

## JUVENAL, THE *PHAEDRUS*, AND THE TRUTH ABOUT ROME\*

### I

In Juvenal's third satire the main speaker, Umbricius, delivers a speech of farewell (a *syntacticon*) as he prepares to leave Rome.<sup>1</sup> In it, he mounts a sustained attack on life in the capital. By contrast, he praises Italian country towns, a combination of *laudatio* and *vituperatio* which is foreshadowed in the prefatory praise of provincial Cumae (2–5) and denigration of Rome (5–9).<sup>2</sup>

In attacking Rome, the satirist himself announces that he prefers (*praepono*, 5) the island of Prochyta to the Subura district in Rome; but *credas* (7) hints at the intrinsic incredibility of exaggerated claims that the horrors of Rome are worse than even the most *solum* and *miserum* place in the world.<sup>3</sup> Of course, exaggeration (*amplificatio*) of virtues and vices was a conventional feature of rhetorical *vituperatio* and *laudatio*.<sup>4</sup> But credibility remained central to the business of persuading audiences that, despite the conventions of *amplificatio*, what they were hearing was the truth.<sup>5</sup> In the third satire, however, credibility seems to be strained from the outset.

Umbricius' treatment of Greek immigrants' skill in dissimulation and of the credence (*creditur*, 93) accorded to it, whether flattering (86, 166) or malicious (122–3), derives from the rhetorical tradition and underlines its relevance to Juvenal's purposes. Central to these technical matters was the plausible representation of fiction, and verisimilitude;<sup>6</sup> and this too features in the third satire. Umbricius' speech is set in artificial caves in the *vallis Egeriae* which do not convey verisimilitude: *speluncas/ dissimiles veris* (17–18, where, given the well-established interplay between realism in art and poetry, it might reasonably be suspected that the choice of location is making a programmatic point about literary verisimilitude).<sup>7</sup> If this is correct (and further

\* I am indebted to Professor Susanna Morton Braund, Dr Malcolm Heath and to the CQ editor and anonymous referees for extensive advice on succeeding drafts of this paper. Section VI was read in a different form to a meeting of the Classical Association of South Africa in January 1997: I am grateful to those present for lively discussion and helpful comment.

<sup>1</sup> For analysis of Umbricius' speech as a rhetorical *syntacticon*, F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972), pp. 47–8.

<sup>2</sup> Praise of Italian towns: 171ff., 190ff., 223ff. On the relationship between preamble and Umbricius' speech, see S. C. Fredericks, 'The function of the prologue (1–20) in the organisation of Juvenal's Third Satire', *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 62–7. Contrasting *laudatio* and *vituperatio* are also prominent in the fourth satire: A. Hardie, 'Juvenal, Domitian and the accession of Hadrian' (forthcoming in *BICS*).

<sup>3</sup> S. C. Fredericks, 'Irony of overstatement in the Satires of Juvenal', *ICS* 4 (1979), 178–91, at 184.

<sup>4</sup> For *amplificatio* in Juvenal, I. G. Scott, *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal* (Northampton, MA, 1927), pp. 37–43.

<sup>5</sup> Plat. *Symp.* 198d–e; Arist. *Rhet.* 1368a; Isocr. *Busiris* 4; Cic. *Brut.* 47. A. W. Nightingale, 'The folly of praise: Plato's critique of encomiastic discourse in the *Lysias* and *Symposium*', *CQ* 43 (1993), 112–30. In general, T. P. Wiseman, 'Lying historians: seven types of mendacity', in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman (edd.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter, 1993), pp. 126–8.

<sup>6</sup> On these issues, see R. Meijering, *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in the Greek Scholia* (Groningen, 1987); also D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 12–33, and Gill and Wiseman (n. 5), in particular the chapter by J. R. Morgan, 'Make-believe and make believe: the fictionality of the Greek Novels', pp. 175–229, at 176–93.

<sup>7</sup> G. Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and its Audience* (London, 1987), pp.

linkages between topography and subject matter will be considered later), then the dramatic setting, and the prefatory denigration of it, would lead the reader straight into the critical issues of plausibility and implausibility, truth and untruth.

Articulation of the truth was among the primary tasks of the Roman satirist; and issues to do with truth are correspondingly prominent in Juvenal's first book.<sup>8</sup> But his approach to these matters is far from straightforward. In a central contribution to the understanding of the *persona* of the satirist, Anderson demonstrated more than thirty years ago that he does not measure up to his claims to truthfulness.<sup>9</sup> His *indignatio* is a façade, behind which lies distortion and untruth. Anderson's findings have been developed by other scholars, in particular by Winkler and Morton Braund; and while it would be wrong to suppose that Juvenal nowhere makes any authentic statements about his own person or life, it is now quite clear that the character 'Juvenal' is a literary construct quite separate from the poet himself. In what follows, I shall assume that the preambular scene-setting to the third satire is spoken by this dramatic character.

Umbricius too, as primary satirical speaker in the third satire, has been shown to be a flawed character; and while Umbricius' relationship to 'Juvenal' remains elusive, there can be little doubt that Juvenal intended both characters to appear as imperfect witnesses to the scenes, events, and issues which they describe and address.<sup>10</sup> At what level, then, are Juvenal's readers to engage with 'truth'? How are they to assess the truth value of Umbricius' rhetoric? And in what sense, if any, is the satirist conveying insights of lasting value about the city of Rome?

The approach adopted in this paper will proceed from a new analysis of the satire's topography and its impact on the speaker. Integral to this will be sustained comparison with a literary antecedent which also has to do with rhetoric and truth, Plato's *Phaedrus*. I hope then to show that, through the medium of intertextual reference and other allusive devices, Umbricius' speech actually says rather more than the character himself will have intended, and that the well-springs of his language are likely to include the inspirational influence of the very place in which he is speaking. The overall aim will be to demonstrate the need for reassessment of Juvenal's treatment of contemporary civic issues in the third satire, and to point to the critical role of the reader in drawing from the text his or her own conclusions about these complex matters.

42–50. Meijering (n. 6), pp. 37–9. For an important analogue of art/fiction in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, Morgan (n. 6), p. 218. For artificial caves and the antithesis between *natura* and *ars*, H. Lavagne, *Operosa Antra*, *BEFAR* 262 (Rome, 1988), esp. 19–22. Fredericks (n. 2), p. 63 comments on the programmatic significance of some physical features of the *vallis*.

<sup>8</sup> Hor. *Serm.* 1.1.24–5: *quamquam ridentem dicere verumquid vetat?* J. C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 153–4. In satires 2 and 4: cf. 2.3, 15–6, 64–5, 153; on 4.35 (*res vera agitur*), D. Sweet, 'Juvenal's *Satire* 4: poetic uses of indirection', *CSCA* 12 (1979), 283–303, at 298.

<sup>9</sup> W. S. Anderson, 'Anger in Juvenal and Seneca', *CSCP* 19 (1964), 127–96 (= *Essays on Roman Satire* [Princeton, NJ, 1982], pp. 293–361, at pp. 301–5), noting Juvenal's juxtaposition of claims to truth and distortions of that truth; and the need to 'distinguish between the satirist's "truth" and truth itself' (305).

<sup>10</sup> R. A. LaFleur, 'Umbricius and Juvenal Three', *Ziva Antika* 26 (1976), 383–431 remains essential reading, together with id., 'Amicitia and the unity of Juvenal's first book', *ICS* 4 (1979), 158–77, at 161–4. From a large bibliography on Umbricius, see M. M. Winkler, *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal* (Hildesheim, 1983), pp. 220–3; B. Frueland Jensen, 'Martyred and beleaguered virtue: Juvenal's portrait of Umbricius', *CM* 37 (1986), 185–97; and S. Morton Braund, *Juvenal Satires Book I* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 233–5.

II

A two-part preamble (1–20) first (1–9) adumbrates a dramatic situation involving an old friend's emigration to Cumae, and then (10–20) sketches the departure scene, at the Porta Capena and in the *vallis Egeriae*. Together with Umbricius' envoi (315–22), the preamble provides the satire with its dramatic context, as regards occasion, location, and the relationship between its two characters; but it is a problematic passage and it presents some unresolved difficulties of both text and interpretation that must briefly be readdressed by way of introduction to the central issues.

'Juvenal' recalls Umbricius' departure from a narrative vantage point lying at some unspecified interval after the events being described (at what might be termed the putative time of writing).<sup>11</sup> He leads off with a reference to his own distress (*confusus*, 1) and proceeds to make a series of personal comments about Cumae, Rome, and the *vallis Egeriae*. It is by no means obvious to what extent these comments might form part of the drama, in the sense of representing what 'Juvenal' said and felt at the time. Plainly, it would be hard to read the critical description of the *vallis* as anything other than reflective comment articulated at the time of writing, for the benefit of the reader. On the other hand, the opening expressions of praise and affection might plausibly be read as representing what 'Juvenal' said to Umbricius, by way of farewell; and that is how they were taken by Jacoby.<sup>12</sup> *confusus* may naturally be referred to 'Juvenal's' emotional state at the moment of parting, while the main verb, *laudo*, may be taken as a vivid narrative present, introducing the terms in which 'Juvenal' praised the proposed destination (and not as praise articulated at the time of writing). Praise of intentions (*destinet*) should logically take place at a point in time before those intentions had been translated into reality; and the subjunctive, indicating virtual indirect speech (and thus the gist of what 'Juvenal' has actually said), helps to confirm this.<sup>13</sup> There is therefore much to be said for the view that the opening lines reflect the conventions of literary departure scenes, and that they should be read as (a summary of) a speech of farewell, that is, as a *propempticon*.<sup>14</sup> The combination of affectionate friendship (*amici*, 1) and praise (*laudo*, 2) is typical of the rhetorical *propempticon*;<sup>15</sup> and a well-known parallel passage at Pliny, *Panegyricus* 86.3 (where there is plainly a reference to the *propempticon*) lends further support: *quam ego confusionem tuam fuisse cum digredientem prosequeris!* How far into the preamble 'Juvenal's' *propempticon* might extend is less clear. Lines 4–9 could be read as later 'authorial comment'; but they can equally, or better, represent a shift from narrative *propempticon* to direct citation, in which case *ianua Baiarum est . . . recitantes mense poetas* would be 'Juvenal's' actual words, and might be placed within quotation marks.

Jacoby suggested that 'Juvenal' accompanied Umbricius from his residence to the Porta Capena, and that his comments will have been made in the course of the walk, prompted in part by the streets through which the two men were passing.<sup>16</sup> This

<sup>11</sup> The narrative time perspective, perhaps self-evident, is reflected in *hic tunc* (21, introducing Umbricius' speech).

<sup>12</sup> F. Jacoby, 'Zwei Doppelfassungen im Juvenaltexst', *Hermes* 87 (1959), 449–62, at 453.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Morton Braund (n. 10) on 1–3; for *laudo quod*, Kühner-Stegmann 2.276–7, including examples of the attraction of the subordinate verb into the subjunctive; the latter represent the terms in which the praise was articulated.

<sup>14</sup> Thus Cairns (n. 1), p. 165; cf. Morton Braund (n. 10) on 1–3.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Men. Rhet. III.395.5ff.Sp.: . . . τῶν λοιπῶν μερῶν δεχομένων καὶ ἐγκώμια καὶ λόγους ἐρωτικούς.

<sup>16</sup> Jacoby (n. 12), p. 453; anticipated in his analysis of the movements by Munro (*ap. Mayor* on 10–20).

attractive but neglected view gains support from the movements referred to in the second half of the preamble. Our understanding of this complex passage has been advanced by Nisbet's revival of Jahn's transposition of 12–16 to follow 20.<sup>17</sup> Nisbet further suggested that the problematic line 11, *substitit ad veteres arcus madidamque Capenam*, should be taken in parenthesis, with *raeda* as its subject. But easier syntax and greater dramatic coherence is achieved if *domus* (10) is taken as subject of (parenthetical) *substitit*, in the sense 'household' (rather than 'furniture', or the like, as in most recent commentaries). *domus* recurs in this meaning at 261–3, where *componit* may echo *componitur* (10); and earlier parallels for *tota domus* which focus ironically on small households provide the right kind of sense for our context.<sup>18</sup> With this modification, then, Nisbet's reading (itself adopted in order to remove illogicalities and topographical anomalies from the transmitted text) points the way to a sounder understanding of the overall dynamics of the departure scenario: Umbricius and his *domus* will have been accompanied by 'Juvenal' to the Porta Capena, where the *domus* will have halted (*substitit*, 11) and will have been embarked on the *raeda*. 'Juvenal's' *propempticon*, spoken during the walk, will have preceded Umbricius' *syntacticon*, and will thus have formed part of the context in which the latter was delivered.<sup>19</sup>

What is envisaged here is a series of movements by the two protagonists, in the course of which they converse and exchange farewells. As a form of discourse, this has literary antecedents in peripatetic philosophical dialogues in which the participants variously walk and sit while conversing.<sup>20</sup> At the end of the satire, Umbricius' break-off and reference to the *mulio* signalling departure is paralleled by a similar dramatic device in Cicero's *Academica* (set in Cumae); and additional verbal parallels suggest the possibility of direct indebtedness.<sup>21</sup> Juvenal's choice of an authentic location, enlivened by reference to local landmarks, also finds parallels in literary dialogue. An important Latin example is Cicero's *de Legibus*, set in Arpinum, in a grove (1.1) and then by the river Liris (2.1): the participants walk and sit while talking (1.15, 2.1); and Atticus admires the natural beauty of the environment, which he contrasts with man-made artifice such as *pavimenta marmorea* and aqueducts (2.2). His comments have points in common with Juvenal's preamble, including the Aqua Marcia aqueduct (11) and the marble surround in the *vallis Egeriae* (20); and the fact

<sup>17</sup> R. G. M. Nisbet, 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Juvenal', in *Vir bonus discendi peritus* (BICS Suppl. 51 [1988]), 86–110, at 92–3; supported, with modifications, by T. E. V. Pearce, 'Juvenal 3.10–20', *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992), 380–3, and by Morton Braund (n. 10) on 10–20.

<sup>18</sup> Cic. *Ver.* 1.94; *Ov. Fast.* 4.543–4; *Met.* 8.636. Nineteenth-century commentators generally took the word in this sense. *Pace* Courtney (on 10), line 286 suggests only that Umbricius was not accompanied by slaves in the street, not that he had no slaves at all. For *compono* with personal or animate objects, *TLL* s.v., I C1a. Pearce (n. 17), pp. 381–2, sets out some cogent objections to taking *raeda* as subject of *substitit*.

<sup>19</sup> For examples of the combination of *propempticon* and *syntacticon*, see I. M. le M. Du Quesnay, 'Vergil's First Eclogue', *PLLS* 3 (1981), 29–182, at 63 (the first eclogue itself directly influenced the third satire: Morton Braund [n. 10], 235–6).

<sup>20</sup> Dramatic satire/dialogue: LaFleur (n. 10 [1976]), p. 393; cf. Sweet (n. 8), pp. 283–4 on satire 4 as 'dramatic monologue' with Juvenal speaking as a character. Peripatetic dialogue: cf. Plato *Laws* 625b; *Phaedr.* 228e; Cic. *de Leg.* 1.15. Peripatetic dialogues in prose and satire, S. [Morton] Braund, *Beyond Anger. A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 148, with bibliography.

<sup>21</sup> *Ac.* 2 (*Luc.*) 147. With *veteris* . . . *amici* (1), cf., perhaps, Cic. *Ac.* 1.1 (Cicero of Varro): *hominem* . . . *vetustate amicitiae coniunctum*; compare *ibid.* 148 *Catulus remansit* (i.e. after the other dialogue participants had departed) with *Sat.* 3.29–30: *vivant Artorius istici et Catulus, maneat qui* . . .

that both writers allude to the Numa/Egeria legend (*de Leg.* 1.4, cf. *Sat.* 3.12) suggests direct imitation.

Additionally, 'Juvenal's' *amicitia* with Umbricius and the contrast between the *amoenitas* of his future *secessus* and Rome, operates in the same conceptual territory as *de Legibus* 2.3–4: acknowledging Atticus' praise of the *amoenitas* of Arpinum, Cicero discloses that it is his own *patria*, whereupon Atticus declares himself still friendlier (*amicior*) towards the place, and suggests that he will love it still more in the future (*plus amabo*). Underlying the interlinkage of *amoenitas* and *amicitia* in both passages is their common derivation from *amor*:<sup>22</sup> Cicero signals the etymology in *amabo*; and Juvenal's reference to Egeria as Numa's *amica* underlines the erotic character of their relationship, thereby elegantly, if rather flippantly, alluding to *amor*.<sup>23</sup> These reflections on friendship and love are particularly appropriate in Juvenal's dramatic context, for departure was conventionally associated with strong marks of affection between the traveller and his friends.<sup>24</sup>

The Porta Capena was of course the natural and normal place for farewells to travellers proceeding to the Via Appia; and the excursion to the sacred grove and the caves might plausibly and conventionally be accounted for by the need to find shade from the sun at its zenith (cf. 316: *sol inclinat*). Yet some suggestive antecedents in prose dialogue raise the possibility that Juvenal's scene-setting is motivated by something deeper than a simple desire for realism. The first two books of the *de Legibus* are prefaced by topographical passages that are skilfully related to the constitutional discourse which follows, and in this respect, the *de Legibus* owes an acknowledged debt (2.6; cf. 1.3) to the classic exemplar of the relationship between topography and the content of dialogue, the *Phaedrus*.

### III

The *Phaedrus* is set in an sacro-idyllic *locus amoenus* lying just outside the walls of Athens.<sup>25</sup> Socrates and Phaedrus, both city dwellers, lie on soft grass in the shade of a plane tree, from under which issues a cool stream running into the Ilissus. The spot is sacred to the river god Achelous and the nymphs, and as such is likened by Socrates to a shrine of the Muses (278b: *καταβάντε ἐς τὸ Νυμφῶν νᾶμά τε καὶ μουσεῖον*: 'descending to the stream and mouseion of the Nymphs'). The topography of the *Phaedrus*, in particular its trees, its sacred space dedicated to the nymphs (*nymphaeum*), and its spring water, was profoundly influential on later sacro-idyllic descriptions.<sup>26</sup> It is cited by Cicero, Plutarch, Lucian, and others; and allusions to it

<sup>22</sup> R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of ancient latin etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), s.v. *amoenus*, citing Isid. *Orig.* 14.8.33: *amoena loca Varro dicta ait eo quod solum amorem praestant et ad se amanda adliciant*; and s.v. *amicitia*, citing Cic. *Lael.* 26: *amor . . . ex quo amicitia nominata est*; also *ibid.* s.v. *amicus*.

<sup>23</sup> The erotic element in the Numa/Egeria relationship (*amicae*, 12) is emphasized also at Plutarch, *Numa* 4.2 and 8.6.

<sup>24</sup> Men. *Rhet.* III.396 Sp.

<sup>25</sup> G. Schönbeck, *Der locus amoenus von Homer bis Horaz* (diss. Heidelberg, 1962), pp. 102–11; A. Motte, 'Le pré sacré de Pan et des Nymphes dans le Phèdre de Platon', *AC* 32 (1963), 460–76; L. Isebaert, 'La fascination du monde et des Muses selon Platon', *LEC* 53 (1985), 205–19; G. R. F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 1–34.

<sup>26</sup> Plut. *Amat.* 749a; Lucian, *de Oeco* 4; Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* 7.11; Cic. *de Or.* 1.28; cf. also Lib. *Decl.* 2.1.26; Them. 32c, 246a. C. Murley, 'Plato's *Phaedrus* and Theocritean pastoral', *TAPA* 71 (1940), 281–95; M. B. Trapp, 'Plato's *Phaedrus* in second-century Greek literature', in D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 141–73, at 141–8 and 171.

have been detected in a wide range of Greek writings.<sup>27</sup> At the time when Juvenal was writing, therefore, the *Phaedrus* was certainly among Plato's best-known dialogues. Of particular importance for its influence on satire is an implicit allusion to it (though not to its topography) by Horace at the opening of *Satires* 2.4.<sup>28</sup>

Juvenal's scenario has much in common with the idyllic location of the *Phaedrus* and its local nymphs.<sup>29</sup> The *vallis Egeriae* too was a sacred place, lying just outside the walls of Rome. Numa claimed to have consulted the water nymph Egeria there and to have received guidance from her on his religious *constitutio*.<sup>30</sup> He dedicated a grove and spring to the Camenae, the indigenous water nymphs with whom the alien (Arician) Egeria came to be associated.<sup>31</sup> He also set up a bronze *aedicula Camenarum*.<sup>32</sup> In the third satire, the ancient sacral and oracular character of the *vallis* is evoked in *nemus*, *sacri fontis*, and *delubra* (13); and *Camenis* (16) evokes the evolution of the oracular water nymphs of the *vallis* into the inspirational Italian Muses, patron deities of Latin poetry (cf. *poetas*, 9). In that sense, the *vallis* might be said, like the *nymphaeum* in the *Phaedrus*, to be a *mouseion*. It is true that 'Juvenal' claims that the *Camenae* have been *eiectae*; but in truth, the Numan *aedicula* had been removed from the *vallis* long since, following a lightning-strike, eventually to be relocated in the *aedes Herculis Musarum* where it symbolized the identification of the *Camenae* with the Greek Muses.<sup>33</sup>

Socrates lavishes praise on his dialogue location, as does Atticus in the *de Legibus*; but 'Juvenal' does the reverse: he attacks the location on the grounds that it has been taken over by a foreign religion, Judaism (13–14). The fact that the *vallis* was well known, notably from the description in Livy's first book (1.21.3) as an ancient *locus amoenus*, with grove, spring, grass, shrines, and a numinous presence (comparable in essentials to the topography of the *Phaedrus*) adds piquancy to 'Juvenal's' attack. The latter contrasts with the *amoenitas* of the oracular centre, Cumae, which Umbricius has chosen as his new home (*amoenil/secsessus*, 4–5).<sup>34</sup> The *vallis* has also, 'Juvenal' alleges, been figuratively desecrated (*violarent*, 20), in the replacement of grass and native tufa by non-indigenous marble, and of natural surroundings by manmade artifice.<sup>35</sup>

We might infer from 'Juvenal's' *vituperatio* that the old religiosity of the place has

<sup>27</sup> Trapp (n. 26), 171; A. Hardie, 'Philitas and the plane tree', *ZPE* 119 (1997), 21–36, at 28–9.

<sup>28</sup> E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 136–7.

<sup>29</sup> There are no caves in the *Phaedrus*, but Plato may have meant the space underneath the plane tree to be an arboreal 'cave', perhaps of the Muses: this is suggested by Rothstein on Prop. 3.3.27, and developed by W. Berg, *Early Virgil* (London, 1974), p. 202, at n. 17; see now Lavagne (n. 7), pp. 446–8. For plane trees as 'caves', cf. Plin. *Nat.* 12.5.9; Sidon. *Apoll.* 24.65–8.

<sup>30</sup> Livy 1.19.5, 1.21.3; Plut. *Numa* 8.6; cf. 13.1. For the *constitutio*, Cic. *de Leg.* 2.23.

<sup>31</sup> G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*<sup>2</sup> (1912, repr. Munich, 1971), pp. 219–20; *RE* s.v. *Camena*; J. H. Waszink, 'Camena', *CM* 17 (1956), 139–48.

<sup>32</sup> Serv. *Aen.* 1.8. The area retained its association with the Camenae, as is shown by the *vicus Camenarum* mentioned in *CIL* 6.975 (A.D. 136).

<sup>33</sup> Serv. *Aen.* 1.8. L. Richardson Jr, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore, MD and London, 1992), pp. 63–4 is probably wrong to suggest that a temple replaced the *aedicula*: the *aedes Camenarum* in which Accius set up his statue (Plin. *Nat.* 34.19) is the *aedes Herculis Musarum*.

<sup>34</sup> Livy 1.21.3: *lucus erat quem medium ex opaco specu fons perenni rigabat aqua. . . . Camenis eum lucum sacrauit, quod earum ibi concilia cum coniuge sua Egeria essent*; see also Ogilvie *ad loc.* F. Williams, 'Vox clamantis in theatro', *PLLS* 4 (1983), 121–7 at n. 15, rightly notes 12–20 as 'the ironic reversal of the *locus amoenus* motif'.

<sup>35</sup> Desecration: *violarent* (20) on aesthetic vandalism, is sacral in tone (*OLD* s.v. *violō* 1a; *CIL* 1.366.1.2: *honce loucom nequis violatod*; Ov. *Fast.* 4.649).

been quite lost; and that is what *quanto praesentius esset/numen aquis* . . . , 18–19) seems at first to suggest. The water-numen (Egeria) would be so much more efficacious had the natural surrounds of the sacred *fons* been left undisturbed.<sup>36</sup> The linkage between the natural, unspoiled, topography of an ancient shrine and a visitor's belief in its numinous efficacy is a well-known motif.<sup>37</sup> But a near-contemporary counter-illustration is provided in Plutarch's reflections on the perceived decline of the Delphic oracle, central to which was scepticism about the inspirational role of Apollo. In the *de Pythiae oraculis*, that role is defended against sceptics and critics (408d), with particular reference to the contemporary renaissance of Delphi (409a): new construction there could not, it is argued, have happened *μὴ θεοῦ παρόντος ἐνταῦθα καὶ συνεπιθειάζοντος τὸ χρηστήριον* (409c: 'if the god were not present [cf. *praesens*], inspiring the oracle').<sup>38</sup> In the third satire, the natural/artificial contrast additionally connects with contemporary interest in oracular shrines and their credibility as places of divine revelation. Pliny (*Ep.* 8.8.5), describing the sacred grove and fountain of Clitumnus, states *praesens numen atque etiam fatidicum indicant sortes*; but he later (7) signals sophisticated amusement at human credulity in such matters, so that it is not to be thought that he personally believes there to be a *praesens numen*.

Notwithstanding *ieictis* . . . *Camenis*, Juvenal is evidently speaking of an Egerian *nymphaeum*; and indeed there is archeological evidence of a second century A.D. *nymphaeum* in the vicinity of the *vallis*, a construction which suggests interest in the cult of Egeria, rather than neglect.<sup>39</sup> 'Juvenal' chooses to denigrate this; but a marble building on a green river-bank was hardly inconsistent with religiosity, or with efficacious cult.<sup>40</sup> 'Juvenal' is in fact adopting a consciously sophisticated, sceptical pose. The fact that he irreverently suggests that Numa met Egeria for erotic purposes (*ubi nocturnae Numa constituebat amicae*, 12, where the verb plays on Numa's *constitutio*) further suggests amused scepticism about the truth of Numa's claim to divine sanction for his constitution, and by extension towards the oracular role of Egeria herself. Numa's claim had, in fact, been a traditional focus of scepticism (Livy 1.19.5); and the old king was widely held to have lied to the Roman people, to the extent that he had been enshrined as the primary Roman *exemplum* of *simulata religio* (Val. Max. 1.2.1). Now, if the Jahn/Nisbet transposition of 12–16 to follow 20 is correct, then Egeria's *numen*, over which 'Juvenal' shakes his head at 18–20, will be picked up two lines later in the sound of *Numa*, but amusingly redesignated as Numa's *amica* (she is normally spoken of, with more respect, as his *coniunx*).<sup>41</sup> This goes rather beyond fashionable scepticism, and as with the bathetic listing of poetic recitations among the *pericula* of city life (9), can scarcely be taken to represent a seriously held view. The passage suggests an easy flippancy in the speaker, a character trait which contrasts markedly with the solemn credence and reverence which Umbricius himself attaches to Numa (adduced as an *exemplum* of truthfulness at 138!).

<sup>36</sup> For *numen* in streams, Wissowa (n. 31), p. 222. For *praesens numen*, cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 1.41, with Clausen's note; *Georg.* 1.10; Ov. *Met.* 15.622.

<sup>37</sup> Ov. *Am.* 3.1.1–2 (cited below, n. 48) is a *locus classicus*; cf. *Fast.* 4.649–52; Lucan 9.519–21.

<sup>38</sup> For Juvenal's sensitivity to these issues, cf. *Sat.* 6.553–64, where the silence of Delphi is contrasted with the credence given to astrologers.

<sup>39</sup> N. Neuerburg, *L'architettura delle fontane e dei Ninfei nell'Italia antica* (Naples, 1965), p. 161 (*non vidi*: cited by Courtney on 11). For *nymphaea* and representations of 'caves', see Lavagne (n. 7), *Index nominum et rerum*, s.v. *Nymphaeum*; on the *nymphaeum* of Egeria, *ibid.*, pp. 620–1.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Virg. *Georg.* 3.13–14 (a figurative temple of the Muses at Mantua): *viridi in campo templum de marmore ponam/propter aquam* . . .

<sup>41</sup> That this word play is intentional is further suggested by a verbal echo at 138: *numinis* . . . *Numa*.

If it is correct to read the third satire in the context of contemporary thinking (scepticism versus credulity) about these mythic-religious issues, then there is clearly room for taking 'Juvenal's' attack on modern 'desecration' with a large pinch of salt. And indeed his own statement about the numinosity of the *vallis* does not entirely exclude the possibility that the water-*numen* is *praesens* in some degree. I conclude that, despite 'Juvenal's' *vituperatio* of the location, the poet Juvenal has given the third satire a sacral setting which lies within a literary tradition established by Plato in the *Phaedrus* and represented in Latin dialogue by Cicero in the *de Legibus*.

#### IV

Central to Plato's development of argument in the *Phaedrus* is the relationship between location and the internal dynamics of the dialogue. He establishes this by skilful interplay of physical topography, the nymphs which are immanent within it, and 'inspiration'. Since I shall be arguing that comparable features are present in the third satire, Plato's sequence of ideas may usefully (if at some risk of oversimplification) be summarized. Socrates variously invokes the Muses and the local nymphs as inspirational influences, and the interconnection of the two is highlighted in his concluding reference to 'the nymphs' stream and mouseion' (278b, see above) and also at 262d (the nymphs, and cicadas as 'prophets of the Muses'). Both nymphs and Muses are closely related to the natural environment: the singing Muses (237a) are represented by the overhead singing of the cicadas (230c, 262d), a connection articulated by Socrates in the form of a myth (258e–259d); and the nymphs (together with Achelous) are the ἐντόπιοι θεοί (262c), the deities which embody, or are immanent in, the sacred locality. In a carefully constructed development of ideas, Socrates tentatively anticipates nymph-inspiration in this *θεῖος τόπος* (238b–d); he then claims that if he proceeds further, he would be completely possessed by the nymphs (241e: ὑπὸ τῶν Νυμφῶν ἐνθουσιάζω); later (262d), he attributes inspirational responsibility to the ἐντόπιοι θεοί; and finally (278b, cf. 279b), the nymphs give authority to the 'messages' which he delivers. These passages can all be read in the light of a key programmatic point in the dialogue, where Socrates delivers his short speech in praise of the *locus amoenus* itself (230b–c). He dwells on the place's impact on his own senses (sight, touch, smell, hearing). The result is that an encomium stimulated by the sensory impact of a place is followed by speeches made under the influence of the nymphs which embody that same place. The sequence of ideas implicitly suggests interconnections between topography, nymph cult, sensory impact, inspiration, and extempore speech.

The *Phaedrus* was an influential text in the development of ideas about inspiration. A series of second-century Greek texts testify to its importance in this respect.<sup>42</sup> Equally significant are two Latin texts influenced by the *Phaedrus*. At Cicero, *de Oratore* 1.28, Scaevola recalls Plato's plane tree and Socrates' speeches *quae philosophi divinitus ferunt esse dicta* ('which the philosophers claim to have been uttered under the influence of divine inspiration'). And at *de Legibus* 2.6–7, Cicero again alludes to Plato's inspirational motif and also to his cross-referencing of water nymphs and Muses: Atticus' praise of the speakers' island location and of the river Fibrenus, with explicit recall of Socrates' praise of location in the *Phaedrus*, leads to Cicero's praise of the river Thyamis at Atticus' estate in Epirus and thence to Quintus' praise of

<sup>42</sup> Trapp (n. 26), pp. 143–4 (Dio Chrys. 1.56–8), 151–2 (Dio Chrys. 36.33–5), 157 (ps.-Lucian *Amores* 31).



Atticus' shrine to the river nymph Amaltheia and its associated plane trees. Cicero then refers to the role of Muse-inspiration in his own poetry ('*a Iove Musarum primordia*', *sicut in Aratio carmine orsi sumus*). Still further testimony in this area is provided by Lucian, who, speaking of the impulse to speech provided by a beautiful and well crafted hall (*de Oeco* 4), contrasts the natural environment (plane, grass, spring) of the *Phaedrus* and recalls Socrates' invocation of the Muses (*Phaedr.* 237a). Lucian suggests that whereas Socrates summoned the Muses, they may choose to visit the hall without any invocation. This passage is of particular interest in that it has to do with inspiration in an artificial environment, and with the literary rejection of natural surroundings.<sup>43</sup>

Among Plato's primary interests in the *Phaedrus*, recognized as such in antiquity, is the truth value of rhetoric;<sup>44</sup> and this is articulated within the same topographical/inspirational context. At 243a–b, Socrates recants an earlier vituperation of Eros and offers contrasting praise of that god. Later (262c–d), he notes that his earlier speeches have by chance illustrated the point that a speaker who knows the truth may, while 'playing in words', mislead the audience. He ascribes this chance illustration to the *ἐντόπιοι θεοί* ('the gods of the locality', i.e. Achelous, and Pan; possibly the nymphs) and perhaps to the inspiration of the cicadas as 'the prophets of the Muses'. Socrates means to suggest that divine intervention, and the cicadas, have been responsible not only for the chance illustration to which he draws attention, but also for the misleading content of the speeches which provided it. In other words, Socrates' *ἐντόπιοι θεοί* are capable of inspiring a misleading speech in order to further the philosophical discourse, and thus the search for truth.<sup>45</sup> Error and fallacy, even as uttered from the mouth of Socrates, may lead, under the impact of extempore dialectic in a particular location, to enlightenment. This too will be of significance for the reading of the third satire to be proposed below, for it provides an authoritative antecedent for the proposition that a flawed speech may yet assist in achieving a closer approach to 'truth'.

In the *Phaedrus*, the discussion of 'truth' in rhetoric focuses primarily on the contrast between Socrates' speeches censuring, and then praising, Eros, i.e. between *vituperatio* and *laudatio*.<sup>46</sup> Socrates' encomium of the *mouseion* foreshadows the wider treatment of praise and censure; and that treatment is intimately interlinked with the inspirational impact of the place, and its natural capacity to inspire truth, and hence with the truth of the encomium itself.<sup>47</sup> I would suggest that a comparable perspective informs the contrast, noted at the outset, between 'Juvenal's' attack on the *vallis Egeriae* and on Rome itself (5–9), and praise of Cumae (2–5, cf. *laudo*). If this is correct, the combination of praise and censure of places, by both 'Juvenal' and

<sup>43</sup> For a further such rejection, cf. Plut. *Amat.* 749a; Trapp (n. 26), pp. 158–9.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Trapp (n. 26), pp. 165–70.

<sup>45</sup> Speech is further related to nymph-topography by the speaker *προσπαίζων ἐν λόγοις* (262d), recalling the characteristic activity of nymphs, namely 'play' (i.e. ritual dance): cf. 229c on the Illisus' waters, *ἐπιτήδεια κόραις παίζειν παρ' αὐτά*.

<sup>46</sup> Ferrari (n. 25), Index, s.v. 'rhetoric: and truth'; invective and encomium contrasted at 241e, 265c, 266a–b; Nightingale (n. 5) notes these passages (112 with n. 1), but does not treat them in depth. Compare also *Phaedrus*' praise of Lysias at 228a with his detraction at 257b.

<sup>47</sup> Theocritus, *Idyll* 7, a dramatic, peripatetic dialogue followed by rest in a sacred *locus amoenus*, reflects similar topographical interests (6–9, 10–11, 131–46), as well as complex interplay of nymphs (92, 148), Muses (12, 37, 47, 82, 95, 129), inspiration (37, 92, 148ff.) truth (44, cf. 38; 99–100, 148–53), the sensory impact of the place (138ff.), and the impact on dialogue of friendship and Eros. It may well have been influenced by the *Phaedrus*: Murley (n. 26).

Umbricius, would take on a wider significance, arguably lying within a distinct literary-philosophical tradition. The reader recognizing this lineage would thereby be encouraged to think critically about the credibility of Umbricius' attack on Rome, his contrasting praise of Italian towns, and Juvenal's aims in juxtaposing the two.

## V

The *vallis Egeriae* was associated with prophecy and inspiration; and Egeria was an oracular nymph who, on one legendary account, conveyed divine wisdom to Numa at the same spot where 'Juvenal' and Umbricius now stand. In the light of the earlier correlations of topography and inspiration sketched above, might the influence of Egeria, and of the *vallis* environment, now make itself felt on Umbricius? That Egeria herself could, for literary purposes, be understood to act in some such way is suggested by Ovid's invocation at *Fasti* 3.261–2: *nympha, mone . . . / nympha Numae coniunx, ad tua facta veni*. And that Juvenal intends some linkage between Umbricius and Egeria is suggested in the verbal correspondence of *amici* and *amicae*. But Juvenal, it needs to be stressed, gives no explicit indication of any inspirational influence; and indeed 'Juvenal's' evident scepticism about Numa's claim to have been inspired by Egeria at the same spot might seem to cast doubt on any such possibility, as might the claim *quanto praesentius esset / numen aquis . . .* (18–19). Yet the concept of 'unbidden' inspirational influence was familiar to ancient readers, and appears in Lucian's *de Oeco* (above, IV). And as I shall try to show, some passages in the third satire are susceptible of interpretation in inspirational terms. Taken together, these passages will point at least to the possibility of Egerian/environmental influence on the speaker. If such influence could be determined and defined with any degree of certainty, it would (on the model of the *Phaedrus*) have important implications for the truth-value of anything said in the location.

Leaving aside the claimed 'desecration' of the *vallis*, the location is, *qua* sacred grove, just the kind of place in which a poet might conventionally seek inspiration, or where a receptive personality might experience a divine presence.<sup>48</sup> Umbricius speaks after descent (*descendimus*) into *speluncae* (17), an action conventionally associated with consultation of oracles.<sup>49</sup> Divination is also suggested by the Cumaean Sibyl (3, making Cumae an appropriate destination for Umbricius).<sup>50</sup> *Prochytam* wittily confirms this, for it alludes to the advice which the Cimmerian (not the Cumean) Sibyl gave to Aeneas: that he should not bury his kinswoman Prochyta in Italy.<sup>51</sup> And if it were correct to see an allusion to Judaic divination at 13–16 (as clarified by a corresponding passage at 6.542–7), the preamble would take on a still more divinatory character.<sup>52</sup> The fact that Umbricius' name (21) can itself carry divinatory

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.1.1–6: *Stat vetus et multos incaedua silva per annos; / credibile est illi numen inesse loco. / fons sacer in medio speluncaque pumice pendens, / et latere ex omni dulce queruntur aves. / hic ego dum spatior . . . / (quod mea, quaerebam, Musa moveret, opus) . . .* For experience of inspiration in a sacred grove, cf. esp. Calp. Sic. 1.89–90; Luc. 9.564–5 (Cato at the oracle of Jupiter Ammon, where it is left ambiguous whether local inspiration is at work, or Cato is 'inspired' by his Stoic concept of the divine, or both).

<sup>49</sup> H. W. Parke, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity* (London, 1988), p. 93. Val. Max. 1.8.10; Ov. *Met.* 3.14; Plin. *Nat.* 28.147; Dion. Hal. 2.61.2. Cf. *Phaedr.* 278b–c.

<sup>50</sup> S. [Morton] Braund, 'Umbricius and the Frogs (Juvenal *Sat.* 3.44–5)', *CQ* 40 (1990), 502–6, at 505.

<sup>51</sup> FGH 813 f.B; Parke (n. 49), p. 72.

<sup>52</sup> Suggested by J. Adamietz, *Untersuchungen zu Juvenal* (Wiesbaden, 1972), p. 41; rejected by Courtney on 13.

associations, from the first-century *haruspex* C. Umbricius Melior, supplies additional grounds for hypothesizing an 'oracular' dramatic setting.<sup>53</sup>

Verbal pointers to some 'prophetic' role appear in Umbricius' introduction to his attack on Greeks in Rome (58–9): *quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris/ et quos praecipue fugiam, properabo fateri*. In combination, *acceptissima* and *divitibus* call to mind the standard phrase *dis acceptus*, for *di* and *divites* were etymologically related to one another.<sup>54</sup> The phrase suggests that Juvenal is imitating the sacral language of public revelation of privileged insights about the gods, while secularizing the context through substitution of *divitibus* for *dis*. Thus, Umbricius' earlier focus of attack, those enriched (*divites*) by dishonest means (29–57), leads here to a sacral/secular 'revelation' about their relationship to his second target, the Greeks. A parallel with obvious resonance for our passage is Numa's transmission of his religious *constitutio* to the people, and his claim to divine authority (Egeria's inspiration) for it: the Livian version of this event (1.19.5) is *eius se monitu quae acceptissima dis essent sacra instituere*; and Valerius Maximus shows that the phraseology was standard (1.2.1): ... *eiusque monitu se quae acceptissima dis immortalibus sacra forent instituere*.

Umbricius' unexpected apostrophe to the Roman citizen body (*Quirites*, 60), suggests the assumption of some public role. This novel departure from the dramatic scenario of two old friends conversing might be understood in psychological terms: in his extempore declamation, Umbricius might be so carried away that he moves into a different, quite imaginary, speaking context.<sup>55</sup> But since Umbricius is talking in revelatory terms about the degeneracy of Rome, in the place where Numa supposedly communed with Egeria, it is reasonable to think also of some authoritative, vatic role. The classic Latin example of a *vates* addressing the citizen body is Horace, *Epode* 16.<sup>56</sup> This too is a poem about flight from Rome. Horace prophesies the occupation of the city (11–12) *barbarus heu cineres insistet victor et Urbem/ l' eques . . . verberabit*, and desecration of the *ossa Quirini* (13–14). He urges mass migration, on the example of the Phocaeans, who left their territory to boars and wolves (*lupis*, 20). This is to be flight/escape from the 'iron age', with Horace as *vates* (66). Umbricius suggests that foreign occupation has already taken place, through eastern immigration. At 66–8, after mention of prostitutes at the Circus, he urges *ite, quibus grata est picta lupa barbara mitra/ rusticus ille tuus sumit trechedipna, Quirine, / et ceromatico fert niceteria collo*: the near location of *barbara* and *Quirine* recalls Horace 11–13 (see above), and is supported by *lupa* (cf. Horace 20), used of the foreign prostitute in Rome. Umbricius flees such people (*fugiam*, 59, cf. Horace's *fuga*, 66).<sup>57</sup> Umbricius himself does not speak overtly of gold or iron ages, but does allude to this body of ideas in his concluding attack on criminality at Rome (312–14): *felicia dicas/ saecula quae quondam . . . / viderunt uno contentam carcere Romam*.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>53</sup> [Morton] Braund (n. 50), following Nisbet (n. 17), p. 92, n. 9. Contrast J. Ferguson, *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal* (Brussels, 1987), s.v. *Umbricius*. Like Tanaquil (cf. *Sat.* 6.565–71 and contrast Livy 1.34 and Sil. 13.818–20), Umbricius is not professionally involved in divination (cf. 44), but his name recalls a historical figure who was.

<sup>54</sup> *dis acceptus*: Cic. *de Rep.* 6.13; Varro *R. R.* 3.16.5; Virg. *Georg.* 2.101; *Ciris* 219; *CIL* I.1012.8; cf. Ov. *Her.* 21.50; Tac. *Ann.* 4.64; Cat. 90.5; Plaut. *Rud.* 25. Maltby (n. 22) s.v. *dives*; Varro *L. L.* 5.92: *dives a divo qui ut deus nihil indigere videtur*.

<sup>55</sup> Morton Braund (n. 7), p. 232. For a speaker being 'carried away', see below, n. 65.

<sup>56</sup> The general relevance of *Epode* 16 to the theme of 'flight from Rome' is noted by Adamietz (n. 52), pp. 13–14.

<sup>57</sup> *Quirites* recurs at 163, in reference to *secessiones plebis* (a form of flight from Rome).

<sup>58</sup> A. L. Motto and J. R. Clark, 'Per iter tenebricosum: the mythos of Juvenal 3', *TAPA* 96

When Umbricius attacks Rome, he temporarily takes over 'Juvenal's' role as satirist. I can find no suggestion that Umbricius is a practising poet, or a fellow satirist. Nor can he securely be shown to be publicly and professionally engaged in divination.<sup>59</sup> However, a parallel combination of 'private' literary and mantic roles is found in the *Phaedrus*. Socrates claims (236d) to be an *ιδιώτης* ('amateur') in comparison to the *ἀγαθὸς ποιητής* ('good poet'), Lysias, to whose written speech he responds in extempore discourse. He also claims (242c) to be a *μάντις* ('seer'), not as a matter of serious commitment, but sufficient for his own private purposes; and when he speaks as a seer (278e), he 'sends a message from these gods' (i.e. from the local deities) (279b). This is appropriate in a dialogue which considers the nature both of mantic (Apolline) and of poetic (Muse-induced) inspiration. Socrates thus has acquired an 'informal' mantic and poetic role, in 'inspirational' topography. It is a similar status which is here postulated for Umbricius. Moreover Umbricius' interests, unlike the public divinatory responsibilities of his namesake the *haruspex*, relate primarily to his private fortunes (financial and otherwise); and his interest in the *Urbs* is determined more by its impact on his own well-being than by public-minded concern for its collective fortunes.<sup>60</sup>

So, is Umbricius inspired or not? The question is implicitly raised in the prefatory scene-setting and also in the very disclosure of Umbricius' name.<sup>61</sup> But he does not appeal for inspiration, and the poet Juvenal gives no authoritative guidance. The reader is therefore under no obligation whatever to infer that inspirational influence is at work. However, if the approach adopted in this section is correct, the text also allows of a positive response.

There is, it must be admitted, no modern consensus as to what ancient writers understood by inspiration.<sup>62</sup> Plato himself explores the issue of divine inspiration in the *Phaedrus* and makes clear that it is not the only possible stimulus to fluency, and to particular modes of expression in an extempore speaker.<sup>63</sup> Other stimuli exist: they include emotional impetus, and the sheer impact on an individual of one's interlocutors and what they have to say. Emotion itself is a standard constituent of extempore speech.<sup>64</sup> Yet emotion and extemporization may both, in turn, interact with ancient concepts of inspiration. Thus, it is Socrates' improvised fluency which leads him to suggest to Phaedrus that he 'has experienced a divine passion' (238c), at which

(1976), 267–76, see in Umbricius' departure a reflection of withdrawal myths such as that of Astraea/Dike: the details of the argument are unconvincing, but the concept may well be correct. *sarcula* (311), an iron agricultural implement (i.e. a *ferrea sarcula*) for the manufacture of which no *ferrum* will be left over from convicts' chains, puns on *ferrea saecula*; similarly, the iron highwayman's sword alludes to the bronze highwayman's sword which characterizes the bronze age at Aratus, *Phaen.* 131–2.

<sup>59</sup> See above, n. 53.

<sup>60</sup> Thus his opening statement: *res hodie minor est here quam fuit atque eadem cras/deteret exiguis aliquid* . . ., a gloomy prognostication of personal financial decline which is structurally reminiscent of the progressive collective decline suggested at Hor. *Odes* 3.6.46–8 and *Ep.* 16.64–6, but relates purely to his own fortunes.

<sup>61</sup> Motto and Clark (n. 58), pp. 273–4, who take 'Juvenal's' attack on the *vallis* at face value, unsurprisingly reach the opposite conclusion about the inspirational role of the topography: 'Egeria and Diana are irredeemable; the Muses silent'; 'inspiration is lost'.

<sup>62</sup> P. A. Murray, 'Poetic inspiration in early Greece', *JHS* 101 (1981), 87–100, at 87–9. The fullest treatment is E. Barmeyer, *Die Musen: ein Beitrag zur Inspirations-theorie* (Munich, 1968).

<sup>63</sup> Socrates' improvising: cf. 236d: *γελοῖος ἔσομαι παρ' ἀγαθὸν ποιητήν, ἰδίωτης, αὐτοσχεδιάζων περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν*. Inspiration and fluency in performance: Murray (n. 62), pp. 94–6.

<sup>64</sup> Emotion and improvisation: Quint. *Inst.* 10.3.18; A. Hardie, *Statius and the Silvae: Poets, Patrons and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World* (Liverpool, 1983), p. 145.

Phaedrus cautiously agrees that an unwonted fluency has 'taken hold' of him (and Socrates wittily rejoins that the place is divine, and that he may yet be 'taken' by its nymphs, *νυμφόληπτος*). Again, Socrates rationalizes his blasphemous error in attacking Eros by reference to the astonishing (242a) impact on him of Phaedrus' reading of Lysias' speech (242d–e), a feeling for discourse which he characterizes as 'divine'. Plato thereby suggests that some psychological or emotional impulse may be reflected in Socrates' speeches and indeed his claims to inspiration. Side by side with these claims, and inseparable from them, is the possibility that Socrates has been carried away by enthusiasm for his extempore theme and by the dynamics of the dialogue.<sup>65</sup> A further interlinked dimension is the inspiration of Eros itself, embodied in the presence of Socrates' young friend Phaedrus.<sup>66</sup>

Umbricius, like Socrates, might be carried away by his own rhetorical impetus. One example is his apostrophe to the *Quirites* at line 60. Another is his invitation to 'Juvenal' to 'see' a wholly imaginary street scene, the *sportula* picnic, at line 249 (*nonne vides, quanto celebretur sportula fumol* . . .). Such evocation of *visiones* (*φαντασίαι*) was related in rhetorical theory to the simulation of emotion; and this too was sometimes seen as a form of inspiration (*ἐνθουσιασμός*), perhaps associated with prophetic articulation of visions.<sup>67</sup> That emotion and inspiration regularly went hand in hand is plainly suggested in the second of 'Longinus' two 'innate' or 'natural' sources of sublimity (8.1): 'powerful and inspired emotion'.<sup>68</sup>

Yet another stimulus to extempore fluency might be the speaker's immersion in earlier literature and recollection of it (whether or not at the conscious level). And this too can be seen as a kind of inspiration. Socrates speaks in overtly inspirational terms of ideas suggested to him by his own (imperfect) memory of earlier Greek writers (235c).<sup>69</sup> The idea appears elsewhere, in programmatic statements of literary allegiance, and it is fully developed in 'Longinus' (13.2, where it is applied to 'even those who show very few signs of inspiration').<sup>70</sup> Another revealing passage is Lucian, *Menippus* 1, where the hero, returning from the underworld, and the company of Homer and Euripides, claims that 'somehow or other I have become filled with poetry, and verses come unbidden to my lips' (tr. Harmon). In the *Phaedrus*, this is a subsidiary topic, illustrating the diversity of the central theme, the varied sources of fluency in extempore speech in dramatic dialogue. But it might none the less bear on Umbricius' speech, for it is evident from his allusions to well-known characters and

<sup>65</sup> For a speaker being 'carried away', cf. Plato's description of the rhapsode Ion's psychological state when performing, described partially in 'inspirational' terms (*Ion* 535b–e); Meijering (n. 6), p. 9. For the inspired poet physically 'carried away', cf. Hor. *Odes* 3.4.21–2; *AP* 7.42.5.

<sup>66</sup> Barmeyer (n. 62), pp. 188–91.

<sup>67</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 6.2.25–33, esp. 29; 'Longinus', *de Subl.* 15.1–2. Scott (n. 4), pp. 20–4; W. J. Verdenius, 'The principles of Greek literary criticism', *Mnemosyne* 36 (1983), 1–59, at 46. For inspiration and prophetic vision, Murray (n. 62), p. 94.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. 8.4: *θαρρῶν γὰρ ἀφορισαίμην ἂν ὡς οὐδὲν οὕτως ὡς τὸ γενναῖον πάθος, ἔνθα χρῆ, μεγαλήγορον, ὥσπερ ὑπὸ μανίας τινος καὶ πνεύματος ἐνθουσιαστικῶς ἐκπνέον καὶ οἰοῖναι φοιβάζον τοὺς λόγους*. Russell *ad loc.* compares Sen. *Tranq. An.* 17.11. See also Meijering (n. 6), pp. 25–6.

<sup>69</sup> Socrates thinks that he has heard something better than Lysias' speech in an earlier poet or prose writer; this is because *πλήρῃς πῶς . . . τὸ σῆθος ἔχων, αἰσθάνομαι παρὰ ταῦτα ἂν ἔχειν εἰπεῖν μὴ χεῖρω*. This cannot be his own idea, but something he has heard from elsewhere, poured in, as it were *ἐξ ἀλλοτρίων . . . ναμάτων* (combining inspirational sentence with a topographical metaphor). For inspiration and memory, Murray (n. 62), pp. 92–4, citing J. A. Notopoulos, 'Mnemosyne in oral literature', *TAPA* 69 (1938), 465–93.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. e.g. Plut. *Mor.* 14e. Prop. 3.1.1; Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.54–5; *Theb.* 12.816–17.

scenes in literature that Umbricius is widely read.<sup>71</sup> he too may be 'inspired' by his own reading (below, VII).

The interface between divine 'inspiration' and concepts deriving from literary-rhetorical theory is complex. Plato (and, I would argue, Juvenal) may be rationalizing traditional ideas about the role of the inspirational deities, while at the same time suggesting that there can be a divine dimension within the theoreticians' emphasis on the emotional, or psychological, state of the speaker, especially in extempore discourse.<sup>72</sup>

The reader's response to the issue of Umbricius' 'inspiration' seems to me to be dependent on his or her interpretative judgement. The common ground between poet and reader lies in the former's deployment of literary allusion and textual cross-referencing, and in the latter's access to both. The critical reader has a privileged interpretative vantage point and is thereby empowered to exercise judgement in ways which may not be available to the characters themselves.<sup>73</sup> I would suggest that it is at this level, and specifically within the allusive 'sacral/secular' phraseology, that Juvenal suggests the presence of inspirational influence.

## VI

Satire 3 deals with a main subject of Juvenal's work, namely Rome itself; and it stands at the centre of the first book, as its longest single poem. Here, evidently, is a satiric statement of especial significance. What, then, does Umbricius have to say? This section returns to the issue, raised at the outset, of Juvenal's aims in relation to his contemporary audience. I hope to show that, in deploying Umbricius as satiric speaker, Juvenal brings on a character who is well read, but yet who may on occasion fail to recognize the import of the words he is represented as uttering. As an approach to the character, this is not wholly new. LaFleur has pointed to the relevance for Umbricius of what Anderson termed the *doctor ineptus*, the 'teacher who fails to grasp the implications of his own precepts'.<sup>74</sup> But this is a difficult area for the modern critic, particularly when it comes to assessing possible instances of inconsistency on the part of an ancient literary character.<sup>75</sup> In what follows,

<sup>71</sup> Umbricius is familiar with the *Aeneid* (25: Daedalus; 199: Ucalegon); the *Iliad* (279–80: Achilles' restlessness); also Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* (238: *vitulisque marinis*, cf. *Nat.* 9.19.41–2). He shows knowledge of plastic arts (89, 217); medicine (232–4); popular philosophy (229); etymology (71); Roman history (53, 114–15, 313–14); Roman religion (137–9); legal processes, both public (33, 137–42) and private (81–2, 161, 273).

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Meijering (n. 6), pp. 8–9, who well notes the linkage of *φαντασία*, madness and inspiration, its importance for the *Phaedrus*, and its force in suggesting that the poet's *φαντασία* might be 'an important source of profound knowledge, only to be rendered comprehensible through allegorical interpretation'.

<sup>73</sup> Author/reader collusion and the reader's privileged position: Feeney (n. 6), pp. 183–4; J. Farrell, *Virgil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History* (New York and Oxford, 1991), pp. 23–4.

<sup>74</sup> LaFleur (n. 10 [1979]), pp. 162–5, suggesting some affinity with Catius in Hor. *Serm.* 2.4, 'meant more to provoke than to persuade'. Anderson cited from 'The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satires', in J. P. Sullivan (ed.), *Satire: Critical Essays on Roman Literature* (Bloomington, IN, 1968), p. 34.

<sup>75</sup> Frueland Jensen (n. 10), p. 191 rightly points to some moral inconsistencies in Umbricius, particularly as regards criticism of Roman legacy-hunting at 126–30; the argument could have been strengthened by reference to a series of intertextual allusions (based on Hor. *Serm.* 2.5) to legacy hunting in the immediately preceding lament about personal displacement from the household of a rich *amicus*: ironically, it is not the *amicus* who perishes, but the poor Roman's investment of time (124–5).

therefore, I shall focus on just one subject area, Umbricius' understanding of Roman history, and I shall consider a small number of passages where, in my view, the underlying sense of the text should be taken either as subverting, or as adding materially to, the surface message.

Umbricius expresses indignation, as a Roman born on the Aventine hill, at having to cede social priority to incoming aliens (81–5): *me prior ille/ signabit . . . / advectus Romam quo pruna et cottona vento?/ usque adeo nihil est quod nostra infantia caelum/ hausit Aventini baca nutrita Sabina?* The passage plays on etymologies of *Aventinus*, as given by Varro at *L.L.* 5.43. He notes that the name was regarded by some as reflecting the association of the hill with immigrant Latins and the temple of Diana: . . . *alii Adventinum ab adventu hominum, quod commune Latinorum ibi Dianae templum sit constitutum* . . . However, Varro prefers another etymology, from *advectus*, on the grounds that because the hill had formerly been separated from the rest of the city by marshes, people who went there from the city were conveyed by boat: *ego maxime puto, quod ab advectu: nam olim paludibus mons erat ab reliquis disclusus. itaque eo ex urbe advehebantur ratibus* . . . Now, Juvenal alludes (*advectus*, 83) to the Varronian *advectus* etymology; but he does this in the conceptual context of an alternative etymology, that of *adventus*, i.e. immigration to Rome. *vento* reinforces the etymological comment.

Varro's *adventus* etymology refers to the foundation of the Aventine temple of Diana, around 540 B.C. A foundation myth of this temple was the Sabine cow, sacrificed there in order to assure the future greatness of Rome.<sup>76</sup> The temple of Diana symbolized Roman absorption of an alien (Arician) cult in order to assert Roman influence over Latium, and the temple's aetiology was later associated with the imperial destiny of the city. The cult of Diana, and the Aventine hill naturally became a focal point for foreigners and newly enrolled citizens. There, in short, could be seen the domestic consequences of territorial expansion.<sup>77</sup> But Umbricius, flaunting his Aventine birth in a complaint about pushy immigrants, seems oblivious to the historical connection his own native area has with immigration. Does the character realize any of this? A key pointer to this being unconscious allusion lies in the near-juxtaposition of overt material belonging to the same body of ideas: twelve lines earlier, speaking of Asian immigration, Umbricius gives an explicit hill-etymology (71): *Esquilias dictumque petunt a vimine collem*.<sup>78</sup> Of course, Roman poets may proceed from an overtly marked etymology to one which is unmarked (and Juvenal does precisely this in our passage); but Umbricius is a dramatic character, not a Roman poet, and I would argue that whereas he parades his etymological knowledge of *Viminalis*, he is 'unaware' of the mixed-up Varronian etymologizing on the Aventine, and of the damage it does to his own case.

Umbricius is not ignorant of Roman history, in the straightforward sense of facts, events, and famous men. His speech is littered with references to occurrences in early republican Rome. But his factual knowledge, ostentatiously paraded, masks an intellectual failing: a failure to analyse contemporary Rome in terms of the historical processes which moulded the city over a period of centuries. The history of Rome is in

<sup>76</sup> The priest of Diana made the sacrifice, after tricking the cow's owner (Val. Max. 7.3.1): *vaccam ipse immolavit et urbem nostram tot civitatum tot gentium dominam pio sacrificii furto reddidit*; Livy 1.45; Plut. *Q.R.* 264c–d. *baca nutrita Sabina* (85) puns on *vacca Sabina*, underpinned by the ancient assimilation of 'b' and 'v'; cf. the dictum *vacca dicta quasi boacca* (Isid. *Orig.* 12.1.31).

<sup>77</sup> See Ogilvie on Livy 1.45.

<sup>78</sup> Maltby (n. 22), s.v. *Viminalis*; further etymologizing suggested by *collo* (68), *collem* (71), *collum* (88): cf. Isid. *Diff.* 1.376: *colles prominentiora iuga montium, quasi colla*.

significant part the story of the extension of its *civitas*. But for Umbricius, a *Romanus* is someone born at Rome (cf. 119). He does not acknowledge that the city is the *communis patria* of all who held *civitas*.<sup>79</sup> Such technical issues are by no means alien to Juvenal's designs, for when Umbricius complains of the immigrant who poisons the patron's mind (122–4: *cum facilem stillavit in aurem/ exiguum de naturae patriaeque veneno, / limine summoveor* . . .) the juxtaposed *naturae* and *patriae* set up a verbal allusion to the concept of dual *patria* (provincial birth, Roman *civitas*) as developed by Cicero at *de Legibus* 2.5 (immediately after the Atticus/Cicero exchange cited earlier [II]): *duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram civitatis* . . . The technical reference to citizenship is confirmed in *limine*, which recalls *postliminium* (the recovery of *civitas* by an exile in his *patria*).<sup>80</sup> Umbricius, himself a *Romanus* both by birth and citizenship (i.e. belonging to a single *patria*), claims to be displaced both from the household of a great *amicus* and from Rome itself, by the immigrant Greek. And in leaving Rome, he intends to acquire *civitas* at Cumae (*unum civem donare Sibyllae*, 3).

Again, Umbricius is aware of famous events in Roman religious history. He refers to the transfer from Mt Ida in 204 B.C. of the image of the Magna Mater, Cybele (137–8), at a critical point in the Second Punic War; and he mentions Metellus' rescue from the burning *aedes* of Vesta of the Palladium, the wooden image of Pallas, conveyed from Troy by Aeneas, on which the safety of Rome was deemed to depend (139, *Minervam*). That both images came to Rome from Asia Minor is a fact which the reader might choose to set beside Umbricius' detestation for the contemporary imported culture of Asia Minor (62–5), including the *tympna* which were integral to the cult of Cybele. Their Asiatic provenance is significantly underlined through repetition of the word *Minervam* (219; again in proximity to a burning *aedes* [222]), for in the latter instance, 'Minerva' is a religious object looted (sc. by a Roman army) from an Asian temple (*Asianorum vetera ornamenta deorum*, 218). The verbal cross-referencing discreetly underlines the influence of Asia Minor on the Roman state religion, while simultaneously reminding the reader of looting by Roman armies of conquest. It encourages the reader to reflect on the historical context of the relationship between Asia Minor (including, of course, ancient Troy) and Rome, and perhaps to draw more mature conclusions about Asian immigration, and the relationship between imperial Rome and Asia Minor, than the character Umbricius means to convey, or indeed, given his analytical failings, would be intellectually capable of conveying.

## VII

The examples given above suggest that intertextual allusions and internal cross-references may cut across Umbricius' surface meaning, or add materially to it; and the allusions to city-state growth, imperial expansion and Roman *civitas* suggest some concealed confrontation between Umbricius' prejudiced oversimplifications and a less biased, and therefore inherently more truthful, approach to Rome and its history. But how might this approach be informed, if the speaker articulates it 'unintentionally'? And how is it that Umbricius can hit on the significant words, echoes, and verbal repetitions which invite the reader to form personal judgements? One response might be to suggest that he is unconsciously recollecting Latin and

<sup>79</sup> A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, 1939), Index s.v. *communis patria Roma*.

<sup>80</sup> *Postliminium*: RE XXII.863–73; and *limen*: ibid., 864–6.



Greek poetry and historiography. As was seen earlier, just such an influence is suggested in the *Phaedrus*, in Socrates' references to earlier literature (235c), and it might be that we should see Umbricius' substratum of wisdom as being 'inspired' in part by his own reading. Another, complementary, response arises from the 'topographical' approach adopted in the earlier parts of this paper, and it is to topography that I now return. That Umbricius can be supposed to be sensitive to his environment is evident from his concluding anticipation that he will listen to Juvenal reciting his satires in a sacred location in Aquinum (318–22); and that he can envisage some form of interaction between the content of what is said and local deities is suggested in *ni pudet illas* (321, of the impact of the *saturae* on Diana and Ceres at their own temples). The sacral location in Juvenal's *patria* is evidently meant to complement the sacral setting of the *vallis Egeriae* in Umbricius' *patria*, Rome.

Umbricius himself says nothing about the *vallis Egeriae*; but its conceptual relevance to the content of his speech is discreetly underlined by a topographical feature, the Aqua Marcia, running close to the Porta Capena. As a stone structure, the aqueduct is implicitly complemented by the stonework in the *vallis*, and its dripping arch by the cave and the sacred fountain.<sup>81</sup> The point of this topographical correlation can be clarified from Frontinus' *de Aquis Urbis Romae*, written not long before the third satire. His account opens thus (4):<sup>82</sup> 'for 441 years, the Romans were satisfied with the use of such waters (*aquarum*) as they drew from wells or from springs (*fontibus*). Esteem for springs still exists and is observed with reverence. They are believed to bring healing to the sick, as for example the springs of the *Camenae*. . . . Now, however, there flow into the city the Appian aqueduct, the Old Anio, the Marcia . . .' The passage helps to show that the water dripping from Juvenal's ancient (*veteres*) Aqua Marcia is imported and alien, in contrast to the indigenous supplies of the Roman *fontes*. Modern landscaping in a sacral environment, involving the importation of non-indigenous substances, is thus nothing new at Rome. The topography, in that sense, complements Umbricius' vituperation of the Asiatic immigrants, as well as his evident failure to see that immigration against its historical context and to understand that it is a modern example of a process which has antecedents reaching back to the earliest days of the city.

Egeria herself does not reappear, and it cannot be argued with any confidence that her name or personality impinges directly on the text.<sup>83</sup> Yet her association with love (*amicae*, 12) might have some relevance for Umbricius and his *syntacticon*. Friendship is a prominent theme in the third satire, both in the positive context of 'Juvenal's' relationship with Umbricius and in the latter's negative portrayal of the perversion of *amicitia* at Rome.<sup>84</sup> A central example is the attack on the immigrant's exclusive attitude to *amicitia* at 119–25, coupled with statements about Umbricius'

<sup>81</sup> The aqueduct (*arcus*)/cave parallelism is clearer when taken with Juvenal's models/artistic analogues: Ov. *Met.* 3.155–62, where *arcum* = 'cave'; and Cic. *de Leg.* 2.2, where aqueducts are contrasted with the natural surroundings of Arpinum.

<sup>82</sup> Fron. *Aq.* 1.4–5: [for 441 years the Romans were content with the use of waters . . .] *quas aut ex Tiberi aut ex puteis aut ex fontibus hauriebant. fontium memoria cum sanctitate adhuc exstat et colitur, salubritatem aegris corporibus afferre creduntur, sicut Camenarum . . .* [in 312 B.C.] *aqua Appia in urbem inducta.*

<sup>83</sup> But at 31–2, the activities of those who should stay at Rome all involve synonyms of *egerere*, from which Egeria's name was etymologized; Maltby (n. 22), s.v. *Egeria*. With *aedem* (i.e. construction, digging and removal of soil) cf. *OLD* s.v. *egero* 2(b); with *flumina* and *siccandam eluvium*, cf. *ibid.* 2(d); with *cadaver*, *ibid.* 1(b).

<sup>84</sup> *Amicus/amica*: 1, 12, 57, 87, 101, 107, 112, 116, 121, 279. LaFleur (n. 10 [1979]).

displacement, both from the house of a great *amicus*, and from his *patria*, Rome: *non est Romano cuiquam locus hic* (119), and *limine summoveor* (124).<sup>85</sup>

The same passage alludes, as noted earlier (VI) to dual *patria*, thereby recalling the Atticus/Cicero discussion of *patria*, and the etymologically interlinked *amoenitas*, *amicitia*, and *amor* at the opening of *de Legibus* 2 (above, II). Juvenal himself turns out at the end of the satire to have a dual *patria*, at Aquinum as well as at Rome, and can recover there from the rigours of life in the city (318–19). Umbricius' love for 'Juvenal' (cf. *memor nostri*, 318) is expressed in terms of his wish to join him on visits to his *patria*, with the topography of which he is evidently already familiar. By contrast, 'Juvenal's' love for Umbricius is paradoxically expressed in terms of reinforcement of his intention to leave his *patria*, and to acquire *civitas* elsewhere, despite the disruption of *amicitia* which that will entail.

A pattern of motifs in the *de Legibus* and in the third satire associates love, friendship, *amoenitas* of topography, *laudatio/vituperatio*, and *patria*. The *Phaedrus* offers some conceptual parallels, and one of these is the inspirational influence on Socrates of Eros (embodied in the presence of Phaedrus), side by side with that of the nymphs/Muses. In the *vallis Egeriae*, Numa's love for Egeria supposedly played some role in the production of the religious *constitutio* of Rome; and now, the dramatic situation leading to Umbricius' speech is the product of the *amicitia* between him and Juvenal. His *syntacticon* follows Juvenal's *propempticon*, takes its cue from it, and echoes its themes. In that sense, 'Juvenal' himself might be said to inspire his *amicus*, Umbricius, just as Socrates was inspired by his friend Phaedrus, and Numa by his *amica*, Egeria.

Here, then, is one way of looking at the 'truth about Rome', revealed in the operation of inspirational Roman topography on the speaker, as well as of *amicitia*, and articulated in the first place through contrasting praise and denigration of locations. Umbricius, like the Horatian *vates* of *Epode* 16, deploys apocalyptic tones to portray a barbarian invasion and the demise of old Rome; but at the same time he uses language that enables the reader to see through the distortions of *laudatio* and *vituperatio*, and to formulate more mature conclusions about the historical processes which went into the making of modern Rome.

Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London

ALEX HARDIE

<sup>85</sup> *non est . . . locus*, echoes Umbricius' opening *quando artibus . . . honestis! nullus in urbe locus*, and the two together play on the topographical content of the satire; similarly, in the *Phaedrus*, Plato deploys a series of 'topographical' word plays, on *ἀτοπος* and *ἀτοπία*: 229b, 229d, 230c.