

Working Paper for the “Literary Interactions under Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian” Research Group (October 2013):

Quintilian and Juvenal’s Fourteenth *Satire*

James Uden (Boston University)

In section 71 of his treatise *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693), John Locke warns of the susceptibility of children to their parents’ corrupting moral influence. ‘Having under Consideration how great the Influence of *Company* is’, he writes, ‘and how prone we are all, especially Children, to imitation; I must here take the liberty to mind Parents of this one Thing, *viz.* That he that will have his Son have a Respect for him, and his Orders, must himself have a great Reverence for his Son’ (Axtell 1968: 171-2). Locke caps his point with a Latin quotation, not from Cicero or Horace, but from the fourteenth *Satire* of Juvenal: *maxima debetur puero reverentia*, the ‘greatest reverence is owed to your child’ (14.47).¹ Those readers who recognized the provenance of the quotation would immediately have perceived that Locke’s quotation is not a disembodied tag; rather, this entire section of the treatise closely paraphrases ideas about the education of children argued in the opening hundred lines of Juvenal’s poem.² The *Satires* were, of course, commonly read as a school text in this period, and seventeenth-century English readers judged the fourteenth *Satire* one of his most instructive.³ The satirist himself was cast as a moral teacher: as Locke put it in a later treatise, the Roman satirists should be included in educational curricula because they ‘paint the deformities of men, yet thereby they teach us to know them’.⁴ For Locke’s audience, the authority attributed to Juvenal in this treatise on childhood education would presumably have occasioned little surprise.

¹ Locke’s primary Roman interlocutor in the work is Cicero (Mitsis 2003), but Juvenal has a minor though significant role. The treatise begins with a translation of Juvenal’s *mens sana in corpore sano* (*Sat.* 10.356), which Locke calls ‘a short, but full Description of a Happy State in this World’ (Axtell 1968: 114). He quotes the same poem later in the work, albeit incorrectly and with a shift in meaning: Locke writes, as an encomium to wisdom, *nullum numen abest si sit prudentia*, ‘if wisdom should be present, no divine power is wanting’ (section 200, Axtell 1968: 314), which is a misquotation of Juvenal’s protest to Fortune, ‘you’d have no power, if we had wisdom’, *nullum numen habes, si sit prudentia*, *Sat.* 10.356 [= *Sat.* 14.315]).

² For Locke’s warning about the pernicious influence of parents on their children, cf. esp. *Sat.* 14.1-4; on the injunction not to do anything shameful in the presence of your child, cf. *Sat.* 14.38-49; on the hypocrisy of the father punishing the son for the vices he has transmitted to him, cf. *Sat.* 14.50-8.

³ On the popularity of the fourteenth *Satire* in the seventeenth century, see Kupersmith (1985: 44-5).

⁴ *Some Thoughts Concerning Reading and Study for a Gentleman* (1703) (Axtell 1968: 403).

For us, though, there *is* surely something surprising about Juvenal's *Satires* as a source for Locke's quotation, since its presumption of children's moral innocence, and its lofty statement of parental responsibility, seems so at odds with the poet's usual grotesque vision of vice as humanity's natural state. *Maxima debetur puero reverentia* caught the eye of Highet, for whom it represented evidence of Juvenal's surprising love of children, an affection so 'genuine that it forces its way into his poetry against his will'.⁵ Yet Mayor long ago recognized the maxim not as an irruption of personal feeling, but as an allusion to Quintilian.⁶ In book 11.1.60-8 of the *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian describes the tact and delicacy required of the orator when pleading suits initiated by sons against their parents, or parents against their children. The deference shown to different family members will be 'more or less', Quintilian, says 'according to the reverence owed to each person' (*magis autem aut minus ut cuique personae debetur reverentia*, 11.1.66); Juvenal's *maxima* is an answer to Quintilian's *magis...aut minus*. But, I would add, the maxim evokes Quintilian in a far broader sense. It calls to mind the opening book of Quintilian's rhetorical opus: its self-consciously innovative focus on the child as the focus of training, on the child's susceptibility to early moral corruption, and on the vital importance of the household as the hothouse in which the ideal Roman citizen is grown.⁷ Ferguson (1979: 307) justly observes that Juvenal's *maxima debetur puero reverentia* has typically been quoted with little regard for its context in the *Satire*, where its idealism is tempered by the satirist's cynical suggestion that parents will inevitably engage in some crime or other: 'the greatest reverence is owed to your child, if you are planning something shameful; nor should you despise your child's years, but let your infant son stand in your way when you are about to sin'.⁸ Yet any perceived disjunction in the tone of these lines underlines the broader strategy of *Satire* 14. Juvenal revives the

⁵ Highet (1954: 145); also Highet (1949: 255). Similar is Wiesen (1963: 469), who cites the line as evidence of Juvenal's 'deep and genuine affection for children'; and Colton (1979), who describes Martial and Juvenal as 'hardened, disillusioned men' who nonetheless betray a poignant 'affection for children'.

⁶ Mayor (1883: 296), who also offers Plato, *De Leg.* 729b-c as a parallel. The Quintilian passage is also cited as a parallel by Courtney (1980: 567).

⁷ There is a further, fleeting but intriguing, parallel to these ideas in Pliny, *Ep.* 8.24, in which Pliny praises the old lady Ummidia Quadratilla for refraining from gambling or watching pantomime actors in the presence of her grandson; 'it seems to me she did this', says Pliny, 'not so much out of love, but out of reverence' (*quod mihi non amore eius magis facere quam reverentia videbatur*).

⁸ *Sat.* 14.47-9: *maxima debetur puero reverentia, si quid/ turpe paras, nec tu pueri contempseris annos, / sed peccaturo obstet tibi filius infans*. I cite Juvenal from the OCT text of Clausen (2nd ed, 1992), and Quintilian from the OCT text of Winterbottom (1970).

educational voice of Quintilian, only to strand the pedagogue and his instructions in a desolate satiric landscape of Juvenal's own creation.

This study – for which this working paper provides only the most tentative initial sketch – analyses Juvenal's striking and uncharacteristic maxim as part of a wider network of allusions to Quintilian in *Satire* 14. The connections between Juvenal and Quintilian have, no doubt, been a theme of previous research. But the focus has almost entirely been on the biographical relations between the two men, or on the ways in which Juvenal's satiric technique has been shaped by his knowledge of rhetorical precepts detailed in the *Institutio Oratoria*.⁹ By contrast, this project considers Juvenal's large-scale appropriation of a defining theme of Quintilian's treatise in a particular poem, *Satire* 14. This poem needs to be re-conceptualized not as a text that awkwardly joins an indictment of parents' corrupting influence (1-106) with a long screed on the stock theme of *avaritia* (107-331), but rather as a text that traces a link between childhood education and the broader moral outlook of the adult Roman citizen.¹⁰ The poem insistently calls the *Institutio* to mind in its themes and structure, but it is also a reading of the earlier work, highlighting the satiric elements in Quintilian's own text.

Moreover, recent scholarship on the *Institutio Oratoria* has moved away from a view of the work as a timeless rhetorical manual, to characterize it instead as a timely, ideologically-engaged text, negotiating between the authority of different cultural practices and centers of power in Domitianic Rome.¹¹ This project asks the question of what it meant for Juvenal, living in the age of Hadrian, some three decades after the publication of Quintilian's work, to

⁹ Kappelmacher (1903: 153-9) argued that Juvenal, like Pliny, had been a student of Quintilian, but positive evidence is lacking. Juvenal names Quintilian in three places in the *Satires* (6.75; 6.278-9; 7.186-9). Despite the unflattering implications of these references (see the end of this paper), scholars have long illustrated Juvenal's 'rhetorical' technique by reference to Quintilian's text (de Decker 1913; Anderson 1961; Braund 1997), and these correspondences have increasingly been explained by assuming Juvenal's close reading of the *Institutio*: see, most recently, Gellérfi (2013a), (2013b). My project aims to offer further evidence of Juvenal's reading of Quintilian.

¹⁰ Colson (1924: 25), in his commentary on Quintilian's first book, recognized a 'general resemblance' between 1.2.6-8 and *Sat.* 14.1-83, but the observation has not been expanded upon (or noticed?) by scholars of Juvenal. Keane (2007: 35-6) sees a Stoic background to the poem, and says that its 'discussion of parental example' can be compared to the Pseudo-Plutarchan *De Liberis Educandis*, though Quintilian seems to me a much more natural and direct model for its vision of childhood education. Perceived structural problems in the *Satire* have dominated the (scant) scholarship on the poem: O'Neil (1960); Stein (1970); Bellandi (1984).

¹¹ See, for example, Walzer (2006); Ussani (2008); Roche (2009); Dozier (2012).

recall to his readers' memory that earlier, totalizing vision of Roman rhetorical and moral training. Education, *paideia*, is just as central to aristocratic self-definition under Hadrian as it was in Rome in the 90s (if not more so), but in a Hadrianic Rome enamored of the foreign intellectuals and rhetoricians whose influence Quintilian sought to qualify or exclude, the *vir bonus dicendi peritus* whom Quintilian envisaged is, Juvenal suggests, an even more imperiled and remote ideal. Part of the satiric force of *Satire* 14 lies in measuring the distance between the Hadrianic world of the late 120s and the Roman model of education and citizenship Quintilian had described in the *Institutio Oratoria*.

Previous writers on the art of oratory, says Quintilian, had despised or neglected to mention the childhood education of the future orator (1pr.4), so his own focus on the child is a conspicuous innovation in his educational scheme.¹² The text itself begins at birth: the *Institutio*'s first prescription, in its very first sentence, is that the father should conceive high hopes for his newborn child (1.1.1). Quintilian emphasizes the susceptibility of the child's mind to the influence of his parents and his nurse, for childhood is when the mind is most 'tenacious' of its impressions, and negative influences cling the most readily of all (1.1.5).¹³ Pivotal for establishing the groundwork for correct linguistic usage is the language use of the nurse (1.1.6), the parents (1.1.6-7), and the *paedagogus* (1.1.8), who transmit their own habits to the children entrusted to their care. The child's *moral* training must also begin early, when the infant is most susceptible to influence.¹⁴ Indeed, moral and linguistic training are 'linked and cannot be divided', according to Quintilian (1.2.3). They are intertwined explicitly in the curriculum he describes, so that, for example, the moral *sententiae* through which the child is taught to read will serve to offer moral guidance as an adult, if the *sententiae* have been 'impressed on an unformed mind' (1.1.36). But moral and linguistic training are also implicitly intertwined in the terms Quintilian uses to describe deviations from correct usage – these are *vitia*, 'faults', which 'cling' (*haerent*, 1.1.15), 'infect' (*imbuit*, 1.1.9), 'sink in'

¹² Cf. Bloomer (2011: 83, 85): 'The presence, dispositions, and curricular progress of the child distinguish Quintilian's work...we have to wait for Rousseau or perhaps even Freud and his students for an equally important, systematic reflection upon the ideology and the practice of child training'.

¹³ 1.1.5: *Et haec ipsa magis pertinaciter haerent quae deteriora sunt. Nam bona facile mutantur in peius: quando in bonum verteris vitia?* ('And the worse [the influences] are, the more stubbornly they cling. For what is good is easily turned to the worse; but when were vices ever turned to the good?')

¹⁴ Arguing that children should be taught to read before the age of seven, Quintilian asks 'why should this not be an age for literary education, when it is already an age for moral education?' (*cur autem non pertineat ad litteras aetas quae ad mores iam pertinet?*, 1.1.17).

(*insidere*, 1.1.11), and, above all, ‘corrupt’ the minds of youth (*corrumpere*; forms of the verb occur sixteen times in the *Institutio*’s first two books).

In arguing that children should be sent to school rather than taught privately at home, Quintilian paints a garish portrait of the *domus* as a den of moral danger. ‘If only we ourselves did not ruin our children’s morals! For from the very start we mollify them as infants with luxuries’.¹⁵ Suddenly summoning all the outrage and hyperbole of satire, Quintilian complains about children crawling on purple, trained to distinguish crimson (*coccum*) from the best vermilion (*conchylium*), even before they can articulate these (similar) words (1.2.6). ‘We train their palate’, he says, before we train their speech’ (*ante palatum eorum quam os instituimus*, 1.2.6).¹⁶ Parents’ addiction to luxury encourages children to grow up in litters, sapping their strength; and they are praised rather than censured if they speak indecently (1.2.7). Proximity to the vices of adults deforms their character. ‘We have taught them’, he stresses, ‘it is from *us* they have heard such things’.¹⁷ Children ‘see our mistresses, our concubines; every dinner party is raucous with obscene songs; they witness things it is shameful to say’.¹⁸ Contemporary society encourages children to ‘learn’ (*discunt*) vices before they learn that they are vices. Habit becomes ‘nature’ (*natura* – one of the key words of the treatise).¹⁹ The entire passage is remarkable for its satirical energy and epigrammatic wit. Quintilian’s authorial voice here is Juvenal *avant la lettre*, and the satirist himself did not miss the cue.

Satire 14 begins with a sentence that recalls Quintilian’s complaint that it is parents who pass on vices to their children. The satiric voice tells Fuscinus that many sordid practices affix a ‘stain’ (*maculam*) that will ‘cling’ (*haesuram*) to a man’s reputation – practices which are ‘shown and handed to their children by their...parents!’ (3) The postponement of the word

¹⁵ 1.2.6: *utinam liberorum nostrorum mores non ipsi perderemus! Infantiam statim deliciis solvimus.*

¹⁶ Colson (1924: 25) cites verses from Ben Jonson’s play *Every Man in his Humour* (1598), which blend influences from Quintilian and Juvenal’s fourteenth *Satire*: ‘Nay, would ourselves were not the first, even parents/ That did destroy the hopes in our own children,/ Or they not learn’d our vices in their cradles,/ And suck’d in our ill customs with their milk./ Ere all their teeth be born, or they can speak./ We make their palates cunning...’ (Act II Scene III, lines 14-9).

¹⁷ 1.2.7: *nec mirum: nos docuimus, ex nobis audierunt.*

¹⁸ 1.2.8: *nostras amicas, nostros concubinos vident, omne convivium obscenis canticis strepit, pudenda dictu spectantur.*

¹⁹ On the various and conflicting uses to which *natura* is put in Quintilian’s treatise, see Varwig (1976), Fantham (1995).

parentes to the final position of this opening sentence is obviously aimed to shock, but for readers of Quintilian it must have been a shock of recognition as much as disapproval.²⁰ As the poem continues, Juvenal imitates Quintilian's emphasis on imitation, nature, and the susceptibility of the young to corruption by their environment. So, for example, Quintilian argued against the pedagogical advice of contemporaries and forebears by advocating for education to begin before the age of seven (1.1.15-9, and see Laes 2011: 96 on the age of seven in the ancient world as a common 'boundary between early and late childhood'); Juvenal echoes Quintilian's warning and says that influences received before the age of seven will be determinative of the child's personality (*septimus annus*, *Sat.*14.10). Juvenal, like Quintilian, warns that domestic *exempla* have particular force on the young: 'Such is nature's law: more swiftly do familial examples of vice corrupt us' (31-2).²¹ We must take care, therefore, so that 'our children do not follow our bad behavior' (39-40).²² Furthermore, just as Quintilian affirms the teachability of all children, remarking that the genuinely 'unable to be taught' (*indociles*, 1.1.20) are as rare as prodigies, Juvenal says emphatically that 'we all are able to be taught (*dociles*) to imitate' – in an enjambed satiric twist – 'depraved and crooked practices'.²³ Juvenal warns that the house of a father should be kept clear of 'what it is foul to say and to see', of prostitutes and the songs of parasites' (45-6; cf. Quintilian's mistresses, dinner parties, and *pudenda dictu* at 1.2.8). Later in the poem, in keeping with Quintilian's own warning about nurses (1.2.6), he warns of the capacity for nurses to corrupt

²⁰ Juvenal's picture of parents' negligence and the moral dangers of the home also bears similarities with Messalla's speech in Tacitus' *Dialogus* (esp. at 28.4-7), which has itself long been seen as giving voice to Quintilianic ideas. Cf. Brink (1989: 488): 'we are dealing with an articulate and well-defined educational theory – Quintilian's neo-Ciceronianism in oratory – which Tacitus makes his Messala express, understandably, in the historical setting of the *Dialogus*, without mentioning Quintilian's name'.

²¹ *Sat.* 14.31-2: *sic natura iubet: velocius et citius nos/ corrumpunt vitiorum exempla domestica*. On the imagery of *natura* in *Satire* 14, see Corn (1992).

²² *Sat.* 14.39-40: *ne crimina nostra sequantur/ ex nobis geniti*. The satirist's use of the self-incriminating first person plural in these passages – far from his typical mode – may reflect Quintilian's usage in his own satiric broadsides against parental influence ('we have taught them; it is from us they hear such things', 1.2.7).

²³ *Sat.* 14.40-1: *dociles imitandis/ turpibus ac pravis omnes sumus*. Only here does Juvenal use *docilis* in its core, pedagogical sense; it appears elsewhere only in the Oxford fragment, in its rarer, poetic sense of 'expert' (O26; cf. *TLL* s.v. *docilis* A 2a [v/1.1768.72 Bulhart]: = *doctus, plerumque apud poetas*).

their wards with their own corrupt *mores*, so that little girls, he says, learn greed ‘even before their ABCs’.²⁴

It is true that none of these sentiments are unique to Quintilian or Juvenal, and commentators have tended to refer to the poem’s ‘many predecessors’ (Courtney 1980: 562) who wrote on education (Xenophon’s *Cyropedia*, Plato in the *Laws*, Aristotle in the *Politics*) as influences on the *Satire*. But the recent Roman author who directed focus specifically on childhood education, and who synthesized all these sources for the Roman reader, was Quintilian, and, aside from any similarity in phrasing or imagery, I suspect that early second-century Latin sermonizing on the vulnerability and importance of children could not have failed to call Quintilian to mind. Moreover, while scenes of students and teachers had occurred in Horace and Persius, and are at home with the genre’s didactic element (Keane 2006: 105-106), these satiric situations typically revolved around individual exchanges between particular teachers and students; the expansive focus on aberrant teaching as an aetiology for adult vice is unique to Juvenal’s fourteenth *Satire*. Indeed, the emphasis on the importance of childhood training seems pointedly dissonant with prior points in Juvenal’s own poems. So, in *Satire* 7 – in a passage in which Juvenal had unflatteringly described Quintilian himself – Juvenal had attributed one’s adult success not to education, but to astrology. ‘What makes the difference is the star-sign that greets you, as you begin to utter your first wails’.²⁵ In *Satire* 14, by contrast, when Juvenal is mimicking Quintilian’s ideas, he advises readers that ‘it will make an enormous difference which arts and morals you teach your children’ (*plurimum enim intererit quibus artibus et quibus hunc tu/ moribus instituas*, 74-5; the lines are themselves enormous, and exaggeratedly prosaic – because they recall a prose treatise?). The shift in

²⁴ *Sat.* 14.208-9: *hoc monstrant vetulae pueris repentibus assae,/ hoc discunt omnes ante alpha et beta puellae*. Gellérffi (2013b: 91-2) also suggests the influence of Quintilian on these lines, noting additionally that the verb *reperere* is used of crawling babies only here, at *Inst.* 1.2.6, and once in Statius (*Theb.* 9.427). These two lines of *Satire* 14 were deleted by Jahn, and Clausen in his *OCT* follows suit, though Ferguson (1979: 311) counsels their retention. If they are an interpolation, they are at very least the work of someone keen to play the poem’s Quintilianic game.

²⁵ *Sat.* 7.194-6: *distat enim quae/ sidera te excipient modo primos incipientem/ edere vagitus...* As has long been recognized, the entire passage from lines 186-198 of *Satire* 7 contrasts the luck of wealthy Quintilian with the fall of the unlucky Valerius Licinianus: see Anderson (1961), Braund (1988: 64-5). The emphasis on infant speech (*edere vagitus*) in line 194-6 certainly suggests that Juvenal still has Quintilian in mind. The lines may even allude to an (autobiographical?) passage from Quintilian’s first book: *ita futururus eloquentissimus edidit aliquando vagitum et loqui primum incerta voce temptavit* (‘a man who was later the most eloquent of all, at one time uttered a wail and tried to say his first word with uncertain voice’, 1.1.21).

ethical orientation signals a shift in satiric voice – in *Satire* 14, the satirist plays the Quintilianic educator, urging the proper training of the young and their protection from ethical corruption.

Juvenal of course expands on vice in a way quite alien to Quintilian. His children, who are polluted by gambling, adultery, and even murder, belong to a far grimmer textual world. Yet, if Quintilian's text pervasively described pedagogical flaws in moral terms, Juvenal's Quintilianic *Satire* insistently describes moral flaws as perverted pedagogy. One boy has 'learned' (*didicit*, 9) to gourmandize, with his wastrel father 'demonstrating' (*monstrante*, 10) how to do it. Rutilus, who takes sadistic pleasure in whipping slaves, does not 'give instruction in' gentleness of spirit (*praecipit*, 16), but rather 'teaches' cruelty (*docet*, 18). For Larga's daughter, naming her mother's many lovers offered training not only in adultery, but in counting: 'she was never able to name them so quickly, or list them off at such a pace, that she didn't need to draw breath thirteen times'.²⁶ Now, while her mother dictates to her, she fills up her kid-sized wax tablets (*ceras...pusillas*) not with practiced *gnomai*, but with letters to her own lover (29-30). As the poem zeros in on *avaritia* as its cardinal fault, the emphasis is on perverted *teaching*:

120

*qui miratur opes, qui nulla exempla beati
pauperis esse putat; iuvenes hortatur ut illa
ire via pergant et eidem incumbere sectae.
sunt quaedam vitiorum elementa, his protinus illos
inbuit et cogit minimas ediscere sordes;
mox adquirendi docet insatiabile votum.* (14.120-5)

The man who marvels at wealth, who knows no *exempla* of a happy poor man, encourages the young to continue down his path, and devote themselves to the same way of life. Vices have certain basic elements. He imbues them with these, and forces them to learn by heart the basest trivialities. Before long, he teaches them an insatiable will for gain.

The cluster of pedagogical vocabulary (*exempla...incumbere...elementa...inbuit...ediscere...docet*) ironically underlines the intellectual poverty of the lesson itself. Education begins with the ethical orientation of the teacher himself; as the child learns, the teacher give

²⁶ 14. 26-8: *quae numquam maternos dicere moechos/ tam cito nec tanto poterit contexere cursu/ ut non ter deciens respiret?*

encouragement;²⁷ instruction begins with the most basic rudiments (*elementa*), then memorization (*ediscere*) of edifying portions of text;²⁸ and eventually the student's own ethical sense will develop as a mirror of his teacher. Here, the young, initially 'unwilling' (*inviti*, 108), develop their own will (*votum*, 125) for gain. The child's natural ethical sense is perverted. 'You're teaching (*doces*) them to rob and swindle and gain wealth by all crooked means', the poet accuses.²⁹ Later, Juvenal depicts an act of murder by a son who has learned his lessons about economic efficiency only too well: 'All the things you think should be obtained on land and sea, a quicker road will give to him: it takes little effort to commit serious crime'.³⁰ He has 'taught' (*praecepit*, 227) the love of money, and 'raised' greedy children (*producit*, 228), and now the son will turn murderous hands to father. 'The disciple lion will roar loudly and do away with its trembling master (or 'teacher', *magistrum*) in its cage'.³¹

A pervasive agricultural metaphor in ancient pedagogical discourse may also offer a way of linking *Satire* 14's condemnation of corrupt education with its many images of land and property being hoarded, mistreated, ruined or destroyed. For educational writers of the ancient world, children are soil to be ploughed, plants to be tended, vines to be supported with stakes.

²⁷ Cf. Quintilian: the child should be 'questioned and praised, and should also take joy sometimes in his achievement' (*et rogetur et laudetur et numquam non fecisse se gaudeat*, 1.1.20).

²⁸ Cf. Quintilian 1.1.35-6 on the young child memorizing edifying *sententiae*; and at 2.7.2-4, on the value for more advanced students of committing to memory texts from the orators and historians. Quintilian particularly criticizes the practice 'which fathers especially demand' (*quidem maxime patres exigunt*) of forcing sons to declaim their sons' own compositions. Cf. Juv. *Sat.* 14.207, in which the father forces his son to memorize a crassly mercantile, limply prosaic *sententia*, evidently of his own devising: *unde habeas quaerit nemo, sed oportet habere* ('no-one cares where it came from, but have it, you ought').

²⁹ 14.237-8: *et spoliare doces et circumscribere et omni/ crimine divitias adquirere*.

³⁰ 14.222-4: *nam quae terraque marique/ adquirenda putas brevior via conferet illi;/ nullus enim magni sceleris labor*.

³¹ 14.246-7: *trepidumque magistrum/ in cavea magno fremitu leo tollet alumnus*. The simile strongly resembles a similar passage in Statius' *Achilleid* – another text productively read in tandem with the contemporaneous pedagogical philosophy of Quintilian (Barchiesi 2005). At a climactic point in the first book (858-863), when the sight of Ulysses' weapons awakens an innate warrior instinct in the young Achilles, Statius describes the young Achilles as a lion who had been captured and 'trained', but which then roars and is ashamed to serve its 'frightened teacher' (*timidoque magistro*) once it rediscovers its native urges. Note, though, the shift in educational philosophy between Statius and Juvenal. In the *Achilleid*, Thetis' effeminizing of Achilles on Scyros could not alter Achilles' noble nature; destined by nature (and literary genre) for epic deeds, he was branded *indocilis* (*Ach.* 1.284, 356). But in Juvenal's conception, the lion's vicious instincts are themselves the result of a corrupt education. In Juvenal (and Quintilian), children are good by nature (*maxima debetur puero reverentia*, 47) and universally teachable (*dociles...omnes sumus*, 40-1), but, all too easily, habituated to vice.

‘Something useful will grow from rich ground even without anyone cultivating it’, says Quintilian, ‘but a farmer will produce more on fertile land than the goodness of the soil will on its own’.³² In the formulation in the pseudo-Plutarchan *De Liberis Educandis*, ‘nature is like the land, the teacher is the farmer, and his instructions and precepts on the subject are the seed’.³³ In *Satire* 14, Juvenal comes closest to mimicking this discourse when he says ‘we must be sparing with children (*parcendum est teneris*)’, a phrase long recognized as an allusion to *Georgics* 2.362-5, where Vergil is advising restraint in the pruning of tender young plants (*ac dum prima novis adolescit frondibus aetas,/ parcendum teneris...ipsa acies nondum falcis temptanda*, ‘as it matures from youth to adolescence, we must be sparing with its tender shoots...we must not yet try it with the knife’s edge’). But, more broadly, *Satire* 14 is replete with images of Romans immorally and irresponsibly cultivating land; and although these passages primarily indict his contemporaries for *avaritia*, it is not surprising, in light of the metaphors of ancient pedagogical discourse, that the poem’s bad educators are also its bad cultivators. One figure compulsively buys up his neighbors’ cornfields, vineyards, and olive plantations, and if a neighbor refuses to sell, he destroys his crops at night out of spite (141-160).³⁴ To this amoral landowner the satirist contrasts a figure from Italy’s idealized rustic past, whom we see offering ethical instruction to his child: he tells his children that nobody who wore gumboots or animal-skin coats ever overstepped their moral bounds (185-7). Consistent with the pervasive metaphor, this idealized old father and teacher is also a good cultivator, and the other half of his lesson concerns the divine injunction for responsible care of the land (179-184).

Despite the ways in which *Satire* 14 reflects ancient thinking on education, and, in particular, revives the voice of Quintilian, there is one very significant deviation from Quintilian in the description of childhood education in *Satire* 14, and it is key to the ideological orientation of the poem as a whole. When Quintilian inveighs against the corruption of children by their parents, and the perverted education in luxury they receive in the home, he does so

³² 2.19.2: *e terra uberi utile aliquid etiam nullo colente nascetur: at in solo fecundo plus cultor quam ipsa per se bonitas soli efficiet.*

³³ [Plut]. *De lib. educ.* 2b: γῇ μὲν ἔοικεν ἡ φύσις, γεωργῶ δ’ ὁ παιδεύων, σπέρματι δ’ αἱ τῶν λόγων ὑποθήκαι καὶ τὰ παραγγέλματα. On this metaphor in ancient pedagogical discourse, see Morgan (1998: 255-9).

³⁴ Cf. especially at *Sat.* 14.150-1: *dicere vix possis quam multi talia plorent/ et quot venales iniuria fecerit agros* (‘It’s hard to express how many people have complaints like this, and how much land goes on sale because of damage’).

specifically to advocate that children ought therefore to be educated *outside* the home, in schools. He would prefer, he says, for children to experience the ‘light’ (*lumen*) of the honorable school to the ‘shadowy solitude’ (*tenebris ac solitudini*) of private education (1.2.9). Despite the fact that Juvenal imitates *in extenso* the Quintilianic attack on the miseducation of youth by their parents, he conspicuously omits this vital conclusion to Quintilian’s argument. There is no mention of classes or schools in *Satire* 14.³⁵ Instead, the satirist deprecates the ability of anyone except parents – particularly, the father – to influence the morals of their children. Father and son play the roles that should, according to Quintilian, be played by professional teachers. Father and son are described as *magister* and *discipulus* (212-3), *magister* and *alumnus* (246-7).

Moreover, the satirist explicitly says that the moral instruction of ‘a thousand bearded teachers’ (*barbatus...mille...magistros*, 12) – that is, philosophers – will be useless once a child has been raised in a corrupting environment. Similarly, Juvenal cites Diogenes (308-314), Epicurus (319), and Socrates (320) towards the end of the poem, but dismissively concludes that ‘Nature and philosophy always say the same thing’ (*numquam aliud natura, aliud sapientia dicit*, 321). In Walzer’s analysis (2006), Quintilian aimed in the *Institutio Oratoria* to fold moral philosophy into his program of rhetorical education, thereby limiting the cultural authority of philosophers and other intellectuals in Domitianic Rome. He created a rhetorical program for the ethical and rhetorical training of a Roman *vir* that was deliberately and polemically self-contained. Juvenal’s Hadrianic *Satire* seems to go one step further and restrict the influence of *anyone* on the young, except for the very people whose moral corruption the poem decries: their parents. As a result, there is a suffocating insularity to the poem, which is not atypical of the *Satires* as a whole.³⁶ Juvenal trots out the old Roman ideals – the Catonian image of father as teacher (189), the citizen ‘useful to his fatherland’ in peace and war (71-2), the rustic hardihood of early Rome (161-5). But given

³⁵ Cf. *Satire* 7.150-177, which is, precisely, a description of students in a class. Colson (1924: 30) notes that Juvenal (at *Sat.* 7.151) and Quintilian are the only two authors to use *classis* in the sense of ‘class’.

³⁶ On this theme, see also Geue (2012: 162-174), who argues forcefully that, by ceding all didactic power to fathers, Juvenal self-consciously limits his *own* power to effect any change in morals in his audience. In Geue’s larger argument, Juvenal thereby continues to cultivate his own deliberate satiric marginality. It is worth emphasizing, though, that this Juvenalian marginality (anonymity, invisibility, insularity) is an aspect of the representation of the author within his own text; it is neither a description of his degree of engagement with other authors or ideas, nor necessarily a description of his reception by contemporaries.

the pervasive condemnation of parents' moral corruption in the home *and* the deliberate exclusion of other positive influences outside of it, there is little sense in *Satire* 14 of how a good Roman citizen might actually come to exist. Juvenal summons Quintilian's voice, conjuring the ghosts of the distinguished pedagogue in vivid maxims such as *maxima debetur puero reverentia*. But he projects the image of his model, bleakly and parodically, against a landscape in which his own precepts are rigged to fail, where his pedagogical program cannot possibly produce a *vir bonus dicendi peritus*.

This sense of insularity might be pushed a little further to help explain what has long been perceived as the bizarre structure of *Satire* 14. While excessive *avaritia* may very well be an example of an adult vice instilled by aberrant childhood education, there does indeed seem to be something off-kilter when the poet moves from the early focus on parents and children to his lengthy invective on greed. This invective on greed is also strikingly repetitive of previous *Satires*. Juvenal has been attacking acquisitiveness since the beginning of his career. When the satirist asks at the conclusion of *Satire* fourteen whether he has 'filled the lap' of the greedy man yet with his escalating amounts of expected wealth, he echoes the question he had asked at the very outset of the *Satires*: 'when did the lap of *avaritia* ever stretch wider?'³⁷ His promise that real life will prove more entertaining than any circus entertainment (255-264) recalls Democritus at the circus in *Satire* 10 (36-50). An entire line at the conclusion of *Satire* 10 is repeated verbatim at the end of *Satire* 14, the only such line repetition in all Juvenal (10.365 = 14.315). *Satire* 12's scene of a merchant's ship wrecked in a sea-storm – which was already described as a second-hand *poetica tempestas* (12.23-4) – is rehearsed once again in *Satire* 14 (267-283), introduced as 'exquisite pleasure', which 'I show you' (*monstro voluptatem egregiam*, 256). For Stein (1970: 36), the invective on greed in *Satire* 14 aims to 'unify' and 'vitalize' the 'commonplace topics of satire' into one 'complete and coherent statement'. It is more that, once Juvenal has fashioned a pedagogical dystopia in which genuine moral instruction is impossible, the needle gets stuck in the groove.

Perhaps the very repetitiveness reflects something of the way in which vices are described in the poem. In the account of Keane (2007: 37), the structure of *Satire* 14 – warped, crooked,

³⁷ *Sat.* 14.327: *si nondum implevi gremium, si panditur ultra*; cf. *Sat.* 1.87-8: *quando/ maior avaritiae patuit sinus?*

swollen – seems to reflect the very corruption the poem attacks. The text itself is wayward and aberrant, then over-inflated through greed. To her observation, I would add that the poem's vices are also, from the very first sentence, associated with repetition. When vices are handed down (*tradunt*, 3) from generation to generation, they are repeated. When children imitate the actions of their parents, they perform a kind of repetition. The young merely follow in the 'track of old fault', which, like *avaritia* in Juvenal's previous poems, they have already been 'shown a long time ago' (*monstrata diu veteris...orbita culpae*, 36). The *Satire* is caught up in its own cycle of repetition, repeating the *vitia* which have been 'shown' and handed down through the different stages of the Juvenalian career, as if through generations. The poem's repetitiveness exemplifies precisely its broader analysis of the transmission of vice.

The *Satire*'s primary repetition, I suggest, is of Quintilian himself, since he too had appeared in the earlier *Satires* of Juvenal. In three places, Juvenal mentions Quintilian by name, and Anderson (1961) [=1982: 397-414] has demonstrated that in no case are the implications flattering. At 6.75 (*an expectas ut Quintilianus ametur?*), he is the type of the old man unable to appeal to women (despite his efforts?).³⁸ Later in *Satire* 6, an adulteress calls upon Quintilian, as master of rhetoric's tricks, to offer her a rhetorical *color* to escape prosecution after she has been caught *in flagrante*. He refuses not on principle, but because he is 'stuck' (*haeremus*), and tells her to think up an excuse herself (279-285). But the third appearance of Quintilian is especially apt, and specifically relevant for *Satire* 14, for here Quintilian is described as a teacher, and one who has amassed great wealth:

*hos inter sumptus sestertia Quintiliano,
ut multum, duo sufficient: res nulla minoris
constabit patri quam filius. "unde igitur tot
Quintilianus habet saltus?" exempla novorum
fatorum transi.* (7.186-90)

Among all this expense, two thousand sesterces - and that is a lot - will suffice for Quintilian. Nothing costs less for a father than his own son. "Then how does he have so many estates?" Pass over examples of novel fates!

³⁸ Anderson (1982: 399) links the jibe to the fact that Quintilian's wife was a much younger woman (6 pr.4-5).

In this section of *Satire 7*, the satirist seeks to illustrate how poorly teachers are paid, and he first lights upon the most famous teacher of all, Quintilian. But instead the satiric point becomes this example's lack of fit, since Quintilian was hardly the typical impecunious teacher, and the following lines unflatteringly imply that his rise to success was due to Fortune, not to any wisdom or skill.³⁹ We know that Quintilian was the first to hold an official 'chair' of rhetoric funded from the public treasury (Suetonius tells us at *Vesp.* 18 that the annual salary was 100 000 sesterces) and Domitian must also have rewarded him for his tutorship of the emperor's young grandnephews and heirs (4 pr. 2; perhaps that hated emperor is the implied answer to the question in 188-9).⁴⁰ Martial seems to allude to Quintilian's wealth in his sole epigram to him (*Ep.* 2.90), in which he hails his fellow Spaniard magniloquently as the 'grand regulator of wayward youth' (*vagae moderator summe iuventae*, 1), but then begs to be allowed to live a simple and humble life, not a life of wealth and ambition. In lines 186-8 of *Satire 7*, Juvenal says that Quintilian receives two thousand sesterces (for each course?), which is a lot by the modest standards of a teacher (*ut multum*, 187), even if a small cost for his students' fathers (187-8). But the modest nature of this sum prompts the question: how has Quintilian come to own 'so many estates' (*tot...saltus*)? The *rhetor*, no doubt exaggeratedly, is cast as a kind of modern-day Mamurra (cf. Catullus 114, 115), whose expansive acquisitions invite the reader to compare him with the acquisitive, building-mad *dominus* (179; = Domitian?) described in the previous lines. Of course, it is not the case that we should see veiled allusions to Quintilian at every point in the invective against the accumulation of wealth in *Satire 14*. On the other hand, for readers as familiar with scurrilous insinuations about Quintilian's riches as they were with his rhetorical *magnum opus*, the shift in *Satire 14* from Quintilianic pronouncements on pedagogy to descriptions of the accumulation of wealth must have had their own incriminating logic.

In Rome under Hadrian, in the midst of what would later be called the Second Sophistic, education (*paideia*) was more central than ever to the construction of elite Roman and Greek identity. The ways in which childhood training could produce a cultured *vir* were very much a matter of contestation and debate among Juvenal's contemporaries, writing in both Latin

³⁹ As the commentators point out, the lines about the *felix* in the following lines sardonically recast Horace's lines about the qualities of the *sapiens* (Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.106-8), though readers may equally have discerned a travesty of Quintilian's appropriation of the figure of the Stoic *sapiens* in his own work (Walzer 2003).

⁴⁰ For the known facts about Quintilian's life, see Kaster (1995: 333-6).

and Greek.⁴¹ Moreover, children were more visible than ever in the early second century in imperial iconography, and the treatment of children became ever increasingly an element of public, political discourse (Rawson 2001). Throughout his *Satires*, Juvenal is alive to the cultural changes around him, and his parochial appeals to old Roman values and personalities are shaped precisely by an awareness of the rapidly-shifting, cosmopolitan Empire around him.⁴² In *Satire* 14, he summons a voice from over thirty years earlier, that of the famous Quintilian, who had issued his own very Roman program for forming a *vir*. But he rigs the formula to fail. The first sections on pedagogy suggest little possibility that the child will avoid being corrupted by his or her parents, who hold power over their child's development, and yet (according to Juvenal) already embody the traits their children must avoid. The latter sections on *avaritia* suggest that all Rome has become that decadent house indicted by Quintilian, in which luxury is ingrained and shamelessness is praised (1.2.6). The satiric distortion of Quintilian's treatise suggests that its program for producing *boni viri* is hopeless in the late 120s, if it was ever possible in the 90s. A good child needs good parents and good teachers, but those, the satirist insists, are in very short supply.

James Uden (BOSTON UNIVERSITY)

⁴¹ Aside from Tacitus' *Dialogus* and the pseudo-Plutarchan *De Liberis Educandis*, think too of the *De audiendis poetis* of Plutarch, and the interest in childhood education in the *Parallel Lives* (Duff 2008); the second *Oration* of Dio Chrysostom, which depicts the education of Alexander as a youth and the capacity of pedagogy to curb passions (Whitmarsh 2008: 200-4); the quasi-paternal and pedagogical role assumed by Pliny in his *Epistles* (Bernstein 2008), and his letter on the endowment and administration of a school (*Ep.* 4.13.3-10); Favorinus' pronouncements on breast-feeding and child-raising, as reported by Gellius (*NA* 12.1); and, if chronology were not so difficult, perhaps also the ideas about education and nature in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*.

⁴² See Uden (forthcoming).

Bibliography

- Anderson, W.S. 1961. "Juvenal and Quintilian". *Yale Classical Studies* 17: 1-91 [= 1982. *Essays in Roman Satire*. Princeton. 396-486].
- Axtell, J. L. 1968. *The Educational Writings of John Locke*. Cambridge.
- Barchiesi, A. 2005. "Masculinity in the '90s: The Education of Achilles in Statius and Quintilian". In M. Paschalis (ed) *Roman and Greek Imperial Epic*. Crete. 47-75.
- Bellandi, F. 1984. "Sulla struttura della satira 14 di Giovenale". *Prometheus* 10: 154-60.
- Bernstein, N.W. 2008. "Each Man's Father Served as his Teacher: Constructing Relatedness in Pliny's Letters". *CA* 27: 203-230.
- Bloomer, W. Martin 2011. *The School of Rome: Latin Studies and the Origins of Liberal Education*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London.
- Braund, S. 1988. *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*. Cambridge.
- . 1997. "Declamation and Contestation in Satire", in W.J. Dominik (ed) *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London. 147-165.
- Brink, C. O. 1989. "Quintilian's *De Causis Corruptae Eloquentiae* and Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus*". *CQ* 39: 472-503.
- Colson, F.H. 1924. *M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutiones Oratoriae Liber I*. Cambridge.
- Colton, R.E. 1979. "Children in Juvenal and Martial". *Classical Bulletin* 56: 1-3.
- Corn, A. M. 1992. "'Thus Nature Ordains': Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire". *Illinois Classical Studies* 17: 309-322.
- Courtney, E. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London.
- de Decker, J. 1913. *Juvenalis declamans: étude sur la rhétorique déclamatoire dans les Satires de Juvénal*. Ghent.
- Dozier, C. 2012. "Poetry, Politics, and Pleasure in Quintilian". In I. Sluiter & R. Rosen (eds) *Aesthetic Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden & Boston. 345-364.
- Duff, T. 2008. "Models of Education in Plutarch". *JHS* 128: 1-26.
- Fantham, E. 1995. "The Concept of Nature and Human Nature in Quintilian's Psychology and Theory of Instruction". *Rhetorica* 13: 125-136.

- Ferguson, J. 1979. *Juvenal: The Satires*. New York.
- Gellérfi, G. 2013a. "Quintilian's Influence on Juvenal's Satire I". *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 53: 165-171.
- . 2013b. "The *Institutes of Oratory* as Inspiration and Source for Juvenal". *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 18: 85-93.
- Geue, T.A. 2012. *Satirist without Qualities: Juvenal and the Poetics of Anonymity*. PhD Dissertation, Cambridge.
- Hightet, G. 1949. "The Philosophy of Juvenal". *TAPA* 80: 254-270.
- . 1954. *Juvenal the Satirist: A Study*. Oxford.
- Kappenmacher, A. 1903. *Studia Juvenaliana*. Dissertationes Philologicae Vindobonenses 7: 159-99.
- Kaster, R.A. 1995. *C. Suetonius Tranquillus: De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*. Oxford.
- Keane, C. 2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. Oxford.
- . 2007. "Philosophy from Satire: The Program of Juvenal's Fifth Book". *AJPh* 128: 27-57.
- Kupermith, W. 1985. *Roman Satirists in Seventeenth-Century England*. Lincoln, NE & London.
- Laes, C. 2011. *Children in the Roman Empire: Outsiders Within*. Cambridge.
- Mayor, J.E.B. 1881. *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*. 3rd ed. London.
- Mitsis, P. 2003. "Locke's Offices". In J. Miller & B. Inwood (eds) *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy*. Cambridge. 45-61.
- Morgan, T. 1998. *Literature Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge.
- O'Neil, E. 1960. "The Structure of Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire". *CPh* 55: 251-3.
- Rawson, B. 2001. "Children as Cultural Symbols: Imperial Ideology in the Second Century". In S. Dixon (ed) *Childhood, Class and Kin in the Roman World*. London & New York. 21-42.
- Roche, P.A. 2009. "The Ivy and the Conquering Bay: Quintilian on Domitian and Domitianic Policy". In W.J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite & P.A. Roche (eds) *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*. Leiden & Boston. 367-385.

- Stein, J.P. 1970. "The Unity and Scope of Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire". *CPh* 65: 34-6.
- Uden, J. forthcoming. *The Invisible Satirist: Juvenal and Second-Century Rome*. Oxford.
- Ussani, V.S. 2008. *Il retore e il potere: Progetto formativo e strategie del consenso nell'Institutio oratoria*. Naples.
- Varwig, F.R. 1976. *Der rhetorische Naturbegriff bei Quintilian: Studien zu einem Argumentationstopos in der rhetorischen Bildung der Antike*. Heidelberg.
- Walzer, A. 2003. "Quintilian's *Vir Bonus* and the Stoic Wise Man". *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 33: 25-41.
- . 2006. "Moral Philosophy and Rhetoric in the *Institutes*: Quintilian on Honor and Expediency". *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 36: 263-281.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.
- Wiesen, D. 1963. "Juvenal's Moral Character, an Introduction". *Latomus* 22: 440-471.
- Winkler, M.M. 1983. *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal*. Hildesheim.