

<i>ACTA CLASSICA</i> <i>UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.</i>	<i>XL–XLI.</i>	<i>2004–2005.</i>	<i>p. 279–290.</i>
--	----------------	-------------------	--------------------

## JUVENALIA STYLISTICA<sup>1</sup>

BY NEIL ADKIN

Courtney's massive commentary on Juvenal has been acclaimed as „definitive”<sup>2</sup>. Considerable attention is paid by Courtney to matters of style, to which he also devotes a special index<sup>3</sup>. It would seem however that in a number of passages Courtney has failed to achieve a proper appreciation of Juvenal's stylistic refinement and of the particular effects it is intended to generate. The object of the present contribution is accordingly to attempt a resection of these hermeneutic *naevoli* from the fair body of Courtney's great commentary.

Courtney duly recognizes that Juvenal employs acoustic effects to reinforce the sense. It might however be thought that some of the examples he adduces are not especially good ones<sup>4</sup>. At all events Courtney would appear to have overlooked a number of far more striking and significant cases of the same phenomenon in the celebrated third satire, which evokes the evils of life in Rome. The first of these texts is particularly important, since it introduces Juvenal's notorious tirade against the Greeks. It also marks the point at which the speaker Umbricius forgets that he is merely supposed to be chatting to a friend; instead he now starts to harangue the entire citizenry of Rome, who are here apostrophized as *Quirites*<sup>5</sup>. The passage at issue reads as follows:

<sup>1</sup> Works are cited according to Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum. 2nd ed. Leipzig 1990.

<sup>2</sup> E. Courtney, A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal. London 1980. For an affirmation of its „definitiveness” cf. (e.g.) the review by G.B. Townend. Journ. Rom. Stud. 72 (1982) 218.

<sup>3</sup> Courtney, op. cit. 643–650.

<sup>4</sup> A single instance may be cited. On p. 206 Courtney states that „the ‘u’-sounds of [4,]31 mirror belching”: *purpureus magni ructarit scurra Palati*. The point might however be made that there are more „u”-sounds in the antecedent line but two, where Courtney detects no acoustic effect. Here all six words evince at least one „u”: *qualis tunc epulas ipsum glutisse putamus*.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. S.M. Braund, Juvenal: Satires, Book I. Cambridge 1996, 232.

*quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris  
et quos praecipue fugiam, properabo fateri,  
nec pudor opstabit. non possum ferre, Quirites,  
Graecam urbem. quamvis quota portio faecis Achaei?* (3,58–61)

Here Courtney does not identify any auditive impact whatsoever. Ferguson merely notes how the terminal *Achaei* „echoes rhythmically” the foregoing *Quirites*, to which it stands in antithesis<sup>6</sup>. Braund draws attention to the „brief sentences” in lines 60–61 (*non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem. quamvis quota portio faecis Achaei?*) and to the „unusual prosody” in line 59 (*properabo*)<sup>7</sup>. Both she and Courtney record that the collocation *properabo fateri* has been taken from Statius’ *Thebaid* (2,342–343: *tua me, properabo fateri, / angit, amate, salus*)<sup>8</sup>. In connection with Juvenal’s employment of these two words Braund merely makes the laconic comment: „epic”. It would however appear possible to show that Juvenal has utilized this „epic” phrase for a purpose that is highly „unepic”.

Rhetoricians prescribe the avoidance of *eiusdem litterae nimia adsiduitas*<sup>9</sup>. When such a phenomenon does occur, it can accordingly be assumed to be significant. The mere twenty words of lines 59–61 contain no fewer than four separate instances of initial „p” followed immediately by initial „f”: *praecipue fugiam, properabo fateri...possum ferre...portio faecis*. The reader is alerted by the first of these lines, in which the four words at issue are directly juxtaposed (*praecipue fugiam, properabo fateri*): apart from the two opening monosyllables they fill the entire line<sup>10</sup>. In the next two lines *possum ferre* and *portio faecis* occupy exactly the same *sedes*<sup>11</sup>: while *possum* and *portio* are metrical equivalents that each take

<sup>6</sup> J. Ferguson, Juvenal: The Satires. London 1979, repr. 1999, 140. He also includes in this „rhythmical echo” the *Orontes* of the ensuing line (3,62: *iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes*). In this connection reference may also be made to the somewhat implausible view of G. Viansino, Decimo Giunio Giovenale: Satire. Milan 1990, 136, who maintains that 3,66 (*ite, quibus grata est picta lupa barbara mitra*) „con vocali e labiali tende a riprodurre l’idioma straniero”.

<sup>7</sup> Braund, op. cit. 28; 30.

<sup>8</sup> Braund, op. cit. 184; Courtney, op. cit. 164.

<sup>9</sup> So Rhet. Her. 4,12,18. Cf. also Martianus Capella 5,514: *compositionis...vitium maximum est ...non vitare...cuiuslibet litterae assiduitatem in odium repetitam*.

<sup>10</sup> A number of other factors combine to invest this string with particular prominence. In the first place both words beginning with „p” are quadrisyllables, while the two „f”-words are both trisyllables. Secondly each word that starts with a „p” also contains a second instance of the same letter: *praecipue / properabo*. Finally the preceding line that introduces this section (3,58: *quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris*) serves as an effective foil, since it by contrast includes no „f” at all and only one highly inconspicuous „p” hidden away in the middle of a quinesyllable (*acceptissima*), in whose Romance derivative this letter disappears altogether: *accetto* (cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 1 col. 319,82–83; s.v. *acceptus*).

<sup>11</sup> Particular importance attaches to the phrase *possum ferre*, which introduces a key point; cf.

up the whole of the fourth foot<sup>12</sup>, both *ferre* and *faecis* are trochaic disyllables that open the fifth. In all three lines the fourth foot accordingly contains a word that begins with „p”<sup>13</sup>. The bilabial plosive „p” in initial position is a highly effective way of expressing both scorn and agitation<sup>14</sup>. The fricative „f” on the other hand was felt to be unusually cacophonous: *illa* (sc. *littera*) *quae est sexta nostrarum, paene non humana voce vel omnino non voce potius inter discrimina dentium efflanda est*<sup>15</sup>. In the present passage the repeated use of such an ugly letter at the beginning of a word powerfully reinforces the impression of scornful agitation generated by the foregoing „p”s. These acoustic means accordingly give very forceful expression to Juvenal’s scorn for Greeks. Since moreover Courtney and Braund note that Juvenal has taken his opening *properabo fateri* straight from the *Thebaid*, he would also appear to be expressing his scorn for Statius.

The second passage in which it would seem possible to show that Juvenal is making use of auditive effects in order to underline his meaning occurs later in the same satire. Here he is describing the congestion in the streets of Rome:

235 *plurimus hic aeger moritur vigilando (sed ipsum  
languorem peperit cibus imperfectus et haerens  
ardenti stomacho); nam quae meritoria somnum  
admittunt? magnis opibus dormitur in urbe.  
inde caput morbi. raedarum transitus arto  
vicorum in flexu et stantis convicia mandrae  
eripient somnum Druso vitulisque marinis.  
si vocat officium, turba cedente vehetur*  
240 *dives et ingenti curret super ora Liburna  
atque obiter leget aut scribet vel dormiet intus;*

---

Braund, op. cit. 184 (ad loc.: „language denoting inability to endure...is characteristic of the angry man”; in this connection she refers to her discussion of „indignation” on p. 17: „... Juvenal’s choice of an angry voice for his early Satires...”). This sentence has also received a recent and substantial treatment from C. Schmitz, *Das Satirische in Juvenals Satiren*. Berlin–New York 2000 (Untersuch. z. antik. Lit. u. Gesch. 58), 108–109.

<sup>12</sup> These two words are accordingly emphasized by a bucolic bridge and a bucolic diaeresis respectively.

<sup>13</sup> Moreover just as *praecipue* had occurred in the first half of the first line, so the first half of the second line is marked by two further „p”s, the first of which also occupies the initial position in the word: *pudor opstabit*. For the „p” in the second word cf. Quintilian, Inst. 1,7,7: *cum dico „optinuit” (secundam enim b litteram ratio poscit, aures magis audiunt p)*.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. (e.g.) L.P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry*. Cambridge 1970, 54–55. The same author notes (p. 68–69) that agitation is also indicated by dactyls. It may therefore be observed that the first of these lines (3,59) evinces a strongly dactylic rhythm: *et quos praecipue fugiam, properabo fateri*. Again a fine contrast is provided by the previous line with its sedate spondees (3,58: *quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris*).

<sup>15</sup> So Juvenal’s contemporary Quintilian (Inst. 12,10,29). Cf. also Cicero, Orat. 163: *insuavissima littera*.

*namque facit somnum clausa lectica fenestra.  
ante tamen veniet: nobis properantibus obstat  
unda prior, magno populus premit agmine lumbos  
qui sequitur; ferit hic cubito, ferit assere duro  
alter, at hic tignum capiti incutit, ille metretam.* (3,232–246)

On the whole of this passage Courtney says nothing whatever about acoustic effects<sup>16</sup>. However the brief parenthesis that begins in the very first line would seem to merit attention in this regard. Here *imperfectus* is used in the sense of „undigested” in conjunction with *cibus* (l. 233). Both Duff and Ferguson merely remark that this meaning of the term is „unusual”<sup>17</sup>. Neither records that the word also generates a rather unusual scansion: employment of the epitrite polysyllable *imperfectus* entails that the fourth foot of this verse lacks a caesura<sup>18</sup>. It would seem that the use of such a long and heavy word in such a position is intended to reflect the notion of „undigestedness”. Duff’s somewhat bewildered note continues: „*concoctus* or *confectus* are the usual words for ‘digested’ ”. He fails however to observe that *concoctus* is altogether unattested with the prefix *in-*, while *inconfectus* does not occur before the fifth century, when it is applied only to wool and soil<sup>19</sup>. Since therefore neither *inconcoctus* nor *inconfectus* was available to Juvenal, he could only achieve the desired aural effect by using *imperfectus*, which had already been employed by Celsus to mean „undigested” (4,23,1). A similar effect would appear to have been sought by Juvenal at 1,121–122, where he is describing how a man and wife scrounge several handouts: *sequiturque maritum / languida vel praegnas et circumducitur uxor*. Here *circumducitur*, which occupies the same *sedes* as *imperfectus*, again precludes a fourth-foot caesura. Juvenal’s purpose in employing such a quinesyllable at this point in the line is evidently to give acoustic expression to the long and laborious trapse for multiple doles. Again Courtney fails to register the auditory effect<sup>20</sup>.

Three lines later Juvenal evokes a traffic jam: *raedarum*<sup>21</sup> *transitus arto / vicorum in flexu et stantis convicia mandrae* (3,236–237). The emphatic position of

<sup>16</sup> Courtney, op. cit. 185–187. Nothing is added by Braund, op. cit. 215–217.

<sup>17</sup> J.D. Duff, D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae XIV. Cambridge 1970, 155; Ferguson, op. cit. 152.

<sup>18</sup> The length and weight of the word are highlighted by the antecedent pyrrhic *cibus* and by the succeeding *ā*.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 7,1 col. 1003,20–21 (s.v. *inconfectus*).

<sup>20</sup> Courtney, op. cit. 110. Braund’s recent commentary likewise says nothing about the word (op. cit. 102).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. E. Saglio, Rheda, Reda ou Raeda. in: C. Daremberg and E. Saglio (edd.), Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines 4,2 (1909) 862: „C’était un char à quatre roues, fortement construit et capable de porter de nombreux voyageurs et une charge considérable... Le nombre des bêtes de trait variait... Il pouvait y en avoir vingt et plus...; deux ou quatre, attelés par paire ..., suffisaient ordinairement”.

*arto* at the end of the line effectively signals the start of the theme of congestion. The next three enjambed words evince a twofold hyperbaton that is especially *serré*: such bunched-up syntax cleverly reflects a bottleneck<sup>22</sup>. The effect is all the more pronounced, since these are the first hyperbata to occur in this section, if one excludes the unobtrusive *plurimus hic aeger* five lines earlier, which is in any case merely an instance of Wackernagel's law. Besides these syntactic means the impression of a traffic snarl-up is also conveyed acoustically by the two successive cases of synaloepha in the same four words: *vicorum in flexu et*. The first of these pairs (*vicorum in*) exhibits the particularly clumsy form of elision known as *ecthlipsis*, which is defined by the grammarian Diomedes as follows: *ecthlipsis est conlisio quaedam difficilis ac dura consonantium cum vocalibus aspere concurrentium, ut est „multum ille... ”* (Gramm. I 442,25–27). In the second pair (*flexu ā*) the elision is again especially cumbersome, since this time both vowels are long and the first is a „u”<sup>23</sup>. The ungainliness of both these synaloephae is further accentuated by three other factors. In the first place they occur respectively at the beginning of the second and third foot<sup>24</sup>. Secondly monosyllables are involved on each occasion. Finally the next elision is as many as four lines away, while no fewer than seven lines preceding the one currently under consideration are entirely free of this phenomenon<sup>25</sup>. The metrical and syntactic congestion of this four-word sequence accordingly mirrors Rome's congested traffic admirably.

This section of the third satire would appear to contain one further instance of the use of acoustic effects: it occurs in the very last line. Here an impressive *distributio*<sup>26</sup> vividly depicts the crush of pedestrians in the streets of Rome: *ferit hic cubito, ferit assere duro / alter, at hic tignum capiti incutit, ille metretam* (3,245–246). On the third of these clauses Ferguson merely offers the following comment: „at: ‘worse still’; it is used to add a climactic horror”<sup>27</sup>. The point should also have been made that this „climactic horror” has been skilfully highlighted by the

<sup>22</sup> It is also a strong argument against the reading *inflexu* (found in [e.g.] R. Marache, Juvénal: Satura III, IV, V. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Paris 1977, 79), which reduces the number of hyperbata to one.

<sup>23</sup> On the undesirability of the clash of long vowels cf. Fortunatianus, Rhet. 3,11: *ne* (sc. *structura*) *hiulca sit vocalium et maxime longarum crebra concursione*. For the particular cacophony of „u” in such cases cf. Quintilian, Inst. 9,4,33: *praecipuus tamen erit hiatus earum* (sc. *vocalium*), *quae cavo...maxime ore efferuntur*. On the applicability of both these statements to synaloepha cf. H. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Stuttgart 1990, 477.

<sup>24</sup> For the particular awkwardness of elision in the latter position when a spondaic word (*flexu*) is at issue cf. E. Norden, P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Stuttgart–Leipzig 1995, 454.

<sup>25</sup> Moreover in these two nearest cases of synaloepha (viz. 229 *unde epulum*; 241 *atque obiter*) all the syllables in question are by contrast inoffensively short; cf. Quintilian, Inst. 9,4,34: *minima est in duabus brevibus offensio*.

<sup>26</sup> For the rhetorical figure cf. Lausberg, op. cit. 340–341.

<sup>27</sup> Ferguson, op. cit. 152.

synaloepha which rounds off the clause: *capiti incutit*. Here elision of „i” gives cleverly aural expression to the impact described. Again care has been taken to achieve maximum cogency. The most cacophonous kind of synaloepha is generated when each of the vowels is long and when each consists of the same letter<sup>28</sup>: such is the case in the present passage<sup>29</sup>. Moreover the synaloepha occurs between the third and fourth feet: elision of a long vowel in this position is relatively infrequent<sup>30</sup>. Once again the present synaloepha is set off by the complete absence of this feature from the previous four lines and from the succeeding eight<sup>31</sup>. The acoustically „Keystone Cop” effect of the present text is highly appropriate to the tone of „mock-epic battle” which Braund detects in this passage<sup>32</sup>; it should have been spotted by commentators.

A final passage of the third satire would seem to merit examination; here however the stylistic effect which Juvenal achieves is not acoustic. The subject is the poor man’s hesitation to have sex with prostitutes, whom he considers too expensive. The text reads:

135                    *alter enim quantum in legione tribuni*  
                       *accipiunt donat Calvinae vel Catienae,*  
                       *ut semel aut iterum super illam palpitet; at tu,*  
                       *cum tibi vestiti facies scorti placet, haeres*  
                       *et dubitas alta Chionen deducere sella.*  
                       *da testem Romae tam sanctum quam fuit hospes*  
                       *numinis Idaei, procedat vel Numa vel qui*  
                       *servavit trepidam flagranti ex aede Minervam.* (3,132–139)

In this passage scholars merely register the traditional pun on *Numa* and *numen* in the penultimate line<sup>33</sup>. It would however appear possible to show that this section of the third satire contains a far wittier and more striking example of word-play.

After all the sexual activity of the foregoing lines (132–136: *alter enim...*

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Quintilian, Inst. 9,4,33: *pessime longae, quae easdem inter se litteras committunt, sonabunt*.

<sup>29</sup> This particular type of clash is especially obtrusive when it takes place between the penultimate and final words of the clause, as it does here; cf. Martianus Capella 5,516.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. G. Eskuche, Juvenals Versbau. in: L. Friedlaender, D. Junii Juvenalis Saturarum libri V. Leipzig 1895, repr. Amsterdam 1962, 64. In the present passage the effect would seem to be further heightened by the bucolic diaeresis and by the lack of a caesura in the fourth foot.

<sup>31</sup> Again the two closest instances of elision at issue involve unobtrusively short vowels (241 *atque obiter*; 255 *veniente abies*). In this connection it may also be observed that *capiti* recurs six lines later (3,252), where it is again used in conjunction with the prefix *in-*. However this time synaloepha is significantly avoided: *inpositas capiti*.

<sup>32</sup> S.H. Braund, City and Country in Roman Satire. in: *ead.* (ed.), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter 1989 (Exeter Stud. in Hist. 23), 34–35 with n. 24.

<sup>33</sup> So (e.g.) Ferguson, op. cit. 146; Viansino, op. cit. 140. For the link between *Numa* and *numen* cf. R. Maltby, A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies. Leeds 1991 (ARCA 25), 416.

*Chionen deducere sella*), the sudden mention of a „witness” at the beginning of the next one (137: *da testem*) is highly surprising. Here it would seem pertinent to compare Cicero’s discussion of this word *testis* in a famous letter on obscene double entendre (Fam. 9,22,4): „*testes*” *verbum honestissimum in iudicio, alio loco non nimis*. At the start of a sentence following a passage devoted to sex it is natural to assume that *testis* is not being used *in iudicio*, but *alio loco*, where it is accordingly a *verbum non nimis honestum* with the sense of „testicle”. Such word-play on the two meanings of *testis* is not uncommon<sup>34</sup>. It would seem therefore that Juvenal is employing a similar equivocation here. The first sentence of this passage ends with a description of successful coitus: *palpitet* (134)<sup>35</sup>. The next sentence, which immediately precedes the mention of *testis*, ends with a shameful failure to achieve coitus: *dubitas alta Chionen deducere sella* (136). The natural sequel to such ignominiously unachieved coitus is the wish for a sexual organ able to accomplish the task: *da testem*. In his choice of such diction Juvenal would moreover appear to have been influenced by both of his immediate predecessors in the writing of satire. Persius had expressed a similar wish in similar language: *haec fierent si testiculi vena ulla paterni / viveret in nobis?* (1,103–104). Here the scholiast glosses *testiculus* as *virilitas*. The wish for old-fashioned „virility” accordingly marks the texts of both satirists. At the same time the influence of Horace would also seem to be discernible in Juvenal’s particular wording. Commentators agree that in this passage of the third satire „the contrast between the aristocratic mistresses [132–134] and the city tarts [135–136] is taken from Horace (*S* 1,2,28ff.)”<sup>36</sup>. It is therefore noteworthy that shortly afterwards (Sat. 1,2,45) Horace speaks of *testēs caudamque salacem*.

Here Juvenal has accordingly achieved a clever combination of the rhetorical figures of *ambiguum* and *cacemphaton*<sup>37</sup>; since both are „funny”<sup>38</sup>, they are admirably suited to satire. Since moreover the point at issue in this sentence is the integrity of Scipio Nasica (*tam sanctum quam fuit hospes / numinis Idaei*), the em-

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict. 1932 (s.v. *testis*<sup>2</sup>; *sub fin.*); also ib. 530 (s.v. *detestatio*<sup>2</sup>), 951 (ss.vv. *intestabilis* 1 *sub fin.*; *intestatus* 1a).

<sup>35</sup> On this word *N. Rudd* and *E. Courtney*, *Juvenal: Satires I, III, X*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Bristol 1982, repr. 1996, 59 comment: „*palpitet*: shudder, i.e. ejaculate”. On the other hand *Braund*, op. cit. (n. 5) 197 thinks that here the term denotes „the rhythmic movement of the sex act”. Her view would seem to be nearer the truth; cf. the present writer in: *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 10,1 col. 164,63–66 (s.v.).

<sup>36</sup> So *Ferguson*, op. cit. 145; cf. most recently *Braund*, op. cit. (n. 5) 197.

<sup>37</sup> On the former cf. Cicero, *De orat.* 2,253–256; on the latter cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 8,3,44–47 (*in obscenum intellectum sermo detortus*). Neither figure is to be found in Courtney’s index of stylistic features.

<sup>38</sup> Cicero’s treatment of *ambiguum* forms part of his general discussion of *risus*. For the risibility of *cacemphaton* cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 8,3,44 (*ridentibus*). Cicero also observes that *ambigua sunt in primis acuta* (*De orat.* 2,253).

ployment of a smutty double entendre to describe such moral probity is especially amusing. Juvenal's use of *sanctus* in this connection also repays closer attention. It is clear from Quintilian's exemplification of *cacemphaton* that *sanctus* denotes the very opposite of such smut: *ut „ductare exercitus” et „patrare bella” apud Sallustium dicta sancte...ridentibus* (Inst. 8,3,44). Juvenal's application of precisely this epithet to the cacemphatic *testis* is accordingly very witty indeed. Courtney's only stylistic comment on the whole of this section concerns the present line, of which he remarks: „The rhythm of 137 is appropriately solemn”<sup>39</sup>. Courtney fails to perceive that this rhythmical solemnity creates a delicious contrast to the line's very unsolemn smut.

Attention may next be drawn to two passages of the satires in which Juvenal achieves noteworthy stylistic effects through imitation of Virgil<sup>40</sup>. The first occurs in the attack on women in the notorious sixth satire:

*endromidas Tyrias et femineum ceroma*  
*quis nescit, vel quis non vidit vulnera pali,*  
*quem cavat adsiduis rudibus scutoque lacessit*  
*atque omnis implet numeros dignissima prorsus*  
*Floralis matrona tuba?* (6,246–250)

250

Friedlaender detected a Virgilian echo in the *scutoque lacessit* which concludes line 248 of this passage<sup>41</sup>. Here he compared the similar verse-ending at *Aeneid* 7,165: *cursuque ictuque lacessunt*. However Friedlaender failed to identify a reminiscence of Virgil in the striking line which opens this section (246). He also ascribed its spondaic fifth foot (*femineum ceroma*) to mere „Muthwillen”<sup>42</sup>. More perceptively Courtney notes that this σπονδειαίζων is one of only two in Juvenal in which the final trisyllable is preceded by a quadrisyllable<sup>43</sup>. He also observes that this line ends with a Greek word which is „bathetically undignified”<sup>44</sup>. The bathetic contrast between the dignified σπονδειαίζων and the undignified Gre-

<sup>39</sup> Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 174.

<sup>40</sup> Neither of these texts is discussed by I. Gehlen, *De Iuvenale Vergilii imitatore*. Göttingen 1886.

<sup>41</sup> Friedlaender, op. cit. 312.

<sup>42</sup> Friedlaender, op. cit. 71.

<sup>43</sup> Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 50, where the reference he gives for the other one is wrong: instead of „14,239” read „14,329”.

<sup>44</sup> Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 50. On the other hand Ferguson, op. cit. 195 sees „indignation” instead of „bathos” in this line. The evidence to be adduced below would seem to indicate that he is wrong. Most recently H.J. Urech, *Hoher und niederer Stil in den Satiren Juvenals: Untersuchung zur Stilhöhe von Wörtern und Wendungen und inhaltliche Interpretation von Passagen mit auffälligen Stilwechseln*. Bern 1999 (Europ. Hochschulschr. 15,80), 237 merely states: „Die beiden Fremdwörter [viz. *endromidas* and *ceroma*] rahmen den Vers in auffälliger Weise ein; *ceroma* erhält durch Spondeus im fünften Versfuss noch besonderes Gewicht”.



cism is all the more piquant when it is recognized that the word which starts the spondaic fifth foot (*femineum*) is evidently an echo of Virgil. This word is not even mentioned by Courtney.

Virgil describes the reaction to the news of Dido's suicide in the following terms: *lamentis gemituque et femineo ululatu / tecta fremunt* (Aen. 4,667–668). Here *femineo* is invested with particular prominence owing to the onomatopoeic hiatus between it and *ululatu*<sup>45</sup>. This very arresting collocation appealed so strongly to Virgil that he redeploys it at *Aeneid* 9,477, where the reference is to Euryalus' mother: *evolat infelix et femineo ululatu / scissa comam muros amens atque agmina cursu / prima petit*. No other poet employs *femineus* in the same fifth-foot *sedes* in the hexameter besides Juvenal<sup>46</sup>. It would seem therefore that Virgil's acoustically striking employment of *femineus* in the fifth foot has inspired Juvenal's similarly reboant use of the same epithet in the same *sedes*. The connoisseur of Virgil may be supposed to have recognized the allusion.

Here Juvenal is evidently thinking of the line describing the lament for Dido rather than the later one concerning Euryalus' mother. In Juvenal and *Aeneid* IV the verse at issue is entirely occupied by a string of coordinate nouns<sup>47</sup>, while the subject and the following verb are also enjambed on each occasion; neither is the case in the passage of *Aeneid* IX. Juvenal has wittily inverted the tone of this line that he is imitating from *Aeneid* IV: the noun he substitutes to go with the antecedent *femineus* now generates a delectably bathetic *para prosdokian*. While in *Aeneid* IV *femineus* had characterized the lofty threnody for Dido, Juvenal applies it to the lowly *ceroma*. Whereas moreover this epithet is eminently appropriate to *ululatus*<sup>48</sup>, wrestling-mud is decidedly *not* „proper to females”. The Virgilian connoisseur who recognized the allusion will also have relished the parody.

The second passage in which imitation of Virgil produces notable stylistic effects is to be found at the end of Juvenal's description of the sea-storm in the twelfth satire, which is the shortest one of all. As the ship heads back to land, the sighting of Mount Alba is described in the following terms:

70

*tum gratus Iulo  
atque novercali sedes praelata Lavino  
conspicitur sublimis apex, cui candida nomen  
scrofa dedit, laetis Phrygibus mirabile sumen.* (12,70–73)

<sup>45</sup> The unusually ionic shape of this terminal word adds to the salience.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Packard Humanities Institute CD ROM #5.3 (1991).

<sup>47</sup> Each text is accordingly marked by a rhetorical figure which would seem to go beyond mere *homoeoptoton* to approach *schesis onomaton* (cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 9,2 col. 641,20–40; s.v. 2. [*onoma*]) or even *hirmos* (cf. ibid. 6,3 col. 2822,73 – 2823,12; s.v.).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Servius ad loc.: „*femineo ululatu*”: *proprio feminarum*.

Courtney notes that in the first half of this passage (*tum...apex*; 70–72) Juvenal has in mind *Aeneid* 1,267–271<sup>49</sup>. However Courtney fails to discuss Juvenal’s employment of *Iulo* at the end of the first line: *tum gratus Iulo* (12,70). Virgil himself uses this proper noun on no fewer than thirty-five different occasions in the *Aeneid*<sup>50</sup>. It is therefore significant that with only a single exception in the very last book (12,185) Virgil invariably places this name in the final position in the line<sup>51</sup>. Juvenal’s use of the same appellation in exactly the same *sedes* here is evidently meant as a parody of the Virgilian practice.

If Juvenal’s final *Iulo* reflects a peculiarity of the *Aeneid*’s prosody, the same would appear to be true of the *Lavino* which ends the next line of this satire: *no-vercali sedes praelata Lavino* (12,71). Here Courtney merely observes that „the usual form is *Lavinium*”<sup>52</sup>. Earlier editors of this Juvenalian line accordingly tended to accept Santenius’ emendation of *Lavino* to the synizetic *Lavinio*<sup>53</sup>. However Courtney adds that „*Lavinum* is presupposed by the adjective *Lāvinus*”. This very rare epithet is found in *Aeneid* 1, 2 (*Lavinaque venit / litora*), where some editors again prefer the synizetic *Lavinia*. The occurrence of the heteroclite *Lavina* in the highly conspicuous second line of the entire epic naturally invited parody: Juvenal is evidently indulging in precisely such mockery of this metrical oddity by his use of *Lavino* here.

Juvenal’s burlesque of Virgil’s prosodic idiosyncrasies in the use of *Iulus* and *Lavinus* generates a perfect end-rhyme in these two adjacent lines of the satire: *...Iulo / ...Lavino /* (12,70–71). It is therefore noteworthy that the passage of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* cited at the start of the present article for its deprecation

<sup>49</sup> Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 525. The Virgilian text, which is part of Jupiter’s prophecy to Venus, reads:

*at puer Ascanius, cui nunc cognomen Iulo  
additur (Ilus erat, dum res stetit Ilia regno),  
triginta magnos volvendis mensibus orbis  
imperio explebit, regnumque ab sede Lavini  
transferet, et Longam multa vi muniet Albam.*

270

<sup>50</sup> Viz. 1,267; 1,288; 1,556; 1,690; 1,709; 2,563; 2,674; 2,677; 2,682; 2,710; 2,723; 4,140; 4,274; 4,616; 5,546; 5,569; 5,570; 6,364; 6,789; 7,107; 7,116; 7,478; 7,493; 9,232; 9,293; 9,310; 9,501; 9,640; 9,652; 10,524; 10,534; 11,58; 12,110; 12,185; 12,399.

<sup>51</sup> Though there are five instances in book I alone, R.G. Austin, P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus. Oxford 1971, 103–104 fails to register the phenomenon in his discussion of *Iulo* at 1,267, which is the first occurrence. This feature would seem to be all the more worthy of notice, since it was evidently Virgil who first converted the disyllable *Iullus* into the trisyllabic *Iulus*; cf. F. Buecheler, Zu Horaz od. IV 2. Rhein. Mus. N.F. 44 (1889) 317; T. Mommsen, Iullus und Iulus. Hermes 24 (1889) 156.

<sup>52</sup> Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 525.

<sup>53</sup> L. Santenius and D.J. van Lennep, Terentianus Maurus de litteris, syllabis, pedibus et metris. Utrecht 1825, 429–430.

of *eiusdem litterae nimia adsiduitas* should also condemn precisely such monotonous uniformity of ending<sup>54</sup>. Juvenal's deliberate resort to this stylistic defect here is evidently intended to underline his spoof of Virgil. This impression is confirmed by the next two lines of the satire, where Courtney duly notes that Juvenal is thinking of another passage of the *Aeneid*<sup>55</sup>. Here Juvenal expresses himself as follows: *cui candida nomen / scrofa dedit, laetis Phrygibus mirabile sumen* (12,72–73). In these two lines the homoeoptotic and homoeoteleutic end-rhyme of the antecedent two is repeated: ...*nomen* / ...*sumen*. The monotony has been carefully accentuated: while both *Iulo* and *Lavino* are antibacchiac trisyllables, both *nomen* and *sumen* are trochaic disyllables. Moreover all four nouns are immediately preceded by an adjective: ...*gratus Iulo* / ...*praelata Lavino* / ...*candida nomen* / ...*mirabile sumen*<sup>56</sup>. Courtney remarks that the term *sumen* is „far from dignified”<sup>57</sup>: he ought therefore to have perceived that it forms an aptly tapinotic *para prosdokian* to cap this string of parodically homoeoteleutic line-ends which likewise escapes him<sup>58</sup>.

Two final observations may be made about this passage. Firstly the hyperbaton (*gratus...sedes praelata...sublimis apex*) led Helmbold to athetize line 71: *atque novercali sedes praelata Lavino*<sup>59</sup>. His objections are however answered by Court-

<sup>54</sup> 4,12,18: *compositio...conservabitur...si non utemur continenter similiter cadentibus verbis*. Cf. also Julius Victor, *Rhet.* p. 85,3: *ne homoeoptota, ne homoeoteleuta* (sc. *sint*).

<sup>55</sup> Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 525, referring to Aen. 8,43–48:

*litoreis ingens inventa sub ilicibus sus  
triginta capitum fetus enixa iacebit,  
45 alba solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati.  
[hic locus urbis erit, requies ea certa laborum,]  
ex quo ter denis urbem redeuntibus annis  
Ascanius clari condet cognominis Albam.*

<sup>56</sup> The next example of such metrical homoeoteleuton occurs over forty lines later (12,118–119): it is the unremarkable ...*illi* / ...*etsi* /, where in contradistinction to the present passage only two lines are involved and the two words at issue are also different parts of speech.

<sup>57</sup> Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 525.

<sup>58</sup> Commentators note that Juvenal's *mirabile sumen* echoes Aen. 8,81 (*mirabile monstrum*), where this Virgilian phrase concludes the line. The next verse but one of the *Aeneid* ends very strikingly indeed: *conspicitur sus* (8,83). On the one hand the combination of the choriambic *conspicitur* and the monosyllabic line-end *sus* prevents the normal fifth-foot coincidence of metrical ictus and speech-accent that gives the line a smooth close. On the other these words constitute a notorious instance of ambiguity, since they can instead be read as *conspicit ursus* (cf. Donatus, *Mai.* 1,5 p. 611,5–6). It would not therefore be surprising if the highly prominent *conspicitur*, which occurs nowhere else in the entirety of Virgil's *oeuvre*, had prompted Juvenal's own *conspicitur* (12,72), which he employs immediately after *Lavino*: numerous synonyms were available (cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 4 col. 498,6–7; s.v. *conspicio*).

<sup>59</sup> W.C. Helmbold, Juvenal's Twelfth Satire. *Classical Philology* 51 (1956) 17–18; 20–21.

ney<sup>60</sup>. More serious is the comment which accompanies Helmbold's athetization: „We must dispense with line 71, in any case no great loss”<sup>61</sup>. The arguments set out above would appear to have shown that the deletion of this verse would on the contrary be a very great loss, since it would destroy Juvenal's cleverly homoeoteleutic parody. The second observation brings us back to the beginning of the present article. There it was argued that Juvenal had employed stylistic effects in order to make fun of Statius. Here he would seem to be using similar effects to poke similar fun at Virgil.

It will be appropriate to conclude this article with the sentence that contains Juvenal's „most familiar epigram”<sup>62</sup>. At the close of his celebrated tenth satire on the vanity of human wishes Juvenal offers the following advice on sensible prayer:

355                    *ut tamen et poscas aliquid voveasque sacellis*  
                       *exta et candiduli divina tomacula porci,*  
                       *orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano.* (10,354–356)

Courtney observes that the humble diminutives *candiduli* and *tomacula* (l. 355) are „ironical”<sup>63</sup>. Courtney might also have „noted the effect” of the word which depends on one of these diminutives and agrees with the other: *candiduli...tomacula porci*. In order to assess the stylistic effect of *porci* it would seem pertinent to adduce the evidence of Juvenal's contemporary Quintilian: *quaedam non tam ratione quam sensu iudicantur, ut illud „caesa iungebant foedera porca”* (Virgil, Aen. 8,641) *fecit elegans fictio nominis, quod si fuisset „porco”, vile erat* (Inst. 8,3,19). Macleane's note on this Juvenalian line compares a text of Horace (Carm. 3,23,3–4), which likewise employs *porca*: *si...placaris... / ...Lares avida...porca*<sup>64</sup>. The *vilitas* entailed by Juvenal's use of *porci* tallies perfectly with the „höchst alltägliche”<sup>65</sup> *tomacula* on which this genitive depends and which immediately precedes it. The same *vilitas* of *porci* at the end of this line also forms a highly piquant counterpoint to the „solemn spondaic line”<sup>66</sup> that follows directly (356): *orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano*.

<sup>60</sup> Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 525.

<sup>61</sup> Helmbold, art. cit. 21.

<sup>62</sup> So Ferguson, op. cit. 275 on *mens sana in corpore sano* (10,356). Cf. also N. Rudd and W. Barr, Juvenal: The Satires. Oxford 1991, 212: „There can be few more famous phrases in Latin literature”.

<sup>63</sup> Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 486. Cf. also Rudd and Courtney, op. cit. (on l. 355): „Note the effect of the diminutives”.

<sup>64</sup> A.J. Macleane, Decii Junii Juvenalis et A. Persii Flacci Satirae. 2nd ed. London 1867, 257: „*Sacellis* means the chapel every man had in his house, in which were images of the Lares, to whom the offering of a pig was common (Hor. C. iii. 23. 4)”. Macleane says nothing about the stylistic register of *porci*. Metrical convenience is not at issue in either Horace or Juvenal.

<sup>65</sup> So Urech, op. cit. 163.

<sup>66</sup> So Courtney, op. cit. (n. 2) 486.