

A MATRONA MAKES UP Fantasy and Reality in Juvenal, Sat. 6,457–507

The relationship of Juvenal's satiric portrait of Rome to the realities of Roman life has always been contentious. On the one hand, he has been used as a rich source (at times, the only source) for a variety of 'Realien'. Sections of the passage to be discussed in this paper, for instance, have been used as evidence for cruelty towards slaves (475 ff.),¹ or for the wearing by women of *coturni* (506).² On the other hand, some literary critics, taking the legitimate line that Juvenal's exaggerated and distorted picture of Roman life cannot be taken at face value, are inclined to dismiss his poetry almost totally as a viable source for everyday reality.³

Both approaches clearly have validity at times. For example, Juvenal's description of a woman who practises gladiatorial moves with a wooden sword as *dignissima ... / Floralis matrona tuba* (6,249–50) is the only, though seemingly valid, evidence that mock gladiatorial fights were performed, presumably by *meretrices*, at the Floralia.⁴ Conversely, the ending of Satire 6 (634 ff.), where Ju-

1) E. g. K. R. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control* (New York/Oxford 1987) 119; R. P. Saller, *Corporal Punishment, Authority, and Obedience in the Roman Household*, in: B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, Oxford 1991, 144–65 at 151–8 (though he admits that such evidence is open to the charge of exaggeration).

2) E. Pottier, *Cothurnus*, DS 1.2 (1887) 1547–8. K. D. Morrow, *Greek Footwear and the Dating of Sculpture* (Madison, Wisc. 1985) 180 comments that the *coturnus* in Rome was worn mostly by women, but fails to cite references; presumably Juvenal would be one of her sources.

3) E. g. D. Cloud, *The client-patron relationship: emblem and reality in Juvenal's first book*, in: A. Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society*, London/New York 1989, 216: "for attitudes as well as for facts the historian would be well advised to ... give a very wide berth indeed to Juvenal"; cf. Susan H. Braund, *City and Country in Roman Satire*, in: Susan H. Braund (ed.), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*, Exeter 1989, 32–4; D. S. Wiesen, *The verbal basis of Juvenal's Satiric Vision*, in: ANRW II.33.1 (Berlin/New York 1989) 708–33 at 731; K. Freudenburg, *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal* (Cambridge 2001) 253–4.

4) E. Courtney (ed.), *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London 1980) ad loc. cites the Scholiast *meretrices nam Florilibus ludis armis certabant gladiatoriiis atque pugnabant*.

venal depicts the dramas of Tragedy played out in every Roman household, is clearly a piece of fantasy which can hardly be used as proof of murderous propensities on the part of the average Roman wife. In general, however, I would subscribe to the view that satire can have no impact unless it is grounded to some extent in reality, though of course this reality is, as has frequently been pointed out, often grossly exaggerated or misrepresented.⁵

One way in which this distortion of reality works is discussed by Susanna Braund in connection with the Third Satire. She defines the “common satiric technique” of distortion as “suppression and omission of the ordinary, everyday and uninteresting aspects of life in the city and . . . exaggeration of the extraordinary, colourful and fascinating aspects”.⁶ Certainly this is often true. In the first Book, for instance, Juvenal’s cast of characters and situations includes eunuchs who marry, legacy hunters, obscenely wealthy parvenus and murderesses (Satire 1), sexual perverts (Satire 2), criminals and foreigners, falling buildings, fires and nocturnal muggings (Satire 3), bad emperors and over-sized fish (Satire 4) and bad patrons (Satire 5).

In the Sixth Satire, some extraordinary women certainly feature, such as Eppia, the senator’s wife who runs off with a gladiator, Messalina, the *meretrix Augusta*, and the murderesses at the poem’s climax. But the overall purpose of the poem is to present a female stereotype to which all contemporary Roman *matronae* are alleged to belong. In keeping with this inclusion of ordinary women among his objects of attack, Juvenal employs in this Satire a somewhat different technique of distortion: he takes a scenario which is not in itself out of the ordinary, but distorts it in such a way as to make the everyday appear both sinister and ludicrous.

5) Cf. J. Gérard, *Juvenal et la réalité contemporaine* (Paris 1976) 479; C. J. Classen, *Satire – the Elusive Genre*, SO 63, 1988, 95–121 at 101; J. Baumert, *Identifikation und Distanz: Eine Erprobung satirischer Kategorien bei Juvenal*, in: ANRW II.33.1, Berlin/New York 1989, 734–69 at 746–50; S. Cecchin, *Letteratura e realtà: la donna in Giovenale. (Analisi della VI satira)*, in: R. Uglione (ed.), *Atti del II Convegno nazionale di studi su La Donna nel mondo antico* (Torino 1989) 141–64, esp. 146, 163 f.; G. B. Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, tr. J. B. Solodow, rev. D. Fowler and G. W. Most (Baltimore/London 1994: originally published as *Letteratura latina. Manuale storico dalle origini alla fine dell’impero romano*, Firenze 1987) 477; C. Schmitz, *Das Satirische in Juvenals Satiren* (Berlin/New York 2000) 10, 21.

6) Braund (n. 3 above) 25.

The best illustration is the Satirist's description of a day in the life of a typical *matrona*. Before examining this in detail, I will first give a general overview of the train of thought. The passage begins:

*Nil non permittit mulier sibi, turpe putat nil,
cum viridis gemmas collo circumdedit et cum
auribus extentis magnos commisit elenchos.*
[*intolerabilius nihil est quam femina dives.*] 460
*interea foeda aspectu ridendaque multo
pane tumet facies aut pinguia Poppaena
spirat et hinc miseri viscantur labra mariti.
ad moechum lota veniunt cute. quando videri
vult formosa domi? moechis foliata parantur,* 465
*his emitur quidquid graciles huc mittitis Indi.
tandem aperit vultum et tectoria prima reponit;
incipit agnosci, atque illo lacte fovetur
propter quod secum comites educat asellas
exul Hyperboreum si dimittatur ad axem.* 470
*sed quae mutatis inducitur atque fovetur
tot medicaminibus coctaeque siliginis offas
accipit et madidae, facies dicetur an ulcus?*

Juvenal starts with the comment that a woman will consider nothing shameful when she has put on her jewellery. Although some commentators have been troubled by the apparent lack of a smooth connection between these verses and the following description of a woman applying her cosmetics,⁷ lines 457–60 are in fact absolutely integral to the train of thought, which (assuming the removal of 460)⁸ may be summarised thus: a woman is capable of any sort of immoral behaviour once she dons her expensive jewellery. In the meantime (i. e. in preparation for setting out adorned in her finery), she employs all sorts of concoctions to improve her complexion, not caring if her husband interrupts her, because all is done for the benefit of a lover. Juvenal is exploiting here the association, traditional in moralising contexts, between female adornment (*cultus*) and immorality. In such contexts, both the wearing

7) See Courtney (n. 4 above) 321–2 on 457 ff.

8) Most editors remove it. Courtney (n. 4 above) 322 is less certain, but one of his main reasons, that it “leaves 457 even more isolated than before”, is irrelevant if, as is here argued, there is a logical thought connection in the passage.

of expensive jewellery and the use of cosmetics is a prominent feature.⁹

The passage continues:

Est pretium curae penitus cognoscere toto 475
quid faciant agitentque die. si nocte maritus
aversus iacuit, periit libraria, ponunt
cosmetae tunicas, tarde venisse Liburnus
dicitur et poenas alieni pendere somni
cogitur, hic frangit ferulas, rubet ille flagello,
hic scutica; sunt quae tortoribus annua praestent. 480
verberat atque obiter faciem linit, audit amicas
aut latum pictae vestis considerat aurum
et caedit, longi relegit transversa diurni
et caedit, donec lassis caedentibus 'exi'
intonet horrendum iam cognitione peracta. 485
praefectura domus Sicula non mitior aula.
nam si constituit solitoque decentius optat
ornari et properat iamque expectatur in hortis
aut apud Isiacae potius sacraria lenae,
disponit crinem laceratis ipsa capillis 490
nuda umeros Psecas infelix nudisque mamillis.
'altior hic quare cincinnus?' taurea punit
continuo flexi crimen facinusque capilli.
quid Psecas admisit? quaenam est hic culpa puellae,
si tibi displicuit nasus tuus? altera laevum 495
extendit pectusque comas et volvit in orbem.
est in consilio materna admotaque lanis
emerita quae cessat acu; sententia prima
huius erit, post hanc aetate atque arte minores
censebunt, tamquam famae discrimen agatur 500

9) For jewellery in moral diatribes, see the references in R. D. Brown (ed.), *Lucretius on Love and Sex* (Leiden 1987) on *Lucr.* 4,1126 *zmaragdi*. For cosmetics, see B. Grillet, *Les femmes et les fards dans l'antiquité grecque* (Lyon 1975); G. Rosati (ed.), *Ovidio: I Cosmetici delle Donne* (Venice 1985) 9–19; A. Richlin, *Making up a woman: The face of Roman gender*, in: H. Eilberg-Schwartz and W. Doniger (edd.), *Off with her Head!: The denial of women's identity in myth, religion and culture*, Berkeley/London 1995, 185–213; P. A. Watson, *Parody and subversion in Ovid's Medicamina faciei femineae*, *Mnemosyne* 54, 2001, 457–71 at 461; R. K. Gibson (ed.), *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book 3* (Cambridge 2003) 174–6.

*aut animae: tanta est quaerendi cura decoris.
 tot premit ordinibus, tot adhuc compagibus altum
 aedificat caput: Andromachen a fronte videbis,
 post minor est, credas aliam. cedo si male parvi
 sortita est lateris spatium breviorque videtur* 505
*virgine Pygmaea nullis adiuta coturnis
 et levis erecta consurgit ad oscula planta.*

In this second section, Juvenal begins with a promise to reveal a woman's usual daily activities (cf. 474–5). In the event, he concentrates on two scenarios: (i) the punishment of slaves and (ii) the hair-dressing scene. In the course of the slave-beating, however, other activities are mentioned (481 ff.), and the overall effect is to suggest that such scenes are typical of how a lady spends her day. Furthermore, they are closely linked to the preceding section, because the theme of *cultus* in association with immoral behaviour runs through them as a unifying thread. The woman's ill temper, taken out on her unfortunate slaves, is said to be a result of her husband denying her intercourse the previous night (475–6), her sexual appetite – a prominent theme of Satire 6 in general – being emphasised by a rôle reversal, in which the wife expects her husband to have sex with her as his nightly duty. Among the slaves punished in the first section are *cosmetae*, male slaves involved in the adornment of the mistress;¹⁰ the activities which she carries on carelessly during the torture of the slaves include making herself up (481) and examining a luxurious garment (482).¹¹ Likewise, the attack on the hairdresser is motivated by the woman's haste to get to an assignation with a lover (487–9), while the vignette of the incongruously small woman with the bee-hive hairdo concludes with an image of her standing on tiptoe to be kissed – presumably by her lover (507).

It is now time to examine the foregoing in greater depth. In what follows, I will focus on those sections which can cast light on the complex relationship between Juvenal's text and everyday reality.

10) The meaning of the word is unclear. Courtney (n. 4 above) ad loc. takes it as 'male hairdressers'; the Scholiast says "those in charge of jewellery etc.". In Greek, the term is used by Xenophon, *Cyr.* 8,8,20 of slaves concerned with adornment.

11) Probably she is to be imagined as perusing an expensive garment which an itinerant salesman has brought to her (as in *Ov. A. A.* 1,421 ff.). The reference to gold also suggests the luxury associated negatively by moralists with female adornment.

1. Jewellery

In lines 457–9 reference is made to the wearing of emerald necklaces and pearl drop earrings. For a woman to thus adorn herself, especially for a special occasion, would not have attracted any special comment.¹² Both physical and written evidence points to the popularity of jewellery among upper-class Roman women, pearls and emeralds being among the most frequently mentioned gems. A number of emerald necklaces were found at Pompeii and pearl earrings have been found in various locations.¹³ From the *Digest* it is clear that jewellery, as well as other female items such as makeup items, unguents and clothes, was often left as part of a woman's legacy;¹⁴ emeralds and pearls are often mentioned in this connection.¹⁵ Literary texts also attest to women's love of jewellery. Although the majority concern *meretrices*,¹⁶ there is some evidence relating to *matronae*. In Ovid's *Medicamina Faciei Femineae*, for instance, he justifies his advice on cosmetics by pointing out that contemporary women are much concerned with their outward appearance:

12) For female use of jewellery, see C. Barini, *Ornatus Muliebris: i gioielli e le antiche romane* (Torino 1958); J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Roman Women: their history and habits* (rev. ed., London 1974) 262–5; A. M. Stout, *Jewelry as a Symbol of Status in the Roman Empire*, in: J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (edd.), *The world of Roman costume*, Wisconsin 1994, 77–100; M. Wyke, *Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Roman World*, in: L. J. Archer, S. Fischler and M. Wyke (edd.), *Women in Ancient Societies: 'An Illusion of the Night'*, London 1994, 141–4. When Pliny the Elder criticizes Lollia Pollina, wife of Caligula, for appearing in public decked in emeralds and pearls on every part of her body (N. H. 9, 114), it is not the wearing of jewellery in itself but the excessive amount that is in question.

13) See Barini (n. 12 above) 37–48; R. Higgins, *Greek and Roman Jewellery* (London 21980) 177–80.

14) Cf. Ulpian, *Digest* 34, 2, where *ornamenta muliebria* left as legacies are said to include earrings, armlets, bracelets and rings.

15) E. g. at *Dig.* 34, 2, 33, 8 a legacy includes two pearl *elenchi* worn as earrings and two emeralds, cf. 6, 11, 32; S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (Oxford 1991) 388–9; A. Oliver in: D. E. E. Kleiner and S. B. Matheson (edd.), *I Claudia II: Women in Roman Art and Society*, Austin, Texas 2000, 118–9.

16) E. g. Plaut. *Most.* 157; Lucr. 4, 1126 ff.; Prop. 1, 2; 2, 16, 43 f.; Tib. 2, 4, 27; Ov. A. A. 3, 129; Mart. 4, 28, 4; 11, 27, 10.

*forsitan antiquae Tatio sub rege Sabinae
maluerint quam se rura paterna coli*

...

*at vestrae matres teneras peperere puellas:
vultis inaurata corpora veste tegi,
vultis odoratos positu variare capillos,
conspicuam gemmis vultis habere manum;
induitis collo lapides Oriente petitos
et quantos onus est aure tulisse duos.*

(Ov. M. F. 11–12, 17–22)

Here, in contrast to the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid does not pretend that his addressees do not include *matronae*.¹⁷ Seneca also offers important evidence when, lauding his mother Helvia as an exceptional paragon of *pudicitia*, he includes an interest in jewellery among the outward signs of immorality which are shared, he asserts, by the majority of his mother's contemporaries.¹⁸

In Seneca and the literary texts in general – in contrast to other, more objective and ethically neutral evidence – the wearing of jewellery is given morally dubious overtones: it is associated with *meretrices* or, as in Seneca, with adultery.¹⁹ Juvenal follows in this well-established moralising tradition, adapting it to the general thesis of Satire 6 – that a chaste *matrona* in contemporary Rome is as rare as a black swan,²⁰ that is, non-existent – by portraying a woman donning her jewellery as part of a general picture of the typical adulterous behaviour of an upper-class woman.

17) Cf. esp. 25–6 *feminea vestri poliuntur lege mariti / et vix ad cultus nupta quod addat habet*; Watson (n. 9 above) 463–70.

18) Sen. Helv. 16 *non te maximum saeculi malum, impudicitia, in numerum plurium adduxit; non gemmae te, non margaritae flexerunt; ... non faciem coloribus ac lenociniis polluisti; numquam tibi placuit uestis quae nihil amplius nudaret cum poneretur: unicum tibi ornamentum, pulcherrima et nulli obnoxia aetati forma, maximum decus uisa est pudicitia*. Cf. also [Lucian] *Amores* 38–41 (on married women).

19) Cf. [Publilius Syrus] ap. Petron. Sat. 55 and elegiac passages such as Prop. 1,2,21 ff. where the wearing of jewellery is connected with infidelity to the lover (*facies aderat nullis obnoxia gemmis ... illis [sc. heroines of myth in contrast to modern puellae] ampla satis forma pudicitia*).

20) Cf. 165 *rara avis in terris nigroque simillima cycno*.

2. *Cosmetics*

In the next section, Juvenal again presents a scenario which would not be out of the ordinary in everyday life: a lady using various preparations to preserve and enhance her skin. Even if the average woman did not resort to some of the more disgusting and/or exotic remedies we hear about such as 'crocodile' dung, vulture's blood, or legs of locusts mixed with goat suet,²¹ most will have tried some sort of face cream or facemask.

Serious instructions on skin care are offered by technical writers such as Galen (14,422–3 Kühn), who includes two recipes for a facial cleanser/toner. The first involves squeezing the liquid out of wheat (*siligo*) and mixing the residue with egg white to the consistency of honey, in the second, equal portions of incense and rouge are ground with honey and smeared on the face, left for a whole day, then washed off again (cf. Juvenal's *lota . . . cute* 464 and 467 ff.). Dioscorides, who wrote on pharmacology in the mid first century A.D., mentions face masks of Chian or Selinan earth mixed with rose-unguents.²² Two of Ovid's recipes in the preserved fragment of the *Medicamina Faciei Femineae* are for face packs, the first (53–66) containing barley, vetch, wheat, eggs, honey, powdered stag-antler, narcissus bulbs and gum, the second (83–98), francincense and myrrh, salpetre, gum, honey, fennel, ammoniac salt, dried rose leaves and barley water.²³ According to Pliny the Elder, women employed asses' milk as a face lotion in the belief that it smoothed out wrinkles and left the skin soft and white (N.H. 28,183), while Juvenal's casual allusion to *pinguia Poppaeanae* suggests that there was a face cream available patented by Poppaea, though this is the only evidence for it.²⁴

Juvenal uses a variety of ploys to turn female beautification into something both sinister and ridiculous. First, by drawing a

21) For the first two and other similar mixtures, see Plin. N.H. 28,183–88. On 'crocodile' (actually, lizard) dung, see M. Hendry, *Rouge and Crocodile Dung*, CQ 46, 1996, 583–8.

22) Cf. R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology* 3 (Leiden 31993) 40.

23) On these, see P. Green, *Ars Gratia Cultus: Ovid as Beautician*, AJPh 100, 1979, 381–92 at 382–6.

24) The existence of such a cosmetic is highly feasible given her obsession with her appearance: cf. n. 34 below. For the naming of a cosmetic after its inventor, cf. the perfume known as 'Cosmianum', produced by the famous parfumeur Cosmus (cf. Mart. 3,82,26; 11,15,6).

contrast between the woman's attitude towards her husband and her lover (esp. 464–5²⁵), he underlines that the use of cosmetics forms a part of the adulterous behaviour to which he alleges women to be prone. The allusion to expensive²⁶ and exotic perfumes (465–6) also enhances the effect – Pliny the Elder regards unguents as the worst example of *luxuria*²⁷ and *emitur* (466) hints at another failing of contemporary wives – that they squander money on whatever takes their fancy²⁸ – in this case, their profligacy is even more culpable, since the money is spent for the sake of a *moechus*.²⁹

Intertextuality is also employed to underscore the immoral associations of the *matrona*'s beauty routine. By recalling passages from elegy and elsewhere in which facial cosmetics and perfume are associated with *meretrices*, Juvenal implicitly identifies his upper-class *matronae* with these *meretrices*.³⁰ The allusion to *foliata*, for instance, is reminiscent of Martial, 11,27,9, where this is one of a number of luxury items which might be demanded by an *amica*. The description of the repulsive face creams (461–3) is inspired by passages from Ovid in which the *puella*'s toilette is a precursor to

25) S. M. Braund (ed.), Juvenal and Persius (Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass./London 2004) 278 accepts Ruperti's transposition of lines 464–6 to after 470, which makes *lota cute* come, in logical order, after the washing in asses' milk. But this also creates too great a separation between the final lines on the treated face (471 ff.) and the earlier description of the facemask, and it does not solve the problem that the reference to perfumes (465 f.) is intrusive in the context of facial care. In the traditional order, the remark that the woman removes her cosmetics before coming to her lover (464) forms a nice contrast with the picture of the husband, to whom she is indifferent, getting stuck in the face creams; the reference to the *moechus* leads to the aside that it is for the benefit of lovers that she spends money on perfumes; Juvenal then returns to the removal of the facemask, the cleansing of the face and finally the comparison of the face with an *ulcus*.

26) For the luxurious unguent *foliatum*, see N. M. Kay (ed.), Martial Book XI: A Commentary (London 1985) on Mart. 11,27,9.

27) Plin. N.H. 13,20–5: expensive unguents are especially condemned because of their ephemeral nature, in contrast to other luxuries like clothing, which lasts some time, and jewels which can also be bequeathed to an heir.

28) E. g. Juv. 6,149 ff.232.355 ff.508–11. Cf. also [Lucian] Amores 40 (women spend their husbands' wealth on perfuming their hair with all the perfumes of Arabia).

29) *His emitur* 'for these is bought' – is ironic in view of passages like Mart. 11,27,9 and 12,65,4, where it is the lover who is required to spend his money on perfume as a gift for the woman.

30) Cf. also Plaut. Most. 157 ff. – a detailed description of a *meretrix* getting ready to meet a lover; her preparations involve jewellery, hair, cosmetics, and perfume.

a meeting with a lover but must be concealed from him because of the unattractiveness of the process: A. A. 3,211 ff. *quem non offendat toto faex illita uultu, / cum fluit in tepidos pondere lapsa sinus? / oesyra quid redolent quamuis mittatur Athenis, / demptus ab immundo uellere sucus ouis!* and R. A. 354 ff. *et fluere in tepidos oesyra lapsa sinus. / illa tuas redolent, Phineu, medicamina mensas; / non semel hinc stomacho nausea facta meo est.* In both passages the cosmetics are made the subject of ridicule,³¹ but Juvenal outdoes his predecessors in wit. For instance, whereas they simply depict the greasy lanolin running down the girl's front, Juvenal has the hilarious image of the husband getting stuck in the grease when he tries to kiss his wife (463).³²

The final lines of the section (467–73), basically a description of the commonplace process of removing a face pack and washing the face with a cleansing agent, become in Juvenal's hands a rich source of amusement at the lady's expense and provide a further opportunity to emphasise her lack of *puđicitia*. The removal of the mask is likened to peeling off layers of stucco on a building, *incipit agnosci* suggesting that she was so thickly covered as to be unrecognisable. A similar image was used, also in the context of deprecating moral decadence, by Petronius at Sat. 23 *inter rugas malarum tantum erat cretae ut putares detectum parietem nimbo laborare* (of a *cinaedus*).

In alluding to the use of asses' milk as a facial cleanser, Juvenal takes advantage of several opportunities for both disapprobation and humour. Pliny the Elder, whose account of the practice Juvenal has in mind,³³ records how it was instituted by the empress Poppaea, wife of Nero, who used it not only on her face but even

31) Cf. Gibson (n. 9 above) on 211–12: "it is common in anti-cosmetic contexts to ridicule women by picturing the moment when their cosmetics are made to run."

32) *Viscantur* is ironic here: *meretrices* catch lovers by hunting (cf. P. Murgatroyd, *Amatory Hunting, Fishing and Fowling*, Latomus 43, 1984, 362–8) and the verb suggests bird-lime – but this time it is the husband not the lover who is caught. Juvenal might also have in mind Lucr. 4,1171–91, on the off-putting, smelly fumigations which a lover's mistress performs behind closed doors (although, as Brown [n. 9 above] on 1175, has argued, this refers to gynecological treatment): in particular, Juvenal's *ridendaque multo* 461 recalls Lucr. 4,1176 *quam famulae longe fugitant furtimque cachimant*.

33) Cf. esp. *comites* 469, recalling Pliny's *gregibus eam comitantibus*, and the allusion at 462 to *pinguia Poppaeanae*, discussed earlier.

added it to her bathwater, keeping a herd of 500 she-asses with her for this purpose: *cutem in facie erugari et tenerescere candore lacte asinino putant, notumque et quasdam cottidie septies genas custodito numero fovere. Poppaea hoc instituit balnearum quoque solia sic temperans, ob hoc asinarum gregibus eam comitantibus* (Plin. N. H. 28,183). In the context of face-care, Juvenal's *matrona* ought to be washing her face with the asses' milk, like the ladies described by Pliny (cf. *genas ... fovere*), but the phrase *lacte fovetur*, along with the allusion to the escort of asses, suggests rather the baths taken by the beauty-conscious³⁴ Poppaea: Juvenal thus turns a practice which may have not been so unusual into something with immoral connotations: Poppaea was not the chastest of *matronae*, if there is any truth at all in Tacitus' description of her (Ann. 13,45). As well, he embellishes his description in a highly amusing manner. Not only does the lady bathe in the milk of she-asses, but she would take them as her companions if she were exiled. The reference to exile further underlines the licentiousness associated with Poppaea, since it calls to mind the punishment under the Augustan marriage legislation for adultery and carries the implication that this would be the reason for the *matrona*'s banishment. Moreover, by making the place of banishment as remote as possible, Juvenal creates further opportunities for wit and moral censure. Firstly, it emphasises the woman's promiscuity: she would not neglect her beauty even in circumstances where potential lovers might be hard to find, but would want to be ready for any chance, however slim, of continuing the very behaviour for which she was exiled.³⁵ The hyperbolic allusion to the Hyperboreans³⁶ parodies the friendship topos whereby a sign of true friendship is willingness to accompany a friend to the far corners of the earth,³⁷ often in the context of exile; in such contexts, the phrase *comes exulis / exilii* is practically

34) For Poppaea's concern about her physical appearance, cf. Plin. N. H. 11,238 and Dio 62,28.

35) It was presumably because Augustus feared Julia would continue her promiscuous behaviour in exile that he forbade her to associate with men without his permission (Suet. Aug. 65,3).

36) For the Hyperboreans as representing the Northern extremity of the world, cf. Catullus 115,6 with Fordyce, Hor. Od. 2,20,16 with Nisbet/Hubbard ad loc., Virg. Georg. 3,196.

37) E. g. Stat. Silv. 5,1,127 ff. *tecum gelidas comes illa per Arctos / Sarmaticas-que hiemes Histrumque et pallida Rheni / frigora*. Cf. L. C. Watson, A Commentary on Horace's Epodes (Oxford 2003) 53 f.

a technical term.³⁸ For a woman, such a companion might ordinarily be her mother, as in the case of Julia the Elder who was accompanied into exile by Scribonia; Juvenal's woman would in similar circumstances prefer her *comites exilii* to be in asinine form: in keeping with her priorities, she would be in more need of beautification than feminine consolation.

The concluding lines of the section (471–3) again combine disgust at women's cosmetic preparations with ridicule. So many preparations does this *matrona* put on her face, that it perhaps should be called an *ulcus* (an ulcerated sore) rather than a face! The witty comparison between a face and an *ulcus* is facilitated by the fact that *medicamen* is regularly used both of medical treatments and cosmetics (cf. the title of Ovid's *Medicamina Faciei Femineae*); it is prepared for by *tumet* in 462 (her face 'swells' with bread [i. e. a face-pack], swelling being associated with ulcers [cf. Celsus, 5,28,2 and 5]). Moreover, all of the procedures alluded to by Juvenal: the smearing on of ointments (*inducitur* 471), ablution with hot water or wine (*fouetur* 471³⁹) and the application of poultices (*coctae siliginis ... madidae* 472–3) appear as well in technical discussions of ulcers. Pliny (N. H. 28,183–88) lists in this connection greasy substances used as ointments, such as butter, bone marrow, dung mixed with oil and goose grease; Celsus (5,28,4D) recommends that the ulcer known as erysipelas be treated (*ulcera ... fouenda sunt*) with hot water or wine; poultices (*kataplasmata*) of various kinds are mentioned, some including wheat or bread.⁴⁰ In short, by exploiting the similarities between methods of facial care and the treatments in medical writers for *ulcera* of various kinds, Juvenal extracts the maximum humour from the situation.

38) E. g. Mart. 7,44,3–5 *hunc Nero damnavit: sed tu damnare Neronem / ausus es et profugi, non tua, fata sequi: / aequora per Scyllae magnus comes exulis isti*; cf. Sen. Ep. 9,10; C. A. Williams (ed.), *Martial's Epigrams, Book Two* (Oxford 2004) on Mart. 2,24,4 and Catullus 11 with J. C. Yardley, *SO* 56, 1981, 63–9.

39) This is emended, however, to *novatur* by R. G. M. Nisbet in: N. Horsfall (ed.), *Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus: Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch's Eightieth Birthday*, *BICS Suppl.* 51, London 1988, 97 f. (= R. G. M. Nisbet, *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* ed. S. J. Harrison [Oxford 1995] 243 f.); this reading is accepted by recent editors such as J. Willis, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae Sedecim* (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1997) and Braund (n. 25 above).

40) E. g. Celsus, 5,18,19; 5,28,13C; Soranus ap. Galen, 12,494K; Galen, 13,731K. On cosmetic preparations which are also medicines, cf. Ov. A. A. 3,215–16 with Gibson (n. 9 above) ad loc.

3. *Punishment of Slaves*

The memorable description of the *matrona* having various slaves flogged, while casually (*obiter* 481) performing her day-to-day business, is a brilliant example of Juvenal's ability to carry his point by creating a scene which is essentially a distortion of factual reality. In this case, the reality consists in the fact that slaves who had committed an offence were routinely submitted to corporal punishment.⁴¹ Furthermore, since a *materfamilias* owned her own slaves and was responsible for those slaves engaged in 'womanly' pursuits such as wool-making⁴² or her own toilette, it is a safe assumption that if these needed to be disciplined, it would be the woman who oversaw the operation. On the other hand, capricious cruelty towards slaves who had done no wrong, or whose offence did not justify the severity of the punishment, was unacceptable, and is condemned by moralists as an example of *ira* deriving from lack of self-control.⁴³ It was also subject to legal sanction, as in the case of the *matrona* who was banished for five years by the emperor Hadrian for mistreating her *ancillae*.⁴⁴ Although it is impossible to know how common such behaviour was, it is hardly likely to have occurred as frequently, and in such an extreme form, as Juvenal implies. More importantly, most of the known factual examples of *saevitia* towards slaves involve male slave owners;⁴⁵ Juvenal, however, represents this scenario as typical female behaviour,⁴⁶

41) Cf. K. Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge 1978) 118–23; Bradley (n. 1 above) 113–37; Saller (n. 1 above) 151–4, 158–60; R. P. Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge 1994) 147–9.

42) Cf. S. Treggiari, *Jobs for women*, *American Journal of Ancient History* 1, 1976, 76–104 at 84.

43) Cf. Hor. Sat. 1,3,80 ff.; Sen. Ep. 47,3; De Ira 2,25; 3,24; Galen, *De prop. an.*, W. de Boer, ed., *Corp. Med. Graec.* 5,4,1,1; 5,4,8; Gaius, *Inst.* 1,53; Plut. *Mor.* 457B, 461C; N. Brockmeyer, *Antike Sklaverei* (Darmstadt 1979) 182 ff.; M. T. Griffin, *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford 1976) 257 ff.

44) Ulp. Dig. 1,2,6 *divus etiam Hadrianus Umbriam quandam matronam in quinquennium relegavit, quod ex levissimis causis ancillas atrocissime tractasset*, cf. Bradley (n. 1 above) 126.

45) See the examples given in the works cited n. 41 above.

46) Notice how in the passage Juvenal shifts between the plural and the singular: the first few lines are in the plural, culminating in *sunt quae tortoribus annua praestent*. This sets the scene for the more vivid concentration on an individual woman, the initial plurals establishing that this scenario is repeated in every upper-class home.

exploiting the common notion that excessive bad-temper and lack of self-control was a womanly trait.⁴⁷

It is worth considering exactly what is supposed to be happening in this passage. Juvenal begins by introducing three types of slave who are the victims of their mistress' ill temper: a female wool worker,⁴⁸ a group of male *cosmetae*,⁴⁹ and finally a Liburnian (Illyrian) slave whose rôle is unspecified.⁵⁰ To balance this trio, three types of flogging instruments are mentioned: the *ferula*, the *flagellum*, and the *scutica*.⁵¹ But these cannot correspond to the three slaves mentioned first, since the genders and numbers of *hic ... ille ... hic* do not match the *libraria*, *cosmetae* and *Liburnus*.⁵² Rather, they suggest an indiscriminate beating of various other slaves – explaining why some women need to employ *tortores* on an annual retainer. While the beating is going on the woman puts on her makeup, talks to girlfriends, examines a garment or checks the account books.⁵³ Once more, ordinary activities incur opprobrium, because carrying them on in such circumstances demonstrates the woman's casual indifference to the beatings, and also because these activities are related to the beautification process that is the basis of the satiric attack.⁵⁴

47) Cf. Sen. De Ira 1,20,3 *ira muliebri maxime ac puerile vitium est*, De Clementia 1,5,5 *muliebri est furere in ira*; see further W. V. Harris, *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass./London 2001) 264 ff.; id., *The Anger of Women*, *Yale Classical Studies* 32, 2003, 121–43.

48) Referred to as *libraria*, which, according to the Scholiast, is equivalent to *lanipenda*, i. e. a slave woman who weighs out the wool for the workers and who also has a supervisory rôle over wool manufacture in the household (see Treggiari [n. 42 above] 82–4; J. Frayn, *Sheep-rearing and the wool trade in Italy during the Roman period* [Liverpool 1984] 152). The term is not testified elsewhere in this sense.

49) For the meaning of this word, cf. n. 10 above.

50) At Juv. 4,75 a *Liburnus* is an usher at the emperor's house. M. Citroni (ed.), *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton liber primus* (Florence 1975) on Mart. 1,49,33 thinks *Liburnus* (sc. *seruus*) is a litter bearer, and compares Juv. 3,240 *diues et ingenti curret super ora Liburna*, where he takes the Liburnian (sc. litter) to be so-called because it is carried by Liburnian slaves, but the image is more likely to be that of a Liburnian war-ship (see Courtney [n. 4 above] ad loc.).

51) On the use of whips in torturing slaves, see T. P. Wiseman, *Catullus and his World* (Cambridge 1985) 5–10.

52) There follows another trio (*verberat ... caedit ... caedit*): whether this corresponds to either of the first groups is unclear: more probably, three (unrelated) groups of three are used for rhetorical effect.

53) For this interpretation of *longi relegit transversa diurni*, see Courtney (n. 4 above) on 483.

54) Cf. n. 11 above.

(The reference to the account books might suggest her expenditure on luxuries, rather than ordinary household expenses.)

In the opening lines of this scene, the slaves are imagined as being summarily punished by their mistress in a fit of temper (476–79). The subsequent beatings that take place amid other business might at first glance be assumed to be punishments also, but the allusions at the end of the passage to *cognitio* and *praefectura* (485 f.) evoke a slightly different image. A *cognitio* was a hearing of a legal case by a magistrate; in Juvenal's day, persons of humble status charged with a criminal offence were tried by the *praefectus urbi* or the *praefectus vigilum*. In the case of slaves, torture was regular, whether they were giving evidence as witnesses or defending themselves on a charge.⁵⁵ After the *cognitio* was finished, the slave would then be led away for punishment.⁵⁶ In the present passage, then, the woman is to be imagined as assuming the rôle of the praefect, conducting a hearing of accused slaves during which they are tortured in order to get them to confess to their 'crimes'.⁵⁷ Not only is the parody⁵⁸ of a magisterial inquisition effective in ridiculing the *matrona*, but the comparison of the woman's *praefectura* to the court of the Sicilian tyrants⁵⁹ allows for an unflattering portrait of a woman who, in undertaking a position of male authority, emulates the worst example of this: the tyrant.⁶⁰

55) See A. H. M. Jones, *The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate* (Oxford 1972) 115.

56) A late example describes the procedure in a public trial: *reus sistitur latro, interrogatur secundum merita; torquetur, quaestionarius pulsatur, ei pectus uenaxatur, suspenditur, crescit, flagellatur fustibus, uapulatur . . . et adhuc negat. puniendus est: perit poena, ducitur ad gladium*. See A. C. Dionisotti, *From Ausonius' School-days? A Schoolbook and its relatives*, *JRS* 72, 1982, 83–125 at 105.

57) Cf. the story that the emperor Caligula often put on displays of inquisition by torture before his dinner guests (Suet. *Gaius* 32,1). On torture see P. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1970) 141–7.

58) The parodic tone is reflected in the language e. g. *intonet horrendum* (485: Courtney [n. 4 above] here compares *Virg. Aen.* 12,700).

59) For the proverbial cruelty of Sicilian tyrants, cf. *Hor. Ep.* 1,2,58 f. *invidia Siculi non inuenere tyranni maius tormentum*. Juvenal is probably thinking in particular of Phalaris of Acragas (6th century BC), famed for the bronze bull in which he roasted victims alive (see H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* [München 1967] 129–32); cf. *Juv.* 8,81 where Phalaris' bull is alluded to in the context of the torture of witnesses in a Roman trial (so here, the woman's trial of her slaves involves Phalaris-like cruelty).

60) G. Vidén, *Women in Roman Literature* (Göteborg 1993) 153–7 argues that Juvenal's attack in *Satire* 6 is in general directed at women who transgress the boundary between accepted masculine and feminine behaviour.

4. *The hairdressing scene*

The portrait of the mass beating of slaves is particularised in the hairdressing scene, which begins with the focus on a single slave, the *ornatrix*, Psecas, who has her own hair torn (490) and then is savagely beaten with an ox-hide whip, ostensibly because her mistress is dissatisfied with her appearance. The whipping is to be imagined as being carried out by one of the *tortores* the woman employs.⁶¹ The torn hair, on the other hand, would be the work of the lady herself, and suggests the literary tradition whereby an ill-tempered *domina* attacks her hairdresser in person. Ovid, for instance, comments that Corinna's hair was easily manageable, so that her *ornatrix* was always *tuto corpore*, nor did Corinna ever pierce her in the arms with a hairpin (*nec unquam/brachia derepta saucia fecit acu* Am. 1,14,17f.), whilst in the *Ars amatoria* (3,239–42) he expresses disgust at the woman who assaults her hairdresser's face with her fingernails and her arms with a hairpin.⁶² In an epigram of Martial which Juvenal also has in mind, Lalage, seeing in the mirror a single lock of hair out of place, hits her hairdresser over the head with the mirror and she falls down, *saevis icta ... comis* (Mart. 2,66,4).⁶³

The focus on a single slave is now expanded to include a group of women. So complex is the hairstyle that it requires a bevy of assessors, who are pictured watching and discussing the proceedings; the passage concludes with a comment on the height of the arranged hair and the discrepancy between the view from the front and the back, which is accentuated if the woman is specially short. Given the popularity of elaborate hairstyles in the late first and early second centuries, the scene of a noble lady having her hair dressed by her servants must have been commonplace; its

61) For such punishment of an *ornatrix*, cf. Ovid's self-defence to Corinna on the charge that he has slept with her hairdresser Cypassis: *quis Veneris famulae conubia liber inire/tergaque complecti uerbere secta uelit?* (Am. 2,7,21–2).

62) This comes soon after the description of cosmetics (205 ff.), and Juvenal may have had the whole passage (3,205–42) in mind.

63) In all these passages the mistress targets the slave's arms or her face. By making her tear the hair (for which cf. Prop. 4,8,61 *direptis comis*, referring to two slave girls attacked by the jealous Cynthia), Juvenal can convey the irony of the girl arranging her mistress' hair while her own is dishevelled.

everyday and innocuous character is demonstrated by numerous artistic representations.⁶⁴

Once again the satirist invests an ordinary event with negative resonances. His methods are various and repay detailed examination. In the first place, the lady's ill-tempered behaviour is motivated by the fact that she is running late for an assignation with her lover. Next, this adulterous *matrona* is identified with a *meretrix* through the allusions (discussed above) to the elegiac topos in which an elegiac *domina* attacks her hairdresser.⁶⁵ Thirdly, the sort of female gathering which is depicted in artistic presentations of the female toilette is turned by Juvenal into a parody of a male *consilium*.⁶⁶ The first woman *in consilio* is a retired hairdresser of the lady's mother, who is now involved in wool-making, possibly as a *lanipenda*.⁶⁷ She is the senior member of the 'council' and has the *prima sententia*⁶⁸ (498). After her those junior in age and skill will give their opinions (*censebunt* 500), as if someone's reputation or life were at stake (*tamquam famae dis-*

64) Cf. N. Kampen, *Image and Status: Roman Working Women in Ostia* (Berlin 1981) fig. 50; W. Helbig, *Wandgemälde der vom Vesuv verschütteten Städte Campaniens* (Leipzig 1868) nos. 1436–7 (1436 is discussed by Kampen 149f.).

65) Also Mart. 2,66, where the mistress bears the *meretrix*-name Lalage.

66) Either the senate, which at this period judged serious criminal cases (cf. 500–1 *censebunt, tamquam famae discrimen agatur/ aut animae; sententia prima* [498] and *censere* are technical terms from senatorial proceedings), or else the *consilium principis*, as in Satire 4: for *sententia* with reference to the members of this council being asked for their opinions, cf. Plin. Ep. 4,22,3; Juvenal uses *censere* at Sat. 4,130 (*quidnam igitur censes? conciditur? [sc. rhombus]*). In favour of the latter interpretation, the hairdresser who leads the proceedings is said to have been the slave of the *matrona*'s mother: cf. the comment of J. Ferguson (ed.), Juvenal. The Satires (New York 1979) on *materna* (497), that a councillor might serve under more than one emperor.

67) Given that the job of *lanipenda* was managerial (cf. n. 48 above), it may well have been given to a retired or older slave.

68) Courtney (n. 4 above) ad loc. says that this is because she is the *princeps senatus*, the senior senator. But according to R. J. A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton 1984) 164, this title was taken over by Augustus and probably by subsequent emperors. Under the empire, the first person to be asked for their *sententia*, after any consuls designate, would have been the senior ex-consul (cf. the description of Juvenal's hairdresser as *emerita*). If, on the other hand, Juvenal has in mind the *consilium principis*, then the hairdresser is playing the rôle of the senior member of the council (the order in which *sententiae* were given is uncertain, but seniority seems a feasible criterion). For the procedure in the *consilium principis* see J. Crook, *Consilium Principis* (Cambridge 1955) 112; F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World: 31BC–AD 337* (London 1977) 228–40.

crimen agatur / aut animae 500 f.), such importance does the *matrona* attach to her appearance.

The hairstyle itself has provoked controversy. Courtney comments that the elaborate coiffure, popular under the Flavians, was going out of fashion by this period.⁶⁹ But this woman is described as contemporary, and the picture would lose all impact if Juvenal's readers were not familiar with it from recent experience.⁷⁰ Several recent scholars have, in fact, argued for a continuation of the style under Trajan.⁷¹ For instance, Eric Varner discusses a portrait type of Domitia as an older woman, issued in the Trajanic period.⁷² In any case, the hairstyle was hardly a sign of feminine decadence, being worn by members of the imperial family. Under Juvenal's pen, however, it not only encapsulates female vanity but is linked closely to the theme of adultery: specifically at the beginning (487 f.) and end (507) of the section.

The ridicule of the hairstyle reaches its climax as the poet focuses attention on how the wearer's height is exaggerated to heroic proportions (an Andromache) when seen from the front, while she appears a different person when viewed from the back. The effect is exacerbated, says Juvenal, if the woman is especially tiny, small-

69) The style is called Flavianic by others e.g. Balsdon (n. 12 above) 256 and N. Goldman, *Reconstructing Roman clothing*, in: Sebesta and Bonfante (n. 12 above) 236 f.

70) For a different slant on the apparently Domitianic colouring of much of Juvenal's first two books, see Freudenburg (n. 3 above) 209–77, esp. 214 f.: "this is satire in a time-warp, making up for all the satires never written in the last twenty years or more".

71) I am assuming that the Satire was written towards the end of Trajan's reign (116) or shortly after the succession of Hadrian in 117 (cf. Braund [n. 25 above] 21): there is a reference at 411 to an apparently recent earthquake in Antioch which can be dated to December 115. A Hadrianic date for Books 1 and 2 is argued by A. Hardie, Juvenal, Domitian, and the Accession of Hadrian (Satire 4), *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 42, 1997–8, 117–44 and id., *Name-Repetitions and the Unity of Juvenal's First Book*, *Scholium* 8, 1999, 52–70: cf. S. H. Braund, *Juvenal – Misogynist or Misogamist?*, *JRS* 82, 1992, 71–86 at 82 nn. 92, 93.

72) E. R. Varner, *Domitia Longina and the Politics of Portraiture*, *American Journal of Archaeology* 99, 1995, 187–206 at 203–5; cf. P. Virgili, *Acconciature e maquillage* (Rome 1989) 41, 47; E. d'Ambra in: Kleiner and Matheson (n. 15 above) 104; D. E. E. Kleiner in: D. E. E. Kleiner and S. B. Matheson (edd.), *I Claudia: Women in Ancient Rome*, New Haven 1996, 169–1 (fig. 124) shows a portrait of a woman with a towering hairstyle from Egypt dating from the Hadrianic period and comments that the hairstyle, from the Flavianic and Trajanic periods, shows that imperial portraits were still influential even outside Italy among aspiring women.

er than a young Pygmy girl in her bare feet (cf. *nullis adiuta coturnis* 506), who is obliged to stand on tiptoe in order to be kissed. The phrase *nullis adiuta coturnis* ‘when not assisted by *coturni*’ seems to imply that she does wear this type of footwear – presumably she takes them off along with her clothes when with her lover.

The passage would have amused Juvenal’s contemporary readers for several reasons. The general Roman propensity to laugh at physical deformities, including smallness of stature, is well-known;⁷³ moreover, Pygmies were intrinsically amusing to the Romans, to judge from the parodic scenes often shown in painting and other works of art.⁷⁴ Next, the mention of *coturni*. This has been invoked as demonstration that Roman women wore the *coturnus*, the high-platformed shoe worn by Tragic actors to enhance their size.⁷⁵ If so, however, it would be the only clear evidence,⁷⁶ and an alternative explanation may be suggested. Even if women didn’t wear *coturni* as such, they may have worn thick-soled shoes to enhance their height, like the wife of Ischomachus in Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* (10,2). Although there is no direct evidence for this, the price list of footwear for both sexes in Diocletian’s Edict is suggestive.⁷⁷ As well as *calcei muliebres*, there is a special kind of ox-hide sandal which when worn by women came in two versions: *taurinae monsoles* and *taurinae bisoles*. Clearly the double-soled sandals would have been increased the woman’s height (*coturni* had as many as five layers of soles⁷⁸). It is possible, then, that women wore shoes with thicker soles if they wished to appear taller, but that Juvenal describes such shoes by the term *coturni* in order to

73) Cf. R. Garland, *The Eye of the Beholder: Deformity and Disability in the Graeco-Roman World* (London 1995) 48–50, 73–86.

74) Cf. J.-P. Cèbe, *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain antique des origines à Juvénal* (Paris 1966) 345–54.

75) Cf. n. 2 above. The allusion to Andromache might prepare the way, since an actor playing this rôle would wear *coturni*. On *coturni* worn by Tragic actors see also N. Goldman, *Roman Footwear*, in: Sebesta and Bonfante (n. 12 above) 101–29 at 125.

76) Venus, in the guise of a huntress, when mistaken for Diana by Aeneas, tells him *virginibus Tyriis mos est gestare pharetram / purpureoque alte suras vincire coturno* (Virg. Aen. 1,336–7), and the *coturnus* is part of Diana’s hunting attire at Ecl. 7,32 *puniceo stabis suras evincta coturno*, but these passages do not seem relevant: hunting was not an occupation of Roman *matronae*.

77) Edict of Diocletian 9,5–25, conveniently reproduced by Goldman (n. 75 above) 127 n. 5.

78) Morrow (n. 2 above) 122, 131 pl. 111a and b.

invoke the humorous image of the woman towering on stilts (as would a tragic actor playing Andromache, with whom she has already been compared).⁷⁹

The allusion to the footwear of the Tragic actor also calls to mind the disgraceful associations of the acting profession,⁸⁰ thus continuing the theme that womanly concern with appearance is morally dubious. Finally, in the same connection, the woman's attempts, by the wearing of elevated shoes, to disguise her lack of height, is a further example of Juvenal's identifying his *matrona* with the *meretrix* of Comedy and Elegy: we may be meant to think of a well-known passage from the Comedian Alexis (fr. 103 K.-A.) which describes how courtesans, as a ploy to disguise shortness, put bits of felt inside their shoes. Moreover, in erotic contexts smallness of stature was not merely risible but a flaw which needed to be concealed from a lover if possible (cf. Ov. A. A. 3,263–6 *si brevis es, sedeas, ne stans videare sedere*) or conveniently overlooked by the lover himself through euphemistic descriptions such as *Chariton mia* or *tota merum sal* (Lucr. 4,1162).

To conclude and summarise: in the Sixth Satire, Juvenal presents a picture of Roman women which ranges from extreme fantasy (as in the final lines of the Satire), to a depiction which, though clearly hyperbolic, relies for its humorous effect on having a basis in ordinary life to which the reader can relate. A detailed examination of a passage has shown how this distortion of the everyday works. In the sections on the woman's toilette, the everyday is transformed by being placed in a context of immorality, since the cosmetics and hairdo are undertaken for the benefit of a lover. This is reinforced by juxtaposing jewellery and cosmetics in such a way as to evoke traditional moralising connections between adornment and adultery, by intertextual allusions to Elegy which associate the *matrona* with a *meretrix*, and by implicit associations such as that with Poppaea, or in the case of the *coturni*, with the immorality of the stage. The effect is also reinforced by parody (e.g. of a male *consilium*) and humour, as in the ridiculous descriptions of the

79) Cf. the illustrations in M. Bieber, *The History of the Greek and Roman Theatre* (Princeton 1961) 231 fig. 773, 243 fig. 799.

80) Earlier in the Satire, Juvenal emphasised women's propensity to fall in love with actors. For the immorality associated with the stage and with actors, cf. C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge 1993) 123–31.

woman's husband getting stuck in her makeup, or the short woman on her tiptoes. In the section on the beating of the slaves, a common situation – punishment of slaves – is given sinister undertones by placing it in a sexual context: the woman's sexual promiscuity is suggested by making her ill-temper derive from her husband's sexual neglect. The distortion here also involves placing a relatively unusual situation (the beating) in the middle of banal, everyday activities, so that the unusual is given an air of the quotidian.

In sum, the passage discussed demonstrates a Satiric technique in which the everyday is distorted in such a way that essentially in-offensive activities such as a lady's toilette become vehicles for both ridicule and moral condemnation. The everyday nature of these activities allows all *matronae* to be included, to reinforce the point that the contemporary decline in moral standards, where married woman are concerned, is all-embracing.

Sydney

Pat Watson