

Sapiens Ubique Civis

**Proceedings of International Conference on
Classical Studies (Szeged, Hungary, 2013)**

Edited by

János Nagyillés, Attila Hajdú, Gergő Gellérfi,
Anne Horn Baroody, and Sam Baroody

ELTE Eötvös József Collegium
Budapest, 2015

This work received support from the
Hungarian Scientific Research Found within
the research project OTKA NN 104456

Editorial board

Mariann Czerovszki
Endre Hamvas
Péter Kasza
Valéria Kulcsár
István Lázár
Péter Mayer
László Odrobina
László Szörényi
Ibolya Tar
Iván Tóth

All rights reserved

ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2015
Felelős kiadó: Dr. Horváth László, az ELTE Eötvös József
Collegium igazgatója
Borítóterv: Egedi-Kovács Emese
Copyright © Eötvös Collegium 2015 © A szerzők
Minden jog fenntartva!
A nyomdai munkákat a Pátria Nyomda Zrt. végezte
1117 Budapest, Hunyadi János út 7.
Felelős vezető: Orgován Katalin vezérigazgató

ISSN 2064-2369
ISBN 978-615-5371-40-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE: GREEK LITERATURE

GIULIA MARIA CHESI: Odysseus' polutropia and the <i>Dialektik der Aufklärung</i> : Odysseus between Enlightenment and semiotics	1
MARINA SOLÍS DE OVANDO: Euripides under the "happy ending" empire: <i>Iphigenia among the Taurians</i> as a real tragedy	11
TRINIDAD SILVA: The sophia of the unwise: knowledge for the purpose of wrongness in Plato	21
JORGE TORRES: Plato's medicalisation of justice in <i>Republic IV</i>	31
YASUHIRO KATSUMATA: Travel and the Greek σοφία: A Study of the Phoenician Merchant in Philostratus' <i>Heroicus</i>	43

PART TWO: ROMAN LITERATURE

DOUKISSA KAMINI: The contribution of the law of <i>epikleros</i> to the comic effect of <i>Phormio</i>	67
FRANTZESKA KATSARI: The war of the generations: when <i>adulescentes and senes</i> act unexpectedly	79
TOBIAS DÄNZER: Rhetoric on Rhetoric: Criticism of Oratory in Seneca's <i>Troades</i>	93
GERGŐ GELLÉRFI: On the Sources of Juvenal's <i>Satire 3</i>	107
CARMELA CIOFFI: <i>Terentium interpretari</i> – Punctuation as an exegetical problem in A. Donatus' <i>Commentum</i>	121

PART THREE: ANCIENT HISTORY

ATTILA HAJDÚ: Portrait of Pericles in Ephorus' Universal History – The causes of the Peloponnesian War (D. S. 12,38,1–41,1)	145
KRISZTIÁN MÁRVÁNYOS: Some aspects of Tiberius' trials from the viewpoint of Libo Drusus case	163
MÁRK SÓLYOM: The <i>Epitome de Caesaribus</i> and the Thirty Tyrants	179

ISTVÁN GERGŐ FARKAS: New data on the use of term Raetia-Vindelicia	189
ÁKOS ZIMONYI: “ <i>Archiatres id est medicus sapientissimus</i> ” – Changes in the meaning of the term <i>archiatros</i> in the Roman Empire	231
GÁBOR SZÉLL: “ <i>Propter potentio rem principalitatem</i> ” – The beginnings of the Primacy of the Church of Rome	243
GÁBOR HORTI: The defense-in-depth in the Roman Empire	255
FEDERICO UGOLINI: Preliminary Account on the Geomorphology of the Roman Port of Ariminum	269

PART FOUR: ANCIENT RELIGION

SAM BAROODY: The Bacchus temple at Baalbek – Defining temple function and the language of syncretism	281
VIKTÓRIA JÁRMI: Discrepancies within a Cult and a Myth: Some Aspect of the figure of Hercules in the Roman Tradition	295
DÓRA KOVÁCS: Liberalia in Ovid – Liber in the Roman religion	307
GYULA LINDNER: Superstition and Propitiation Plutarch and the Phrygian-Lydia n Confession Inscriptions	321

PART FIVE: LATE ANTIQUITY AND RECEPTION

ÁGNES MIHÁLYKÓ: Greek and Coptic in the Late Antique Christian Magical Tradition	335
FRANCESCO LUBIAN: The Construction of a Literary (Sub-) Genre: the Case of the Late Antique <i>tituli historiarum</i> – with a Commentary on Rusticus Helpidius’ <i>Tristicha</i> V and VI	347
ALEKSANDRA KRAUZE-KOŁODZIEJ: Hades as the ruler of the Damned in the mosaic complex on the west wall of Basilica Santa Maria Assunta in Torcello, Italy	379
ERIKA JUHÁSZ: “Nobis id maxime studendum, ut obsequi studeamus”	397
GYÖRGY PALOTÁS: Birth and Death in Michael Verancius’ Poems Written to the Szapolyai Family in 1540	407

ON THE SOURCES OF JUVENAL'S *SATIRE 3*

GERGÓ GELLÉRFI

Juvenal's *Satire 3* is a peculiar poem in many aspects. The 322-line satire is much longer than was usual before Juvenal, and almost the entire poem consists of a speech of Umbricius, the longest continuous speech by an interlocutor in all extant Roman satires. I have analysed *Satire 3* as part of my research, focusing on the mixture of genres that can be observed in Juvenal's satires. From this viewpoint, *Satire 3* is the most interesting satire by Juvenal before one considers the crucial role epic and bucolic literature play interpreting the poem. Examining the interlocutor's character and his literary sources, we can conclude that he is the most complex figure in Juvenal. Although the assumption of Umbricius' historical background and possible connection with real persons had been criticized, we must consider the possibility that on the one hand, the figure of Umbricius can be traced back to a historical character, and on the other hand, the dramatic setting of the satire (a friend leaves Rome) can be based on a real event.

After a short introduction by the narrator, Juvenal's *Satire 3* contains the 300-line speech of the *interlocutor*, Umbricius, explaining why he decided to move from Rome to Cumae. Umbricius is the most complex figure of the Juvenalian Satires in several aspects: his character is ambiguous, and he seems to be composed using multiple sources. In this paper, I hypothesize about Umbricius, using the results of the earlier analyses on this mysterious figure.¹

We should start our investigation from the article of Motto and Clark, who summarize the character as follows: "Umbricius is no historical figure contemporary to Juvenal, a neighbour or a friend, but the "immaterial presence" itself – that shade or *umbra* representative of the deceased Eternal City."² Their interpretation is problematic, since they treat

¹ The most important analyses of Umbricius: MOTTO–CLARK (1965: 267–276); ANDERSON (1970: 13–33); LAFLEUR (1976: 383–431); JENSEN (1986: 185–197); BRAUND (1990: 502–506); SARKISSIAN (1991: 247–258); STALEY (2000: 85–98). In this study, my purpose is not to re-examine all of the interpretations of Umbricius, as they often contradict each other, and I concentrate only on the relevant aspects of the character.

² MOTTO–CLARK (1965: 275).

Gergő Gellérfi

Umbricius as a homogeneous character “in the sum of his virtues, most Roman: he *is* in essence Rome itself”;³ however, as I will show, his figure is not so consistent.⁴ From a certain viewpoint, we can see a man leaving his home because of its decay. He emphasizes traditional Roman values and looks back to the glorious past of the city.⁵ Umbricius longs for the possibility of earning an honest living with a decent job,⁶ and does not want to take part in criminal activity.⁷ He speaks for the poor,⁸ and recalls the good old times with bittersweet nostalgia, particularly when speaking about public safety at the end of his speech.⁹ However, he is also jealous of the success of others, and his thoughts lead him toward envy and xenophobia.¹⁰ His departure is motivated by his own inability to succeed as much as by Rome’s corruption. Talking about the traditional values and virtues, he is also corrupted by the city. This ambiguity determines Umbricius: his Romanness goes hand in hand with the negative characteristics of contemporary Rome.¹¹ Thus, one part of the

³ MOTTO–CLARK (1965: 269).

⁴ ANDERSON (1982: 223) sees Umbricius similarly, as a *vir bonus atque Romanus*, and states that Juvenal “created a completely sympathetic, because completely Roman, Umbricius, and he has made a completely unsympathetic, because totally un-Roman, city.” cf. BRAUND (1988: 202, note 32): “I dissent from the view taken by Anderson (1982) 223 that Umbricius is a ‘completely sympathetic’ figure; see Winkler (1983) 220–3 on the darker side of Umbricius.”

⁵ In his speech, expressions like *moribus* (140), *virtutibus* (164) and *vires* (180) frequently occur.

⁶ The monologue starts with the description of this problem: *quando artibus [...] honestis nullus in urbe locus*, Juv. 3,21–22.

⁷ Umbricius declares that later while talking about the lack of possibility of an honest living again: *me nemo ministro / fur erit*, Juv. 3,46–47.

⁸ Among others: *quod / pauperis hic meritum*, Juv. 3,126–127; *nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se*, Juv. 3,152; *quis pauper scribitur heres?* Juv. 3,161; *libertas pauperis haec est*, Juv. 3,299.

⁹ Juv. 3,312–314: *felices proavorum atavos, felicia dicas / saecula quae quondam sub regibus atque tribunis / viderunt uno contentam carcere Romam*.

¹⁰ Following the interpretation of WINKLER (1983: 220–223), BRAUND (1996: 233–234) exhibits the “dark side” of Umbricius. STALEY (2000: 87) also emphasizes this aspect of the character. HARDIE (1998: 248–249) points out that Umbricius is unaware of certain historical processes, which can be traced back to his xenophobia.

¹¹ The conclusion of the analysis of WEHRLE (1992: 70) is worth quoting here: “His self-defacing monologue provides as much satirical substance as do the various faults of Rome specified therein; these manifold and much exaggerated urban ills (which indeed are almost universal) are presented to the reader by a persona which is simultaneously satirized.”

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire 3*

interpretation of Motto and Clark is true, though not in the sense suggested by the authors—namely, that Umbricius represents Rome, indeed, including all of its aspects. His figure carries the essence of the Roman past and that of the decadent Rome as well.

The character's interpretation is not the only disputed aspect of Umbricius, as there are different views on the "literary building-blocks" of him, as well. Certain scholars state that we should not seek any historical or contemporary person in his sources.¹² Nevertheless, we should examine this possibility, since the following arguments suggest that we must account for historical and contemporary sources.

"Who is Umbricius?" is the first question. Scholars who deny the historical background state that he has nothing to do with any real person, and Juvenal names his *interlocutor* Umbricius only because this name was appropriate for his poetic purposes. On the meaning of the name however, different interpretations were proposed.¹³ Moreover, it seems certain to me that the name is not Juvenal's own creation, but the name of a real historical person. Nisbet brought up the idea again that the *interlocutor* is the same person as Umbricius Melior, the *haruspex* about whom Tacitus wrote in the *Histories*, and whom Pliny the Elder and Plutarch also mentioned.¹⁴ Braund examined this proposition in detail, focusing on a few lines of the speech of Umbricius.¹⁵

¹² MOTTO-CLARK (1965: 275) and STALEY (2000: 88) among others.

¹³ STALEY (2000: 87) connects the name with the expression *in urbe locus* in line 22 and states that Umbricius suggests with these words that his name means Mr. "Place in the City". WINKLER (1983: 222–223) suggests that the name alludes to the ending of *Satire 2* where, among the shades of great Roman heroes, Juvenal mentions Fabricius. MOTTO and CLARK (1965: 275) deduce that the name might originate from *umbra* according to their interpretation that Umbricius is the "shade or *umbra* representative of the deceased Eternal City." LAFLEUR (1976: 390–391) rejects this interpretation and states that Umbricius got this name because of the "pastoral associations of *umbra*", as Umbricius leaves Rome for living "in the shade", while FERGUSON (1987: 235) writes that "Umbricius is a shadowy name for a shadowy person, and the fact that *umbra* means a shady retreat is hardly accidental."

¹⁴ For the appearances of the name Umbricius in the Roman literature, see NICE (2003: 401–402).

¹⁵ NISBET (1988: 92) briefly mentions this possibility, having been rejected by MAYOR and FERGUSON (1979: 136) earlier without any reason, as BRAUND (1990: 505) states in her article on the identity of Umbricius. According to HIGHET (1954: 253), this identification is impossible because of lines 42–45; however, we have to agree with BRAUND, who identifies Umbricius with the *haruspex* on the grounds of these very lines.

Gergő Gellérfi

Following her interpretation, we can describe the character of the *haruspex*-Umbricius based on these lines:¹⁶ he is not a liar (like other diviners), which he proves with a general example; he does not know the movement of the stars (since he is a *haruspex* deprived of his privileged position by astrologers);¹⁷ he does not foretell the death of relatives (that is also illegal);¹⁸ and he does not sink to utilizing inappropriate animals—frogs, for instance—for divination. According to this interpretation, Umbricius is an old *haruspex* who no longer needed, one who cannot and does not want to adapt to the changing conditions of his age, choosing instead to leave Rome. Furthermore, in the *Histories*, Umbricius Melior foretells dark events, an act which perfectly corresponds to the mood of the monologue of *Satire* 3.¹⁹ Moreover, this interpretation dissolves the contradiction between Umbricius' hatred of the Greeks and the fact that his destination, Cumae, is the oldest Greek colony.²⁰ He moves there because it is the seat of the greatest diviner, the Sibyl.

In my opinion, the arguments presented suggest that a 1st century *haruspex* might be in the background of the character of Umbricius. However, we should not rule out the possibility that the choice of the *interlocutor* was influenced by the name “Umbricius”,²¹ and in this manner, this name can carry a message as it was proposed earlier. If we want to define the role of the imperial *haruspex*, we can say that his name and identity are barely more than a mask given to his *interlocutor* by Juvenal. Thus, his audience could connect the narrator's “old friend” with the familiar name of a known person who was successful and recognized

¹⁶ Juv. 3,41–45: *quid Romae faciam? mentiri nescio; librum, / si malus est, nequeo laudare et poscere; motus / astrorum ignoro; funus promittere patris / nec volo nec possum; ranarum viscera numquam / inspexi;*

¹⁷ Cf. NICE (2003: 405–406).

¹⁸ MACMULLEN (1967: 129–130).

¹⁹ Tac. *hist.* 1,27,1: *Octavo decimo kalendas Februarias sacrificanti proaede Apollinis Galbae haruspex Umbricius tristia exta et in stantis insidias ac domesticum hostem praedicat...* Umbricius is mentioned by Pliny the Elder as well: Plin. *Nat.* 10,19: *Umbricius, haruspicum in nostro aevo peritissimus, parere tradit ova XIII, uno ex his reliqua ova nidumque lustrare, mox abicere. triduo autem ante advolare eos, ubi cadavera futura sunt.*

²⁰ Juv. 3,60–61: *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem.* Cumae is a suitable destination for Umbricius from another point of view as well, see STALEY (2000: 88–90).

²¹ BALDWIN (1972: 101) also brings up this idea; however, he follows HIGHET's views concerning the *haruspex*, and counts with the possibility that Juvenal actually had a friend called Umbricius.

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire* 3

in his own time.²² The effect of Umbricius' speech is made even stronger by the contrast between the esteemed imperial *haruspex* and the "covetous failure driven away by his lack of success"²³ that contributes to the negative portrayal of Rome.

While we cannot deny that Umbricius' departure from Rome had some historical background, Nice's suggestion that Umbricius was a *vetus amicus* of Juvenal seems improbable.²⁴ However, it should not be ruled out that the dramatic setting of *Satire* 3 was inspired by an actual event. Claiming that Umbricius is somehow connected with Martial, whose significant influence was subsequently proven in other Juvenalian Satires,²⁵ is a recurring idea in present scholarship. When examining the speech of Umbricius, we find so many textual and thematic parallels with Martial's *Epigrams* that we can rightly name him the most important inspiration for *Satire* 3.²⁶ At first, a few proper names occur in Umbricius' speech which also appear in the *Epigrams* in the same context, such as the examples of poor Cordus²⁷ or Chione the prostitute.²⁸ Of course, we cannot say that they are the same people, nor that Juvenal's Cordus and Chione are real figures. More likely, they are probably merely names with obvious meanings: Cordus is poor and Chione is a prostitute – just like in Martial's *Epigrams*.

The proper names, together with textual parallels, advise the reader on the relation between the texts. These parallels are sufficiently presented by

²² cf. NICE (2003: 404). Pliny names Umbricius *haruspicum in nostro aevo peritissimus*, Plin. *Nat.* 10,19.

²³ Quotation from BRAUND (1996: 235).

²⁴ NICE (2003: 402–403).

²⁵ For example MORFORD (1977: 219–245). On the relationship between the two authors, WILSON (1898: 193) is even more categorical in stating that "in all the field of Roman literature there are perhaps no two writers who are more closely related or throw more light each on the other than Juvenal and Martial."

²⁶ The parallels presented in the next section of my argument are detected by WILSON (1898: 198–209), HIGHET (1951: 370–387), COLTON (1966: 403–419), COURTNEY (1980: *ad loc.*), and BRAUND (1996: *ad loc.*), but in most cases they do not explain them in detail.

²⁷ Juv. 3,203–205: *lectus erat Cordo Procula minor, urceoli sex / ornamentum abaci, nec non et parvulus infra / cantharus et recubans sub eodem marmore Chiron*; Mart. 3,15: *Plus credit nemo tota quam Cordus in urbe. / 'Cum sit tam pauper, quomodo?' Caecus amat.*

²⁸ Juv. 3,135–136: *cum tibi vestiti facies scorti placet, haeres / et dubitas alta Chionen deducere sella*; Mart. 3,30,1–4: *Sportula nulla datur; gratis conviva recumbis: / Dic mihi, quid Romae, Gargiliane, facis? / Unde tibi togula est et fuscae pensio cellae? / Unde datur quadrans? unde vir es Chiones?* Both names occur more than once in Martial's *Epigrams*.

Gergő Gellérfi

the commentaries and articles on the two authors,²⁹ but stronger connections can be detected concerning a number of passages, since Umbricius talks continuously about social phenomena and problems which have a central role in one or more epigrams of Martial.

In the first section of his speech, Umbricius complains that in Rome, it is impossible to earn an honest living by a decent job. Furthermore, he mentions low-born former horn-players who, once relegated to accompanying gladiatorial shows, have made such a large fortune from these degrading jobs that now they are rich enough to organise the games themselves:

*quis facile est aedem conducere, flumina, portus,
siccandam eluviem, portandum ad busta cadaver,
et praeberere caput domina venale sub hasta.
quondam hi cornicines et municipalis harenae
perpetui comites notaeque per oppida buccae
munera nunc edunt et, verso pollice vulgus
cum iubet, occidunt populariter; inde reversi
conducunt foricas, et cur non omnia? cum sint
quales ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum
extollit quotiens voluit Fortuna iocari.*
(Juv. 3,31–40)

This is a recurring topic of Martial's Book 3. He addresses *Epigram* 16 to the "prince of cobblers" giving gladiators,³⁰ a figure mentioned again in *Epigram* 59 in connection with gladiatorial games, together with the fuller from Mutina, and another low-class occupation, the *copo*.³¹ After these lines, Umbricius utters his aforementioned complaint of the lack of possibility of an honest life in Rome:

*quid Romae faciam? mentiri nescio; librum,
si malus est, nequeo laudare et poscere; motus
astrorum ignoro; funus promittere patris
nec volo nec possum; ranarum viscera numquam
inspexi; ferre ad nuptam quae mittit adulter,
quae mandat, norunt alii; me nemo ministro*

²⁹ see note 26.

³⁰ Mart. 3,16,1–2: *Das gladiatores, sutorum regule, Cerdo, / Quodque tibi tribuit subula, sica rapit.*

³¹ Mart. 3,59: *Sutor Cerdo dedit tibi, culta Bononia, munus, / Fullo dedit Mutinae: nunc ubi copo dabit?* He refers to this in *Epigram* 99, as well. Mart. 3,99: *Irasci nostro non debes, Cerdo, libello. / Ars tua, non vita est carmine laesa meo. / Innocuos permitte sales. Cur ludere nobis / Non liceat, licuit si iugulare tibi?*

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire 3*

fur erit...
(Juv. 3,41–47)

The point of an epigram in Martial's Book 3 is that a good man cannot make a living in Rome, or he can do so only by chance. Furthermore, there is a textual parallel between the two passages:³²

*'Quid faciam? suade: nam certum est vivere Romae.'
si bonus es, casu vivere, Sexte, potes.*
(Mart. 3,38,13–14)

In *Epigram 5* of Book 4, Martial goes further: it is not worth it for a good man to go to Rome. After that, he deals with themes that are also found in this section of Umbricius' speech: dishonest jobs, fraudulence, mendacity, adulation, and the worthlessness of virtue.³³ Umbricius mentions the praise of bad literary works as an aspect of adulation, a topic which is also found in Martial.³⁴ Juvenal's *interlocutor* returns to the topic of adulation several times, and soon thereafter, attacks Greek flatterers who use Greek mythological comparison to heroise their unworthy patrons, an act which Martial also criticizes in Book 12:

*et longum invalidi collum cervicibus aequat
Herculis Antaeum procul a tellure tenentis*
(Juv. 3,88–89)

*exiguos secto comentem dente capillos
dicet Achilleas disposuisse comas.*
(Mart. 12,82,9–10)

The attacked flatterer is Greek in the works of both authors. However, Umbricius sometimes talks about Greeks in certain contexts where Martial does not, because of his contempt for Greek and Middle Eastern people. He summarizes the superiority of the Greeks in adulation: *non sumus ergo pares* (Juv. 3,104). These words recall *Epigram 18* of Martial's Book 2,

³² see also Mart. 3,30 in note 28.

³³ Mart. 4,5: *Vir bonus et pauper linguaque et pectore verus, / Quid tibi vis, urbem qui, Fabiane, petis? / Qui nec leno potes nec comissator haberi, / Nec pavidos tristi voce citare reos, / Nec potes uxorem cari corrumpere amici, / Nec potes algentes arrigere ad vetulas, / Vendere nec vanos circa Palatia fumos, / Plaudere nec Cano, plaudere nec Glaphyro: / Unde miser vives? 'Homo certus, fidus amicus.'* / *Hoc nihil est: numquam sic Philomelus eris.*

³⁴ Mart. 12,40,1: *recitas mala carmina, laudo.* Horace also mentions this type of adulation: Hor. S. 2,5,74–75: *scribet mala carmina vecors / laudato.*

Gergő Gellérfi

where he repeats the sentence *iam sumus ergo pares* three times. We can sum up Martial's epigram this way: although the narrator is subjected to the addressed Maximus, they are of the same status, since Maximus has the same relationship with another person. Instead of a simple allusion, Umbricius uses these words to express his hatred of the Greeks again, whose adulation cannot be matched. Thus, while a Roman can be equal to another Roman in this "system of flattery", it is impossible for a Greek. The theme of this epigram is recalled again when Umbricius mentions the morning salutations that everyone, even the praetor, uses:

*quod porro officium, ne nobis blandiar, aut quod
pauperis hic meritum, si curet nocte togatus
currere, cum praetor lictorem inpellat et ire
praecipitem iubeat dudum vigilantibus orbis,
ne prior Albinam et Modiam collega salutet?*
(Juv. 3,126–130)

This *locus* also resembles *Epigram* 10 of Martial's Book 10, which deals with the difficulties of clients' being hurried greetings.³⁵ Besides the obvious thematic-motivic parallel, a textual allusion also connects this epigram with the speech of Umbricius, who rewrites line 5 of the epigram (*qui me respiciet, dominum regemque vocabo?*), discussing the salutation as well, (*quid das, ut Cossum aliquando salutes, / ut te respiciat clauso Veiiento labello?* Juv. 3,184–185), while lines 127–128 of the satire (*curet nocte togatus / currere*) also have a precedent in an epigram of Martial (*nocte togatus ero*, Mart. 10,82,2).

After that, Umbricius approaches the humiliation of poor men on the basis that their dirty and ragged clothes make them ridiculous:

*quid quod materiam praebet causasque iocorum
omnibus hic idem, si foeda et scissa lacerna,
si toga sordidula est et rupta calceus alter
pelle patet, vel si consuto volnere crassum
atque recens linum ostendit non una cicatrix?*
(Juv. 3,147–151)

³⁵ Mart. 10,10: *Cum tu, laurigeris annum qui fascibus intras, / Mane saluator limina mille teras, / Hic ego quid faciam? quid nobis, Paule, relinquis, / Qui de plebe Numae densaque turba sumus? / Qui me respiciet, dominum regemque vocabo? / Hoc tu – sed quanto blandius! – ipse facis. / Leticam sellamve sequar? nec ferre recusas, / Per medium pugnas et prior ire lutum. / Saepius adsurgam recitanti carmina? tu stas / Et pariter geminas tendis in ora manus. / Quid faciet pauper, cui non licet esse clienti? / Dimisit nostras purpura vestra togas.*

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire 3*

His words remind us of *Epigram 103* of Martial's Book 1, whose third couplet reads like a dense antecedent of the Juvenalian description, as these two lines also contain the dirty toga, the cloak, the *calceus*, and the multiple tears in the clothes—that is, every important element of the words of Umbricius:

*Sordidior multo post hoc toga, paenula peior,
Calceus est sarta terque quaterque cute*
(Mart. 1,103,5–6)

The humiliation of the poor is still not over. In the next lines, Umbricius complains about the embarrassing treatment connected with the *census equestris* and *lex Roscia theatralis*. This census is often mentioned in Martial's Book 5,³⁶ and the first lines of *Epigram 25* closely resemble the words of Umbricius, quoting the outrage against someone who is not wealthy enough to sit in the first fourteen rows:

*'exeat' inquit,
'si pudor est, et de pulvino surgat equestri,
cuius res legi non sufficit...'*
(Juv. 3,153–155)

*'Quadringenta tibi non sunt, Chaerestrata: surge,
Leitus ecce venit: sta, fuge, curre, late.'*
(Mart. 5,25,1–2)

We can also find elements for which Martial is a potential inspiration in the next section of the speech, one which demonstrates the dangers of the city. Describing a fire consuming houses in the city, the *interlocutor* presents an example of social injustice: if a poor person suffers losses, he becomes even poorer, but when a rich man is affected by the disaster, he becomes even richer due to the donations of his clients. This is exactly the same scenario which Martial mentions in *Epigram 52* of his Book 3. In both cases, suspicion arises that the rich man set his own house on fire. This so-called insurance fraud is another crime committed by wealthy Romans:

*meliora ac plura reponit
Persicus orborum lautissimus et merito iam
suspectus tamquam ipse suas incenderit aedes.*
(Juv. 3,220–222)

³⁶ Mart. 5,23; 5,25; 5,38.

Gergő Gellérfi

*Empta domus fuerat tibi, Tongiliane, ducentis:
Abstulit hanc nimium casus in urbe frequens.
Conlatum est deciens. Rogo, non potes ipse videri
Incendisse tuam, Tongiliane, domum?*
(Mart. 3,52)

Umbricius then briefly returns to the advantages of rural life before comparing the situation of the lower and higher strata of Roman society with another viewpoint, one which also has an antecedent in Martial. This time, the rich/poor contrast is discussed by complaining about nighttime noises that make sleeping impossible for those who cannot afford to live in a quiet neighbourhood:

*plurimus hic aeger moritur vigilando [...]
nam quae meritoria somnum
admittunt? magnis opibus dormitur in urbe.*
(Juv. 3,232–235)

*nec cogitandi, Sparse, nec quiescendi
in urbe locus est pauperi. Negant vitam
ludi magistri mane, nocte pistores,
aerariorum marculi die toto;*
(Mart. 12,57,3–6)

Neither of the above parallels would be enough on its own to suppose a close connection with Martial, but together they prove that his *Epigrams* play key role in the whole of the *interlocutor's* speech. The most important evidence of this is the passage where Umbricius compares Rome and the rural countryside, stating that toga is seldom worn in the country. Martial mentions this in a few of his epigrams, one of which, *Epigram* 18 of his Book 12, is the key to revealing the connection between Umbricius and Martial, since the epigrammatist addressed this poem to Juvenal:

*pars magna Italiae est, si verum admittimus, in qua
nemo togam sumit nisi mortuus. [...]
aequales habitus illic similesque videbis
orchestram et populum; clari velamen honoris
sufficiunt tunicae summis aedilibus albae.*
(Juv. 3,171–179)

*Dum tu forsitan inquietus erras
Clamosa, Iuvenalis, in Subura,
Aut collem dominae teris Dianae;
Dum per limina te potentiorum
Sudatrix toga ventilat vagumque*

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire* 3

*Maior Caelius et minor fatigant:
Me multos repetita post Decembres
Acceptit mea rusticumque fecit
Auro Bilbilis et superba ferro [...]
Ignota est toga, sed datur petenti
Rupta proxima vestis a cathedra.
(Mart. 12,18,1–18)*

The direction of communication is reversed. Juvenal, who “restlessly wanders in noisy Subura”, is addressed by Martial from idyllic Bilbilis, the countryside where Juvenal’s “friend” in *Satire* 3 desires to be and therefore leaves Rome.³⁷ In the narrator’s introduction however, Juvenal mentions Subura, seemingly as his dwelling-place, where Martial places him in the epigram: *ego vel Prochyta[m] praepono Suburae* (Juv. 3,5). Together with the numerous parallels, this suggests that the satire’s basic situation can be inspired by an actual event: a friend leaves Rome, and his destination is the place where he belongs. Martial returns to his homeland, whereas Umbricius goes to Cumae, where a useless diviner still has his place.³⁸

The close relation between Umbricius and Martial was rejected on different grounds.³⁹ In his article, Anderson presents the differences between Martial and Juvenal.⁴⁰ Baldwin asserts that the main problem with this identification is the fact that Umbricius is xenophobic, whereas Martial came from Hispania.⁴¹ Concerning the latter argument, it should be noted that Umbricius attacks only Greeks and Middle Easterners in his speech, but it is even more important to make the relationship between the

³⁷ The friendship of the two authors is widely accepted, among others WILSON (1898: 197), HIGGET (1951: 386), and SYME (1989: 3) refer to them as friends, the latter stating that “no friend is both verifiable and tangible, except for Martial”.

³⁸ This idea is briefly mentioned by HIGGET (1951: 370–371), and COURTNEY (1980: 154) also refers to the same: “One wonders if Juvenal accompanied his friend to the gates of Rome when he retired to Spain about A.D. 98.” However, neither of them discusses this possibility in detail.

³⁹ ANDERSON (1970: 1–34), BALDWIN (1972: 101). Other interpretations, for instance, the article of MOTTO and CLARK cited before do not even mention this possibility. HIGGET (1951: 386) and WILSON (1898: 196–197) quote and reject FRIEDLAENDER’s opinion, denying any closer connection between Juvenal and Martial: „Ihre Uebereinstimmung in Worten und Wendungen ist grösstenteils zufällig und natürlich: eine absichtliche Beziehung möchte ich nur bei Juvenal 5, 147 auf Martial I, 20, 4 annehmen.“

⁴⁰ ANDERSON (1970: 1–34).

⁴¹ BALDWIN (1972: 101) does not enter into a detailed analysis, citing only one parallel (Mart. 12,18,17–18) between *Satire* 3 and the *Epigrams*.

Gergő Gellérfi

interlocutor and the epigrammatist clear, as it can explain the differences discussed by Anderson as well.

As in the case of the imperial *haruspex*, we should not identify Umbricius with Martial. We cannot do this because certain features of his character do not correspond with the epigrammatist. The *interlocutor* is a complex figure—his various aspects and features can be traced back to different sources and inspirations. Now, we can draw up the building-blocks of Juvenal's Umbricius.

According to our hypothesis, the dramatic setting of the satire, the departure of Umbricius, was inspired by Martial's return to Bilbilis, thus *Satire 3* can be understood as an answer to Martial's last epigram to Juvenal, in which Martial addresses the satirist, who wanders to Subura from the countryside. Juvenal's friend leaves Rome, the reasons for which are the common themes of the speech of Umbricius and the epigrams of Martial. But the *interlocutor* is neither identical to Martial nor to the *haruspex* telling gloomy prophecies to Galba, who gave his name and a mask to the *interlocutor*. Furthermore, the character of the *interlocutor* gets some features from the poet who created him. Umbricius talks like a satirist: his language is varied, his speech is interrupted by rhetorical questions and exclamations, and he emphasizes the indignation and anger that carries him away, just like a satirist. Moreover, at one point he falls out of his role and breaks the fourth wall since in his speech addressed to the narrator he uses the vocative *Quirites*, thus turning to the audience of the satire: *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem...* (Juv. 3,60–61)

Besides that, Juvenal also gives negative characteristics to his figure: the speech of Umbricius does not only show the virtues and values he talks about but also xenophobia and envy. In this manner, Umbricius actually becomes the essence of Rome, whose figure represents the city that is based on traditional Roman values, but sunk into a state of moral decadence. Or, from another point of view, Umbricius gives the most complete picture of Rome, presenting some faults with his words and some with his character flaws – in the style of a satirist, with themes of Martial's *Epigrams*, bearing the name of an imperial *haruspex*.

References

- ANDERSON 1970 = W. S. ANDERSON: *Lascivia vs. ira: Martial and Juvenal*. *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 3 (1970) 1–34.
—, 1982 = W. S. ANDERSON: *Studies in Book One of Juvenal*. In: *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton 1982, 197–254.
BALDWIN 1972 = B. BALDWIN: *Three Characters in Juvenal*. *CW* 66 (1972) 101–104.

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire 3*

- BRAUND 1990 = S. H. BRAUND: *Umbricius and the Frogs (Juvenal, Sat. 3.44-5)*. CQ 40 (1990) 502–506.
- . 1996 = S. M. BRAUND (ed.): *Juvenal: Satires, Book I*. Cambridge 1996.
- COLTON 1966 = R. E. COLTON: *Echoes of Martial in Juvenal's Third Satire*. *Traditio* 22 (1966) 403–419.
- COURTNEY 1980 = E. COURTNEY: *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London 1980.
- FERGUSON 1979 = J. FERGUSON (ed.): *Juvenal: The Satires*. New York 1979.
- . 1987 = J. FERGUSON: *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal*. Bruxelles 1987.
- HARDIE 1998 = A. HARDIE: *Juvenal, the Phaedrus, and the Truth about Rome*. CQ 48 (1998) 234–251.
- HIGHET 1951 = G. HIGHET: *Juvenal's Bookcase*. *AJPh* 72 (1951) 369–394.
- 1954 = G. HIGHET: *Juvenal the Satirist*. Oxford 1954.
- JENSEN 1986 = B. F. JENSEN: *Martyred and Beleaguered Virtue: Juvenal's Portrait of Umbricius*. *C&M* 37 (1986) 185–197.
- LAFLEUR 1976 = R. A. LAFLEUR: *Umbricius and Juvenal Three*. *ZAnt* 26 (1976) 383–431.
- MACMULLEN 1967 = R. MACMULLEN: *Enemies of the Roman Order*. Cambridge 1967.
- MORFORD 1977 = M. MORFORD: *Juvenal's Fifth Satire*. *AJPh* 98 (1977) 219–245.
- MOTTO-CLARK 1965 = A. L. MOTTO – J. R. CLARK: *Per iter tenebricosum: The Mythos of Juvenal 3*. *TAPhA* 96 (1965) 267–276.
- NICE 2003 = A. NICE: *The Persona of Umbricius and Divination in Juvenal Satires Three and Six*. In: C. Deroux (ed.): *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XI*. Bruxelles 2003, 401–418.
- NISBET 1988 = R. G. M. NISBET: *Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Juvenal*. *BICS* 35 (1988) 86–110.
- SARKISSIAN 1991 = J. SARKISSIAN: *Appreciating Umbricius: The Prologue (1–20) of Juvenal's Third Satire*. *C&M* 42 (1991) 247–258.
- STALEY 2000 = G. A. STALEY: *Juvenal's Third Satire: Umbricius' Rome, Virgil's Troy*. *MAAR* 45 (2000) 85–98.
- SYME 1989 = R. SYME: *The Patria of Juvenal*. 74 (1989) 1–15.
- WEHRLE 1992 = W. T. WEHRLE: *The Satiric Voice: Program, Form and Meaning in Persius and Juvenal*. Hildesheim 1992.
- WILSON 1988 = H. R. WILSON: *The Literary Influence of Martial upon Juvenal*. *AJPh* 19 (1988) 193–209.
- WINKLER 1983 = M. M. WINKLER: *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal*. Hildesheim 1983.