of Cicero's modern times, a man like Appius appears outdated and ridiculous.

The satiric character of the *Pro Caelio*, at least in the passages

23) Albert Curtis Clark, *M. T. Ciceronis Orationes ...* (Oxford, 1905; new impr. 1908), adds *abavum, non*. Clark's text is the basis for Austin's commentary.

24) Austin on 34.16.

25) On this sentence, replete with alliterations and anaphorae, see Marouzeau (above, note 17) 176–77. On the Via Appia see Livy 9.29.6 and Pompon., Dig. 1.2.2.36; on the Aqua Appia see Livy, *ibid.*; on Appius' speech in the senate against peace with Pyrrhus see Plut., *Pyrrh.* 19.

26) Jacob van Wageningen, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Oratio Pro M. Caelio* (Groningen, 1908), ad loc.

27) Cf. Arch. 17: *quis nostrum tam animo agresti ac duro fuit ut Rosci morte nuper non commoveretur?* Cf. *ibid.*, 19 (*durior*) and 24 (*rustici*); see also especially Off. 1.129 (*durum aut rusticum*).

where Cicero employs *prosopopoiia*, becomes even more evident when, after conjuring up both Clodia's ancestor and her brother Clodius, Cicero returns to his immediate subject, the conduct of Caelius, and uses two opposite types of fathers from Roman comedy – the one stern and old-fashioned, the other modern and liberal – to call for leniency in judging the young man (Cael. 37)<sup>28</sup>. The type of father from Caecilian comedy is similar to Appius. He is described as being *vehemens atque durus* and *tristis ac derectus* (37.9–10, 38.25)<sup>29</sup>; Cicero characterizes such fathers as *ferrei* and *vix ferendi* (37.15, 18). Both *ferreus* and *ferre* are terms highly charged with irony; indeed, they are key words of satire which belong to the terminology of *indignatio*. Proof of this is found in Juvenal's first three satires.

*Ferreus* occurs at a prominent point in Satire 1, in which Juvenal lays out his satiric program. The satirist's anger (cf. line 45, quoted earlier) is roused by the omnipresence of vice and depravity in Rome; the satirist is bound to attack these as vehemently as he can:

*difficile est saturam non scribere. nam quis iniquae  
tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus, ut teneat se*<sup>30</sup>. (1.30–31)

Since this highly rhetorical outburst can only receive a negative answer, the satirist will proceed to denounce vice and folly, pretension and hypocrisy, wherever he finds them:

*quidquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas,  
gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est.* (1.85–86)

The verb *ferre* is of even greater significance for Juvenal's perspective on the satirist's task. The term is closely linked to some of the speakers appearing in his satires (cf. also *patiens* at 1.31, just quoted). Umbricius in Satire 3 cites as one of his main reasons for leaving Rome the fact that it has become thoroughly infested with Greeks: *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem* (3.60–61).

28) On fathers from Roman comedy see Geffcken 22–23; see also Classen (above, note 17) 81.

29) On *tristis* cf. Juv., Sat. 2.9, 2.62, and 14.110.

30) Juvenal's description of Rome as *iniqua urbs* harks back to Cicero's *tam maledica civitas* at Cael. 38.1–2; on this see Richard A. LaFleur, Horace and Onomasti Komodein: The Law of Satire, ANRW 2.31.3 (1981) 1791 note 2; see also Cic., Flacc. 7 and 68. Cf. Juv., Sat. 7.150: *o ferrea pectora Vetti*. For *ferreus* in Cicero cf. Lael. 48: *neque enim sunt isti audiendi qui virtutem duram et quasi ferream esse quandam volunt*.

*Ferre* also appears in rhetorical questions full of *indignatio*, as at 1.139–40: *sed quis ferat istas / luxuriae sordes?*<sup>31</sup>) In Satire 2, where Juvenal attacks hypocrisy and perversion hidden under a cloak of philosophical righteousness, the satirist bursts into the question, full of anger and exasperation: *quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?* (2.24). Shortly afterwards he introduces Laronia, who takes over his satiric attack, with the highly charged phrase, *non tulit ... Laronia* (2.36). The Laronia episode of Satire 2 is an example of sustained *prosopopoiia* in Juvenal and is comparable to Cicero's opening of the *Pro Caelio* in that the figures appearing in either passage are imaginary. We may conclude, then, that Cicero's choice of the words *ferreus* and *ferre* in describing the stern advocates of old-time morality reveals his sarcastic intention. Since the delivery of speeches was accompanied by appropriate gestures and changes in the orator's tone of voice<sup>32</sup>), we can infer that Cicero's *ferrei sunt isti patres* and *vix ferendi* were accompanied by a gesture of mock-abhorrence, an exaggerated but funny recoil as from some horrible sight.

Shortly after this, Cicero again reveals his satiric purpose (Cael. 39–40). After describing the characters of such great forefathers as the Camilli, Fabricii, and Curii – all of whom duly recur as satiric targets in Juvenal – Cicero notes that such men are never encountered in real life and even rarely appear in books: *Verum haec genera virtutum non solum in moribus nostris sed vix iam in libris reperiuntur* (40.7–9)<sup>33</sup>). When Cicero continues: *Chartae quoque quae illam pristinam severitatem continebant obsoleverunt*

31) Also at Sat. 2.24 (quoted below), 6.166 (*quis feret uxorem cui constant omnia?*), and 7.147 (*quis bene dicentem Basilum ferat?*). At 6.30–32, 6.115–16, 6.651–52, and 13.13–16, *ferre* similarly expresses indignation. A Ciceronian parallel to Umbricius' *non possum ferre ...* is found at Clod., frg. 20: *non possunt hi mores ferre hunc tam austerum et tam vehementem magistrum*. Wordplay involving *ferre* and *ferreus* occurs at Lael. 87: *quis tam esset ferreus, qui eam vitam ferre posset, cuique non auferret fructum voluptatum omnium solitudo?* For Cicero on the uses of indignation in court see Inv. Rhet. 100–05.

32) Cf. Austin 141–43 and 173–75, who cites Cicero, Seneca, and Quintilian; see also Curt Fensterbusch, *Mimik*, Kl. Pauly 3 (1975) col. 1308 (with further references).

33) At Brut. 55, Appius Claudius Caecus is named alongside Ti. Coruncanius and M'. Curius. Great figures from the past serve a serious function in Cicero's philosophical works, e. g. at Leg. 2.4 and Fin. 5.1–8, on which see Heinrich Dörrie, *Summorum Virorum Vestigia: Das Erlebnis der Vergangenheit bei Cicero*, Grazer Beiträge 7 (1978) 207–20. Camillus, Fabricius, and Curius appear together and are satirized collectively at Juv., Sat. 2.153–54; Fabricius, along with the Fabii, Scauri, and *durus Cato*, is ridiculed at 11.91; Curius receives his share of mockery at 11.78–79, as do the Curii at 8.4.

(40.9–10), he implies at the same time that these men have outlived their usefulness as exemplars even more than the parchment has aged. Cicero drastically emphasizes their unsuitability as moral examples by asserting that this kind of man *respueretur omnis voluptates* (39.23). The crude verb *respuo* indicates that such ancestors are uncouth and not at all *urbani*<sup>34</sup>).

The figures of the venerable *maiores* who made Rome great – in Cicero's words, *qui haec ex minimis tanta fecerunt* (Cael. 39.6–7) – are regularly ridiculed by Juvenal. *Prosopopoiia* with its wide range of rhetorical possibilities, as outlined by Quintilian in the passage quoted earlier, is most useful for the satirist, too, since it enables him to puncture the pretensions of the grand and the grandiose the more effectively because in this way they themselves reveal their true nature in their own words. Indeed, Juvenal combines the technique of *prosopopoiia* and the figure of a supposedly great forefather to good satiric effect in Satire 14. In this loosely structured poem the speaker attacks modern extravagance and *avaritia*, comparing current excesses with the *parvitas* of yesteryear (14.156–72). In this context we find the *prosopopoiia* of an old-fashioned *senex* worthy of Cicero's Appius Claudius and of striking similarity:

*'vivite contenti casulis et collibus istis,  
o pueri,' Marsus dicebat et Hernicus olim  
Vestinusque senex, 'panem quaeramus aratro,  
qui satis est mensis: laudant hoc numina ruris,  
quorum ope et auxilio gratae post munus aristae*

---

34) Cf. Hor., Sermon. 2.5.41 (parody of a notorious line by the epic poet Furius Alpinus: *Iuppiter ... conspuat Alpes*); Petron. 74.13 (*in sinum suum non spuit*), and Juv., Sat. 7.112 (*conspuiturque sinus*), on which see Courtney ad loc.; see also Cael. 36.2. See further Cic., Mur. 74, and Col., De Re Rust. 1.3.5. On Horace's Furius Alpinus see Bramble (above, note 1) 64–66 and Kiessling-Heinze on Hor., Sermon. 1.10 (page 166). – In connection with *ferre* (see above and note 31) cf. also Cic., Brut. 236: *Is laborem [quasi cursum] forensem diutius non tulit, quod ... hominum ineptias ac stultitias, quae devorandae nobis sunt, non ferebat iracundiusque respuebat sive morose, ut putabatur, sive ingenuo liberoque fastidio*. In this passage *ferre* and the image of ingestion and egestion of food (*devorare*, *respuere*, *fastidium* – the metaphor's starting point is the preceding sentence where M. Piso's *acumen* is described as *saepe stomachosum*) effect a tone of vivid indignatio. For *stomachus*, *stomachosus*, and *stomachari* as implying anger cf., e.g., Cic., Off. 3.60; Hor., Sermon. 1.4.55 and 2.7.44, Ep. 1.1.104 and 1.15.12; Apul., Met. 5.31.1. See also Kiessling-Heinze on Hor., Carm. 1.6.6 (cf. 1.16.16) and Carm. 1.13.4 (*iecur*), with which cf. Juvenal's *iecur* at Sat. 1.45.



*contingunt homini veteris fastidia quercus.  
nil vetitum fecisse volet, quem non pudet alto  
per glaciem perone tegi, qui summovet euros  
pellibus inversis: peregrina ignotaque nobis  
ad scelus atque nefas, quaecumque est, purpura ducit.'*  
(14.179–88)

This composite picture of a Marsian–Hernican–Vestinian oldtimer is meant to invite our ridicule<sup>35</sup>). Not only does the old man voice nothing but outmoded commonplaces, extolling the virtues of country-life, agriculture, and *severitas*, but he also betrays his lack of refinement in his trite rhetoric, replete with predictable alliteration and repetition (*ope et auxilio, scelus atque nefas*), which is, of course, fully intended as such by Juvenal. The *senex* is stripped of *urbanitas* and *elegantia* when Juvenal makes him warn against dangerous foreign influences as exemplified by *peregrina* ... *purpura*, which contrasts with the furs turned inside out (*pellibus inversis*) and with the old-fashioned boot of the farmer of yore (*alto* ... *perone*) which the old man recommends as appropriate apparel<sup>36</sup>). Moreover, he loses the last vestige of his *auctoritas* when he admits, quite innocently, that he has never seen the ruinous purple which he condemns; it is, after all, *ignota nobis*. The old man simply does not know what he is talking about<sup>37</sup>). By allowing him to undermine his own credibility, Juvenal undercuts him as effectively as Cicero did Appius. Here as elsewhere, Juvenal is by no means a *laudator temporis acti*, as he so often has been regarded to be<sup>38</sup>).

If the *veteres* summoned back from their graves by Cicero and Juvenal are devoid of sophistication, the opposite is true for

35) The conjunctions linking the three tribe names at lines 180–81 and the singular in the verb (*dicebat*) indicate that Juvenal is deliberately deflating the puffed-up speaker. On the tribes see Livy 8.6.8, 8.29.4, 9.45.18, and per. 72–76 (*Marsi*); Livy 2.40–41 and 9.43 (*Hernici*), and 8.29.1, 10.3.1, and per. 72–76 (*Vestini*). On *Marsi* cf. also Pers., Sat. 3.75, and Hor., Carm. 1.2.39–40. – I have briefly examined the Juvenalian passage from a different perspective in *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal* (Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York, 1983) 45–46.

36) On *pero* see Friedländer (above, note 6) ad loc. The *Hernici* wear a *crudus pero* at Aen. 7.690; cf. Pers., Sat. 5.102: *peronatus arator*.

37) Cf. Courtney on 14.187.

38) Most prominently by Scott (above, note 1) 103; de Decker (above, note 1) 22–38; Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (above, note 6) 100 and 268 note 11 (on the opening of Satire 6); recently by Peter Green, *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires* (Harmondsworth, 1967) 27. Cf. my *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal* (above, note 35) 23–58.



our two authors. They are highly urbane in their refined ridicule with which they subvert the supposed *auctoritas* and *gravitas* of venerable ancestors. For Juvenal, this is standard satiric technique; Cicero, in the *Pro Caelio*, uses humor, irony, and a host of other rhetorical tricks to further his otherwise shaky case. When Juvenal conjures up an Appius-like *senex* in Satire 14, we may assume that he is aware of and imitates Cicero's famous *prosopopoiia*. Since we cannot doubt that the satirist was familiar with Cicero's speeches and other works, both rhetorical and philosophical<sup>39</sup>), we are justified to conclude that Juvenal's *prosopopoiia* in Satire 14 is an indirect tribute to Cicero. Naturally, this is not to imply that Juvenal holds Cicero in such high esteem that he cannot satirize his fellow-rhetorician, as we have seen earlier in this paper. Juvenal's satiric range includes all and sundry targets which he assaults with equal zest, short of naming those currently in power – a restriction necessary for the satirist's survival (Sat. 1.150–71).

We see, then, that Juvenal recognizes Cicero's greatness, at least as a rhetorician, and acknowledges, however indirectly, his influence upon himself. In particular, Juvenal pays tribute to Cicero when he models his *prosopopoiia* of Satire 14 on that of Appius Claudius in the *Pro Caelio*. Indeed, the assumption might not be undue that Quintilian's high praise of the *Pro Caelio* alerted Juvenal to the satiric potential inherent in the *prosopopoiia* of an outmoded ancestor. But even while creating a similarly silly figure, Juvenal, in a manner appropriate for the indignant satirist, feels no qualms about satirizing the poetic foibles and shortcomings of Cicero, the man to whom he owes some of his rhetorical inspiration. Nevertheless we should keep in mind that Juvenal does not satirize Cicero's *oratorical* skills. Juvenal places himself in the tradition of Roman rhetoric by applying it to the genre of satire and infusing it with *indignatio*, one of his basic poetic principles. Had Cicero been able to read Juvenal, he might well have appreciated the latter's high level of *urbanitas*, even as it is, on occasion, directed against himself.

Bucknell University

Martin M. Winkler

---

39) See, e. g., Homer Franklin Rebert, *The Literary Influence of Cicero on Juvenal*, TAPA 57 (1926) 181–94; Highet, *Juvenal's Bookcase* (above, note 3) 377, 383–84, and 389 note 43, and *Juvenal the Satirist* 276 and 280 note 4. See also Courtney on Juv., Sat. 10.258. We might even consider Sat. 1.15–17, quoted at the beginning of this paper, to be a mocking allusion to Cicero's ideal orator at *de Or.* 1.83.