

Forgetting the Juvenalien in Our Midst: Literary Amnesia in the *Satires* Tom Geue

We critics usually want to see our authors talking with one another.¹ And if they happen to look the other way, committed to riding out the cringe of reciprocal snubbing, we have ways of making them talk.² Intertextuality – at least its current form in mainstream Latin studies – is one such way of forcing the conversation. The reader-response slant of this intertextuality³ empowers the critic as host to make use of many gestures, from the minute verbal echo to the macrocosmic structural parallel, to shoehorn even the most autistic of authors into meaningful ‘interaction’. And yet, as many of this volume’s contributions caution, the toolkit for these acts of socio-textual engineering has been assembled from the texts of a very different time, and a very different Rome.⁴ In addition, the model of a coterie gluing itself together through adhesive allusivity works well for the interactions seen in our grand document of the age, Pliny’s correspondence; but it gets on less well in the darker corners of the Nervan-Trajanic-Hadrianic network. This chapter will worry about what we do with one mute partygoer stewing in his own isolation, the one who fails to say much to or about anyone important, and fails to have anything much said to or about him: that silent assassin of post-Domitianic life, the satirist Juvenal.

Juvenal presents a problem for tracking literary interactions. The founding pose of his first satire (1-18) is that of an audience member standing up to be counted after years passively enduring a stagnant (where Pliny might say flourishing) literary scene: no more. Juvenal’s first act as mayor of his own making is to retract himself from the society of letters trending around him: a society of one-way traffic jammed between booming soliloquists and studiously ignored audiences. And, if our speculative dates⁵ hold true enough, that society took its revenge by genteel neglect of his roaring protestations. Save Martial (probably/perhaps⁶), no contemporary names Juvenal or alludes to the *Satires*.

¹ Thanks to the editors and conference participants for talking with me, and making this project such an interactive pleasure.

² Cf. Gibson in this volume, whose fictional dialogue is a nice way of sublimating this desire for interaction.

³ Hinds 1998: 10, 47-51 notably privileges (or at least raises to equality) the reader as agent in the intertextual transaction.

⁴ See e.g. Uden (this volume): 3.

⁵ Publication dates for the works treated in this paper are notoriously fuzzy, and that is part of the interactive entertainment. For Juvenal (the star of my second-rate show), I follow broadly the contours of Syme 1979 and Courtney 1980, but take Uden 2015’s redating very seriously; suffice to say the *Satires* were being trotted out somewhere between the posts of AD c. 100 and c. 130.

⁶ Though see Kelly in this volume. Ash (also this volume) puts late Juvenal together with Martial only through their common funnelling of *mirabilia* discourse; this interaction is diachronic, indirect, but no less interesting for it. Uden (this volume) shows Juvenalian interaction through introversion in a nice juxtaposition of Pseudo-Plutarch, Quintilian, and Juvenal 14.

When it comes to the self-appointed nub of the arbiters of taste, i.e. Pliny and his teammate Tacitus, the silence is especially deafening.⁷ They take no notice; Juvenal shrugs it off, for he wants nothing to do with the living, and only wants to get at them via the dead (*Satires* 1.170-1). So: is this more mutual indifference than literary interaction?

Some scholars have thought as much. Highet stretched subtle intertextual clues to breaking point to freeze a nice solid layer of ice between Pliny and Juvenal, the men themselves.⁸ Freudenburg's more recent attempt at reading the Juvenal, Pliny, Tacitus triangle shifts the claim from the social to the literary sphere, but still makes much of Juvenalian hostility: certain early satires come across as parodies to knock the wind out of a huffing, puffing 'indignation industry' (i.e. Pliny and Tacitus).⁹ In this chapter, I shall probe how far we can take this idea of Juvenal the disaffected alien at odds with the Plinian zeitgeist of association, interaction, reciprocity, connectedness; how our satirist might corrode the social seal of the *Letters*, which ceaselessly slog away at building prosopographical community. I shall apply a key metaphor cluster from Latin studies – memory, and its dark side, oblivion – to see where (if anywhere) the conventional lexicon of intertextuality might get us at the Juvenalian end of days, a long trek from the Augustan poets. The diffuseness and obliquity of allusion in Juvenal may well be part of the blunted point, a favourite technique in a brand of satire that stubbornly *refuses* to point, brand, or name anyone or anything in the vicinity of contemporaneity.¹⁰ But before we commit, let us limber up with a bracing trot around some methodological pitfalls.

Firstly, we (a thinly disguised I) could afford to be a little more up front about the relationship between social and literary networking, and how the elevation of the former (in a fundamentally historicist discipline such as Classics) can often draw lines around, and in some cases outright determine, our response to the latter. By this I mean that, even in our post-biographical heyday of sophisticated, skeptical and suspicious criticism, the hint of an 'actual relationship' can act as unfairly stout hermeneutic scaffolding to prop up flimsy intertextual latticework.¹¹ We (think we) know that Pliny and Tacitus got along

⁷ The notion of Tacitus and Pliny as united front is itself a Plinian effect; for the complex relationship between them (sometimes itself modelled as a one-way conversation), see Whitton 2012, and Marchesi 2008: 97-206.

On the broader relationship between Juvenal and Tacitus through satiric 'tone', see Keane 2012.

⁸ Highet 1954: 292-4. Syme 1979 finds the silence unremarkable: multiple literary circles can, and always did, spin along in tandem (255).

⁹ For Freudenburg 2001's reading of Juvenal against team Pliny-Tacitus, see 209-77, and especially 234-42.

¹⁰ On Juvenal's timelessness, see Uden 2015: 13 and *passim*; on his vague targeting as an encouragement to the audience to make the final strike, 24-50.

¹¹ Cf. Marchesi in this volume (e.g. 15, 17) on how we orient Martial and Pliny vis-a-vis Lucan, which usually depends on what caricaturised political positions we ascribe to all three. Whitton (this volume): 13 notes the scale of variation in the Pliny-Quintilian relationship, and how difficult it is to band diverse intertextual moments into a sealed, solid 'interaction'.

swimmingly, so the suite of metaphors used to frame their points of contact is swung positively: homage, wink, nudge, nod, play; just lads and banter yeah? But could that dominant background story of social intimacy actually blind us to moments of greater (textual, biographical?) hostility? The same goes for dates, although these are excitingly tough to nail in our period: the sense of real-time priority or posteriority always makes us look in certain ways, for certain things (and directions of reference ‘making more sense’ in turn often ground arguments for dating). In this chapter, my version of the Tacitus-Juvenal and Pliny-Juvenal relationships couldn’t quite be misted up by flicking through real social calendars, because we have no (erm...textual) evidence for Juvenal skirting the same scene. I like to think that my vision of the relationships, then, is based on a more dependable sense of aesthetic and generic incompatibility; a noble virtue made of necessity. And yet I shudder to think what I would do if Pliny had mentioned Juvenal favourably in his correspondence, just once. The dependable earth (not to mention the sinkhole-ridden moral high ground) would move. Such is the power of literature to produce a light of extratextual reality, which it then casts back over itself. That hermeneutic circle is a vicious one, much as we try to be virtuous with it.

The next issue, set for recurrence *ad nauseam*, is that of genre. This can of worms springs open immediately as soon as Juvenal enters the interaction – and other chapters in this volume run up against the same problem.¹² It is often difficult to ‘prove’ intertextual activity through the old trump card, the substantive verbal echo, when scanning the prose-verse interface; it is also possible that we pernicky scholars set far too much store by these minor details, and overestimate the ‘ideal reader’ as enhanced cyborg versions of ourselves.¹³ Nevertheless, sustained lexical pokes and brushes are a means whereby authors pin themselves to other specific authors, and for that reason, we should note their absence as much as unpick their presence.¹⁴ And that brings me to the next point: the kinds of interactions we are monitoring here are not simply the monogamous relationships favoured by intertextuality studies in Latin (Pliny and Tacitus, Pliny and Martial, Virgil and Horace etc.); nor are they the less faithful three-or-more-way flirtations of ‘window-reference’¹⁵ type intertextuality. Rather, we are plotting bigger attractive/repulsive energies working at the level of genre as well as individual texts, which amount to no less than a spirited confrontation over the right way to write the real. Juvenalian satire is a perfect instance of this, and the question is tied to debates about what satire and its close companion parody are really after in the end. Some examples: when Juvenal sounds off against blustering epic at the beginning of *Sat.* 1, is he puncturing the genre itself, or does the whole stand for a particularly offensive part

¹² See Buckley (this volume).

¹³ See Whitton (this volume): 3. On interaction without lexical repetition, see Uden (this volume): 2-3.

¹⁴ This is less controversial when presence draws attention to absence (such as with Marchesi 2013’s reading of the relationship between Pliny and Martial); this paper argues that we can look to absences full stop, even when we miss all-out authorising markers (such as named mention of the author in question somewhere else in the text). See also Marchesi’s chapter in this volume.

¹⁵ Thomas 1986: 188.

(namely, say, Valerius Flaccus)?¹⁶ Does *Satire 4* pick on the general mode of panegyric poetry – or does it swipe at Statius and his shameless *De Bello Germanico*?¹⁷ The question of target (general vs particular, particular through general, general through particular?) is a monotonous one for satire scholars, but it should be kept somewhere accessible at all times for the discussion below, in which we must flip agnostically between calling Pliny and Tacitus, or their genres, or their worldviews, the palimpsestic/holographic butt of the joke.

The next problem grows from this, and looms even larger: the old chestnut of what to do with ‘conspicuous absence’, and how to dodge the trap of tendentiousness and/or intellectual dishonesty in making absences a little more conspicuous than they perhaps should be. One of the purposes of this volume is to find new ways of mapping all the rich varieties of interaction coursing through our period; and the volume shows that these are richer and more varied than once thought. But does this hum of interactive background noise authorise us to do something meaningful with *gaps* in interaction – with silences, absences, polite or polemic ignoring? I would say yes – and intertextuality studies had better get used to counting the benefits. Several chapters in this volume do wonders with deliberate omissions and heads buried in sand.¹⁸ Ours is a period of remembering, associating, and aligning; but it is also one of hardcore oblivion, of wiping certain slates clean.¹⁹ It is an age when the avalanche of cultural and economic interactions in the Roman empire means digging in the self to the pointed blanking of the other.²⁰ This chapter, then, belongs amid the genial company testing what happens when interactions fail to happen: in my case, how more aggressive acts of neglect, rewriting and erasure can be considered, paradoxically and against-the-grain, as priceless forms of interaction in themselves.

Selective Memory

This chapter began thought-life as a vague desire to stir the pot: what would happen if we applied some of the standard tropes of Conte-Hindsian allusion – memory and

¹⁶ Henderson 1999: 260-64 tracks *Sat.* 1’s opening salute to Valerius Flaccus, but also allows oscillation between general and specific e.g. 262: ‘The shades tortured by Aeacus’ (vv. 9 f.) points away from Valerius and toward the epic katabasis in general.’

¹⁷ Santorelli 2012: 9-13 follows tradition and reads *Sat.* 4 as targeted parody of *DBG*, Uden 2011: 123 goes for general caricature of panegyric.

¹⁸ Marchesi (cf. Marchesi 2013), Rimell, Uden in this volume.

¹⁹ The balance is nicely encapsulated in the famous formulation of Tac. *Agr.* 2: *memoriam quoque ipsam cum voce perdidissemus, si tam in nostra potestate esset oblivisci quam tacere*. See Rimell (this volume, e.g. 4) on the complex relationship between remembering and forgetting in the *Agricola* (and Martial *Ep.* 10). Juvenal is deeply infused with the post-Domitianic spirit of *damnatio memoriae*; cf. the crowd’s treatment of Sejanus in 10, for which see Freudenburg 2001, 11-13.

²⁰ On which phenomenon see Uden in this volume, and Uden 2015: 203-15’s excellent reading of *Sat.* 15 (he mentions the growing discourse of local identity at 208, among other places).

recognition in particular²¹ – to a completely inappropriate text, in a completely inappropriate fashion. The tropes were made for verse-verse intertextuality; I am interested in prose-verse. Memory and recognition naturally lend themselves to vertical/diachronic intertextuality (e.g. Lucan channeling Virgil), because, well, it is difficult to get so worked up about ‘remembering’ or ‘recognising’ what you heard at last month’s recitation; I am interested in the horizontal/synchronic version, i.e. ‘remembering’ the very recent literary past (a sure sign of short-term memory gone awry). I was also intent on testing a suspicion I had always harboured about the obverse of memory: could one also operate an anti-allusion²² by troping a moment not in terms of remembering, but in terms of forgetting?

Believe it or not, the search turned up two cases in Juvenal where the systems of memory/(oblivion) and intertextuality touch. The first is about the politics of the memorandum: what *should* be mentioned (cf. *memorare* below) and recalled in the written record. I’m talking about the now disproportionately famous reference to Otho’s mirror and the ‘Annals and fresh History’ in which it should have been treated (at least in Juvenal’s book (of Tacitus?)). This verse has borne on its slim shoulders the heavy weight of dating: it has been slapped back and forth as one of the only possible *termini post quem* in *Satires* 1,²³ depending on whether one takes it as a reference to Tacitus in particular, or Historiography in general (that issue again). In what follows, I bravely slink from leaning either way; rather, I want to press what Otho’s mirror and its non-inclusion in previous history tells us about Juvenalian satire’s avowedly more capacious hard drive, and how all of this (if obliquely) gets at Pliny’s epistolographic habit of supplementing Tacitean history with anecdotal tidbits. The second example (*Sat.* 10.229 and surrounds, after Pliny *Ep.* 8.18) is perhaps less well known, but certainly on the map of Juvenalian intertextuality (noted by Syme, again on a quest for chronology).²⁴ This instance is an even richer case of allusion mingled with marker tropes; but here the relevant nexus is of dementia, amnesia, and non-recognition. I shall argue that the nod to Pliny works in tandem with a nearby eruption of intra-authorial intertextuality (back to *Sat.* 1) to test how much and how far our ‘ideal’ reader remembers; and if they do remember, to make sure that the next step is to forget Pliny and his naive ethic of a world pulled back from the brink. Juvenal upends the Plinian target text, and effaces the Plinian *Weltanschauung in nuce* – there will be no last minute happy endings emerging from this blighted interaction. So satire tries to dispose of its main generic rival for anecdotage (letters) via a timely bout of radical forgetfulness.

²¹ For various tropes of self-annotation, see Hinds 1998: 1-16. For memory, see Hinds 1998: 3-4 (via Conte 1986: 57-69); recognition, Hinds 1998: 8-10 (via Narducci 1973).

²² For the notion of the anti-allusion in Lucretius – a glancing reference to an author or genre, for the sole purpose of rejection – see Cowan 2013. He explicitly distinguishes it from antiphrastic allusion (125): ‘Anti-allusion excludes the source text and even denies its status as source text, or as bearing any significance at all.’

²³ Syme 1979: 262 basically represents the old orthodoxy, which has stuck hard; for the revisionist position and early dating, see Uden 2015: 219-226, and now Kelly in this volume.

²⁴ Syme 1979: 253-5.

Mirroring History's Addenda

Our first 'interaction' looks more like narcissistic navel gazing. Halfway through *Satire* 2, the one about the aristocratic *cinaedus* who acts like a Cato, Juvenal lights on a particularly offensive type of mirror-brandishing pathic. The toilette of this gentleman reminds Juvenal of how Otho used to admire himself looking all nice and armed before battle action. The episode is marked as a supplement to other, less adequate historical accounts of Otho doing the rounds in Rome. This is not quite counterfactual history, but corrective history, gerundival history. Juvenal focuses on what *should* have been 'there' (i.e. the part that history glosses over):

ille tenet speculum, pathici gestamen Othonis,
Actoris Aurunci spoliū, quo se ille uidebat
armatum, cum iam tolli uexilla iuberet.
res memoranda nouis annalibus atque recenti
historia, speculum ciuilis sarcina belli.
nimirum summi ducis est occidere Galbam
et curare cutem, summi constantia ciuis
Bebriaci campis solium adfectare Palati
et pressum in faciem digitis extendere panem,
quod nec in Assyrio pharetrata Sameramis orbe
maesta nec Actiaca fecit Cleopatra carina. (*Sat.* 2.99-109)²⁵

Another holds a mirror, the accessory of pathic Otho, 'spoils of Auruncan Actor', in which he used to check himself out when he'd put on his armour, while ordering the battle standards to be raised. It's an episode worth a mention in recent annals and modern history, that a mirror was part of the kit for civil warfare. Well I guess it's the mark of a supreme general to slaughter Galba while pampering his skin, the courage of the highest citizen on the battlefields of Bebriacum to claim the Palatine throne while plastering his face with a mask of dough. Quivered Sameramis in her Assyrian city did no such thing, nor did Cleopatra weeping in her ship at Actium.²⁶

The question raised above is: where is *there*? Which new annals and recent history are we revising here? The received wisdom once was that this just had to be a dig at Tacitus. Mention of *historia*, Galba and Otho in the same breath – come on, a no-brainer!²⁷ The tag was used to push *Satires* 1 definitively beyond the publication of *Histories* 1²⁸ – and

²⁵ Texts are *OCT*.

²⁶ Translations are adapted (imperfectly remembered) from Braund 2004.

²⁷ E.g. Keane 2012: 412 on this moment as an 'implicit reproach' to Tacitus for giving too balanced a portrayal of Otho.

²⁸ Tacitus was thought to be at work on *Histories* by AD 106, from Pliny's Vesuvius letters (6.16 and 6.20) – see for example Damon 2003: 4-5. Ash 2007: 2 n. 9 revives the position of Syme 1958: 119-20: publication could have been in installments, with rounds of recitations.

that seemed as good as we could get. Recent histories have been positively revisionary, however: Uden has argued convincingly²⁹ that this need not strictly refer to Tacitus, hence helping to shunt *Satires* 1 back a few years to a political context in which it makes more sense (AD 100/101). While I cannot help bending with the wind here, I also wonder whether we can't have our date cake and eat some too. If we accept an early 2nd century ambit for *Satires* 1, perhaps we could read this creative act of supplementation not just as an allusion (albeit to something *not* there) in the conventional sense, but rather a kind of premature editorial intervention into a gestating, still crystallising text.³⁰ By this I mean that, if word was circulating that Tacitus was already working on *Histories*, and if very early drafts of the text were floating round alongside recitation sneak-previews and general hype, Juvenal's memorandum could be a bid to fill out and top Tacitus' Otho narrative before it even set. Such a move would be an interesting instance of preemptive 'corrective' allusion: a process enabled by the porous filters and lengthy drip-feedback loops of recitation, revision and publication that was literary culture in contemporary Rome.³¹ Even if this is necessarily speculative, the possibilities of interaction fan out into a vertiginous, epicyclic complexity. The typical temporalities of intertextuality go wild when we let texts do their thing as motile *processes* rather than box them to languish as static outcomes.³²

So a pointed glare at Tacitus is still conceivable, but perhaps neither necessary nor sufficient to give us something good to interact with. If Otho's mirror were mentioned in Tacitus, this could be the place where we might see in the mirror a nice self-reflexive marker: Juvenal 'reflecting' or 'echoing' Tacitus right back at him, or using the mirror preemptively to distort his Otho-in-the-making. But instead, Juvenal makes us look in that mirror only to find nothing there; he tricks us with the ultimate optical a/i-llusion. If the mirror only performs a fraction of the work my Hindsian Mr Hyde wants it to here, perhaps we can inch a little further by paying attention to the original object of interest: memory. Juvenal boils down the task of historiography with a historiographically-inflected tag: *res memoranda*.³³ 'Recollection', of course, isn't just a metaphor of

²⁹ See n.23 above.

³⁰ Syme 1958: 119 thinks Tacitus could have begun his 'serious researches' as early as AD 98. We are in murky waters here, as we should be; we would do well to abandon the notion of crisp publication dates and one-way directions of influence (as if it were ever straightforward to establish them, even in our glorious information age!).

³¹ On which see Dupont 1997, Gurd 2012, Johnson 2010.

³² Cf. Whitton 2012: 350, Marchesi (this volume): 1.

³³ *memorare* and relatives are fundamental to Tacitean (as to most) historiography: cf. *Histories* 1.1: *initium mihi operis Seruius Galba iterum Titus Vinus consules erunt. nam post conditam urbem octingentos et uiginti prioris aevi annos multi auctores rettulerunt, dum res populi Romani memorabantur pari eloquentia ac libertate...* Then *Annals* 1.1: *sed ueteris populi Romani prospera uel aduersa claris scriptoribus memorata sunt*; cf. also the memory language of *Dialogus* 1: *ita non ingenio, sed memoria et recordatione opus est, ut quae a praestantissimis uiris et excogitata subtiliter et dicta grauitate accipi, cum singuli diuersas [uel easdem] sed probabilis causas adferrent, dum formam sui quisque et animi et ingenii redderent, isdem nunc numeris isdemque rationibus*

intertext: it is the very job that Roman historiography liked to see itself (in the mirror) *doing*. That which ‘ought to be recalled’, then, is the plume of historiography on that year of the four emperors (in which Tacitus’ contribution was/is/will be but the latest installment). This is a flash of charged generic interaction whereby Juvenal makes a big claim for totalising *satura*: not just better than epic at seeing the world as it is,³⁴ but better than history at remembering it as it was – a true reflection!

Juvenal’s satiric history is crafted to wow in a few ways here.³⁵ The claim to know more than historiography is especially impressive given the genre’s standing in the Juvenalian satire of the near future. *Sat. 7* gives us a glimpse of what history means to Juvenal³⁶ – a bloated stack of papers whose volume could only be surpassed by satire itself:

uester porro labor fecundior, historiarum
scriptores? perit hic plus temporis atque olei plus.
nullo quippe modo millensima pagina surgit
omnibus et crescit multa damnosa papyro;
sic ingens rerum numerus iubet atque operum lex.
quae tamen inde seges? terrae quis fructus apertae?
quis dabit historico quantum daret acta legenti? (*Sat. 7.98-104*)

So is your work more profitable, you writers of history? This process swallows yet more time and midnight oil. With no limit for any of them, the thousandth page swells and grows, bankrupting you with papyrus outlay; so the huge number of facts and the law of the genre lay it down. But what’s the yield from it? What’s the fruit of the earth you’ve ploughed? Who’ll give a historian as much as he’d give to some newsreader?

The massive stock of facts dictates a whole lot of wasted paper; such are the rules of the game. If the most salient feature of historiography is its comprehensiveness, we come back to Juvenal’s historical supplement with a jaw dropped even lower: somehow our weighty satirist has managed to expand the genre that was already at maximum capacity, by definition, by law. Though there be infinite *res* for history to incorporate, one thing it

persequar, seruato ordine disputationis. And then *Agricola 1: sed apud priores ut agere digna memoratu pronum magisque in aperto erat, ita celeberrimus quisque ingenio ad prodendam uirtutis memoriam sine gratia aut ambitione bonae tantum conscientiae pretio ducebantur*. But don’t forget *Agricola 2: memoriam quoque ipsam cum uoce perdidissemus, si tam in nostra potestate esset obliuisci quam tacere*. One might say memory is one of *the* Tacitean themes, threading the most prominent positions of every single one of his works.

³⁴ Juvenal’s relationship with epic is an old hand of scholarship: see Jones 2007, Connors 2005, Freudenburg 2005. Syme 1979: 265 also understands Juvenal’s relationship with historiography here through the analogy of his relationship with epic.

³⁵ For more on history in Juvenal’s satire, see Keane 2012: 406-9.

³⁶ Keane 2012: 411 limits the applicability of this passage to Tacitus in particular, taken as it is with impoverished, jobbing writers; but the statement about the *operum lex* still stands.

cannot do is include the juicy, trivial details; satire, on the other hand, is free to chew over this bread and butter, as well as modulate upwards as high as you care to climb.³⁷ This kind of interaction is a megalomaniac version of the apparently more modest supplementary strategies of epistolography (see below) and biography; if *Sat.* 2 fell just a few years down the line, it would be hard to resist seeing this as a simultaneous poke at the Suetonian Otho forming in the wake of the Tacitean one. For he too missed the mirror.

But Juvenal does far more to vaunt the capacity of satiric history here. Not only does he parade satire's remarkable knack for capturing the world in efficient bursts of synecdoche (a mirror image is representative gear for civil war, where opponents are really facing 'themselves'): the way he tells this 'story' is also a showpiece for what satire can do. And that is to rewrite history so that big events are shaken out of their causal and chronological straitjackets, and interspersed with a raft of trivia to break any lingering sense of narrative progression. Galba's death comes first (and it is suggested, against the grain, that this is the direct handiwork of Otho himself, mirror in one hand, bloody sword in the other); then (or simultaneously) comes Otho's manicure; suddenly we lurch forward to Bedriacum, Otho's last stand; then comes the lunge at the Palatine (*solium adfectare Palati* 104), which seems to skip to Otho's last stand against Vitellius at Bedriacum, while at the same time maintaining a strange sense of 'beginning' (*adfectare* usually refers to the initial stages of a campaign, the striving/aspiring phase – as if Bedriacum (vs. Vitellius) were the same moment as the first shot at the throne (vs. Galba)). So Juvenal wreaks havoc with due historical process, mixing up cosmetics and conquests.³⁸ Through the rapid-fire references to Sameramis and Cleopatra, he also shows how much history satire – with its penchant for cramming in comparables only to have them outdone – can get through in a few lines of verse. Eastern queens, both legendary and historical, rub shoulders with the western queen of AD 69. Satire's hyperactive rolling through exemplum after exemplum, with no respect for causality, chronology, or corollary, makes for the most extensive history of all.³⁹

This, then, is how satire 'recalls': it scratches in and fills up the details absent from the more official historical record. In that sense, it closely (pre-?) mimes a trick often pulled by Pliny in his letters to Tacitus. The following could be a good example of an interaction that doesn't rest on verbal echo, but plugs in via its similarity of 'pose', 'gesture', 'move':

auguror nec me fallit augurium, historias tuas immortales futuras; quo magis illis (ingenue fatebor) inseri cupio. nam si esse nobis curae solet ut facies nostra ab optimo quoque artifice exprimatur, nonne debemus optare, ut operibus nostris similis tui scriptor

³⁷ On the 'universal inclusiveness' of Juvenalian satire, see Jones 2007: 18-19; he also mentions (if curtly) Juvenal's relationship with historiography (18-19, 123).

³⁸ As is good and proper when dealing with civil war; Bedriacum in the background of the mirror perhaps also shunts us forward to the second battle of 69 fought there.

³⁹ Cf. interestingly Koenig 2014's parallel arguments about Frontinus' stretching and straining of historiography and epic in the *Stratagemata*.

praedicatorque contingat? demonstro ergo quamquam diligentiam tuam fugere non possit, cum sit in publicis actis, demonstro tamen quo magis credas, iucundum mihi futurum si factum meum, cuius gratia periculo creuit, tuo ingenio tuo testimonio ornaueris. (Pliny *Epistles* 7.33.1-3)

I augur that your histories will be immortal, and the augury won't be wrong. That's why (I freely admit) I'm desperate to be included in them. If we usually make sure that none but the best artist take our portraits, why shouldn't we want our deeds to fall to a writer and publicist like yourself? So here is an account of an incident which can hardly have escaped your thorough eye, since it was in the official records; but I am sending it nonetheless so that you may be more assured of my pleasure if this episode of mine, which accumulated acclaim from the risks attending it, is embellished by the testimony of your genius.⁴⁰

Pliny's famous humble request for his own inclusion in Tacitus' *Histories* is a more genteel example of the same 'supplementing' strategy we have seen in *Sat.* 2 – the big difference being that here, the author himself wants to be written in (*inseti cupio*). I shall make more of this key split between the Plinian/Juvenalian approaches to writing the self below. From a Juvenalian point of view, Pliny becomes the vain Otho admiring his own desired reflection in the Tacitean mirror. But, importantly, this is also a site of generic abrasion and sparking, where Pliny points out the limits of historiography, and shows off the 'spontaneous', episodic, anecdotal capabilities of the letter form. The Vesuvius letters are up to something similar: even if Pliny frames that material as of little interest to Tacitus, as somehow 'beneath' history, he is simultaneously snickering at history's reluctance to get its hands so sooty.⁴¹ Pliny's polite plea for treatment under the historical agenda's 'any other business' is also – like Juvenal's correction – a sortie in a campaign of generic imperialism: I can move into and landscape your turf, but you have to keep off mine.

The question still bugs: how can we model such an interaction? If we were still lazily reclined on the deceptive *terra firma* of pre-Uden, I would probably push to read the passage of Juvenal as a strike at both Tacitean history and the Plinian tic of wanting to supplement Tacitean history (with himself). As indeed I did in the original conference paper on which this chapter is based. But the interaction has rubbed off on me. Now that *Satires* 1 could fare just as well before the time of *Histories* 1-2 and *Letters* 7, I am hesitant to insist on a traditionally direct triangulation where the scathing satirist punctures the serious litterati. And perhaps this is a godsend. It allows us to see that an 'interaction' can take place through parallel responses to a fundamental literary crux of the age: what is the best form to 'remember' things in text? Is historiography, the tried and tested repository of *memoria*, the best/only way? Or can different forms remember differently, remember more, and remember better? In some ways historiography is a

⁴⁰ Pliny translations again misremembered from the old Loeb (Radice 1969).

⁴¹ See *Epistles* 6.20.20, and Marchesi 2008: 171-89 on the relationship between historiography and epistolography in 6.16 and 6.20; according to her, 6.20 'is allegedly not *historia*, but offers itself as such' (188).

much greater threat to Juvenalian satire than epic or tragedy, because it carries the weight of the document, the true reflection; we could speak similarly of its strained overlap with verisimilar letter-writing. I have tried to stress, then, that this flash of ‘memory’ in Juvenal is nowhere near a ‘mere’ trope of intertextuality, but a grappling with a zeitgeist: how you record, what you record, what forms tell more of the whole story. This interaction is a tussle of genres all bidding for the best memory and biggest database – and no need for a verbal echo to seal the deal.

Forgetting Happy Endings

So we’ve run over the stakes of the memory game; now to look into a case of deliberate memory *loss*. My second family of examples will relieve classical intertextualists in so far as the chronology and direction are much clearer: it’s generally agreed that Juvenal 10 appeared somewhere around 120, a long way removed from the Trajanic *floruit* of Pliny 8.18.⁴² But it will again cause squirming because – even with a litany of contextual and thematic similarities to bolster the connection – there is precious little verbal correspondence on which to fall back. In this case, I want to claim a little more vociferously that this lack of *direct* reference is part of the dynamics of the interaction. In these two passages that deal with senescence ended right and ended wrong respectively, it is in Juvenal’s interests to forget – and make the reader forget – that Pliny ever happened.⁴³

Pliny *Ep.* 8.18 deals with the last will and testament of Domitius Tullus, a man split 50-50 between negative and positive exemplarity: in life he actively courted the attention of legacy hunters, but at the last hurdle he made good by gifting everything to his adopted niece and grandchildren. For a while he looked like a willing victim of *captatio*, but managed to keep it in the family in the end. Towards the end of the letter, Pliny tests the lower limits of epistolary gentility by rendering a grim picture of Domitius on his nursing home death-bed, a man completely dependent and incapacitated:

quippe omnibus membris extortus et fractus, tantas opes solis oculis obibat, ac ne in lectulo quidem nisi ab aliis mouebatur; quin etiam (foedum miserandumque dictu) dentes lauandos fricandosque praebebat. auditum frequenter ex ipso, cum quereretur de contumeliis debilitatis suae, digitos se seruorum suorum cotidie lingere. uiuebat tamen et uiuere uolebat, sustentante maxime uxore, quae culpam incohati matrimonii in gloriam perseuerantia uerterat. (Pliny *Ep.* 8.18.9-10)

⁴² Sherwin-White 1966: 38-9 estimates a ‘book-date’ for book 8 of around AD 107-8, although 8.18 is elegantly stripped of temporal markers: ‘There are no close indications of time.’ (468).

⁴³ For other prosopographical connections and allusive overlap between Juvenal and Pliny, see Whitton 2013: 34-5. He scrapes together no antipathy from the allusions themselves (n. 203, p. 45), though this chapter begs to differ in the case of *Ep.* 8.18/*Sat.* 10; and we might ponder whether to do something similar with Juvenal’s blow-out of a Plinian unequal dinner party (*Sat.* 5 and *Ep.* 2.6) – although the dating (did I mention that already?) gets complicated.

Crippled and deformed in every limb, he could only go over his vast wealth with his eyes, and could not even turn in bed except through outside help. He also had to have his teeth cleaned and brushed for him – a disgusting and pitiful detail – and when complaining about the humiliations of his deformity was often heard to say that every day he licked the fingers of his slaves. Yet he went on living, and kept his will to live, helped chiefly by his wife, whose devoted care turned the former criticism of her marriage into a lasting honour.

Domitius' slaves now perform his most basic bodily functions for him, including the embarrassing task of popping food into his mouth; the old man barely has enough life in him to joke that he was licking the fingers of the hands that fed him. The Juvenalian response to this degraded geriatric was first noticed by Syme,⁴⁴ who pointed to the striking image of taking food from someone else's fingers – one vivid detail in *Sat.* 10's morbid catalogue of old-age horrors:

ille umero, hic lumbis, hic coxa debilis; ambos
perdidit ille oculos et luscis inuidet; **huius
pallida labra cibum accipiunt digitis alienis,**
ipse ad conspectum cenae diducere rictum
suetus hiat tantum ceu pullus hirundinis, ad quem
ore uolat pleno mater ieiuna. sed omni
membrorum damno maior dementia, **quae nec
nomina seruorum nec uoltum agnoscit amici**
cum quo praeterita cenauit nocte, nec illos
quos genuit, quos eduxit. nam codice saeuo
heredes uetat esse suos, bona tota feruntur
ad Phialen; tantum artificis ualet halitus oris,
quod steterat multis in carcere fornicis annis. (*Sat.* 10.227-39)

Old man A is crippled in his shoulder, B in the groin, C in the hip. The loss of both eyes makes this man jealous of one-eyed men. That man takes food in his bloodless lips from someone else's fingers. He used to split his jaws wide at the sight of dinner but now just gapes like a swallow's chick when his fasting mother flies to him with her mouth full. But worse than any physical decline is the dementia. It doesn't remember the names of slaves or recognise the face of a friend who dined with him the previous evening or the children he fathered and raised himself. You see, in a cruel will, he keeps his own children from becoming his heirs and leaves everything to Phiale. That's the power of the breath of her skillful mouth, which was for sale for many years in the brothel's den.

If we wanted to cast this as a troped, targeted, and downright rubber-stamped allusion, we certainly could (and I shall): the very concept of 'taking food from someone else's fingers' hints at a process of incorporating outside material which, within satire's bodily

⁴⁴ Syme 1979: 253-5.

systems and along its alimentary canals,⁴⁵ must already be suspicious. The context is also too similar to ignore. Two old men on their last legs, both harried by legacy-hunters; one resists the temptation and passes his wealth to his family as he should, the other melts in the prostitute's mouth and forgets his rightful biological heirs. What I am really driving at here, however, is the curious combination of taking a Plinian image, inverting his example, and topping it all with glazed non-recognition (*nec...agnoscit*). This is the dark side of allusion-as-recognition. Not the old woman at the end of Lucan 1 who recognises Pompey's trunk, and models the reader recognising Priam's trunk underneath,⁴⁶ but an old man who fails to recognise anything: literary past and literary future, the whole damn legacy. Crippled with dementia, he has to forget. Here the reader gets invited to obliterate the Plinian example, yield to the experienced mouth of the Juvenalian, and indulge in pure self-destructive pleasure; no last-ditch redemption at the end of days.

The paradox of course is that we need to recognise in order not to recognise, remember in order to forget.⁴⁷ To be sure, few readers today have the memory of a Syme to call on to realize that they should be forgetting something. But this section of Juvenal 10 has another precious moment of recall embedded within the frame of amnesia, a moment so easy to recognise that I wonder how far Juvenal is baiting the reader's 'memory', and satirizing our own mental exercise of recollection-through-reading.⁴⁸ I might even say he is dramatising his own dementia alongside the reader's recall, forgetting himself even as we try to remember.

The breadcrumbs are first laid earlier in the long mini-treatise on old age which makes up a quarter of *Sat.* 10. If we flashback to that forgotten recent past, we see that the old man is not only characterised by his inability to recognise, but to be recognised. We couldn't identify this old man even if we tried; we couldn't say if it was Domitius Tullus or not, for they all look the same to us:

deformem et taetrum ante omnia uultum
dissimilemque sui, deformem pro cute pellem
pendentisque genas et talis aspice rugas
quales, umbriferos ubi pandit Thabraca saltus,
in uetula scalpit iam mater simia bucca.
plurima sunt iuuenum discrimina, pulchrior ille
hoc atque +ille+ alio, multum hic robustior illo:

⁴⁵ Gowers 1993: 109-219 is always seminal on the metapoetics of food in satire.

⁴⁶ Lucan *BC* 1.686, Conte's flagship troping of allusion as recognition (see Hinds 1998: 8-10; cf. n. 21 above).

⁴⁷ Cf. Cowan 2013's version of this problem (129-30).

⁴⁸ Cf. Galen's invited reader, deftly moving their way around all sorts of cross-referencing and recollection (Johnson 2010: 83-4 – thanks to Alice Koenig for the suggestion!). Cf. Rimell (this volume): 6 on the ring-compositional structures of *Agricola* and *Epigrams* 10, another way of thematising memory through reading. We might also bring in Quintilian 10.1.19-20, a passage hooking together reading, memory – and literature as food/reading as digestion.

una senum facies, cum uoce trementia membra
et iam leue caput madidique infantia nasi;
frangendus misero gingiua panis inermi. (10.191-200)

Above all get a load of that face, ugly and hideous and unrecognizable, and the ugly hide where the skin should be, and the floppy jowls and such wrinkles as the mother ape scratches on her cheek where Thabraca spreads its shady groves. Young men have a lot of differences between them: this one's more handsome than that one, and that one more handsome than another, this one is much more strapping than that one: but old men have one common face; their limbs tremble along with their voice, their head is now smooth, they're a kid with a runny nose; the poor sod's bread has to be chewed with unarmed gums.

The squint to individuate wrinkles the reader into the position of recogniser. Perhaps *una senum facies* already lays down the gauntlet: the topos of old age looks the same in every author, Pliny among them, and it will be difficult to spot the difference. Immediately after this, we have the first case of the old man's chronic forgetfulness:

nam coitus iam longa obliuio, uel si
coneris, iacet exiguus cum ramice neruus
et, quamuis tota palpetur nocte, iacebit. (10.204-6)

Sex is now a long forgotten memory, and if you were to try him, his little muscle just lies there with its blood vessel, and will continue just to lie there, even if you manipulate it the whole night.

Primed as we are with the themes of non-recognition and oblivion, I hope the next step in the working won't jar too much. For when Juvenal tries to capture the host of ailments circling round the old man a few lines later, the issues of recognition, memory, similarity and identity come through loud and clear at the level of poetic practice:

praeterea minimus gelido iam in corpore sanguis
febre calet sola, circumscilit agmine facto
morborum omne genus, quorum si nomina quaeras,
promptius expediam quot amauerit Oppia moechos,
quot Themison aegros autumnno occiderit uno,
quot Basilus socios, quot circumscrisperit Hirrus
pupillos, quot longa uiros exorbeat uno
Maura die, quot discipulos inclinet Hamillus;
percurram citius quot uillas possideat nunc
quo tondente grauis iuueni mihi barba sonabat. (10.217-26)

More to the point, the trickle of blood in his already frozen body warms up only with fever, and the whole bunch of diseases dances around him in formation. If you asked their names, I would sooner set out how many lovers Oppia has had, how many sick people Themison finished off in a single autumn, how many associates Basilus ripped off, how

many wards Hirrus did the same to, how many men the lanky Maura sucks off in one day, how many students Hamillus lays; I would speed more rapidly through how many villas he possesses, the guy at whose bladework my heavy beard used to rasp as a young man.

Many have pegged this passage as a strange lapse into nostalgia. The OTT Juvenal of *Satires* 1 is back, and the intra-authorial intertextuality is marked beyond doubt by the perfect rehashing of a whole hexameter, the famous autobiographical mid-point in that asphyxiating 12-verse sentence of *Sat.* 1.19-30: *quo tondente grauis iuueni mihi barba sonabat* (1.25). Interestingly, this is a memory of a memory: a throwback to a time when Juvenal was already remembering the same beard rasping, the same barber shaving. Can we hear this line's repetition in a section that makes the old man deaf (209-216); or can we see it in a context making him blind (227)? Is this slip of repetition an intentional (uh-oh!) self-reference, or is it the work of an old satirist⁴⁹ who won't list the names of the diseases because he can't, just as the old man stricken with Alzheimer's can't remember the names of his slaves (234)? Juvenal perhaps plants this low-hanging fruit to get us in the mood for recollection, so that we remember to forget or forget to remember Pliny's Domitius a few lines later. Thus, in the same textual neighbourhood where Juvenal crosses out Pliny, he also appears to forget himself.

I have attempted to chalk up how two forms of intertextuality – inter and intra-authorial⁵⁰ – here work not on the expected plane of memory, but on that of wholesale memory loss. This is an acrimonious interaction indeed, and well worthy of a satirist: Juvenal takes an image from Pliny's fingers, then upends the protagonist's fate to avert Pliny's vapid happy ending. Whereas Pliny saves the elite Roman male from himself, preserves the backbone and hope of Rome for another generation, Juvenal sells the toothless old codger to the youngest and most accomplished sucker. Pliny resolves a crisis point into an affirmation and continuity of the status quo; Juvenal diverts the precious legacy away from the legitimate heirs and into the dead-end of Phiale the oral artisan's gob-pocket. The contrast in world-view could barely be starker. Throughout the episode, thematic seeding of oblivion, deafness, blindness, non-recognition, as well as a bold recycling of a memory of a memory, livens us up to the complex interaction. This Hadrianic satire urges us to forget that brief blooming of hope under Pliny's Trajan; remember that it's as bad as it's ever been, and of course probably worse (*quo tondente*...still shaving after all these years); and forget about the future, for Rome is old, and the Greek prostitute is running off with the inheritance in her mouth.

Keeping to himself

There is one more general point to be made on the Juvenal-Pliny interaction, and this time it is about the very idea of 'interaction' within the two authors. The English word smacks of the social, and translates dangerously naturally to literature: authors meet,

⁴⁹ All that we know of Juvenal's body is that its beard was once maintained by a plucky barber; and that it is old and wrinkled (11.203). Try picking that in a line-up.

⁵⁰ For more on intra-authorial intertextuality in Juvenal, see Gold 2014.

greet, converse in person as in texts, and the interpersonal and intertextual worlds cross, collide, stand in and speak for each other. This is Pliny to a T. His letters are quasi-autobiographical pieces that, more often than not, *place* him in society. He names names; he talks to specific people; he works with A in the forum for or against B; he mourns the loss of X; he sees the famous Y speak in Rome; he gives a gift to town Z.⁵¹ In short, Pliny is embedded in the Rome he writes. His letters are social documents working to create bonds, and the selves bound by those bonds. Just as letters – those targeted vessels of communication – are wont to do. They like to interact.

Juvenal is in the other corner, and a corner so dark we barely know where it is. His satires are defiantly anti-autobiographical. He refuses to name names.⁵² His poems tend to take the form of tiring tirades at their most monologic; they give the finger to the Plinian ideals of polite aristocratic exchange and indulgent reciprocity. *Sat.* 10 is a prime example: this solipsistic soliloquy addresses no one in particular. It is true that some of the satires (especially the later ones) talk to an addressee. But this addressee either disappears as soon as he is invoked (cf. Umbricius forgetting his audience of one in *Sat.* 3,⁵³ or Fuscinus fading immediately behind the clouds in 14);⁵⁴ or they are there only to become part of the skewering process (e.g. Persicus in *Sat.* 11).⁵⁵ Juvenalian satire obstinately opts out of any such thing as ‘interaction’. The satirist tries his best not to be present in the poems he writes, let alone the society he writes about.⁵⁶

This is where Juvenal and Pliny really don’t get on: the idea of an authorial self actively interacting with, even shaping, a functioning society; the idea of writing as an integral and integrating part of a social process rather than a voice booming in the wilderness.⁵⁷ But these vastly different approaches to the individual in society don’t necessarily mean these authors have nothing to say to each other, even across the chasm. On the contrary: this is a true interaction, and an interaction so important because it gives us two roughly contemporary visions of what literary interaction might (not) be. For a fuller cross-section, we should audit the grumpy recluse as well as, alongside, the breezy socialite at whom he growls.

Forget it

⁵¹ Whitton plays on the geometry with his clever triangular beast (PQT). Studying such interactions perhaps inevitably takes us back to school mathematics, as we are ever looking to compass nicely bounded literary ‘circles’.

⁵² Cf. n. 10 above.

⁵³ *Sat.* 3.60; see Braund 1996’s note *ad loc.*, and her essay on *Sat.* 3.

⁵⁴ Cf. Ferguson 1979 *ad* 14.1 (and note the metaphor!): ‘the name appears only in the first line: the person addressed is as dark as his name, and Juvenal promptly forgets him for the general reader.’

⁵⁵ Cf. Geue forthcoming (2017).

⁵⁶ For this phenomenon of the ‘invisible’ satirist, see Uden 2015, and my own work forthcoming (2017).

⁵⁷ For literary revision as a key motif and zone of social cohesion in Pliny, see Gurd 2012: 105-26.

This chapter has tried its darnedest to convince that intertextuality studies can sometimes afford to forget about verbal correspondence and targeted one-to-one relations.⁵⁸ The first example showed how useful it can be to play non-committal on the old question of general/specific target. Even if we retreat from claiming a direct relationship to Tacitus, we can still project interesting interactive patterns at the level of generic turf wars. The second case was admittedly a more ‘classical’ author vs. author contretemps. We saw how an (anti-)allusion can function to crowd out, discredit, and erase another text; how the tropes of forgetting and non-recognition can paradoxically invoke an ‘original’ only to have it obliterated. In that case, our ideal reader better sit up and take notice, lest she be the old sod caught out with chronic amnesia.

If intertextual readings can still help farm the pickings of our embarrassingly rich period, they need to accommodate better the various forms of interaction which float free of the prized verbal echo: silences, absences, erasures; woolier dynamics where the precise participants are unnamed, the precise relationships unspecified, the precise co-ordinates unverifiable. There is nothing better than a scrupulously vague satirist to get these nebulous conversations flowing – from which he will, of course, promptly slide away.

Bibliography

- Ash, R. (2007). *Tacitus: Histories Book II*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Braund, S. (1996). *Juvenal: Satires Book I*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Braund, S. (2004). *Juvenal and Persius*, Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press
- Connors, C. (2005). Epic Allusion in Roman Satire. In K. Freudenburg, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 123-45
- Conte, G-B. (1986). *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, trans. and ed. C. Segal, Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Courtney, E. (1980). *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London: Athlone
- Cowan, B. (2013). Fear and Loathing in Lucretius: Latent Tragedy and Anti-allusion in *DRN* 3. In T. D. Papanghelis, S. J. Harrison, S. Frangoulidis, eds., *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 113-34
- Damon, C. (2003). *Tacitus: Histories Book I*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Dupont, F. (1997). Recitatio and the Reorganization of the Space of Public Discourse. In T. Habinek, ed., *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 44-59
- Ferguson, J. (1979). *Juvenal: The Satires*, Basingstoke: Macmillan
- Geue, T. Forthcoming (2017). *Juvenal and the Poetics of Anonymity*, Cambridge:

⁵⁸ Though not (necessarily) that it *should*: Whitton (this volume) makes a good case for servicing the older intertextual ‘nodes’ still coming on strong in our period, especially those linking prose authors.

Cambridge University Press

Gurd, S. (2012). *Work in Progress: Literary Revision as Social Performance in Ancient Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Freudenburg, K. (2001). *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Freudenburg, K. 2005a. Making Epic Silver: The Alchemy of Imperial Satire. In M. Paschalis, ed., *Roman and Greek Imperial Epic*, Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 77-89

Freudenburg, K., ed., (2005b). *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Gold, B. K. (2012). Juvenal: The Idea of the Book. In S. Braund and J. Osgood, eds., *A Companion to Persius and Juvenal*, Hoboken (NJ): Wiley Blackwell , 97-112

Gowers, E. (1993). *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Henderson, J. (1999). Pump Up the Volume: Juvenal, *Satires* 1.1-21. In J. Henderson *Writing Down Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 249-73.

Hight, G. (1954). *Juvenal the Satirist: A Study*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and Intertextuality: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Johnson, W. A. (2010). *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press

Jones, F. (2007). *Juvenal and the Satiric Genre*, London: Duckworth

Keane, C. 2012. Historian and Satirist: Tacitus and Juvenal. In V. E. Pagan, ed., *A Companion to Tacitus*, Malden (MA): Wiley Blackwell, 403-27

Koenig, A. (Unpublished Paper, 2014). **To-ing and Fro-ing between Foreign, Civil and 'Mixed' Wars in Frontinus' *Strategemata*.**

Marchesi, I. (2008). *The Art of Pliny's Letters: A Poetics of Allusion in the Private Correspondence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Marchesi, I. (2013). Silenced Intertext: Pliny on Martial on Pliny (on Regulus). *American Journal of Philology*, **134**, 101-18

Narducci, E. (1973). Il tronco di Pompeo. *Maia* **25**, 317-25

Radice, B. (1969). *Pliny: Letters*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press

Santorelli, B. (2012). *Giovenale, Satira IV: introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Berlin: De Gruyter

Sherwin-White, A. N. (1966). *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Syme, R. (1958). *Tacitus*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
Syme, R. (1979). Juvenal, Pliny, Tacitus. *American Journal of Philology*, **100**, 250-78
Thomas, R. F. (1986). Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, **90**, 171-198
Uden, J. (2011). *The Invisibility of Juvenal*. PhD Dissertation, Department of Classics, Columbia University, New York

Uden, J. (2015). *The Invisible Satirist: Juvenal and Second Century Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Whitton, C. L. (2012). 'Let us tread our path together: Tacitus and the Younger Pliny. In V. E. Pagán, ed., *Blackwell Companion to Tacitus*, Malden (MA): Wiley Blackwell, 345–68

Whitton, C. L. (2013). *Pliny the Younger: Epistles Book II*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press