

LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

JUVENAL  
AND  
PERSIUS



*Edited and Translated by*  
SUSANNA MORTON BRAUND

JUVENAL  
AND PERSIUS

江苏工业学院图书馆

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY  
SUSANNA MORTON BRAUND

藏书章



HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS  
LONDON, ENGLAND  
2004

Copyright © 2004 by the President and Fellows  
of Harvard College  
All rights reserved

LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY® is a registered trademark  
of the President and Fellows of Harvard College

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 2004042213  
CIP data available from the Library of Congress

ISBN 0-674-99612-7

*Composed in ZephGreek and ZephText by  
Technologies 'N Typography, Merrimac, Massachusetts.  
Printed and bound by Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, Michigan  
on acid-free paper made by Glatfelter, Spring Grove, Pennsylvania.*

## PREFACE

My aim in translating the Satires of Juvenal and Persius for the Loeb Classical Library has been to produce a translation that is vivid and vigorous and accessible, without compromising accuracy to the Latin text. Ramsay's 1918 Loeb translation has lasted remarkably well, but it is clearly time to update it and to incorporate advances in scholarship since then. One central difficulty of preparing a translation which is designed for a long shelf life is that of contemporary idiom. There is no doubt that when we look back at translations of Juvenal that were in vogue in the 1960s, such as those of Rolfe Humphries (1958), Hubert Creekmore (1963), Jerome Mazzaro (1965), Charles Plumb (1968), and above all Peter Green's 1967 Penguin, they seem very dated, not just because of their covers, but because they indulge too much in ephemeral expressions. I have tried to strike a balance between their strategy of trendiness and the clumsiness that results from trying to reproduce the structures of an inflected language like Latin in a largely uninflected language like English.

The intrinsic problem of the Loeb Classical Library is that of turning poetry into prose. In this particular case, it is highly rhetorical poetry, which self-consciously resonates with intertextual allusions to earlier satire and to epic and other classics of the ancient literary canon. I hope that

## PREFACE

in the case of Persius I have not made his Latin too easy. He is one of the hardest poets any student of Latin literature is likely to meet, and I believe that to “dumb down” the intensity and obscurity of his idiom would be to do him an injustice. In the case of Juvenal, I have tried to convey the verve and energy of his rhetorical impetus in the early Satires and his tone of superiority in the later Satires. Particularly in his case, I have designed my translation to be read aloud, because I consider it crucial that we reconnect with the oral presentation and the performative aspect of these poems.

A central difficulty is presented by the emphasis created by word order in Latin. To convey the effects of word order in Persius and Juvenal, I have at times recast sentences. Another problem is that some kinds of question and exclamation clause sound unnatural in our English; for example, relative clauses with the possessive genitive “whose.” I have taken liberties in such situations, aiming for a result that will sound at least possible for a native speaker. Another difficulty arises over connections between clauses and especially with words like *nam* and *enim*, conventionally translated “for,” and similar words, such as *itaque*, “therefore.” No one I know actually uses the connectives “for” and “therefore” in spoken English, so I resolved to avoid them in my translation, sometimes omitting them, where the thought connection seemed self-evident, but more often spelling out the connection of ideas more explicitly than may seem warranted in the Latin. And in terms of choice of vocabulary, I have tried to provide a judicious blend of Latinate roots with the more periphrastic expressions that currently dominate spoken English. I hope that these strategies combine fidelity to

## PREFACE

the Latin with a vitality which can last a long time. That, after all, is the crucial aim of the Loeb Classical Library: to make these fascinating and provocative authors accessible to students of Roman culture for years to come.

Both Juvenal and Persius have been well served by their editors in the twentieth century and I was consequently in the happy position of being able to rely to a considerable degree on the judgement and imagination of some eminent Latinists. I based my study of the text of Juvenal on Wendell Clausen's 1992 Oxford Classical Text and on James Willis' new Teubner (1997), and I had frequent recourse to the editions of A. E. Housman (1931), Edward Courtney (1984), and J. R. C. Martyn (1987) and to articles on the text of Juvenal by Robin Nisbet. I also had access to the conjectures of the scholar Guyet and to the annotations made by Markland on a MS in St John's College, Cambridge, thanks to the generosity of J. N. Adams. When I met him in Perth, James Willis kindly supplied me with the *Testimonia* prepared for his Teubner edition, which they had declined to print. With Persius I am likewise indebted to the scholarship exemplified by Clausen's Oxford Classical Text; I also used Bo's 1969 edition, Harvey's 1981 commentary, and Lee's 1987 edition, although none of these differs hugely from Clausen. For both authors, I follow the Oxford Classical Text fairly closely, although I offer a number of repunctuations and adopt some different readings and conjectures. These are listed in the rudimentary apparatus, along with other MSS variants and critical emendations that struck me as worthy of mention. I have translated in my notes all the lines that I propose to remove from Clausen's 1992 OCT if they appear unbracketed in Clausen, along with a selection of the lines that Clausen

## PREFACE

brackets. My aim has been to produce the most plausible text and translation of Persius and Juvenal, while making it possible for the reader to identify textual cruces that might affect interpretation.

In terms of translations, there were four stalwarts beside me throughout my work on Juvenal: Ramsay's 1918 Loeb, Niall Rudd's translation for Oxford World's Classics (1991), Steven Robinson's idiosyncratic 1983 translation from Carcanet Press, and an old and lasting favourite of mine, the Rev. J. D. Lewis' prose translation of 1873, my copy of which I purchased in 1975, just after I completed my B.A., at a bookshop in Hay-on-Wye. John Henderson's lively rendition of Satire 8 (1997) also proved provocative. In the case of Persius, Niall Rudd's Penguin Classics translation (revised version, 1987) and Guy Lee's 1987 translation published by Francis Cairns were my first resort, along with J. R. Jenkinson's 1980 Aris and Phillips translation.

### Acknowledgements

I started work on this new translation of Persius and Juvenal for the Loeb Classical Library, at the invitation of George Goold, during a welcome semester of leave at the University of Bristol in spring 1995. Progress slowed when I moved to the Classics Department at Royal Holloway, University of London, in September 1995. I finished the substantive version in November 1998. In hindsight, it seems amazing that I did finish—and, indeed, that anyone working in the British university system ever finishes anything—and I am grateful for the patience extended to me by those at the Loeb Classical Library. The ensuing delay can be attributed to changes within the Loeb Classical

## PREFACE

Library and to my move to Yale University in 2000. The new General Editor, Jeffrey Henderson, has devoted painstaking attention to every level of detail and improved the result immeasurably. I cannot express myself adequately about his contribution. Margaretta Fulton at the Press has been marvelous from beginning to end.

I wish to thank all those friends and colleagues, in Bristol and London, at Yale, and in the wider academic community, who supported me in this project. Vital assistance came from Dr Stephen Harrison, who took time during his Research Leave to trawl through my text and translation of Juvenal, and from Brother Paulinus Greenwood, O.S.B., who performed the same task for my translation of Persius. To both I am hugely grateful. I would also like to thank the entire Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Auckland, where I spent July and August of 1998 as a Foundation Visitor “finishing off” Juvenal, especially Marcus Wilson, for all his time and continuing friendship and support. J. N. Adams, John Barsby, Duncan Cloud, Michael Hendry, Harry Jocelyn, John D. Morgan III, and James Willis all gave me advice on specific passages and problems. My London colleague Nick Lowe gave invaluable technical help, and John Jacobs, a Yale graduate student, was a marvelous proofreader. Where none of the above could persuade me of my ignorance, I take full blame. I cannot conclude without naming the friends who have supported me during this project: Lene Rubinstein, Jonathan Walters, Patricia Moyer, Carole Newlands, Ted Kenney, the three Christophers—Carey, Gill, and Rowe—and above all Adam Morton.

New Haven  
August 2003

# CONTENTS

PREFACE	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
THE SATIRES OF PERSIUS	
Prologue	43
Satire 1	46
Satire 2	63
Satire 3	72
Satire 4	87
Satire 5	94
Satire 6	114
THE SATIRES OF JUVENAL	
Satire 1	128
Satire 2	147
Satire 3	164
Satire 4	194

## CONTENTS

Satire 5	213
Satire 6	230
Satire 7	296
Satire 8	320
Satire 9	348
Satire 10	364
Satire 11	399
Satire 12	419
Satire 13	432
Satire 14	456
Satire 15	487
Satire 16	505
INDEX TO JUVENAL	513
INDEX TO PERSIUS	533

## INTRODUCTION

“Satire” seems a seductively straightforward term, because everyone can think of satirical forms of writing. But any attempt to define “satire” shows it to be a slippery term. “The playfully critical distortion of the familiar” is Feinberg’s attempt.<sup>1</sup> This pinpoints four features common to most works of satire, usually distributed along two axes: the spectrum of playfulness and criticism, and the spectrum of the familiar and its distortions, ranging from suppression to exaggeration. Satire, moreover, is “an urban art,”<sup>2</sup> “set in the city, particularly in the metropolis with a polyglot people.”<sup>3</sup> These definitions work well for Roman satire. They offer a reminder that these texts are not streams of angry consciousness but highly crafted artefacts written for a sophisticated audience. It follows that the uncritical use of the texts of Roman satire as evidence for Roman social practices is highly problematic: the apparent realism of these texts should not blind us to the degree of distortion exerted in the interests of entertainment. In particular, the habit of attributing what is said to the poet himself (the biographical fallacy) has been countered by an awareness

<sup>1</sup> Feinberg *The Satirist* 7.

<sup>2</sup> Hodgart *Satire* 129.

<sup>3</sup> Kernan *The Cankered Muse* 7–8.

## INTRODUCTION

that the satirists create a range of satiric mouthpieces, conveniently called the satirist's mask or persona.<sup>4</sup> The dramatic dimension of these poems would have been readily appreciated by the Roman elite audience, who were thoroughly accustomed to the creation of characters from their rhetorical training.

So the first Satire of Juvenal may seem familiar. Juvenal presents a character who seems to be an ordinary citizen of the metropolis of Rome, ranting at the excesses and outrages that surround him, a simple man who is so frustrated at society's hypocrisy and corruption and at its failure to address burning issues of inequality and immorality that he is driven to deliver a scathing condemnation of that decadent society. This fits modern ideas of "satire" rather closely. The fact is that Juvenal has had such a profound and lasting influence on the development of satire that it would be surprising if our concept of satire did not match his. But the story of satire is much more complex. This introduction will briefly review the origins and development of the genre of Roman satire through more than three centuries, from the first experiments of Ennius in the late third to early second century B.C., through the establishment of the standard features of the genre by Lucilius in the late second century B.C., the refinement of the form by Horace, close associate of both the emperor Augustus and his "minister of culture" Maecenas, to the radically different treatments of the genre by the satirists of the

<sup>4</sup> Hight *Juvenal the Satirist* was chiefly responsible for popularising the biographical approach; Anderson *Essays on Roman Satire* was crucial in shifting the parameters of the debate. All subsequent work on Roman satire is indebted to him.

## INTRODUCTION

early Principate, Persius and Juvenal. This diachronic overview is crucial to a proper understanding of the individual poets and poems.<sup>5</sup>

Greek and Roman literature operated within a framework of genres with their unwritten rules. Although "genre" itself is a relatively modern word, the ancients clearly found ways of classifying their literary productions into family groups. It was expected that a writer would acknowledge his debt to his predecessors by imitation, which was regarded as the highest form of compliment. This element of imitation needed to be blended with innovation, to avoid stagnation and to develop the genre. This makes it important to be aware of the history of any Greco-Roman genre: later writers invariably demonstrate an intimacy with earlier writers by reworking and adapting and even at times overturning their ideas.

The rules of the genre of Roman verse satire prescribed the metre and form, material, presentation, and language. The metre was the dactylic hexameter, and the form required compositions of short to middle length, usually in the range 50–250 lines long. The content included matters of morality, education, and literature. The type of presentation was generally the autobiographical monologue, with occasional excursions into dialogue, epistle, or narrative form. The language ranged from mock-epic grandeur, through everyday discourse, to moments of explicit crudity. These features emerged in the *Satires* of Lucilius, who is regarded by later satirists as the founder of the genre: Horace actually calls him its inventor at *Satires*

<sup>5</sup> For a fuller account see Braund *Roman Verse Satire* and Freudenburg *The Walking Muse*.

## INTRODUCTION

1.10.48. From the few surviving fragments of his *Satires*, Lucilius' influence upon later satirists is palpable. Horace, for example, reworked his predecessor's diary-type poem depicting a journey to Sicily in his journey to Brindisi (*Satires* 1.5), and presented himself as a new Lucilius for a more sophisticated era (*Satires* 1.4, 1.10, 2.1). In the case of the relationship between Horace and Persius we fare better. Virtually every line of Persius' *Satires* demonstrates his deep familiarity with Horace's satirical writings.<sup>6</sup> He takes individual words, phrases, patterns of thought, and material from Horace and reworks them into something distinctively his own which all the same is indelibly Horatian. Juvenal shows more independence, but is nevertheless indebted to Horace and Persius throughout his *Satires*—and, doubtless, to Lucilius too. Persius and Juvenal both include in their opening, "programmatic," satires indications of their literary pedigree. Persius opens his first Satire with what is probably a quotation from Lucilius, and he later asserts the right to express his views because he is following the precedent set by Lucilius and Horace (1.114–18): "Lucilius ripped into Rome—you, Lupus, you, Mucius—and broke a molar on them. While his friend is laughing, the rascal Horace touches every fault in him and, once he's got in, he frolics around his heart, clever at dangling the public from his cleaned-out nose." Similarly, early in his first Satire Juvenal cites the precedent of Lucilius, "the great protégé of Aurunca" steering his chariot across the plain (19–20), and later that of Horace's "Venusian lamp" (51); he reworks from Persius a scene of death in the bath (142–6, cf. Persius 3.98–106); and near the end

<sup>6</sup> See Rudd in *Lines of Enquiry* 54–83.

## INTRODUCTION

of the poem he parades Lucilius blazing and roaring “as if with drawn sword” (165–6).

### *The Origins of Roman Satire*

For the Romans, there were two types of satire, one in prose and one in verse.<sup>7</sup> The two share many characteristics, yet ancient discussions of the genre privilege the verse form. This may be because the prose form, often called Menippean satire, had its roots in Greek culture, specifically in the diatribe, a kind of sermon associated with the Hellenistic philosophical schools such as Cynicism. In contrast, the verse form was claimed as Roman.

The origins of the genre of satire and the significance of the word *satura* have been much debated, in antiquity and since. The most famous Roman statement about satire is Quintilian’s: “Satire is entirely our own” (*Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.93, *satura quidem tota nostra est*). This seems to mean that there is no original Greek form which the Roman satirists are imitating, unlike the rest of Latin literature, which is heavily influenced by Greek literature. This view is supported by Horace when he calls satire “verse never handled by the Greeks” (*Satires* 1.10.66, *Graecis intacti carminis*) and by the fact that this is the only genre discussed by Quintilian which is identified by a Latin name. This does not, of course, mean that Greek literature never uses a satirical or critical or aggressive tone—the genres of comedy and iambus offer plenty of examples—but it does mean that there is no Greek satire in the form used by Lucilius, Horace, and Persius.

<sup>7</sup> Coffey *Roman Satire* discusses both genres of satire.

## INTRODUCTION

Quintilian, writing in the late first century A.D. (earlier than Juvenal), groups together Lucilius, Horace, and Persius as the chief exponents: "The first to win renown in *satura* was Lucilius, who has some devotees who are so dedicated to him that they without hesitation prefer him not just to other authors in the same genre but to all poets. I disagree with them as much as with Horace, who thinks that Lucilius is a muddy river with a lot of stuff that you could remove. His learning is remarkable, as is his freedom of speech and the sharpness and abundant wit which derives from it. Horace is much terser and purer and, unless I lapse because of my affection for him, the best. Persius has won a considerable and legitimate reputation, although he wrote only one book. There are eminent satirists today who will be celebrated in the future" (*Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.93–4). When he goes on to mention a more ancient form of satire, "an older kind of *satura*, composed by Terentius Varro, which has a mixture variegated not just by verse" (*Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.95), he is clearly referring to Menippean satire, which later develops into all kinds of prosimetrum compositions.

Apart from Quintilian's comments, we find *satura* appearing incidentally in the historian Livy's discussion of the history of Roman drama and directly in the writings of Diomedes, a fourth century grammarian. Livy, writing early in the Augustan era, presents an elaborate theory of the development of Roman drama. He mentions a dramatic form which he calls *satura*, a scripted musical stage-show with no organised plot (7.2.4–10). What relation this bears to the polished literature that survives as hexameter satire is hard to say, but it supports a view of satire as a form of drama.

## INTRODUCTION

The only theoretical discussion of *satura* from antiquity is that of Diomedes, who may have derived this material from Varro, the late Republican antiquarian scholar and author of Menippean satires. Diomedes offers four possible explanations of the word *satura* (Diomedes, *GLK* I.485): “*satura* takes its name either from satyrs, because in this form of poetry laughable and disgraceful things are said in the same way as if produced and performed by satyrs; or from a full dish which, stuffed with many varied first fruits, was offered to the gods in religious ritual among the ancients and was called *satura* from the abundance and fullness of its material; . . . or from a certain type of sausage which, stuffed with many ingredients, Varro says was called *satura* . . . Others think that its name came from the *lex satura* [lit. “full law”], which combines together many provisions in a single bill, because in the poetry form *satura* many poems are combined together.” The connection with satyrs (*satyri*) seems tenuous (although Petronius clearly plays on it in his *Satyricon*): Roman satire does not have the ribald and obscene nature of Greek satyr drama. The other three explanations hinge upon the notions of mixture and variety: the derivation of *satura* from the *lanx satura*, “mixed dish” of offerings to the gods; the association with a kind of stuffing or sausage made from many ingredients; and the derivation of *satura* from the *lex per satura*, a law with mixed provisions of Republican times.

Although it is impossible to make a firm choice, these ideas of abundance and variety dominate. Maybe the poet is offering a “mixed dish” to the inspiring deity; or he is like a moral legislator; but it is most appealing to view the satirist as a cook, serving up to his audience a sausage stuffed