

MENSURA INCOGNITA
QUEER KINSHIP, CAMP AESTHETICS, AND JUVENAL'S NINTH SATIRE
by

MICHAEL BRODER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Classics in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2010

© 2010
MICHAEL BRODER
All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Classics in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Craig A. Williams

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

Jennifer T. Roberts

Date

Acting Executive Officer

Joel Allen

Ronnie Ancona

Craig A. Williams

Supervision Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT
MENSURA INCOGNITA
QUEER KINSHIP, CAMP AESTHETICS, AND JUVENAL'S NINTH SATIRE
by
Michael Broder

Adviser: Professor Craig Williams

The dissertation addresses four problematic aspects of scholarship on Juvenal 9. The first two are matters of reception history: first, the poem has been understudied; and second, most major extant studies of the poem have been grossly or subtly homophobic. The other two problems are matters of literary criticism: Juvenal's ninth satire has traditionally been read as an attack on homosexuality, when in fact it is neither an attack, nor is it about homosexuality. The current study addresses each of these problems, reassessing the ninth satire in the context of queer theory and camp aesthetics. Chapter One traces the homophobic tendencies in the modern reception of Juvenal 9 across reception modalities including expurgation, biographical criticism, and persona theory. Chapter Two reviews relevant concepts in queer theory and the discourse of camp. Queer theory emphasizes the performative dimensions of sex, gender, and kinship. Camp is a counter-normative discourse in which incongruous situations and juxtapositions are presented in a theatrical manner for humorous effect, expressing the relationship of sex, gender, and kinship deviants to dominant discourses of normativity and embracing the stigmatized identity of the deviant, marginalized other. Chapter Three reviews the debate over Juvenal's moralism among scholars of satire beginning in the 1960s. This debate serves as an unwitting proxy for a debate about camp aesthetics by emphasizing the role

of perverse wit in articulating a moral satiric vision. Chapter Four offers a close, detailed reading of Juvenal's ninth satire within the framework of queer theory and camp aesthetics laid out in previous chapters. The reading identifies instances of camp incongruity, theatricality, and humor, the embrace of stigmatized identity, and the expression of solidarity with the deviant. Particular emphases are the parody of social and cultural institutions such as marriage and patronage; literary genres such as epic, elegy, and declamation; and literary motifs such as *servitium amoris*, *militia amoris*, and *exclusus amator*, among others. A Conclusion recaps and extends some of the major contentions of the study and indicates directions for further research. Finally, an Appendix provides an original translation of Juvenal's ninth satire.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation began life as a paper written for a Juvenal seminar taught by Professor Harry Evans at Fordham University in the fall of 2005. I owe Professor Evans a great debt for inspiring my interest in Juvenal and my fascination with the ninth satire. I subsequently presented my research in progress at a number of academic and professional conferences. I am grateful for the hospitality and intellectual camaraderie of students, faculty, and fellow conference participants at Princeton University; the University of California, Los Angeles; the University of Cincinnati; the University at Buffalo of the State University of New York (special thanks to Will Duffy); and the Centre for Medical Knowledge at the University of Exeter (special thanks to Kate Fisher and Rebecca Langlands). At the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY), I was graciously received on a number of occasions by the students, faculty, staff, and guests of the PhD Program in Classics, the English Students Association, and the Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies. I am also grateful to the officers, staff, and members of the American Philological Association, the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, and the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, where I presented portions of my research. My attendance at various academic and professional conferences was facilitated by travel awards from the Sue Rosenberg Zalk Fund at the CUNY Graduate Center; the Office of the President of the CUNY Graduate Center; the Classical Association of the Atlantic States; and a Student Bursary from the Wellcome Trust in London. Thanks to Ann Suter for her enthusiastic response to my work. Judith Hallett's support and encouragement have been precious, invaluable, and irreplaceable. Back in Brighton

Beach, Stuart (Shlomo) Felberbaum convinced me to study Greek and Latin, for better or worse. At Columbia University, Jeffrey Perl taught me that antiquity was the key to understanding modernity, whether that was his intention or not. Thanks to those who taught me Greek and Latin many years ago: Floyd Moreland, Rita Fleischer, Hardy Hanson, Stephanie Russell, and the rest of the faculty at the Latin/Greek Institute of the City University of New York in the summers of 1982 and 1983; Frank Romer, who read Thucydides and Tacitus with me at the CUNY Latin/Greek Institute in the summers of 1984 and 1986; and all of my professors in the Graduate Faculty in Classics at the Graduate Center, as well as those who taught me as part of the consortium with Fordham University and New York University. For their teaching, research, and contributions to pedagogy, I want to acknowledge the late Gerry Quinn, Jack Collins, and Seth Benardete, all formative influences in my early study of Greek and Latin language and literature. As for this dissertation, Joy Connolly, Holt Parker, Amy Richlin, Ralph Rosen, and Marilyn Skinner gave me valuable feedback on earlier incarnations of my research, and inspired me with their own research, writing, and teaching. My supervisor and the members of my committee, Craig Williams, Ronnie Ancona, and Joel Allen, provided ongoing encouragement and invaluable feedback. They also helped me to ensure that I argued my often controversial contentions vigorously and documented them rigorously. Of course, any errors that remain are my own responsibility. Finally, I must acknowledge Rand Snyder, the one who got away, and Jason Schneiderman, the one who didn't.

CONTENTS

Copyright page	ii
Approval page	iii
Abstract	iv
Acknowledgments	vi
Table of Contents	viii
INTRODUCTION: Taking the Measure of Juvenal's Ninth Satire	1
CHAPTER ONE: Problems of Reception and Interpretation	22
CHAPTER TWO: Queer Existence, Camp Aesthetics, and Classical Antiquity	64
CHAPTER THREE: Perverse Wit and the Crisis of Juvenalian Moralism	130
CHAPTER FOUR: A Reading of Juvenal's Ninth Satire	191
CONCLUSION: Juvenal's Ninth Satire (More) Fully Measured	294
APPENDIX: A Translation of Juvenal's Ninth Satire	311
BIBLIOGRAPHY	320

INTRODUCTION

Taking the Measure of Juvenal's Ninth Satire

The Ninth Satire is one of the most shocking poems ever written. ... In spite of its repulsive subject it is a masterpiece. ... Because of its repulsive theme, the satire has been little imitated as a whole. ... The beautiful poetry of 9.126-9 is worthy of a better setting, and once more shows the peculiar character of Juvenal, who, like Swift, has a soft heart inside his armour of cynicism.

—Gilbert Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (1954)¹

Juvenal's ninth satire is a very special poem, a poem at once obsessed over and neglected, a poem whose full measure, it would seem, has never been adequately taken. Hence the Latin phrase used as the main title of this dissertation, *mensura incognita*, "unknown measure," a phrase adapted from the words of Naevolus, the poem's vivid, dramatic, and compelling interlocutor, who utters those words at 9.34 to characterize the size of his own indefatigable penis. The ninth satire has been both revered and reviled, often by the same scholars, who tend to hail it as one of Juvenal's most accomplished poems while lamenting that such artistry should be wasted on such sordid subject matter (note Highet's observation in the epigraph above to the effect that a lovely sentiment uttered by Naevolus is "worthy of a better setting"). Indeed, the poem has a striking reception history that has been driven largely by its startling representations of sex,

¹ Quotes are from Highet 1954: 116, 118, and 274n1. Juv. 9.126-9 reads as follows:

*festinat enim decurrere velox
flosculus angustae miseraeque brevissima vitae
portio; dum bibimus, dum certa, unguenta, puellas
poscimus, obrepit non intellecta senectus.*

For the swift little flower and briefest portion of a narrow and wretched life hastens to depart; while we drink, while we demand garlands, perfumes, girls, old age creeps up unawares.

gender, and kinship deviance, including male sexual submission, effeminacy, adultery, prostitution, and paternal surrogacy (what one might uncharitably call *bastardy*). To be sure, we read about these same phenomena in other Roman sources, such as the speeches of Cicero or the *Naturales Quaestiones* of Seneca, where they scarcely provoke the apoplexy often associated with Juvenal 9.² The difference, it would seem, is not a matter of *topic* but of *tone*. Cicero generally alludes to matters like effeminacy or sexual impropriety to discredit a legal or political opponent; Seneca describes the sexual deviance of Hostius Quadra as a blazingly negative moral exemplum, an absolute failure of manly virtue. Whether or not the authors in question take any pleasure in their scathing portrayals of immorality, an argument can be made that they dredge such vices primarily in the interest of promoting normative moral standards. In Juvenal's ninth satire, by contrast, try as we may, it is virtually impossible not to detect a certain gleeful indulgence in what I refer to throughout this study as *perverse wit*: humorous banter about patently deviant ways of performing one's sexual role, gender identity, or kinship relations; in particular, banter that pretends to respect moral standards while describing shocking departures from such standards in graphic and arguably gratuitous detail and, I would argue, without any real interest in moral censure.

In the nineteenth century, the topical immorality and tonal perversity of the ninth satire led to its expurgation from many editions, particularly those intended for the use of British and American schoolboys. In the twentieth century, with expurgation out of

² For varieties of effeminacy and male sexual profligacy, see for example Cicero's attacks on Verres and Clodius, discussed by Williams 2010: 158-60, as well as Seneca's account of Hostius Quadra (*Nat. Quaes.* 1.16), discussed by Bartsch 2006: 103-114. For literary representations of sexual immorality more generally, see Edwards 2002 and Langlands 2006, which explicitly focuses on women's sexual morality.

fashion, critics sought to explain how the poem utilized perverse wit as a cudgel against its satiric targets. Among the majority of scholars who agreed that Juvenal's target in the ninth satire was male homosexuality, these twentieth-century analyses tended to produce homophobic readings tinged with a bias against commercial sex (as exemplified by Naevolus) and a lament for the decline of noblesse oblige (as exemplified by the effeminate, sexually submissive patron). In some cases the critic seemed to espouse such views as his own; that is, Juvenal was only arguing what any reasonable person would. In other cases, the scholar might distance him- or herself from these views, displacing them onto the historical poet, his poetic persona, or an implied ancient reader. In any event, the result was to reproduce the poem as a gesture of solidarity with a dominant ideology of masculine virtue, feminine modesty, and public morality. Even among critics who conceded that Juvenal's satires characterized virtue, modesty, and morality as lost or illusory ideals, the deviant forms of existence represented in the ninth satire were viewed as monstrous failures of humanity. Moreover, if analyses of the ninth satire in the twentieth century tended to be homophobic and disdainful in their approach to Naevolus and his patron, they also tended to be relatively rare; compared to satires that had less controversial subject matter, relatively few studies of the poem were published, and relatively few pages were devoted to it in the major Juvenal commentaries that appeared in English in the last quarter of the century, Ferguson 1979 and Courtney 1980.³

Thus, Juvenal's ninth satire at the end of the twentieth century suffered from both a tradition of homophobic and elitist readings and a history of scholarly neglect. In the latter part of the century, however, new developments in gender studies and the history of

³ Cf. the review of Ferguson 1979 and Courtney 1980 in LaFleur 1984.

sexuality set the stage for a comprehensive reevaluation of the poem. Specifically, work on sex and gender dynamics and ideologies of Roman masculinity encouraged a more nuanced reading of Naevolus, his patron, and their sexual relationship. In particular, Craig Williams' *Roman Homosexuality* revoked scholars' license to refer to the pair as "perverts" or even as "homosexuals." Williams built on previous work on sexuality and gender in Greek and Roman antiquity to argue that the binary opposition between heterosexuality and homosexuality, so familiar to the modern discourse of sexual normativity and deviance, was not applicable to ancient Rome.⁴ Instead, normativity and deviance were based on an alignment between anatomical sex and gender identity, such that males were expected to be masculine-gendered and sexually dominant, while females were expected to be feminine-gendered and sexually submissive. Social approbation attached to conformity with these sex and gender expectations, while disapprobation and ridicule attached to their misalignment.

According to this schema, a Roman male would maintain his reputation for manliness (*virtus, virilitas*) so long as he was perceived to be masculine-gendered in terms of comportment and dominant in terms of his sexual disposition. His masculinity remained intact regardless of whether his sexual partners were male or female, provided that his partners were sexually submissive and he remained sexually dominant. By contrast, a Roman male compromised his reputation for manliness either through

⁴ Williams 2010: 4-9, with relevant notes, discusses how his study relates to previous work on the history of sexuality in antiquity, including Veyne 1978 and 1985, Lilja 1983, Fantham 1991, Cantarella 1992, Richlin 1992a, Richlin 1993a, Meyer-Zwiffelhofer 1995, Robert 1997, and Taylor 1997. Other influential works, dealing with the sex and gender dynamics in ancient Greece, include Dover 1978, Halperin 1990, and Winkler 1990.

effeminacy or sexual submissiveness. A masculine-gendered Roman male who sexually penetrated other adult males or boys, while engaging in “homosexual sex” in the most trivial sense of the term, could not meaningfully be referred to as a homosexual, any more than he could meaningfully be referred to as a heterosexual if and when he similarly penetrated a woman or girl: the operative binary was not homosexual/heterosexual, but rather dominant/submissive, which could also be viewed in terms of penetrating/penetrated, insertive/receptive, and, with some caution, active/passive (caution, because the penetrated/receptive partner can be quite active in every aspect of a sexual encounter). Ultimately, Williams argues that a masculine/effeminate gender binary incorporates and shapes all the others. Indeed, Roman males could be marked as effeminate even as they engaged in heterosexual practices, based on putatively feminine practices of grooming, dress, comportment, and perceived lack of self-control, particularly in sexual matters.⁵

This more nuanced model of sexual role play and gender dynamics demanded a more subtle characterization of Naevolus and his patron in Juvenal 9. To some extent, this revised reading was evident in discussions of the poem published since the 1990s, including those by Williams himself.⁶ The prevalence of such readings, however, remained slight, as the poem continued to suffer from its history of scholarly neglect. Part of this neglect was a matter of momentum: scholarship tends to be a matter of building on

⁵ See Williams 2010, Chapter Four.

⁶ See Williams 2010: 12, 90-1, 95, 193, 198-9, 201, 203, 210 *et passim*. An interesting example of scholarly practice in flux is provided by Braund 1996: viii, which in a note appended to the second impression points out that her own “use of the word ‘homosexual’ in the commentary to [Juvenal’s] *Satire 2* is inappropriate; the term ‘effeminate’, which minimises the anachronism, is preferable.” This note was apparently added in response to the review in Williams 1997, which provides a compelling example of the interpretive problems that arise from imposing the category of homosexuality on the sex and gender dynamics of ancient Rome.

previous work either to contest or reaffirm earlier conclusions based on new evidence or new critical methodologies. Scholars generally had been so circumspect in discussing the ninth satire, however, that there was little previous work to build on; thus, even as old taboos withered, the foundation for new work on the poem remained thin.

Another reason for neglect, I would argue, was the trajectory of gender studies and the history of sexuality within classics. Much of this work was done by feminist scholars and gay scholars whose motivations included a desire to use the study of classical antiquity as a means of resisting oppression based on sex or gender in their own time and place (the industrialized West in the latter part of the twentieth century). This motivation led to two lines of inquiry that were sometimes at odds with each other but were each fruitful in their own way. One approach, deriving from feminist and gay liberationist thinking, sought to demonstrate the presence of a masculinist, patriarchal, and phallogocentric ideology in Roman culture and to elucidate how Roman literature supported this ideology by ridiculing and stigmatizing categories of marginal persons whose existence was devalued, including women and girls, effeminate men, boys, slaves, and others who were socially subordinate and rhetorically constructed as submissive, penetrable, receptive, and passive. The other approach, already alluded to above, sought to historicize the category of sexuality and to denaturalize the homosexual/heterosexual

binary, thereby undermining the claim that heterosexuality was part of a transhistorical human nature and that homosexuality was unnatural and potentially immoral.⁷

Both of these approaches tended to slight Juvenal's ninth satire in favor of two other satires that are often categorized along with the ninth based on their provocative sexual content, namely the second and the sixth. The sixth satire, a book-length poem in the form of an argument against marriage addressed to a young bachelor, provided better grist for the feminist mill, since it seemed to demonstrate the devaluation of women based on their sex.⁸ The second satire, a tirade against men who maintain a masculine appearance in public but privately engage in effeminate practices such as depilation and submission to anal penetration at the hands of masculine-gendered men, provided gay and other anti-homophobic scholars with the best evidence for the stigmatization and ridicule of sex and gender deviance.⁹ Compared to these other two satires, the ninth, with its focus on a masculine-gendered male who behaves precisely as the Roman sex and

⁷ The approach I am calling feminist and gay liberationist is well exemplified by Boswell 1980 and Richlin 1992a (orig. pub. 1983). Boswell's is an historical account that encompasses all of Western Europe through the fourteenth century, while Richlin focuses exclusively on sexuality and aggression in Roman literary humor. The approach I am calling history of sexuality derives from the work of Michel Foucault, particularly Foucault 1978, and is well exemplified by Halperin 1990, Winkler 1990, and Williams 2010 (orig. pub. 1999). Useful reviews of the work done in this period on the history of sexuality in classical antiquity, including discussion of the tensions between proponents of different theoretical positions, include Karras 2000 and Skinner 2001. See also Sedgwick 1990: 27-35 for the relationship between "feminist" and "antihomophobic" scholarly inquiry.

⁸ See for example the discussions in Wilson and Makowski 1990: 21-34 and Braund 1992. Anderson 1956 is an important study of Juvenal 6 that predates the feminist era.

⁹ See for example Richlin 1993a and Walters 1998.

gender system permits him to, was of no more than passing interest to scholars focused primarily on issues of sexuality and gender.¹⁰

The present study builds on the work of feminists and historians of sexuality alike, taking for granted their main contentions and focusing on other concerns that remain to be addressed.¹¹ Every new phase of research on sex and gender in antiquity seems to start with an intuitive response to the texts we study. For example, the feminist approach to sexuality and aggression in Roman humor starts from the recognition that the rhetorical deck is stacked decidedly against the socially marginal members of Roman society (usually feminine, as in the case of women; effeminate, as in the case of the feminine-gendered *cinaedi*; or feminized, as in the case of slaves and boys), and proceeds to study the nature and function of this ridiculing and stigmatizing dynamic. The history

¹⁰ An exception is Fögen 2000, which deals with the relationship between satires 2 and 9. It is a problematic study, however, because it discusses these poems within the framework of “homosexuality,” despite the persuasive arguments, already widely disseminated by the time of its publication, about the inapplicability of the homosexual/heterosexual binary to classical antiquity. Aside from scholars focused primarily on issues of sexuality and gender, modern studies of Juvenal 9 include Highet 1954: 117-21, Mason 1962, Anderson 1962 and 1970 (repr. in Anderson 1982), Pryor 1965, Watts 1972, Bellandi 1974, Bishop 1976, Cecchin 1982, Saller 1983, Winkler 1983: 107-129, Braund 1988: 130-177, Colton 1991: 347-67, Garrido-Hory 1997, Grazzini 1997, Hendry 1999, Ihm 2000, Schmitz 2000: 265-9, Tennant 2003, Plaza 2006: 159-166, and Rosen 2007: 210-235. Many of these studies are brief and very narrow in their focus. Nobody to date has published a comprehensive study of the ninth satire that takes account of state of the art concepts of gender and sexuality in antiquity.

¹¹ For the purposes of this study, the main relevant contention of the historians of sexuality is that sexuality is a historically specific category; moreover, that the homosexual/heterosexual binary (as well as the notion of bisexuality) is not part of any transhistorical human essence, but is rather a theoretical construct of nineteenth-century sexology and twentieth-century psychoanalysis. The main contention, for current purposes, of the feminist and gay liberationist approach is that patriarchal societies often marginalize, stigmatize, and oppress women, effeminate men, and other feminized human objects, including men who submit to sexual penetration. Both approaches seek to challenge oppressive sex and gender paradigms, although their methods often differ.

of sexuality approach starts from the recognition of Roman phalldominance, and proceeds to study the structure and function of an ideology based on sexual *dominance* rather than the more characteristically modern notion of sexual *difference*. The current study starts from the recognition of perverse wit in many of the same texts considered as evidence by scholars favoring these other approaches, including sexually explicit poems of Martial or Juvenal or the *Satyricon* of Petronius. By perverse wit, I mean humorous references to sex, gender, and kinship deviance.¹² It is precisely this sort of wit that we see on display not only in Juvenal's ninth satire but throughout his corpus, as well as in much of the literature encompassed by Amy Richlin's groundbreaking 1982 study, *The Garden of Priapus*.

Starting from the recognition of perverse wit in Juvenal's ninth satire, the current study proceeds to consider how such wit functions and what it signifies, ultimately contending that perverse wit in this poem may best be understood in terms of *camp*, an aesthetic and performative mode that takes pleasure in calling attention to deviant forms of existence in a way that serves to dignify the stigmatized identity and undermine the power of the stigmatizing ideology. Camp is a particular deployment of perverse wit that involves assuming an air of moral seriousness only to undermine one's own moral pretense by indulging in gratuitously graphic descriptions of deviant behavior,

¹² The term "perverse wit" is common and has no universally agreed technical meaning. To a degree, my notion of perverse wit overlaps with the notion of incongruous juxtaposition as defined by Newton 1979: 106. Newton argues that camp sensibility is a combination of incongruity, theatricality, and humor; in a sense, my notion of perverse wit combines Newton's notions of incongruity and humor into one. I am also influenced by Jonathan Dollimore's notions of the paradoxical perverse, the perverse dynamic, and transgressive reinscription, all of which have to do with the ultimately deconstructive notion that perversion, or deviance, is an effect of exclusion from dominance or normativity. Cf. Dollimore 1991: 33 *et passim*.

particularly behavior that involves transgressions of sex, gender, and kinship norms, such as male sexual submissiveness, flagrant effeminacy, wanton adultery, or indulgence in actual or virtual prostitution by the freeborn and nominally respectable.¹³ Thus, where previous studies have argued that any sympathy expressed for Naevolus by his unnamed interlocutor is ironic and ultimately scornful, I will argue precisely the opposite: in a characteristically camp manner, any ridicule of sex, gender, or kinship deviance, whether on the part of Naevolus or of his effeminate, sexually submissive patron, is ironized in a manner that ultimately reconfigures moral probity as moral pretense.

This is certainly not to say that all instances of such ridicule in any text are always examples of camp irony. Rather, I am suggesting that (1) a camp reading is often *possible*, even where the ridicule is arguably earnest; and that (2) some texts may be better read as instances of camp irony than not. This corresponds to the well-established distinction between intentional and unintentional camp, and the notion that camp is, to some extent at least, in the eye of the beholder: that is, camp can exist in the imagination of the observing subject even when it is not the intention of the performing subject.

A camp reading of perverse wit in Roman texts is a daring interpretive approach for a number of reasons. For one, camp is traditionally thought of as a modern

¹³ What I mean by “virtual prostitution” is the exchange of sex not for outright financial compensation but rather for meals, gifts, or other benefits usually associated with the Roman institution of patronage (*clientela*). As Highet 1954: 274n1 points out, “no treatment of the subject of Satire 9 on the same scale has survived, although no doubt the character of the active pervert [i.e. Naevolus] was discussed by philosophers and portrayed by dramatists.” Mart. 9.63, to be discussed at length in Chapter Three, addresses a man who is invited to dinner by numerous *cinaedi*, presumably in the expectation of oral or anal intercourse (or both) in exchange for a meal, with food perhaps standing in metonymically for financial compensation; this would seem to be a more concise representation of a similar kind of relationship as we find between Naevolus and his patron in Juvenal 9.

phenomenon whose roots extend to seventeenth-century France and whose emergence was catalyzed by Oscar Wilde at the turn of the twentieth century. While some people, both within and outside the field of classics, have argued for a camp reading of Petronius' *Satyricon*, nobody has ever argued explicitly for a camp reading of Juvenal. Nevertheless, as we shall see in Chapter Three, tantalizing hints of Juvenal's camp legibility emerge whenever the ninth satire is discussed, from Gilbert Highet's 1954 *Juvenal the Satirist* to Ralph Rosen's 2007 *Making Mockery*.

Another challenge posed by reading Juvenal's ninth satire as a camp text is how to account for Naevolus as representing a deviant form of existence that is stigmatized by the dominant ideology. As I noted above, from a sex and gender perspective, Naevolus is a masculine-gendered male who behaves precisely as the Roman sex and gender system permits him to behave.¹⁴ Here the current study is driven by another intuitive response to the text, this time the recognition that while Naevolus is not strictly speaking a sex or gender deviant, he represents a form of deviance previously unrecognized or at least undertheorized; namely, *kinship deviance*. Kinship is a primarily anthropological term referring to relations of affinity (marriage) and consanguinity (blood) among husbands, wives, children, siblings, and extended family members. Prior to the sexual revolution of the 1960s, Western society had a relatively high sensitivity to kinship deviance, although it did not call it by this name. On the analogy, for example, of oral and anal intercourse as instances of *sexual deviance* (for moral systems that condemn all sexual acts apart from

¹⁴ A potential parallel for Naevolus in earlier Latin literature is an Atellan farce called "The Prostitute" (*Prostibulum*), of which only a handful of fragments survive, staged by Pomponius in the early first century B.C.E., about a male prostitute who penetrates his male clients. See Williams 2010: 12, 30-1, 42, 90-1. For the notion of a sex/gender system, see Rubin 1975, a foundational document of gender studies.

vaginal intercourse), and of male effeminacy or female masculinity as forms of *gender* deviance, we might say that any sex outside of marriage, including adultery, prostitution, and premarital sex among marriageable partners, constituted forms of *kinship* deviance in the modern West, at least until the sexual revolution of the 1960s and even today in many quarters.

Many of my examples of kinship deviance correspond to what Rubin 1984 refers to as “bad sex,” meaning stigmatized forms of sexual expression. Rubin’s motivation for publishing “Thinking Sex” in 1984 was her conviction that we needed to develop a field of sexuality studies distinct from the already well established field of gender studies. In particular, she realized that there were serious limitations to positing sexuality as an effect of gender, since there were theoretical problems of sexuality, including issues around fetish sex, commercial sex, and age-discordant sex, that have little or nothing to do with the opposition between heterosexuality and homosexuality. In a sense, I am making a similar case, a generation later, for a field of kinship studies that does not limit our definition of kinship relations to marriage and procreation. My main contention in this regard is that every sexual transaction establishes a kinship relation. Traditionally, the only sexual transactions that have qualified as kinship relations are those of heterosexual marriage and procreation. Today, we see the gay rights movement reaching a kind of culmination in a same-sex marriage movement, with implications for same-sex parenting. What the movement for marriage equality obscures, however, is the element of kinship in non-marital and non-procreative sexual transactions, such as that between prostitute/hustler and john, or between sugar daddy and gold digger/kept boy.

My intention is not to elide the important differences between normative and deviant forms of kinship. Rather, I seek to develop a discourse that demystifies the dominant discourse of kinship normativity by allowing us to talk about deviant kinship formations, queer kinship formations, and kinship performativity; that is, the notion that kinship is an aspect of selfhood that we *perform*, no less than we perform our sex or our gender. In the case of same-sex relationships, the importance of a discourse of queer kinship is to demonstrate that *the kinship relation already exists*, whether the state recognizes the relationship or not. In the case of Juvenal's ninth satire, a discourse of kinship performativity allows us to consider Naevolus' relationships with his sexual patron and the patron's wife as performances of kinship, albeit ones that the dominant discourse can only acknowledge as adultery (wife) or prostitution (husband), which is what leads Naevolus to identify himself ironically as a "client" (*clientis*, 59; *cliens*, 72), since he wants to preserve the dignity of his sexual patron.

In many quarters, adultery, prostitution, and premarital sex no longer arouse quite the same kind or degree of outrage as they once did, although, to be sure, in other quarters they do. Nevertheless, I contend that scholars studying Juvenal's ninth satire in the twentieth century, while certainly aware that Naevolus was engaging both in adultery and in a type of sexual patronage that amounted to barely disguised prostitution, tended to focus predominantly, even obsessively, on the sexual aspect of Naevolus' deviance: for most scholars, Naevolus was a homosexual first, and only secondarily, even perhaps incidentally, an adulterer and a prostitute. This nearly obsessive focus on Naevolus' homosexuality is problematic for several reasons. For one, as I noted above, scholars following Craig Williams (who in turn was following the conceptual model established

for the Greeks by Dover 1978 and further theorized by Halperin 1990) would argue that Naevolus cannot properly be called a homosexual; nor, for that matter, would they deem his effeminate, sexually submissive male patron a homosexual, either. Nevertheless, there are significant differences both in their performances of masculinity and in how their gender performances are valued in the context of Roman ideologies of masculinity. In the Roman context, for Naevolus to penetrate other males does not at all compromise his own masculinity; it does, however, compromise the masculinity of his sexually submissive partners.¹⁵

While Naevolus is by no means above reproach in his sexual encounters with men, the traditional analytic framework of homosexuality made it virtually impossible to understand in what ways he was blameworthy and in what ways he was not. Naevolus is not deviant in terms of his sexual role or in terms of his gender identity, but he does violate normative Roman standards of sexual availability and sexual desirability. By choosing freeborn sexual objects, he is violating the customary respect for the sexual integrity of freeborn Romans of both sexes. By choosing an adult male as a sexual object, he is violating what Williams 2010 describes as a “proclivity toward smooth young bodies” in men’s sexual object choices.¹⁶ Finally, by ministering to the pleasures of others, Naevolus is behaving in a servile manner, even though his particular performance

¹⁵ The notion of corrupting agency would seem to be confirmed by the scholiast, who glosses 9.92, “He says nothing and seeks himself another two-legged donkey” (*Neglegit atque alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum*) as “He does not care, but seeks another man to corrupt him” (*non curat, sed alium quaerit, qui eum conrumpat*).

¹⁶ See Williams 2010: 17-9 for the protocols that regulate the sexual activity of Roman males, discussed further in Chapter Four.

of sexual servility is insertive rather than receptive.¹⁷ All of these reproachable aspects of Naevolus' behavior, however, are obscured by viewing Naevolus in terms of homosexuality rather than in terms of Roman ideologies of masculinity.

To consider Juvenal's ninth satire in terms of sex, gender, and kinship deviance is to consider it in relation to a dominant ideology of normativity. To consider the possibility that the very existence of these forms of deviance may challenge, undermine, or subvert the structure of normativity is to position this study within the context of postmodernism generally and queer theory in particular. Queer theory is a recently emergent discipline that inherits ideas from feminism, gay and lesbian studies, and other postmodern critical frameworks.¹⁸ One might say that feminism emerged as a response to oppression based on female sex, while gay and lesbian studies emerged in response to oppression based on homosexuality. Ultimately, while the two movements had their differences, they converged on the issue of gender oppression, since both sexism and homophobia were fueled by rigid ideas about the normative expression of masculine and feminine gender identity and social, cultural, and even legal demands for gender identity to conform to anatomical sex. It is out of this convergence of concerns about sexism and homophobia that queer theory emerges, ultimately offering a critique of all stable gender identities and sexual roles, and sometimes encompassing other categories such as race,

¹⁷ For the servility of prostitution, the assimilation of servility to effeminacy, and the potential social and legal consequences of "unspeakable professions," see Edwards 1997.

¹⁸ For an introduction to feminist theory, see Tong 2009. For queer theory and its emergence from gay and lesbian studies, see Jagose 1996. Hutcheon 2002 is a particularly useful introduction to postmodernism for its treatment of the relationship between postmodernism and feminism as well for its discussion of the postmodern emphasis on parody, an important aspect of camp aesthetics.

class, ability, and various kinds of social and legal status. My analysis of Juvenal's ninth satire is intended not only to enrich and, I hope, complicate a reading of this poem but also to open up larger possibilities, suggesting ways we might read other Juvenalian satires or other Latin texts using a range of conceptual tools deriving from queer theory and related postmodern frameworks.

In effect, the starting point of this study is to isolate two *modern* constructs for the understanding of Juvenal's ninth satire, and replace them with two *postmodern* constructs. For the notion of "perversion" that was so often invoked throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century to characterize the way Naevolus and his patron perform their sex and gender, I substitute the concept of *perverse wit*, not so much to describe the sex and gender performances themselves as to locate the representation of these performances in an aesthetic context. For the notion of "homosexuality" that was inaccurately applied to Naevolus and his patron and identified by so many scholars as the poem's satiric target, I substitute the formulation of sex, gender, and kinship deviance as a more historically accurate and theoretically subtle way to understand the complex set of relations among Naevolus, his patron, and the patron's wife. The substitution of *perverse wit* for *perversion* is mediated through *camp aesthetics*, while the substitution of sex, gender, and kinship deviance for *homosexuality* is mediated through *queer theory*. Ultimately, these two mediating frameworks overlap, as queer theory undergirds the social and historical account of queer existence, and camp aesthetics explain the performative mode through which queer existence frames its deviant relationship to the dominant ideology of normativity.

Chapter One, “Problems of Reception and Interpretation,” explores the persistence of masculinist, patriarchal, and heteronormative reading practices in the study of Juvenal’s ninth satire as illustrative of larger tendencies in Latin literature, thereby using Juvenal 9 as an occasion for addressing questions of much broader relevance, including the role of expurgation, biographical criticism, and persona theory and the potential for counter-normative reception strategies. While Juvenal was celebrated as a classic of moral instruction, his occasional representations of sexual immorality became increasingly problematic for modern readers. Selected passages of the ninth satire are cited to provide a sense of how the poem’s representations of sex, gender and kinship could be considered objectionable by modern standards. After a brief overview of why the ninth satire caused so much anxiety on the part of editors, translators, and scholars, I proceed to consider the forms that this anxiety has taken. Victorian expurgators omitted the ninth satire from editions of Juvenal or used other means to signal its unspeakability, such as moralistic commentary or bowdlerizing translations. In the mid-twentieth century, Gilbert Highet used a biographical approach to disseminate and popularize an interpretation of the poem as an attack on homosexuals and homosexuality and as an expression of Juvenal’s own abhorrence of both the vice and its vicious exponents. Three decades later, in the era of a burgeoning feminist and queer scholarship, Susanna Morton Braund recast a nearly identical reading in the somewhat more fashionable garb of persona theory, attributing the poem’s homophobia to a poetic persona rather than a historical poet. Following this review of prevalent reading practices, I discuss how these receptions served a conservative ideological function during the nineteenth and twentieth

centuries. Next, I consider available strategies for receiving Juvenal's ninth satire in ways that are not homophobic, effeminophobic, submissophobic, or misogynistic, including resistant reading (which grows out of feminism), dissident reading (which grows out of cultural materialism), and reparative reading (which grows out of queer theory).

Chapter Two, "Queer Existence, Camp Aesthetics, and Classical Antiquity," begins with definitions of queer existence and queer kinship and explains why these concepts are important for the current study. I then proceed to define *camp* and discuss its characteristic features, including incongruity, theatricality, and humor, among others. Next comes a historical overview of camp theory, including Susan Sontag's groundbreaking essay "Notes on 'Camp'" and its initial impact; how the gay movement seized on camp's liberatory potential; how identity politics pushed camp out of favor among gay intellectuals and advocates; and how the emergence of queer theory, and particularly the gay scholarly reclamation of Oscar Wilde, led to a revival of queer commitment to camp. I then consider the camp aesthetics evident in cinematic treatments of ancient Rome as evidence for the camp potential in Roman history and literature. Against this background, I consider why camp was of little apparent interest to classicists, even at its peak of cultural influence. I focus on two major obstacles, including varieties of homophobia and a tendency on the part of some classicists to devalue genres that exploit ribaldry and sexual humor in favor of genres like epic and tragedy that were perceived to be of greater moral seriousness. While classics as a field did not embrace camp, it did join the wider culture in a turn to studies of sexuality and gender beginning in the 1970s. I discuss the sex and gender turning point in classics, and

the opportunities presented by three groundbreaking scholarly works: Henderson's *The Maculate Muse*, which legitimated the study of sexual and scatological humor; Dover's *Greek Homosexuality*, which legitimated the study of same-sex desire and activity; and Adam's *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, which legitimated the study of sexual language across genres. I suggest reasons why, while each of these groundbreaking studies provided interpretive tools or conceptual frameworks that were potentially conducive to a camp discourse within classical studies, such a discourse scarcely emerged. I then consider Cecil Wooten's 1984 essay "Petronius and 'Camp,'" the single brief foray into camp analysis published by a classicist, and conclude that this essay had little impact and may even have had a negative effect on the prospects for camp as a framework for classical studies.

The premise of Chapter Three, "Perverse Wit and the Crisis of Juvenalian Moralism," is that the debate among scholars of satire beginning in the 1960s over Juvenal's moralism serves as a kind of unwitting proxy for a debate about camp aesthetics by emphasizing the role of perverse wit in articulating a moral satiric vision. Analyzing some of the key contributions to this debate helps illustrate both the potential for a camp reading of Juvenal and the way a persistent scholarly commitment to the essential morality of satire has kept such a critical innovation at bay. In 1954, Gilbert Highet recognized the importance of wit in Juvenal, but contained Juvenal's subversive humor within a conservative critical framework. In a 1962 response to Highet in particular and moralistic criticism in general, H.A. Mason argues for a Juvenal who is morally indifferent; by doing so, however, Mason ultimately cedes ground to the

persistent notion of a Juvenal who is morally conservative. In a 1963 essay, David Wiesen mounts a strenuous defense of Juvenal's moral character in response to Mason, whom he positions as the culmination of a historical attack on Juvenal's moral seriousness. Wiesen ultimately preserves Juvenal's moralistic intent only by *ironizing* all references to sex, gender, and kinship deviance in Juvenal as well as in Martial's three references to Juvenal—a critical move that, as we shall see, has interesting implications for a camp reading of both authors. Wiesen's detailed readings of Juvenal 2 and 6, published in 1989, suggest a sensitivity to the operations of perverse wit which, we are told, should not lead us to discount Juvenal's moral sincerity, yet Wiesen here seems to argue for Juvenalian satire as precisely the kind of “solvent of morality” posited in Sontag's influential definition of camp. Next, I consider the work of S.C. Fredericks. In his 1974 book chapter on Juvenal, he offers a homophobic paraphrase of the ninth satire, but in a 1979 article, Fredericks characterizes Juvenalian irony in terms closely related to prevalent definitions of camp. While Fredericks recognizes the camp aesthetics at work in Juvenal's satires (without using the word “camp”), he maintains that the “artful play” of Juvenalian satire has a “serious moral purpose” in solidarity with a conservative rather than a subversive morality. I then consider some studies that flirt even more closely with a camp reading of Juvenal, beginning with Tony Reekmans' analysis of the ninth satire as a “travesty” in his 1971 article, “Juvenal's Views on Social Change.” Reekmans views Juvenal 9 as a poem about social nonconformity and, in contrast to some earlier scholars, does not impute any kind of subtle or ironic malice to the Juvenalian interlocutor, nor does he use any homophobic language or suggest that the poem is in any way an attack

on homosexuals or homosexuality. Nevertheless, Reekmans considers the ninth satire to be a kind of decadent creative failure rather than a self-conscious subversion of dominant ideologies of normativity.

Chapter Four, “A Reading of Juvenal’s Ninth Satire,” begins with two main contentions; first, that a camp aesthetics of incongruity, theatricality, and humor operates in Juvenal 9 to represent deviance in a way that dignifies stigmatized identity rather than ridiculing the deviant other; and second, that Naevolus may profitably be understood in terms of kinship deviance, while his relationships with his patron and his patron’s wife may profitably be understood in terms of queer kinship. I then proceed to a close analysis of the poem guided by the principles of camp aesthetics laid out in chapters two and three and further elaborated as the reading proceeds.

A Conclusion recaps the arguments made throughout the study and extends some of them into new territory, ending with some observations about how the methodology developed here might apply to readings of other Juvenalian satires and other Latin texts. Finally, an Appendix provides a text and original translation of Juvenal’s ninth satire, with brief explanatory notes.

CHAPTER ONE

Problems of Reception and Interpretation

Marshall says, that, on account of certain expressions in this Satire, Jul. C. Scaliger advised every man of probity to abstain from the whole work of Juvenal.

—The Rev. Martin Madan in an introductory note to the ninth satire in his *Juvenal and Persius* (1829)¹

The Trouble with Juvenal

The Roman satirist Juvenal wrote 16 satires in five books in the early second century CE. As the genre par excellence of social commentary, Roman satire in general and Juvenal's satires in particular became the model for such European satirists as Donne, Dryden, Boileau, Pope, and Samuel Johnson.² But while Juvenal was celebrated as a classic of moral instruction, his occasional representations of sexual immorality became

¹ The Marshall referred to is the editor of an edition of Juvenal published in London in 1723. Cf. Dibdin 1827: 155. Scaliger is Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558), an Italian scholar and physician. Cf. Hall 1950.

² See Braund 2004a: 24-25 and Highet 1954: 216-17. This short list emphasizes earlier satirists and is by no means exhaustive. Less familiar European satirists influenced by Juvenal include Joachim Rachel (1618-69), Salvator Rosa (1615-73), and Lodovico Sergardi (1660-1726. Beyond the realm of verse satire, Juvenal's influence appears on Anglo-European prose writers including, among others, Joseph Addison (1672-1719), John Locke (1632-1704), and Denis Diderot (1713-84), whose *Le Neveu de Rameau* is modeled partly on Juvenal's ninth satire. Juvenal's influence on the emergence and development of English and European satire was of course shared with that of Horace and Persius, although Horace and Juvenal were ultimately the most influential. For the relative influence of the three major Roman verse satirists during different periods, cf. Griffin 1994: 6-34.

increasingly problematic for modern readers.³ Juvenal's obscenity is far more a matter of content than form. Unlike Roman epigram, which revels in dirty words, satire generally eschews obscene vocabulary.⁴ But Juvenal is a master at using the most polite terminology to create the most shocking images.⁵ Consequently, in the fifteenth century, we begin to see evidence of concern about Juvenal's suitability for use in schools and

³ Juvenal is far from being the only Roman poet to have suffered this critical fate. In her study of time and the erotic in the *Odes* of Horace, Ancona 1994: 146n1 writes: "Much of the history of critical attention to Horace has been characterized by interest in his use as a 'morally edifying' author. As a consequence, material that did not support this version of Horace was often omitted from texts, commentaries, and translations, and discussions of Horace's writings in conflict with this version were avoided." Ancona cites the final chapter of Wilkinson 1946 for an account of Horace's varied reception over time. Ancona's application of feminist and psychoanalytic theory to her analysis of the relational dynamics between the poet/lover and the beloved in some of the *Odes* is in some ways analogous to my application of feminism, queer theory, and other theoretical perspectives in my analysis of sex, gender, kinship, and camp aesthetics in Juvenal's ninth satire. For a recent discussion of expurgation of classical texts, see Roberts 2008.

⁴ Adams 1982: 2 distinguishes basic obscenities from metaphors and euphemisms. He writes: "Those words which can be identified as basic obscenities from the comments of Latin writers (notably *mentula*, *cunnus*, *futuo*, *pedico*) have a distinctive distribution: they are common in graffiti and epigram (Catullus, Martial, the *Corpus Priapeorum*), but almost entirely absent from other varieties of literature (including satire, if one excludes the first book of Horace's *Sermones*)." He later (221) notes that, despite some suggestive usages, "one cannot be certain that Lucilius employed basic obscenities," and that "the lexical decency [of Horace's second book of *Sermones*] set the pattern for later satire." Moreover, "Juvenal did not use the basic obscenities, but neither did he entirely avoid the coarser elements of the Latin sexual language.... For the most part Juvenal favored bland euphemisms...., references to the positions of participants in a sexual act...and to concomitant events." For example, *inguina* at Juv. 9.4 (a bland euphemism) and *inclinare* at Juv. 9.26 (a reference to sexual position). "Concomitant acts" are things that happen during sex but that are not in and of themselves sexual, as in the phrase *lectum concutere*, "pounding the bed" at Juv. 6.22-3.

⁵ Cf. Hight 1954: 214-15, "He never uses the most obscene words. But he describes carnal acts in terms of the most drastic vividness.... There is really no one like him for creating a phrase that can turn your stomach in three words."

public lectures.⁶ At the end of the sixteenth century the first expurgated edition appeared, offering up the Satires as a source of moral exemplarity while shielding women and children from the satirist's occasional licentiousness.⁷

Juvenal's morally objectionable content is concentrated largely in three poems, Satires 2, 6, and 9. Satire 2 focuses on *cinaedi*, effeminate men who like to be anally penetrated by other men. The book-length Satire 6 focuses on the evils of women and marriage. Satire 9 is a dialogue between a fictionalized version of Juvenal and Naevolus, the approximate Roman equivalent of a male escort. Naevolus has sex with a freeborn Roman man and the man's wife and fathers the man's children, but the man has now ended their relationship.⁸ My focus in this chapter is on modern scholarly receptions of Satire 9. Specifically, my concern is with the way these receptions incorporate the poem into a hegemonic conceptual framework—in particular a masculinist, patriarchal, and heteronormative framework characterized by (1) homophobia, (2) effeminophobia, and (3) submissophobia: that is, psychologically deep and socially pervasive anxiety about: (1) men who have sex with other men; (2) men whose gender presentation is perceived as

⁶ Sanford 1948: 97. Sanford is presumably referring to Latin editions, not vernacular translations. Cf. Enders 2000: 323, who cites the following comment of Ugolino Pisani (1405-1445), a scholar and writer of the Italian Renaissance: "Juvenal, Persius, Martial, and others should not be publicly read and taught, but kept for private study—so that knowledge can be increased without contaminating young men."

⁷ Sanford 1948: 111.

⁸ Naevolus refers to himself as a "client" (9.59, 72; cf. 9.48, *humili adseculae*, and 9.49, *cultori*) and implies that his effeminate, sexually submissive male sex partner is his "patron" (although the word *patronus* is never actually used). Most readings take this patron/client dichotomy completely seriously, but I will argue in Chapter Four that the language of patronage is being used ironically. For discussions that take the patron-client relationship in Juvenal 9 more literally than I do, cf. Bellandi 1974, Damon 1997: 184-188, and Tennant 2003.

feminine or effeminate; and (3) men who submit or desire submission to anal penetration.⁹ I will argue that scholarly receptions in the modern period have generally sought to contain or negate the transgressive potential of the poem, particularly with regard to how it represents counter-normative formations of sexual behavior, gender identity, and kinship relations.

What I mean by *transgression* and *containment* is as follows. The poem represents four behaviors whose normative moral status is increasingly contested during the modern period: sex between men, sex outside of marriage, commercial sex, and sex that produces children outside of marriage. Most scholarly receptions from the nineteenth century to the end of the twentieth century posit these four behaviors as *transgressive* (that is, as *vices* to be *condemned*), and implicitly oppose them to four *compliant* behaviors posited as *virtues* to be *endorsed*: sex between man and woman, sex between husband and wife, sex that is non-commercial, and sex that results in legitimate children. In other words, since the nineteenth century, Juvenal 9 has been edited, translated, and

⁹ Of these three terms, *homophobia* is the most familiar. The term effeminophobia, less common, is often traced back to Sedgwick's discussion of the stigmatization of effeminate boys in the essay "How to Bring Your Kids Up Gay" (Sedgwick 1993: 153). As far as I can tell, *submissophobia* is my own coinage. I would argue that what we commonly refer to as homophobia is in fact a combination of these three factors; that is, anxiety about same-sex desire *per se*, anxiety about gender deviance, and anxiety about sex-role deviance. The terms effeminophobia and submissophobia clearly apply only to homophobia provoked by *male* sex and gender deviance; but the general principle applies to homophobia provoked by *female* sex and gender deviance as well. That is, homophobia provoked by the "specter" of lesbians includes not just anxiety about same-sex desire *per se*, but also anxiety about masculine gender presentation and assumption of a dominant sex role. This is by no means to suggest that all gay men are effeminate and sexually submissive nor that all lesbians are masculine and sexually dominant; rather, I am referring to the range of phobic responses that have often been provoked on a societal basis by the very idea of gay male and lesbian existence.

analyzed in ways that enforce the sex, gender and kinship norms not of ancient Rome, but of contemporary Western society. In the first part of the chapter, I discuss three modes of reception: expurgation, biographical criticism, and persona theory. In subsequent sections, I consider the implications of these receptions for the politics of desire and the potential for alternative receptions that do not reproduce hegemonic constructions of sex, gender, and kinship.

A Survey of Objectionable Content

In this section I cite selected passages of the ninth satire to give the reader a better sense of how the poem's representations of sex, gender and kinship could be considered objectionable by modern standards. The poem begins with a chance meeting between Juvenal and Naevolus. Note that I refer to the unnamed interlocutor of the poem as "Juvenal" for convenience, although he is of course a fictional poetic persona. In lines 1-26, Juvenal asks Naevolus why he looks so miserable and unkempt of late, when he used to be a dapper figure known for his charm and wit at dinner parties. Towards the end of this section, Juvenal paints a concise portrait of Naevolus as what the Victorians called an adulterer and a sodomite and what recent scholars have called a bisexual gigolo:

nuper enim, ut repeto, fanum Isidis et Ganymedem
 Pacis et advectae secreta Palatia matris
 et Cererem (nam quo non prostat femina templo?)
 notior Aufidio moechus celebrare solebas,
 quodque taces, ipsos etiam inclinare maritos. (22-6)¹⁰

¹⁰ My text of Juvenal is that of Clausen's 1959 Oxford Classical Text. All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated. See the Appendix for a complete text and translation with selected explanatory notes.

For it was only recently, as I recall, that you were accustomed to frequent the shrine of Isis, the statue of Ganymede in the Temple of Peace, the shrine of the immigrant Mother on the palatine, and the temple of Ceres (for in what temple does a woman not prostitute herself?), an adulterer more notorious than Aufidius, and (a fact about which you remain silent), you were accustomed to bend the husbands over as well.

The assertion that Naevolus engaged in both adulterous relationships with married women and homosexual relations with married men was no doubt a chief source of concern about the moral propriety of this poem for nineteenth-century expurgators and twentieth-century scholars alike.

A few lines later, Naevolus discloses the generosity of his natural endowment and suggests, via a witty Homeric parody, that effeminate men who enjoy submission to anal intercourse exert a powerful attraction over masculine-gendered males like him:¹¹

fata regunt homines, fatum est et partibus illis
 quas sinus abscondit. nam si tibi sidera cessant,
 nil faciet longi mensura incognita nervi,
 quamvis te nudum spumanti Virro labello
 viderit et blandae adsidue densaeque tabellae
 sollicitent, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναϊδος. (32-7)

The Fates rule human beings, and even those parts hidden beneath the toga have a fate. For if the stars are not on your side, the unfathomable length

¹¹ I use the term “masculine-gendered male” rather than “masculine man” to reinforce the distinction between anatomical sex (male, female) and the more performative and socially constructed category of gender (masculine, feminine). Thus, either a male or a female may be masculine gendered or feminine gendered. The terms “masculine-gendered” and “feminine-gendered” are relatively rare, but I did not coin them. For example, Jackson 2009: 369 refers to “Thailand’s masculine-gendered homosexual women”; Bryson 2008: 100 refers to a character in an African novel having a “masculine gendered identity”; Guck 1994: 36 refers to “masculine-gendered intellectual standards and feminine-gendered emotional awareness.” These terms grow out of the body of transgender theory that began to emerge in the early 1990s. For transgender, cf. Halberstam 1998 and 2005, Prosser 1998, Cromwell 1999, Namaste 2000, Green 2004, Stryker and Whittle 2006.

of your massive penis will do you no good, even though some john with his foaming little lip sees you nude and his frequent coaxing letters beseech you continually, for a *cinaedus* himself attracts a man.

The last five words of line 37 (αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος) are a parody of a line from Homer's *Odyssey*, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος—"for an iron weapon (σίδηρος) itself attracts a man," that is, tempts him to use it, the idea being that warrior instincts are a natural part of manly virtue.¹² Naevolus has replaced the word σίδηρος (iron weapon), with the word κίναιδος, the Greek equivalent of the Latin *cinaedus*, the word for an effeminate man who enjoys submitting to anal penetration.¹³

Naevolus then complains of his shabby treatment at the hands of his sexual patron, whom he refers to as a "stingy molly" (*mollis avarus*, 38), who reckons Naevolus' tab while gyrating his buttocks in gleeful anticipation (or perhaps even actually in the act) of anal penetration (*computat et cevet*, 40). Naevolus claims that his compensation is woefully incommensurate with the services he renders, which he describes as follows:

an facile et pronum est agere intra viscera penem
legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae?
servus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum
quam dominum. (43-6)

¹² Juvenal's αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος (37) is a parody of Hom. *Od.* 16.294=19.13, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος. For more of the Homeric context, see note in the Appendix *ad loc.*

¹³ See Williams 2010: 193-4 for the origin and range of meaning of the word *cinaedus*, which "denotes in the first instance an effeminate dancer who entertains his audiences with a *tympanum* or tambourine in his hand, sometimes suggestively wiggling his buttocks in such a way as to suggest anal intercourse."

Or do you think is it smooth and easy to drive a proper penis into the guts and there run into yesterday's dinner? The slave who plows a field will be less wretched than the slave who plows his master.

These 15 lines (22-6; 32-7; 43-6), all occurring within the first third of the poem, are the most sexually graphic in the entire text, and the most egregious in terms of representing same-sex desire and behavior among males. Note that Juvenal completely eschews obscene vocabulary in these passages, but nevertheless manages to contrive strikingly counter-normative representations of sex, gender, and kinship that could be considered objectionable by nineteenth- and twentieth-century standards. Juvenal's reference to Naevolus' "bending over" of the husbands at line 26 (*inclinare maritos*) may seem like pretty tame stuff to today's reader; but in the context of a Victorian society intent upon shielding women and children from intimations of same-sex desire, even that euphemistic phrase could not help but provoke concern among the professional classicists who produced editions for the schools and taught Latin literature in the classrooms. Naevolus' reference to the parts of the male anatomy that lie hidden in the folds of the toga (*partibus illis / quas sinus abscondit*, 22-3) provides another example of euphemistic sexual language that is no less disturbing to normative Victorian sensibilities for its lack of explicit obscenity. His reference to the length of his penis (*longi mensura incognita nervi*, 34), while relatively explicit, contains no outright obscenity (*nervus* is a euphemism with a number of common non-sexual meanings); nevertheless, it contributes to the overall impression of moral impropriety that the poem has made on some modern readers, notably including those who controlled the dissemination and reception of the text in the modern period. Similarly in the case of phrases like *mollis avarus* (38) and

computat et cevet (40); while there are no obscene words or direct references to sexual acts, the implications of effeminacy and male sexual submissiveness are overt enough to provoke a censorious response among the censoriously inclined.¹⁴ The entire passage in which these phrases occur, with its description of male homosexuality, while not strictly obscene in its diction, is certainly salacious in its intent; and while this fine distinction between the explicit and the suggestive is part of the ironic wit of Juvenalian satire, it is a distinction either lost on, or ignored by, a community of editors, educators, and scholars whose investment in the classics was moral rather than scientific. That is, the perverse wit of the poem was just as offensive as outright obscenity to censorious readers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. We will see more specific evidence for this claim in the following pages. In the meantime, I hope this brief overview helps convey a sense of why the ninth satire caused so much anxiety on the part of editors, translators, and scholars. Now let us take a closer look at the forms that anxiety has taken.

Expurgation

Expurgation generally refers to the removal from a text of content deemed vulgar, obscene, or otherwise objectionable by those in a position of authority over the dissemination and reception of the text in question. Expurgation can take the form of simple omission of words, passages, or entire pieces (poems, stories, plays) from an edition of works by an author; or it can take the form of alterations that replace

¹⁴ Again, I am using *obscene* in the sense established by Adams 1982. Thus *cevet* at 9.40 would be considered a metaphor or a euphemism rather than an outright obscenity, the same way “gyrate” or “wiggle one’s buttocks” would be perceived in English; that is, the salaciousness of the usage arises from the context and the overall description, not the vocabulary itself.

objectionable language with acceptable language. Based on the efforts of Thomas Bowdler, an English physician who published an expurgated edition of Shakespeare in 1818, the latter kind of expurgation is often referred to as Bowdlerization.¹⁵ Expurgation may be considered a kind of censorship, although that term is more suggestive of state or state-sponsored control of the dissemination of texts or images; that is, legal prohibitions and sanctions on importing, printing, distributing, selling or possessing certain kinds of material. In addition, as will be discussed further below, censorship for much of its history was concerned primarily with religious heresy and seditious libel. Expurgation, by contrast, tends to be more a matter of self-regulation by translators, editors and publishers, and tends to focus more on vulgarity, obscenity, and other types of moral objection to content, particularly sexual content.

By the second half of the nineteenth century, most editions of Juvenal in the United Kingdom and the United States omitted satires 2, 6, and 9.¹⁶ Nor were Juvenal's

¹⁵ For an account of Bowdler and his contribution to the history of expurgation, see Perrin 1969.

¹⁶ Examples of editions and translations that omit Satires 2, 6 and 9 include Chase 1885, Mayor 1886; Owen 1924; Pearson & Strong 1887; Simcox 1873; Leeper 1892; Hardy 1883. Duff 1957 (repr. of 1899 ed.) includes fourteen satires, omitting Satires 2 and 9 but including an expurgated text of Satire 6 (he omits lines 309-345, which include passages vividly depicting the immodesty of Roman wives and the profanation of the rites of the Bona Dea). This list is by no means exhaustive. Nor is it the case that no complete editions were available. Expurgation practices varied among Anglo-European countries. German editions tended to be complete (e.g. Friedländer 1895, Jahn 1851, Weidner 1873), while British and French editions often omitted the satires 2, 6, and 9 or provided bowdlerizing translations; British editions were often distributed in the United States as well. There were also age, gender and class dimensions to expurgation practices, particularly in the United Kingdom. The general principle was that classically educated elite males could have access to complete editions; but children, women, and less well educated men of the lower classes might be morally compromised by exposure to sexual content in classical texts. For accounts of censorship practices, see note 49 below.

sexually explicit satires the only works of Latin literature that suffered this fate; rather, the expurgation of Juvenal was part of a broader cultural and literary phenomenon that affected other classical texts, including the poems of Catullus and Martial as well as the plays of Aristophanes, among many other works.¹⁷ The expurgation of these works, based on their representations of sodomy, adultery, pederasty, prostitution, and sexual immodesty among women, served to enforce Victorian sex and gender norms by a very assertive act of omission.

We can see evidence of Victorian attitudes toward satires 2, 6 and 9 in the prefatory comments of editors justifying omission of these poems by citing the dangers of exposing young men and women to their language and themes. For example, in the preface to the 1887 edition of Juvenal in the Clarendon Press Series, edited by Pearson and Strong, we find: “The text has been expurgated so that it may safely be perused by the mixed classes in our modern English Colleges.”¹⁸ In the preface to the 1901 edition in the College Series of Latin Authors, editor H. P. Wright states, “It did not seem best to include in the annotated edition Satires 2, 6, and 9, which from the nature of their subjects are not generally read with undergraduate students.”¹⁹ And in the introduction to

¹⁷ Green 1989 writes movingly of his own experience as a British schoolboy who, along with his similarly motivated classmates, were spurred to heights of scholarly attainment by their intense curiosity to track down the original Latin or Greek of the passages omitted from their expurgated school editions with their bowdlerized translations. Ancona 1994: 146n1 discusses expurgation and bowdlerization of erotic elements in the works of Horace, giving examples from an 1838 school edition and the 1914 Loeb Classical Library edition of Horace. See Williams 2004: 11-12 for the impact of nineteenth-century prudishness on the reception of Martial.

¹⁸ Pearson and Strong 1887: 8, presumably referring to coeducation and the danger of exposing women to sexual content.

¹⁹ Wright 1901: v.

the 1903 translation of S. G. Owen (second edition 1924): “The present translation of thirteen satires of Juvenal (three are omitted for obvious reasons) was made partly to convince myself that I understood the satirist’s meaning, and partly to assist my pupils towards so doing.”²⁰

In fact, until 1979, only two anglophone commentaries included all sixteen satires. One of these is the 1867 edition of A. J. MacLeane.²¹ His introductory comments to the ninth satire are instructive:

This satire will not be read with any pleasure. It is nevertheless written with much power. It is a dialogue between two acquaintances, one of whom has been making a livelihood by the vilest services rendered to effeminate men.... The humour and severity of the satire...are sufficiently amusing. But the subject is disgusting, and only the surpassing iniquity of the age could have justified the author to himself for devoting another satire to it.²²

While he praises the artistry of the poem, MacLeane calls the subject matter “disgusting” and he declines to include a prose summary as he does for all the other satires in the collection, even Satires 2 and 6. The 1882 edition of J. D. Lewis includes text, translation, and notes for all 16 Satires. But while 15 of the Satires receive 300 word introductions, Satire 9 is introduced with a note saying that “This Satire requires no

²⁰ Owen 1924: ix.

²¹ The other nineteenth-century commentary that includes all sixteen satires is Lewis 1882. Cf. LaFleur 1984: 257. Note that this statistic refers to commentaries, not editions or translations. Complete editions and translations existed, but they were not the texts most widely used in schools or available in book stores or libraries. Thanks to a resource like Google Books, the modern reader probably has better access to unexpurgated editions of Juvenal’s satires than a nineteenth- or twentieth-century reader would have had.

²² MacLeane 1887: 216. The other satire to which MacLeane alludes by referring to Satire 9 as “another satire” about this “disgusting” subject is Satire 2.

words by way of introduction.”²³ His translations tidy up some objectionable language, and to 9.43-4 he appends the note, “This passage like many others cannot appear in our translation.”²⁴ Lewis’ translation of these lines is as follows: “Pray, is it an easy matter, or in accordance with one’s tastes, to minister to his lusts?” That is, Lewis declines to render the sexually graphic clauses about anal penetration, with the joke about “running into yesterday’s dinner.” Thus, like the editors who omit the poem entirely, MacLeane and Lewis find ways to render the ninth satire unspeakable, even while publishing the text with commentary and, in Lewis’ case, with a translation.

These editors and translators are of course more literally rendering the poem *illegible*, by denying readers access either to the Latin text (in the case of outright expurgators), an English summary (in the case of MacLeane), or an English translation (in the case of Lewis). But the context of moral reproach, acknowledged openly or hinted at subtly, renders this illegibility likewise an unspeakability, as the poem is positioned rhetorically as so morally objectionable that members of a given community of readers may not decently publish it, summarize it, faithfully translate it, or in some cases

²³ Lewis 1882: 268. Ancona 1994: 146n1 documents a similar phenomenon with respect to Horace, noting how Bennett 1901 deals with Epodes 8 and 12, which Bennett later omitted from the 1914 Loeb Classical Library edition of Horace: “Interestingly, Bennett’s own edition of Horace...does include the Latin text of the two epodes, but omits both notes and summary (part of the book’s normal structure), giving with each poem the following explanation: ‘The coarseness of this epode leads to omission of any outline of its contents.’” Ancona adds: “While it might be tempting to view such an omission as a curious relic of a more prudish critical practice from the earlier part of the century, it should be noted that Bennett’s edition remains influential; it is still used today in many reading courses in Horace for want of more frank editions with sufficient grammatical help for the student.” Other examples of Bowdlerizing translations of Juvenal 9 include Madan 1829, Gifford 1836, and Badham 1841 (not an exhaustive list).

²⁴ Lewis 1882: 272.

comment on it in a scholarly manner. These censorship practices have concrete implications: expurgation of the poem in the nineteenth century had a chilling effect on academic scholarship throughout the twentieth century. For example, Ferguson 1979 and Courtney 1980 devote from about 40% to 65% fewer pages to Satire 9 than they do to Satire 4, which has about the same number of lines. LaFleur 1984: 261 suggests that the relative paucity of commentary on the ninth satire in these otherwise thoroughly modern editions results from the historical scarcity of scholarship on the poem, which in turn results from the squeamishness of the scholarly tradition about its themes and language. We can see this in practical terms by looking at theses and dissertations of the early twentieth century that limit their scope to the thirteen satires included in nineteenth-century editions (e.g., Corbett 1908; Lathrope 1911).²⁵

Biographical Criticism

By the end of World War II, the censoriousness of the Victorian era was no longer tenable, and although there was by no means a burgeoning of scholarship on satires 2, 6,

²⁵ Ancona 1994: 146n1 documents a similar phenomenon in the scholarly reception of Horace: “Even Fraenkel, in his highly influential book *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), devotes little attention to the poems of Horace that deal with love. While there has been a fair amount of recent work on Horace’s love poems, indicating a new, or at least revived, interest in Horace as a love poet, blindness to the erotic aspect of Horace’s work has not entirely disappeared.”

and 9, they were cited more frequently, if circumspectly, in the scholarly literature.²⁶ But a greater tolerance of graphic sexual language was not accompanied by a greater acceptance of counter-normative moral implications. Gilbert Highet's influential 1954 study *Juvenal the Satirist* sets the tone for a generation of scholarship when he argues that Juvenal's "apparent sympathy" for Naevolus is in fact "an ironic screen for bitter mockery and scorn."²⁷ Highet 1954: 121 asserts confidently that Juvenal "hates the vice described," but his assessment is based largely on his own reconstruction of Juvenal's biography, which itself is derived almost entirely from statements in the Satires. In a lengthy footnote, Highet observes that Juvenal expresses contempt towards women and fails to either praise their beauty or affirm the pleasure of having sex with them, while he does, by contrast, assert the comparative convenience of sex with boys:

We notice, then, that he never speaks of women in a sexual context without contempt or revulsion. He never praises the beauty of women. Unlike Martial, he never says that making love to a woman is pleasant. On

²⁶ Typical is a reference in Lelièvre 1958: 23, on Juvenal's use of parody: "The substitution of κίναϊδος for Homer's σίδηρος in 9. 37 explains itself." In fact, the substitution does not explain itself; the scholar/critic is simply loath to explicate an obscene reference in detail. When a reference to the ninth satire does not involve obscenity, Lelièvre is happy to explicate: "In the same Satire, vss. 102-3: *o Corydon, Corydon, secretum divitis ullum/esse putas ?* which glance at Verg. *Ecl.* 2. 69: *a, Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit*, the parody is similar in character." I return to Lelièvre and these examples in Chapter Four.

²⁷ Highet 1954: 117, where the author calls the ninth satire "one of the most shocking poems ever written." This is a striking assessment in view of the many potentially shocking depictions of violence and cruelty found in literature throughout classical antiquity and Western modernity. Highet was not alone in his ambivalence about the ninth satire: Ferguson 1979 on one hand writes, "This is indeed one of the most powerful of the satires" yet elsewhere writes, "It may well seem perverse to praise this satire. The sheer sordidness of the subject has left it unread by many." Quotes are from Ferguson 1979: 248 and 252, respectively.

the other hand, he once says—in an emphatic place at the beginning of Satire 6 (33-37)—that it is easier to be an active homosexual.²⁸

As further evidence for Juvenal's sexuality, Hight cites Martial 12.18, an epigram “about the delights of life in the Spanish countryside” addressed to Juvenal, who was Martial's friend:

venator sequitur, sed ille quem *tu*
secretis cupias habere silva. (22-23)

My huntsman follows, whom *you* would desire to have in a forest hideout.

The emphasis on the personal pronoun *tu* is added by Hight, who continues

It looks then as though Juvenal had begun life with normal instincts, and had then been so disgusted by women that he turned to active homosexuality. The passives, the *pathici*, the *molles*, the women-men, he despised and hated. A professional active, like Naevolus in 9, was disgusting to him; but far less disgusting than Naevolus' passive employer. The combination of activity and passivity he describes (in a very early poem) as *morbus uterque* (2.50); but nowhere else does he satirize the actives, whom—from disappointment or disgust—he himself had joined.

Thus, we see Hight adducing literary evidence to draw biographical conclusions about the historical Juvenal, then using this biography as the basis for his assertion that Juvenal

²⁸ Hight 1954: 269n17. The passage Hight cites from Satire 6 about the advantages of pederasty is as follows:

aut si de multis nullus placet exitus, illud
nonne putas melius, quod tecum pusio dormit?
pusio, qui noctu non litigat, exigit a te
nulla iacens illic munuscula, nec queritur quod
et lateri parcas nec quantum iussit anheles.

But if none of the many ways out [of marriage] appeals to you, don't you think it better that a young boy sleeps with you? A young boy who does not squabble at night, who lies there asking you for no little gifts, and does not complain about the fact that you are sparing to his flank or that you don't pant as much as he orders.

abhors homosexuality as a vice, and finally using his reconstructed biography to argue that Satire 9 is an attack on homosexuals and homosexuality.²⁹ Much could be said about the validity of Hightet's biographical methodology and his psychoanalytically influenced interpretation both of Juvenal's life and of the Satires. My objective here, however, is only to argue that the biographical approach served to receive and transmit the poem as an attack on perceived vices and an implicit endorsement of putative virtues.³⁰

Persona Theory

In a series of essays published in the 1960s and reprinted in 1982, William Anderson introduced persona theory to the study of Roman satire.³¹ Persona theory is the idea that the speaker of the satire is a fictional creation, distinct from the historical poet. This is standard New Critical fare, but for classicists in the 1960s it was a revelation.³² In an implicit repudiation of Hightet, Anderson argues convincingly that the indignation famously associated with the speaker of Juvenal's first book is in fact the anger not of

²⁹ Note Hightet's claim that Juvenal here "satirize[s] the actives." We may try to tease out whether Hightet thinks this satiric attack is based on homosexuality per se, or simply on having sex for money, but the fact is he does not clarify any such distinction. What we have, then amounts to a claims that Satire 9 is an attack on homosexuals and homosexuality, regardless of distinctions of sex-role, commerce, or any other potentially mitigating (or exacerbating, as the case may be) factor. In his assessment of Juvenal's intent in this regard, Hightet follows most nineteenth century editors. For example, Stocker 1839: 227 writes, "Juvenal's purpose was to impress the minds of others with the same loathing which he himself felt for this disgusting vice."

³⁰ A valuable albeit somewhat personal and subjective assessment of Hightet's scholarly concerns and methods may be found in Bovie 1967.

³¹ For an account of persona theory in antiquity, see Clay 1998. For Anderson's adaptation of persona theory, see Anderson 1982: 3-12, which cites the influence of Mack 1951 and Kernan 1959.

³² For New Criticism and its attack on biographical criticism, see Wimsatt and Beardsley 1946. The New Critical movement derives its name from Ransom 1941.

Juvenal himself, but of a fictional persona.³³ Building on Anderson's work in her important and insightful 1988 study of Juvenal's third book, Susanna Morton Braund adopts persona theory to argue that Juvenal's poetic persona abhors the vice of homosexuality and that the speaker's sympathy for Naevolus is an ironic veil for mockery and scorn. If this sounds familiar, it is because her reading of the poem is in fact nearly identical to that of Highet, except that she displaces the perceived homophobia of the poem from the historical Juvenal onto his poetic persona.

A crucial point in Braund's argument comes in her analysis of lines 130-3, where Juvenal reassures Naevolus about his future prospects:

ne trepida, numquam pathicus tibi derit amicus
stantibus et salvis his collibus; undique ad illos
convenient et carpentis et navibus omnes
qui digito scalpunt uno caput.

Don't worry, you'll never lack a sexually submissive male friend while these hills stand; from all sides they will come, by land and by sea, all those who scratch their head with one finger.³⁴

Braund 1988: 155 insists that this reassurance is ironic, and deploys persona theory to argue that the text means the opposite of what it says.

Although the speaker appears to adopt Naevolus' viewpoint in giving his reassurance, i.e. that Rome is and will remain the centre of attraction for passive homosexuals, we know from his earlier moral stance and from his propensity for irony that we must invert his statement to understand him

³³ Cf. the programmatic line from the first satire, "If nature refuses, then indignation makes verse" (*si natura negat, facit indignatio versum*, 79); that is, even if the satirist lacks native poetic genius, his righteous anger will prompt his pen.

³⁴ The Romans understood scratching the head with one finger to be a sign of effeminacy, which by extension could be understood as expressing a desire for submission to anal penetration. Cf. Williams 2010: 244; Edwards 2002: 63; and Richlin 1993a: 523, 542, all citing additional examples.

correctly. This reveals scorn for the man who chooses to make his living sexually.

Braund acknowledges that Juvenal appears sympathetic to Naevolus, but she argues that taking the speaker's words at face value would be naïve. Instead, we must supplement our reading of Satire 9 with an assessment we have made about the speaker's morality from our reading of earlier poems.³⁵ We then have to assume irony to arrive at a correct understanding of the speaker's condemnation of both homosexuality and financially motivated sex.³⁶ Again, much could be said about the validity of this style of analysis, but in the interests of brevity I will note here only that Braund uses persona theory, as Highet used biographical criticism, to receive and transmit the poem as an attack on perceived vices and an implicit endorsement of putative virtues.

³⁵ It is possible that I am misreading when I claim that Braund's statement amounts to an argument for supplementing one's reading of Satire 9 with an assessment of the speaker's morality derived from a reading of earlier poems, but I do not know what else Braund could possibly mean when she says "we know from his earlier moral stance." Moreover, this line of argument closely parallels Anderson 1970: 22, who claims that H.A. Mason's analysis of wit in Satire 9 is "brilliant, but misapplied," because Satire 9, despite its playfully naughty tone, should properly be interpreted in light of Satire 2, with its angry tone of earnest moral censure. Cf. Mason 1962 and further discussion in the following section.

³⁶ While it is true that in the passage referred to above, Braund refers specifically to "passive homosexuals," elsewhere in the same chapter Braund describes the speaker's condemnation as extending to homosexuality per se, regardless of distinctions of insertivity or receptivity in acts of anal penetration. Cf. Braund 1988: 167ff.: "In his final contribution to the dialogue (130-4) the speaker depicts the city of Rome as a homosexual honeypot, an ironic twist to the motif of *urbanitas*, for he does not approve of homosexuality; he describes pathics as men who reveal their bodily vice by a bodily gesture; and he advises Naevolus to eat an aphrodisiac."

Implications for the Politics of Desire

In 1964, Anderson wrote that Victorian commentators felt “embarrassed” in connection with the satires 2, 6, and 9.³⁷ Rosen 2007: 236 notes that critics, “laden with their own moral baggage...have routinely assumed that Juvenal cannot possibly approve of Naevolus, and that any *amicitia* [friendship] he displays toward him must be feigned and ironized.” Why has Juvenal’s ninth satire been read so persistently through a moralistic lens? The reason, I would argue, is that classics as a discipline has historically served a conservative ideological function; that is, defending normative morality is part of the job that classics was created to do—part of the “disciplinary” nature of the discipline that is best understood via Althusser’s notion of ideological state apparatuses and Foucault’s concept of the disciplinarian society.³⁸ In brief, Althusser argues that the modern nation state regulates the behavior of citizens through two sets of institutions: the Repressive State Apparatus (RSA), including official bureaucratic institutions of law and order such as the military and the criminal justice system; and the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA), including social and cultural institutions such as the church, the family, and the educational system. The distinctive feature of the ISA is that it produces willing compliance with ideological constraints, in contrast with the more overtly coercive

³⁷ Anderson 1982: 305: “Anyone who has read Victorian discussion of Juvenal or tried to secure an annotated edition of all the Satires knows how embarrassed the commentators feel in connection with Satires 2, 6, and 9. At best, the typical editor deplures Juvenal’s lack of good taste in dealing with sex; at worst, he may attempt any number of autobiographical interpretations to explain these three on the whole skillfully composed poems.”

³⁸ See Althusser 1978 and Foucault 1977. My contention about the hegemonic bias of the discipline of classics applies far beyond the specific case of Juvenal’s ninth satire, other works of Juvenal, or even the genre of satire. It is rather a general point about many classicists’ ways of reading ancient texts.

operation of the RSA. Hardt and Negri 2000: 23 describes Foucault's notion of the disciplinary society as follows:

Disciplinary society is that society in which social command is constructed through a diffuse network of dispositifs or apparatuses that produce and regulate customs, habits, and productive practices. Putting this society to work and ensuring obedience to its rule and its mechanisms of inclusion and/or exclusion are accomplished through disciplinary institutions (the prison, the factory, the asylum, the hospital, the university, the school, and so forth) that structure the social terrain and present logics adequate to the "reason" of discipline. Disciplinary power rules in effect by structuring the parameters and limits of thought and practice, sanctioning and prescribing normal and/or deviant behaviors.

More specifically, the discipline of classics has been instrumental in resisting counter-normative performances of manhood throughout modernity.³⁹ That is, classical education

³⁹ This claim needs to be argued far more rigorously than I have done in the present context. Sources that attest to anxiety about effeminacy as a result of the growth of polite society in eighteenth-century England include Foucault 1979 and Trumbach 1998. Cf. Trumbach 1978. Taylor 2004: 180, discussing the emergence of polite society and the notion of sensibility as a model of manhood, notes that "there was a nagging fear that something was lost in all this; that manliness, heroism, greatness of soul was being eroded." Stray 1996 provides a concise overview of the role of classical education in forging a disciplinary society in Victorian England (a argument he pursues more fully in Stray 1998. Cf. Too and Livingston 1998 as well as the review in Bryce 2001). As Stray 1998: 34-5 comments, "In their largely rural environments, in the total institutional situations characteristic of boarding schools, they made new men: and the curricular core of this process was classics, which occupied almost all the classroom teaching." Howsam et al. 2007 raises some preliminary questions about "the way schoolbooks worked to produce knowledge" in Anglo-American society. Ellis 2007 addresses the role of masculinity in the conflict that took place at Oxford between Newman and Arnold in the 1830s. Evangelista 2007 discusses the role of homosexual scandal in the Oxford career of Walter Pater and the role of Pater's lectures on Plato in "the contemporary process of re-establishing a culturally admissible tradition of homoerotic reading and writing in modern times." None of these studies, however, make a direct connection among classical education, the forging of the disciplinary society, and the regulation of manly virtue. This is an important scholarly project that I hope to undertake in future research; for now, I take the connection as axiomatic based on a range of evidence, including the sources cited above and the scholarly reception of texts such as Juvenal's ninth satire.

and scholarship have tended to emphasize and celebrate classical ideals of manly virtue, while minimizing and in many instances not merely deriding but lamenting and virtually mourning counter-normative representations of male sex, masculine gender, and homosocial kinship relations.

While the early history of censorship was dominated by concerns about seditious libel and religious heresy, it was directed increasingly at obscenity beginning in the eighteenth century, and in particular at representations of sexual license.⁴⁰ Expurgation, whether it takes the form of complete suppression or of bowdlerization, is a historically specific, symbolically strategic use of the past in the service of regulating access to and expressions of sexual knowledge. The English verb “expurgate” is a derivative of the Latin *expurgare*, to make clean, and suggests the literal or figurative cleansing of impurities.⁴¹ In Lacanian terms, we might say that expurgation of Juvenal’s ninth satire is a concession to the big Other, the moralistic fantasy of heteronormative patriarchy that seeks to refuse but in the long run cannot help but betray the obscene truth of male

⁴⁰ For censorship, see Thomas 1969 and Robertson 1979. For expurgation and bowdlerization, see Perrin 1969. For a concise legal discussion, see Sarkar 1967. While Thomas, Robertson and Perrin are thorough in regard to English literature, they do not have much to say about classical texts. A better service is rendered for classical Greek texts by Dover 1980. McPherson 1981 provides a useful discussion focusing narrowly on Roman comedy in 17th-century England.

⁴¹ See OED s.v. expurgate.

homosexuality, effeminacy, and sexual submissiveness.⁴² We can locate the expurgation of Juvenal's ninth satire in the context of increasingly heteronormative formations of sex, gender and kinship. The emergence of a (male) homosexual minority and a (male) heterosexual majority in the course of the eighteenth century, particularly in Northern Europe and North America, was accompanied by a shift in censorship practices away from sedition and heresy and towards obscenity, including the increasing use of expurgation and bowdlerization to suppress sexual content in classical texts.⁴³ The nineteenth- and twentieth-century receptions I have reviewed may be seen as part of this same heteronormative suppression of counter-normative representations of sex, gender and kinship.

None of the receptions I have discussed leaves room for the possibility that the poem is anything other than a condemnation of counter-normative performances of sex, gender, and kinship. Other readings are possible and have been offered. In 1962, H. A. Mason published an article entitled "Is Juvenal a Classic?" in which he argued, in direct opposition to Hightet, for a Juvenal characterized not by savage indignation but by Martialian wit, and motivated not so much by moral concerns as by a passion for literary

⁴² For Lacan's notion of the big Other, see Lacan 1999 and Žižek 2006. In Lacan's tripartite division of human consciousness into the realms of the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real, the big Other is identified with the Symbolic order, the realm of language and the law. Lacan 2004: 163: "If I have said that the unconscious is the discourse of the Other (with a capital O), it is in order to indicate the beyond in which the recognition of desire is bound up with the desire for recognition. In other words this Other is the Other that *even my lie invokes as a guarantor of the truth in which it subsists*" (emphasis added). Cf. Miller 2004: 5-15.

⁴³ For the emergence of a male homosexual minority alongside a male heterosexual majority, see Trumbach 1998, especially Chapter One. For the focus of early censorship practices on seditious libel, see Loades 1974.

allusion and comic entertainment. Mason's starting point in his argument for a charmingly naughty rather than savagely indignant Juvenal is Satire 9, which he represents as a paradigm of Juvenalian wit. But Anderson 1970: 22, writing just a few years later, undermines Mason's argument, calling his analysis of wit in Satire 9 "brilliant, but misapplied." Anderson argues that the playfully naughty tone of Satire 9 is part of a shift in Juvenal's style that begins with the third book, the book that contains Satires 7, 8, and 9. Satires 1 through 6, by contrast, have an earnest and angry tone of moral censure. Anderson then argues that Satire 9 should properly be interpreted in light of Satire 2, the other of Juvenal's satires in which male same-sex desire and activity play a central role and are represented in an angry tone of earnest moral censure. Twenty years later, Braund uses the same strategy to argue that we should read the ironic moral ambiguity of Satire 9 through the earnest moral censure of Satire 2, crediting the earnest moralism of Satire 2 as somehow transitive (that is, applicable from one text to another) and real, while discrediting the moral ambiguity of Satire 9 as somehow local and illusory. To put it simply, it is okay to generalize the *homophobic* reading of Satire 2, but it is not okay to generalize the *homophilic* reading of Satire 9. To be fair, Anderson does not suggest that one should generalize at all; his point is rather to gently but firmly chide Mason for reading Juvenal's later tone of playful naughtiness onto the earlier poems of earnest moral indignation. But by arguing at length that Mason's analysis of Satire 9 is "misapplied," Anderson tends to undermine his simultaneous judgment of Mason's analysis as "brilliant." Anderson thus unwittingly paves the way for Braund to reassert a Highet-inflected reading of the morality of Satire 9, while retaining the Anderson-

inflected methodology of persona theory to deflect the moralism of the poem from the historical Juvenal to his poetic persona. But the effect is ultimately the same: the poem itself enters the 1990s still generally perceived by students and scholars of Roman satire as an attack on homosexuals and homosexuality.

Potential for Postmodern Receptions

As I suggested earlier, classics as a discipline tends to incorporate ancient texts into a heteronormative conceptual framework characterized by homophobia, effeminophobia, and submissophobia. Any such framework, however, also implies institutionalized sexism and misogyny. Accurately if starkly, Pharr 1997: 19 states:

When gay men break ranks with male roles through bonding and affection outside the arenas of war and sports, they are perceived as not being “real men,” that is, as being identified with women, the weaker sex that must be dominated and that over the centuries has been the object of male hatred and abuse. Misogyny gets transferred to gay men with a vengeance and is increased by the fear that their sexual identity and behavior will bring down the entire system of male dominance and compulsory heterosexuality.

Another way of putting this is that homophobic attacks, through their stigmatization of effeminacy and male sexual submissiveness, simultaneously reproduce the heterosexist devaluation of women. This assessment applies to homophobic readings of Juvenal’s ninth satire as much as to any other instance of homophobia. In view of the persistent perception of Juvenal’s ninth satire as an attack on homosexuals and homosexuality, what are the prospects for receiving this text in a way that is not homophobic, effeminophobic, submissophobic, or misogynistic?

I raise this question in the context of two distinct but related notions that pose challenges to the traditions of classical philology: *postmodernism* and *reception*.

Throughout this chapter, I have suggested that expurgation, biographical criticism, and persona theory dominated modern scholarly responses to Juvenal's ninth satire, using the term "modern" to refer broadly to Western society and culture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This period was marked by the emergence of the research university and the proliferation of academic disciplines, including the discipline of classics.⁴⁴

Twentieth-century Western society, however, also saw the emergence of new theoretical formations that challenge many of the methodological assumptions and ideological positions of modernity. These formations are often grouped together under a loosely defined rubric of postmodernism, and include such approaches as structuralism, deconstruction, cultural materialism, feminism, queer theory, critical race theory and postcolonial studies, to name just a few.⁴⁵ Among these new approaches is reception theory, a movement that grows out of the work of Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser

⁴⁴ In addition to the discussion of the disciplinarian society above, see also Graff 1987, which focuses on the rise of English as an academic discipline but also includes discussion of the emergence of the modern research-based university and the relationship between the discipline of classics and the newly emerging disciplines organized around the study of modern languages and cultures.

⁴⁵ There are so many possible references for these terms that it becomes unfairly selective to cite just a few. For a valuable overview of postmodern literary theories, see Eagleton 1996. Eagleton 2003 is a kind of sequel offering a critique of postmodern movements that has surprised some readers who were inspired by his earlier work. For applications of postmodern theory to classical texts, see de Jong and Sullivan 1994 and Schmitz 2007. For a historical and conceptual introduction to queer theory cf. Jagose 1996.

at Germany's University of Constance in the 1960s.⁴⁶ In contrast to earlier models of *classical tradition*, whereby Greco-Roman antiquity provides a foundation for, and influences the development of, modern Europe and Western civilization, *classical reception* provides a model whereby individuals and societies continually reappropriate and redefine classical antiquity in an effort to assert (or, at times, to challenge) continuity with a privileged past.⁴⁷

The program for reception studies outlined by Jauss includes studying a text in three historical contexts: (1) that of the text's initial production; (2) the reception of the text by communities of readers in diverse times and places; and (3) the social function of the text, which could include an exploration of the values and meanings of the text for readers at the time of the text's production or during any subsequent period of the text's reception, including for today's reader. The previous sections of this chapter have studied Juvenal's ninth satire in the second and third of Jauss' three contexts, considering the

⁴⁶ For the foundations of reception theory, see Jauss 1982; Iser 1974 and 1978. For an overview of Jauss, Iser and other reception theorists, see Holub 1984. Holub 1992 places reception in the context of poststructuralism and deconstruction. For applications to classical studies, see Martindale 1993; Hardwick 2003; Martindale and Thomas 2006; Kallendorf 2007; and Hardwick and Stray 2008. See also the entire series of texts in the series *Roman Literature and Its Contexts*, edited by Stephen Hinds and including Oliensis 2009; O'Hara 2007; Hunter 2006; Gowing 2005; Farrell 2001; Fitzgerald 2000; Keith 2000; Hinds 1998; Feeney 1998; Edwards 1996; Martindale 1992; Hardie 1992; and Kennedy 1992. For an impassioned defense of a reception-oriented approaches to both Latin texts and the modern tradition of classical scholarship, cf. Connolly 2005. Connolly's article appears as part of a collection of seven papers from the conference *Critical Divergences: New Directions in the Study and Teaching of Roman Literature*, held October 24-25, 2003 at Rutgers University. Several of these papers argue for a reception-oriented approach in terms consistent with Connolly's argument, including Hinds 2005, Habinek 2005a, and Farrell 2005.

⁴⁷ The classical tradition model is enshrined in texts such as Hightet 1949 and Bolgar 1954. Cf. Kallendorf 2007 and Hardwick and Stray 2008.

reception of the poem by a particular community of readers, namely professional classicists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries whose receptions took the form of editions, translations, commentaries and essays or monographs. As I have argued, the text served a conservative social function for these recipients, as their editions and other scholarly work served to reproduce masculinist, patriarchal and heteronormative beliefs, attitudes, and even possibilities for aesthetic response. This process of reproduction, I would argue, additionally served to reaffirm masculinist, patriarchal and heteronormative social values and cultural practices. In order to receive Juvenal's ninth satire in ways that are not homophobic, effeminophobic, submissophobic, or misogynistic, one must offer *resistance* to the masculinist, patriarchal and heteronormative reading practices that have previously prevailed.

The notion of *resistant reading* grows out of feminist literary criticism and has been taken up on occasion by classicists.⁴⁸ With specific reference to Juvenal, Larmour 1991:47 writes:

A resisting reader will turn the spotlight away from the supposedly representative types which Juvenal presents and focus squarely on the ideological structure which creates them. The *implied* reader shares the basic structures and assumptions of the ideology which generates the text; the *resisting* reader, by contrast, questions these structures and assumptions and may concretize the text in a completely different way.... (Emphases added)⁴⁹

⁴⁸ For resistant reading generally, see Fetterley 1978 and the discussion in Culler 1982: 43-64 ("Reading as a Woman"). For applications of this concept to classical studies, see Larmour 1991 (on Juvenal), Ancona 1994 (on Horace), and Liveley 1999 (on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*).

⁴⁹ For the notion of the implied reader, see Iser 1974. While Larmour does not elaborate on what he means by the implied reader in the context cited, I would not assume that the implied reader necessarily corresponds to any actual reader, even a Roman reader of Juvenal's own time.

Not all resistant readings, however, are created equal. Sinfield, 1992: 21, using the term *dissident reading* rather than *resistant reading*, lists five possible approaches.⁵⁰ Three of these approaches are modeled on the reading practices that “conservative criticism” historically has employed to make “literature politically agreeable,” which include “[1] selecting the canon to feature suitable texts, [2] interpreting texts strenuously so that awkward aspects are explained away, and [3] insinuating political implications as alleged formal properties (such as irony and balance).” The expurgation of classical texts deemed vulgar or obscene may be viewed as an example of the kind of canon selection referred to by Sinfield. I would argue that the readings of Juvenal’s ninth satire by Highet and Braund, discussed above, may be seen as examples of strenuous interpretation of texts to explain away awkward aspects: that is, what could be read as equanimity towards or even endorsement of male same-sex desire and activity is instead read as an attack on a perceived vice of homosexuality. We also see in the scholarly reception of Juvenal’s ninth satire the imputing of formal properties such as irony to insinuate meanings that meet masculinist, patriarchal and heteronormative objectives; consider, for example, the longstanding practice of reading scornful irony into the apparently sympathetic relationship between the poem’s Juvenal and Naevolus, a reading practice which

⁵⁰ See also Sinfield 1983. Sinfield’s work focuses on the post-classical literary canon and in particular on English literature, but his methodological observations are equally relevant to classical studies. Reception theory and reception-oriented reading practices, discussed above, may also be considered as potentially resistant or dissident reading strategies. As will be discussed below, one of Sinfield’s dissident reading strategies involves “placing the text in its contexts,” and this is clearly consistent with aspects of Jauss’ program for reception studies outlined above.

ultimately justifies conclusions about Juvenal's condemnation of commercial sex and same-sex relations, as we have seen specifically in the readings of Hight and Braund.

Sinfield 1992: 21 argues that, "as a consequence of the long-term practice of these three strategies, the received literary canon and discourses of criticism are...resistant to progressive readings." On the other hand, he notes, "the three strategies are available also to dissident critics, who may [1] offer their own texts, [2] re-read canonical texts so as to produce acceptable political tendencies, and [3] propose that formal properties inscribe a progressive politics (social realism, for instance, or internal distancing)."⁵¹ I would cite Mason's focus on the exemplarity of Juvenal's ninth satire, discussed above, as an instance of critical readjustment of the canon: a text that was previously expurgated via both outright omission from editions and bowdlerization of translations is now reclaimed as paradigmatic within the Juvenalian corpus.⁵² As an example of re-reading canonical texts so as to produce acceptable political tendencies, we might consider the scholarly debate that has raged since antiquity regarding the pro- or anti-Augustan sympathies of Virgil, and particularly how this debate manifested itself in the modern period, including its relevance to civic and political discourse over United States intervention in Vietnam and the wider conflict in Southeast Asia in the 1970s.⁵³ I am not aware of any clear

⁵¹ The concept of *internal distancing* is first found in Louis Althusser's "A Letter on Art" (cf. Althusser 2001: 221-27), and suggests a process whereby a text both objectifies the ideological context in which it was formed and achieves a kind of epistemological distance from that ideology, making the nature and function of the ideology particularly conspicuous.

⁵² Another example that fits here, or perhaps somewhere in the interstices of Sinfield's strategies, is Amy Richlin's recent work on the amatory letters between Fronto and Marcus Aurelius. Cf. Richlin 2006a and 2006b.

⁵³ For an account of the ideological reception of Virgil at specific moments since antiquity, see Thomas 2001.

examples within recent classical studies of a scholar proposing that formal properties inscribe a progressive politics; but this is precisely what I am proposing to do with Juvenal's ninth satire: a text in which humor, irony, and invective were previously read as an earnest attack on homosexuals and homosexuality will now be reread a camp reinscription of transgressive formations of sex, gender and kinship.⁵⁴

Sinfield 1992: 22 lists two other types of dissident reading practice: (1) "placing a text in its contexts" and (2) "blatantly reworking the authoritative text so that it is forced to yield, against the grain, explicitly oppositional kinds of understanding." Of the first strategy, Sinfield 1992: 22 writes:

This strategy repudiates the supposed transcendence of literature, seeking rather to understand it as a cultural intervention produced initially within a specific set of practices and tending to render persuasive a view of reality; and seeing it also as re-produced subsequently in other historical conditions in the service of various views of reality, through other practices, including those of modern literary study.

Sinfield's notion of literary contextualization is consistent with Jauss' program for reception studies, outlined above. As I suggested earlier, this chapter has sought to locate Juvenal's ninth satire in the context of scholarly reception, considering how the text has been reproduced (or, in the case of expurgation, has failed to be reproduced) via edition, translation, commentary and analysis in ways that serve to reinforce particular views of reality; in particular, masculinist, patriarchal and heteronormative views that may or may not be consistent in any or all respects with the views of reality that prevailed at the time

⁵⁴ See Dollimore 1991 for the notion of transgressive reinscription, esp. pp. 26 and Part 8, part of which is excerpted in Dollimore 1999. See Chapter Two for a detailed discussion of the nature, function, and history of camp, as well as its potential applicability to classical studies in general and Juvenal's ninth satire in particular. A close reading of Juvenal 9 in accordance with camp principles is undertaken in Chapter Four.

of the text's composition. Recent classical scholarship includes many examples of reception-oriented studies that locate texts in social, cultural, and historical contexts, including the context of modern literary scholarship, as well as studies that seek to understand classical texts as cultural interventions in the way described by Sinfield.⁵⁵

Of Sinfield's fifth and final strategy, that of "blatant reworking" of the text against traditional expectations to arrive at explicitly oppositional new meanings, the author writes:

This strategy confronts both the attitudes and the status that have accrued to the canon. It is a strategy scarcely available in the established discourse of literary criticism. It seems out of order there.... But blatant reworking is used freely in other kinds of writing, for instance in plays such as Arnold Wesker's *Shylock* (formerly called *The Merchant*), Charles Marowitz's *Measure for Measure*, and Edward Bond's *Lear*. It is what Dollimore, with reference to Howard Barker's rewriting of Thomas Middleton's *Women Beware Women*, calls creative vandalism.⁵⁶

By "blatant reworking," Sinfield is referring to creative adaptations of existing works, not critical studies within the conventions of academic scholarly discourse. And yet, this notion of creative reworking seems consistent with the notion of critical reworking suggested by Larmour's description of resistant reading cited above. Picking up the

⁵⁵ In addition to examples of reception studies in classics previously noted, I would cite Habinek 1998 and 2005b as examples of studies that seek to locate ancient texts as cultural interventions in their initial social and cultural context rather than in terms of reception by later epochs. Habinek is particularly interested in the way texts emerge from historically specific sets of social and cultural practices and how they tend to render a particular view of reality persuasive to their contemporary audiences.

⁵⁶ Sinfield 1992: 22. Sinfield is referring to Jonathan Dollimore, whose "Middleton and Barker: Creative Vandalism" appears in the program for the Royal Court production of *Women Beware Women*, published with a text of the play as Playscript 111 (London: Calder; New York: Riverrun, 1986).

quotation from Larmour 1991:47 where I left off earlier, we see that he proposes two general directions for the kind of resistant reading he proposes:

The implied reader shares the basic structures and assumptions of the ideology which generates the text; the resisting reader, by contrast, questions these structures and assumptions and may concretize the text in a completely different way: for instance, a feminist reading of *Satire 6* might well argue that what is often called Juvenal's masterpiece is, from at least one perspective, no laughing matter. It might also open up new areas of laughter—perhaps at the structuring assumptions themselves and the scholars and critics who blindly accept them.

Larmour's suggestion that the resistant reader might "concretize the text in a completely different way" is reminiscent of Sinfield's suggestion that the dissident reader might "blatantly [rework] the authoritative text so that it is forced to yield, against the grain, explicitly oppositional kinds of understanding." When Larmour writes "completely different way" and Sinfield writes "explicitly oppositional," I take them both to suggest difference from or opposition to both the ideological assumptions that surround the text's initial composition and the meanings and values that are reproduced through the process of scholarly reception over time.

The two general directions I see suggested in Larmour's account are the "no laughing matter" approach and the "new areas of laughter" approach, which correspond very suggestively with Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's notions of *paranoid* ("no laughing matter") and *reparative* ("new areas of laughter") reading practices.⁵⁷ Sedgwick developed her notions of paranoid and reparative reading in the process of writing an

⁵⁷ See the introductory essay in Sedgwick 1997 ("Paranoid Reading and Reparative Reading; or, You're So Paranoid, You Probably Think This Introduction Is about You"). The essay also appears in slightly different form in Sedgwick 2003: 123-151. Further citations from this essay will refer to the version in Sedgwick 1997.

introduction to *Novel Gazing: Queer Readings in Fiction*, a groundbreaking 1997 collection of queer theoretical essays on a wide range of literary works. In her introduction, Sedgwick 1997: 2 observes that the essays in the volume seem to be remarkably distant “from a certain stance of suspicion or paranoia that is common in the theoretical work whose disciplinary ambiance surrounds them.” While Sedgwick explores the issue of paranoia at length, she does not offer a specific program for reparative reading, instead allowing the essays in the volume to suggest the contours of its variable practice. She provides enough indications, however, for me to conclude that her notion of reparative reading overlaps with Larmour’s “new areas of laughter,” particularly in the context of Larmour’s example of laughing “at the structuring assumptions themselves and the scholars and critics who blindly accept them.” The notions of paranoid and reparative reading are useful for understanding some of the most important recent scholarship on sex, gender, and sexual humor in antiquity, including work on Juvenal’s ninth satire; thus, I will summarize Sedgwick’s argument briefly but comprehensively.

Sedgwick frames her discussion of paranoid reading in the context of the so-called hermeneutics of suspicion, a phrase derived from the work of Paul Ricoeur that refers to the theoretical stance of Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud.⁵⁸ Ricoeur writes:

For Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud, the fundamental category of consciousness is the relation hidden-shown or, if you prefer, simulated-manifested. . . . The distinguishing characteristic of Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche is the general hypothesis concerning both the process of false consciousness and the method of deciphering. The two go together, since the man of suspicion carries out in reverse the work of falsification of the

⁵⁸ Cf. Ricoeur 1970 and 1981.

man of guile....Fundamentally, the *Genealogy of Morals* in Nietzsche's sense, the theory of ideologies in the Marxist sense, and the theory of ideals and illusions in Freud's sense represent three convergent procedures of demystification....Yet there is perhaps something they have even more in common, an underlying relationship that goes even deeper. All three begin with suspicion concerning the illusions of consciousness, and then proceed to employ the stratagem of deciphering.⁵⁹

Sedgwick 1997: 5 explains that Ricoeur's intent in offering this formulation "was descriptive and taxonomic rather than imperative," but adds:

In the context of recent U.S. critical theory...where Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud by themselves are taken as constituting a pretty sufficient genealogy for the mainstream of New Historicist, deconstructive, feminist, queer, and psychoanalytic criticism, to apply a "hermeneutic of suspicion" is, I believe, widely understood as a mandatory injunction rather than a possibility among other possibilities....Not surprisingly, the methodological centrality of suspicion to current critical practice has involved a concomitant privileging of the concept of paranoia.

Sedgwick quotes Freud as writing that "the delusions of paranoiacs have an unpalatable external similarity and internal kinship to the systems of our philosophers," and adds that, "in a world where no one need be delusional to find evidence of systemic oppression, to theorize out of anything but a paranoid critical stance has come to seem naive, pious, or complaisant."⁶⁰

What is most salient for my purposes in Sedgwick's account is her characterization of paranoid reading as placing "an extraordinary stress on the efficacy of knowledge per se—knowledge in the form of exposure."⁶¹ As she had noted earlier, Ricoeur's notion of hermeneutic suspicion involves demystification via the deciphering of some kind of hidden ideological code. Larmour's program for resisting readers of

⁵⁹ Ricoeur 1970: 33-34; cf. Sedgwick 1997: 5,17.

⁶⁰ Sedgwick 1997: 5, citing Freud 1953v17: 261.

⁶¹ Sedgwick 1997: 17.

Juvenal, in fact, is rooted largely in the same kind of suspicious hermeneutic, with an emphasis on revealing the hidden assumptions of certain ideological structures which govern and even generate the text:⁶² Larmour 1991: 43 summarizes these assumptions as follows:

[T]he Roman class structure...has been corrupted and misused by certain groups of people—namely foreigners, parvenus and degenerates. Juvenal's text posits a set of clearly defined polarities and then suggests that these have been undermined. The principal oppositions are Roman/Foreign, Ruling (Aristocrats or Equestrians)/Ruled (Plebeians) and Male/Female. In each case, the first element is privileged over the second. These oppositions he equates with the Roman class system which keeps everyone in her or his proper place.

Larmour 1991: 43 then argues that “the assumptions behind the text...betray an intolerant and authoritarian desire to dictate human behavior. The consequences of this are largely hidden from the reader by intensely clever linguistic play designed to make most readers laugh at least some of the time.” Note in this formulation that the governing assumptions are *behind* the text, suggesting that they are in some way hidden. When the scholar/critic reveals these hidden assumptions, they in turn *betray* (i.e., reveal, expose) an authoritarian impulse on the part of Juvenal (or his persona; Larmour is silent on the relationship between poet and speaker) which in turn is *hidden from the reader* by clever and humorous language. Later, Larmour 1991: 48 claims that “the opening lines of the [sixth] *Satire* reveal a concern with the breakdown of polarities and an attempt to foist a structure upon the reader.” What Sedgwick calls an emphasis on *exposure*, I would characterize as an impulse toward *exposé*. Larmour codifies this impulse in the first of his three “steps” in his program for resisting readers:

⁶² Cf. Larmour 1991: 41, 42, 47.

Evaluate the polarities upon which the text rests; what assumptions are made? What is the position of the standard Commentaries vis-à-vis these polarities and assumptions? In most cases, it turns out that the Commentaries tend to work within the structures of the text and to reproduce, albeit in a subtler way, its prejudices.⁶³

Paranoid reading is not in and of itself a bad thing. A certain amount of suspicion and mistrust is necessary for survival; just think what would happen if no one ever looked both ways before crossing the street. There is no question that forms of oppression have existed wherever and whenever human beings have lived, from subtle bias to blatant discrimination to physical violence; and scholars, be they New Historicist, cultural materialist, deconstructive, feminist, queer, psychoanalytic or other, have made valuable contributions by exposing and thereby offering resistance to oppression based on race, class, gender, sexuality, or other forms of marginalized social status. I would acknowledge that my own account of expurgation, biographical criticism, and persona theory in this chapter constitute a kind of paranoid project in Sedgwick's terms.⁶⁴ As if following Larmour's program (although I started down this road long before perusing his "Plan for Resisting Readers"), I have sought to expose the ways in which modern

⁶³ Larmour 1991: 47. Larmour's emphasis on polarities, or binary oppositions, betrays (so to speak) a deconstructive bent that he only alludes to in passing and does not explicitly elaborate. He is in effect advocating a deconstructive approach and virtually equating deconstruction with resistant reading. As Sedgwick 1993: 5 and 7 observes, the hermeneutics of suspicion and paranoid reading practices are endemic to deconstructive criticism.

⁶⁴ In a similar vein, Ancona 1994 alternates between discussing the gender-based biases of previous critics of Horace's erotic odes, and her own reparative project of "[reconceptualizing] both the erotic dynamics of lyric poetry and the reader's relationship to these dynamics" (Ancona 1994: 15) from a theoretical perspective that combines Judith Fetterly's notion of resistant reading with the feminist framework of Jan Montefiore and the psychoanalytic framework of object relations theorists Nancy Chodorow and Jessica Benjamin. See Ancona 1994: 4-21 for a detailed introduction to her theoretical framework.

scholarly receptions of Juvenal's ninth satire have tended to work within the masculinist, patriarchal, and heteronormative structures of the text and to reproduce its homophobic, effeminophobic, submissophobic and misogynistic biases.⁶⁵

The negative connotations of the term *paranoid* should not obscure the fact that much important critical writing in the traditions of feminism, gender studies and the history of sexuality may be subsumed under this rubric. The paranoid nature of the reading reflects the critical assumption that the text under study is categorically hostile to one's own sense of justice; and in many cases, this assumption is well founded. For example, Amy Richlin's influential 1983 study, *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, is a fundamentally paranoid project in Sedgwick's terms. In her introduction to the 1992 revised edition, Richlin describes her choice to engage in a politically charged analysis of sexual language and humor in Roman poetry as follows:

What are we to make of a humor, and a sexual poetics, in which an ithyphallic male stood at the center of a protected space and threatened all intruders with rape? The feminist interpretation of sexual behavior as enactments of gendered hierarchies of power seems to me to provide the best analytical model for these Roman texts and history. When I argue here that forms of misogyny and phallic thinking characterized Roman culture *in the same way* as they have both earlier and later cultures, and

⁶⁵ Imputing homophobic and heteronormative tendencies to Juvenal's ninth satire or any ancient Greek or Roman text is complicated, for a number of reasons, beginning with the fact that some forms of same-sex desire and behavior were normative in classical antiquity, and thus homosexuality, homophobia and heteronormativity did not exist in their modern forms. Nevertheless, even dominant Roman discourse insisted on a certain kind of heteronormativity, demanding that masculine-gendered males penetrate either women, effeminate males, younger free males, or slave boys who could be assimilated to a feminine role in the Roman social imagination. Sexual relations between partners of the same sex *and* the same gender identity *and/or* the same social status and age-group were *not* considered normative. See Williams 2010: 17-19 for the protocols of masculine behavior the choice of sexual object based on sexual role, social status, and aesthetic standards of desirability.

that these forms are essentially related to humor, my thesis places me among those feminists who use “patriarchy” to denote the very *longue durée* of institutionalized oppression of women. . . . One message of *The Garden of Priapus* is that Greek and Roman societies, though they have sometimes been looked to by those searching for a prepatriarchal golden age, are neither outside of, nor do they predate, patriarchy—the “ancient” world is not different in kind. Another is that humor itself is a patriarchal discourse. [Emphasis in original.]⁶⁶

Turning to Juvenal’s ninth satire and referring specifically to lines 130-3 (cited above), Richlin 1992a: 202 claims: “The satirist in effect rapes Rome with Naevolus as his agent--an agent at whom he jovially sneers.” Richlin appears to distinguish carefully throughout her study between the poet and the speaker or poetic persona. In this case, however, while it is clear that Naevolus is a fictional character speaking in a poem, it is unclear to whom Richlin is referring when she says “the satirist rapes Rome.” The term *satirist* may refer to the flesh-and-blood, historical Juvenal; or it may refer to a kind of implied writer, analogous to an implied reader, an imaginary construct hovering somewhere between the poet and the text. What is perfectly clear is Richlin’s main point: the ninth satire is a Priapic poem employing Priapic humor, a form of humor which is essentially patriarchal, misogynistic, and cruel.

Richlin’s study, then, would seem to correspond both to Larmour’s “no laughing matter” approach and to Sedgwick’s paranoid reading (which is by no means to suggest that it is not an important, well-documented, and insightful study). The other option for resistant reading is Larmour’s “new areas of laughter” approach, corresponding to

⁶⁶ Richlin 1992a: xvii. Richlin characterizes her analysis, or aspects of it, as “political” (cf. xiv, “my political analysis was shaped by the feminist critique of the pornographic” and xvii, “[Foucault’s *History of Sexuality*] leaves out much that cries out for political analysis”). Cf. Richlin 1993b, in which the author critiques scholarly notions of Greek and Roman societies as an idealized prepatriarchal golden age.

Sedgwick's reparative reading and even overlapping with Sinfield's idea of "blatant reworking" (a creative strategy that may offer a model for critical practice as well). Sedgwick's conception of reparative reading, like her conception of paranoia, is based on the formulations of Austrian-born British psychoanalyst Melanie Klein (1882-1960). In contrast to the developmental phases of Freudian psychoanalysis, Klein uses the term *position* to describe "the characteristic posture that the ego takes up with respect to its objects."⁶⁷ Klein identifies two positions as part of the structure of the human psyche: the paranoid-schizoid position and the depressive position. The paranoid-schizoid position is characterized by paranoid anxiety, or fear of invasive malevolence. The paranoid-schizoid ego splits its world into good and bad categories, identifying with the good and rejecting the bad. When the ego enters the depressive position, it develops the ability to integrate the bad and tolerate ambivalence and conflict. The ego continues to maintain some of its schizoid defenses, but an anxiety-mitigating desire for reparation becomes dominant. It is this impulse toward reparation that Sedgwick seizes on as the basis for her notion of reparative reading.

As I noted above, Sedgwick does not fully characterize reparative reading practices, letting her edited volume of essays speak for the concept. But she does provide some hints, including hints that support the approach I am taking to Juvenal's ninth satire and could potentially apply to other Roman texts that deploy sexual language and humor. A reparative reading stance, Sedgwick 1997: 25 imagines, "will leave us in a vastly better position to do justice to a wealth of characteristic, culturally specific practices, many of

⁶⁷ Hinshelwood 1991: 394, cited by Sedgwick 1997: 8.

which can well be called reparative, that emerge from queer experience but become invisible or illegible under a paranoid optic.” An interesting observation that emerges from this comment is that paranoid readings seem to reveal paranoid tendencies in their object of study (the indignant satirist’s phobic orientation toward those who violate normative social hierarchies, for example), while reparative readings seem to discover and explicate, perhaps even celebrate, reparative tendencies (Rabelais’ notion of carnival laughter, for example, which deploys obscene humor “to affirm the power of life over death”).⁶⁸ Indeed Richlin herself, citing Rabelaisian humor as a model, ultimately exhibits a reparative impulse, although she sees its fulfillment in an imagined extinction of the hierarchical forms of sexually aggressive humor found in Roman satire and other forms of Roman poetry.⁶⁹

I am interested in making a different sort of case, one that I think exemplifies Sedgwick’s notion of reparative reading; namely, that Juvenal’s ninth satire represents a series of counter-normative performances of sex, gender, and kinship that subvert normative constructions of masculinity and of male sexual and social dominance. While Juvenal “jovially sneers,” the joke is not on Naevolus, his effeminate, sexually submissive patron, or the patron’s wife, but rather on the dominant Roman discourse of sex, gender, and kinship normativity. The poem portrays a world in which women commit adultery with a man who is also having sex with their husbands, who in turn do

⁶⁸ Richlin 1992a: 211. For Rabelais and carnival laughter, see Bakhtin 1984.

⁶⁹ Cf. Richlin 1992a: 211-2. Richlin 1993b: 281 likewise evinces a reparative impulse: “My own preference is for an Optimistic epistemology that maps a real reality and then does something about it.” By Optimistic epistemology, Richlin means “a kind of theory which claims validity across history and culture” (Richlin 1993b: 274).

not seem to want to have sex with their wives. The only terms readily available within the dominant Roman discourse to describe this deviant series of relationships are those of adultery and prostitution. These categories, however, do not correspond to the reality of lived experience, since the expectations of marriage, paternity, and male dominion on which they are based do not match the needs and desires of the participants involved. This failure of lived experience to align with cultural expectations provides Juvenal and Naevolus an opportunity reinscribe these relationships through a series of camp parodies: of social institutions, such as marriage, paternity, and patronage; and of literary tropes such as the epic hero, the abandoned heroine, the *exclusus amator*, and the bucolic shepherd. I will develop this reading more fully in Chapter Four. The following chapters will pave the way with discussions of queer kinship, camp aesthetics, and the changing fortunes of Juvenal's reputation as a morally sincere and earnest social reformer.

CHAPTER TWO

Queer Existence, Camp Aesthetics, and Classical Antiquity

By accepting his homosexuality and flaunting it, the camp undercuts all homosexuals who won't accept the stigmatized identity. Only by fully embracing the stigma itself can one neutralize the sting and make it laughable. Not all references to the stigma are campy, however. Only if it is pointed out as a joke is it camp, although there is no requirement that the jokes be gentle or friendly. A lot of camping is extremely hostile; it is almost always sarcastic. But its intent is humorous as well.

--Esther Newton, *Mother Camp* (1972)¹

Redeeming the Text

As we saw in the previous chapter, Juvenal's ninth satire is among three of his works that prominently feature representations of deviant sex roles, gender performances, and kinship relations. While these representations were deviant even for Juvenal's contemporary readers, they were not taboo, and in fact were consistent with a sizable body of similarly transgressive literature by a number of other Roman authors. Among modern scholars, editors, and translators, however, Juvenal's satires 2, 6, and 9 have often given rise to considerable anxiety, and the ninth satire in particular has provoked expressions of disgust and revulsion around male homosexuality, effeminacy, and sexual submissiveness. In the previous chapter, I explored the persistence of masculinist, patriarchal, and heteronormative reading practices through successive eras characterized by expurgation, biographical criticism, and persona theory. In one way or another, all of these receptions served to affirm the abject status of forms of existence despised on the

¹ Newton 1979: 111 (orig. pub. 1972).

basis of perceived sex, gender, or kinship deviance.² Wittingly or not, these modern readers acquiesce in the stigmatizing power of their own society's dominant ideology, reaffirming not only the dominance of that ideology but also its justice. Moreover, even as my specific examples of expurgation, biographical criticism, and persona theory recede into history, the stigmatizing reading practices they represent continue, often unwittingly, through a prevalent assumption that the only valid reading of a classical text is one that reproduces the dominant ideology within which the text was composed. The possibility that a classical text might gesture sympathetically toward the despised and abject forms of existence at its own social and cultural margins is generally ignored or neglected, particularly in the case of Juvenal scholarship.³

Some readers, however, do not identify with the dominant ideological subject position, and in fact may identify with one or more of the despised and abject margins. That is, they may be effeminate; they may be sexually submissive; or they be in counter-normative kinship relations, perhaps having sex or raising children outside of marriage, or perhaps exchanging sex for money. As one of those counter-normative readers, I seek

² The terms “abject” and “abjection” are used throughout this study in their ordinary sense to refer to people or conditions that are perceived or constructed in public discourse as wretched, despicable, or debased. See the Conclusion for discussion of how the concept of abjection is developed in Kristeva 1982 and applied to the poetics of satire by Rosen 2007.

³ Cf. Fögen 2000 for a recent reading of Juvenal 2 and 9 that makes many of the same stigmatizing critical moves as earlier readings. For example, Fögen 2000: 70 claims that Naevolus is disgusted by his own penetrative role (“seine eigene ihn anekelnde Rolle als Penetrierender“). Fögen 2000: 74 claims that Naevolus engages in homosexual acts only “under compulsion” (“nur zwangsweise homosexuell handelden”) and is “clearly a non-homosexual who obviously represents an external, heterosexual perspective” (“der als eindeutig Nicht-Homosexueller offensichtlich eine heterosexuelle Außenperspektive vertritt”). As we shall see in Chapter Four, this is hardly the only possible reading.

to read Juvenal's ninth satire in a way that confronts the marginalizing power of dominant ideology, reclaims the despised, and redeems the abject. Following Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, I call this kind of reading *reparative*.⁴ But as we saw in the previous chapter, there is no algorithm for reparative reading, only a suggestion to tap the reparative potential inherent in characteristic cultural practices of despised and abject forms of existence. Thus, this chapter will explore the potential for a *camp reading* of Juvenal's ninth satire, defining *camp* as a mode of subjectivity, performance, and composition characterized by the exercise of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant.⁵ (By *perverse wit* I mean humorous representations of incongruous situations or juxtapositions, often but not exclusively in matters of sex, gender, or kinship. I will discuss the notion of *solidarity with the deviant* below.) Itself a reparative practice, camp performs its work of reclamation and redemption with a degree and kind of wit characteristic of Roman satire.⁶ In preparation for a camp reading of Juvenal's ninth satire, this chapter provides a sustained and thorough explanation of camp aesthetics and their applicability to classical antiquity. First, however, it is important to provide a rationale for a camp reading of a classical text. It is not enough to claim that such a reading is possible: it would also be possible to do a Marxist reading, a formalist reading, or any of a number of kinds of readings; the fact that a given interpretive approach is possible does not guarantee that it

⁴ For reparative reading, see Chapter One, "Potential for Postmodern Receptions."

⁵ My definition of camp, like my definition of perverse wit, is most influenced by Newton 1979 and Dollimore 1991, although my formulations are ultimately my own. Cf. Newton 1979: 109, "Camp humor is a system of laughing at one's incongruous position instead of crying." This provisional definition of camp will be expanded and refined below. Cf. Sedgwick 1997: 27-8 for a discussion of camp as a reparative practice.

⁶ For wit as a constitute element of Juvenalian satire, cf. Mason 1963 (=Mason 1962a and Mason 1962b) and Martyn 1979, as well as the discussion in Chapter Three.

is necessarily warranted. I am interested in exploring camp because camp discourse provides an opportunity to read Juvenal's ninth satire in a way that allows for an embrace of deviant formations of sex, gender, and kinship rather than a rejection. This undertaking thus assumes a reparative stance not only towards the ancient text, but towards the history of its modern receptions. In a sense, I seek to redeem the text from its history of expurgation, bowdlerization, and homophobic, heteronormative reading practices.⁷

Embracing Stigmatized Identity

Let me clarify what I mean by *embrace* and *rejection* and the extent to which these are functions of both the text and its reception. Juvenal's ninth satire represents sex between men, commercial sex, sex outside of marriage, and procreation outside of marriage as transgressive practices; that is, as deviant formations of sex, gender, and kinship.⁸ There is no question that the poem includes representations of invective against sex and gender deviance (Naevolus' complaint against his sexual patron) as well as representations of fear and suspicion about the revelation of shameful or illicit performances of sex, gender, and kinship (Naevolus' demand for secrecy at 9.96-101 and Juvenal's assertion at 9.102-21 that deviance always comes to light). In other words, the poem includes representations of what Newton 1979: 111 refers to as *stigmatized identity*. Traditionally, most scholars have received and transmitted Juvenal 9 as a *rejection* of

⁷ For a reception-oriented interpretive approach that recognizes the importance of considering ancient texts in the context of their modern receptions, see Martindale 1993, whose title I have borrowed for the heading of this section.

⁸ Note that sex between men in Juvenal 9 is not deviant because it is between men, but rather because an adult freeborn Roman male is penetrated. See Williams 2010: 17-9 for a formulation of the protocols that regulate the sexual activity of Roman males, discussed further in Chapter Four.

stigmatized identity; that is, Juvenal, his poetic persona, and/or some kind of implied reader are assumed to recognize the deviant as perverse and to judge that perversity to be worthy of mockery, derision, and scorn.⁹ Moreover, when scholars receive and transmit the poem as a rejection of stigmatized identity, they tend to *reaffirm* that rejection; that is, by reading rejection of stigmatized identity as a meaning or value of the poem, they tend to reproduce it as a meaning or value for the here and now in which their own reading takes place. Thus, as we saw in Chapter One, expurgation implies that homosexuality was a vice abhorred by Juvenal, and asserts that it is a vice abhorred by Victorian society as well. Highet's biographical approach boldly asserts that homosexuality was a vice abhorred by Juvenal, and strongly implies that it is an abominable vice by his own contemporary standards as well. The case of Braund is somewhat different: she follows the nineteenth-century expurgators and Highet in assuming that Juvenal abhorred a vice of homosexuality, but she is more circumspect about asserting or implying any view on the matter for her own time and place, the Anglo-American scholarly community of the late twentieth century.

By contrast, as Esther Newton suggests, it is the function of camp to *embrace* stigmatized identity so as to render the stigma laughable and undercut its power to despise and abject marginalized others. Camp, as we shall see further below, is both a mode of composition or performance *and* a mode of aesthetic perception; that is, the camp embrace of stigmatized identity resides in the text, but it also resides in the reading of the text. What's more, if camp aesthetics have no meaning for the reader, the embrace

⁹ Cf. Larmour 1991:42, 47 for the role of an "implied reader" in the composition of Juvenal's satires.

of stigmatized identity that resides in the text remains *illegible*. Thus, in order to receive and transmit the text as an embrace of stigmatized identity rather than a rejection, we must engage in a camp *reading* of the poem, and this in turn suggests that we be or become, however provisionally, camp *readers*.

Although camp has been a mainstream cultural phenomenon since the 1960s, its origins and theoretical formulations have always been firmly linked with a queer subculture, that is, with gayness or homosexuality, and so queer existence must be taken into account in any camp-inflected reading of Roman satire.¹⁰ What I mean by “taken into account” is that a camp-inflected reading is virtually by definition a queer-inflected reading: the inherent queerness of a camp reading must therefore be acknowledged and the validity of such a reading must be defended. To put it more bluntly: by embarking on a camp reading of Roman satire, I risk incurring the charge of imposing a “gay

¹⁰ Cf. Cleto 1999, esp. the editor’s main introduction (“Queering the Camp”) and the section introductions. Camp thus runs parallel with analogous cultural practices of other marginalized groups, such as the parodic performance of blackface minstrelsy by African Americans in the nineteenth century, and the Jewish “borscht-belt” humor that is part of a much larger culture of Jewish comedy aimed at parodying mainstream stereotypes of Jews and ironically glamorizing the marginal status of Jews in mainstream society. It must be underscored, however, that as black minstrelsy is to the repair of racial stigma, and as Jewish humor is to the repair of religious/ethnic stigma, camp is to the repair of stigma based on sex and gender deviance, and is therefore rightfully identified as a characteristic cultural practice of sex and gender deviants including effeminate men, masculine women, homosexuals, and the transgendered, among others.

sensibility” on the poem inappropriately.¹¹ Consequently, the need to explain basic assumptions, always an important aspect of any scholarly endeavor, is particularly urgent here. The following sections will thus define and explain the relevance of the categories of queer existence and camp aesthetics. Subsequent sections will offer a more detailed description of the development of camp over the past fifty years; discuss cinematic receptions as an illustration of how popular culture appreciated the camp potential of Rome when classicists for the most part failed to do so; explore potential reasons why the category of camp has not been widely applied to readings of Latin texts; review key scholarship on sex and gender in classical antiquity that helped pave the way for a camp approach to Roman literature; and finally, consider Wooten 1984, the only example of classical scholarship that explicitly applies the category of camp to a Latin text, albeit with serious limitations.

¹¹ This charge has already been incurred in at least one public academic forum, the 2009 annual meeting of the American Philological Association, where an early version of my camp reading of Juvenal 9 was presented on a panel organized by the Lambda Classical Caucus. Holt Parker, in his role as respondent, singled out my paper and one other as “attempts to find ourselves in antiquity [that] merely reinforce the old homo versus hetero split that queer theory has been seeking to dismantle ever since Sedgwick and so reifies an unexamined heterosexuality as unmarked, normal, natural, and right” (copy of remarks provided by Parker). As I hope this chapter will make clear, it is hardly my intention to “reinforce the old homo versus hetero split.” See the bibliography for representative works of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, a major influence on the current study.

Queer Existence

In this study, the term *queer* is not synonymous with gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, or homosexual.¹² Thus, in talking about queer formations of sex, gender, or kinship in Juvenal's ninth satire, I am not suggesting that Juvenal or any of his characters are gay, homosexual, or bisexual; these terms all refer to identity categories that are historically specific to Western society (and societies influenced by Western culture and discourse) especially since the twentieth century.¹³ Queer, however, has a wider range of potential usages. While common usage includes the term *queer* as an identity category (that is, a sort of catch-all synonym for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender), I use it to refer to formations of sex, gender, and kinship that are counter-normative with respect to a given society or culture, regardless of geographical location or historical period. In

¹² The OED (Draft Revision Sept. 2009 s.v. *queer*. *adj.*¹, sense 3) defines *queer* as an American colloquialism synonymous with *homosexual*, and adds, "Although originally chiefly derogatory (and still widely considered offensive, esp. when used by heterosexual people), from the late 1980s it began to be used as a neutral or positive term (originally of self-reference, by some homosexuals; cf. QUEER NATION *n.*) in place of *gay* or *homosexual*, without regard to, or in implicit denial of, its negative connotations. In some academic contexts it is the preferred adjective in the study of issues relating to homosexuality (cf. *queer theory* *n.* at Special Uses 2); it is also sometimes used of sexual lifestyles that do not conform to conventional heterosexual behaviour, such as bisexuality or transgenderism."

¹³ The historicist view I embrace here is generally prevalent among scholars of gender and historians of sexuality. For a vigorous defense of the historicist position, see Halperin 2002. See further Williams 2010, especially 3-14, 253-268. It should be noted, however, that claims about the continuous transhistorical existence of certain sexual identity categories (*homosexual*, for example), persist in contemporary discourse. In a recent article in the *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide*, influential gay author and activist Larry Kramer writes (Kramer 2009a: 11) writes, "I do not understand why historians and academics, including many gay ones, refuse to believe that homosexuality has been pretty much the same since the beginning of human history, whether it was called homosexuality, sodomy, buggery, or had no name at all." For a response to Kramer's argument, see Schneiderman 2009.

effect, using the term *queer* signals the intention to dignify sex, gender, and kinship counter-normativity, not by denying its deviance, but by asserting its right to exist. My usage of the phrase *queer existence* is inspired by Adrienne Rich's usage of the term *lesbian existence*, and refers both to the *fact* that deviant formations of sex, gender and kinship exist, and to *how* they exist.¹⁴ Since I define the term *queer* in a way that is not historically limited, I am able to apply it to counter-normative formations of sex, gender, and kinship in times other than modernity and in places other than the Anglo-European West. Specifically, I can talk about queer formations of sex, gender and kinship in the Rome of Juvenal and his ninth satire.

Queer Kinship in Juvenal's Ninth Satire

I contend that queer existence, as I have defined it above, is a flexible category that may be used in historical analysis provided that the analysis respects historical specificity.¹⁵ For example, in the course of this study I will refer to the *queer household* portrayed in Juvenal's ninth satire. This household is constituted by (1) a wife whose husband does not desire her sexually; (2) the husband who prefers to submit sexually to

¹⁴ Cf. Rich 1980: 648, "Lesbian existence suggests both the fact of the historical presence of lesbians and our continuing creation of the meaning of that existence." By "the meaning of that existence" I understand Rich to refer to how existence is embodied, enacted, and performed in social, cultural and historical contexts.

¹⁵ My intention here is simultaneously to acknowledge and to sidestep the essentialist-constructionist debate in which feminism, gender studies, and the history of sexuality were unfortunately mired during the 1980s and 1990s. To a great extent, queer theory was born of the effort to transcend that debate. See Sedgwick 1990: 40-44 and *passim* as well as Skinner 2001, which refers specifically to the debate within the field of classics and provides relevant bibliography. See Seidman 1993 for an account of how essentialist and constructionist views impact potential forms of postmodern queer theory and political activism.

anal penetration by other men; (3) Naevolus, a kind of Roman client *manqué* who is procured by the husband to have sex with both him and his wife and to procreate their children; and of course (4) the children, whose paternity is publicly recognized as belonging to the husband of their mother, while Naevolus' role in their production remains a desperately guarded secret. Let us consider the textual evidence for each of these four characterizations.

For the wife whose husband does not desire her sexually, consider Juvenal 9.70-80, in which Naevolus, apostrophizing the husband, complains that he is not adequately compensated for satisfying the wife when the husband failed to do so. Note in particular 9.71-2

ni tibi deditus essem
devotusque cliens, uxor tua virgo maneret.

If I had not been your dedicated and faithful client, your wife would still be a virgin.

and 9.79-80

instabile ac dirimi coeptum et iam paene solutum
coniugium in multis domibus servavit adulter.

In many households an adulterer has saved a marriage that was shaky and falling apart and already almost dissolved.

Note that desire is not explicitly addressed, and on the basis of these lines, we can only conclude that the husband does not penetrate his wife vaginally, not that he does not desire her sexually. Indeed, other literary examples, including Martial 3.96, 11.47, 11.78, and 11.85, suggest that a Roman male might be interested in *cunnilinctus* or anal

intercourse with women while being averse to vaginal intercourse.¹⁶ But each of these examples deploys a distinct kind of humorous logic: a camp irony, in fact, based on incongruous juxtapositions. For example, in Martial 3.96, 11.47, and 11.85, the humor lies in the incongruous notion that a male wants to engage in oral-vaginal sex but not penile-vaginal sex. In Martial 11.78, the humor lies in the prospect of a young bridegroom who is so accustomed to anally penetrating boys that his inclination is likewise to anally penetrate his new bride; the speaker thus advises him that he needs to make a special effort to cultivate the desire for and practice of vaginal penetration. Juvenal 9, however, provides no evidence that the husband wants to perform cunnilingus on his wife or penetrate boys or women anally. The humor in the ninth satire, by contrast, would seem to lie in the incongruous notion that a freeborn adult man wants to be penetrated by men and not to penetrate boys or women, not even his own wife.

For the husband who prefers to submit sexually to anal penetration by other men, consider 9.35-40, in which Naevolus alludes to his sexual relationship with the husband, whom he feels has not compensated him adequately for his sexual services.

...te nudum spumanti Virro labello
 viderit et blandae adsidue densaeque tabellae
 sollicitent, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλλεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος,
 quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis avarus?
 “haec tribui, deinde illa dedi, mox plura tulisti.”
 computat et cevet.

...Virro with his foaming little lip sees you nude and his frequent flattering letters beseech you continually, for the *cinaedus* himself attracts a man. And yet, what is a worse portent than a stingy molly? “I gave you these, then I gave you those, then I gave you more.” He reckons his tab while he pumps his butt.

¹⁶ Cf. Williams 2010: 184-5 with nn. 34, 40.

There is debate among the commentators as to whether Virro is in fact the name of the husband or rather serves as a kind of epithet for miserly patrons in general, perhaps identical with or modeled on the patron in Juvenal 5, whose name is Virro and whose primary personality trait in the poem is his abusiveness of clients. I think it is a distinction without much of a difference, as the passage as a whole certainly refers to Naevolus' frustration regarding inadequate compensation in the context of his relationship with the husband in the current poem.

For Naevolus' role as sexual surrogate for husband and wife and as procreator of children, consider, in addition to the passages cited above, 9.82-83, in which Naevolus, apostrophizing the husband, complains that he is not adequately compensated for fathering the latter's two children with his wife:

nullum ergo meritum est, ingrate ac perfide, nullum
quod tibi filiulus vel filia nascitur ex me?

Is it therefore worth nothing, you deceitful ingrate, nothing that a little son
or a daughter is born to you from me?

For the fraudulent paternity of the children, consider 9.84-88, in which Naevolus, apostrophizing the husband, describes how the latter publicly affirms the paternity of his children:

tollis enim et libris actorum spargere gaudes
argumenta viri. foribus suspende coronas:
iam pater es, dedimus quod famae opponere possis.
iura parentis habes, propter me scriberis heres,
legatum omne capis nec non et dulce caducum.

For you raise them and you delight in sprinkling the newspapers with
announcements that prove you are a man. You hang wreaths from your
doors: Now you are a father, I furnished you with a claim against ill

repute. You have the privileges of a parent, on account of me you will be inscribed as an heir; you take a legacy whole and even a sweet escheat.

Finally, for the urgent secrecy surrounding Naevolus' multiple roles as sexual and paternal surrogate in this household, consider 9.93-5, in which Naevolus addresses

Juvenal:

haec soli commissa tibi celare memento
et tacitus nostras intra te fige querellas;
nam res mortifera est inimicus pumice levis.

These things entrusted to you alone, make sure you hide them and quietly fix my complaints within yourself; for a deadly thing is an enemy smooth by means of pumice.

As I have just described them, I do not think anyone familiar with normative standards of Roman sex roles, gender identities, or kinship relations would have any problem acknowledging this set of relationships as counter-normative or deviant with respect to sex, gender, and kinship. By calling this household *queer*, I assert the dignity of the household and of its members, rather than stigmatizing them as wrong, bad, perverse, corrupt, or immoral. This does not mean that I maintain any illusions about the historical prospects for this dignity: there would be no queer theory, queer advocacy, or queer activism if the dignity of queer existence were not constantly under siege. Rather, my objective is to engage in a reading of Juvenal's ninth satire that respects the poem's own intimations of perversity in its representation of these relationships, while interpreting those perverse gestures in a way that allows for the dignity of the poem's deviant formations of sex, gender, and kinship. Such acknowledgement of deviance combined with an assertion of dignity for the deviant is, I would argue, the essence of camp. Thus, my decision to engage in a camp reading of the poem is not arbitrary or whimsical, but is

rather the approach best suited to my understanding of how the poem represents queer formations of sex, gender, and kinship.

Queer Kinship in the Context of Queer Theory

The inclusion of gender identity and sexual orientation within the purview of queer theory is well established; my inclusion of kinship, however, alongside sex and gender is more innovative, though by no means unprecedented.¹⁷ The term *kinship* traditionally refers to relations of affinity (marriage) and consanguinity (blood). Since same-sex relationships in the Western cultural tradition have historically been denied access to marriage and procreation, these relationships have long existed beyond the discourse of kinship.¹⁸ Extending Judith Butler's concept of performativity from gender to kinship, one might say that heteronormative relationships have historically been viewed as *performances* of kinship;¹⁹ that is, the social expectation was that opposite-sex couples would enjoy a period of courtship, then marry and have children. Indeed, in the Roman context, Treggiari 1991 demonstrates that the primary social function of marriage was the production of legitimate children. Moreover, as Williams 2010: 280-1 suggests,

¹⁷ Cf. Schneider 1984 and Weston 1991.

¹⁸ Anthropologists have documented kinship patterns that differ from the heteronormative model of the Western tradition. See Schneider 1984 for a skeptical view of the naturalization of kinship categories. For an ethnographic study of gay and lesbian kinship in the United States, see Weston 1991. Although Murray and Roscoe 2001 positions itself as a study of African sexuality, it ultimately documents kinship patterns that do not align with Western heteronormative expectations.

¹⁹ For gender performativity, see Butler 1990. Butler's concept is in effect an elaboration of Simon de Beauvoir's famous assertions in *The Second Sex* that "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman." Performativity suggests that this becoming of one's gender is an ongoing process and that one's gender only exists insofar as it is performed through the repetition of acts that are socially legible as constitutive of gender.

the very terms *matrimonium* (marriage) and *patrimonium* (heritable paternal property) suggest the constitutive connection in the Roman social imaginary among maternity, paternity, the procreation of legitimate children within marriage, and the hereditary succession of paternal property.

Same-sex relationships, by contrast, have historically been viewed primarily as (deviant) performances of sex and gender. That is, the basis of same-sex relationships was historically assumed to be the partners' desire to fulfill sexual needs, and these sexual needs were gendered to the extent that the partners were assumed to divide masculine and feminine roles. We see these sex and gender prejudices expressed in such typical questions posed by heteronormative observers of same-sex relationships as "What do they do *in bed*?" and "Which one is *the man*?" To the extent that same-sex relationships were viewed in terms of kinship at all, they have generally been viewed as *parodies* of kinship, not the real thing.²⁰ It is only very recently that some queer-friendly friends or relatives of same-sex couples might ask, "I wonder if they plan to have children?" Indeed, one of the challenges of modern queer existence is that of performing kinship in a way that is subjectively experienced and objectively perceived as *authentic* rather than *parodic*. We see this is the gradual and grudging evolution of the way newspapers have omitted or included the existence of same-sex partners in obituaries, first refusing to note

²⁰ In Juvenal's second satire, we see marriages between men explicitly inveighed against as parodies of normative, heterosexual marriage (cf. Juv. 2.117-142). According to the satiric persona, a saving grace of these sham marriages is that they do not produce offspring (cf. Juv. 2.139-42). See Williams 2010: 279-86 for a discussion of the Roman textual evidence for same-sex marriages and an assessment of what we may learn from this evidence about the social recognition (or lack thereof) of marriages between men in ancient Rome.

their existence at all, then adopting euphemistic expressions like “assistant” or “companion” in an attempt to assimilate same-sex relations to something other than a kinship model, and only recently embracing the term “partner,” which has come to signify a marital degree of affinity even in the absence of formal marriage. (It should be noted that such reticence was generally enforced by the families of the deceased as much as by the editorial style of the newspaper.)

I contend that much the same challenge is faced by the characters in Juvenal’s ninth satire. That is, the married couple in the poem constitutes, on a superficial level at least, an authentic performance of kinship. But the fact that the husband’s sex and gender performances are failures (that is, he is effeminate and sexually submissive and he does not sexually penetrate his wife or father children with her; he is thus more of a *mollis*, *pathicus* or *cinaedus* than a *vir*) renders their marriage a sham, a parody of kinship.²¹ In an attempt to bolster the bona fides of his marriage, the husband procures the services of Naevolus as sexual surrogate for both himself and his wife, and as paternal surrogate for the procreation of their children. While Naevolus serves in turn as a substitute spouse for both husband and wife and a substitute father, he never really has an authentic kinship role of his own. His only socially legible roles are that of adulterer, prostitute, or client. But these categories do not contain him any more adequately than the categories of

²¹ Naevolus calls the husband “soft” or “effeminate” (*mollis*, 38) and refers to him (or people like him; the context may be generalizing) with the Greek word κίναϊδος (37), cognate with the Latin *cinaedus*. The husband is never directly referred to as *pathicus* (submitting to sexual penetration), but he is indirectly given the label when the Juvenalian speaker says that Naevolus should not fret over the loss of the husband, since Rome teems with many a “sexually submissive male friend” (*pathicus amicus*, 130) to replace him as Naevolus’ sexual patron.

husband, wife, or father. This series of ironic and humorous incongruities and parodies, along with the trope of secrecy (a manifestation of the characteristically camp opposition between appearance and reality, as well as an acknowledgement of the stigma associated with sex, gender, and kinship deviance), contribute to the camp legibility of this poem: that is, the potential for the poem to be read as a camp text by readers for whom the category of camp has meaning.

Camp Aesthetics in Brief

There is no one agreed-upon definition of camp, but I have provisionally defined camp as a mode of subjectivity, performance, and composition characterized by the exercise of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant. The most characteristic form of camp is drag, the highly theatrical, stylized performance of feminine gender by homosexual men. Many other things, however, have been identified as camp by theorists and scholars, including ballet, opera, and a wide range of art, literature, theatre, film, and even personal styles.²²

²² See Core 1984 for an encyclopedic compendium of camp people, places and things, including the Roman poet Catullus (p. 50) and the pioneering classical archaeologist Johann Joachim Winckelmann (p. 201). In his entry on Catullus, however, Core excludes Juvenal from the camp canon on the basis that he is “a truly moral social critic,” a contention at odds with much recent Juvenal scholarship and with which my entire thesis is in profound disagreement (cf. Core 1984: 50).

Major Hallmarks

Major hallmarks of camp, first identified by Esther Newton and Jack Babuscio, include incongruity, theatricality, humor, irony, and aestheticism.²³ Other camp features cited by a range of scholars include sarcasm, wit, parody, rhetorical exaggeration, and a certain joyful indulgence in excess, which often takes the form of sexual exuberance, moral impropriety, and a perverse pleasure in scandal.²⁴ Several of these characteristics, it should be noted, are also manifested in many works of Roman satire. Most of these features are to be understood according to their common dictionary meanings and need no elaborate explanation here. The one exception may be Babuscio's notion of aestheticism as a characteristic feature of camp. The common dictionary definition of aestheticism is *devotion to and pursuit of the beautiful*.²⁵ But Babuscio may be referring primarily to aestheticism as a doctrine with roots in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant that was subsequently elaborated by Théophile Gautier, taken up in France by Baudelaire, Flaubert, and the Symbolists, and adopted in England by Walter Pater, Oscar Wilde, and a

²³ Newton 1979: 106 characterizes camp in terms of the three major "themes" of incongruity, theatricality, and humor, while Babuscio 1999: 119 refers to camp's four basic "features" as irony, aestheticism, theatricality, and humor. As Newton 1979: 106 explains, "Incongruity is the subject matter of camp, theatricality its style, and humor its strategy."

²⁴ Cf. Booth 1999:76; Case 1999: 182-3; Cleto 1999: 3-5, 9, 31, 33, 46; Dyer 1999: 113; Robertson 1999:386; Sontag 1999:53, 386. Of course, some of these features overlap or may even be considered synonyms, such as humor, sarcasm, irony, and wit. Incongruity is often cited as a factor contributing to humor and as a constituent of irony. Sarcasm is a form of caustic wit and is often listed as a manifestation of irony. If one is bothered by the wide range of specific qualities historically associated with camp, one can refer back to my more functional definition: *the exercise of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant*.

²⁵ Cf. American Heritage Dictionary s.v. aestheticism; OED Second Edition 1989 s.v. aestheticism.

number of literary figures of the 1890s, often under the slogan *l'art pour l'art* (art for art's sake).²⁶ Babuscio cites a maxim of Wilde's, "It is through Art, and through Art only, that we can shield ourselves from the sordid perils of actual existence."²⁷ Babuscio claims that "Wilde's epigram points to a crucial aspect of camp aestheticism: its opposition to puritan morality. Camp is subversive of commonly received standards: it challenges the status quo."²⁸ As we shall see in the subsequent section, this claim for camp as an instrument of moral subversion is controversial within camp theory and discourse; on the other hand, my own camp reading of Juvenal's ninth satire will in fact claim subversive potential for the camp sensibility of the poem.

I find Newton's formulation of camp as an effect of (1) incongruous situations or juxtapositions (2) presented in a theatrical manner (3) for humorous effect as (4) an implicit embrace of stigmatized identity to be particularly useful as a framework for the formal analysis of literary texts, and so these are the terms I will return to most consistently in my close reading of Juvenal's ninth satire in Chapter Four. Babuscio's emphasis on irony is also important, and explication of camp irony will also be part of my reading of Juvenal 9. Camp irony is typically based on the deliberate failure of adherence to pretended moral or aesthetic standards. For example, when a rakish figure meets a girl in a dive bar and says, "What's a nice girl like you doing in a place like this?" he makes a pretense of moral standards, on the one hand, with his nod to the

²⁶ Cf. Baldick 2004 s.v. aestheticism.

²⁷ Cited in Babuscio 1999: 120, incompletely quoted from Wilde 1909: 18, where the complete epigram reads, "It is through Art, and through Art only, that we can realise our perfection; through Art, and through Art only, that we can shield ourselves from the sordid perils of actual existence."

²⁸ Babuscio 1999: 120.

notions of “nice girls” and improper places, but simultaneously makes a mockery of those standards by his very presence in the seedy locale, as well as by his obviously sexual advance on the girl. If such a statement in such a situation is made humorlessly, the irony is just an instance of crass sexual opportunism. If, however, the same statement is made, perhaps in a theatrical manner, with deliberate humorous intent, it becomes an instance of camp.

Parody and Authenticity

In its recognition of their deviant status, camp gestures at the tension between parody and authenticity that exists in queer performances of sex, gender and kinship.²⁹ This gesture is at the heart of camp’s intimate historical and theoretical connection with queer existence, and helps explain why, as I suggested earlier, a queer reading of Juvenal’s ninth satire inexorably tends towards a camp reading, and vice versa. The moment we choose to read the ménage à trois among Naevolus, his patron, and the patron’s wife as a queer household, and to claim that, even draped in layers of humor, irony, and invective, the poem ultimately accords that household a certain level of dignity, we have entered the realm of camp. Camp does not provide a definitive answer to

²⁹ This is my own formulation, although it is consistent with views expressed by other camp theorists. Cf. Newton 1979: xx, “...camp humor ultimately grows out of the incongruities and absurdities of the patriarchal nuclear family...” Newton 1979:102 notes that “the kinship system (wife, mother, etc.)” is the most obvious example of sex-role typing in American culture, alongside “the occupational-role system (airline stewardess, waitress, policeman, etc.)” Discussing drag (gay male performance of femininity) as a manifestation of camp, Newton continues, “The effect of the drag system is to wrench the sex roles loose from that which supposedly determines them, that is, genital sex.” Of course, the kind of sex-role typing Newton describes was more ubiquitous in the America of the 1960s (when she was writing this text) than it is in the twenty-first century. See also Bartlett 1999, Dollimore 1999, and Robertson 1999.

the question of authenticity versus parody, because no definitive answer exists: the tension between parody and authenticity is the condition of queer existence. This is why *normativity* takes us out of the space of camp: for example, the moment same-sex marriage becomes truly normalized as both subjective experience (i.e., the perspective of same-sex married couples) and objective perception (i.e., the perspective of the community at large), it is (or will be) no longer susceptible to camp representation, except perhaps as a kind of quaint, kitschy, nostalgic reproduction of what once would have been legible as true camp.³⁰ The same could be said of other queer formations, such as transgender identity and homosexual orientation: to the extent that they become normative, they are less susceptible to camp representation. This can be explained in purely formal terms: camp depends on incongruities of sex, gender, and kinship; to the extent that a male nurse or a female executive or a same-sex married couple no longer seem incongruous, it is no longer possible to represent them in a camp manner. This helps explain why camp is becoming increasingly *less prevalent* in contemporary queer culture

³⁰ Kitsch is only slightly less difficult to define than camp. Dictionary definitions include notions of sentimentality, vulgarity, pretentiousness, and bad taste in art or design. Cf. The University of Chicago *Theories of Media Keywords Glossary*, s.v. kitsch; includes bibliography (<http://csmt.uchicago.edu/glossary2004/navigation.htm>).

as ostensibly deviant forms of sex, gender, and kinship become gradually but inexorably normalized.³¹

Camp Performativity

Camp is performative, which means that its legibility depends on the subjectivity of its audience; that is, the camp text requires a camp reading in order to be legible as camp. Earlier I referred to performativity at it relates to gender and kinship. The performativity of camp might better be understood by comparison with the performativity of language, which refers to the tendency of some uses of language to bring about a state of affairs, rather than simply to denote a proposition.³² The classic example is the way the phrase “I do,” under the correct ritual and juridical circumstances, brings about the state of matrimony. If a language user does not understand the performative context of the declaration, he may think the statement “I do” is no different from such syntactically

³¹ Nevertheless, camp itself persists, in both quintessentially queer as well as in more mainstream forms. For the mainstreaming of camp, cf. Section IV of Cleto 1999 and Shughart and Waggoner 2008. Queer camp, with its characteristic emphasis on incongruities of sex and gender, continues to be created by queer actors, writers, filmmakers, and performance artists including Kate Bornstein (b. 1948), Charles Busch (b. 1954), John Epperson (b. 1955), and Justin Bond (b. 1963), to name just a few. The AIDS epidemic claimed a number of camp artists who would have enhanced the visibility of camp in contemporary culture had they lived, including Charles Ludlam (1943-1987) and Ethyl Eichelberger (1945-1990). Contemporary queer camp is often more overtly confrontational and political than the camp that was characteristic of more repressive sociocultural conditions. Cf. Bornstein: 1994: 159, “As outlaws--lesbians, gay men, transgendered, bisexual, or as *S/M* players--we lampoon the images of the dominant (*i.e.*, heterosexual) culture.”

³² For the classic accounts of performativity in language, also known as speech act theory, see Austin 1962 and Searle 1969.

equivalent statements as “I eat” or “I run.”³³ Similarly with camp: if an audience member at a drag show thinks the drag queens are biologically female, the camp performance is not legible as camp for that audience member. Similarly, if a viewer of an Andy Warhol rendering of a Brillo soap box thinks he or she is looking at a box of soap rather than an ironic parody of commodification, the camp force of the pop art object is totally lost. This will become important when we consider the work of several classicists who unwittingly identify camp elements in Juvenalian satire, some approvingly, others in disgust, but all unaware, it would seem, of the relevance of camp to Juvenal or of Juvenal to camp.

The performativity of camp suggests the question, if camp is largely in the eye of the beholder, does it require the conscious participation of the performer? At its most reductive, the question for the current study becomes, can the satires of Juvenal be camp if Juvenal did not think they were? The New Critical critique of the intentional fallacy would say *yes*; the author does not fully determine or control the meanings and values of a text or other object of aesthetic perception.³⁴ This New Critical critique of intentionality was taken to much more radical lengths by poststructuralist and postmodernist theorists and critics (Barthes’ death of the author or Derrida’s infinite play of signification, for

³³ Austin 1962 calls this type of utterance (“I eat,” “I am”) *constative*, meaning that it denotes a state of affairs which is either true or false. Cf. Austin 1962: 3 and *passim*.

³⁴ For the intentional fallacy cf. Wimsatt and Beardsley 1946.

example).³⁵ Be that as it may, I do not wish to depend entirely on the critique of intentionality for my license to do a camp reading of Juvenal. I contend that while Juvenal did not have access to the word “camp” or the corresponding theoretical discourse, his deployment of a camp aesthetic *avant la lettre* was nevertheless deliberate. That is, to the extent that Juvenal’s satires represent incongruous situations and juxtapositions in a theatrical manner to humorous effect in a way that tends to undermine moral pretense, I maintain that this is a creative choice, not something that simply happened willy-nilly. This is not to insist on any particular kind of political or oppositional commitment on Juvenal’s part. A camp writer, artist, or performer may intuitively subvert conventional morality in a characteristically camp manner without necessarily having a self-conscious political or philosophical agenda--or he or she may in fact have one. We do not know for sure unless he or she tells us (and even then there is always the possibility that he or she is lying, ambivalent, delusional, etc). In any event, the object itself remains legible as camp.

Dominance, Deviance, and Camp

I defined camp above as an exercise of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant. Having explored camp hallmarks, the notion of parody and authenticity, and camp performativity, we may expand upon this formulation and define camp as (1) an ironic

³⁵ For Barthes’ death of the author, cf. Barthes 1977: 142-8, esp. 142, “As soon as a fact is *narrated* no longer with a view to acting directly on reality but intransitively, that is to say, finally outside of any function other than that of the very practice of the symbol itself, this disconnection occurs, the voice loses its origin, the author enters into his own death, writing begins” (emphasis in original). For Derrida’s infinite play of signification, cf. Derrida 1978: 351-70, esp. 354, “The absence of the transcendental signified extends the domain and the play of signification infinitely.”

discourse that (2) expresses the marginal relationship of a deviant subjectivity to dominant structures of normativity, (3) asserting the dignity of deviance in the face of ridicule and (4) embracing the stigmatized identity of the deviant, marginalized other. Participating in this discourse, often referred to as having a “camp sensibility,” does not require engaging in any particular acts or having any specific political allegiance. It simply means that a camp voice ironizes the relationship between deviance and dominance and expresses solidarity with the deviant; that is, embraces a stigmatized identity which need not necessarily be its own identity. Aestheticist illustrator Aubrey Beardsley is perhaps the paradigmatic example of a camp personality who produced camp art but was not, at least on the public record, a member of any stigmatized deviant identity group.³⁶

I have appealed above to drag and pop art as characteristic examples that convey the range of camp. Let us return to these examples to clarify how dominance and deviance interact in camp. As we shall see, there are parallels to both drag and pop in Juvenal’s ninth satire.

For drag, dominance is normative conventions of sex, gender, and kinship: masculine males, feminine females, heterosexual marriage, and procreation of legitimate children. While drag is formally a type of female impersonation, Newton 1979 argues

³⁶ For Beardsley’s relationship to the homosexual underground of Oscar Wilde and his circle, see McKenna 2005: 260-3. “Yes, yes, I look like a sodomite,” McKenna 2005: 262 reports Beardsley to have said, “But, no, I am not one.” McKenna 2005: 261 describes Beardsley as “artistically and intellectually precocious, with a sharp wit and a profound interest in all matters sexual, an interest which was reflected in his frequently priapic drawings.” Of course, history does not record every closed-door encounter, but on the public record, Beardsley was of normative gender identity and sexual orientation.

persuasively that drag, at least in the time and place in which she studied it, always refers to the stigmatized identities of sex and gender deviance: that is homosexuality and effeminacy. In drag, stigmatized identity or deviance is embraced via a highly stylized and elaborate performance of femininity including not only clothing and accessories but also aspects of voice, facial expression, body habitus, and so on. In drag, the camp irony appears in the deliberate theatricality and humor of the incongruous juxtaposition of male sex with feminine gender. This ironic performance of gender deviance stands as a sort of synecdoche for the more unspeakable deviance of homosexuality and the morally troubling notion of affinity between same sex partners--what I refer to throughout this study as queer kinship. Without this irony, drag ceases to be camp, and is simply a matter of female impersonation or an earnest manifestation of transgender identity with no humorous intent.

The normative conventions of masculinity, femininity, marriage, and procreation that constitute the dominant context of drag's deviant performance of gender are the same normative conventions that form the social and historical context of Juvenal's ninth satire, notwithstanding historical differences in ideologies of masculinity. That is, Roman males were expected to be masculine, females to be feminine, and Roman marriage was a relation of affinity between one man and one woman for the procreation of children and the efficient generational transfer of paternal property. Juvenal's representation of sex, gender, and kinship deviance in the ninth satire may thus be viewed as a kind of poetic drag show, with the gender deviance and homosexual desire of heterosexually married Roman men forming the basis for a series of incongruous situations and juxtapositions

performed in a highly theatrical manner to great humorous effect, as we shall see in greater detail in Chapter Four.

For pop art, dominance is normative conventions of aesthetic beauty as conceived in the domain of fine art, the conventions of the museum and the traditional art gallery. Deviance for pop is less a matter of stigmatized identity than it is of cultural forms that are stigmatized by their vulgar association with consumer capitalism, including consumer product packaging and advertising and artifacts of consumer-oriented graphic design such as comic books and popular magazines. Pop art embraces this stigmatized form of cultural identity through the composition of objects that are deliberately positioned as art, but that appropriate the visual language of consumer design. The most iconic examples are Andy Warhol's soap boxes and soup cans, but we may also cite Roy Lichtenstein's large-scale paintings of comic book panels or James Rosenquist's combination of highly recognizable images from newspapers, magazines, and advertisements in large-scale works whose use of composition, color, brushstroke and other techniques locates them undeniably in the tradition of academic painting.

I would argue that Juvenal's declamatory style, including his frequent mythological references and literary allusions, functions in much the same way as pop-culture references in pop art.³⁷ Declamation was the mainstay of an elite Roman education, but over time it moved out of the classroom and became a form of popular entertainment, particularly as the practice of political oratory waned in the transition from

³⁷ For historical background on rhetoric in Roman society and culture, see Clarke 1996. For a theoretically informed consideration of the role of rhetoric and declamation in the formation of Roman identity, see Bartsch 1994 and Gleason 1995, as well as Gunderson 2000 (rhetoric) and 2003 (declamation).

republic to principate; in the early principate, the declamatory model was adapted to the public performance of poetry.³⁸ The professional practice of declamation was ascribed to Juvenal himself, accurately or not, in the ancient biographies. The inanity of contemporary poetry performed in public settings is the very first target at which Juvenal takes aim in his programmatic first satire, beginning with the very first words of the poem, “Am I always to be merely a member of the audience?” (*Semper ego auditor tantum?*, Juv. 1.1). To be sure, the status of the dactylic hexameter, originally associated with the lofty genre of epic in the Roman literary tradition, as the standard meter of Roman verse satire after Lucilius created a perfect opportunity for an incongruous juxtaposition of high form with low content.³⁹

Note that *deviance*, as I am using the term here, does not necessarily have a strictly moral connotation; it simply implies a remarkable departure from normative standards, which in the case of pop art means normative *aesthetic* standards. On the other hand, I would argue that moral connotations lurk just beneath the surface of most structures of normativity, even aesthetic ones, which is why pop art may ultimately have been as morally provocative a type of camp performance as drag. These moral connotations, moreover, arise both from the content and the context of the ironic camp juxtaposition. That is, there are potential moral connotations in the very existence of pop culture artifacts such as comic books (whose lurid representations of sex and violence provoked a backlash from American parents in the 1950s) or pop culture icons such as

³⁸ Cf. White 2005: 322-3.

³⁹ Pryor 1965 argues that the ninth satire represents an innovative use of mock epic tone.

Elvis Presley (a.k.a. Elvis the Pelvis) and Marilyn Monroe (the subject of a renowned nude photo shoot that provided the centerfold image for the inaugural issue of *Playboy* in 1953).⁴⁰ These substantive moral connotations are then compounded by referencing these artifacts and icons in the context of objects that position themselves as high art. As Newton 1979 explains, it is the *incongruity* of the juxtaposition between normativity and deviance that creates camp, along with the theatricality of the presentation and the appeal to humor. As Newton 1979: 107 observes, the morally provocative juxtaposition of male embodiment and feminine gender performance is “the most characteristic kind of camp, but any very incongruous contrast can be campy. For instance, juxtapositions of high and low status, youth and old age, profane and sacred functions of symbols, cheap and expensive articles are frequently used for camp purposes.” As we shall see in Chapter Four, virtually all of these types of incongruous juxtaposition are found in Juvenal’s ninth satire in the context of theatrical presentation and humorous appeal that qualify them as camp gestures.

⁴⁰ The 1954 book *Seduction of the Innocent*, by American psychiatrist Fredric Wertham, argued that comic books lead to juvenile delinquency. Congressional hearings in the same year on the role of comic books in promoting juvenile delinquency led the comic book industry to adopt the Comics Code Authority, a voluntary ratings code. For Wertham, see Beaty 2005. For the Comics Code, see Nyberg 1998.

Emergence and Development of Camp

As I noted at the outset, applying the concept of camp to Roman satire is new and different and hence controversial.⁴¹ To help understand how this important cultural concept remained so alien to classical studies for so long, I provide in this section a concise overview of camp's entry into literary criticism and cultural studies and the evolution of its association with queer existence over the past fifty years.

Camp Makes the Scene

The OED dates the use of the word *camp* in reference to a distinctive type of style to the early twentieth century.⁴² Scholars of camp date the word's usage in English to the nineteenth century, and its French antecedent, the verb *se camper* (to flaunt, posture, or pose), to as early as 1671.⁴³ But the existence of a camp "sensibility" came to the

⁴¹ Wooten 1984 argues that the *Satyricon* of Petronius is a camp text, and this short essay will be discussed below; but it remains, to my knowledge, the only attempt in classical scholarship to consider the camp legibility of an ancient text, and although it is included in bibliographies relating to homosexuality, camp, and Petronius, it does not appear to have had a major impact on classical studies generally.

⁴² For examples of usage, cf. OED Second Edition 1989 s.v. *camp*, *a.* (and *n.*⁵), with the following definition: "Ostentatious, exaggerated, affected, theatrical; effeminate or homosexual; pertaining to or characteristic of homosexuals. So as *n.*, 'camp' behavior, mannerisms, etc. (see quot. 1909); a man exhibiting such behavior." The quotation cited from 1909 is an entry from J. Redding Ware's *Passing English of the Victorian Era* and reads: "actions and gestures of exaggerated emphasis. Probably from the French. Used chiefly by persons of exceptional want of character. 'How very camp he is.'" The reference in this citation to "persons of exceptional want of character" likely refers to effeminate male homosexuals; it may also refer to "dandies," but in any case, after Oscar Wilde, many observers assumed, rightly or not, an equivalence between dandyism and homosexuality. It should be noted that the near equivalence of "camp" and "homosexual" in the OED definition cited above is more characteristic of British than of American English.

⁴³ For English usage as early as 1869 see Cleto 1999: 21. For uses of *se camper* in French literature as early as 1671 see Booth 1983: 33-39.

attention of the critical community (academics, scholars, and intellectuals) with Susan Sontag's essay, "Notes on 'Camp,'" published in the *Partisan Review* in 1964.⁴⁴ Sontag 1999: 53, influentially if not accurately, traces the appearance of the term in contemporary literature to a passage in Christopher Isherwood's 1954 novel *The World in the Evening*. In the novel, Charles Kennedy visits first-person narrator Stephen Monk and probes his awareness of camp:

"In any of your voyages au bout de la nuit, did you ever run across the word, 'camp'?"

"I've heard it used in bars. But I thought--"

"You thought it meant a swishy little boy with peroxidized hair, dressed in a picture hat and a feather boa, pretending to be Marlene Dietrich? Yes, in queer circles, they call *that* camping. It's all very well in its place, but it's an utterly debased form--" Charles' eyes shone delightedly. He seemed to be in the best of spirits, now, and thoroughly enjoying this exposition. "What I mean by camp is something much more fundamental. You can call the other Low Camp, if you like; then what I'm talking about is High Camp. High Camp is the whole emotional basis of the Ballet, for example, and of course of Baroque art. You see, true High Camp always has an underlying seriousness. You can't camp about something you don't take seriously. You're not making fun of it; you're making fun out of it. You're expressing what's basically serious to you in terms of fun and artifice and elegance. Baroque art is largely camp about religion. The Ballet is camp about love...."⁴⁵

As we can see from Isherwood's examples of ballet and the baroque, he does not restrict camp to the twentieth century (a few lines later he lists Mozart, El Greco, and

⁴⁴ Reprinted in Sontag 1966 and frequently anthologized, including in Cleto 1999. My references to this essay will be from the Cleto anthology and will thus be cited as Sontag 1999.

⁴⁵ Isherwood 1954: 125. It is instructive to see Isherwood use the term *queer* to refer to a homosocial and homosexual subculture in a novel published in 1954. Although we often think of *queer* as a term that came to replace *gay* and *homosexual*, particularly among activists and academics since the late 1980s, the fact is that *queer* as a term for homosexuals, especially homosexual men, dates to the late nineteenth century. Cf. OED Draft Revision Dec. 2007 s.v. *queer*, *n.*²

Dostoevsky).⁴⁶ Sontag is consistent with Isherwood in dating exemplars of camp to early modernity, calling the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries “the great period” of camp.⁴⁷ Sontag also concurs with Isherwood in associating camp with queerness, or what she calls, in the polite nomenclature of 1964, homosexuality: “While it’s not true that Camp taste *is* homosexual taste, there is no doubt a peculiar affinity and overlap.”⁴⁸

Somewhat parallel to Isherwood’s opposition between high and low camp is Sontag’s opposition between naïve and deliberate camp, claiming that deliberate camp is “usually less satisfying.”⁴⁹ Sontag refers to deliberate camp as “camping” (with inverted commas), echoing the Isherwood passage (“a swishy little boy...they call *that* camping”).⁵⁰ It is here that Sontag begins rhetorically to exclude gay people from the kind of camp she values, allowing gay people access to the more satisfying “naïve, or

⁴⁶ Bear in mind that Isherwood’s account appears in the context of a conversation between interlocutors in a novel, not in a critical treatise. It thus represents the ideas of a character in a work of fiction, not the claims of critical or scholarly discourse. Nevertheless, it does provide information about a historically specific subjective perspective on camp (in particular, the perspective of a white, Anglo-American, middle class homosexual man in the United States in the mid twentieth century). As such, it has been a very influential account and remains an important starting point for discussions of camp.

⁴⁷ Sontag 1999: 57. In particular, many associate camp with the enthusiasm for artifice and excess of Versailles. Cf. Sontag 1999: 57; Booth 1999: 75-9; Cleto 1999: 93.

⁴⁸ Sontag 1999: 64. Newton 1979: 110 quotes one of her informers, a female impersonator interviewed in the late 1960s, as saying that “*homosexuality is not* camp. But you take a camp, and she turns around and she makes homosexuality funny, but not ludicrous: funny, but not ridiculous...this is a great, great art.” (Emphasis and ellipsis in original) Note the use of “camp” as a noun referring to persons, a usage now obsolete. The editor’s main introduction (“Queering the Camp”) and section introductions in Cleto 1999 provide a very useful overview of how the discourse of camp has been imbricated with the evolving discourse of same-sex desire (homosexuality, gayness, queerness) from Isherwood to the present.

⁴⁹ Ibid. 59.

⁵⁰ Sontag 1999: 59; Isherwood 1954: 125.

pure, Camp” (1999: 59) only as audience, not as practitioners. She considers the plays of Noel Coward, for example, to be mere “camping,” that is, the deliberate and less satisfying form of camp, and thus excludes them from her canon of “pure” camp.⁵¹ Sontag associates camp taste with “snob taste,” and argues that “since no authentic aristocrats in the old sense exist today to sponsor special tastes...the bearer of this taste... [is] an improvised self-elected class, mainly homosexuals, who constitute themselves as aristocrats of taste.”⁵² Sontag thus inaugurates a long-running debate about the necessity and sufficiency of the relationship between camp and same-sex desire (homosexuality, gayness, queerness). In other words, is camp, or is camp not, the “gay sensibility,” and if it is, what does that mean?⁵³ Via her “Notes on ‘Camp’” and a series of other essays in the *Nation*, *Partisan Review*, and elsewhere (culminating in her 1966 book *Against Interpretation and Other Essays*), Sontag branded the popular consciousness with the notion of camp as a type of taste or sensibility contingently associated with homosexuals but available to anyone and everyone who knew where to look and what to look for.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Sontag 1999: 58.

⁵² Sontag 1999: 64. She continues, “...not all homosexuals have Camp taste. But homosexuals, by and large, constitute the vanguard--and the most articulate audience--of Camp.” I cannot help but be put in mind of the opening words of Juvenal’s first satire, *Semper ego auditor tantum...?* (Am I always to be an audience member only...?). I elaborate below on the satirist’s position as cultural outsider and self-appointed arbiter of (camp) taste.

⁵³ See virtually all of the essays in Cleto 1999, as well as the editor’s main introduction (“Queering the Camp”) and section introductions.

⁵⁴ For bibliography see Cleto 1999: 461ff. Referring to the rapid and widespread influence of “Notes on ‘Camp,’” Cleto 1999: 46 writes, “Within weeks camp literally exploded as a mass media keyword, precisely because of its relevance to the contemporary cultural order, given the fashionable transgression, excitement and ‘in’ value of camp.”

The Queer Claim to Camp

While camp caught on as a popular “way of relishing mass culture” (Sontag 1966: 231) and a strong influence on the creation of pop cultural objects (James Bond films, the *Batman* television series, *Rowan & Martin’s Laugh-In*, to name a few of the popular camp products of the mid-to-late 1960s), its cachet in critical circles was surprisingly short-lived. As Cleto 1999: 46-7 notes, “As early as 1974 Louis Rubin Jr. could easily affirm the sterility of Sontag’s claim for anti-hermeneutic (surface-oriented) criticism in *Against Interpretation* by ironising on the virtual disappearance of her ‘camp followers.’” Camp remained centrally important, however, to the emerging discourse of an increasingly self-conscious gay community. The gay commitment to camp was inextricably bound up with gay activism, a nascent gay pride movement, and the emerging field of gay studies.⁵⁵ Esther Newton’s *Mother Camp*, originally published in 1972 and based on a doctoral dissertation completed in 1968, was the first study to assess the role of camp within the homosexual subculture. Newton, trained as a sociologist, documents the world of female impersonators, as found both in theatrical performance settings and in daily life, in which camp and drag are distinct but equally central phenomena.

In the settings Newton studied, camp was a kind of performance and even a mode of existence largely organized around notions of gender identity in terms of the dichotomies male/female and inside/outside. Drag, Newton claims, “symbolizes two

⁵⁵ See Cleto 1999: 88 and Dilley 2002: 396, who reports that the first undergraduate gay studies courses “appear to have been offered in the late 1960s at New York University and Yale University” and that the first gay studies program was inaugurated in 1972 at California State University, Sacramento.

somewhat conflicting statements concerning the sex-role system.” One, that the sex-role system is natural and that homosexuals are therefore unnatural; two, that the sex-role system is unnatural, implying that sex-role behavior is achieved rather than inherited and can be manipulated at will.⁵⁶ The idea that sex roles are natural can be seen as a formulation, deriving from within drag practice itself, of an essentialist view of gender identity and sexual desire, while the denaturalization of sex roles, equally characteristic of drag practice, may be seen as a formulation of an anti-essentialist view of gender and sexuality. Newton argues that drag symbolizes both of these assertions (the naturalizing/essentialist and the denaturalizing/anti-essentialist) on two levels of increasing complexity. On the level of gender performance, the drag queen appears to be a woman, while on the level of biological embodiment, she is male; however, at what she perceives to be an even deeper level of reality, the drag queen experiences herself subjectively as a woman. Thus, her surface appearance corresponds with her innermost subjective reality, bypassing or negating, as it were, the subjectively inauthentic external body.

These observations about the nature of drag queen gender identity and sexual embodiment are relevant to an understanding of effeminate men in antiquity, including the *cinaedi* that feature so prominently in Juvenal’s second satire as well as appearing

⁵⁶ Newton 1979: 3 refers to camp as “homosexual humor and taste,” citing it as a skill possessed by clever drag queens. Cf. Newton 1979: 100-103. By *sex-role system*, Newton seems to mean the idea that men are masculine and sexually desire women, while women are feminine and sexually desire men; thus, “sex-role” combines gender identity and sexual orientation. Cf. the notion of a sex/gender system posited in Rubin 1975. The susceptibility of gender to manipulation “at will” is an assumption that was imputed to Judith Butler by many critics on the basis of Butler 1990. Butler, however, claimed that it was never her intention to argue that gender could be manipulated at will, and she explicitly clarified her stance in later writings, in particular Butler 1993a.

elsewhere in Juvenal and in other Roman texts. Much scholarship touching on *cinaedi* has viewed them primarily from the perspective of the dominant discourse as failures of normative Roman masculinity. While this approach offers a necessary elucidation of the dominant Roman discourse of gender normativity, it simultaneously runs the risk of reproducing the marginalization, stigmatization, and oppression of gender deviants. Newton, by contrast, provides us with a model for understanding gender-deviant or transgender subjectivity in a way that resists such othering and its oppressive consequences, or at least challenges the justice of such conceptualizations. Applying Newton's model to the study of Roman *cinaedi* and the texts that represents them may facilitate counterhegemonic readings that champion the dignity of queer existence. For example, Walters 1998 analyzes Juvenal's second satire through an anti-essentialist framework, contending that the poem functions to define normativity by representing deviation from the norm in the existence of the gender-deviant *cinaedi*.⁵⁷ While he hints at the deconstructive notion that the dominant discourse actually *requires* deviance in order to construct normativity, and that normative masculinity thus depends for its own existence on the existence, real or imaginary, of gender-deviant, effeminate others to be marginalized, stigmatized, and despised, he does not in fact make this argument outright.

The formations of camp performance and drag queen existence described by Newton correspond to ideas about homosexual definition characteristic of the post-World War II era in the United States, as well as to aspects of the homophile movement of the

⁵⁷ Williams 2010: 137 is eloquent in this regard: "Effeminate men constitute a negative paradigm: in their failure to live up to standards of masculine comportment, they are what real men are not, and real men are what effeminate men are not."

pre-Stonewall era and the gay liberationist movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s.⁵⁸ Newton, along with film scholars Richard Dyer and Jack Babuscio, restored the connection between camp and queerness (on the level of practice, not just perception) that was severed, or at least severely strained, by Sontag.⁵⁹ These writers argued that camp was a characteristically queer (gay, homosexual) strategy for coping with the burden of social stigma. As Babuscio puts it, camp was “a means of dealing with a hostile environment and, in the process, of defining a positive identity.”⁶⁰

The Crisis of Camp

Since the 1970s, the connection established by Newton, Dyer, Babuscio and others between camp aesthetics and queer existence has remained unbroken. Nevertheless, the valence of camp theory and practice has shifted over the last four decades, as the inclusive ideology of gay liberation evolved first into a fragmented

⁵⁸ Cf. Jagose 1996 and Seidman 1993. Seidman 1993: 112 notes that “Gay liberation theory materialized in the post-Stonewall period between roughly 1969 and 1973. Jagose 1996 follows Seidman in this chronology. Interestingly, 1973 is the year that the American Psychiatric Association decided to drop the pathologizing diagnosis of homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (cf. Bayer 1987: 3). The term *Stonewall* refers to the series of violent protests and street demonstrations in June 1969 in response to a police raid on the Stonewall Inn, a gay bar in New York City. As Carter 2004:1 notes, “These riots are widely credited with being the motivational force in the transformation of the gay political movement.”

⁵⁹ Cf. Cleto 1999: 89ff; Dyer 1999; Babuscio 1999.

⁶⁰ Babuscio 1999: 126. Dyer 1999: 110 and *passim* specifically associates camp with gay *male* subculture; indeed, lesbians were virtually absent from camp theory until the appearance of Case 1999 (originally published in 1988), which explores the characteristically lesbian butch-femme dynamic as a variety of camp performance.

rhetoric of identity politics and then into a more expansive discourse of queer theory.⁶¹ These shifts in the connotations of camp are relevant to the legibility of Juvenal's ninth satire as a camp text because they may help account for the apparent lack of interest in camp among classicists during the period in question, including gay classicists occupied with gender studies and the history of sexuality. In particular, camp's appeal as a survival strategy for gay people living in a homophobic world waned somewhat in the ambience of identity politics that prevailed beginning in the mid 1970s. In 1978, Andrew Britton objected that, "in a contemporary context, gay camp seems little more than a kind of anaesthetic, allowing one to remain inside oppressive relations while enjoying the illusory confidence that one is flouting them." Britton concludes, "Camp has a certain minimal value, in restricted contexts, as a form of *épater les bourgeois*; but the pleasure...of shocking solid citizens should not be confused with radicalism. ...Camp is simply one way in which gay men have recuperated their oppression, and it needs to be criticised as such."⁶²

Britton's essay is the clearest example of what Cleto 1999: 91 calls the "crisis of camp as a gay discourse." In an environment where homophobic oppression is no longer acceptable as natural or right, there is no longer a rationale for the kind of survivalist strategy implied by camp. Thus, in the 1980s, a burgeoning field of gay studies tended to focus on the historicization of camp as a mode of performance originally associated more

⁶¹ For a concise historical overview of gay liberation, identity politics, and queer theory as social and discursive formations, see Jagose 1996. For a more theoretical account, see Seidman 1993. Lesbian feminism is also part of this history, to some extent bridging gay liberation and identity politics. See Jagose 1996: 44-57 and Seidman 1993.

⁶² Britton 1999: 138-42. Note the pun on the idea of a "camp aesthetic" in Britton's assertion of camp as an "anaesthetic."

with effeminacy than with homosexuality, but increasingly adopted by the emerging homosexual minority and consolidating the publicly legible existence of the homosexual as a “species” in the sense posited by Michel Foucault, with Oscar Wilde understood by many gay scholars as the originary camp queer, and the Wilde trials of 1895 seen as a watershed event in the legibility of camp and queerness as such.⁶³ Thus, camp was increasingly dismissed by gay scholars in the 1970s as being out of synch with an identity politics agenda, and was historicized as a phenomenon of Wilde’s Britain by many gay scholars in the 1980s. At precisely the time when classicists were beginning to reevaluate sex and gender in antiquity (see below), camp was losing prestige as an analytic framework that might have a place in the queer reception of classical texts.

The Reemergence of Camp

In the transition from identity politics to queer theory in the 1990s, camp regained ground as a contemporary (not merely historical) site of resistance to oppression, as the goal of queer activism became not the assimilation of gay men and lesbians into mainstream society, but rather the destabilization of sex and gender categories and a rejection of mainstream normativities in general. Alongside the historicization of queerness and camp via the postmodern reevaluation (and gay scholarly reclamation) of Oscar Wilde, other developments renewed the relevance of camp to contemporary queer discourse. Judith Butler introduced the notion of gender performativity in her 1990 book *Gender Trouble*, a germinal text of queer theory that privileged drag as a site of the

⁶³ Cf. Cleto 1999: 91-95; Beaver 1999; Bartlett 1999; Foucault 1978: 43. This line of argument culminates in such studies as Dollimore 1988, Cohen 1993, Sinfield 1994, and Koestenbaum 1996.

denaturalization of gender.⁶⁴ In the same year, Jenny Livingston's film *Paris Is Burning* increased the public visibility of camp by documenting the drag ball culture of New York City in the 1980s within a predominantly African American and Latino gay and transgendered community.⁶⁵ While much early historiography and theory focused on camp as a practice of a gay male subculture, later scholars extended the discourse of camp to women's performances of femininity (Robertson 1996) and lesbian reinscription of heteronormative sex and gender formations via butch-femme role play (Bornstein 1994, Case 1999). Muñoz 1999 extends the discourses of both queer and camp to encompass nonwhite racial and ethnic groups, using the term *disidentification* to refer to a process whereby queer/camp performances of race and ethnicity denaturalize dominant cultural representations of racial and ethnic stereotypes "in a fashion that both exposes the encoded message's universalizing and exclusionary machinations and recircuits its workings to account for, include, and empower minority identities and identifications."⁶⁶

My own choice to engage in a camp reading of Juvenal's ninth satire grows out of this reemergence of camp as a characteristically queer reparative cultural practice. For one thing, the fact that camp has expanded its tent to include performers and audiences other than members of a twentieth-century gay white male subculture supports my license to view Roman satire through a camp interpretive lens. Even more important are recent

⁶⁴ As a pun not only on the euphemistic phrase "female trouble" but also on the title of the 1974 John Waters film *Female Trouble*, the very title of Butler's text gestures towards camp and itself constitutes a camp gesture.

⁶⁵ Important discussions of *Paris Is Burning* include "Is Paris Burning?" in hooks 1992 and "Gender Is Burning: Questions of Appropriation and Subversion" in Butler 1993b.

⁶⁶ Muñoz 1999: 31.

advances in the theory of camp and its relationship to sex, gender, and kinship deviance. Characteristic of the emergent queer discourse on camp is the notion of parodic sex, gender, and kinship performances as *transgressive reinscriptions* of heteronormative formations; that is, engaging in a performance that challenges the exclusive claim to authenticity of the putative original of which the parody is perceived to be an imitation.⁶⁷ Thus, I would argue that in Juvenal's ninth satire, even though the ménage à trois among Naevolus, his patron, and the patron's wife is represented as deviant (that is, indeed, part of its camp humor), its success in satisfying its members' needs for sexual pleasure, procreation, and material support calls into question the inevitability of "traditional marriage" as the uniquely natural or viable way to achieve those objectives.

Why Not Classics?

If the discourse of camp has remained so vibrant among queer artists, activists, and scholars, why was it never widely appropriated as an analytic framework for the study of classical texts? Had Isherwood wished to reach further back into history, he might well have cited the "underlying seriousness" beneath the "fun and artifice and elegance" of the poets Catullus and Martial, the verse satirists Lucilius, Horace, Persius, and Juvenal, or the prose authors Petronius and Apuleius. In fact, fleeting attempts to include classical antiquity within the purview of camp were made in the 1980s. Mark Booth, in the first book-length monograph on camp, hints at a camp aesthetic at work in the *Satyricon* of Petronius when he cites Trimalchio as the earliest exemplar of the

⁶⁷ The phrase "transgressive reinscription" is Dollimore's, and the concept is explained at length throughout Dollimore 1991; see also Robertson 1996 (both of these texts are excerpted in Dollimore 1999 and Robertson 1999).

archetype of the bourgeois gentleman, “the butt of camp scorn, a ludicrous figure pretending to wit and style, but totally devoid of them.”⁶⁸ In *Camp: The Lie That Tells the Truth*, his encyclopedic compendium of camp people, places and things, Philip Core includes not only Catullus, but also Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768), the pioneering classical archaeologist who “in a rhapsody more erotic than aesthetic, wrote about his revealing passion for the Belvedere Torso.”⁶⁹

But these passing references to classical authors or scholars in the literature of camp were made by well educated humanists, not classicists. As I noted above, Isherwood and Sontag were influential in setting the historical parameters of camp, and despite his crucial reference to Petronius, Booth’s emphasis on an etymological approach (that is, seeking the origins of the camp phenomenon in the history of a particular usage of the word “camp”) reinforced the sense of camp as an early modern phenomenon. To be sure, classicist Cecil Wooten in 1984 published a brief essay in *Helios* entitled “Petronius and ‘Camp.’” Citing Sontag’s definition of camp to demonstrate the aptness of her definition to the *Satyricon*, Wooten focuses on Petronian examples of the theatricalization of experience and the undermining of seriousness.⁷⁰ I will discuss Wooten’s essay in detail below; but here, I want to address the question of why classicists beyond Wooten did not pick up on the applicability of a camp framework to the analysis of classical texts despite the cultural prominence of Sontag’s initial popularization of the phenomenon and

⁶⁸ Booth 1983: 136.

⁶⁹ Core 1984: 50, 201.

⁷⁰ Cf. Wooten 1984: 133, 133-5.

the tantalizing hints dropped by Booth and Core about the camp potential of Catullus and Petronius.

There are a number of possible explanations. For one thing, classicists were probably not reading Booth and Core in great numbers, let alone Sontag, Newton, Babuscio, or Dyer. For another, an argument can be made that the strategies of containment discussed in Chapter One achieved their objective, and the more ribald, transgressive, and potentially subversive aspects of classical literature and culture had, through such tactics as expurgation and bowdlerization as well as via the permitted and encouraged standards of research and teaching, been successfully hidden from the view of all but the most highly trained classical philologists or their most incorrigibly inquisitive students. To put it more bluntly, classics as a professional discipline had no interest in associating itself with a theoretical framework that was so closely connected not only with modernity, but also, and perhaps more importantly, with homosexuality, despite the demonstrable applicability of that framework to particular Roman texts or the actions of particular Roman historical figures.⁷¹

⁷¹ As I will detail below, Wooten 1984: 138 sees camp tendencies in Neronian literature and in the behavior of Nero himself. I contend that these tendencies are also evident in literature of the Flavian and Nervan-Antonine periods. On the general climate of theatricality and performance in the Roman principate, see Bartsch 1994 and Duncan 2006. To a great extent, however, arbitrary lists of which authors or texts “count” as camp are beside the point, regardless of whether we are talking about antiquity or modernity. Among other things, camp is a way of reading, a way of interpreting incongruous juxtapositions in all sorts of texts and performances that gesture towards instabilities in the opposition between dominance and deviance and towards the tension between parody and authenticity in counter-normative forms of existence. Moreover, camp is by no means limited to witty references to sex, gender, and kinship deviance. Wooten 1984: 137, for example, claims that Lucan’s *Pharsalia* and Seneca’s tragedies are susceptible to a camp reading.

Moreover, as I discussed above, for all its ubiquity in the popular culture of the later 1960s, camp quickly lost its grip on the public imagination, becoming a nostalgic fad to all but its most tenacious exponents within early gay activism and a nascent field of gay studies. Classics, however, tended to lag behind the rest of the humanities in joining critical movements like New Criticism or adopting critical concepts like persona theory.⁷² Thus, we could expect classics at best to have arrived late to camp (pun intended). Nor did the fact that camp's influence beyond the 1960s persisted chiefly in lesbian and gay circles help its cause among classicists. Indeed, *defining a positive gay identity*, which early camp theorists like Babuscio and Newton cited as a major function of camp, was not something that was ever strongly encouraged in the field of classics, and in fact was barely tolerated until the entry into the profession of openly gay and lesbian classicists in the 1980s, including those who formed the Lesbian and Gay Classical Caucus of the American Philological Association in 1989 (later renamed the Lambda Classical Caucus).

Cinematic Camp and Classical Antiquity

As I noted above, Mark Booth identified camp aspects of Petronius in 1983, and Philip Core included Catullus in his encyclopedic 1984 compendium of camp people and objects, setting precedents for the camp appeal of classical authors and texts among well educated humanists who were not professional classicists. Apparently alone among classicists, Cecil Wooten attempted a serious if lackluster exploration of the *Satyricon* as a representation of camp subjectivity in a homosexual context (see below). But as I

⁷² Cf. Anderson 1982: 9, "Light comes to the darkened minds of Classicists these days from their more sophisticated colleagues in English."

argued in the previous section, distaste among professional classicists throughout most of the last century for things lowbrow, as well as for things having the scent of homosexuality,⁷³ kept camp largely outside the critical vocabulary of the discipline. Beyond academia, however, a series of cinematic receptions of ancient Rome found the potential for a camp reading of Roman history, authors, and texts virtually irresistible.⁷⁴

Hollywood's historical, biblical, and mythological epics often have an inherent camp quality based simply on the theatrical grandeur of their large casts, extravagant costumes, and elaborate sets.⁷⁵ But I would not propose that the cinematic camp of bad acting in Joseph L. Mankiewicz's *Cleopatra* (1963) or of cheesy special effects in Desmond Davis' *Clash of the Titans* (1981) provides an intriguing rationale for a camp approach to classical texts. What I am interested in, rather, is the way some films have used classical mythology, history, or literature as an imaginative realm within which to explore transgressive performances of sex, gender, and kinship via camp's characteristic

⁷³ In the preface to the reissue of *The Maculate Muse*, originally published in 1975, Jeffrey Henderson 1991: vii writes, "Friends warned me that I was unlikely to get the dissertation published even if I did manage to say something worthwhile about comic obscenity, which they doubted. One professor was sympathetic but suggested I write the dissertation in Latin, while another angrily asked, 'How could you do this to Aristophanes?'"

⁷⁴ For the cinematic reception of ancient Rome, cf. Wyke 1997; Joshel, Malamud, and McGuire 2001; Solomon 2001; Winkler 2001; and Cyrino 2005.

⁷⁵ I have been arguing that camp is a mode of subjectivity characterized by the deployment of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant; but from Sontag on, another usage of the term *camp* has been to describe cultural artifacts that are egregiously extravagant, ostentatious, and, in these and other respects, "so bad, they're good." This kind of camp is certainly transgressive, in that it violates canons of good taste. It may be subversive; it may even, in a symbolic or metaphorical sense, express solidarity with the deviant. Here, though, I am simply pointing out that cinematic receptions of ancient Rome have sometimes been characterized as *camp* in a way that I am not particularly focused on in this study.

techniques of incongruity, theatricality, and humor and its characteristic gesture of embracing stigmatized identities while rejecting stigmatizing ideologies. In such films as the Italian peplum or sword and sandal films; the Hollywood epics or toga films; a number of Roman camp comedies produced in Britain; and such art-house films as *Fellini Satyricon* (1969) and Derek Jarman's *Sebastiane* (1976), the distance of classical antiquity provides a safe imaginative space in which to represent deviant formations of sex, gender, and kinship. While these films are primarily concerned with making statements about the present, they nevertheless reveal a camp potential in both the historical individuals and events on which they are based and the classical texts from which our knowledge of history and historical figures derives.

The camp dimension of cinematic receptions of ancient Rome is a broad topic that I include here mostly as a suggestive hint and a direction for future research. Thus I will not cover most examples in detail, but only note in brief some recent scholarship in this area. Fitzgerald 2001 argues that Hollywood epics including *Ben-Hur* (1959) and *Quo Vadis* (1961) serve to reinforce the centrality of Christian values to American society while eliding the subversive, counterhegemonic implications of early Christianity. While Fitzgerald does not address the notion of camp, I discern camp potential in these films' highly theatrical and exaggerated portrayals of Roman social decadence and political corruption, as well as their representation of the interplay between homosocial relations

and homoerotic desire among men.⁷⁶ Cull 2001 focuses squarely on camp in his discussion of comic representations of ancient Rome in the British films *Carry On Cleo* (1964), *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum* (1966), and *Up Pompeii!*, the title of a television series running from 1969 to 1970 and a cinema spinoff released in 1971. To be sure, the well developed tradition of British camp comedy was primarily concerned with issues of gender, sexuality, and class in contemporary British society, but its camp send-up of ancient Rome ultimately points to an analogous camp potential in the ancient textual and material remains on which it is based, from the biographies of Plutarch and Suetonius to the comedies of Plautus and the lascivious texts of Petronius, Martial, and Juvenal, among others. In her discussion of Derek Jarman's 1976 film *Sebastiane*, Wyke 2001 explores Jarman's transfiguration of Roman decadence and corruption into a site of liberated same-sex desire. Again, while Jarman's concerns are primarily presentist rather than historical, his transvaluation of Roman motifs suggests a commensurate multivalence in the ancient sources. While the study of the 1969 film *Fellini Satyricon* in Sullivan 2001 is not concerned with camp aesthetics, the author's exploration of the moral ambiguities inherent in both the modern film and its ancient source text are relevant to an assessment of camp elements in Petronius that goes beyond

⁷⁶ The 1925 film version of *Ben-Hur*, directed by Fred Niblo and starring the androgynously alluring Ramon Novarro as Ben-Hur and the muscularly masculine Francis X. Bushman as Messala, has its own set of camp resonances, as does the enormously popular 1880 novel by Lew Wallace on which the subsequent films were based. For the concept of homosociality, see Sedgwick 1985. The concept originated in history and the social sciences to describe social relations between members of the same sex, and since Sedgwick 1985 (where the concept is applied to a reading of literary texts) has become an important concept in the study of gender and sexuality. For an application of the concept to women in antiquity, see Rabinowitz and Auanger 2002.

that outlined by Wooten 1984. Günsberg 2005 explores the negotiation of homosociality and homoeroticism in the so-called peplum or sword and sandal films made in Italy between 1957 and 1965. As with the other films cited above, these Italian cinematic receptions of Rome include elements of incongruity, theatricality, and exaggeration that suggest a camp potential in the broad range of ancient sources by which they are inspired. Fredrick 2008 explores the “violated male body” in cinematic portrayals of Rome and gives a reading of Julie Taymor’s film *Titus* (1999) against Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus*. Since the normative Roman male body is inviolable under normal circumstances, the trope of violation is incongruous and thus has immediate camp potential, especially since it involves incongruity in the domain of sex and gender.

My contention is that these cinematic receptions of Rome, in their representations of sex, gender, and kinship deviance, often gesture towards a morally ambivalent tension between stigmatized identity and stigmatizing ideology. Fredrick 2008: 214 evokes “the long line of Roman emperors in the movies who eat, drink, and mince their way across the screen, tongue-lashing their inferiors but simpering before their wives,” including Nero, as portrayed by Charles Laughton in *The Sign of the Cross* (1932), directed by Cecil B. DeMille, and by Peter Ustinov in *Quo Vadis* (1951), directed by Mervyn LeRoy. Fredrick claims that “the paradigm of imperial mincing and screaming” is the emperor Caligula, as portrayed by Jay Robinson in *The Robe* (1953), directed by Henry Koster, and its sequel, *Demetrius and the Gladiators* (1954), directed by Delmer Daves.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ The portrayal of Caligula by John Hurt in the 1976 BBC production, *I, Claudius*, seems to owe much to this cinematic pedigree. I thank Craig Williams for bringing this example to my attention.

Fredrick writes, “Drawing upon Laughton’s precedent, but without the baby fat, Robinson splays himself across Rome’s furniture in poses both effeminate and improbably uncomfortable, and then rises to deliver his lines in a quavering, ever-increasing shriek.” Fredrick 2008: 215 continues,

Alternately effeminate and extravagant in their mannerisms, all three emperors are also characterized by sexual inadequacy. Both Neros are cuckolded by their Poppaeas, while Robinson’s Caligula remains strangely unmarried and asexual. However, the woman who plays the empress role in *Demetrius and the Gladiators*, Susan Hayward’s Messalina, openly pursues Victor Mature’s Demetrius and temporarily spirits him away to her pleasure villa. While married to Claudius, who will replace Caligula after his murder by the palace guard, Messalina spends most of the movie panting for Demetrius while at Caligula’s side, essentially cuckolding both the present and the future emperor.

Perhaps the most striking example of this phenomenon appears in a scene from the 1960 film *Spartacus*, directed by Stanley Kubrick from a screen adaptation by Dalton Trumbo of the novel by Howard Fast. The film includes a scene in which Marcus Licinius Crassus, played by Laurence Olivier, is being attended at his bath by the slave Antoninus, played by Tony Curtis. The following dialogue ensues:

Crassus: Do you eat oysters?
 Antoninus: When I have them, master.
 Crassus: Do you eat snails?
 Antoninus: No, master.
 Crassus: Do you consider the eating of oysters to be moral and the eating of snails to be immoral?
 Antoninus: No, master.
 Crassus: Of course not. It is all a matter of taste, isn't it?
 Antoninus: Yes, master.
 Crassus: And taste is not the same as appetite, and therefore not a question of morals.
 Antoninus: It could be argued so, master.

Crassus: My robe, Antoninus. My taste includes both snails and oysters.⁷⁸

When next Crassus turns to address Antoninus, the slave has slipped away, escaping to join Spartacus and the slave revolt. In this brief dialogue, oysters and snails are coded references to and heterosexual and homosexual intercourse, respectively, and the scene represents Crassus' attempted sexual seduction of Antoninus. As Fredrick 2008: 221-2 argues:

[Director] Stanley Kubrick...here...represent[s] deviant Roman sexual appetites through food, overlapping mouth with genitals. ...Reducing both male and female objects of desire to foodstuffs to be consumed, the metaphor conveys Crassus's tyrannical, and stereotypically Roman, infatuation with power. At the same time, however, the scene provocatively reverses the customary arrangement of gendered positions of viewing in mainstream Hollywood movies. The male body is here fetishized, presented behind see-through drapery with lighting and poses that call attention to, but do not finally expose, the genitals. This is particularly clear when Crassus calls for his robe and emerges from the bath. Antoninus has been provided with a kind of bathing suit, but the viewer is led to believe that Crassus is naked. As he rises, the bathrobe is wrapped around him precisely at the moment his genitals are about to be revealed, replaying with the male body the treatment of the female body in countless other movies, Roman or not. Like Mercia and Joyzelle [in *The Sign of the Cross*], or Claudette Colbert [as Poppaea] and Vivian Tobin [as the courtesan Dacia] in asses' milk [in the same film], Antoninus and Crassus are both offered up as sexual objects, visual snails, for the viewer.

In addition to representing deviant sexual appetites and fetishizing the male body, the dialogue implicitly addresses the moral ambiguity of same-sex desire, and the impulse to undermine that ambiguity by displacing deviant desire from the realm of the immoral to

⁷⁸ As cited in "Memorable Quotes for Spartacus (1960)" on the Internet Movie Database, available at <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0054331/quotes>, accessed on December 28, 2009. Also cited in Russo 1987: 120 with slight variation.

the morally neutral realm of personal taste.⁷⁹ Fredrick 2008: 22 puts this scene in a larger cinematic context of sex and gender deviance in cinematic receptions of ancient Rome:

While this episode from *Spartacus* is particularly explicit, it simply brings to the surface the element of male-male desire and fetishizing of the male body common to bathing scenes, which, like orgies, are a staple of classic Roman movies. As such, the Roman bath would be adapted by Derek Jarman to become THE scene in his overtly homoerotic *Sebastiane*. Well over half of the total run time of this movie is devoted to extended, highly fetishized scenes of males splashing about in showers, streams, and the sea, often under the openly desirous gaze of other males. By staging her orgies [in the 1999 film *Titus*] around and in the circular pool, [director Julie] Taymor manages to evoke both bath and orgy scenes from the tradition of Roman movies, scenes that carry with them their association of transgressive same-sex desire with eating and the scopophilic exposure of the male body to the gaze.

This brief cinematic moment in *Spartacus* has several important implications for my argument about the camp legibility of classical antiquity. First, the conflation of homosociality with homoeroticism, the suggestions of sex and gender deviance, and the presence of verbal wit all contribute to the camp legibility of this cinematic text. Second, while the sexual ambiguity, moral ambivalence, and witty language and imagery are all products of the filmmakers' imagination, their presence suggests a perception on the part of the filmmakers that these camp elements are at least potentially legible in the cultural and historical texts of which the film is a cinematic reception. Thus, these filmmakers are performing a camp reading of classical antiquity that would scarcely have been endorsed (at least in writing) by most classical scholars at the time of this film's production. It is

⁷⁹ The same analogy between sexual preference and taste is made, incidentally or not so incidentally, by Halperin 1990: 27 (who refers explicitly to culinary taste) and Parker 1997: 55 and 56 (not explicitly culinary), in both cases in the context of arguments for why same-sex desire in antiquity was not tantamount to sexual orientation in the modern sense.

noteworthy, too, that this scene was omitted from the film before its original release and only restored in a 1991 reconstruction.⁸⁰ Thus, as we saw in Chapter One in a different context, expurgation serves to elide sexual ambiguity and moral ambivalence from the modern reception of ancient Rome, and the potential for camp subversion of stigmatizing ideology is suppressed along with the camp text itself.⁸¹

The Sex and Gender Turning Point in Classics

While camp is by no means limited to witty sexual references, it is connected by history and definition with sex and gender deviance. Thus, until classicists were comfortable writing about sex and gender in both their normative and deviant forms, it was in practical terms unlikely that literary or historical analyses within a camp theoretical framework could take place within classics. The field of classics reached a kind of turning point with regard to the serious study of sex and sexuality in classical society and culture in the mid 1970s, with the publication of studies such as Henderson's *The Maculate Muse* (1975), Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* (1978), and Adams' *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (1981). I contend that while none of these studies mentions camp or

⁸⁰ I have been unable to document precisely who was responsible for cutting the scene, but the salient fact is that the film was produced during the period (1930 to 1968) when the Motion Picture Production Code of the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) remained in force, and the film would have had to receive MPAA approval in order to be commercially released. Thus, it matters little whether the scene was cut prior to submission for MPAA approval or in response to a request from the MPAA; in either case, the scene was cut by the filmmakers, as part of a regime of voluntary industry self-censorship, to ensure MPAA approval and consequent commercial viability. For censorship and regulation of Hollywood films in the studio era, see Bernstein 2000.

⁸¹ On further implications of the film *Spartacus* for ideologies of masculinity, see Hark 1993.

engages in camp analysis, each of them contributes to creating the conditions in which classicists could begin to think and write about camp.

Henderson's Maculate Muse

Henderson's groundbreaking study of obscene language in Attic comedy is particularly relevant in this regard, not least because the very notion of a muse who is maculate (spotted, soiled, stained, or defiled) is suggestive of camp's fascination with the perverse nature of the despised and the abject.⁸² This is not to suggest that Henderson offers a camp reading of obscenity in Attic comedy; but his study takes at least two steps in the direction of a camp analysis. First, he insists on the integral thematic relevance of sexual and scatological humor, as well as of representations of homosexuality, to the plays of Aristophanes and other poets of Old Comedy.⁸³ Second, he argues for a sociological function of metaphorical obscenity in Attic comedy, whereby "the mind manipulates comparisons, symbols, and verbal displacements to identify objects and acts subject to underlying feelings of hostility, anxiety, and desire, and to achieve pleasure in their expression."⁸⁴ Henderson thus makes the study of *perverse wit* an acceptable pursuit for classical scholarship, thereby creating an opening for a camp perspective on texts such as Juvenal's ninth satire, among many others.

Henderson's maculate muse, however, is not a camp muse per se, and Henderson certainly does not suggest that obscene humor in Aristophanes serves, in a camp manner, to redeem the abject or reclaim the despised; quite the contrary: "Sex with prostitutes as

⁸² Cf. OED Draft Revision Sept. 2009 s.v. maculate.

⁸³ Cf. Henderson 1991: xiv.

⁸⁴ Henderson 1991: 41.

well as with older homosexual objects is nearly always frowned upon by the poet and is at best a poor substitute for normal sexual relations between man and woman.”⁸⁵ Indeed, Henderson’s emphasis on obscene humor as a means to ridicule sex and gender deviance *earnestly* rather than *ironically* renders Aristophanic comedy the antithesis of camp. And that is all well and good, for this is not to suggest that Henderson is wrong about Aristophanes; rather, I would argue that Henderson’s study, as the first frank examination of obscene humor in classical literature to be published in English, may have served to encourage subsequent scholars to follow his lead in finding a pervasively earnest ridicule of sex and gender deviance in ancient comic literature. To be sure, Richlin’s 1983 study of sexuality and aggression in Roman humor parallels Henderson in relying on Freudian theories of humor and obscenity to develop both psychological and sociological explanations of the function of obscene humor; and Richlin likewise reaches the conclusion that sexual humor is earnest rather than ironic in its aggressive derision of sex and gender deviance.⁸⁶ Nevertheless, the breaching of scholarly taboos represented by studies such as those of Henderson, Dover, and Adams certainly cleared a path for camp analyses of classical texts, had any classicists been interested in pursuing that avenue of research.

Dover’s Greek Homosexuality

Dover’s profoundly influential study states at the outset that philhellenism and homophobia had historically combined to thwart the academic study of homosexuality in

⁸⁵ Ibid: 58.

⁸⁶ Cf. Henderson 1991: 36 and *passim*; Richlin 1992a: 59-63, 72, 80.

classical antiquity, leading to moralism where a spirit of dispassionate scholarly inquiry should have prevailed. Interesting and provocative is Dover's assertion that he would prefer to avoid the traditional antithesis of heterosexual and homosexual, substituting "sexual" for the former and "pseudo-sexual" for the latter. This conceptualization, he insists, is a matter of judgment, not prejudice, of which Dover claims to be free, since he counts himself fortunate in not experiencing "moral shock or disgust at any genital act whatsoever, provided that it is welcome and agreeable to all the participants (whether they number one, two, or more than two)." He adds, "No act is sanctified, and none is debased, simply by having a genital dimension."⁸⁷ Thus Dover's study, like that of Henderson, signals a change in classics' traditional role as a bulwark of traditional morality, in response to, or at least in step with, the profound social, cultural, and political changes of the period, including the civil rights movement, the women's movement, and the gay liberation movement.

This is not the place for a lengthy review of how Dover's scholarship combined potently with the genealogical work of Michel Foucault to influence the thinking of David Halperin, John J. Winkler, and other classicists who led the burgeoning field of the history of ancient sexuality; that work has already been done by, among others, Karras 2000, Davidson 2001, and Skinner 2001.⁸⁸ Some observations are in order, however, regarding the implications of Dover's approach for the discourse on queer existence and camp aesthetics as they relate to the current study. Dover's decision to elide the

⁸⁷ Dover 1978: vii-viii.

⁸⁸ For some of the work in this field most widely cited as bearing the explicit and prominent influence of Foucault, see Halperin 1990; Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin 1990; and Winkler 1990.

traditional homo/heterosexual binary in favor of a newly defined sexual/pseudo-sexual binary is infuriating from a gay liberationist or identity politics perspective, because it denies *authenticity* to homosexual relations. That is, if the sexual is confined, in actual fact if not in terminology, to the heterosexual, and same-sex desire and activity are relegated to the pseudo-sexual, then same-sex desire and activity can never be more than *parodies* of a model of sexuality both perceived and conceived as *authentic*. My point here, I hasten to add, is not to adjudicate whether such denial is either historically accurate or theoretically valid vis-à-vis classical Greece; rather, I am referring to the cognitive and emotional impact that such a formulation implied for the gay movement at the time of the book's publication. On the other hand, this very framework, wittingly or not, gestures towards the tension between parody and authenticity that I have posited as a defining condition of queer existence. I have also argued that this very gesture is a fundamental operation of camp. Thus, to a degree, Dover's study may be said to have a certain unintentional camp appeal. Moreover, Dover arguably displays a characteristically camp deployment of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant when he declares his freedom from disgust in the face of any genital act that is "welcome and agreeable to all the participants." Particularly witty is his assertion that, in this freedom from disgust, he is "fortunate," and his insistence that he maintains his sangfroid in the face of such acts regardless of whether their participants "number one, two, or more," thus expressing solidarity with, among others, the masturbator, the sodomite (oral or anal), and the participant in a ménage à trois or, for that matter, an orgy. Thus, Dover would seemingly be equipped to enjoy, as perverse wit, the account of sexual activity among Naevolus, his

patron, and his patron's wife in Juvenal's ninth satire, or the orgiastic behavior of the women celebrating the rites of the Bona Dea in the sixth satire (lines 314-45).

The camp resonance of Dover's study goes beyond his prefatory gesture towards the tension between parody and authenticity in queer existence or his deployment of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant. Indeed, the heart of Dover's study is an account of Aeschines' prosecution of Timarchus (Aesch. 1) on the grounds that, having prostituted himself in his youth, the latter could not hold public office or address the Assembly, and was thus disqualified from leading the attack in the Assembly against the Athenian envoys to Philip II of Macedon (envoys who included Aeschines himself).⁸⁹ Dover's emphasis in his analysis of the speech is less on the factual accuracy of the charges than it is on the thoroughly rhetorical nature of the attack. That is, Dover's gesture towards the tension between parody and authenticity in queer existence is ultimately a reflection of Aeschines' parallel gesture: Aeschines' forensic strategy is to argue that Timarchus himself is a mere parody of manhood, not the real thing, and as such he is not entitled to the full privileges of participation in the Athenian democracy.

Dover's study clears a path for camp analyses of classical texts by demonstrating that the ridicule of deviance in ancient Greece often gestured toward the tension between parody and authenticity in queer existence. Starting from this point, one could proceed to look for texts in which the stigmatizing ideology implied by such ridicule is resisted via the deployment of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant. As I noted above, Henderson, writing at about the same time as Dover, finds that perverse wit in

⁸⁹ For the complex legal and social issues raised by the case, see Dover 1978: 19-110 and Fisher 2001: 1-66.

Aristophanes tends to ridicule the deviant and express solidarity with the dominant; thus, no camp is in evidence there. Nevertheless, the search for a camp response to the ideology of ridicule might have continued, perhaps bearing more fruit in the hands of other scholars, in the analysis of other Greek authors or texts, or in the study of Roman literature. On the contrary, however, literary analyses in the wake of Dover's study tended to find acquiescence in the dominant ideological model rather than resistance to it.⁹⁰

Adams' Latin Sexual Vocabulary

J.N. Adams' important 1982 study, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, provides some intriguing hints at the camp potential in sexual language. His fundamental distinction between primary obscenities on the one hand, and metaphors and euphemistic designations on the other (see above, p. 23, n. 4), begins to get at the very basis of camp wit, which is generally suggestive rather than explicitly obscene, as when Juvenal in the ninth satire observes that Naevolus is not only a notorious adulterer (*notior Aufidio moechus*, 25), but is accustomed to engage discreetly in penetrative anal intercourse with the husbands of his adulterous paramours, which Juvenal refers to with witty euphemism

⁹⁰ I am thinking in particular of several analyses of Juvenal's second satire that appeared in the 1990s, including Konstan 1993, Richlin 1993a: 541-54, and Walters 1998. There are other relatively recent publications on Juvenal 2 that are less relevant to my purposes here. Braund and Cloud 1981 are primarily concerned with a reconsideration of the structural integrity of the poem that leads them to argue (204) that "the theme of the poem is homosexuality as it appears *both* in its dissimulated *and* in its admitted forms." Winkler 1983: 90-107 provides what is essentially a paraphrase of the poem, concluding with the observation, "the satire... ends on a remarkably serious tone of moral pessimism." Braund 1995 is primarily interested in determining the extent to which Laronia in the second satire is an "autonomous character" with an "authentically female voice," and concludes that "there is no woman in this text, only the construct of the speaker, himself a construct of the man-satirist" (quotations from pp. 207 and 215).

as “bending the husbands over” (*ipsos etiam inclinare maritos*, 26). Moreover, Adams’ identification of a wide range of linguistic usage points beyond the realm of aggression and humiliation (to which Richlin’s *Garden of Priapus* largely reduces all sexual language in Latin literature) to such diverse areas as apotropaic and ritual obscenity, humor and outrageousness, and titillation, all of which have enormous potential for camp exploitation.⁹¹

Opportunities Lost

While neither Henderson’s *The Maculate Muse* nor Dover’s *Greek Homosexuality* nor Adams’ *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* mentions camp or engages in camp analysis, each provided interpretive tools or conceptual frameworks that were potentially conducive to a camp discourse within classical studies. In short, Henderson legitimated the serious academic study of comic representations of sex and gender deviance; Dover elucidated the trope of gender parody that lay beneath many instances of classical invective against sex and gender deviance; and Adams provided the tools for an analysis of Roman sexual language in terms of perverse wit. Nevertheless, such a camp discourse scarcely emerged. Notwithstanding the ultimate emergence of prominent gay classicists and the formation of a lesbian and gay affinity group within the American Philological Association, I would argue that it was the resistance of the discipline to openly gay and lesbian perspectives that forestalled interest in camp within the field. While Henderson,

⁹¹ Cf. Adams 1982: 1-8. My assertion about Richlin’s equation of sexual language with humiliation and aggression may seem broad, but cf. Richlin 1992a: 14, “I hoped when the book was first published that it would...provide a historical perspective for the study of humor and sexuality, which I defined as interrelated discourses of aggression.”

Dover, Adams, and Richlin wrote more-or-less frankly about sexuality and gender deviance, they do not profess to write from a gay or lesbian perspective.⁹² Richlin, moreover, was writing from an avowedly feminist perspective, and Mark Booth, writing from a camp subject position, makes some intriguing observations about the feminist relationship to camp. Noting a number of points of contact between feminism and camp, Booth specifically cites arguments made by Simone de Beauvoir, Betty Friedan, Elizabeth Janeway, Germaine Greer, and Kate Millet, but concludes that

while feminism and camp may share the same point of departure, they travel in different directions. The feminist pose is heroic where camp's is unserious and self-deprecating. Feminists seek to abolish or to minimise their marginal status, while the camp try to *make a virtue of marginality*. Where feminism uses polemic, camp relies on *mockery*--something about which most feminists hold the gravest suspicions.⁹³

While Booth's stark characterization is an oversimplification of feminism and indulges in certain stereotypes regarding feminists and "the feminist pose," the substance of his assessment nevertheless parallels the reservations I expressed about Richlin's approach to the realm of so-called priapic literature in the previous chapter. Nor is this to suggest that Richlin is wrong about the potential for sexually aggressive humor to reinforce patriarchal norms and power dynamics; but as Booth suggests, Richlin's urge to resist the marginal status of what she refers to as "the penetrated," meaning the sexually submissive, marginal objects of masculine-gendered Roman male desire and power, be

⁹² Halperin 1990: 4 notes, "No less crucial to the reception of Dover's work than his credentials as a scholar were his credentials as a heterosexual, which were equally above suspicion...and both sets of credentials were celebrated by reviewers. Whatever the book's other defects...it could be accused of neither faulty scholarship nor special pleading."

⁹³ Cf. Booth 1983: 54-57; quote from pp. 56-57. (Emphases added)

they women, boys, slaves, prostitutes, foreigners, or criminals, was a characteristically second-wave feminist approach, consistent with the views of Richlin and a number of other feminists of the same era on pornography and other representations of the sexual objectification of women in contemporary society.⁹⁴ While camp shares the feminist opposition to oppression, particularly oppression based on the putative deviance of sexuality, gender, and kinship formations, camp's approach is to *subvert* the oppressive power by glamorizing its own marginality, not in a spirit of delusion, but rather in a spirit of willful defiance. Moreover, camp's subversive strategy has been increasingly embraced by third-wave feminists.⁹⁵

Wooten on Petronius and Camp

My contention here is that camp, as a critical framework based on solidarity with the deviant, is particularly well suited to a novel reinterpretation of sexuality and aggression in Roman humor, as well as to a queer reading of sex, gender, and kinship deviance in a diverse range of Latin texts. Thus, while I began an earlier section by asking "Why not classics?" in a retrospective sense, I now repose the question in a prospective sense: indeed, why should classics not employ camp as a critical framework

⁹⁴ By "resist" I mean "offer resistance to," in the sense implied by the notion of resistant reading; that is, *challenge the justice of*. For "the penetrated," cf. Richlin 1992a: xxii and *passim*. Richlin notes points of contact between *The Garden of Priapus* and her edited volume, *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (Richlin 1992b). The term *second-wave* feminism emerged to distinguish the modern feminist movement, beginning in the 1970s, from the earlier movement of women suffragists in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Beginning in the 1990s, some began to speak of a *third-wave* feminism, conceived partly in chronological terms and partly in terms of theoretical emphasis, with third-wave feminism sometimes understood to embody postmodernist and postcolonial perspectives. Cf. Henry 2004: 3 and *passim*.

⁹⁵ Cf., for example, Robertson 1999, Case 1999, Bornstein 1994.

for analyzing and interpreting particular texts in which a camp sensibility is demonstrably legible? In fact, there is one example of such a critical undertaking; unfortunately, it is a tepid effort that seems to have retarded the cause of camp among classicists rather than advancing it. Wooten 1984 cites Sontag's definition of camp and demonstrates the aptness of her definition to the *Satyricon*, focusing on Petronian examples of the theatricalization of experience and the undermining of seriousness.⁹⁶

In addition to identifying hallmarks of camp in the *Satyricon*, Wooten seeks to account for the presence of camp behavior in the Petronian narrative, focusing on Sontag's association of camp with boredom and affluence. As Wooten 1984: 136 argues,

The overeating at Trimalchio's banquet, the fascination with exotic foods presented in strange ways, Trimalchio's obsession with death, the unusual sexual practices throughout the novel can all be seen as a reaction against boredom on the part of men and women who live in an affluent and permissive society.⁹⁷

As another explanation for camp behavior in the *Satyricon*, Wooten offers the association of camp "with homosexuality and a gay sensibility," noting that "the *Satyricon*, or at least what we have of it, is the only extensive piece of Latin literature in which the characters are predominantly homosexual (probably 4 or 5 on the Kinsey scale) and which depicts a

⁹⁶ Cf. Wooten 1984: 133, 133-5.

⁹⁷ In connection with luxury and satiety in the *Satyricon*, Wooten cites Arrowsmith 1966 and Bacon 1958.

predominantly homosexual milieu.”⁹⁸ Wooten argues, “It is possible, therefore, that in the *Satyricon*, which, among other things, is a ‘roman de mœurs,’ Petronius is describing a predominantly homosexual comportment, what is now called ‘campy’ behavior, which dates back at least to the first century A.D.” Ultimately, Wooten seems most interested in refuting Sontag’s insistence on an early modern origin for camp. He cites Sontag’s tracing of camp’s source in the eighteenth-century penchant for artifice, surface, symmetry, the picturesque, the thrilling, epigram, and dramatic gestures, and notes

All of these tendencies, however, are characteristic also of Latin literature at the time of Nero and are most evident in those works produced at court: the *Pharsalia* of Lucan, the tragedies of Seneca the Younger and the *Satyricon* of Petronius. Moreover, it is quite clear that there were many people in the highly literate court of Nero who were frequently engaged in play-acting, often based on literary models, a tendency which Sontag sees as the essence of “camp.” Nero himself, for example, liked to act out especially melodramatic roles such as the blinding of Oedipus and the matricide of Orestes, wearing masks in his own likeness or in the likeness of those of whom he was enamoured at the time, thereby clearly showing the self-conscious artificiality, the confusion between theater and reality which must have been so prominent at this court.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ Wooten 1984: 136. My objective in this section is primarily to summarize Wooten’s argument for a camp *Satyricon*. But as a matter of sexuality and gender studies, his contention here about so-called predominant homosexuality is not convincing. Encolpius and Giton, to name just two characters in the text, are just as interested in, and capable of having, sexual relations with women as they are with each other and indeed with other men. Heterosexual and homosexual desire and acts coexist in this text side by side. See the discussion of the problems raised by positing a “gay subculture” here and elsewhere in Williams 2010: 239-45.

⁹⁹ Wooten 1984: 137. Nero’s love of ostentatious display extended also to his penchant for staging same-sex marriages in which one partner played the role of the bride and wore a wedding veil. For Nero’s same-sex weddings, see Suet. *Nero* 28-29. For a recent discussion of Roman same-sex weddings, see Frier 2004, which suggests that these weddings may have been performed as intentionally subversive parodies of traditional marriage, thus raising the possibility of camp performativity (although Frier never uses the word “camp” and I do not mean to suggest that he would concur in this suggestion). See Williams 2010, Appendix 2, for more on this and other male/male weddings.

Wooten's two-sentence concluding paragraph reiterates that camp is not necessarily a modern phenomenon, but rather, on the evidence of the *Satyricon*, "has been associated with bored and permissive societies, and possibly with homosexual milieux, at least since the time of Nero."¹⁰⁰

Wooten's brief essay provides evidence of at least one classicist in the post-Sontag era who was aware of camp as a cultural phenomenon, recognized its relevance to Roman literature particularly of the Neronian period, and thought it was important to counter the widely accepted claim (made not only by Sontag, although Sontag is the one and only source on camp that Wooten cites) that camp was a modern European phenomenon with its roots in the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries at the very earliest. Unfortunately, however, Wooten's essay may do more to contain the potential of camp as a critical framework for Roman literature than to promote it. For one thing, Wooten writes about camp only from the perspective of Sontag and only in terms of theatricality and frivolity (the undermining of seriousness), completely neglecting queer theorists of camp such as Newton and Babuscio and the other elements of camp they identified, particularly those elements having to do with a transgressive, potentially subversive solidarity with the deviant.¹⁰¹ In Wooten's hands, camp becomes a phenomenon concerned exclusively with a cultural boredom and social permissiveness that tend to

¹⁰⁰ Wooten 1984: 138.

¹⁰¹ By failing to address the subversive potential of the *Satyricon*, Wooten yields the lectern to other classicists with decidedly hegemonic views. Three of the most influential moralistic readings are Hightet 1941; Bacon 1958; and Arrowsmith 1966. For studies that challenge the view of a moralistic Petronius, see Sullivan 1967; Zeitlin 1971; Walsh 1974; and Sullivan 2001.

play themselves out, for reasons not explored, in the context of homosexual existence. He acknowledges Petronius for representing realistically what might be called a homosexual subculture (although Wooten uses the term “milieu”), noting that “other Roman authors...portray homosexual relationships as being superficial, fleeting, and mainly physical, a diversion practiced by men who conceive of themselves largely in heterosexual terms.”¹⁰² In effect, Wooten here recognizes what I described earlier in this chapter as the tension between parody and authenticity in queer existence; in other words (and I mean quite literally that Wooten does not use my terminology), he credits Petronius with seeking to represent queer formations of sex, gender, and kinship as *authentic*, in stark contrast with other Roman authors who represent such formations as mere *parodies* of sex, gender, and kinship. Wooten, however, shows no interest in exploring the vast and profound social, cultural, and political implications either of the tension between parody and authenticity itself, or of the way camp--either as a “Neronian” subjectivity or as “Petronian” aesthetics--tends to gesture at this tension and call into question its naturalness or necessity on the one hand, and on the other hand the

¹⁰² Wooten 1984: 137. Again, my objective in this section is primarily to summarize Wooten’s argument for a camp *Satyricon*; but as a matter of sexuality and gender studies, his contention here about Roman males’ self-conception as either heterosexual or homosexual is inconsistent with currently prevailing views, such as those argued in Williams 2010. Taylor 1997 argues for the existence of so-called “pathic subcultures” at Rome. See Williams 2010: 239-45 for arguments against.

justice of the dominant ideology's denial of authenticity to queer existence.¹⁰³ Not surprisingly, then, while Wooten's article shows up on bibliographies relating to homosexuality and literature, camp aesthetics, and Petronius, it seems to have caused barely a ripple in subsequent classical scholarship, and certainly did not inspire subsequent forays into the application of camp aesthetics to the study of classical antiquity.

¹⁰³ I am here using the term *queer existence* as defined earlier in this chapter, viz., formations of sex, gender and kinship that are deviant vis-à-vis the historical context in question, not vis-à-vis Anglo-European modernity. As Williams 2010 argues, the dominant Roman discourse denied authenticity only to certain kinds of existence that in the modern Western context would be considered queer. For example, a married man who has both a girlfriend and a boyfriend on the side, occasionally pays for male or female prostitutes, foos around with his slaves of both sexes, and is open about all of this to his wife and others might be considered deviant by contemporary American standards, but in Roman terms was normative and authentic in the sense I have posited (of course, we would not expect a contemporary American man to own slaves, but that is a different matter).

CHAPTER THREE

Perverse Wit and the Crisis of Juvenalian Moralism

In camp the talk of sex contrasts with an attentiveness to conventional moral codes of behavior, with speakers often alluding to the principles of decency and rectitude to which they feign to adhere... The incongruity inherent in the juxtaposition of a detailed interest in the mechanics of sex with a trumpeted adherence to traditional moral codes is one of the chief sources of irony in camp.

—Keith Harvey, “Translating Camp Talk” (1998)¹

The Importance of Being Earnest

Shortly before Sontag’s “Notes on ‘Camp’” was to turn the “solvent of morality” into a mainstream phenomenon, Juvenal scholars were engaged in a heated debate about Juvenal’s status as a sincere moral critic and earnest social reformer. My decision to call this debate a “crisis” may seem hyperbolic, but I defend it on two grounds: first, a bit of hyperbole seems fitting in a study not only of Juvenal but of Juvenal and camp; and second, I would argue that the major participants in this debate, including H.A. Mason and David Wiesen, did in fact believe that the stakes were quite high, as we shall see shortly when we consider their arguments in detail. In brief, Mason argued for a kind of Martialian wit at work in the satires and claimed that Juvenal was minimally concerned with morality or social reform, while Wiesen insisted on a fiercely moral and seriously reformist Juvenal (and he therefore struggled to account for the satirist’s gleeful indulgence in depictions of pederasty, sodomy, effeminacy, and other scandalous forms of

¹ Harvey 2000: 449.

sex and gender deviance).² Between these extremes lay classicists such as W.S. Anderson, S.C. Fredericks, and Tony Reekmans, who displayed neither the moral zeal of a Wiesen nor the aesthetic humanism of a Mason, but contributed in their own ways to the debate about Juvenal's moral seriousness and the meaning of his patently perverse sense of humor. My main contention in this chapter is that the debate over Juvenal's moralism serves as a kind of unwitting proxy for a debate about camp aesthetics, emphasizing as it does the role of perverse wit in articulating a moral satiric vision. Analyzing some of the key contributions to this debate helps illustrate both the potential for a camp reading of Juvenal and the way a persistent scholarly commitment to the essential morality of satire has kept such a critical innovation at bay.

The Emergence of Juvenalian Wit

Wit is one of the core features of camp aesthetics, cited in the *Theogony* of camp discourse, Susan Sontag's "Notes on 'Camp,'" in which the author writes, "To camp is a mode of seduction—one which employs flamboyant mannerisms susceptible of a double interpretation; gestures full of duplicity, with a witty meaning for cognoscenti and another, more impersonal, for outsiders," later adding, "Camp taste supervenes upon

² Scholars like Mason and his contemporary, W.S. Anderson, seemed to take it quite for granted that Martial's epigrams were trivial, unobjectionable, and morally frivolous (see Anderson 1970). In what may seem like an almost Ecclesiastical turn of scholarly events, Spisak 2007 argues for a morally serious and socially earnest Martial, placing him in the tradition of iambic poets who praise virtue and ridicule vice so as to deter actual or potential offenders from socially destructive behavior. If Mason were writing today, he would have to beat back the likes of Spisak before he could take on the advocates for a didactic Juvenal.

good taste as a daring and witty hedonism.”³ The centrality of wit to camp is confirmed by subsequent camp theorists including Newton, Babuscio, and Booth, among others.⁴ Of course, not every instance in the history of wit is camp; but witty language or performance in the context of sex, gender, and kinship deviance is likely to be legible as camp wit, for the reason stated so aptly and concisely by Keith Harvey in the epigraph to this chapter; namely, the fact that camp tends to juxtapose ironically and humorously a perverse pleasure in descriptions of sex and gender deviance with a pretended adherence to standards of moral probity. Thus, arguments for a witty Juvenal, particularly when the object of wit is the moral ambiguity surrounding incongruous formations of sex, gender, and kinship, may be considered evidence for a camp Juvenal. The deciding factor is what I referred to in Chapter Two as the embrace of stigmatized identity or (my preferred formulation) *solidarity with the deviant*. If witty references to deviant formations of sex, gender, and kinship appear to be in solidarity with the deviant rather than hostile to it, then the witty performance might well qualify as camp. If, however, witty references to deviance seem hostile to the deviant, then the witty performance might simply be ridicule, an expression of contempt for the deviant that theorists both of satire and of humor have often considered the very essence of satirical laughter.⁵ Indeed, most scholars

³ Sontag 1999: 57, 65. Cf. OED Second Edition 1989 s.v. wit, *n.*, sense 8.a., “That quality of speech or writing which consists in the apt association of thought and expression, calculated to surprise and delight by its unexpectedness...; later always with reference to the utterance of brilliant or sparkling things in an amusing way.”

⁴ Cf. Newton 1979: 3 and *passim*; Babuscio 1999: 126 and *passim*; Booth 1983: 29 and *passim*. Cf. also Core 1984: 27, 43, 117 and *passim*.

⁵ For the ethics of laughter cf. Purdie 1993; for the ethics of satirical laughter in particular, cf. Gantar 2005: 32-49. Also relevant in this regard are Plaza 2006 and Rosen 2007.

of Juvenal through the end of the twentieth century have understood his witty references to sex and gender deviance to be examples of earnest ridicule based on sincerely held standards of conventional moral probity.⁶ Camp, however, ironizes ridicule so that the sincerity of its moral basis and the earnestness of its mockery become ambiguous, a phenomenon that Harvey 2004: 408-9 calls *ambivalent solidarity*. As we shall see below, the ambiguity of camp humor has led some classicists to extreme feats of critical gymnastics in pursuit of a Juvenal whose morality and ethics match their own.

Perhaps the first modern scholar to call attention to Juvenal's wit was Inez Scott Ryberg. Her 1924 dissertation, published in 1927 as *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal*, devotes a chapter to epic parody in Juvenal, which she classifies "according to Cicero's classification of the different forms of wit."⁷ Some thirty years later, Highet 1954: 121 cites wit specifically as a feature of the ninth satire in the context of his biographical reconstruction of Juvenal's life and work:

The impulses which produced the satire come then from the earlier periods of his life, and its style, its wit, its vivid tone of immediacy and perception, its daring, its urbane conversational tone, and its desire to shock all indicate that it was conceived and largely created early in his working career as a satirist.

Highet's assertion that Juvenal wrote the ninth satire early in his career is based on a reconstructed biography that he admits is "hypothetical" (and which has long since been largely discredited within the field of classics), but which allows him to account for the satirist's gleeful indulgence in perverse wit as something other than solidarity with the

⁶ Plaza 2006 and Rosen 2007 mark a twenty-first century turn away from the idea of sincerely moral and socially earnest satire.

⁷ Scott 1927: 46. Among her examples is Juv. 9.37 (see above, p. 74).

deviant.⁸ Highet claims that in his youth, Juvenal was an affluent and successful equestrian, but his career stalled, and late in the reign of Domitian Juvenal offended the emperor with his verse and was banished and impoverished.⁹ This reconstructed biography also includes a fanciful account of Juvenal's psychosexual development, based entirely on evidence from the satires, as I discussed in Chapter One. This account includes the assertion that "Juvenal had begun life with normal instincts, and had then been so disgusted by women that he turned to active homosexuality."¹⁰ Thus, for Highet, the ninth satire is a product of Juvenal's jaunty but disillusioned youth, before his exile and penury, but after his descent into sexual perversion.

Highet's description of the poem as stylish, witty, vivid, daring, urbane, and willfully perverse ("desire to shock") are completely consistent with a camp reading. This is not to suggest that Highet entertained any such notion. For one thing, Highet's study of Juvenal was published a full decade before Sontag's essay on camp brought the latter phenomenon to widespread (read: mainstream, non-gay) critical attention. Moreover, Highet's account of the poem parts ways with a true camp reading in his assertion of the poem's *disavowal* of deviance where camp requires *solidarity*. Of the poem's representation of "homosexuality," Highet 1954: 269n17 claims "although Juvenal still hates the vice described, he appears to have overcome the earlier horror he felt, which makes the Second Satire a trifle incoherent, and to have settled into a steadier contempt." As I noted in Chapter One, Highet's claims about Juvenal's sexual attitudes and their

⁸ For this reconstructed biography, see Highet 1954: 40-41.

⁹ Cf. Highet 1954: 89.

¹⁰ Highet 1954: 269n17.

relationship to the satires are themselves a trifle incoherent. He variously asserts that Juvenal hated men who submitted to anal penetration; was disgusted by the prospect of a man engaging in insertive anal intercourse with other men for money; and yet that Juvenal himself engaged in insertive anal intercourse, albeit only because he was disgusted by women. Equally incoherent, perhaps, are Highet's assertions that the ninth satire is, on the one hand, stylish, witty, vivid, daring, urbane, and willfully perverse, and on the other hand a morally sincere attack on social decadence. Immediately after characterizing the poem's delightfully artificial surface, Highet continues as follows:

But its meanings are serious enough. There is not a virtuous person in the whole poem. Everyone is weak or vicious or both. The first four lines contain an obscenity so startling that classical editors tried to replace it by something milder and nineteenth-century editors sometimes failed to understand it. Mentioning the temples of the gods, Juvenal adds, "Of course women prostitute themselves in every temple, don't they?" and his last words are, like the last words of Satire Two, the hideous assertion that Rome is now the centre of corruption for the whole civilized world.¹¹

The ninth satire, it would seem, is witty *despite* its seriousness, or perhaps serious *despite* its wit; in any case, Highet thinks that a "but" belongs between his description of the poem's entertaining form and his assessment of its didactic content. Highet thus inaugurates a trend that we will see again in Wiesens 1963: the scholar (1) recognizes the presence of perverse wit in Juvenal, (2) betrays at least some anxiety about the tendency

¹¹ Highet 1954: 121. The obscenity to which Highet alludes is the reference to Ravola performing cunnilinctus on Rhodope at 9.4, "while Ravola rubs Rhodope's crotch with his wet beard" (*Ravola dum Rhodopes uda terit inguina barba*). Line 5, "We strike a blow to the slave who licks the pastries" (*nos colaphum incutimus lambenti crustula servo*), is attested by Servius, but editors since François Guyet (1575-1655) have assumed it was a scribal interpolation and generally have excised it from the text. Defenders of the line's authenticity read it as a metaphor for the appropriate castigation of vice; as we would punish a slave who "licks the pastries," so we should censure a man who engages in cunnilinctus.

of perverse wit to undermine moral sincerity, but (3) ultimately asserts that the two can coexist unproblematically.

Even Highet's account of the satire's serious meanings, however, wavers right on the threshold of a camp reading. Remember Isherwood's foundational assertion that camp "always has an underlying seriousness...expressing what's basically serious to you in terms of fun and artifice and elegance."¹² The absence of virtuous exempla, the startlingly coarse euphemism about cunnilinctus, and the sarcastic joke about women prostituting themselves in temples are all entirely consistent with a camp reading of the poem. It is only at the very end of his thumbnail sketch that Highet reminds us why he is not a camp reader: he believes Juvenal ends the poem with a "hideous assertion" that Rome has become a "center of corruption." He is referring to lines 130-3, in which Juvenal reassures Naevolus about his future prospects:

ne trepida, numquam pathicus tibi derit amicus
stantibus et salvis his collibus; undique ad illos
convenient et carpentis et navibus omnes
qui digito scalpunt uno caput.

Don't worry, you'll never lack an anally submissive male friend while these hills stand safe; from all sides they will come, by land and by sea, all those who scratch their head with one finger.¹³

Highet's claim that these lines portray Rome as a "center of corruption" is in fact quite defensible: the phrase "from all sides they will come" (*undique...convenient*, 131-2) certainly imply Rome's centrality, and the word *pathicus* (130), meaning "inclined to take pleasure in sexual submission," is unequivocally pejorative, strongly suggesting the

¹² Isherwood 1954: 125.

¹³ As discussed in Chapter One, scratching the head with one finger is the rough Roman equivalent of the modern limp wrist.

corruption of Roman manliness by exotic and luxurious habits of effeminacy. The claim that this assertion is to be understood as “hideous,” however, imposes a moralistic reading that is entirely Highet’s own. If the Juvenalian interlocutor thought that an influx of sexually submissive males eager to patronize Naevolus was truly hideous, he could very well say so, using the language of indignation for which the first two books of Juvenal’s satires are particularly notable, and which we see in the ninth satire when Naevolus complains about his patron;¹⁴ but no such rhetorical markers of indignation are present here. In fact, these lines are framed rhetorically as a consolation (“Don’t worry,” *ne trepida*, 130), and that is precisely what is so striking about them: the Juvenalian persona of this satire takes the prospect of an endless supply of sexually submissive male friends (*pathici amici*) for Naevolus completely in stride. To be sure, Highet, like generations of scholars before him and many scholars since, takes *ne trepida* at 9.130 ironically, and in particular as an irony at the expense of Naevolus and in solidarity with a stigmatizing ideology of normative masculinity. This is the exact opposite of a camp reading, in which the irony of ambivalent solidarity undercuts the ridicule implied by

¹⁴ Cf. Naevolus’ exclamation at 9.38, “And yet, what is a worse portent than a stinky molly? (*quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis avarus?*), where the interrogative adjective (*quod*), the adversative conjunction (*tamen*), the comparative adjective (*ulterius*), the noun *monstrum* and the inherently pejorative epithet *mollis avarus* combine to signal the speaker’s indignation. Of course, while this sentence provides a good example of rhetorical markers of indignation, it is an equally good example of the kind of ambivalent solidarity identified by Harvey 2004: 408-9; that is, while Naevolus formally ridicules his effeminate, sexually submissive patron, there is an ironic and humorous incongruity between the perverse pleasure he takes in the graphic depiction of sex and gender deviance (cf. in particular lines 34-46) and his own pretended adherence to standards of moral probity, a pretense which is arguably undercut by his very participation in a commercially motivated sexual relationship with the man he ridicules. Cf. the ambivalent solidarity implied in Groucho Marx’s famous witticism, “I wouldn’t want to belong to any club that would have me as a member.”

pathicus, rendering ambiguous both the sincerity of the statement's morality and the earnestness of its mockery, and profoundly dignifying what it formally appears to ridicule.¹⁵

In summary, Highet's discussion of Juvenal's perverse wit is important both for what it avows and for what it denies. Highet recognizes the role of perverse wit in the formal design of the ninth satire, acknowledging that there is an undeniably irreverent quality ("desire to shock") in Juvenal's representations of sex and gender deviance. On the other hand, it is inconceivable to Highet that Juvenal's perverse wit is in solidarity with the deviant rather than with the dominant. Thus, he insists that Juvenal has earnest didactic intent based on a sincere adherence to communal standards of moral probity. Maria Plaza characterizes Highet's approach to Juvenal's wit as an instance of the superiority theory of humor, the belief that people laugh at what is inferior to them. Plaza notes, "Highet's study is basically in sympathy with this humor...in effect the critic *continues* the satirist's mockery."¹⁶ There is an ambiguity in Juvenal's humor, however, that undercuts the pretense of superiority in a characteristically camp manner; thus, what Plaza reads as Highet's *continuation* of mockery may in fact be Highet's own *assertion* of a mockery that the satirist does not initiate at all. As a sensible and sophisticated reader,

¹⁵ Incidentally, if Highet *were* a camp reader, he could say "hideous assertion" with the feigned moral sincerity of camp irony, meaning that the assertion isn't really hideous at all. One of the most fascinating things about camp is that I can *read* the phrase "hideous assertion" as an instance of camp irony, even though Highet most likely did not speak it that way. This is what Newton and others call "unintentional camp," in which, as Newton 1979: 106 puts it, "the campy person or thing does not perceive the incongruity." Of course, Highet would likely not agree that the putative incongruity was indeed an incongruity, even if it were pointed out to him as such: a complicated phenomenon indeed.

¹⁶ Plaza 2006: 18. Emphasis in original.

Highet cannot ignore the perversity of Juvenal's wit; but as a socially and morally conservative critic, he cannot acknowledge the subversive implications of the formal qualities he so aptly perceives: Highet comes perilously close to a camp reading, but he ultimately refuses to become a camp reader.¹⁷

I consider Highet's *camp manqué* reading important because it is an extremely influential example of a mid-to-late twentieth-century tendency to recognize the formal qualities that render Juvenal's satire morally subversive while simultaneously denying the subversiveness and, in fact, insisting that these very same formal qualities are the rhetorical embodiment of Juvenal's moral conservatism.¹⁸ This is an excellent example of

¹⁷ The term *subversive* often raises eyebrows in contexts where no evidently dramatic change in social, cultural, or historical circumstances can be directly credited to the text, work, or performance being so labeled. That is to say, one might object that Juvenal's camp satire is not truly subversive because it did not evidently *subvert* anything (radically change any social, cultural, or political situation). This is explicitly why Alan Sinfield uses the term *dissident* instead of the term *subversive*, arguing (Sinfield 1992: 49) that dissidence implies "refusal of an aspect of the dominant, without prejudging an outcome." Both Sinfield and his partner Jonathan Dollimore (cf. Dollimore 1991 [*Sexual Dissidence*]) are concerned with evading what Sinfield calls the "'entrapment model' of ideology and power, whereby even, or especially, maneuvers that seem designed to challenge the system help to maintain it" (Sinfield 1992: 39). I, however, am rather more sanguine about the term *subversive*: I believe its adjectival ending suggests a *tendency toward* the action of the verb that may or may not be fully realized; thus, I do not believe Juvenal's camp satire has to have upended the patriarchy or displaced male dominance or normative masculinity in order for it to have been fundamentally subversive.

¹⁸ At the risk of being repetitive, I should reiterate that Highet's conception of Juvenal's satiric vision does remain influential, despite the fact that his biographical approach has become largely discredited. *Juvenal the Satirist* was the first full-length monograph on its chosen topic in English, and Highet was unquestionably a man of immense classical learning and literary perceptivity. As such, he remains a kind of touchstone, whether subsequent scholars ultimately agree with, disagree with, or recast his positions (as Braund ultimately recasts an essentially Highetesque reading in persona theory garb). The specialist will seek out newer and more theoretically sophisticated scholarship, but the generalist, including graduate and undergraduate students, will continue to read Highet, more or less credulously, for the foreseeable future.

the phenomenon observed by Alan Sinfield, and discussed in Chapter One, whereby conservative critics “[interpret] texts strenuously so that awkward aspects are explained away, and [insinuate] political implications as alleged formal properties (such as irony and balance).”¹⁹ A relatively straightforward reading of Juvenal 9.130-3, where *ne trepida* means just what it says and not some contortionist paraphrase of what it says, is indeed awkward from the masculinist, patriarchal and heteronormative perspective that Highet and many other critics of his day represent. The conservative critic has to invent a kind of counter-camp irony so as to elide the subversive implications of a camp reading, which is arguably the more straightforward reading. We saw this quite explicitly in our discussion of Braund 1988: 155, where the scholar insists that precisely these lines, 9.130-3, are an ironic reversal of the consolation they appear to provide, and in fact reveal Juvenal’s scorn for Naevolus based on his engagement in commercial sex. This may sound almost too complicated to be plausible, but that is precisely why I chose the phrase “critical gymnastics” above in reference to this type of critical maneuver.

Mason’s Amoral Juvenal

While Highet allows Juvenal access to perverse wit without sacrificing moral sincerity, H.A. Mason takes the development of Juvenalian wit a step further. In Chapter One, I discussed Mason’s 1962 article entitled “Is Juvenal a Classic?” in which the author argues for a Juvenal characterized not by savage indignation but by Martialian wit, and motivated not so much by moral concerns as by a passion for literary allusion and comic

¹⁹ Sinfield 1992: 21.

entertainment.²⁰ Mason tried to rescue the satires from the long-running debate regarding Juvenal's moral sincerity and reformist zeal, not by coming down on one side or the other of the moralism debate, but rather by declaring the issues of moral sincerity and social reformism irrelevant to an appreciation of Juvenal's satires.²¹ One of Mason's objectives is to counter a perception of Juvenal as

a neurotic sufferer from ill-treatment by Domitian; full of pent-up feelings all clamoring for simultaneous expression; with a prophet's diagnosis of the true ills of his times and a prophet's mission to set them right; deeply indignant, morally earnest, passionately sincere; simple-minded and literal on the whole; a man with something of a philosophy, though not a formal philosopher; and at the same time an admirable witness to what was really happening on the seamy side of Rome.²²

Though Mason does not mention him by name, he is clearly referring to Highet when he offers the above characterization, to which he is "deliberately opposed."²³

²⁰ Cf. Mason 1962a and 1962b, reprinted in its entirety as Mason 1963.

²¹ The highlights of this debate are laid out by Wiesen 1963, to be discussed below.

²² Mason 1962a: 9-10.

²³ Anderson 1970: 9-10 asserts that Mason was writing "in patent disagreement with Highet's emphasis" on Juvenal as "an unhappy, hypersensitive person who has experienced profound personal suffering and upon the passionate truth of the Satires." In response to the potential objection that the views of Highet and other biographical critics are outdated and thus consideration of them is irrelevant, it should be noted that the 1918 Loeb Classical Library edition of Juvenal and Persius, edited by G.G. Ramsay and characterizing Juvenal as "one of the greatest moralists of the world," was only replaced with a new edition by S.M. Braund, with a less biographical emphasis, in 2004 (cf. Ramsay 1965: vii). Many libraries, moreover, will not replace their Ramsay editions with Braund editions until the former turn to dust, with the result that the non-specialist student will continue to read moralistic interpretations and bowdlerizing translations, perhaps for generations to come. For example, Ramsay translates *ipsos etiam inclinare maritos* at Juv. 9.26 as "You would corrupt the husbands themselves" (where *inclinare* = "corrupt" rather than the more literal and more perversely witty "bend over"), and omits from his translation entirely 9.33-37, with its graphic description of anal intercourse in terms of the penis' encounter with "yesterday's dinner."

The starting point of Mason's argument for a charmingly naughty rather than savagely indignant Juvenal is Satire 9, which he represents as a paradigm of Juvenalian wit. Though acknowledging the potential objections to his choice of example, Mason asserts that this poem represents "Juvenal's art in the purest, most concentrated form," and continues:

My first contention is that Juvenal appears here without the faintest moral concern about the subject matter he has chosen as the substratum of his poem. He never for one moment directs his attention to the verdict he would have to give on his hero if he had been an actual figure in Roman society. . . . Nor, on the other hand, can we conclude from this poem that Juvenal in private life would have been either fascinated with or cynical about such abominable behavior. The effect of the poem is to direct our attention into a region remote from that of the social commentator. Why then, the rejoinder might come, does Juvenal abound and even seem to delight in the abundance of pointed obscenities? My second contention is that the key to Juvenal's art lies in the study of Martial. The two poets appeal to the same taste and presuppose the same habits in their listening and reading public.²⁴

While Mason here gives us a perversely witty Juvenal who is not motivated by moral sincerity or reformist zeal, his amoral Juvenal has no greater solidarity with the deviant that did Hightet's morally sincere Juvenal, and is thus no more a camp Juvenal than was Hightet's. Mason here is arguing not that the satires are morally *subversive*, but rather that they are morally *irrelevant*, because Juvenal operates in a literary milieu, exemplified by the epigrams of Martial, in which entertainment is distinct from didacticism, and

²⁴ Mason 1962a: 10-11. It should be noted that Juvenal's sexual and scatological references in this satire, as throughout his corpus, are not in fact "obscenities," as Mason claims, but rather euphemisms or other kinds of suggestive imagery, startling and even shocking though they may be. See p. 23, n. 4 above for Adams' distinction between obscenity and euphemism in the Latin sexual vocabulary.

obscurity (or other potentially objectionable language) serves a strictly comic function, free from moral context.²⁵

Mason insists not only that lascivious poetry among the Romans could coexist with moral probity, but that lascivious poetry could itself serve as a kind of moral index. He cites Martial *Epigrams* 9.63 as evidence “that the pervert offended against a clearly held social and moral standard.”²⁶ The epigram reads as follows:

Ad cenam invitant omnes te, Phoebe, cinaedi.
mentula quem pascit, non, puto, purus homo est.

Mason offers a translation intended to emphasize the pun implied in the contrast between *Phoebus* and *purus*:

Purebright, you are a welcome guest at the tables of all the pathics in town: a man who pays for his dinner by satisfying them may be bright but he cannot, I think, be called pure.

As Mason renders the poem, Martial’s speaker seems to be saying that prostitution, however dignified by the veneer of patronage, renders a man corrupt. In the long run, I agree with Mason’s reading; it is his translation that is highly problematic, not only for its

²⁵ In fact, Mason’s own moralism emerges in the passage cited above, when he refers to “the verdict he [Juvenal] would have to give on his hero [Naevolus] if he had been an actual figure in Roman society” and insists that the poem gives us no indication of the historical Juvenal’s attitude towards “such abominable behavior.” The implication is that if Juvenal were forced to render a “verdict” on Naevolus, it would be a harsh one indeed; regardless of whether the historical Juvenal would have been “fascinated with” or “cynical about” such behavior, the behavior itself remains, in the stated opinion of Mason, “abominable.”

²⁶ Mason 1962a: 11. In this regard, Mason’s argument overlaps with that of Spisak 2007, although the latter argues for Martial as a social guide whose invective serves a conservative social function, while Mason argues for a Martial (and by extension a Juvenal) whose primary goal is entertainment; the poet’s lasciviousness, on this argument, is not *inconsistent* with the moral standards of his peers, albeit morality is not the poet’s primary concern.

lack of faithfulness to Martial's Latin, but for what it obscures about the camp sensibility at work in this brilliant little poem. Mason's contention is that the poem is witty because of its humorous play on the double meaning of *purus* as both (1) clear and bright, like the divine namesake of Phoebus, and (2) pure and undefiled, which the Phoebus of our epigram arguably is not. That is indeed part of the poem's humor, and to the extent that Mason identifies an incongruous juxtaposition between the expectation of purity and the reality of filth, he is in fact performing a camp reading of the text.

Mason's main point, however, is that Martial's intention in this epigram (and others in a similar tonal register of perverse wit) is not to castigate moral deviance or indiscretion, but merely to have a laugh at its expense. That is, Martial is not a social guide, as Spisak 2007 argues, but a mere entertainer whose stock in trade is the unobjectionable triviality, not unlike the *nugae* (trifles) of Catullus.²⁷ Mason goes on to cite defenses of lascivious language in the letters of Pliny and the epigrams of Martial and to conclude that the "resort to verse on obscene matters must have contained an element of play and an element of convention." Mason claims that what holds true of Martial holds equally true of Juvenal, who "is far less interested in presenting a social reality than in extracting opportunities for witty excursions."²⁸ Here again we see Sinfield's principles of conservative criticism exemplified (discussed in Chapter One):

²⁷ Cf. Cat. 1.3-4, addressed to Cornelius Nepos: "For you in fact were inclined to think my trifles were anything at all" (*namque tu solebas / meas esse aliquid putare nugas*). Of course, everything I am arguing about the subversive camp wit of Martial may also apply to Catullus; that thesis, however, awaits future research.

²⁸ Mason cites Pliny the Younger, 4.14 and 5.3 and Martial 1.4.8 (*lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba est* [my page is raunchy but my life is upright]); 3.86, 8 *praef.*, 8.3, and 11.15 (*mores non habet hic meos libellus*, 13 [this book of poems does not contain my real-life character]). Quotes are from Mason 1962a 11-12 and 14.

Juvenal's awkward (because inconsistent with moral probity) sexual and scatological references are explained away as artful play, and the political implications of the poem's insouciant attitude towards sex, gender, and kinship deviance is alleged to be frivolously entertaining rather than socially challenging.

I question, however, whether the kind of moral detachment suggested by Mason is possible according to any comprehensible theory of humor.²⁹ That is, most theorists of humor would argue that we laugh at something either because we find it absurd (incongruity theory) or because we consider it inferior (superiority theory). The type of lascivious humor exploited by Martial involves elements of both incongruity and superiority: the incongruity lies in the disparity between what is expected based on accepted standards of morality and decorum on the one hand, and what is experienced as deviant or perverse in a given situation on the other; the superiority lies in the moral or aesthetic judgment about the deviant or perverse behavior. Thus, in the case of Martial 9.63, there is an incongruity between our expectation that Phoebus will be pure and undefiled, and the speaker's suggestion the Phoebus is in fact corrupt. Once the possibility of Phoebus' corruption has been established, we experience him as inferior to us, because we are presumably pure and undefiled ourselves. That, at least, is the set of

²⁹ See Plaza 2006: 6-13 or a concise explanation of the major theories of humor, including superiority theory (we laugh at what we consider inferior to ourselves), incongruity theory (we laugh at what seems absurd or incongruous), and relief theory (we laugh to relieve nervous energy or tension). Morreall 1983: 4-37 is more detailed but not necessarily more useful. Despite the fact that Freud's theory of humor falls into the relief category, the other theories are more prevalent in theoretical writing on humor; relief of nervous energy is often viewed as a psychological explanation that is consistent with one or both of the other two theories, which address the *objects* of laughter rather than laughter as a physiological *process*.

rhetorical assumptions underlying the humor of the epigram, which we experience from the perspective of an implied ideal reader rather than from that of any actual reader, who may or may not live up to the normative standards implied by the joke. Thus, when we laugh at the epigram, we are indeed making a moral judgment about a man who, like the Phoebus of the poem, supports himself by satisfying the sexual desires of *cinaedi*, despite Mason's insistence that Martial has no morally didactic intent. If we are camp readers, moreover, we understand the epigram precisely as just described, and then we ironize that moral judgment, redefining moral *standards* as moral *pretense*, and identifying with the deviant, marginalized other rather than with the stigmatizing standards of presumed moral probity.

The problem with Mason's argument for an amoral Martial (the supposed inspiration for a supposedly amoral Juvenal) stems in part from his milquetoast translation of Martial 9.63, which tends to dull the piquancy of Martial's wit by diluting the crudeness of his language, thereby suggesting to the Latin-less reader a rather dry, censorious speaker, when the effect of the original is rather more that of a Roman Joan Rivers. In particular, Martial's *ad cenam invitant omnes te, Phoebus, cinaedi* ("All the *cinaedi* invite you to dinner, Phoebus") evokes the sexual avidity of Phoebus' effeminate, sexually submissive male admirers in a way that Mason's "You are a welcome guest at the tables of all the pathics in town" simply does not. For one thing, Martial's *ad cenam invitant* allows for precisely the same double entendre as the English "they invite you for dinner"; that is, it allows the reader to imagine that Phoebus may ultimately be the *dinner* as well as the *diner*, inferring the promise of sexual high jinks as soon as we reach the

word *cinaedi*, which helps explain its placement at the end of the line as the left jab in a verbal one-two punch. Moreover, Martial's *cinaedi* refers to a pathological kind and degree of gender deviance that is largely elided by Mason's much more polite "pathics," which, in any case, is a loanword based on the Latin *pathici*, a term considerably more euphemistic than *cinaedi*, since it refers ultimately to the phrase *muliebria pati*, "to suffer womanly things," while *cinaedi* has more of the essentially denigrating tone of "faggot" or "queer" (although direct translation of *cinaedi* by such historically specific terms is best avoided).³⁰ Finally, Martial's *mentula quem pascit* ("a man whom his penis feeds") suggests a perverse pleasure in graphic sexual imagery that is obscured by Mason's highly euphemistic "a man who pays for his dinner by satisfying them." Mason's failure to translate the term *mentula*, a primary obscenity best translated as "dick" or "cock," amounts to a veritable expurgation of the text.³¹

Thus, in Mason's hands, Martial takes on a snide, mean-spirited tone that is not all that different from the scornfully mocking Juvenal we find in Hight's analysis of the ninth satire. A more literal translation of *Epigrams* 9.63, however, gives us a Martial whose sportive tone is difficult to mistake for the sneering mockery of sex and gender deviance that Mason would have us perceive:

All the *cinaedi* invite you to dinner, Phoebus. A man whose dick feeds him is not, I should think, so pure a man after all.

My own inclination would be to give Martial 9.63 a camp reading whereby both Phoebus and the *cinaedi* are targeted by a perverse wit that expresses ambivalent solidarity, an

³⁰ For the discursive construction of effeminacy and its distinction from masculinity in Roman sources, see Williams 2010: 137-76.

³¹ For *mentula* as a primary obscenity see Adams 1982: 9-12.

ironizing of ridicule that undercuts the epigram's mockery and renders the poem morally ambiguous. Phoebus, a masculine-gendered male, is very popular among feminine-gendered males, the *cinaedi*, who entertain him in their homes in the expectation of being penetrated by him orally, anally, or both. This is an example of a recurring trope in Roman sexual humor, that of sexual commerce in the guise of sexual patronage. That is, Phoebus, like Naevolus in Juvenal 9, is essentially a hustler or at least a kept man;³² but the men who seek his company avoid the appearance of frequenting a male prostitute by encouraging the perception of a patron-client relationship, which was not only a respectable Roman social institution but a fundamental one that had to do not with sexual commerce but with relations of legal, political, and material support between an elite *patron* and his socially subordinate *client*. As numerous scholars have noted, the speaker's suggestion that Phoebus may be impure (*non...purus*, 2) refers to the Romans' conception of oral sex as both degrading and filthy, as indicated by its frequent association with the adjective *impurus* and particularly the notion of the *os impurum* (unclean mouth).³³ The connection with oral sex here is made via the sly, epigrammatic logic typical of Martial, in which the phrase *mentula quem pascit*, "a man whom his dick feeds," while literally referring to the fact that Phoebus gets dinners in exchange for agreeing to penetrate the *cinaedi*, comes to suggest that Phoebus himself is stained by the contagion associated with oral sex. I take this wry verbal association to amount to an accusation on the part of the speaker that Phoebus, as a man who supports himself by

³² Cf. Juv. 9.136, *pascitur inguine venter* "one's belly is fed by one's loins" words spoken by Naevolus to describe his own way of making a living. Scholars, including Colton 1991: 365, have suggested that Juv. 9.136 is influenced by Mart. 9.63.2.

³³ See Richlin 1992a: 26 and Williams 2010: 218-24.

providing sexual service, is as likely to perform fellatio as to engage in any other sex act.³⁴ This suggests a kind of slippery moral slope between masculinity and a broader notion of dignity. That is, while Phoebus does not compromise his masculinity by penetrating *cinaedi* anally or orally, he does undermine his integrity by allowing his body to be used for the pleasure of others, especially in exchange for compensation. Since he accepts compensation for sex, how much control does he ultimately have over what he does with his body? I do not take this to be an insistence that Phoebus necessarily performs fellatio, but rather a broader and more wry suggestion of the limitless potential for self-corruption that Phoebus invites once he has chosen to go down the path of sexual *clientela*.

And yet, to claim that this poem is a camp text is to insist that its ultimate gesture is not one of ridicule, but of solidarity with the deviance of both Phoebus and the *cinaedi*. Keith Harvey locates his notion of ambivalent solidarity as a feature of camp within a context of ritualized insult in gay subcultural discourse (Murray 1979) and the pragmatic theory of politeness (Brown and Levinson 1979), built around notions of negative face-wants, positive face-wants, and face-threatening acts.³⁵ “Face” is reputation or public perception, comparable to the Roman notion of *fama*. “Negative face-wants” constitute one’s desire for autonomy of agency and freedom from interpersonal aggression, in some ways analogous to the Roman notion of *libertas*. “Positive face-wants” express one’s

³⁴ Craig Williams, who addresses this epigram at Williams 2010: 396n.203 and 408n.313, has indicated to me via personal communication that he sees the joke as referring primarily to the idea that Phoebus is *like a fellator* because he is “fed” by his penis. He sees the language as playful, punning, drawing attention to itself in the first instance, rather than making any assertions about Phoebus’ sexual practices.

³⁵ See Harvey 2004: 452-3.

desire for at least a modicum of respect and acceptance of one's values by other members of the community, approximating the Roman notion of *honor*. "Face-threatening acts" are statements that challenge an interlocutor's positive or negative face-wants, either by depriving him of autonomy or undermining his respectability and sense of self-worth. The invective ridicule familiar from the tradition of poetic mockery in classical literature, from Achilles in *Iliad* 1 or Thersites in *Iliad* 2 to the epigrams of Martial and the wide-ranging attacks of the Juvenalian persona, certainly qualify as literary examples of face-threatening acts, and analogous examples abound in the literature of forensic oratory, both Greek and Latin. Harvey's contention is that camp often works by deploying face-threatening acts in an ironic mode that paradoxically serves to support face rather than threaten it. In short, what is formally structured as an insult becomes in camp practice a gesture of solidarity.

As an example, Harvey cites a passage from Edmund White's 1988 gay coming-of-age novel, *The Beautiful Room is Empty*, which includes the following exchange between two characters in a group of gay men:

"Grab your tiaras, girls, we're all royalty tonight, why I haven't seen so many crowned heads since Westminster Abbey—"

"I know you give head, Abbie, but the only crowns you've seen are on those few molars you've got left."³⁶

Harvey 2004: 452 describes the bitchy insult cited above in terms that might well be applied to Martial 9.63: "The parting shot, though vicious, is in fact part of an elaborate game used to hone the tools of queer verbal self-defense and to reassert, albeit paradoxically, a communal belonging." I would argue that Martial's speaker (who may or

³⁶ White 1988: 42, cited in Harvey 2004: 452.

may not coincide with the historical Martial) is here expressing solidarity with the deviant, including both the sex-and-gender deviant *cinaedi* and the men of dubious dignity who engage in acts of insertive anal and/or oral intercourse with them, of whom Phoebus is representative. Like the Martial epigram, the insult in the White novel is based on complex word play (Abbey/Abbie; crowned heads/giving head/crowned molars). The suggestion made by Martial's speaker that Phoebus may perform fellatio is no more earnest than the suggestion made by White's speaker that gay man referred to as "Abbie" has hardly any of his own teeth left in his mouth.

My argument for a camp Martial implies that such examples, cited by Mason, as Martial 1.4.8:

lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba est.

My page is raunchy but my life is upright.

and 11.15.13:

mores non habet hic meos libellus.

This book of poems does not contain my real-life character.

are, on some level at least, disingenuous, and that is in fact my contention.³⁷ That is to say, they are disingenuous as camp is disingenuous: their language is coded, or, to paraphrase Sontag, duplicitous, with one meaning for cognoscenti and another for

³⁷ Cf. Mason 1962a: 11-12 and note 29 above. These statements form part of a tradition of such apologia in Latin poetry, from Martial back to Ovid (*Trist.* 2.354) and perhaps originating with Catullus 16 (cf. Selden 1992). The claim of disingenuousness I make here with regard to Martial may extend equally to some or even all of the other instances, pointing to a substantial archive of texts that could be reevaluated for their camp potential; such investigation is an avenue for future research.

outsiders.³⁸ Verses such as these acknowledge the claims of traditional morality and pretend to accede to those claims, but we have no way of knowing how sincere the accession is, and we have much reason to doubt its sincerity. Such a reading would agree with Mason's premise that obscene poetry can be an index of popular morality, and with his contention that Martial's primary objective is entertainment rather than didacticism. But it would part ways with Mason in reading Martial's perverse wit as *undermining* the "clearly held social and moral standard" of which it provides an index, rather than supporting it; that is, as being in solidarity with the deviant rather than the dominant. Indeed, a camp reading in a curious way has something in common with a morally didactic reading in that it lays claim to an underlying moral seriousness, with the proviso that its moral intent is *subversive* rather than *conservative*.

Mason's argument for a *witty* Juvenal, then, while salutary as a corrective to a tradition of morally conservative readings, is above all an argument for a Juvenal who is morally disengaged, and thus is not in and of itself an argument for a *camp* Juvenal. At least, it is not an argument for a camp Juvenal as camp has been theorized by queer theorists from Esther Newton and Jack Babuscio in the 1970s to Jonathan Dollimore, Judith Butler, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Wayne Koestenbaum and others in the 1990s and since.³⁹ Mason's argument does, however, accord in many respects with the version of camp articulated by Sontag. Consider Mason 1962a: 20, a statement of his main thesis:

³⁸ Cf. Sontag 1999: 57 and note 5 above.

³⁹ Cf. the section entitled "Emergence and Development of Camp" in Chapter Two above, especially the subsections on "The Queer Claim to Camp" and "The Crisis of Camp."

I shall try to substantiate the claim that if Juvenal is a classic he is a classic of wit; that this wit is obtained both by detachment from 'reality' and complicity in the 'unreal' substream of obscene or scandalous subject matter. In particular I hope to show that he was more interested in literature than social conditions and that he lacks any consistent standpoint or moral coherence. Indeed his whole art consists in opportunism and the surprise effects obtainable from deliberate inconsistency.

By comparison, Sontag writes:

38. Camp is the consistently aesthetic experience of the world. It incarnates a victory of "style" over "content," "aesthetics" over "morality," of irony over tragedy.

[...]

41. The whole point of Camp is to dethrone the serious. Camp is playful, anti-serious. More precisely, Camp involves a new, more complex relation to "the serious." One can be serious about the frivolous, frivolous about the serious.

[...]

52. ...Camp is a solvent of morality. It neutralizes moral indignation, sponsors playfulness.⁴⁰

I do not think Mason would find Sontag's characterization of camp inconsistent with his own account of the type of wit found in Martial and Juvenal. Mason describes their poetry as witty, playful, detached from reality, and complicit in an unreal substratum of obscene and scandalous subject matter. Thus, like Highet, Mason comes perilously close to a camp reading of Juvenal (in this case linked with a similarly camp reading of Martial) while not himself quite becoming a camp reader. He champions the notion of perverse wit in Martial and Juvenal, but clings to the ultimately conservative notion of perverse wit deployed in solidarity with the dominant, lacking access to the (camp) notion of perverse wit deployed in solidarity with the deviant. Not unlike Highet, precisely against whom his argument for a witty Juvenal is positioned, Mason recognizes

⁴⁰ Sontag 1999: 62, 64 (preserving the epigrammatic format of the original).

Juvenal's subversive formal qualities but implicitly denies their subversiveness and, by giving us a Juvenal who is morally indifferent, ultimately cedes ground to the persistent notion of a Juvenal who is morally conservative.⁴¹

Wiesen's Defense of Moralism

Mason's argument that Juvenal was a classic of wit rather than a classic of moral satire was apparently the last straw for David Wiesen, who in 1963 published "Juvenal's Moral Character, an Introduction," written with the express purpose of refuting the likes of Mason, whom he positions as the rear-guard of a 150-year assault on the moral sincerity and earnest reformism of Juvenal.⁴² In his strident defense of Juvenal's moral character, Wiesen dramatizes the high social, cultural, and political stakes in the effort to rescue Juvenal from the deviant and reclaim him for the dominant, a strenuous disavowal of a camp Juvenal that is part of a seldom acknowledged history of classical scholarship in the service of a conservative and indeed heteronormative morality. For what Wiesen ultimately argues is that Juvenal is only valuable as an earnest social reformer; Juvenal is only credible as an earnest social reformer if he is morally sincere; Juvenal can only be

⁴¹ I want to acknowledge at least the possibility that Mason in the flesh was a completely camp reader who, writing as he was in the conservative milieu of 1962, was employing a kind of code when he used phrases like "abominable behavior" to refer to the goings on in Juvenal's ninth satire. For that matter, the same could be said of Highet's reference to Juvenal's "hideous assertion" at 9.130-3. There is no way of knowing whether or not these scholars' tongues were (even somewhat) in their cheeks when they used hyperbolic, potentially camp signifiers like "abominable" and "hideous" to describe sex and gender deviance. All I can say is that, in their extant critical writing, they do not give any indication of having a camp ironic intention when they make such comments.

⁴² Cf. Wiesen 1963: 440, where the author cites deplorably Mason's assertions that Juvenal "is without the faintest moral concern about the subject matter he has chosen" (Mason 1962: 10) and that Juvenal "rollicks and revels in the disgusting and obscene" (Mason 1962: 28, slightly misquoted).

called morally sincere if he is morally virtuous; and Juvenal is only morally virtuous to the extent that he is heterosexual. Ultimately, then, the satires cannot be considered ethical if the satirist proves to be homosexual, and in Wiesen's hands, "ethical" becomes code for heterosexuality and "wit" becomes code for homosexuality. Wiesen's defense of Juvenal's moral probity becomes even more striking in the context of analyses he later wrote of the second and sixth satires that provide a stunning example of what I have been calling *camp manqué*, meaning analyses that all but enact a camp reading without acknowledging camp aesthetics and at times expressing implied or overt hostility to the social, cultural, and political implications of a camp sensibility on the part of either modern scholar or ancient poet. These kinds of readings, as I have been suggesting, are too critically sophisticated to ignore the nature and function of perverse wit in Juvenal's satires, but they deny its subversive implications, admitting at most only that verbal wit tends to undermine moral credibility.⁴³ A close examination of Wiesen's arguments can be a helpful reminder of the kinds of assumptions, strategies, and aims that characterized much Juvenal scholarship during the mid twentieth century.

The Importance of Being Moral

For most of modernity, claims Wiesen, Juvenal was thought to be a sincere moral critic and earnest social reformer. Since the nineteenth century, however, scholars have

⁴³ We will see this argument at work in Wiesen 1989 as well as in Plaza 2006, who cannot be described as a conservative critic, but who can scarcely credit Juvenal with having been a subversive poet and so contends only that humor tends to undermine the satirist's morally conservative message. The only scholar to date who seems to attribute critical agency to Juvenal—that is, allows Juvenal to play his comedy against his didacticism willfully—is Ralph Rosen (cf. Rosen 2007, especially Chapter 6).

increasingly come to argue that the mask of the satiric persona “conceals... a lascivious smirk, attacking Juvenal’s ethical purpose based on claims that Juvenal (1) led a “thoroughly debauched life” and (2) had “no clear and consistent moral principles.” Mason is thus something of a straw man for Wiesen, since (as shown above) Mason does not in fact claim that Juvenal was morally corrupt; only that his satires are morally disengaged and that his humor is characterized by a perverse wit whose poetic deployment is conventional and playful but by no means at odds with conventional morality. Nevertheless, Wiesen maintains that the opponents of an ethical Juvenal have based their argument on claims about the poet’s own dubious morality. Thus, in order to defend the ethics of the satires, he must first refute the evidence for a morally compromised poet.⁴⁴ In what follows, I will be summarizing Wiesen’s citation of previous Juvenal scholars; while his sources are cited in my footnotes and bibliography for the sake of completeness, my objective here is not to conduct my own review of these sources, only to indicate the use that Wiesen makes of them.

Wiesen briefly reviews the history of Juvenal’s reputation as religious and moral champion, citing in support of Juvenal’s reputation for probity a range of moral luminaries from Lactantius to Victor Hugo.⁴⁵ Wiesen traces the case against an ethical Juvenal to Nisard’s 1834 study of the later Latin poets, which provides readers with two possible and equally unpalatable Juvenals, (1) the writer as fugitive from the schools of

⁴⁴ Wiesen 1963: 440-2; the quotes are from 441 and 442.

⁴⁵ Cf. Wiesen 1963: 442-6. The list of witnesses to Juvenal’s moral probity includes Prudentius, Paulinus of Nola, St. Augustine, RATHERIUS of Verona, John of Salisbury, Pope Innocent III, Dante, Petrarch, Chaucer, Pope Pius II, and Friedrich Schiller.

declamation and (2) the heedless moralist who was no more upright in his life than he was in his letters.⁴⁶ Later scholars proved Juvenal's moral claims to be a mere hodge-podge of philosophical and rhetorical commonplaces; de Decker characterized Juvenal's notorious savage indignation as nothing more than a fictional fervor.⁴⁷ The most thorough attack was mounted by Marmorale, who according to Wiesen argued "that Juvenal was incapable of examining life ethically because his detailed knowledge of corruption indicates that he was subject to the very faults for which he claimed to feel the greatest horror."⁴⁸ These faults, as we shall see, turn out to be homosexuality.

With Wiesen's concise restatement of Marmorale's thesis, we are ambling toward yet another *camp manqué* reading of Juvenal's satires, like those I have been identifying throughout this chapter, in which camp is unwittingly viewed, as it were, through the wrong end of a kaleidoscope. For when Wiesen represents Marmorale as condemning the ethics of the satires based on Juvenal's own moral failings, he is pointing towards precisely that *solidarity with the deviant* that I contend is the defining affective dimension

⁴⁶ In the words of Nisard, "le fougeaux écrivain de l'école et le moraliste assez insouciant," cited by Wiesen 1963: 448; "aussi roide dans son commerce qu'il l'est dans ses livres," cited by Wiesen 1963: 449. According to Wiesen (448-9), Nisard's moral critique is supported by "evidence drawn from Juvenal's relationship with the supposedly disreputable Martial, the only one of Juvenal's friends of whom we have any sure knowledge." Cf. Nisard 1834. The discrediting of Juvenal based on the declamatory nature of the satires he traces to Boileau's famous couplet, "Juvenál élevé dans les cris de l'école / Poussa jusqu'à l'excès sa mordante hyperbole" (Juvenal, raised among the cries of the school [of declamation], pushed to the point of excess his mordant hyperbole). Wiesen attributes this oft-repeated charge to a misplaced credulity in the statement "until about middle age he practiced declamation" (*ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit*) in the ancient biographies (cf. Clausen 1959: 177-9).

⁴⁷ In the words of de Decker, "chaleur fictive," cited by Wiesen 1963: 449. Cf. de Decker 1913.

⁴⁸ Wiesen 1963: 450. Cf. Marmorale 1938.

of camp. Of course, since Wiesen is not interested in solidarity with the deviant, he positions the attitude in question as a kind of corrupt sexual knowledge that disqualifies Juvenal as a social critic. In other words, Juvenal is disqualified as morally sincere and socially earnest because of his embrace of stigmatized identity, arguably camp's *raison d'être*.

Wiesen maintains that the scholarly turn against a morally sincere, socially earnest Juvenal grew out of the Romantic embrace of *novelty* in the nineteenth century, which he characterizes as a radical turn from more traditional notions of literature that valued adherence to generic conventions rather than innovation. He argues that Marmorale and his followers proceed from complaints about Juvenal's "lack of originality" to assertions about his moral insincerity bolstered by unsubstantiated claims about his bad character. Thus, he argues, if the case against Juvenal's morality can be undermined, then "the fragility of the romantic case against Juvenal will be exposed," thereby paving the way for a reassessment of the ethical value of the satires, unencumbered by concerns that their ethical value is compromised by the moral corruption of their author.⁴⁹ Ethical satires are thus heteronormative satires, and the intimations of homosexuality associated with perverse with must somehow be explained away. An ethical Juvenal certainly cannot be a camp Juvenal.

⁴⁹ Cf. Wiesen 1963: 451-2. Note the mark of a paranoid reading stance, as defined in Chapter One, in Wiesen's rhetoric of "exposure." In view of the fact that Sedgwick's discussion of paranoid reading might suggest that it is a practice associated with left-leaning critical thinkers, this is a good example of how paranoid reading can be a practice embraced from either end of the political spectrum.

Saving Juvenal from Martial

Wiesen claims that Marmorale, like Nisard, impugns Juvenal's morality based primarily on his association with the lascivious Martial. Wiesen denies that Juvenal's appearance in some epigrams of Martial says anything about Juvenal's character at all, but nevertheless goes on to review the three poems in question so as to demonstrate that they are in fact benign.⁵⁰ What emerges, however unwittingly, is a demonstration of Martial's camp sensibility, with a striking evocation of "Juvenal" as literary conceit within this camp poetic context.

Wiesen first considers Martial 7.24, which reproves an anonymous addressee for trying to drive a wedge between Martial and Juvenal.

Cum Iuvenale meo quae me committere temptas,
 quid non audebis, perfida lingua, loqui?
 Te fingente nefas Pyladen odisset Orestes,
 Thesea Pirithoi destituisset amor,
 tu Siculos fratres et maius nomen Atridas
 et Ladae poteras dissociare genus.
 Hoc tibi pro meritis et talibus inprecor ausis,
 ut facias illud quod, puto, lingua, facis.

Faithless tongue that seeks to set me at odds with my dear Juvenal, what will you not dare to say? If you had fabricated such an unspeakable charge, Orestes would have hated Pylades, the love of Pirithous would have abandoned Theseus, you could have dissolved the alliance of the Sicilian brothers, and the sons of Atreus (a greater name), and the progeny of Leda. This curse I utter upon you, as befits such deeds dared and wages earned, that you should do that thing which I think, o tongue, you do.

About this tour de force of perverse wit, Wiesen has but two things to say: first, that the use of exaggeration, irony, and mythological parody all suggest that Martial did not take his friendship with Juvenal very seriously; and second, that the sexually suggestive

⁵⁰ Cf. Wiesen 1963: 453-6.

reference in the last two lines do not implicate Juvenal personally. Wiesen adduces this example for the express purpose of dismissing its value as a testament either to Juvenal's intimacy with Martial or his moral deviance, but I contend that he ends up demonstrating Martial's camp sensibility, and providing evidence for including Juvenal within a camp social and literary milieu. The case for camp is made by citing the qualities of exaggeration, irony, and parody, all hallmarks of camp. The case is strengthened when Wiesen wonders whether Martial would have written so frivolous a poem if he had been seriously concerned about the potential loss of a friend. Remember that camp employs frivolity to address matters it takes seriously; thus, the frivolity of the epigram, rather than negating the historicity of Martial's friendship with Juvenal, confirms Martial's own camp sensibility, and suggests that Juvenal could be implicated in the perversely witty *entendres* of a camp text. Wiesen doubts the assertion of Salanitro that the *nefas* in line 3 "must have something to do with homosexual relations";⁵¹ but many a reader, particularly many a camp reader, would agree with Salanitro. Indeed, the mystery of the *nefas* attests to what Sontag (cited earlier in this chapter) refers to as camp's duplicitously "flamboyant mannerisms" that reveal their witty meaning to an inside group while allowing outsiders to arrive at a more conventional meaning that conforms to their moral expectations; or, as in this case, lets them deny that we can know what the gesture means at all, if denial is preferable to affirming a meaning that troubles their expectations.

Wiesen next considers Martial 7.91, addressed to Juvenal to accompany a gift of nuts sent for the Saturnalia.

⁵¹ Wiesen 1963: 454n1, citing Salanitro 1948: 12.

De nostro, facunde, tibi, Iuvenalis, agello
 Saturnalicias mittimus, ecce, nuces.
 Cetera lascivis donavit poma puellis
 mentula custodis luxuriosa dei.

From my little farm, eloquent Juvenal, I send you, behold, nuts for the Saturnalia. The generous cock of the vigilant god [Priapus] gave the rest of the fruit to the naughty girls.

Regarding this poem, Wiesen rightly insists that we cannot impugn Juvenal's morality based on the possibility that he may have enjoyed a dirty joke. Again, however, we have an epigram that displays Martial's camp sensibility and implicates Juvenal as a camp conceit. The literal nuts (*nuces*, 2) that come from a tree are incongruously juxtaposed with the figurative fruit (*poma*, 3) that is a euphemism for sexual intercourse between the garden god Priapus (*custodis...dei*, 4) and a group of girls imagined as "naughty," a (barely) tactful way of suggesting that they are sexually avid (*lascivis...puellis*, 3). The sportive quality of the girls, while no doubt sanctioned by the occasion of the Saturnalia, is nonetheless an incongruous juxtaposition with the modesty that is generally expected of them during the rest of the year. Thus, we have Juvenal as the addressee of a thoroughly camp text, strongly arguing for the camp personality of both sender and recipient of this poem and its accompanied gift.

Finally, Wiesen considers Martial 12.18, a 26-line poem in hendecasyllables addressed to Juvenal in Rome from Martial's retirement in Bilbilis (near modern-day Calatayud), where Martial imagines the satirist enduring the harsh city while he languishes in the Spanish countryside. The passage that concerns Wiesen, lines 22-3, describes the daily ministrations of Martial's loyal and efficient household: *venator sequitur, sed ille quem tu / secreta cupias habere silva*. A literal translation would be "A

hunter follows, but the kind whom you would wish to have in the secluded woods.” The effect of *sed ille quem*, however, seems to demand something more like “Not just any huntsman follows, but the sort of fellow you would love to get your hands on in a forest hideout.” Wiesen comments:

The reference to pederasty is plain enough, but not even Marmorale can bring himself to argue that these lines are positive proof of Juvenal’s homosexuality. He is willing at this point to admit the obvious: that Martial is here employing the impersonal second person singular. Nonetheless, claims Marmorale, Martial’s comment is of value in reconstructing Juvenal’s biography, since he would surely never have made obscene remarks to Juvenal if he had not known where his correspondents’ interests lay.⁵²

This is the first time Wiesen mentions homosexuality by name, but this reference confirms that his notion of “moral character” has all along been a euphemism for heterosexuality, and that what he considers attacks on Juvenal’s “moral character” are in fact charges of homosexuality. Indeed, these are precisely the same two lines cited by Hight 1954: 269n17, discussed in Chapter One above, to demonstrate that Juvenal “turned to active homosexuality” because he became “disgusted by women.” This line of reasoning lands us in a thicket of homophobia combined with misconceptions about (1) the historicity of sexuality as a category and (2) the sex and gender norms and dynamics of ancient Rome. Here we have a generation of biographical critics, on both sides of the Juvenalian moralism debate, insisting (1) that there is such a thing as homosexuality in classical antiquity, (2) that homosexuality, wherever one finds it, is an index of

⁵² Wiesen 1963: 455, citing Marmorale 1938: 40. One must give Wiesen credit for characterizing as “naïve” the interpretation of Italian classicist Augusto Serafini, which he paraphrases in a footnote as follows: “Juv. would have been glad to have a strong *venator* with him when facing dangerous wild beasts in the forest” (citing Serafini 1957: 104).

immorality, and (3) that staining or clearing Juvenal of the taint of homosexuality is tantamount to qualifying or disqualifying him, respectively, as a sincere moral critic and earnest social reformer.

My interest here, however, is not so much in the conceptual deficiencies and homophobia of Wiesen and his contemporaries, as it is in the evidence for a camp sensibility on display in the passages Wiesen cites from Martial. The reference to the charming *venator* at Mart. 12.18.22-3 is one of several touches of perverse wit in this epigram; witty references, moreover, that again implicate Juvenal as a poetic conceit in a camp context of risqué duplicity of precisely the sort described by Sontag. The poem begins with Martial imagining Juvenal in any of three locations: wandering restlessly in the noisy Subura (1-2), the so-called red-light district of Rome associated in a number of sources with prostitutes;⁵³ treading the Aventine Hill, where sits the temple of Diana (3), cited in Juvenal's ninth satire as a place of assignation for adulterous women;⁵⁴ or cooling his heels on the thresholds of wealthy patrons on the larger and smaller peaks of the Caelian Hill (4-6). This last scenario takes on witty connotations as part of a network of references, throughout texts of both Martial and Juvenal, to the Roman institution of patronage as a site of profound moral pretense, in which the poor and weak incessantly curry favor with the wealthy and powerful in an often humiliating and emasculating

⁵³ Platner 1929: 501, citing sources, refers to it as “a resort of harlots (Pers. 5.32; Mart. II.17; VI.66.1-2; XI.61.3; 78.11; Priap. 40.1).”

⁵⁴ Cf. Juv. 9.22-4, in which the Juvenalian interlocutor addresses Naevolus: “For it was only recently, as I recall, that you were accustomed to frequent the shrine of Isis, the statue of Ganymede in the Temple of Peace, the shrine of the immigrant Mother on the palatine, and the temple of Ceres--for in what temple does a woman not prostitute herself?” (*nuper enim, ut repeto, fanum Isidis et Ganymedem / Pacis et aduetae secreta Palatia matris / et Cererem--nam quo non prostat femina templo?*).

distortion of traditional Republican ideals of noblesse oblige. Moreover, as we saw in our earlier discussion of Martial 9.63 and as we see throughout our study of Juvenal's ninth satire, the rhetoric of patronage functions in Martial and Juvenal as a euphemism for a kind of polite, cunningly dignified version of homosexual prostitution. In this light, the progression in Martial 12.18 from the Subura to the temple of Diana to the threshold of a powerful patron is shot through with duplicitous camp references to sex and gender deviance.

Martial concludes his description of idyllic indolence at Bilbilis not with the image of the winsome huntsman at 22-3, but with an ever slyer reference to slaves maintained in a prolonged state of sexual availability: "the smooth overseer issues orders to the slave boys and asks to have his long hair cut" (*dispensat pueris rogatque longos / levis ponere vilicus capillos*, 24-5).⁵⁵ Cutting a slave's long hair is a rite that marks his passage out of adolescence and into adulthood, but also out of the period of soft, feminine sexual availability and into the period of hard, masculine sexual maturity during which he would no longer be considered a seemly object of sexual desire for a masculine-gendered Roman male (notwithstanding the fact that there is nothing criminal or emasculating about a Roman man penetrating his own slaves of either sex or any age). By seeking to postpone shearing his comely overseer of his long locks, the speaker is seeking to

⁵⁵ For *ponere* meaning "to cut hair," cf. OLD s.v. *ponere*, sense 6b. Some readers have understood this passage to mean that the overseer asks permission to cut the slave boys' long hair. Reading the line this way would not in fact alter my interpretation, merely shift the issue of prolonged sexual availability from the overseer, who is probably already an adult, to the slave boys, who would seem to be adolescents. See the fascinating note in Watson and Watson 2003: 149-50 *ad loc.* They suggest that the overseer would seem to be "of an optimum age for a sexual relationship with his master, still without a beard (*levis*) but old enough to want to be a man (i.e. engage in heterosexual activity)."

prolong his sexual objectification beyond generally accepted limits (based on standards of *desirability*, not of *availability*). While sexually penetrating a slave of any age would not compromise the speaker's masculinity, I would argue that masculinity per se is not the only criterion of dignity for the masculine-gendered Roman male, and that for Martial's speaker to make sexual use of his adult slaves, while not illegal or contrary to canons of masculinity, would be perceived as undignified. I would further argue that this boundary of sexual availability for the adult slave has to do with the slave's own burgeoning sexual agency; that is, the point at which the slave might be expected to take a female partner of his own is precisely the point at which subjecting the slave to sexual submission is no longer decorous on the part of the adult freeborn master. We see this "aging out" of the male slave as sexual object for his master in Catullus 61, an epithalamion which declares that a young bridegroom must now give up his slave boy as sexual object (*concupinus*, 123 [130]), while the slave boy will be shorn of his locks must now develop a taste for sex with slave women (*vilicae*, 129 [136]).⁵⁶ Similarly in the context of impending marriage, the speaker of Martial 11.78 urges a young bridegroom (actually, urges his *mentula*, 2) to learn the ways of vaginal intercourse with his bride,

⁵⁶ This reading of Cat. 61.124-33 (131-40) is suggested by Richlin 1993a: 534, and I concur with it. The idle (*iners*, 124 [131]) slave boy has played with nuts for long enough; now he should serve Talasius, the wedding god. Slave girls used to displease him, but now the pitiable concubine (*miser a miser /concubine*, 132-3 [139-40]) is going to have his hair cut. Here the refrain commanding him to scatter nuts (*nuces da*, 133 [140] = 128 [135]), a ritual gesture associated with the Roman man's passage from bachelor to bridegroom, is repeated. I would argue that the speaker is suggesting a passage from homosexual submissiveness to heterosexual dominance for the slave boy, a passage that parallels his master's passage from bachelor to bridegroom. Cf. Ancona 2005. Note that the alternative line numbers for these passages arise from the presence of a series of lacunae posited by editors. Cf. Mynors 1958: 44-5 *ad vv.* 78, 107.

who will in turn cut off the long hair of her new husband's slave boys.⁵⁷ In both of these poems, the transition of the slave boy from adolescent object of male sexual desire to adult sexual agent parallels the transition of the young master from bachelor to bridegroom. The speaker in Martial 12.18, evidently long past the age generally associated with getting married, is intent on prolonging the youthful concubinage of his male slaves. The presence of the overseer's wife (*vilica*, 21) only serves to emphasize the absence of any female companion for the speaker. Thus, not only his own maturity and the maturity of his slaves, but also his apparent lack of interest in a female partner lend a kind of camp incongruity to his ongoing sexual interest in his slaves. (I want to underscore that the incongruity *does not lie in his desire for a same-sex object*, but rather in the idea of his artificially prolonged bachelorhood, the slaves' artificially prolonged sexual availability, and his lack of interest in a female sexual object.) The final verse suggests that Martial wishes this state of prolonged and exclusively homosexual pleasure to last indefinitely: "Thus it pleases me to live, thus it pleases me to die" (*sic me vivere, sic iuvat perire*, 26).⁵⁸

In conclusion: Wiesen reviews Juvenal's appearance in three epigrams of Martial so as to demonstrate that their content renders no verdict on Juvenal's "moral character," which turns out to be code for heterosexuality. What Wiesen reveals, however unwittingly, is that Juvenal's appearance in epigrams of Martial always occurs in the context of a demonstrably camp sensibility. These poems exploit formal qualities

⁵⁷ These examples are discussed in Richlin 1993a: 534-5, whose interpretation I am following here (although Richlin does not discuss these poems in terms of camp).

⁵⁸ Cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.9.24, "With you I should like to live, with you I should gladly die" (*tecum vivere amem, tecum obeam lubens*).

associated with camp such as exaggeration, irony, and parody; they exhibit camp's characteristic duplicity of a witty meaning for insiders and a more conventional meaning for outsiders; and they take pleasure in gratuitous references to sex that belie their pretended adherence to standards of moral probity (for example, whatever the *nefas* of Martial 7.24 might be, Martial presumably would never indulge in such a thing, nor would he indulge in whatever unspeakable thing it is that the *perfida lingua* does). The appearance of "Juvenal" as a camp conceit in these epigrams of Martial contributes, however modestly, to the case for a camp Juvenal.

Saving Juvenal from Himself

Having considered Juvenal's appearance in three epigrams of Martial, Wiesen insists there is no indication that the two were particularly close or, even if they were, that Martial was a bad moral influence on Juvenal. Like Mason, Wiesen reminds us of the "raunchy page, life upright" (*lascivia pagina, vita proba*) tradition from Catullus through Ovid and Pliny to Martial, and states that "obscenity" was an inheritance of satire not only from Lucilius, but from such generic progenitors as Cynic diatribe and Old Comedy. In the eleventh and twelfth satire, Wiesen argues, Juvenal explicitly disavows the vices he has castigated in his other poems, proclaiming his satisfaction with modest living.⁵⁹ The only recourse left to Juvenal's moral assassins, claims Wiesen, is the passage in the sixth satire (34-7) where he seems to advocate pederasty:

nonne putas melius, quod tecum pusio dormit?
pusio, qui noctu non litigat, exigit a te
nulla iacens illic munuscula, nec queritur quod

⁵⁹ Cf. Wiesen 1963: 456-62.

et lateri parcas nec quantum iussit anheles.

Don't you think it is better that a boy sleeps with you? A boy who doesn't quarrel at night, who demands of you no little gift while he is lying there, and does not complain that you spare your strength and that you do not pant as much as he commands.

If this advice is offered sincerely, Wiesen claims, then Juvenal's ethical mask has indeed slipped from his hypocritical face. All along, Wiesen has maintained that all we can ask of Juvenal is that he abstain from the vices he castigates; and, as he would have it, Juvenal inveighs mightily against homosexuality throughout the second and ninth satires as well as in the Oxford fragment of the sixth. To save the satirist from himself, Wiesen proceeds to argue that Juvenal's exhortation to pederasty is not to be taken seriously, but is rather "an ironic exaggeration intended simply to highlight the horror which the poet felt for marriage."⁶⁰

To be sure, Wiesen makes a series of conceptual errors when he conflates under the rubric of "homosexuality" a range of behaviors, including sexual dominance of an adult male over another adult male ("active homosexuality"), sexual submission of an adult male to another adult male ("passive homosexuality"), and sexual submission of an adolescent male to an adult male ("pederasty"). While I do not want to discount the importance of these conceptual errors, they are not my primary concern here. Rather, my primary concern is the fact that Wiesen recognizes the operation of perverse wit in this passage; that is, the reference to pederasty is not an earnest prescription for social reform based on sincerely held moral principles, but is rather an instance of humorous sexual banter that is exaggerated to signal its irony. Thus, like Hightet and Mason before him,

⁶⁰ Cf. Wiesen 1963: 463-8.

Wiesen comes close to offering a camp reading of sexual humor in Juvenal. He even recognizes that the detailed description of sex stands in ironic contrast to pretended moral standards (an important feature of camp discourse); that is, the speaker of the sixth satire would love to love marriage (the moral standard) if only he could, but he simply cannot, because women make such abominable wives (the ironic contrast). But again, like Highet and Mason before him, Wiesen fails as a camp reader because he reads Juvenal's perverse wit in solidarity with the dominant (the traditional ideology of feminine modesty for women) rather than the deviant (women who do not live their lives according to the normative ideology of femininity). On this reading, the speaker may abhor the traditional institution of marriage, but he does so only because women are odious, not because he favors any kind of radical alternative. Thus, again like Highet and Mason before him, Wiesen acknowledges the presence of perverse wit but not its subversive implications.

Just how strenuously Wiesen denies the subversive implications of perverse wit is shown in his reading of Juvenal 4.106, a line that he cites as evidence for Juvenal's abhorrence of homosexuality, and thus as evidence that his exhortation to pederasty in the sixth satire could not be in earnest. The context in the fourth satire is a mock-epic catalogue of advisers who have been summoned to a council by Domitian to advise him on the disposition of an enormous turbot. As Juvenal describes each adviser in turn, he comes at length (4.102-4) to Rubrius Gallus, a military leader who held commands under Nero, Otho, and Vespasian:⁶¹

nec melior vultu quamvis ignobilis ibat
Rubrius, offensae veteris reus atque tacendae,

⁶¹ Cf. Mayor 1872: 233 *ad loc.*

et tamen inprobior saturam scribente cinaedo.

Rubrius went [to the council of Domitian], of no happier appearance [than the nobler advisers] despite his low birth, accused of an old, unspeakable crime, and yet more shameless than a *cinaedus* writing satire.

The idea behind “of no happier appearance” (*nec melior vultu*, 102) is that, as a man of humble station (*ignobilis*, 102), Rubrius might be expected to fear less from the wrath of the emperor than his more estimable colleagues, all of whom Domitian is said to have hated (*quos oderat ille*, 74). The term *cinaedus*, as we have seen previously, refers to a feminine-gendered adult male, generally supposed to desire submission to anal penetration by other men.⁶² Again, Wiesen is conflating various formations of same-sex desire inaccurately under the rubric of “homosexuality,” since neither the bachelor whom Juvenal addresses in the sixth satire (*Postume*, 21), nor the hypothetical young man (*pusio*, 34) whom he urges as a favorable alternative to a wife, could properly be considered a *cinaedus*. But again, while not wishing to minimize the relevance of such misconceptions, my primary concern here is with how Wiesen treats the sexual humor. I read 4.106 as an instance of ambivalent solidarity, an ironic form of ridicule characteristic of camp. Like the *nefas* of Martial 7.24.3, the “unspeakable crime” of Rubrius (*offensae...tacendae*, 103) may suggest a reference to a deviant sexual practice, although it may refer to a political incident: again, as in the case of Martial’s *nefas*, the hyperbolic

⁶² “Generally” is the operative word in this formulation. See Williams 2010, esp. 193-214 and 230-239, for a more comprehensive characterization of the type of man to whom the word *cinaedus* is disparagingly applied. In particular, cf. Williams 2010: 239 and 407n296 on women who penetrate men (*viros ineunt*) at Sen. *Epist.* 95.21; and Williams 2010: 209, 212-13 for fables of Phaedrus in which men are identified as *cinaedi* solely on the basis of their effeminate appearance and comportment, in the absence of any information regarding whether or not they have submitted to anal penetration by anyone of either sex.

mystery is part of the humor.⁶³ Nevertheless, despite having been accused of such a crime, Rubrius displays no shame; indeed he appears “more shameless than a *cinaedus* writing satire (*inprobior saturam scribente cinaedo*, 104). In a camp reading, the use of the term *cinaedus* is an instance of perverse wit that paradoxically expresses solidarity with the very form of deviance it formally ridicules. Wiesen, however, detects no irony in the ridicule, but rather reads it as Juvenal’s personal affirmation that “the nature of satire is essentially ethical.” He continues:

The satirist is not merely a mercilessly realistic portrayer of human life in general but a *ensor morum* who points out and ridicules, in an effort to destroy, the forces which undermine society. The three words *saturam scribente cinaedo* are pregnant with meaning. The phrase makes no sense unless Juvenal is assuming that the reader will immediately understand and acknowledge the basically ethical character of the *satura* and thus perceive, without further explanation, the horror of a pervert pretending to teach morals.

Thus, while we see Wiesen appeal to ironic exaggeration in his reading of “better” (*melius*) at 6.34 (“Don’t you think it is *better* that a boy sleeps with you?”), where imputing irony allows him to disavow a behavior that he considers immoral (*quod tecum pusio dormit*) he insists on a sincere, unironic reading of “more shameless” (*inprobrior*) at 4.106, “more *shameless* than a *cinaedus* writing satire,” again so as to disavow a behavior that he considers immoral (*saturam scribente cinaedo*). In effect, Wiesen will embrace or reject a camp reading style as it suits his moral purpose, which is to preserve the text’s solidarity with the dominant. Contrary to Wiesen’s reading in the passage

⁶³ Indeed, the scholiast on Juv. 4.105 says that Rubrius had made unwelcome sexual advances on Domitian’s niece, making his alleged crime both sexual and political (*Aliquando Iuliam in pueritia corruerat, et verebatur ne pro hac mercede poenas ab ipso reposceret*). Cf. Mayor 1872: 233 *ad loc.*

quoted above, the phrase *saturam scribente cinaedo* also makes sense if the reader understands satire to be morally ambiguous and thus perceives the camp humor of a gender-deviant *cinaedus* practicing the very genre that pretends to uphold the moral and ethical standards of the dominant discourse.

Wiesen concludes his defense of Juvenal's moral character by quoting Salanitro to the effect that the satirist aspired to a society that was just, humane, virtuous, and ethically improved.⁶⁴ As we shall see below, however, Wiesen would go on to abandon this traditionally humanistic view, coming to see Juvenal as ever more characterized by a perverse wit that, if not in solidarity with the deviant, at least had little respect for the dominant.

Satire as (Camp?) Verbal Icon

The view of Juvenal that Wiesen 1963 borrowed from Salanitro seems to be almost diametrically opposed to the view he expressed in Wiesen 1989, a posthumously published study of satires 2 and 6. Here Wiesen asserts that the key to Juvenal's "satiric vision" lies much less in the poet's own ideas, opinions, or specific satiric targets than it does in his verbal artistry.⁶⁵ To be sure, he reiterates his earlier stance against Mason's claim that Juvenal was chiefly interested in displays of wit and had no coherent social vision. He claims, however, that Juvenal's vision of society is far from that of the sincere moral critic and earnest social reformer he himself had earlier advocated:

⁶⁴ Cf. Wiesen 1963: 471, citing Salanitro 1944: 49.

⁶⁵ Wiesen, even in 1963, claimed to be no fan of biographical fallacy, but believed that Juvenal's moral assailants, who for the most part assumed a biographical approach, had to be fought on their own turf. Cf. Wiesen 1963: 440-1.

The language of the Satires, if rightly read, does convey a coherent vision, the vision of a soulless society that has exhausted its intellectual capital and is living off its accumulated treasury of traditions, a society that is hollow at its core and has lost its sense of the future. Just as for Juvenal there is nothing to look forward to—and hence no future—so there is no real past, for the past is a wretched congeries of dead tradition, absurd legends, rhetorical exempla, topoi, and lies.⁶⁶

Particularly relevant to a camp reading of Juvenal is Wiesen's assertion that the satirist projects a vision of a "soulless" and "hollow" society that is all surface ("wretched congeries of dead tradition, absurd legends, rhetorical exempla, topoi, and lies") and no substance. Beginning with Sontag, theorists of camp have emphasized camp's privileging of surface over substance, and a Juvenal who sees the world in terms of superficial rhetoric with no substance beneath is potentially a very camp Juvenal indeed.⁶⁷ Dollimore 1991 demonstrates how Oscar Wilde, the father of modern camp, developed an aesthetic based on an inversion of the traditional values of depth and surface, an attitude evinced in several of Wilde's *Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young*, including: "Only the shallow know themselves....It is only the superficial qualities that last. Man's deeper nature is soon found out."⁶⁸

Wiesen asserts that "Juvenal at once holds up the past as a model for the present and undermines that model....The past is almost never represented by Juvenal in other than ironic and ridiculing tones." He rejects the excessive "literalness" of much Juvenal scholarship and urges a high index of suspicion "even in passages of the greatest apparent seriousness and moral passion." Turning to the fifteenth satire, about cannibalism in

⁶⁶ Wiesen 1989: 709.

⁶⁷ Cf. Sontag 1999, sections 5 and 14.

⁶⁸ See Dollimore 1991: 14-15, citing Wilde 1909: 142-4.

Egypt, Wiesen offers a veritable textbook definition of camp: “The poem is pervaded by the tension between sincerity and irony because even while the matter seems most serious, the manner trembles on the cusp of the grotesquely comic.” Wiesen confirms his embrace of this surface/substance model when he writes, “Beneath the apparently serious, moralizing surface text, we hear the note of self-questioning irony.” In a refreshing take on the programmatic opening of the first satire (Juv. 1.1-21), Wiesen concludes that these lines “stand as a warning to the reader to expect a high level of stylization, of artifice, and of irony, rather than an abundance of spontaneity and deep personal conviction.” Juvenal promises no positive program for social reform, only “an attack on the present.” In place of reaffirming an old doctrine or proposing a new one, Juvenal offers “a sophisticated verbal art which conveys the message that the denunciation of evil is also an elaborate form of literary wit and play calling into question that very denunciation.”⁶⁹

Wiesen then proceeds to demonstrate his thesis via highly nuanced readings of the second and the sixth satires. Of particular interest for a camp poetics is Wiesen’s emphasis on the subversion of apparent incongruities. In modern camp we see this, for example, in drag, where the incongruity of a male body performing feminine gender comes to undermine the notion of stable gender identities and denaturalize the presumed alignment between gender identity and anatomical sex. Wiesen argues that in the second satire, Juvenal opposes the manliness and morality of the past to the effeminacy and

⁶⁹ Wiesen 1989: 710-713. Wiesen’s later view is thus very close to that of Plaza 2006 and Rosen 2007, both of whom argue at length that satiric humor undermines the pretended moral and ethical stance of satire.

moral pretense of the present, only to undermine the contrast by emptying the past of any true moral authority. In turning to the sixth satire, Wiesen argues that the poem's verbal artistry undermines its moral sincerity and social reformism. In their place, it presents a vision of a vacuous culture based on wealth, luxury, and sophistication that "lacks an inner core of belief or of ethical standards and is seriously deficient in true humanity." But the sheer "exhibitionistic" wit of the sixth satire rescues it from complete "pessimism," because the faithless, hopeless, meaningless world it describes is no more believable than the idealized past it has displaced.⁷⁰

Wiesen thus travels a long way from the idea, borrowed from Salanitro in the 1960s, of a morally sincere Juvenal who earnestly sought justice, humanity, virtue, and the ethical improvement of society. In its place, he offers a "nihilistic" Juvenal who undermines the values of the past and withholds "any alternative to the absurdity of an intolerable world." And yet Wiesen clings, strangely and perhaps stubbornly, to the idea of Juvenalian moralism. The fact that "Juvenal is fascinated as well as appalled by the corruption he has chosen to treat," he observes, "does not, of course, destroy his moralism, for such ambiguity is found in much satire."⁷¹ Thus, Wiesen remains an essentially conservative critic; but he now recognizes the pervasiveness of the ironic exaggeration previously acknowledged only when it supported his case for a heteronormative Juvenal. While Wiesen never becomes a truly camp reader, he ultimately recognizes the tendency of wit and irony to undermine the moral seriousness and earnest social reformism of Juvenal's satiric persona.

⁷⁰ Wiesen 1989: 724, 733.

⁷¹ Wiesen 1989: 733, 722.

Fredericks and Ironic Overstatement

The extremes in the Juvenalian moralism debate were represented by Mason, who argued for a Juvenal who had no moral agenda at all and was only concerned with witty and ironic verbal display, and by Wiesen, who argued, at least initially, for a sincerely moral Juvenal who was an earnest social reformer. As we saw in the preceding section, however, Wiesen's own characterization of Juvenal collapsed once he started performing close readings of the satires and found that wit and irony were indeed pervasive features of both his verbal artistry and his social conception; features, moreover, that tended to undermine moral sincerity and earnest social reformism in a manner that I characterize as camp, although neither Mason or Wiesen used that term. We have also seen that even when wit and irony are recognized as pervasive features of Juvenalian satire (as they were increasingly throughout the twentieth century), they are perceived by essentially conservative critics to be in solidarity with a dominant ideology that values normative performances of sex, gender, and kinship, while stigmatizing forms of sex, gender, and kinship deviance. Particularly instructive in this regard are two passages by the noted Juvenal scholar S.C. Fredericks. The first, from "Irony of Overstatement in the Satires of Juvenal" (1979), begins by citing Leonard Feinberg's definition of satiric technique as a "*playfully critical distortion of the familiar*" and continues as follows:

This tactical approach to satire thus involves four interrelated parameters: by "playfulness" Feinberg means that wit and humor are essential to satiric discourse; "criticism" presupposes that the satirist rejects an established set of values in favor of another set which is not yet established, or (if he is a conservative) no longer in force, or perhaps only implicit in his thinking; "distortion" suggests that the fictions created by the satirist are bound to be unrealistic to some extent since it is the satirist's purpose to induce a new sense of the real in his readers; finally,

“the familiar” informs us that satire requires norms, at least as a point of departure.⁷²

The phrase “playfully critical distortion of the familiar” could serve as a characterization of camp; think, for example, of the playful distortion of femininity by which drag critiques stable gender identities, or of the playful distortion of representational art by which Warhol’s soap boxes and soup cans critique consumer culture. Feinberg’s definition, especially as expanded by Fredericks’ gloss, would appear to be a very promising starting point for a camp reading of Juvenal’s ninth satire. That is, if “the familiar” is the set of normative Roman ideologies of masculinity, femininity, phalldominant sexuality, and the heteronormative family with its masculine-gendered husband, feminine-gendered wife, and conventionally procreated children, we might expect “playfully critical” to suggest a witty and humorous rejection of these values in favor of alternatives that embrace sex, gender, and kinship deviance. In addition, Fredericks’ gloss of “distortion” suggests that the hyperbolic invective and exaggerated perversity of the poem’s fictional characters might aim at denaturalizing the dominant ideology (thereby “[inducing] a new sense of the real”); similarly, his explanation of “the familiar” (norms as a point of departure), offers potential for a subversive distancing in which the poem both objectifies the ideological context of its fictive world and achieves a

⁷² Fredericks 1979: 178, citing Feinberg 1963: 7. The emphasis in Feinberg’s definition is in the original. It should be noted that Feinberg is theorizing about satire generally, not Roman verse satire in particular, although Fredericks, in citing Feinberg’s definition, does not seem to regard this distinction as relevant to his own argument about Juvenalian irony.

kind of epistemological distance from that ideology, making the nature and function of the ideology particularly conspicuous.⁷³

In short, Fredericks' gloss of Feinberg's definition of satiric technique might allow for a perversely witty ninth satire in solidarity with the deviant. And yet, summarizing the ninth satire in his chapter on Juvenal in the handbook that he coauthored, Fredericks 1974: 154-5 writes (emphases added):

Like Trebius [the disaffected client of Satire 5], Naevolus is *not really an object of sympathy* for Juvenal at all, for the satirist's words *are intended as cynical mockery* of this man's *immorality*. *Juvenal is fully aware* that the source of *Naevolus' corruption is really a moral and spiritual one*, but the addressee, *blinded by materialism, never catches on to this fact*.... [Naevolus] *has the nerve* to complain that Virro has cruelly subverted the sanctity of the patron-client relationship, even though *their whole homosexual arrangement is a perversion of the original meaning of "patron-client."* [...] Juvenal *ironically concedes* that Naevolus' cause is just and inquires of him what Virro has to say for his part. [...] "O Corydon, Corydon," Juvenal *mockingly* responds, in a comic allusion to the *homosexual atmosphere* of Vergil's second eclogue. [...] The *slavish* client closes the satire by *discrediting himself once and for all* with his *absurd pretences*. [...] With *absurd self-pity*, Naevolus shows how *perverted his notion of justice is* and *how limited is the meaning of his life* which aims only at wealth.

My interest here is in the shocking disparity between Fredericks' endorsement of satire's "playfully critical distortion of the familiar" and his paraphrase of Juvenal 9. In Fredericks' summary, we see no recognition of the poem's playful wit or humor. Nor does Fredericks credit the ninth satire with rejecting an established set of values, inducing in the reader a new sense of the real, or departing from an existing set of norms. Instead, Fredericks gives us a poem characterized by cynical mockery and scornful ridicule; reaffirmation of traditional Roman morality (which presumably stigmatizes Naevolus,

⁷³ A notion of distancing borrowed from Althusser 2001: 221-27.

whether as homosexual, as prostitute, or both); a re-reification of the same old sense of the real (implied in the claim that homosexuality constitutes a “perversion of the original meaning” of *clientela*); and norms not as a “point of departure,” but as a final destination (Naevolus is ridiculous because his sense of justice and entitlement go beyond what is right and proper for a man of his rank and station).

In the excerpt cited above, the italicized phrases indicate the extreme tendentiousness of Fredericks’ account, which is positioned as a mere paraphrase of the poem but in fact abounds in language that is much more interpretive than summarizing, and that tells the reader not just what happens in the poem on the level of narrative, but how the reader is supposed to think about and understand the rhetorical dynamics at work, including the idea of Naevolus as clueless bumpkin, a trope I discussed in Chapter One with regard to Braund’s analysis of the poem. In observing that Naevolus “has the nerve to complain” about his treatment at the hands of his patron, Fredericks’ glibly reproduces the sentiment of the patron, who, according to Naevolus, calls the latter impertinent when he makes demands (*improbus es cum poscis*, 63). In addition, Fredericks repeats a long-standing critical assertion of irony in the phrase *iusta doloris, / Naevole, causa tui* [90-1] that is totally unsubstantiated by the context. What makes Fredericks so sure that we should take Juvenal’s words at 90-1 ironically, but lend our earnest credence to the patron’s words at 63? I would argue that Fredericks appeals *either* to irony *or* to sincerity *as needed* in the service of supporting a fundamentally homophobic prejudice against Naevolus, his patron, and their unorthodox performances of sex, gender, and kinship. (This is reminiscent of the way Wiesen 1963, discussed

above, saw irony in Juvenal's endorsement of pederasty at 6.34-7, but a sincere attack on gender deviance in *saturam scribente cinaedo* at 4.106.) Fredericks hears "mockery" in the phrase "*O Corydon, Corydon*," a Virgilian parody, to be sure, but there is a virtually audible sneer in Fredericks' characterization of these words as "a comic allusion to the homosexual atmosphere of Vergil's second eclogue," suggesting, I would argue, that comic allusion necessarily goes hand-in-hand with moral condemnation. Note, finally, how often Fredericks uses highly tendentious adjectives and adverbs to color his putatively objective summary of the poem: Juvenal is *cynical*, *ironic*, and *mocking*; Naevolus is *slavish* and *absurd*.⁷⁴ None of these words, however, are literally in the text: all of them are generated by the biases and prejudices of Fredericks' critical perspective. In effect, Fredericks reads the poem as a rejection of stigmatized identity, and his reading tends to reproduce the terms of the stigmatization, which has a distinctly homophobic component.

Even granted that Fredericks' brief but highly interpretive summary of the ninth satire was published five years before his essay on the irony of overstatement in Juvenal, I see no reason to suspect that Fredericks developed an entirely new view of Juvenalian satire between 1974 and 1979; rather, I would expect his interpretive paraphrase in the

⁷⁴ With Fredericks' "absurd self-pity" as a characterization of Naevolus, compare Hight 1954: 119 ("All he [Naevolus] wants—he says pathetically—is to get a steady independent income. That is why he became a pervert and the utensil of a pervert") and Braund 1988: 157 ("Naevolus keeps making pathetic attempts at dignifying his lack of success with elevated language and allusions, which sound utterly incongruous in his mouth"). Hight's and Braund's characterizations of Naevolus as "pathetic," like Fredericks' characterization of him as absurdly self-pitying, are highly tendentious paraphrases that can be tied to no particular verbal cues in the text to suggest either that the Juvenalian interlocutor sees Naevolus as absurd or pathetic, or that the implied reader is supposed to see him that way.

earlier book chapter to align with the theoretical essay he subsequently published. In a 1971 study of the eighth satire, Fredericks had referred to Juvenal as no “sterile moralist,” but rather a satirist characterized by “irony, hyperbole, and wit” who was “more intent on providing humorous descriptions of vice than positive moral exhortations.”⁷⁵ Thus, it would appear that his theoretical perspective did not change appreciably between 1971 and 1979. And yet, despite the promising hints in his brief gloss of Feinberg’s “playfully critical distortion of the familiar,” Fredericks’ paraphrase of the ninth satire represents it in moralistic terms that seem quite sterile indeed. It should be noted, moreover, that Fredericks 1979 does not mention the ninth satire at all. His omission, in fact, is curious, in light of the following account of Juvenal’s use of “exaggerated counter-structures” to satirize traditional Roman ideologies of sex, gender, and patronage:

In Satire 2, to counter the Roman mythology of virility and manliness and martial virtue, particularly elaborated in Silver Age epic, Juvenal gives us a contrived epic travesty about the total effeminacy of an entire culture’s males. To correspond to the overly pious and traditional view of Roman woman, paraded in Statius’ *Silvae* and elsewhere, Juvenal gives us an equally exaggerated portrait of female *impudicitia* and *luxuria* in Satire 6. Satire 5 (based on the conventional *cena*-theme) exposes the complete impossibility of the traditional patron-client relationship, a social structure hopelessly perverted by a mean, vicious patron like Virro, but also perverted by a decadent, servile client like Trebius.⁷⁶

Virtually all Juvenal scholars recognize the significant connections among Satires 2, 6, and 9, since all three relate to sex, gender, and kinship deviance and were consequently subject to similar histories of expurgation and scholarly neglect. Fredericks, however, chooses to cite Satire 5 as the satire that targets the perversion of the patron-client

⁷⁵ Quotes are from Fredericks 1971: 111, 112, 132.

⁷⁶ Fredericks 1979: 182.

relationship, describing it in terms that one could easily imagine him using to describe Satire 9, only substituting the name “Naevolus” for that of “Trebius” in the last sentence. Fredericks’ citation of Satire 5 in this context is perfectly reasonable; but it remains striking that he does not include Satire 9 as well, especially alongside Satires 2 and 6.

Fredericks provides another reminder of the kinds of assumptions, strategies, and aims that characterized much Juvenal scholarship throughout the twentieth century. All of Fredericks’ major characterizations of the text: Juvenal’s scornful intent towards Naevolus; Naevolus’ immorality and spiritual corruption; Naevolus’ lack of insight into Juvenal’s mockery; the perversion of *clientela* implied by the relationship between Naevolus and his patron; the invalidation of Naevolus’ indignation; the refusal of Naevolus’ dignity; the devaluation of Naevolus’ aspirations—all of these are common themes in traditional readings of Juvenal 9. It is also typical that squeamishness about same-sex desire on the part of the critic is never acknowledged but is betrayed by his emphasis on “homosexuality.” That is, Fredericks’ emphasis on the relationship between Naevolus and his patron as “homosexual” rather than simply “sexual” is excessive: since they are both men, doesn’t the former go without saying? Moreover, by emphasizing homosexuality, Fredericks misleadingly neglects the other aspects of the so-called “arrangement,” whereby Naevolus also has sex with the patron’s wife and fathers the couple’s children. Indeed, the “arrangement” is by turns homosexual, heterosexual, and procreative; but it is the homosexuality of the relationship which is foregrounded by the scholar, and *only* this aspect. In Chapter One, my focus was on the fact that homophobic reading practices prevailed in the major reception strategies of the modern period,

including expurgation, biographical criticism, and persona theory. Here, I am focusing on the fact that homophobic reading practices tended to undermine the recognition of a camp sensibility at work in Juvenal, since acknowledging that sensibility would tend to require more homophilic readings. As we have seen, scholars who recognized Juvenal's playfully defamiliarizing wit and ironic humor consistently denied the morally subversive implications of these formal qualities, and insisted that these same qualities are the rhetorical embodiment of Juvenal's moralism, which also consistently proved to be a homophobic moralism.

Reekmans, Social Change, and Travesty

If camp constitutes an exercise of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant, it follows that camp actually *requires* stigmatization, if only ultimately to reject the stigmatizing ideology (cf. the familiar norms that satire playfully critiques in Fredericks' gloss of Feinberg, discussed above). Thus camp, far from encouraging what we would ordinarily call "positive" representations of counter-normative sex, gender and kinship, often includes *negative* representations of deviance, which the camp performance or composition embraces in a defiant gesture of solidarity. Juvenal undoubtedly represents identities as stigmatized, as we are told by Hight, Mason, Wiesen, Fredericks, and their many contemporaries who took one side or the other in the debate over Juvenalian moralism. Perhaps the most camp of the *camp manqué* studies of Juvenal as earnest reformer appears in Tony Reekmans' 1971 article, "Juvenal's Views on Social Change," in which the author seeks to classify Juvenal's social critique in modern sociological terms.

Reekmans' analysis is comprehensive, sophisticated, and utterly humorless.

Reekmans, as earnest as he imagines his subject to be, considers Juvenal an example of negative social integration, meaning that he is hopelessly at odds with other members of his society, including immigrants, the wealthy, laborers, performers, women, patrons, and legacy hunters. Moreover, he considers Juvenal to be an earnest social critic who uses the *ensis strictus* ("drawn sword," Juv. 1.65) of satire to "thwart" these social miscreants and "prop up the defective functioning of social control." Juvenal's antipathy towards social change and desire to reestablish social control are characteristic of the "authoritarian personality," a popular preoccupation of social psychologists in the post-World War II period, a personality type which Reekmans describes as "characterized...by excessive conformity, rigidity, concern with status, a tendency to see the world as harsh and unfriendly and an inclination to favour strong punishment of deviants and offenders."⁷⁷ It may be an interesting index of the novelty of W.S. Anderson's arguments for the application of persona theory to Roman satire that Reekmans, writing in 1971, never considers the possibility that Juvenal's voice is that of a fictive poetic persona or that the negatively integrated, authoritarian personality complex that Reekmans identifies may be a comic pose.

Interestingly, and very fortuitously for my own thesis, Reekmans believes that one, and only one, out of Juvenal's sixteen satires is a *parodic travesty* of Juvenal's characteristic brand of social intolerance: it is of course that perennial flashpoint in the

⁷⁷ Reekmans 1971: 161n152 and 153. For his definition of the authoritarian personality, Reekmans cites Klineberg 1964: 534B. For the classic exposition of the authoritarian personality, cf. Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford 1950.

debate over Juvenalian moralism, Satire 9, which Reekmans considers evidence of the diminution of Juvenal's "satirical power." Reekmans 1971: 119 writes:

After sat. VIII Juvenal was no longer a poet *qui nil expositum soleat deducere* [who is accustomed to spin out nothing trite] (VII. 54); his main *vena* of inspiration was exhausted. This appears clearly from satire IX, which is a parody on previous themes: after the complaints of the poor client about the trifling proceeds of his services (sat. III. 126-30), the lamentations of the honest Roman about the fruitlessness of virtue (sat. III. 21-57) and the *indignatio* of the author caused by the sterility of the liberal arts in Rome (sat. VII), sat. IX contains the lamentations of a *pathicus* about the small proceeds of vice.

Reekmans is mistaken in calling Naevolus a *pathicus* (a man who enjoys submitting to anal penetration), since Naevolus is always portrayed phalldominantly, as the active, insertive, penetrating partner in sexual acts. Once again, I do not wish to minimize the relevance of such misconceptions; in fact, as we have seen throughout this chapter, misconceptions about ancient Roman sex and gender dynamics have often skewed characterizations of Juvenal's morality or ethics. Nevertheless, my primary concern here is with Reekmans' views on the literary decadence of the ninth satire. As Reekmans 1971: 119 says in a note on the passage just cited:

Juvenal's parodical treatment of previous themes is significant of the exhaustion of those themes. There are, as is well known, in the history of world-literature several examples of how the wear and tear of literary themes have led to their travesty.

Based on his use of the term "exhaustion," it would seem that Reekmans associates travesty with decadence. Decadence, moreover, is a historical precondition for camp, since camp emerges from the very gaps in social distance, social integration, and social hierarchy that concern Reekmans, gaps which are generally perceived to accompany periods of social and cultural decline, as in fact they are represented as doing in the

satires of Juvenal.⁷⁸ Here Reekmans claims that decadence leads to *travesty*, which the OED defines as “A literary composition which aims at exciting laughter by burlesque and ludicrous treatment of a serious work; ...hence, a grotesque or debased imitation or likeness; a caricature.”⁷⁹ This definition substantially overlaps with the OED definitions of caricature and burlesque, such that all three terms become practically synonymous. Most important for our purposes, travesty, caricature and burlesque are all closely related forms of parody that are historically associated with camp.⁸⁰

Reekmans 1971: 133-138 returns to the ninth satire, locating the poem in the context of other Juvenalian satires concerned with “nonconformity to rules imposed by social positions,” including “renunciation of rights” and “neglect of duties and lack of responsibility.” For example, a *maritus* (husband) may renounce his right “to the conjugal fidelity of his wife” based on greed, heterosexual desire, or homosexual desire; the latter is the case in Satire 9 as well as in Satire 2:

If he [the husband] is a homosexual, as for example the *mollis avarus* of sat. IX, he gladly renounces his rights and may even become a sort of financially disinterested *leno* by asking his ambivalent friend to take over his duties with respect to his wife (IX. 70-74). In order to redeem those duties (or make his wife abandon her own rights), the homosexual

⁷⁸ Social distance refers to the degree of intimacy among people sharing a social space, such as a house, village, or town. Social integration refers to the degree of accord (positive integration) or discord (negative integration) among members of a social group. Social hierarchy refers to “the degree of differentiation among members of a social unit with respect to power and prestige.” Cf. Reekmans 1971: 144-5.

⁷⁹ OED Second Edition 1989 s.v. *travesty*, *ppl. a. and n.*, sense B.1. It is perhaps not insignificant that *travesty* also refers to cross-dressing, particularly in theatrical contexts; consequently, travesty is ultimately connected with drag and thus with camp. It should be noted, however, that the etymology is from the French verb *se travestir*, which means to disguise oneself or take on another man’s appearance, not necessarily to dress in the clothing of the opposite sex.

⁸⁰ Cf. OED Second Edition 1989 s.v. *travesty*; *caricature*; *burlesque*.

husband is even willing to pay: *notum est cur solo tabulas impleverit
Hister / liberto, dederit vivus cur multa puellae; / dives erit magno quae
dormit tertia lecto* (ll. 58-60).⁸¹

Reekmans' use of the term homosexual as a categorical noun is not tenable in light of Williams 2010; nevertheless, if we substitute the less anachronistic paraphrase "interested in homosexual submission," his point remains valid. Regarding neglect of duties and lack of responsibility, Reekmans 1971: 136 asserts that "Juvenal's favorite topics in this respect are the infidelity of *uxores* and the niggardliness of *patroni*." Here Reekmans returns to the ninth satire once more, focusing on how the poem travesties the theme of the miserly patron, which Reekmans considers Juvenal to have treated in an earnest manner in Satires 1 and 5. In what follows, each of the narrative examples Reekmans 1971: 138 cites of the relationship between Naevolus and his "rich friend" parallel examples he cites from Satires 1 and 5 in a preceding paragraph:

Satire IX is a travesty of this theme [of the miserly patron who fails as a protector of clients]: the *patronus* becomes a rich homosexual, and his client is his partner in vice. Naevolus' expectations with respect to his rich friend are those of a client with respect to his *patronus*, and they are equally illusory. The presents he receives are small (IX. 28-31), but his rich friend makes a note of them (IX. 39-40). His explicit demands for more substantial help are simply turned away (IX. 63). Just as the poor client of sat. v. 76-79 recalls the discomfort of the *salutatio* (cf. also v. 19-23), Naevolus gives an enumeration of his own presents (IX. 50-53), his labours within (IX. 43-47) and his merits beyond (IX. 70-90) their homosexual relation.

⁸¹ Reekmans 1971: 136. The translation of Juv. 2.58-60 is as follows: "It is well known why Hister filled his will with only his freedman, why during his life he gave many gifts to his girl; wealthy will be she who sleeps third in a large bed." The Latin word *puella* suggests a perpetual state of maidenhood; i.e., Hister never seems to have had sex with his own wife: thus, Braund 2004a: 155 translates "young, still-virgin wife." Note how the characterization of the patron as a procurer (*leno*) assimilates Naevolus to the role of prostitute rather than either adulterer or client.

Again, Reekmans' substantival (as opposed to adjectival) use of the term homosexual is anachronistic, but his point remains valid: the ninth satire's portrayal of sexual patronage parallels more typical forms of patronage depicted in previous satires. Reekmans is certainly correct that the sexual submission of the patron is a "vice" in terms of traditional Roman ideologies of masculinity, and that Naevolus is his "partner in vice," although, as the sexually insertive partner, not actually guilty of the same vice himself. One might question whether the references in Satires 1 and 5, which Reekmans imagines to be earnest, are any more so than those in Satire 9; all that can be said for sure is that the context in Satire 9 is sexual, while in previous satires it was not.

Reekmans would certainly seem to be onto something with his argument that the ninth satire offers a perversely witty twist on the theme of the abusive patron. In Reekmans' hands, however, the travesty of Juvenal's ninth satire is not an admirable accomplishment, but rather an index of satiric failure. Reekmans 1971: 119 claims that "Satire IX is an attempt to continue the criticism of social behaviour," but by calling it a travesty, he clearly means to label it a failed attempt. Since he is not a camp reader, he does not recognize the possibility that in its travesty is precisely where the poem succeeds, and that what the poem criticizes is the moral hypocrisy that stigmatizes Naevolus, his patron, and their deviant performances of sex, gender, and kinship. Let me underscore that I am not accusing Reekmans of "getting it wrong" about the ninth satire; Reekmans has it exactly right: the poem is indeed a parodic travesty of familiar Juvenalian themes. What I am arguing is that Reekmans is not a camp reader, and so for him the poem lacks camp legibility, even though he himself has identified some definitive

camp aspects of the poem's rhetoric and composition.⁸² We see here another manifestation of the insider/outsider phenomenon associated with camp and its deployment of perversely witty duplicity: in this case, Reekmans, the camp outsider, understands the joke perfectly well, but doesn't find it funny because he is not sympathetic to the camp program of solidarity with the deviant. This is no different from the camp outsider who understands drag merely as "female impersonation," and does not particularly enjoy it, because he thinks it is a travesty of traditional gender performance, and therefore an index of decadence rather than a canny deconstruction of stable gender identities; nor is it different from the camp outsider who understands Warhol's soap boxes and soup cans as travesties of visual art, and perhaps can even explain how they comment on both the commodification of art and the aestheticization of consumerism, but would rather look at a Rembrandt.

Despite the fact that Reekmans considers Satire 9 to be a kind of decadent creative failure, there is quite a bit of merit in his brief analysis of the poem cited above, particularly when compared with a tendentious and arguably homophobic summary like that of Fredericks discussed in the preceding section. For one thing, Reekmans' would appear to be the only extant critical treatment of the ninth satire in accord with my

⁸² Rosen 2007: 217-23 addresses this issue of readerly orientation in terms of "insider" and "outsider" audiences for comic mockery, using Juvenal 9 as his paradigmatic example. Cf. Rosen 2007: 218, "One moment it [comic mockery] makes claims about its didactic purposes that seem serious enough; the next, it undermines them with its own stances of *ponêria*." Having convinced the outsiders of his high moral purpose, he can "proceed with his 'true' project of satiric *ponêria*—that is, his forays into scandalous diction, compromised self-representation, and other similarly comedic gestures." What Rosen describes as the insider audience for comic mockery substantially coincides with what I describe as a camp reader, and Rosen's notion of satiric *ponêria* comes very close to a representative definition of camp.

contention that the language of *clientela* is used ironically rather than sincerely in this poem; that is, Naevolus isn't really a *cliens* in the traditional sense, nor is his partner in this relationship really his *patronus*: Reekmans 1971: 138 uses the term "his rich friend," which I think is quite apt, particularly compared with some of the other things he has been called (cf. Hight 1954: 120, "rich canny pervert"). Moreover, Reekmans does not impute any kind of subtle or ironic malice to the Juvenalian interlocutor, nor does he use any homophobic language or suggest that the poem is in any way an attack on homosexuals or homosexuality, but rather views it as a part of a sustained Juvenalian critique of social nonconformity. Finally, Reekmans helps us understand precisely how Juvenal's ninth satire admits of a camp reading: indeed, camp's witty, ironic embrace of stigmatized identity is enacted precisely through a canny performance of what the dominant ideology rejects as travesty, caricature, and burlesque—terms that by definition imply decadence and degeneracy. Thus, while Reekmans never calls the ninth satire a camp text, he comes closer to giving us a camp reading of it than any of the other *camp manqué* critics we have discussed.

CHAPTER FOUR

A Reading of Juvenal's Ninth Satire

To explore the history of perversion is to see how culture is not only formed, but consolidated, destabilized, and reformed. It is a violent history: perversion is a concept that takes us to the heart of a fierce dialectic between domination and deviation, law and desire, transgression and conformity; a dialectic working through repression, demonization, displacement, and struggle.

—Jonathan Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence* (1990)¹

Preliminaries

In this chapter I offer a reading of Juvenal's ninth satire guided by the ideas about queer existence and camp aesthetics laid out in Chapters Two and Three and further elaborated below. This reading will focus on how the poem represents deviant performances of sex, gender, and kinship via incongruous situations or juxtapositions presented in a theatrical manner for humorous effect in solidarity with the deviant. In most cases, I discuss sections of the text without quoting them in full, since a complete text and translation are included as an appendix.

Preliminaries 1: Argument of Juvenal 9

The poem is structured as a dialogue between a fictionalized version of Juvenal and an interlocutor named Naevolus, who the reader soon learns has a “way of life” (*genus vitae*, 27) that involves catering to the sexual desires of effeminate, sexually submissive men in exchange for material compensation. The poem opens with a chance

¹ Dollimore 1991: 103. Dollimore traces the history of perversion and its deconstructive potential back to the late antiquity of St. Augustine, but his critique is applicable to the dialectic between dominance and deviance in ancient Rome as well.

meeting in a public setting at which Juvenal inquires as to why Naevolus now looks so sad (*tristis*, 1) when he used to be happy (*contentus*, 11). Juvenal provides a vivid description of Naevolus' appearance, with an emphasis on how it has changed (12-20), and then draws certain conclusions about Naevolus' current circumstances (20-6).

Naevolus replies, noting the general difficulties associated with his way of life (27-46) and describing his mistreatment at the hands of his sexual patron (46-69). Here the reader learns that Naevolus, at the patron's request, has also had sex with the patron's wife and fathered his two children (70-90). Juvenal briefly comments on the justice of Naevolus' complaint, and asks what the patron has to say for himself (90-1). This provides Naevolus with an opportunity for further complaint, quickly becoming a plea for Juvenal to be discreet about the information he has shared (92-101). Juvenal replies that wealthy men's secrets are at the mercy of gossipy slaves, and Naevolus is deceiving himself if he thinks he has any recourse other than living a decent life (102-23). Naevolus comments on the inadequacy of Juvenal's advice (124-9). This leads to Juvenal's final consolation, in which he assures Naevolus that he will always find men who want his services, and encourages him to maintain his attractiveness with aphrodisiacs (130-4a). The poem ends with Naevolus' final assertion of his misfortune and his insistence that his demands in life are few and modest (135-50).

Preliminaries 2: Two Basic Problems

As discussed in Chapters One and Three, the ninth satire has generally been read as an attack on homosexuality. From the perspective of this study, there are two problematic words in that formulation: "attack" and "homosexuality."

The problematic nature of the notion of satiric attack has already been addressed to some extent in Chapter Three, where I discussed the debate over Juvenal's moralism. The notion of satire as attack poem (reinforced by the notion of a "satiric target") requires faith in a satirist who is morally sincere and earnest about social reform. As we saw in the previous chapter, both Juvenal's moral sincerity and his earnest social reformism took a beating over the course of the twentieth century, with even a staunch moralist like David Wiesen ultimately coming to argue that Juvenal's satiric vision was not that of a just and ethical society, but of a corrupt society incapable of reform.² Confronting such a society, the satirist has little incentive for vigorous attack on anything at all. If the reading is in solidarity with the dominant structure of normativity, as Wiesen's seems to have been, then such a state of affairs is a prescription for *nihilism*.³ If the reading is in solidarity with the deviant, such a state of affairs is a prescription for *camp*.

Some recent studies, particularly Plaza 2006 and Rosen 2007, argue that satiric humor by its very nature undermines satiric moralizing. Plaza argues that the satirist uses humor as the spoonful of sugar that helps his moral medicine go down, but that by inverting the traditional power dynamic between superior and inferior for humorous

² David S. Wiesen authored two essays (Wiesen 1963 and Wiesen 1989) that are very important to my research on Juvenal, but he is certainly not as well known as some of the other scholars cited frequently in this study. Born in 1936, he taught at Brandeis University and the University of Southern California, publishing studies of Vergil, Tacitus, and Juvenal. He died in 1982 at the age of 46.

³ Cf. Wiesen 1989: 733, "The withholding of any alternative to the absurdity of an intolerable world justifies the application of the term nihilism to Juvenal."

effect, the satirist ultimately undermines his own moral message despite himself.⁴ Rosen observes a similar tension between comedy and didacticism, but argues that Juvenal, particularly in the ninth satire, deliberately creates this tension so as to demonstrate the ultimate vanity of satire's moral claims: Juvenal's didacticism is a pretense to which his comedy ultimately gives the lie. Rosen's view of Juvenal's mockery as essentially comic rather than didactic ultimately accords with Wiesen's notion that Juvenal's verbal wit ironizes his moral intensity, but Rosen gives no indication that he considers this poetics of comic mockery to be nihilistic.⁵

The problematic nature of the notion of homosexuality was touched on in the Introduction and will be discussed further below. As we shall see, sexual relations in classical antiquity may be seen as an effect of a social hierarchy organized not around the homosexual/heterosexual binary but rather around a dominant/submissive binary in which freeborn adult males have social license to choose their sexual objects without regard to anatomical sex, as long as they respect certain conventions of sexual role and

⁴ For the notion of "mockery from below," see Plaza 2006: 53-57. For the subversive effect of satiric humor, see Plaza 2006: 1-5, esp. 2: "In [Horace and Juvenal] the periphery of potentially subversive humour interferes with the central message so much as to blur the contours of this centre and render its shape difficult to grasp... This is not an accident, but an incongruity built into the very foundation of the genre: while the Roman satirist needs humour for the aesthetic merit of his satire, the ideological message inevitably suffers from the ambivalence that humour brings with it... and... the double mission of criticism combined with humour drives the satirists to build their art on paradox from the very beginning."

⁵ Commenting specifically on Juvenal 9, Rosen 2007: 218 states, "One moment it [comic mockery] makes claims about its didactic purposes that seem serious enough; the next, it undermines them with its own stances of *ponêria*." Having convinced the outsider of his high moral purpose, the satirist can "proceed with his 'true' project of satiric *ponêria*—that is, his forays into scandalous diction, compromised self-representation, and other similarly comedic gestures."

social status. In Juvenal's ninth satire, these conventions and others are flouted with gleeful abandon. Thus, this purported attack on homosexuality proves to be neither an attack nor a representation of homosexuality. (As the hostess of *Coffee Talk with Linda Richman* would say, "Discuss!").⁶ Instead, the poem represents how the structure of normativity is undermined by deviant performances of sex, gender, and kinship. More than simply representing, however, I contend that the poem takes evident delight in dramatizing how the structure of normativity is undermined by deviance; that delight is, in effect, what makes the ninth satire a camp text. If we may use the term *patriarchy* to describe the normative Roman domestic structure whereby men marry women to produce legitimate children to whom they may transfer their property upon their own demise, we may summarize this delightful subversion as follows: Patriarchy is working out just fine for the poem's effeminate, sexually submissive patron, despite the fact that he is an utter failure of maleness, masculinity, and paternity, and should by all rights be patriarchy's ultimate loser. By contrast, patriarchy is working out disastrously for Naevolus, despite the fact that he is fully masculine gendered and sexually dominant.⁷ This incongruous juxtaposition between the resounding success of the deviant patron and the abysmal failure of the dominant Naevolus is the camp narrative premise from which all the rest of the poem's camp incongruity, theatricality, and humor flow.

⁶ *Coffee Talk with Linda Richman* was a comedy sketch recurring on the *Saturday Night Live* television series from 1991 to 1994. The decidedly camp title character was a middle-age Jewish talk show host with a strong New York accent and abundant makeup and jewelry, created and performed by comic actor Mike Myers.

⁷ I owe this trenchant observation to my partner, the poet and scholar Jason Schneiderman.

Preliminaries 3: The Homosexual Question

As I noted in the general Introduction, Juvenal scholars throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries generally treated the ninth satire as an attack on homosexuals and homosexuality. Twentieth-century scholars have referred to Naevolus as a pervert, a sodomite, a homosexual, and a bisexual gigolo.⁸ In the latter part of the twentieth century, the relatively clinical term “homosexual” (and its abstract noun, “homosexuality”) came increasingly to be preferred by scholars in all fields over earlier terms like “sodomite” and “pervert” (along with their abstract forms, “sodomy” and “perversion”).⁹ While the *fact* of homosexuality might remain morally fraught, the term, at least, was generally considered inoffensive and even respectful of the human beings whose sexuality it claimed to characterize. Thus, while we find “homosexual” alongside “sodomite” and “pervert” in mid-century studies by Hightet, Anderson, and even as late as Courtney’s 1980 commentary, by Braund 1988 we find the term “homosexual” exclusively, and terms like “pervert” and “sodomite” are rarely if ever to be seen again in any serious classical scholarship.

Notwithstanding the proliferation of nomenclature, scholars for most of the twentieth century discussed Juvenal 9 in terms of sexual orientation and sexual role. On this view, Naevolus is an “active” (homosexual, sodomite, or pervert) while the men he

⁸ . For “pervert” see Hightet 1954: 118 *et passim*; Anderson 1962: 155; Anderson 1982: 471, 475. For “sodomite” see Hightet 1954: 117. For “bisexual gigolo” see Courtney 1980: 424; Miller 1998: 259. This list is representative, not exhaustive.

⁹ Foucault 1978: 43 traces the first use of “homosexuality” to an 1870 article on “contrary sexual feeling” by Carl Westphal in the *Archiv für Neurologie*.

penetrates are “passives.”¹⁰ In recent decades, increasing attention has been paid to the importance of sexual role in the sex and gender dynamics of classical antiquity. At the same time, the very category of sexuality, as well as the notion of a homosexual/heterosexual binary, has been subjected to profound and sustained critique. Sexual roles, the category of sexuality, and the homo/hetero binary are distinct but interrelated issues that often become conflated in critical discourse. Since each of these issues is so important to understanding Juvenal’s ninth satire, we must unravel somewhat these closely interwoven threads.

SEXUALITY GOES LEGIT

The gradual emergence of sexuality as a legitimate topic of scholarly discourse is a large, complex topic that I treat here in a summary manner, citing only a few major moments in the story by way of giving an idea of overall tendencies. I touched on this to some extent in Chapter One, where I discussed the emergence of expurgation as an accepted response to concerns about objectionable sexual content in classical texts, followed by a change in editorial and scholarly practices in the twentieth century. In Chapter Two, I touched on the impact of the sexual revolution of the 1960s, the women’s movement, and gay liberation as important influences on the academic discourse of sexuality and gender and changes in the theory and practice of camp. Here I am mostly concerned with how the beginnings of the history of sexuality as a subspecialty within the

¹⁰ We find the qualifiers “active” and “passive” usually with the noun “homosexual,” but not exclusively. The phrase “active pervert” is used, for example, by Hight 1954: 274n1, while the phrase “passive pervert” is used by Courtney 1980: 424.

academic field of classics in the 1970s set the tone and laid the groundwork for subsequent work in the field.

At least some classically trained readers of the post-Enlightenment period were aware that the ancient Greeks and Romans viewed the insertive and receptive roles in sex acts between men differently. For example, Jeremy Bentham, in an essay arguing for the decriminalization of “pederasty” (his term for homosexual anal intercourse) written about 1785, states:

According to the notions of the antients [sic] there was something degrading in the passive part which was not in the active. It was ministring [sic] to the pleasure, for so we are obliged to call it, of another without participation, it was making one’s self the property of another man, it was playing the woman’s part: it was therefore unmanly....On the other hand, to take the active part was to make use of another for one’s pleasure, it was making another man one’s property, it was preserving the manly, the commanding character. Accordingly, Solon in his laws prohibits slaves from bearing an active part where the passive is borne by a freeman.¹¹

Bentham’s essay, however, remained unpublished until 1978. Indeed, in keeping with the repressive climate that prevailed in the West during the rise of modern academic scholarship, sex remained largely off limits as a topic of scholarly inquiry until the sexual revolution of the 1960s.¹² A notable exception in the general culture was the always controversial field of sexology (in which we may include Freud’s psychoanalytic contributions to the understanding of sexuality), considered to have begun with the publication in 1886 of Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia Sexualis*. A major exception within the field of classics is A.E. Housman’s 1931 article “Praefanda,” an essay on aspects

¹¹ Bentham 1978: 395.

¹² I use the term “repressive” here in full cognizance of Foucault’s critique of the so-called “repressive hypothesis” in Foucault 1978.

Roman sexual discourse that the German journal *Hermes* published after the editors of the British *Classical Quarterly* deemed it too shocking for publication, even though it was written entirely in Latin. Housman makes the same point as Bentham about the distinction in penetrative role, and notes in passing that the same distinction remained in force in his own day among the country folk of southern Italy. German scholars were generally less squeamish than their Anglo-American counterparts in this regard: the pseudonymous Hans Licht's *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece* appeared in 1932 (originally published in German in 1925); Otto Kiefer's *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome* appeared in 1934 (originally published in German in 1932 and translated by none other than Gilbert and Helen Highet); Theodor Hopfner's *Das Sexualleben der Griechen und der Römer* appeared in 1938.¹³

As we saw in Chapter Two, the field of classics reached a kind of turning point with regard to the study of sex with the 1978 publication of Kenneth J. Dover's *Greek Homosexuality*. Dover focused scholarly attention on the cultural significance of activity (insertivity) and passivity (receptivity) in sexual relations between men in antiquity.¹⁴ Dover's key observations in this regard were that (1) the Greeks considered it normal and natural for all men to experience desire for both males and females; however, (2) the Greeks considered male homosexual desire to be natural only for the insertive partner: male homosexual receptivity was generally stigmatized in ancient Greek sources, while

¹³ Dynes 2005 traces the genealogy of German classical scholarship on ancient sexuality even farther back, beginning with the publication of Johann Matthias Gesner's "Socrates Sanctus Paederasta" in 1767.

¹⁴ Dover and most others use the terms "active" and "passive," but I follow Williams 2010 in preferring the terms "insertive" and "receptive" (and their corresponding nouns, "insertivity" and "receptivity"). Cf. Williams 2010: 309n16.

male homosexual insertivity was not; and (3) male homosexual insertivity was considered an assertion of dominance or superiority over the receptive partner.¹⁵

Similar claims were made regarding Roman homosexuality by Veyne 1978 and 1985, Lilja 1983, and Cantarella 1992 (Italian original published in 1988). The emphasis in these studies, then, was mostly on explaining the range of available sexual roles and the social and cultural significance of each. Also noteworthy in this regard is Richlin 1992a (first edition published in 1983), a groundbreaking study of sexuality and aggression in Roman humor that looked at the social, cultural, and moral valorization of male sexual dominance and its implications for the stigmatization of penetrated others. None of these studies, however, thoroughly interrogated the category of sexuality itself, or the validity of the homo/hetero binary for understanding sex and gender in classical antiquity.¹⁶ The impetus to do so was spurred to a great extent by Foucault's three-volume *History of Sexuality*, the English translations of which were published between 1978 and 1986. Foucault sought to historicize the category of sexuality generally and, more specifically, to denaturalize the homo/hetero binary. His goal was to develop a theoretical framework in which sex could be understood not as an aspect of nature, but as an effect of power in human relations.

¹⁵ Cf. Dover 1978: 16, 67-8, 104, 135. For a brief but insightful appreciation of Dover's contribution, see Nussbaum 2010: xi. For a more critical perspective, see Davidson 2001, a critique which is incorporated in Part II of Davidson 2009.

¹⁶ See the discussion of this point in Williams 2010: 4-9, esp. 5.

HALPERIN'S CRITIQUE OF SEXUALITY

The scholar most associated with the Foucaultian turn in classical studies is David Halperin, who in an influential 1989 essay argues for a “cultural interpretation of sexual experience” that is not organized around the category of sexuality.¹⁷ Halperin favors such a “cultural poetics of desire” (1989: 273) for the study of sexual experience in modernity no less than in antiquity, but he thinks antiquity provides usefully stark examples of the inadequacy of the category of sexuality for interpreting sexual experience in any time or place. Halperin proposes to consider “sexuality” in two senses: (1) as an autonomous domain of human existence, and (2) “as a principle of individuation in human natures.” (1989: 259) For Halperin, sexuality in sense (1) is a matter of what I would call *sexual subjectivity*, of experiencing oneself as a subject of sexual desire, activity, and pleasure. Halperin argues that the hierarchical structuring of sexual relations in classical Athens grants access to such sexual subjectivity only to adult male citizens. All other inhabitants of the polity, including women, children, foreigners, and slaves, are *sexual objects*, not sexual subjects, and thus do not have access to sexuality in this first sense. Since not all human beings have access to sexual subjectivity in the sense described, he argues, it makes little sense to use the term “sexuality” to denote an autonomous sphere of human existence.

¹⁷ Cf. Halperin 1989: 271, “If there is a lesson that we should draw from this picture of ancient sexual attitudes and behaviors, it is that we need to de-center sexuality from the focus of the cultural interpretation of sexual experience—and not only ancient varieties of sexual experience.” Let me clarify that in the current study the term “Foucaultian” has absolutely no pejorative connotations.

Sexuality in sense (2) is a matter of what we ordinarily refer to as sexual orientation, which may include homosexuality, heterosexuality, or bisexuality. Halperin writes:

Because, as we have seen in the case of classical Athens, erotic desires and sexual object-choices in antiquity were generally not determined by a typology of anatomical sexes (male versus female), but rather by the social articulation of power (superordinate versus subordinate), the currently fashionable distinction between homosexuality and heterosexuality (and, similarly, between “homosexuals” and “heterosexuals” as individual types) had no meaning for the classical Athenians: there were not, so far as they knew, two different kinds of “sexuality,” two differently structured psychosexual states or modes of affective orientation, but a single form of sexual experience which all free adult males shared—making due allowance for variations in individual tastes, as one might make for individual palates. (1989: 264)

Thus, according to Halperin, whether we consider sexuality in the sense of sexual subjectivity or in the sense of sexual orientation, the category of sexuality is meaningless in classical Athens because social hierarchy, not anatomical sex, determines sexual desire and sexual object choice. Halperin continues:

Scholars sometimes describe the cultural formation underlying this apparent refusal by Greek males to discriminate categorically among sexual objects on the basis of anatomical sex as a bisexuality of penetration—or even more intriguingly—as a heterosexuality indifferent to its object, but I think it would be advisable not to speak of it as a sexuality at all but to describe it, rather, as a more generalized ethos of penetration and domination, a sociosexual discourse structured by the presence or absence of its central term: the phallus. (1989: 265)

In subsequent publications, Halperin refined his thesis to emphasize the role of gender in this system of sexual relations. According to Halperin 1990: 35, gender figures into this system not at the level of sexual object choice (male versus female), but rather at the level of sexual subjectivity, since

the kind of desire described by Greek sources as failing to discriminate between male and female objects was itself *gendered* as a specifically *male* desire....The *sexual* system of classical Athens, which defined the scope of sexual object-choice for adult men in terms independent of gender, was therefore logically inseparable from the *gender* system of classical Athens, which distributed to men and to women different kinds of desires, constructing male desire as wide-ranging, acquisitive, and object-oriented, while constructing female desire (in opposition to it) as objectless, passive, and entirely determined by the female body's need for regular phallic irrigation. (Emphases in original)

In his eagerness to resist the historically inaccurate and misleading application of terms that describe types of sexuality (homo-, hetero-, or bi-), Halperin has perhaps too hastily dismissed "sexuality" itself. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines "sexuality," in the sense here challenged by Halperin, as the possession or expression of a sexual nature or sexual instincts or feelings, and it seems clear enough that even the kind of objectified female desire described by Halperin above qualifies as a "sexuality" in this sense.¹⁸ To be sure, this circular definition of "sexuality" leaves us asking how we should define "sexual" and, ultimately, how we should define "sex." The problematic nature of sexual definition, however, does not, I think, justify eliminating the *term* "sexuality" from our lexicon when we speak about the "sociosexual discourse" of classical antiquity: a cautious periphrasis is not necessarily preferably to a simpler formulation, provided the latter is clearly defined in its context. Nevertheless, Halperin makes an important contribution by demonstrating that the uncritical application of the historically specific terms "homosexuality," "heterosexuality," and "bisexuality" retard rather than advance our efforts to understand sexual relations in antiquity and, I would add, all performances of sex, gender, and kinship.

¹⁸ See OED Draft Revision, March 2009, s.v. sexuality, *n.*, sense 2.

WILLIAMS' PROTOCOLS OF MASCULINITY

Williams 2010 (a revised and expanded edition of the original 1999 monograph) maintained Halperin's rigorous critique of the historically specific categories of homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality while performing carefully nuanced readings of a wide range of ancient Roman sources. Williams demonstrates persuasively that freeborn adult Roman males, like their Greek counterparts, were not inclined to discriminate among sexual objects on the basis of anatomical sex. As Halperin had proposed, Williams describes Roman sexuality as a system of phalldominance (my term, not his), citing three fundamental "protocols governing sexual practices" for Roman males. These included: (1) always appearing to play the insertive and not the receptive role in penetrative acts; (2) refraining from sex with freeborn Roman males and females other than one's wife, choosing instead from among slaves, prostitutes, and noncitizens of either sex; and (3) choosing sexual partners who meet certain standards of sexual desirability, the main criterion of which was youth and its corresponding smoothness, including freedom from body hair and wrinkles.¹⁹

Williams makes important distinctions among these three protocols in terms of the social or cultural domain that each protocol regulates and the potential consequences of violating each. Protocol 1 regulates the public perception of masculinity, which I would define as the quality of being a masculine-gendered male; that is, a male who gives a consistently convincing public performance of masculine gender as defined by cultural expectations for sexual role, habits of appearance and behavior, and kinship relations

¹⁹ Cf. Williams 2010: 18-19.

such as marriage and paternity. Violating protocol 1, by ever appearing to be the receptive and not the insertive partner in acts of penetrative sex, carries the risk of compromising one's reputation for masculinity.

Protocol 2 regulates the sexual integrity of freeborn Romans of either sex.²⁰ Violating protocol 2 risks incurring a charge of *stuprum*, a term that defies precise English translation but is used often by Roman writers to describe the offense committed when one violates the sexual integrity of the freeborn Roman male or female, a quality connoted by the Latin term *pudicitia*, sexual inviolability that carried implications of sexual modesty. Thus, while the most legally problematic form of *stuprum* was adultery, the term also applied to sex between a freeborn Roman male and any freeborn Roman male or female other than one's own wife.

Protocol 3, the principle of sexual desirability, was, as Williams 2010: 19 notes, "less of a rule than a tendency pervading the ancient sources," and violating it did not incur consequences comparable to violation of the other two protocols. From a queer theoretical perspective, protocol 3 is in some ways the most interesting protocol, because it attests so eloquently to the mutual imbrication of sex and gender, as well as of biology and culture. That is, the "proclivity to smooth young bodies," as Williams 2010: 19 puts it, is (presumably) based on the masculine-gendered male's desire (or need) to choose feminine-gendered sexual objects, be they anatomically male or female. It may be an overstatement to say that males begin life as feminine-gendered and become masculine-gendered as they *mature*, while females begin life as feminine-gendered and become

²⁰ Cf. Williams 2010: 103.

masculine-gendered as they *age*; but some such conception seems to be encoded in the dominant male preference for smooth young sexual objects.

Preliminaries 4: A Word about the Word “Patron”

Based on Naevolus’ use of the words “client” (*clientis*, 59; *cliens*, 72), “follower” (*cultori*, 49) and “hanger-on” (*adseculae*, 48) to describe himself, virtually all previous analyses have referred to the effeminate, sexually submissive husband of the ninth satire as Naevolus’ “patron,” despite the fact that the Latin word for “patron” (*patronus*) never occurs, and “friend” (*amicus*, 130), a word that can be used to refer to a patron or a client, is used only to describe Naevolus’ potential future benefactors. not his most recent one.²¹ Moreover, previous analyses have discussed the ninth satire and its degenerate vision of *clientela* (patronage) as the last word in Juvenal’s ongoing critique of the patron-client relationship. The most sustained and rigorous such analysis is that of Bellandi 1974, where Naevolus is compared extensively to Umbricius in Satire 3 and Trebius in Satire 5, but the trope is very common throughout the scholarship on this text (we saw some examples of this in Chapter Three). My contention, by contrast, is that Naevolus uses the word “client” ironically, the way a modern-day hustler might say that he has a “date” when in fact he has an appointment to service a

²¹ See LaFleur 1975, 1979 and Konstan 1995 for *amicus* in Juvenal. For general discussions of *clientela*, see Wallace-Hadrill 1989 and Saller 2002.

customer.²² Consequently, I long resisted using the word “patron” in my discussions of this poem, instead referring to the man in question as “the husband” or as Naevolus’ “partner.” I ultimately decided, however, that this demurrer on my part does a great disservice to my beloved Naevolus and to his (and Juvenal’s) poem. If Naevolus is camp enough to call himself a “client” when he really means that he is getting paid to have sex with men, then I can certainly be camp enough to maintain the ironic pose and call the man with whom he has sex his “patron.” Indeed, the poem is, among other things, about a kind of sexual patronage for which Latin has no vocabulary distinct from that of patronage (*clientela*) as traditionally conceived. We are reminded of this near the end of the poem, when Juvenal consoles Naevolus regarding his prospects of finding another “sexually submissive male friend” (*pathicus...amicus*, 130), using a word (*amicus*) that may connote both patrons and clients.

In what follows, then, I will generally refer to the man in question as the patron, with the understanding that my own use of the word “patron” must be taken in every instance no less ironically than Naevolus’ use of the word “client.” I will also vary my terminology for the patron as appropriate, sometimes referring to him as the husband, and sometimes as the *mollis* (“soft,” a term connoting effeminacy with intimations of sexual submissiveness), especially during my discussion of Naevolus’ elegiac parody, in which

²² Particularly prior to the 1960s, such hustlers might be ostensibly heterosexual men who engaged in penetrative acts with homosexual men for money, a situation reminiscent of that of Naevolus in Juvenal 9, albeit historically specific in its existence within the construct of a modern homo/hetero binary. For a study of hustlers and “trade” (ostensibly heterosexual men who engaged in homosexual sex for free) in New York from the 1940s to the 1960s, see Reay 2010.

his own “stingy molly” (*mollis avarus*, 38) parallels the generic “greedy girlfriend” (*puella avara*) of the elegiac poet-lover.

A Chance Encounter (9.1-8)

The ninth satire begins with a chance meeting, perhaps in the Roman forum, between an unnamed interlocutor and Naevolus.²³ It is customary to call this unnamed interlocutor Juvenal, and to associate him with the poetic persona of the other satires. I follow this custom here, making no claim as to the nature of this persona other than that he is not to be identified with the historical poet. Juvenal is the first to speak, addressing Naevolus directly (*Naevole*, 1) and asking him why he looks so miserable and unkempt of late, when he used to be a dapper figure known for his charm and wit at dinner parties. The name “Naevolus” is related to the Latin word for a skin discoloration, mole, or birthmark (*naevus*), which has a diminutive, *naevulus* or *naevolus*. As Ferguson 1979 comments on 9.1, “The name occurs several times in Martial [1.97, 2.46, 3.71, 3.95, and 4.83] but none corresponds: the character in book 3 is a passive pervert.”²⁴

The form of Juvenal’s initial inquiry is an indirect question introduced by a forceful declaration: “I should like to know why” (*scire velim quare*, 1). Thus, an intensely stated desire for knowledge is the first theme to emerge from this text. As we soon see, what Juvenal wants to know is the reality behind appearances; in particular, the reality behind the recently altered appearance of Naevolus. Already, then, we see an

²³ The possibility of a setting in the Forum Romanum is suggested by the allusion to Marsyas in line 2. There was a statue of Marsyas in the Roman Forum, and a Satire of Horace (1.6.120) alludes to this statue as a vivid way of evoking the setting of the forum.

²⁴ In fact, at Mart. 3.71.1 he is said to be penetrated by his slave boy: (*mentula cum doleat puero, tibi, Naevolus, culus...*).

incongruous juxtaposition emerging between appearance and reality that will ultimately thematize the social, cultural, and ideological pressure to conceal stigmatized forms of existence.

From Juvenal's opening inquiry we may gather that Juvenal and Naevolus are of at least passing acquaintance: they run into each other frequently (*totiens mihi...occurras*, 1-2); they are on friendly enough terms for Juvenal to inquire after Naevolus' well being, but not so intimate as for Juvenal to know the full explanation for Naevolus' evident distress. Elaborating on Naevolus' appearance, Juvenal describes him via a series of three comparisons that figure the disparity between his previous reputation as a stylish man about town and his current disheveled appearance (2-8). Marsyas, Ravola, and Crepereius Pollio are rhetorically linked to Naevolus via words that refer to his appearance: "face," (*fronte*, 2), "facial expression" (*vultu*, 3), and "facial appearance" (*facie*, 6). This series of comparisons raises the question of how Naevolus' appearance corresponds to his reality, if in fact it does so at all. The theme of appearance and the questioning of its correspondence with reality is a very basic example of camp incongruity. It exemplifies one of the two kinds of incongruity that are central to camp, the kind that involves disagreement in character or qualities, the notion of one thing not "fitting" with another.²⁵ This kind of incongruity says "Things may or may not in fact be what they seem." This is a fundamental camp truism that points both to the existence of deviance and to the pressure to conceal deviance, to make the deviant appear to conform to the dominant.

²⁵ See OED Second Edition 1989 s.v. incongruous, incongruity, sense 1.

Another sense of incongruity, equally central to camp, involves failure to accord with what is reasonable, fitting, becoming, suitable, or appropriate.²⁶ This sense implies much greater moral implications than does the other sense of incongruity, that of simple disagreement in kind. Juvenal's three comparisons exemplify this morally complex kind of incongruity as well. In each case, the figure of comparison is imagined as having a distraught appearance because of his inopportune circumstances: Marsyas was defeated (*victus*, 2) by Apollo; Ravola was caught (*depressus*, 3) in the act of cunnilingus; and Crepereius Pollio failed to find anyone foolish enough to lend him money (*fatuos non invenit*, 8).²⁷ It is this element of distressed appearance that makes Naevolus comparable to each of these examples in the first instance. In each case, however, the haplessness of the figure of comparison involves a morally incongruous situation, that is, an instance of inappropriate or unsuitable behavior. It is incongruous in this sense for Marsyas, a mere mortal, to challenge Apollo, a god (2);²⁸ it is incongruous for Ravola, a Roman man, to

²⁶ See OED Second Edition 1989 s.v. incongruous, incongruity, sense 2.

²⁷ As the scholiast explains, *fatuos non invenit: qui ei scilicet pecunias credant non soluturo*; that is, he finds no one so foolish that they will lend him money even though he is not going to pay back his debt. This may be the same Pollio as that mentioned at Juv. 11.43, where he has lost the ring indicating his equestrian status and is reduced to begging (*digito mendicat Pollio nudo*). Cf. Braund 2004a: 351n3, 403n8.

²⁸ For the literary and material record of Marsyas see Veyne 1961; Richardson 1992: 371; Wyss 1996: 19-25; Small 1982: 68-92, 127-42. For recent discussions of the Marsyas myth in historical, literary, and political contexts, see Wiseman 1988; Niżyńska 2001; Usher 2002; Schertz 2002; Fantham 2005. For Marsyas in Juvenal 9, see especially Braund 1988:143-58 and Rosen 2007:226-7.

perform the self-defiling act of cunnilinctus on a prostitute (3-4);²⁹ and it is incongruous for Creperieus Pollio, a notorious welcher, to seek creditors (6-8).

Taking it a step further, each of these morally incongruous situations implicitly juxtaposes a normative behavioral expectation with an incongruous instance of deviant or transgressive behavior: piety versus hubris for Marsyas; vaginal penetration versus cunnilinctus for Ravola; and frugality versus profligacy for Crepereius Pollio.³⁰ That is, in each instance, our perception of the abjection of the figure of comparison involves our understanding of the implicit normative behavior that these figures are deviating from in the situations explicitly described: if only Marsyas had shown due deference to Apollo, he would not have been flayed alive; if only Ravola had been found vaginally penetrating Rhodope rather than performing cunnilinctus on her, he would not have been embarrassed; if only Crepereius Pollio had a better reputation for repaying loans, he would not have been at a loss for creditors at a reasonable rate of interest.

Let me reiterate that the term *deviance* is being used in this study to mean departure from or transgression of a normative expectation, generally either moral or aesthetic: not every deviant transgression in this sense is necessarily an abject failure of humanity or utter perversion of justice. On the other hand, each does potentially *gesture*

²⁹ For the associations of oral sex of any kind with foulness, filth, and contamination in the Roman textual tradition, see Richlin 1992a: 27 *et passim* and Williams 2010: 218-24. The assumption, made by most scholars, that Rhodope is a prostitute is based on her Greek name. Ferguson 1979: 249 comments on this line: "The name is taken from Aesop's fellow-slave Rhodopis, a Thracian, who was ransomed from slavery by Sappho's brother Charaxus, and acquired a large fortune in Egypt through her charms." As the scholiast suggests, the name Ravola is derived from the adjective *ravulus*, "hoarse." Cf. Grazzini 1997.

³⁰ For usury and debt in ancient Rome, see Louis 2006: 209-12.

towards such abjection and perversion, given the overall camp context in which each local incongruity is ultimately a synecdoche for the systemic incongruity of dominance/deviance that gestures toward the tension between parody and authenticity in queer existence. That is to say, the entire conceptual framework of the poem is bracketed by two major incongruous juxtapositions that figure sex, gender, and kinship deviance, both appearing in the context of comments addressed by Juvenal to Naevolus: (1) “you were in the habit of bending the husbands over, too” (*solebas...ipsos etiam inclinare maritos*, 25-6), and (2) “you will never lack a sexually submissive male friend” (*numquam pathicus tibi derit amicus*, 130). Let me underscore immediately that the deviance in question is not homosexuality; that is, the counter-normative aspect of the sex, gender, and kinship performances figured in these two statements is not the fact that Naevolus and his sexual partners are both male. The deviance rather lies in the combination of male sexual submission, effeminacy, and the violence done to the integrity of kinship relations by the participation of “husbands” (*maritos*, 26) and “friends” (*amicus*, 130) in these effeminate acts of sexual submission. Note that my usage of “kinship” casts a relatively wide net, as it encompasses friendship as well as marriage or consanguinity. One of the main contentions of this study is that “kinship” by tradition has been defined in an overly narrow manner based on a patriarchal bias in favor of heterosexual marriage and marital procreation. I maintain that we need to apply the concept of kinship to other kinds of relationships as well, including those that would be encompassed by Adrienne Rich’s (1980) notion of a lesbian continuum, or Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s (1985) notion of a homosocial continuum. In any event, as Esther Newton (1979) has persuasively argued,

camp is fundamentally about incongruities of sex role, gender identity, and kinship relations. In effect, all other incongruous juxtapositions in camp texts or performances come to stand in for these most problematized incongruities of sex, gender, and kinship.

Contrary to most previous scholarship, I contend that the insistence on deviance and transgression in these comparisons is not a negative verdict on Naevolus, but rather a characteristically camp deployment of perverse wit. The interlocutor Juvenal here appeals to putatively shocking incongruities by which he is not really shocked at all. This disparity between expected indignation and actual indifference exemplifies both camp irony and camp humor. Camp irony is often based on the deliberate failure of adherence to pretended standards. As we saw in Chapter Three, Harvey 2004: 449 locates camp irony in the incongruous juxtaposition of detailed sexual references with feigned adherence to dominant standards of morality. To this formulation I would add the refinement that the standards may be aesthetic as well as moral, and the incongruous references need not always be sexual (although, as we have seen, incongruous juxtapositions of sex and gender are the most characteristic forms of camp incongruity). In any case, the line between moral and aesthetic standards becomes blurred, since there tend to be moral implications to the aesthetic domain. This conception of camp irony helps explain the duplicitous insider/outsider dynamic of camp legibility discussed in previous chapters; for the standards that camp loves to transgress, whether moral or aesthetic, are specifically conceived by camp as *pretended* standards. The satiric target of camp is thus always moral or aesthetic pretense, not morality or aesthetics *tout court*. Only the camp insider, however, is in on the secret of pretense; the sincere outsider is in

earnest about his standards, and thus the camp irony is totally lost on him. Much of camp humor lies in the frivolous attitude towards the failure of adherence to these dominant standards. If one were to have a serious attitude towards the failure of adherence, one would be either an earnest social critic, as Wiesen 1963 argues that Juvenal was, or a pessimistic nihilist, as Wiesen 1989 argues that Juvenal was. In neither case, however, would one be camp.

At Juvenal 9.1-8, in fact, we see a fascinating example of how camp may signal its frivolous attitude toward moral standards via incongruous aesthetic choices, as the three comparisons unfold in ascending tricolon structure: the flaying of Marsyas, which should be the most shocking of the three (it is a matter of life and death, after all, as well as of human transgression of divine limits), is expressed in just two words, while the sexual impropriety of Ravola gets a considerably more generous two lines, and the profligacy of Crepereius Pollio, arguably the least shocking revelation, extends over a completely unjustified three lines. The verbal density of each comparison thus stands in inverse proportion to the egregiousness of its implied moral failure. This is fun to read, and our delight is only increased by our recognition that epic diction (e.g. *Marsya victus*; see below) and expansive elaboration of imagery are invited by the highly formal hexameter rhythm.

In contrast to the expansiveness of epic is the inherent capacity for concision in the Latin language, allowing the defeat of Marsyas to be expressed with such verbal economy (precisely two words: *Marsya victus*). This reference, however, is ultimately the

most epic of all, as it alludes to the flaying of Marsyas at Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6.383-400, which begins:

...satyri reminiscitur alter,
quem Tritoniaca Latous harundine victum
adfecit poena. (683-5)

...another one remembered the tale of the satyr whom the son of Leto slew
after defeating him at playing Athena's pipe.

Juvenal's *victus* (9.2) recalls Ovid's *victum* at *Met.* 6.384, and Ovid uses the nominative singular form *Marsya* at *Met.* 6.400, as opposed to the alternatives *Marsyas* or *Marsuas*, and in the metrical context of an adonic (*Marsya nomen* at the beginning of *Ov. Met.* 6.400) as Juvenal does here (*Marsya victus* at the end of 9.2). In between, Ovid provides a harrowing account of the flaying that would certainly account for Naevolus' "worried brow" (*fronte obducta*, *Juv.* 9.2).

Also coming into play in these lines is Juvenal's avoidance of obscene language, a generic constraint that invites him to develop elaborate and charmingly euphemistic periphrases for vulgar notions such as Ravola performing cunnilinctus on Rhodope. Juvenal's "while [Ravola] rubs Rhodope's crotch with his wet beard" (*dum Rhodopes udat erit inguina barba*, 4) uses the words "rub" (*tero*), "crotch" (*inguen*, here in the plural), and "beard" (*barba*) instead of the words "cunt" (*cunnus*), "lick" (*lingo*), and "mouth" (*os*) or "tongue" (*lingua*). In all these cases, the euphemistic word is a kind of metonymy that replaces an objectionable word with a word that refers to a nonsexual part of the body or a nonsexual component of the sexual act. In the case of "crotch" (*inguen*) for "cunt" (*cunnus*), the avoided word is a basic obscenity, meaning that its only possible connotation is sexual. In the cases of "rub" (*tero*) for "lick" (*lingo*) and "beard" (*barba*)

for “mouth” (*os*) or “tongue” (*lingua*), the avoided words are not inherently obscene, but have “acquired an offensive tone” through their well established associations with oral stimulation of the genital organs.³¹

Naevolus Past and Present (9.8-26)

The play of incongruous juxtapositions continues as Juvenal describes Naevolus’ grim and unkempt appearance. We learn that Naevolus is suddenly sporting wrinkles (*rugae*, 9), which Juvenal reads as an outer sign of some kind of inner turmoil at odds with his previous experience of Naevolus as a witty bon vivant. The phrase “all things now are opposite” (*omnia nunc contra*, 12) underscores the incongruity of past reality and present appearance. The ensuing description emphasizes changes in physical appearance: “facial expression” (*vultus*, 12), “hair,” (*comae*, 13), “skin,” (*cute*, 13), “legs” (*crura*, 15), “demeanor” (*habitum*, 20), “appearance” (*facies*, 20). Like the wrinkles at 9.9, these bodily changes serve as an index of the disparity between past reality and present appearance on the one hand, and between surface and substance on the other, culminating in the contrast between “mind” (*animi*, 18) and “body” (*corpore*, 19).³²

Most of the specific bodily changes cited involve Naevolus’ abandonment of a previously maintained regimen of grooming and depilation. These practices could be

³¹ Cf Adams 1982: 1, 47, 80, 134, 183, and 212. The quote is from p. 134. Let me clarify that the image of Ravola rubbing his wet beard on Rhodope’s crotch is quite explicitly sexual; it is only euphemistic in terms of the contrast established by Adams 1982 between the relative handful of primary Latin obscenities, that is, words that have no other denotation than their sexual one, and the relatively robust vocabulary of words whose primary meaning is not sexual but that are used metaphorically to convey sexual connotations.

³² Courtney 1980: 425 writes, “Naevolus, formerly so trim, is now unkempt; here too an apparent expression of sympathy carries a barbed gibe at his former dandyism. “

associated in the Roman imagination with effeminacy and eastern luxury if they were taken beyond a certain point of moderation, and previous scholars have seen here another example of Juvenal's subtle mockery of Naevolus, pretending to sympathize with his evident distress while in reality ridiculing his self-indulgent vanity.³³ A camp reading once again locates the irony and humor elsewhere: for one thing, Naevolus' embrace of feminine gender attributes constitutes an incongruous juxtaposition with his male sex; for another, while Juvenal might be expected to disdain Naevolus' effeminate gender performance, he instead takes it completely in stride, only wondering why Naevolus' attention to his physical appearance has faltered. In fact, Naevolus has allowed his grooming to deteriorate so much that he might well be faulted for his hypermasculinity. As Williams 2010: 143 notes in commenting on Martial 2.36, "excessive masculinity is embodied in unkempt hair, skin, and beard, as well as bristly legs and chest, while insufficient masculinity is shown by artificially curled hair, skin treated with the finest of cosmetics, feminine headgear, and depilated legs and chest."

In fact, we might well compare Martial 2.36:

Flectere te nolim, sed nec turbare capillos;
splendida sit nolo, sordida nolo cutis;
nec tibi mitrarum nec sit tibi barba reorum:
nolo virum nimium, Pannyche, nolo parum.
nunc sunt crura pilis et sunt tibi pectora saetis
horrida, sed mens est, Pannyche, volsa tibi.

I should not like you to curl your hair, but neither to derange it; I don't want your skin to be shiny, I don't want it to be dirty; your chin should be fitted neither with the ribbons of a bonnet nor the beard of a thug: I don't want too much of a man, Pannychus, I don't want too little. Now you have

³³ For the association of excessive grooming and depilation with effeminacy, see Williams 2010: 139-44.

legs bristling with hair and a chest bristling with fur, but your mind,
Pannychus, is depilated.

with Juvenal 9.12-5:

omnia nunc contra, vultus gravis, horrida siccae
silva comae, nullus tota nitor in cute, qualem
Bruttia praestabat calidi tibi fascia visci,
sed fruticante pilo neglecta et squalida crura.

Everything now is the opposite: Your face is grim; your dry hair is a
bristling forest; gone is the gleam your complexion used to get from a
bandage of hot Bruttian pitch. *Au contraire*, your legs are rough and
sprouting a messy crop.

There are many parallels. The word “bristling” (*horrida*, Juv. 9.12; Mart. 2.36.6) occurs
in both texts, as does the reference to hairy “legs” (*crura*, Juv. 9.15; Mart. 2.36.5).

Juvenal describes Naevolus’ “dry hair” (*siccae...comae*, 12-3), while Martial urges
Pannychus not to “derange his hair” (*turbare capillos*, 1). Juvenal refers to the “gleam” of
Naevolus’ “complexion” (*nitor in cute*, 13), while Martial refers to Pannychus’ “shiny
skin” (*splendida...cutis*, 2). Both poets use the same word for body hair (*pilo*, Juv. 9.15;
pilis, Mart. 2.36.5). For “dirty” or “messy,” Juvenal uses *squalida* (15) while Martial uses
sordida (2), but the tone and effect are similar. Perhaps most interesting is the little
temporal adverb “now” (*nunc*, Juv. 9.12; Mart. 2.36.5), indicating that the addressee’s
grooming regimen has deteriorated *compared with the past*. In Martial, this past is not
distinctly referenced; the first two couplets are not temporally specific, and only the word
“now” (*nunc*) at 2.36.5, the very first word in the final couplet, indicates a temporal
contrast. In Juvenal, the first eight lines suggest that the past was different somehow, and
the past reality is described explicitly at 9-11:

certe modico contentus agebas

vernā equitem, conviva ioco mordente facetus
et salibus vehemens intra pomeria natis.

Indeed, content with little, you used to go around playing the role of a homegrown equestrian, a clever dinner guest with a mordant wit, spouting the latest wisecracks springing up around town.

Martial concludes with a mind/body contrast: Pannychus' legs and chest (*crura...pectora*, 5) are hairy (*horrida*, 6) but his "mind" (*mens*, 6) is depilated or "plucked smooth" (*volsa*, 6). As noted above, Juvenal's comparison between Naevolus' past reality and present appearance similarly culminates in a contrast between "mind" (*animi*, 18) and "body" (*corpore*, 19). What we have in both poems, then, is a camp incongruity, a juxtaposition between past appearance and present reality staged in terms of outer signs of the inner self, in particular around gender identity, specifically hypermasculinity versus "hypomasculinity" or effeminacy.³⁴

Based on his observation of appearances, Juvenal can only conclude that Naevolus' reality has changed. The incongruity between old reality and new reality is described in spatial terms: "you seem to have changed course and to be going contrary to your previous way of life" (*flexisse videris / propositum et vitae contrarius ire priori*, 20-1). The crowning incongruity comes in Juvenal's description of Naevolus' sexual behavior, where it is revealed that Naevolus' partners included not only married women but also their husbands (22-6). The emphasis remains on incongruities, only now the disparities are not between past appearance and present reality, but rather between

³⁴ Much has been written on the question of literary influence between Martial and Juvenal. Anderson 1970: 6-11 provides a useful sketch of the controversy, including the positions of Nettleship, Duff, Wilson, Highet, and Mason, with appropriate references. Colton 1991 provides a usefully comprehensive catalogue of the apparent Martialian references in each and every satire of Juvenal.

expectation and reality with respect to performances of sex, gender, and kinship. Thus, women who are supposed to be faithful to their husbands are in fact committing adultery with Naevolus, while men who are supposed to be sexually inviolable are in fact being sexually penetrated by him. Juvenal characterizes Naevolus as an “adulterer” (*moechus*, 23), a term that denotes criminal and therefore decidedly transgressive behavior of the sort that I refer to as kinship deviance.³⁵ In addition, Juvenal reveals that Naevolus assumes the penetrative role in acts of anal intercourse with men, represented specifically as the husbands of the women with whom he commits adultery. To be sure, this single image of “bending the husbands over” (*inclinare maritos*, 26) has been one of the most provocative in the entire poem during its modern reception history, and implicates Juvenal’s ninth satire in the discourse of sexuality that occupied sex and gender studies in the latter part of the twentieth century (see *Preliminaries 3: The Homosexual Question* in the introductory section of this chapter). Before turning to Naevolus’ first words, therefore, we must carefully explicate Juvenal 9.26: “and although you remain silent about it, the fact is [you were accustomed] to bend the husbands over as well” (*quodque taces, ipsos etiam inclinare maritos [solebas]*).

Sex, Gender, and Kinship Deviance (9.26)

It is in the context created by Dover, Halperin, and Williams that we must consider Juvenal’s remark about Naevolus’s sexual activities with men. As we have seen (in *Preliminaries 3: The Homosexual Question* above), Dover demonstrates that the

³⁵ For adultery and the related concept of *stuprum* in ancient Rome, see Fantham 1991, Edwards 2002: 34-62, and Williams 2010: 103-36.

relevant binary in classical Athenian sexuality was not homo/hetero but rather insertive/receptive; he also establishes the important association of male homosexual insertivity with social dominance over the receptive male partner. Halperin characterizes ancient sexuality as an effect of a social hierarchy that organizes relations not just between men but among adult male citizens and all other members of the polity, regardless of sex, age, or status. To the extent that sexual penetration is in effect a playing out or performance of this social hierarchy, the most important binary is neither homo/hetero nor even insertive/receptive, but rather dominant/submissive. Williams describes the social conventions that governed the performance of Roman masculinity with regard to sexual relations, including compulsory insertivity, respect for free status, and adherence to standards of sexual desirability.³⁶ In the context of these insights, Juvenal 9.26 describes not an instance of male homosexuality, but a performance of masculinity in which sexual penetration reproduces a social hierarchy of freeborn adult male citizens over other social actors within limits set by conventions of sexual role, social status, and sexual desire.

This particular performance, however, is complicated by the fact that its reproduction of social hierarchy contains troubling intimations of deviance within its simple assertion of dominance. Notwithstanding the fact that Naevolus' homosexual insertivity in no way compromises his own reputation for masculinity, the fact that this aspect of Naevolus' sexual activity is veiled in secrecy (*quodque taces*, 26) indicates that

³⁶ My use of the term "compulsory insertivity" is inspired by Adrienne Rich's usage of the term "compulsory heterosexuality" elaborated in Rich 1980. In short, we might say that Dover made it morally acceptable to discuss sexuality; Halperin made it theoretically untenable to appeal to sexuality; and Williams shifted the emphasis from sexuality to gender, specifically masculinity and effeminacy.

the behavior remains problematic.³⁷ As we shall see, the nod to secrecy here is reinforced throughout the poem. Obviously, the husbands do not want it known that they are being penetrated by Naevolus, because the promulgation of such knowledge would indeed compromise *their* reputation for masculinity, even though Naevolus' own masculinity remains intact. Later, Naevolus will express at some length his concerns regarding the consequences of divulging his patron's secret (93-101), and Juvenal will second his concerns while arguing that the best way to avoid the consequences of risky behavior is to avoid the activities that incur the risks (102-19): a kind of "safer sex" prescription against the ill effects of indulging other men in their "sickness" (*morbo*, 49).

I contend that this dynamic in and of itself qualifies Naevolus as a transgressive figure, because his performance of sexual *insertion* completely overlaps with the husbands' performance of sexual *reception*. Notwithstanding the fact that the husbands willingly and eagerly submit, Naevolus' sexual dominance transgresses the putatively inviolable boundary of the Roman male body. The structure of normativity is a public matter, not a private one; the husbands may wish to debase themselves by submitting to sexual penetration by another man, but the socially constructed and morally sanctioned

³⁷ Some of the manuscripts read *quod taceo atque* instead of *quodque taces*. The former reading, which translates "a fact about which I remain silent, and," would make Juvenal's silence refer to Naevolus' sexual encounters with women but not to those with men. One manuscript reads *quodque taceo*, "and, a fact about which I remain silent," which shifts the burden of silence from Naevolus to Juvenal, but does not affect the object of secrecy, which remains Naevolus' sexual encounters with men rather than with women. This reading is non-metrical and thus unlikely to have been written by Juvenal, but its occurrence as a scribal error is interesting. The scholiast attests to the reading *quodque taces* (adopted by Clausen and others) which he glosses with the phrase "a fact which you do not admit" (*quod non confiteris*); that is, he explains Naevolus' silence as a disavowal of his sexual relations with the husbands.

structure of normativity deprives them of normative status if they do so. In effect, the husbands' private desires cannot absolve Naevolus of publicly violating their *pudicitia* and committing *stuprum*. As in the case of an adulterated wife and her adulterous male partner (*moechus*), any assault upon the sexual integrity of the freeborn Roman body implicates not only the violated party but also the violator: in this case, Naevolus. Of course, practical consequences are likely to accrue to Naevolus' sexually submissive male partners only if they are *caught* submitting or if they develop a *reputation* for having done so (as Ravola is represented as having been "caught" [*depreusus*, 3] in the shameful act of *performing* cunnilinctus); but in fact, consequences or no, caught in the act or not, the moment they sexually submit, they are transgressing the dominant structure of normativity and engaging in a deviant performance of manhood, which we might view alternately or simultaneously as a deviant performance of sex, gender, or kinship.

This is in effect to say that what I am calling the dominant structure of normativity is equivalent to Lacan's realm of the symbolic: it is an abstract but nevertheless very real structure that regulates human behavior and influences the individual's status, both subjectively (in their own estimation) and objectively (in the estimation of others), as either conforming to normative standards or deviating from them, and therefore marks individuals, both in their private thoughts and in public discourse, as either normal or deviant.³⁸

³⁸ Lacan lays out his system of three orders of conscious human existence, the imaginary, the symbolic, and the real, in the essay "The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis" (Lacan 2004: 31-106).

Precisely how the “bending over” of the husbands is transgressive has itself been a matter of scholarly debate, since it includes elements of both sex and gender. Historians of sexuality have distinguished between gender identity (masculine/feminine or masculine/effeminate) and sexual orientation (homo/hetero), demonstrating that effeminacy is not equivalent to homosexuality. In particular, Roman terms such as *impudicus*, *mollis*, *pathicus*, and *cinaedus* refer not to sexual orientation but to gender identity and, moreover, to gender *deviance*.³⁹ As Williams 2010: 237 argues, *cinaedi*,

as represented *by others* in the public discourse of their cultural environment, violate standards of gender rather than of sexuality, and are characterized as a subset of the larger category of effeminate men rather than as homosexuals. Insulting remarks drawing attention to such men’s desire for male partners place the emphasis on their desire for men (*viri*) in particular--not for male partners (*mares*) in general and certainly not for boys (*pueri*), a choice of erotic object that would never have raised eyebrows. (Emphases in original)

Throughout his study of Roman masculinity, Williams maintains a consistent focus on the characteristic Roman antithesis between masculinity and effeminacy, rightly arguing that one of the major organizing principles of Roman masculinity was “an opposition between masculine and effeminate traits or behavior that was not aligned with the distinction between heterosexual and homosexual acts but instead associated masculinity with dominion and control.” (Williams 2010: 6) While this important distinction between sexual orientation and gender identity contributes to our understanding of male-embodied femininity, it has the additional effect of potentially suggesting that the only deviant

³⁹ See Williams 2010: 230-9 for the debate over whether the term *cinaedus*, in particular, points to homosexuality or gender deviance. Williams’ invaluable discussion cites theoretically important passages from works by Foucault, Halperin, John Winkler, and Maud Gleason.

aspect of male sexual submission is gender deviance. Clearly, however, the act of sexual submission is a sexual act, and the husbands who “bend over” for Naevolus are engaged in an act of *sexual deviance*, even if—in fact, precisely because—their sexual act is gendered as feminine. Moreover, since the husbands at Juvenal 9.26 are characterized specifically *as husbands (maritos)*, their act of sexual submission is also represented as an act of *kinship* deviance; that is, what the dominant structure of normativity demands that they do insertively with their wives, they are instead doing receptively with Naevolus.

Restricting our analytic framework to a choice between sexuality and gender keeps us within the constraints of potentially misleading notions of “orientation” and “identity” that are historically bound up with binary oppositions between same and different (homo/hetero) on the one hand and between masculine and feminine on the other. Elucidating the category of effeminacy certainly helps by giving us a term for a particular kind of counter-normative performance of manhood. Ultimately, I would argue, the best alternative is to move away from notions of sexual orientation and gender identity altogether and towards a model of selfhood based on performance and performativity that encompasses not only sex and gender but also kinship. We may then discuss how persons, real or imaginary, perform their sex, gender, and kinship, including the issue of whether a given performance conforms to dominant expectations or deviates from them.

I would argue that the model of sex, gender, and kinship performance, with its terminology of transgression, deviance, and queerness alongside the notions of

normativity and dominance, helps us understand and describe the *imagination* of Juvenal's ninth satire; that is, the imaginative poetic work of representing performances of sex, gender, and kinship that are deviant within a dominant discourse and that tend to subvert that dominant discourse by transgressing its limits. Indeed, my contention is that the poem represents these performances (1) as deviant, (2) as transgressive by virtue of their deviance, and (3) as subversive by virtue of their transgressiveness. The Juvenalian interlocutor recognizes that "bending the husbands over" is transgressive on the levels of sex, gender, and kinship, and he signals that recognition with the words *quodque taces*. On this model of sex, gender, and kinship performativity, we need not parse out who is the sexual deviant, who the gender deviant, and who the kinship deviant. Instead, we may regard sex, gender, and kinship as mutually constitutive and simultaneously occurring aspects of human existence and selfhood that are performed by individual human beings in relation to other human beings in social contexts. Ultimately, the transgressiveness and deviance of these performances transcend the individual performers and encompass the relations and the social contexts in which they are embedded.

To say merely that Juvenal's ninth satire represents certain performances of sex, gender, and kinship as deviant, transgressive, and subversive is not necessarily to read the poem differently than nineteenth-century editors or twentieth-century scholars have done. Most of these readers, to judge by their practices of expurgation, bowdlerization, and interpretation, seem to have viewed the effeminacy and sexual submissiveness of the patron, and the adultery and prostitution of Naevolus, as in effect deviant, transgressive, and subversive, although they might not have used that terminology. What is different

about my reading is my claim that the poem may be read as enacting an embrace of these stigmatized identities (the effeminate, the sexual submissive, the adulterer, the prostitute) rather than ridiculing them, and may be read as performing a gesture of solidarity with the deviant actors and actions rather than with the normative demands of the dominant discourse.

Naevolus' Reply (9.27-90)

By the end of Juvenal's inquiry, we are eager to learn how Naevolus will account for his incongruous appearance, as well as how he will respond to Juvenal's assertions about his incongruous behavior. His sustained reply breaks into three sections of approximately equal length with the following general outline:

- General difficulties associated with sexual *clientela* (27-46)
- Naevolus' mistreatment at the hands of his sexual patron (46-69)
- I even saved your marriage and fathered your children (70-90)

Each section of Naevolus' reply is considered in a separate subsection below.

***Hoc Vitae Genus* (9.27-46)**

Like Juvenal's earlier use of *propositum* (21), Naevolus' phrase *utile et hoc multis vitae genus* (27) evokes a tone of learned discourse, as if his career of prostitution were in fact the prescriptions of a philosophical school.⁴⁰ Naevolus refers to the "reward for his efforts" (*operae pretium*, 28) as if they were the wages of dignified labor or the profits from a respectable business enterprise (or perhaps the writing of the *Ab Urbe Condita*)

⁴⁰ Ferguson 1979: 250 *ad. loc.* comments that *utile* is "an ironically Epicurean term" that "shows where Naevolus' real interests lie: in his purse."

and not the proceeds of sex, gender, and kinship deviance.⁴¹ Thus, there is an incongruous juxtaposition between the ordinary, estimable connotations of these terms, and their euphemistic use in this context of contemptible behavior. Moreover, just as Juvenal shows no sign of being shocked or offended by any of the objectionable comparisons or scandalous revelations at 9.1-26, so Naevolus here reveals putatively shocking details about penetrating freeborn adult Roman males for material compensation without any apparent moral scruple. The very insouciance of these two interlocutors, by contrast with the normative expectation of indignation (on the part of Juvenal) or some sign of shame or disgrace (on the part of Naevolus) is another level of incongruous juxtaposition, and is fundamental to their characterization as camp personalities.

Previous analyses have noted that terms like *propositum* (21) and *utile* (27) and phrases like *vitae...priori* (21), *hoc...vitae genus* (27), and *operae pretium* (28) suggest a parody of learned philosophical discourse. Less often noted, however, is the way Naevolus in this section of the poem begins an extended parody of Roman elegiac poetry that sets up a dazzling array of incongruous juxtapositions.⁴² Sharon James has analyzed the interrelated themes of the “greedy girlfriend” and the “generous rival” in Roman elegy, describing their connection as follows:

[T]he *puella* demands gifts and money from her lovers (as advised by the *lena* [procuress]), the wealthy rival meets her demands, and the elegiac lover complains, arguing both that he has no means of paying her, since he is an impoverished poet, and that poetry is a better exchange for her favors than either concrete goods or coin. Underlying this set of demands and counterarguments are, first, the *puella*'s material

⁴¹ Cf. Livy, *Praef.* 1, “Whether I would accomplish something worth the effort” (*Facturusne operae pretium sim*).

⁴² Hendry 1999 is a brief essay that focuses narrowly on the elegiac parody of the *exclusus amator* motif at 9.77-8.

needs, which her lover attempts to ignore or overcome with elegiac persuasion...and second, the lover-poet's generic voluntary poverty.⁴³

In Naevolus' elegiac parody, the greedy girlfriend is replaced by the "stingy molly" (*mollis avarus*, 38) and the generous rival is replaced by the generously *endowed* rival; that is, the well-hung stud or "two-legged donkey" (*bipedem...asellum*, 92), hypothetical or actual, who may replace or has replaced Naevolus in his relationship with his erstwhile patron. Thus, instead of a *puella* who demands payment and withholds sex, we have a *mollis* who demands sex and withholds payment, or rather insists that he has already paid enough, reportedly reproaching Naevolus: "I gave you these things, then I gave you those things, then you got more" (*haec tribui, deinde illa dedi, mox plura tulisti*, 39).⁴⁴ In an incongruous role reversal, it is not the miserly patron (cast in the role of the elegiac *puella*) who demands gifts and money, but rather Naevolus, here parodying the role of the elegiac lover-poet. Just as the elegist fails in his amorous quest, so Naevolus fails in his mercenary one, receiving only some cheap clothing and accessories as "payment for his efforts" (*operae pretium*, 28).

Naevolus further parodies the elegist in his appeal to fate as the force that compels him to live as he does and to suffer the consequences of his way of life. As the speaker of Propertius 1.6.29-30 declares, "Not suited to praise, not to warfare was I born: *this* is the military service the fates want me to endure" (*non ego sum laudi, non natus idoneus*

⁴³ James 2003: 71.

⁴⁴ Note the variation in the Latin (*tribui... dedi... tulisti*). I believe that rendering this with a similar variation in my English prose version (e.g., I bestowed...I gave...you took) would constitute an overtranslation, since I do not detect any crucial semantic difference in the three Latin verbs *in this context*.

armis: / hanc me militiam fata subire volunt),⁴⁵ By comparison, Naevolus asserts: “The Fates rule human beings, and even those parts hidden beneath the toga have a fate” (*fata regunt homines, fatum est et partibus illis / quas sinus abscondit*, 32-3). Where the elegist curses fate for burdening him with a desire that enslaves him to his mistress, Naevolus curses fate for burdening him with a desire that enslaves him to his effeminate, sexually submissive male patron:⁴⁶

nam si tibi sidera cessant,
 nil faciet longi mensura incognita nervi,
 quamvis te nudum spumanti Virro labello
 viderit et blandae adsidue densaeque tabellae
 sollicitent, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος. (33-37)

For if the stars are not on your side, the unfathomable length of your massive penis will do you no good, even though some john with his foaming little lip sees you nude and his frequent coaxing letters beseech you continually, for a *cinaedus* himself attracts a man!

As we saw in Chapter One, the last five words of 9.37 (αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος) are a parody of Homer, *Odyssey* 16.294 (=19.13), αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος—“for an iron weapon (σίδηρος) itself attracts a man,” that is, tempts him to use it.⁴⁷ There is camp theatricality in the appeal to epic allusion, as well as camp humor in the witty and ironic parody. In addition, there is an incongruous juxtaposition between the

⁴⁵ For references to fate in the elegiac poets, see James 2001: 9, 11, and 12.

⁴⁶ Cf. the imagery of slavery at 9.45 (*servus*), 9.103 (*servi*), and 9.119 (*servi*), none of which, to be sure, refer directly to Naevolus.

⁴⁷ LSJ defines this use of ἐφέλκεται as “draw to oneself, attract,” glossing Hom. Od. 16.294 (=19.13) as “the very sight of iron (i.e. arms) draws men on, i.e. tempts them to use them.” See the Appendix for the Homeric context. The Homeric line is said by a number of scholars to be a proverb reflecting the Iron Age milieu of Homer’s own day rather than the Bronze Age world of his heroes; for example, Griffin 1987: 5.

(sexually) receptive and vaginal connotations of the parodic κίναιδος and the (martially) insertive and phallic connotations of the original σίδηρος.

THE STRUCTURE OF DESIRE

The Homeric parody at 9.37 is an explosive concatenation of five words of Greek verse in a Roman satire, a line so controversial that many scholars writing on the poem in the last century were reluctant to discuss it directly or in detail. Lelièvre 1958: 43 makes a typical gesture when, in a paragraph devoted to explaining an innovative type of Juvenalian parody, will say only that “The substitution of κίναιδος for Homer’s σίδηρος in 9.37 explains itself.”⁴⁸ Of course, it explains itself no more and no less than any other line of poetry, but Juvenal scholars in the mid twentieth century were often loath to explicate literary representations of effeminacy and sexual submissiveness.

Ferguson 1979: 249 does a much more satisfying job when, in his brief summary of 9.27-69, he writes in part, “Pansies may be proverbially attractive, but they’re no use if they don’t pay.” Ferguson here gets at the two fundamental element of the relationship between Naevolus and the patron: (1) Naevolus is attracted to effeminate, sexually submissive men, and (2) he expects to be compensated for penetrating them sexually. Naevolus expresses his expectation of compensation throughout his lengthy speech (27-90), beginning with 9.27-8:

⁴⁸ This type of parody, Lelièvre argues, is “intended to provide an unspoken comment on the contrast in moral values between the two worlds that Juvenal has juxtaposed, that of literature or legend and that of [contemporary] real life.” This is, indeed, a description of parody as an display of camp incongruity, although of course Lelièvre does not use the term “camp.” See Chapter Three for an in-depth discuss of camp manqué, my term for scholarly analyses that employ camp concepts unwittingly.

utile et hoc multis vitae genus, at mihi nullum
inde operae pretium.

Many men profit even from this sort of life, but I get no reward for my efforts.

It is in the Homeric parody at 9.37 that Naevolus most clearly and explicitly expresses his attraction, which remains no more than implicit throughout the rest of the poem. Let us consider precisely how the phrase “for a *cinaedus* himself attracts a man” (αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος) represents the expression of this attraction.

The conjunction “for” (the Greek particle γὰρ) is *explanatory*, indicating that the present clause explains the immediately preceding statement. Here the situation is rather complex, though, because the previous statement is itself a *concessive* clause, introduced by the adverbial phrase “even though” (Latin relative adverb *quamvis*, 35), indicating that the present clause describes a possible (not necessarily actual) situation that qualifies the immediately preceding statement. That statement, in turn, is a *causal* clause, also introduced by the conjunction “for” (the Latin particle *nam*, 33), this time indicating that the present clause provides a proof or an example of the immediately preceding statement. Thus, we must consider 9.32-7 as a single rhetorical unit in which Naevolus makes a rather complicated and nuanced argument, all in the interest of explaining why he is a failure at obtaining sexual patronage, the sad state of affairs he has just acknowledged at 9.27-31. A further rhetorical complexity lies in the fact that, even though Naevolus is presumably speaking about himself, he casts this entire argument in the general second person, using the pronoun “you” (*te*, 35).

Taking all of the preceding syntactical information into account, we may summarize Naevolus' statement at 9.32-7 as follows. First, Naevolus asserts that fate rules men's lives, including their sexual lives; that is, our genitals, too, have a fate (32-3). As a proof or example of this, Naevolus adduces the observation that prodigious genital endowment cannot prevail against an unfavorable astrological alignment (33-4). This is the case, he insists, even despite the possibility that an effeminate, sexually submissive man may see you, express sexual interest in you, and seduce you (35-7). What facilitates this possibility, he explains, is that the effeminate, sexually submissive man exerts an attractive force of some sort upon you (37).

To make the most sense of this, we almost have to read the clauses in reverse order: (1) masculine, sexually dominant men find effeminate, sexually submissive men attractive; (2) a particular effeminate, sexually submissive man aggressively seduces you; (3) you penetrate him with your large penis; (4) his material generosity fails to match your genital endowment; (5) misfortune has evidently placed a parsimonious effeminate, sexually submissive man in the path of your desire to penetrate effeminate, sexually submissive men; (6) this is the sort of thing that has made me, Naevolus, a failure at obtaining sexual patronage.

Is it fair to talk about this kind of attraction in terms of "desire"? I maintain that it is indeed fair, and accurate, to do so. At Juvenal 9.37, the intensive adjective "itself" (αὐτὸς, 37) emphasizes the paradoxical agency attributed both to the sword in the Homeric source text, and to the effeminate, sexually submissive man in Naevolus' parody: the man may pick up and wield the sword of his own accord, but in fact the

sword *itself* draws the man toward it; similarly, the masculine-gendered male *subject* of desire may penetrate the effeminate, sexually submissive male *object* of desire, but the submissive male object *himself* draws the dominant male subject toward him. Odysseus claims that men have a desire to wield weapons, and Naevolus transforms this into a claim that masculine, sexually dominant men have a desire to penetrate effeminate, sexually submissive men. This is true, Naevolus seems to suggest, independent of the fact, also presumably true, that masculine, sexually dominant men expect to be compensated when they penetrate effeminate, sexually submissive men.

DESIRE, SEX, AND KINSHIP

Naevolus' suggestion that masculine, sexually dominant men both *desire* to penetrate effeminate, sexually submissive men and *expect to be compensated* for penetrating them is, in effect, a description of a kind of kinship relation for which there is no readily available terminology within the established Roman discourse of kinship. Thus, while it may seem somewhat cheeky for James 2003 to offer "greedy girlfriend" as her rendering of *puella avara*, the generic female object of elegiac desire, it nevertheless seems reasonable and even accurate by traditional philological standards, because *puella* is well recognized as a kinship term, a term that expresses a relation of affinity between a man and a woman. By contrast, it seems downright perverse for me to offer "stingy boyfriend" as a translation of *mollis avarus*, the term used by Naevolus at 9.38 to describe the effeminate, sexually submissive object of his masculine-gendered male desire, because *mollis* is not generally recognized as a kinship term. And yet, Naevolus

would seem to use the term *mollis* at 9.38 to express a relation of affinity between two males, one masculine-gendered, one effeminate.

It would of course be perverse to insist on an equivalence *in the Roman social imaginary* between Naevolus' attraction to freeborn adult Roman men and the elegiac poet's attraction to freeborn adult Roman women.⁴⁹ Nor would I claim that they can have nothing in common. To be sure, the elegist claims that his attraction is a kind of "slavery of love" (*servitium amoris*) and that his devotion to his female objects of desire is a kind of "soldierly duty in the service of love" (*militia amoris*).⁵⁰ Naevolus, by contrast, claims that his attraction is based on a kind of material exigency that is only ever characterized obliquely, as when Naevolus asserts that "many men profit even from this sort of life, but I get no reward for my efforts" (*utile et hoc multis vitae genus, at mihi nullum / inde operae pretium, 27-8*).

The elegist speaks of a kind of desire that subjects him to a mistress for love; Naevolus speaks of a kind of desire that subjects him to a master for money. Both of these rhetorical stances are poetic fictions; neither is a historically documented psychosocial phenomenon; and neither is entirely reliable within its own poetic context. That is, while the elegist tries to convince his addressee that his passion is a *servitium*

⁴⁹ Taylor 2004: 23 writes, "By social imaginary, I mean something much broader and deeper than the intellectual schemes people may entertain when they think about social reality in a disengaged mode. I am thinking, rather, of the ways in which they imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations which are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations."

⁵⁰ For *servitium amoris* and *militia amoris* see James 2003: 8, 18, *et passim*, including additional bibliography. James 2003 includes a useful glossary of elegiac terms, including *servitium amoris* and *militia amoris*, among many others.

amoris, he may just want sex, or he may have a subjective experience of love and devotion driven by his sexual arousal, to suggest just two of many possible configurations of that complicated experience we call desire and love. Naevolus, however, has no need to idealize his sexual objectives with amorous rhetoric, precisely because there is no expectation of an amorous kinship relation between him and his effeminate, sexually submissive male partner. On the other hand, the dignity of both parties demands that their deviant relationship be assimilated to some kind of dominant social hierarchy. Based on the male sex of both partners, and the evident exchange of goods for services, much more readily assimilable than the discourse of marriage or of elegiac love is that of “friendship” (*amicitia*) or “patronage” (*clientela*), and these are the discourses to which Naevolus appeals throughout the poem to characterize his sexual relationships, as we shall see below.

VIOLATIONS OF PROTOCOL

For the sake of clarity, let me reiterate that the deviance here is not homosexuality, but rather (1) the patron’s effeminacy and sexual submissiveness, a sex and gender performance that completely overlaps with Naevolus’ penetration of him, which is to say his penetration of (2) a freeborn adult Roman male who (3) does not appear to meet the normative standards of youthful beauty for a sexual object choice. We have ample evidence that the patron is not a “boy” (*puer*): he is a married adult man, implicitly a member of the group that Juvenal refers to as “husbands” (*maritos*, 26); he is likened to, if not identified with, Virro (35), the patron of Juvenal 5; he is called a “molly” (*mollis*, 38), that is, an effeminate, sexually submissive adult male. How do we know the patron is

not young and smooth? Primarily by inference from Naevolus' failure to praise the youthful beauty of his patron, as might be expected if he were in fact young and beautiful.⁵¹ Rather than call attention to any qualities of age or ugliness the patron might possess, Naevolus describes their sexual intercourse in terms that suggest not the amorous rapture that Encolpius feels for Giton in Petronius' *Satyricon* (79.8):⁵²

Qualis nox fuit illa, di deaeque,
quam mollis torus! Haesimus calentes
et transfudimus hinc et hinc labellis
errantes animas. Valete curae
mortales. Ego sic perire coepi.

Oh what a night that was, o gods and goddesses, how soft the bed! We clung ardently and poured our wandering souls into each other on this side and that with our lips. Farewell to mortal cares. Thus I began to die.

but rather in terms of a wretched slave performing a dirty and difficult task on behalf of his master:

an facile et pronum est agere intra viscera penem
legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae?
servus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum
quam dominum. (43-6)

Or do you think it is smooth and easy to drive a proper penis into the guts and there run into yesterday's dinner? The slave who plows a field will be less wretched than the slave who plows his master.

⁵¹ Naevolus never directly comments the patron's age or physical attractiveness, except if one reads lines 46-7 as Naevolus addressing the patron (see discussion below). If those lines do refer to the patron, they imply strongly that he is no longer "a soft, beautiful boy worthy of the heavenly ladle [of Ganymede]" (*tenerum et puerum te / et pulchrum et dignum cyatho caeloque*), as he used to consider himself (*putabas*).

⁵² See Williams 2010: 203-8 for a discussion of how "boys" (*pueri*) compare with effeminate, sexually submissive adult men (*cinaedi*) as objects of masculine-gendered male desire.

This passage has, naturally enough, generally been read as evidence that Naevolus despises the patron and is revolted by his own sexual service. I rather view these lines, with their stark and vivid sexual and scatological imagery, as an example of carnival humor and the bodily grotesque, concepts originally elucidated by Mikhail Bakhtin in *Rabelais and His World*, his highly influential study 1964 of the Renaissance novel *The Life of Gargantua and Pantagruel* (English translation published in 1984).

The bodily grotesque involves representations of whatever goes on in the so-called lower bodily stratum—eating, drinking, pissing, shitting, having sex, and giving birth. Not surprisingly, representations of the bodily grotesque often result in objects of art or literature that are objectionable by some standards. Bakhtin made a distinction between “carnival laughter” and “satiric laughter,” suggesting that representations of the bodily grotesque in a carnival context are regenerative and democratic (associated with life and rebirth), while such representations in a satiric context are degenerative and autocratic (associated with death and decay). But it is not clear how Bakhtin's notion of “satire” relates to Roman verse satire. On some occasions he cites Roman satire specifically, but in most instances he seems to be referring to the European tradition of satire, a form—sometimes in verse, sometimes in prose—that was concerned with making direct critical attack on civil or religious authorities. On the other hand, Bakhtin argues that medieval carnival is closely linked with the Roman Saturnalia, strongly suggesting an connection between carnival laughter and Roman forms of comic mockery such as satire. I contend that there is indeed a carnival element to Roman satire, perhaps more so in Juvenal than in his predecessors, and that images of the bodily grotesque in

Juvenal have a vital, regenerative quality that is consistent with a camp sensibility that embraces stigmatized identity and expresses solidarity with the deviant.⁵³ I will return to Naevolus' words at 9.43-6 in the Conclusion.

In a parody of the elegist's complaint that he receives no gratification from the *puella* in exchange for his poetic gifts, Naevolus at 9.32-46 complains that he receives inadequate compensation in exchange for his sexual services. Naevolus' complaint against the "stingy molly" (*mollis avarus*, 38) parallels and parodies the elegist's complaint against what Sharon James calls the "greedy girl" (*puella avara*), for example at Tibullus 2.4.35-46:

heu quicumque dedit formam caelestis avarae,
 quale bonum multis attulit ille malis!
 hinc fletus rixaeque sonant, haec denique causa
 fecit ut infamis nunc deus erret Amor.
 at tibi, quae pretio victos excludis amantes,
 eripiant partas ventus et ignis opes:
 quin tua tunc iuvenes spectent incendia laeti,
 nec quisquam flammae sedulus addat aquam.
 seu veniet tibi mors, nec erit qui lugeat ullus
 nec qui det maestas munus in exsequias.
 at bona quae nec avara fuit, centum licet annos
 vixerit, ardentem flebitur ante rogam.

Alas, whichever god gave beauty to the greedy girl, what a good he compounded with so many evils. From this source flow the sound of weeping and brawling, this indeed is why Love now wanders a discredited god. But from you, who shuts out lovers beaten by the high price you demand, may wind and fire snatch away your gotten gain: let young men then watch happily your flames, and let no one take care to put water on the fire. Or if death comes to you, there will be no one to mourn you or pay tribute at your funeral rites. But as for the girl who was good and not greedy, even if she lives a long, full life of a hundred years, people will still weep before her pyre.

⁵³ For perspectives on Bakhtin's notion of the grotesque in classical studies, see Miller 1998 and A.T. Edwards 2002.

We see verbal reminiscences not only in the parallel usage of *avarus/avara*, but also in the emphasis on *pretium*, which for Naevolus is the reward he does not receive (*mihi nullum / inde operae pretium*, 9.27-8), and for Tibullus is the exorbitant price that the impoverished poet-lover cannot pay (*pretio victos excludis amantes*, 39). Later, Naevolus will apostrophize his erstwhile patron, asking him at what price (*quanto...pretio*, 70-1) he values (*meritis*, 71) Naevolus' paternal surrogacy of the patron's children. The elegiac *puella* stores up wealth (*opes*, Tib. 2.4.40), presumably obtained from generous rivals; the *mollis* counts his wealth (*computat*, Juv. 9.40; cf. *opibus*, 9.100). Both the elegiac lover and Naevolus dignify their sexual servility via metaphor: Propertius 1.6.30, for example, refers to his passionate pursuit of the *puella* as a kind of military service (*militia*), while Naevolus refers to his sexual service as a series of labor (*labores*, 9.42), with the plural perhaps suggesting heroic connotations, as in the labors of Herakles or Theseus.

GROUNDS FOR INVECTIVE

Note that the invective of the elegiac lover is scarcely less harsh than that of Naevolus. In fact, while Tibullus wishes destruction and death upon the greedy girl, Naevolus merely complains that giving his patron a satisfying sexual experience is hard, under-appreciated work (43-6, cited above). Whereas the elegiac lover complains that his poetry and passion are worth more than the gifts or money that the *puella avara* demands, Naevolus complains that his sexual service is worth more than what the *mollis avarus* is willing to concede. But the economies of sexual scale favor the stingy molly no less than they do the greedy girl. In the elegiac setting, the supply of rival lovers is great, so the *puella avara* can withhold sex and demand compensation. In Naevolus' situation, the

supply of well-hung studs is great, so the *mollis avarus* can withhold compensation and demand sex: when Juvenal asks how the patron defends himself against Naevolus' "just cause for complaint" (*iusta doloris...causa*, 90-2), Naevolus replies, "'He ignores me and seeks himself another two-legged donkey" (*neglegit atque alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum*, 92)⁵⁴

At 9.38-46, Naevolus displays the fervent indignation that we associate with Juvenal's own poetic persona in earlier satires.⁵⁵ At 9.38, "And yet, what is a worse portent than a stingy molly? (*quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis avarus?*), the interrogative *quod*, the adversative conjunction *tamen*, the comparative adjective *ulterius*, the noun *monstrum*, and the inherently pejorative epithet *mollis avarus*, set off and thus emphasized by a bucolic dieresis, combine to signal Naevolus' indignation. The following line (39), although formally a quotation attributed by Naevolus to the patron, blurs the line between the patron's anger and the indignation of Naevolus through such devices as asyndeton; short, staccato phrases; parallel construction; and a bucolic dieresis that sets off and emphasizes the phrase "you got more" (*plura tulisti*). Naevolus' vituperative "He reckons his tab and pumps his butt" (*computat et cevet*, 40) suggests Naevolus' frustration that the patron continues to derive sexual pleasure even while he

⁵⁴ Hendry 1999 argues that Naevolus' characterization of himself as a two-legged ass at 9.90-92 refers both to his prodigious sexual endowment and to his reluctant endurance of near-intolerable burdens. For the Roman idealization of large male genital endowment, see Williams 2010: 94-9.

⁵⁵ The classic modern studies of Juvenal's indignant persona are Anderson 1964 and 1970. Wiesen 1989: 712-3 provide a valuable reading of Juvenal's "outrage, which is clearly a mock-outrage," in the first satire. Braund 1988: 130-4 is an exemplary analysis of Naevolus' indignation throughout his entire 63-line reply.

refuses to continue paying for it: the alliteration, as well as the rhetoric of avarice and a highly “active” sexual penetrability, underscores Naevolus’ indignation.

At 40-2, the commands (a mix of jussive subjunctives and an imperative) contribute to the indignant tone, as does a rising tricolon series imagining the calculation of Naevolus’ receipts, followed by a shorter colon contrasting Naevolus’ heroic “labors” (*labores*, 42) to his payment: since Naevolus’ labors are presumably weightier, in his own estimation at least, than his compensation to date, the contrast between the three rising cola and the single shorter colon constitutes a camp incongruity similar to what we saw at 9.2-8, where the number of syllables devoted to each image of deviance stood in inverse proportion to the egregiousness of its implied moral failure. Finally, as we saw above, Naevolus portrays sexual intercourse with the patron in scatological terms that emphasize the difficulty of “proper” (*legitimum*, 44) sexual performance, likening his role to that of a “slave” (*servus*, 45) and comparing penetration of his patron unfavorably with the work of plowing a field (45-6). The interrogative particle expecting a negative answer (*an*, 43) is yet another rhetorical marker of indignation.

CAMP SUBVERSION OF MORALITY

Sontag 1999: 64 famously called camp a “solvent of morality.” Naevolus is here making a series of moral claims, that is, claims about right and wrong behavior. He believes he has done honest “work” (*labores*, 42). He wields a “proper penis” (*penem...legitimum*, 43-4) and believes he should receive fair compensation (*operae pretium*, 28). But he has been treated unfairly: the effeminate, sexually

submissive male (*mollis*, 38) to whom he provides sexual services is “stingy” (*avarus*, 38), and Naevolus complains bitterly at this “rightful cause for complaint” (*iusta doloris...causa*, 90-1). Naevolus’s camp sensibility, however, subverts his moral seriousness, not only through his verbally excessive and shamelessly exhibitionistic references to the size of his penis and the indefatigability of his sexual prowess, but also through his hyperbolic references to his own misery and mistreatment.

We see verbal excess in the phrase “unfathomable length” (*mensura incognita*, 34) alongside the virtually synonymous “long” (*longi*, 34), each redundantly modifying *nervi* (34); in the phrase “with his lip foaming” (*spumanti...labello*, 35) to describe Virro; in the adverb “continuously” (*adsidue*, 36) to modify the verb “beseech” (*sollicitent*, 37); and in the adjectives “coaxing” (*blandae*, 36) and “frequent” (*densae*, 36) to describe the “letters” (*tabellae*, 36). We see hyperbole in Naevolus’ assertion that he receives absolutely “no” (*nullum*, 27) reward for his effort; that the “cloaks” (*lacernas*, 28) he receives are not only “greasy” (*pingues*, 28) but also “badly finished by the comb of the Gallic weaver, (*male percussas textoris pectine Galli*, 30); that the “silver plate” (*argentum*, 31) he receives is not only “thin” (*tenue*, 31) but also “from an inferior vein” (*venae...secundae*, 31). Hyperbolic also is the duplication of words for “fate” (*fata...fatum*, 31); the periphrasis of “those parts which the fold of the toga hides” (*partibus illis...quas sinus abscondit*, 32-3); and the insistence that his generous genital endowment will do him absolutely “no good” (*nil*, 34).

Thus, even though Naevolus’ anger is heartfelt, the moral credibility of his invective is undermined by his camp sensibility. That is, while Naevolus attacks his

former patron's effeminacy and sexual submissiveness, these are not the real source of his indignation. Naevolus labels the patron "effeminate" and "sexually submissive" (κίναυδος, 37; *mollis*, 38), calls him "stingy," (*avarus*, 38), and suggests that penetrating him anally is hard work (42-6) that renders Naevolus himself abject (*miser*, 45); but he makes no explicit gesture of moral condemnation: presumably, Naevolus couldn't care less about his patron's deviant sexual desires; in fact, they provide the basis of his own livelihood. Rather, he is angry because the patron abused the terms of their relationship. This is a complex instance of camp incongruity. First, Naevolus' expected moral indignation is at odds with his actual moral indifference. Moreover, his indignation is based on his own mercenary self-interest rather than on moral scruple. And finally, he dares to wax indignant when his own *parody* of patronage fails to provide the perks of *authentic* patronage. All of these incongruities exhibit camp irony and are played for camp humor.

As with my reading of 9.1-26, my emphasis on Naevolus' shameless self-revelations and fierce invective at 9.27-46 does not differ greatly from that of scholars who have characterized the poem as an attack on homosexuals and homosexuality. Again, though, what is different about my reading is my choice to read Naevolus as a camp figure who ultimately embraces not only his own stigmatized identity as an adulterer and a prostitute, but also that of his effeminate, sexually submissive patron, performing a gesture of solidarity with deviant actors and actions rather than with the dominant discourse. I will have more to say about Naevolus' embrace of his patron's stigmatized identity later, when we have examined the rest of Naevolus' reply.

Ganymede and Other Pretty Boys (9.46-69)

Having described his own current state of abjection, Naevolus next evokes an image of Ganymede, the cupbearer of Zeus whose example served to make cup-bearing a metaphor for sexual servility throughout the classical tradition.⁵⁶

sed tu sane tenerum et puerum te
et pulchrum et dignum cyatho caeloque putabas. (46-7)

But you surely used to consider yourself to be a boy soft and pretty and
worthy of the heavenly ladle.⁵⁷

There is considerable confusion among readers and editors as to the attribution of these lines within the dialogue and regarding both the referent of *tu* and the identity of the addressee: that is, who is speaking *to* whom *about* whom. In her 2004 Loeb edition, Braund assigns the lines to Juvenal addressing Naevolus; but in her 1988 study, she assigns the lines to Naevolus as an apostrophe to the patron.⁵⁸ Ferguson likewise assigns the lines to Naevolus, but acknowledges the indeterminacy as to who is addressing whom: is Naevolus addressing the husband, reminding him how he once thought of himself as a Ganymede;⁵⁹ is Naevolus addressing himself; or does Naevolus imagine the husband to be addressing him? Ferguson seeks a clue in the reference to Ganymede, but

⁵⁶ The scholiast adds support for *cyatho caeloque* as a synecdoche for Ganymede, glossing 9.46-7 as “You used to compare yourself to Ganymede” (*Ganymedi te comparabas*). For Ganymede as a pederastic figure, see Williams 2010: 59-66 *et passim*. For a discussion of *puer* at 9.41, 9.46 and 9.64, see Garrido-Hory 1997.

⁵⁷ I here treat *cyatho caeloque* as a hendiadys and translate one of the nouns as an adjective; but it could just as well (perhaps better) be rendered as “worthy of heaven and of the ladle” (which would still clearly denote the ladle wielded by Ganymede once he had been translated to Olympus).

⁵⁸ Cf. Braund 2004: 355 and 1988: 139-40.

⁵⁹ Cf. the following comparison of the husband to a matron (50-3) and ironic address to the patron as a “sparrow” (*passer*, 54).

finds that Zeus's mythic cupbearer adds to the confusion rather than clarifying it, because "Ganymede was the servant (Naevolus) but also the passive (Virro)."⁶⁰ On balance, Ferguson concludes that Naevolus is addressing himself, and I follow him in this reading, precisely because the incongruity that Ferguson notes is so irresistibly camp. That is, Naevolus was a Ganymede with respect to his pretty-boy good looks, but a Zeus with respect to his phalldominant masculinity: as so often in camp, looks can be deceiving and things are not what they seem.⁶¹ Nevertheless, while I read Naevolus as speaking to himself about himself in the lines cited above, the hint of confusion about the addressee may signal the extent of Naevolus' indignation: he is so distraught at this point that his words strain comprehension.

In any event, the heavenly ladle is the one used by Ganymede to serve wine to the gods after he has been translated to Olympus by an admiring Zeus.⁶² This may be more of a commonplace than an outright allusion to a specific earlier text, but it is certainly a mythological reference in elevated language (for example, the hendiadys and compression of *dignum cyatho caeloque*) with literary parallels.⁶³ But before considering

⁶⁰ Ferguson, like many scholarly readers, takes the *Virro* in 9.35 to be the proper name of the husband; I side with other readers (including Braund 1988: 242n32) who take *Virro* to be a typical name ("men like *Virro*"), a type of usage found elsewhere in Juvenal; for example, with this very same name, *Virro sibi et reliquis Virronibus* (5.149). Ferguson 1979: 250 *ad* 9.35 states, "The name is provincial from Juvenal's home district." There may be a play on the Latin noun *vir* ("man"), but there is no specific evidence for this and my reading does not depend on it.

⁶¹ See Williams 2010: 31-32 for the motif of men who have slave boys as their sexual partners, but in fact are penetrated by the boys rather than the other way around. Tantalizingly, one of Martial's epigrams on the theme of "things are not always what they seem when it comes to slave boys" (3.71) is addressed to a man named Naevolus.

⁶² Cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.230-235.

⁶³ For discussion of the theoretical and methodological distinctions between allusion or reference and commonplace, see Hinds 1998.

these parallels, one must note the intertextual connection with Juvenal's own fifth satire, where the speaker describes the disparity between patron and clients in terms of the desirability not only of the drinks served to each, but also of the servers:

non eadem vobis poni modo vina querebar?
 vos aliam potatis aquam. tibi pocula cursor
 Gaetulus dabit aut nigri manus ossea Mauri
 et cui per mediam nolis occurrere noctem,
 clivosae veheris dum per monumenta Latinae.
 flos Asiae ante ipsum, pretio maiore paratus
 quam fuit et Tulli census pugnacis et Anci
 et, ne te teneam, Romanorum omnia regum
 frivola. quod cum ita sit, tu Gaetulum Ganymedem
 respice, cum sities. nescit tot milibus emptus
 pauperibus miscere puer, sed forma, sed aetas
 digna supercilio. (51-62)

Did I complain just now that you were not served the same wine? You drink something different—water. A Gaetolian courier will give you your cups, or the bony hand of a dark Mauretanian whom you would not want to run into in the middle of the night when you drive through the tombs on the hilly Via Latina. The bloom of Asia attends The Man Himself, gotten for a sum greater than the wealth of warlike Tullus or Ancus or, not to belabor the point, all the trifles of the Roman kings. And since this is so, look to your Gaetolian Ganymede when you are thirsty. The boy bought for so many thousands knows not how to mix a drink for paupers, but his beauty, but his youth--worthy of his arrogance!

Note that the speaker of Juvenal 5 observes the masculine Roman proclivity toward youthful beauty (*forma...aetas*, 61) in sexual objectification (Craig Williams' third protocol) which Naevolus so flagrantly violates in his relationship with the freeborn adult male patron.⁶⁴

⁶⁴ Note that if 9.46-7 are Naevolus' words addressing the patron, precisely this violation of Protocol 3 is being underscored through the ironic evocation of Ganymede: "You thought of yourself as a beautiful, soft young thing, a Ganymede, but you weren't, or at least you aren't anymore!" Thus, 9.46-7 has more or less equal camp potential regardless of whom we assign the lines to or to whom they refer.

A kind of sexualized irony (or ironized sexuality) flows between Juvenal's fifth and ninth satires, energizing the camp sensibility at work in each. In Satire 5, the convivial setting leads the satiric imagination to characterize the slave boy (*puer*, 61) as a Ganymede whose youth and beauty justify (*digna*, 62) his arrogance. Thus, the erotic associations of Ganymede render the satiric passage sexual. In Satire 9, *puerum* (46) and *dignum* (47) pick up on the *puer* and *digna* of Satire 5, and the connection to Ganymede in the hendiadistic *cyatho caeloque* (47) comes not via any convivial setting, but via the overtly sexual context of the dialogue. So in Satire 5, a convivial setting leads to Ganymede and generates a sexual subtext, while in Satire 9, a sexual setting leads to Ganymede and generates a convivial subtext.

The circulation of this camp energy from conviviality to sexuality and back again, however, can only happen to the extent that conviviality is always already sexualized. Indeed, this motif of eastern decadence, with attendant associations of effeminacy, is pervasive in Roman literature, particularly as commerce between Rome and the provinces expands in the early Principate, and it often exploits the imagery of pretty boys and serving ladles. For example, at Horace, *Carm.* 1.29.5-10, the poet chides Iccius for choosing war and its spoils over philosophy and its riches, asking:

quae tibi virginum
sponso necato barbara serviet,
puer quis ex aula capillis
ad cyathum statuetur unctis

doctus sagittas tendere Sericas
arcu paterno?

What barbarian maiden will attend you as a slave, now that you have slain
her bridegroom; what slave boy from the palace with oiled hair will take

his position at your ladle, though he has been taught to stretch the Chinese arrows in his father's bow?

Notes the presence of the words *puer* (7) and *cyathum* (8).⁶⁵ Other intertextual referents for Juvenal 9.46-7 may be cited from the elegiac tradition. At Propertius 4.8.37, for example, the poet tells of a visit to the courtesans Phyllis and Teia, where he lay between the two on a couch, "Lygdamus [a slave] at the ladles" (*Lygdamus ad cyathos*), i.e., serving the wine.

Neither the Horace passage nor the Propertius passage refers explicitly to the cupbearer as sexual partner, and Lygdamus, who also appears as a slave in two other Propertian contexts (3.6.42 and at 4.7.96), does not seem to be an object of erotic attention. The erotic overtones of the Horace passage, however, are quite palpable. The hypothetical maiden's bridegroom has been slain, leaving her defenseless and enslaved, and the young male slave will be forced to put aside his warrior heritage so as to minister to the pleasures of Iccius: the dignified omission of explicit reference to sexual service does not suggest that such service is not completely expected; in fact, if anything, the omission heightens the suggestion. Indeed, to the extent that Horace's subtlety allows for a double reading (one sexual, the other nonsexual), thereby setting up the inside-reader/

⁶⁵ Hor. *Carm.* 1.38, though it does not refer to heaven or ladles, does refer to a boy (*puer*) in terms that combine the convivial and the sexual.

outside-reader dynamic previously noted as an aspect of camp, I would argue that the passage cited is an example of a camp sensibility at play in Horace's ode.⁶⁶

Finally, there is the very interesting passage in Suetonius's life of Julius Caesar (*Jul.* 49.2), which is neither mythological nor elevated but is nevertheless relevant to our Juvenal 9 passage for its reference to cupbearers:

sed C. Memmius etiam ad cyathum †et ui † Nicomedi stetisse obicit, cum reliquis exoletis, pleno convivio, accubantibus nonnullis urbicis negotiatoribus, quorum refert nomina.

But Gaius Memmius claims that he [Julius Caesar] stood as Nicomedes' cup-bearer with the rest of his adult male prostitutes, during a crowded dinner party at which quite a few of the guests were businessmen from the city [of Rome], whose names Memmius gives.

Note the presence of the word *cyathum* and the inclusion of Julius Caesar among a group of *exoleti*, adult male prostitutes who, according to the available evidence, may have played either the insertive or receptive role in penetrative acts.⁶⁷ Thus, we have here three intertexts: one lyric, one elegiac, and one from historical biography. None refer to heaven (Juvenal's *caelo*) but all three refer to cupbearers. Horace and Propertius refer specifically to slaves. Horace uses the word *puer*, which often refers to a young male slave (although it may refer to a male slave of any age, and in fact connotes the slave's perpetual lack of the agency associated with male adulthood in Roman masculine

⁶⁶ The brief focus on the boy's "oiled hair" (*capillis...unctis*, 3-4) may contribute to sexualizing him, and the image of "stretching arrows" (*sagittas / tendere*, 5-6) may likewise be a subtle sexual reference. Note that the sense of *tendere* here is to draw or string a bow; *sagittam* may be described as an internal accusative or a type of hypallage, since it is really the bow (*arcu*, 10) that is being drawn or strung. A similar usage occurs at Verg. *Aen.* 11.858-9, "The Thracian [nymph, Opis,] drew a swift arrow from her gilded quiver and, enraged, stretched it in her bow" (*aurata volucrem Threissa sagittam / deprompsit pharetra cornuque infensa tetendit*).

⁶⁷ For *exoleti* and their sexual ambidexterity, see Williams 2010: 90-3.

ideology).⁶⁸ His Greek name helps characterize Lygdamus as a slave, an association reinforced by his presence in two other Propertian elegies as a slave of Cynthia's, at 3.6.42 and at 4.7.96 (where Cynthia refers to him, from beyond the grave, as *verna*, a slave born in the household, a word used by Juvenal of Naevolus at 9.10). Julius Caesar is of course not a slave at all; Memmius, however (as reported by Suetonius), renders him slavish by identifying him not merely as one of Nicomedes' numerous adult male prostitutes (*cum reliquis exoletis*), but as his cupbearer (*ad cyathum...stetisse*).⁶⁹

Juvenal 9.46-7 may not necessarily allude deliberately or directly to all or even any of the specific texts cited above. Nevertheless, these intertexts provide evidence for an elaborate trope linking the mythological figure of Ganymede to conviviality and sexuality, and in fact ultimately employing Ganymede as a figure for the virtually inevitable (and yet often somewhat scandalous) connection in the Roman imagination between conviviality and sexuality through the medium, as it were, of puerility, with puerility having dual connotations of youth and slavery. Again, I reiterate that the hint of scandal has nothing to do with homosexuality, but rather with various other contingent circumstances, such as eastern luxury in Horace, the always somewhat effeminate *militia amoris* in Propertius, or the slavish sexual service of a freeborn Roman youth in Suetonius.

When Naevolus at 9.46-7 refers to his own erstwhile youth and beauty in terms of Ganymede and cup-bearing, he invokes with camp incongruity, theatricality, and humor

⁶⁸ For the servility of *pueri* and the puerility of *servi*, see Williams 2010: 20-40.

⁶⁹ Quite crucial to a reading of this passage is its setting at the court of Nicomedes, with whom Caesar was widely and publicly said to have had an affair in which he, Caesar, played the receptive role. See Williams 2010: 182 *et passim*.

this complex trope of conviviality, sexuality, slavish puerility, and eastern decadence.⁷⁰ Moreover, the opportunity to enjoy the implications of sexual impropriety, while never departing from the most decorous of language, is part of the camp pleasure of the text, as is the opportunity to enjoy the instantaneous association of all these literary antecedents without having to make any specific or explicit connections among them--this is what it means for camp to revel in “aestheticism,” as some camp theorists have argued, not so much in the specific sense of the nineteenth-century literary movement, but in the more general sense of pleasure in literary texture, the bright sheen of the intertextual surface even apart from narrative context or thematic implications: camp rhetorical fireworks. This is also part of camp theatricality, in the extended sense of “theater” as not only dramatic performance onstage, but also the highly rhetorical and even declamatory use of language, which is both an ongoing reference to the declamatory culture of Roman masculinity, and an instance of the kind of offstage theatricality attested as a central aspect of camp by Mark Booth.⁷¹

In this section of the poem (46-69), Naevolus continues to parody the role of the elegiac poet-lover complaining about rejection at the hands of a *puella*. Naevolus refers to the patron’s desire as a “disease” (*morbo*, 49), a term often used to characterize an

⁷⁰ As noted above, even reading 9.46-7 as Naevolus referring to the patron in these terms still arguably admits of a camp reading. The referent of those lines is not entirely certain and I am not insisting on one way of reading as the only way.

⁷¹ Booth 1983: 18 states, “Camp self-parody presents the self as being wilfully irresponsible and immature, the artificial nature of the self-presentation making it a kind of off-stage theatricality, the shameless insincerity of which may be provocative, but also forestalls criticism by its ambivalence.” Booth 1983: 23 adds, “Off-stage theatricality, though not synonymous with camp, is certainly a common manifestation of it.” For the declamatory culture of Roman masculinity, see Gunderson 2003.

effeminate man's desire to be penetrated.⁷² Naevolus *cum* elegiac lover lists the gifts he lavished on his *mollis* (50-3).⁷³ Naevolus addresses the patron as "sparrow" (*passer*, 54), a term of endearment that extends the elegiac parody to other amorous genres,⁷⁴ and asks rhetorically to what end the patron hordes his massive wealth (54-62).⁷⁵ Most remarkably, Naevolus reports giving his patron gifts (*munera*, 53) for the Matronalia, (*femineis...Kalendis*, 53), a festival celebrated on the first of March in honor of Juno as the patron goddess of women, childbirth, motherhood, and marriage. Traditionally, Roman husbands gave gifts to their wives on this holiday, and Roman wives sang the praises of their husbands.⁷⁶ Thus, Naevolus with characteristic camp incongruity assimilates himself to the role of husband and his patron to the role of wife. Beyond its camp irony and humor, this disclosure reinscribes the two men's sexual performance as a kinship performance. Most intriguing is Naevolus' assertion that the Matronalia gifts are "secret" or "hidden" (*secreta*, 53), continuing the trope of secrecy that began when Juvenal noted Naevolus' discreet silence about his sexual encounters with husbands (*secreta*, 23 [which could refer also to adulterous liaisons with women]; *quodque taces*, 26). Is it only his matronly and therefore effeminate role play that the patron wants to

⁷² For the language of disease with reference to desire for sexual submission, see Williams 2010: 199-200 *et passim*.

⁷³ The second-person pronoun here (*tu*, 50) is unambiguously Naevolus addressing himself. This lends support to reading the the second-person pronoun at 46-7 as Naevolus addressing himself, too.

⁷⁴ Cf. Cat. 2 and 3. Mart. 1.7.3, 4.14.14, and 11.6.16 refer specifically to the Catullus poems.

⁷⁵ Ferguson 1979: 250 *ad loc.* comments, "The sparrow was sacred to Venus, and had the reputation of being oversexed (Plin, *NH* 10, 107)."

⁷⁶ Cf. Smith 2000: 142 and Boëls-Janssen 1993: 309-19.

conceal, or is it also the transformation of a deviant sex and gender performance into a counter-normative kinship relation?

In the context of these references to a sex, gender, and kinship deviance, Naevolus begins to refer to himself in terms that suggest the more normatively homosocial institution of patronage. He calls himself a “lowly hanger-on” (*humili adseculae*, 48, a “follower” (*cultori*, 49), and finally a “client” (*clientis*, 59; cf. *cliens*, 72). These occurrences have led previous scholars to read the ninth satire as one of a series of Juvenalian attacks on the degeneration of the patron-client relationship, analyzing Naevolus in the context of Umbricius in Satire 3 and Trebius in Satire 5.⁷⁷ To my knowledge, the closest any scholar has come to reading the references to *clientela* in the ninth satire ironically is Reekmans 1971, who as we saw in Chapter Three views Satire 9 as a “travesty” of the theme of the abusive patron and the abused client that he argues was treated in earnest in the earlier satires.⁷⁸ Thus, for Reekmans, while the characterization of Naevolus as a *cliens* is parodic, it represents a diminution of Juvenal’s satiric powers, rather than a deliberately ironic parody played for humorous effect. I contend that *cliens* is not only the most ironic word in the entire text, but is an integral part of Naevolus’

⁷⁷ The most extensive, and masterful, example of this type of analysis is Bellandi 1974.

⁷⁸ Braund 1988: 130-77, the last major analysis of Juvenal 9 published in the twentieth century, appears to take Naevolus’ *status* as a client as factual. Cf Braund 1988: 135, “Naevolus has been found sexually desirable by a rich patron (or more than one) who has sought sexual relations with him.” She does, however, read Naevolus’ complaint as “a parody of the usual complaint of the neglected client.” (1988: 139) Nevertheless, Braund does not read Naevolus’ complaint as a *camp* parody, embracing stigmatized identity and expressing solidarity with the deviant; rather, as we saw in Chapter One, she reads it as a parody that ridicules Naevolus and undermines the reader’s sympathy for him (cf. Braund 1988: 139-42 and 150-7).

camp parody of dominant ideologies of Roman masculinity. On this reading, Naevolus' parodic word play comments ultimately not on the degradation of the traditional patron-client relationship, but on the failure of Roman structures of subjectivity to provide any authentic way to perform queer sex, gender, and kinship, and suggests how that failure compels such performances to assume the guise of a perverted form of patronage. As we saw in Chapter Three, Reekmans 1971 identifies a number of narrative parallels between Satire 9 and Satires 1 and 5. A close verbal parallel that he does not note occurs in Satire 1, after Juvenal describes a typical day in the life of a Roman client:

vestibulis abeunt veteres lassique clientes
votaque deponunt. (132-3)

The tired old clients leave the anterooms and give up on their prayers.

Note the reminiscence of *lassique clientes* (1.133) in the *exhausti...clientis* of 9.59, as well as the echo of *veteres...clientes* (1.133) in *deditus...devotusque cliens* at 9.71-2.

Bellandi 1974, and others arguing in a similar vein, assume that Naevolus really believes he is a client in the conventional sense, albeit one who performs unconventional duties for his patron;⁷⁹ but the conceit of *clientela* is Naevolus' own parodic metaphor to describe his role in a quite real but decidedly counter-normative household—a household with queer structures of sex, gender, and kinship for which there is no conventional nomenclature or unironic descriptive language.

⁷⁹ To the extent that Bellandi 1974: 289 characterizes Naevolus as representing “total [moral] capitulation, accompanied by the rewarding disappearance of all moral sensibility” (*il cedimento [morale] totale, accompagnato dalla gratificante scomparsa di ogni senso morale*), his amounts to yet another camp manqué reading of Juvenal 9 (for my concept of camp manqué, see Chapter Three).

Interwoven with his parody of *clientela* in this second major section of his lengthy reply (46-69), Naevolus maintains his already established parody of elegy. While Naevolus parallels the elegiac poet-lover in his failure to achieve his objective (for the elegist, seduction of the beloved; for Naevolus, adequate material compensation), he parallels the *puella* in his mercenary motives (as we saw above, *pretium* is generically associated with the elegiac *puella*). His reason for *demanding* compensation from his *mollis*, however, parallels the elegist's excuse for *refusing* compensation to his *puella*: namely, his own poverty (63-9). In another incongruous role reversal, it is not Naevolus (correlative with the elegist) who complains about unreasonable demands for compensation, but rather the *mollis* (correlative with the *puella*), who tells Naevolus, "You are impertinent when you beg" (*improbis es cum poscis*, 63). In another incongruous juxtaposition, the role of the elegiac procuress (*lena*), who advises the *puella* to pursue a mercenary path, is assumed by Naevolus' slave boy (*puer*, 64), soon to be supplemented by another, both of whom must be fed and clothed (66-7).

In summary, Naevolus' parody of elegiac conventions includes the following series of incongruous juxtapositions: jilted male prostitute assimilated to the role of spurned elegiac lover-poet; miserly patron assimilated to the role of greedy girlfriend; rival sexual servant assimilated to the role of generous rival lover; needy slave assimilated to the role of mercenary procuress; and finally, the appropriation by Naevolus of the language of the spurned elegiac lover's lament in his own vicious invective against his effeminate, sexually submissive patron.

A Queer Household Indeed (9.70-90)

In the third and final section of Naevolus' extended tirade against his erstwhile patron (70-90), Naevolus, apostrophizing the patron, complains that he is not adequately compensated for satisfying the wife when the husband failed to do so, nor for fathering two children with the wife, whom the husband recognizes as his own. Again Naevolus refers to himself as a "client" (*cliens*, 72; cf. *clientis*, 59), ironically assimilating the relationship between Naevolus and the husband to that of traditional patronage. The elegiac parody continues alongside the parody of patronage, with roles now not merely reversed, but crazily scrambled, as the formerly elaborated erotic dyad (Naevolus/*mollis* analogized to elegist/*puella*) is expanded to include the patron's virginal wife (*uxor...virgo*, 73). The wife is presumably not satisfied with her effeminate husband, who apparently does not desire her sexually and clearly prefers sexual submission to other men.⁸⁰ The husband, according to Naevolus' testimony, has asked him to minister to his wife's sexual needs. For performing this service, the ersatz client deserves a reward (*pretio*, 71), which is also what the elegiac *puella* seeks in exchange for the sexual gratification of her lovers (as we saw, for example, at Tibullus 2.4.39, cited above). Here, however, the wife is assimilated to the role of elusive elegiac beloved when Naevolus refers to her as a "girl often in flight" (*fugientem saepe puellam*, 74). At the same time, she is assimilated to the role of the ravished maidens of mythology, as

⁸⁰ Cf. 9.74-8 for evidence of the wife's attitude; of course, this is Naevolus' account, not the wife's, so it must be understood to reflect Naevolus' own perspective. An interesting parallel is Martial 7.58, where the speaker refers to a woman who seems destined to marry *cinaedi* and never to find a "real man" as a sexual partner.

Naevolus uses the language of rape to describe his seduction as “snatching” her in his “embrace” (*amplexu rapui*, 75).⁸¹

Also encompassed by Naevolus’ elegiac parody is the theme of the excluded lover. Tibullus 2.4.39 provides an example: “you shut out your lovers” (*excludis amantes*).⁸² We see this trope kaleidoscopically transformed at 77-8, where Naevolus recalls the husband crying outside the bedroom door (*plorante foris*) while he has sex with the wife inside.⁸³ The bed (*lectulus*, 77) bears witness (*testis*, 77) to Naevolus’ performance of this marital service, recalling the talking bed (*cubile*) of Catullus 6 that discloses the sexual hijinks of Flavius to the speaker:

nam te non viduas iacere noctes
nequiquam tacitum cubile clamat... (6-7)

For the scarcely silent bed shouts that you lie through nights not bereft...

The patron is tormented by the sound of the bed and by the voice of his wife, who is here identified as *dominae* (78): not the learned but greedy girl whom the elegist tries to seduce, but the powerful mistress who enslaves him through love.⁸⁴ This reference to female dominion recalls Naevolus’ earlier assertion that “the slave who plows a field will

⁸¹ The list of parallels is long, including many of the stories told by Ovid in the *Metamorphoses*: Persephone, Europa, Daphne, Philomela, etc. Cf. Richlin 1992c. See Brownmiller 1993: 283-208 for an influential discussion of the “heroic rapist.”

⁸² For the classic study of the theme, see Copley 1956.

⁸³ Hendry 1999 argues that 9.70-78 should be seen as a parody of the *exclusus amator* figure in which the patron wishes that he, rather than his wife, were having sex with Naevolus. While I do not think this inference is necessary (the patron could just as well be crying because his marriage is on the verge of dissolution [see below]), it is both defensible and amusing, and certainly adds another layer of camp incongruity to the passage. Hendry 1999: 85-8 is a valuable consideration not only of the *exclusus amator* figure but also of the broader elegiac parody in the ninth satire.

⁸⁴ For the motif of the elegiac *domina*, see James 2003: 8 *et passim*, including additional bibliography.

be less wretched than the slave who plows his master” (*servus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum / quam dominum*, 45-6): Naevolus’ camp *servitium amoris* has placed him in the service of both master and mistress, an ironic and humorous twist on a conventional elegiac theme. Naevolus, however, claims that this is no unusual occurrence:

instabile ac dirimi coeptum et iam paene solutum
coniugium in multis domibus servavit adulter. (79-80)

In many households an adulterer has saved a marriage that was shaky and falling apart and already almost dissolved.

Along with the phrase “sexually submissive male friend” (*pathicus amicus*, 130) discussed below, this provides the clearest evidence for my contention that the ninth satire gestures toward the tension between parody and authenticity in a queer kinship structure, as Naevolus uses the only terminology available, that of adultery, to describe what is clearly a consensual arrangement among a group of adults constituting a counter-normative household.

By “household,” I am not referring exclusively to the notion of a husband, wife, and children living under one roof (although that is certainly one type of household). The English word “household” is generally used to render the Latin *familia*, itself a complex term that may refer alternately or simultaneously to real or human property, kinship relations, or ancestry.⁸⁵ Moreover, when I use the term “kinship” in this study, it comprises what other scholars might refer to as “non-kin relations,” such as freedmen,

⁸⁵ For the concepts of “family” and “household,” including points of continuity and discontinuity between the two and between antiquity and modernity), see Saller 1984 and 1994, Bradley 1995 and 2000, Wallace-Hadrill 1995, and Gardner 1998.

clients, and legal dependents, whom other sources would agree are members of the Roman household. Nor am I claiming that the picture presented in Juvenal 9 is one of husband, wife, and Naevolus living under one roof on an ongoing basis. Naevolus does, however, clearly represent himself as having spent time in the house and indeed in the master bedroom, even spending the entire night (*tota...nocte*, 76) having sex with the wife in her own bed (*lectulus*, 77). Moreover, with his close juxtaposition of the phrase “in many a house” (*in multis domibus*, 80) and “adulterer” (*adulter*, 80), Naevolus virtually redefines the adulterer as a member of the household, and adultery as a component of marriage and the family. Again, we must be cautious about using a poetic fiction as historical evidence, but we may certainly use it as evidence of a discourse: even if only as part of an ironic counter-discourse of deviance, this poem suggests that queer structures of kinship are thinkable within the Roman social imaginary.⁸⁶

Naevolus at length reveals that his service to the marriage has been not only as surrogate spouse to both husband and wife, but also as a paternal surrogate. He does so, moreover, in the context of reminding the patron of his meritorious service, and assailing him for his perfidy and ingratitude:

nullum ergo meritum est, ingrate ac perfide, nullum
quod tibi filiulus vel filia nascitur ex me? (82-3)

Is it therefore worth nothing, you deceitful ingrate, nothing that a little son
or a daughter is born to you from me?

⁸⁶ For the variety of sex, gender, and kinship structures and arrangements represented in Roman texts, see Williams 2010: 224-230, particularly the male/male/female triangles and polygons cited in Williams 2010: 403n254 (*Ov. Am.* 1.8.68, *Ars* 3.437-8; *Tibull.* 1.8 and 1.9), poetic scenarios that “illustrate a striking fluidity in sexual combinations.”

When Naevolus reminds the patron of his “service” (*meritum*, 82) and addresses the patron as a “deceitful ingrate” (*ingrate ac perfide*, 82), he evokes the violation of trust (*fides*) central not only to patronage (*clientela*) and to friendship (*amicitia*), but also to erotic relationships.⁸⁷ Thus, Naevolus’ elegiac parody accrues another level of complexity, as he rhetorically assimilates himself to the spurned lovers and abandoned heroines of myth, epic, and elegy.⁸⁸

In amorous poetry, the themes of perfidy and ingratitude may occur separately or together. We encounter the theme of perfidy in Catullus 64, where Ariadne apostrophizes Theseus:

sicine me patriis avectam, perfide, ab aris,
perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu? (132-3)

Is this the way, you deceitful man, after carrying me off from my father’s altars, you leave me on a deserted shore, deceitful Theseus?

Dido similarly apostrophizes Aeneas at *Aeneid* 4.305-6:

dissimulare etiam sperasti, perfide, tantum
posse nefas tacitusque mea decedere terra?

Deceitful man, did you really expect to be able to hide so great a crime and slink off in silence from my land?⁸⁹

⁸⁷ For an example in the context of *amicitia*, cf. Cat. 30.3, addressed to Alfenus, “do you not now hesitate to betray me, to deceive me, you faithless man?” (*iam me prodere, iam non dubitas fallere, perfide?*). Interestingly, this verse and Ariadne’s address to Theseus, discussed below, are the only occurrences of *perfide* in Catullus: one context homosocial, the other heterosexually amorous.

⁸⁸ Cf. Schmitz 2000: 225, 228.

⁸⁹ There may also be an echo of Dido’s sneer at Aeneas’ tacit departure (*tacitusque...decedere*) in Juvenal’s reference to Naevolus’ discreet silence about his sexual encounters with married men (*quodque taces*, 26), a motif of silence that recurs throughout the poem, as we shall see below. Dido apostrophizes Aeneas as *perfide* again at 4.366.

Note Dido's indignation at the thought that Aeneas might try to disavow (*dissimulare*) his betrayal. Naevolus echoes this sentiment with regard to the patron:

verum, ut dissimules, ut mittas cetera, quanto
metiris pretio quod, ni tibi deditus essem
devotusque cliens, uxor tua virgo maneret? (70-2)

But, though you pretend, though you pass over the rest, at what price do you value the fact that, had I not been your dedicated and faithful client, your wife would still be a virgin?⁹⁰

At Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 597, Phyllis apostrophizes "deceitful Demophoön" (*perfide Demophoon*), words that occur again in the Appendix Virgiliana's *Culex* (133).⁹¹

In elegy, the themes of ingratitude and perfidy are directly linked with the pleasure in remembering meritorious deeds, as in the opening lines of Catullus 76:

Siqua recordanti benefacta priora voluptas
est homini, cum se cogitat esse pium,
nec sanctam violasse fidem, nec foedere nullo
divum ad fallendos numine abusum homines,
multa parata manent in longa aetate, Catulle,
ex hoc ingrato gaudia amore tibi. (1-6)

⁹⁰ As if to confirm the intertext, Naevolus' reference to dissimulation comes right after a Virgilian parody in which Naevolus wonders rhetorically whether he should advise his naked, shivering slave boys to "hang in there and wait for the cicadas" (*durate atque expectate cicadas*, 69), a parody of Aeneas' enjoinder that his disheartened followers "Bear up and save yourselves for better times" (*durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis*, *Aen.* 1.207). An added intertextual treat: Aeneas' exhortation concludes a brief rehearsal of the hardships the Trojans have endured, including their encounter with the Cyclopes (*vos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque sonantis / accestis scopulos, vos et Cyclopea saxa / experti*, 200-2); Naevolus' mock admonition comes just after he characterizes his slave boy as "one-and-only as Polyphemus' wide eye by which clever Ulysses escaped" (*unicus ut Polyphemi / lata acies per quam sollers evasit Ulixes*, 64-5). This is surely a Homeric reference, but it alludes to an episode in the *Odyssey*, namely the encounter with the Cyclopes, to which Aeneas' catalogue of hardships points as well.

⁹¹ Cf. Ross 1975: 251, an essay that recognized the importance of Latin literary parody long before intertextuality became of widespread interest among classicists.

If a man derives any pleasure from remembering former good deeds, when he thinks that he is dutiful, and that he has not violated a sacred trust, and that he has not by any treaty abused the power of the gods in order to deceive men, many joys await you, Catullus, stored up in a long lifetime on the basis of this thankless love.

Note that Catullus has been “dutiful” (*pium*, 2); similarly, Naevolus has been “dedicated and devoted” (*deditus...devotusque*, 71-2). Catullus has not violated any “trust,” (*fidem*, 3), but he has endured a “thankless love” (*ingrato...amore*, 6). Bessone 1995 hears an echo of Catullus 76.1-6 in Ovid, *Heroides* 12.23-4, an epistle in the voice of Medea addressed to Jason:

est aliqua ingrato meritum exprobrare voluptas.
hac fruar, haec de te gaudia sola feram.

It is some pleasure to remind an ungrateful man of one’s meritorious deed.
This I shall enjoy; these are the only joys I shall carry from you.

Bessone’s analysis of the relationship between the Catullus and Ovid passages provides an insight that we can apply to Juvenal 9:

While the situations are analogous, Ovid's Medea assumes an attitude diametrically opposed to that of Catullus: not the aspiration, though sceptical, to be satisfied with the consciousness of good deeds, but rather the desire for an outburst, which casts one’s services in the face of the ingrate.⁹²

Naevolus, of course, performs precisely this gesture of reproachful outburst. Bessone’s observations about the vocabulary of meritorious service in Catullus and Ovid also sheds

⁹² Bessone 1995: 576. As Bessone notes, Seneca employs this same vocabulary of meritorious service and ingratitude in his *Medea*: “I shall suffer less than I deserve, ungrateful one” (*minora meritis patiar, ingratum caput*, 465). Fulkerson 2005 reads Ovid’s heroines themselves as an intertextually astute community of readers who use allusion as part of a rhetorical self-fashioning. It would be interesting to consider whether this poetic strategy amounts to a kind of camp theatricality on the part of Ovid.

new light on Juvenal 9: “Not without significance, Catullus’ *benefacta* is replaced by *meritum*, which, referred to Medea, suggests at the same time ‘fault’: in her case, merits paradoxically coincide with crimes.”⁹³ We could likewise say that “merits paradoxically coincide with crimes” in the case of Naevolus, since his procreative services engender a child whose publicly recognized paternity is fraudulent. Of course, unlike Medea, Naevolus has not harmed anyone; he has simply participated in an end-run around normative Roman standards of marriage and procreation, a deviant performance of kinship that he heartily embraces, as we see in his self-characterization as a “dedicated and devoted client” (*deditus...devotusque cliens*, 71-2).⁹⁴ Moreover, although Naevolus does not refer to pleasure, all of the rhetorical qualities we have noted--hyperbole, excess, exaggeration, carnivalesque grotesquerie--betray a camp sensibility that suggests a perverse pleasure in this invective performance.

As many previous scholars have noted, however, paternal surrogacy is a most unconventional kind of service within the normative structure of patronage. Thus Reekmans 1971 calls the ninth satire a “travesty” and others call it an attack on the degradation of the patron-client relationship. My contention, by contrast, is that *there is no actual patron-client relationship in this poem, only a deliberate, self-conscious parody of the institution of patronage*. Naevolus’s *clientela* is a camp parody based, like all other camp parodies, on incongruous juxtapositions, in this case between the appearance of patronage and the reality of a queer kinship dynamic that has elements of what the

⁹³ Bessone 1995: 577.

⁹⁴ Indeed, Naevolus would urge the patron to accept additional service, reminding him that he will receive the full legal benefits of paternity under the *lex Papia Poppaea* only if Naevolus produces a third child for him (cf. 89-90).

dominant structure of normativity can recognize only as adultery, prostitution, or fraudulent paternity.

In contrast to previous analyses focusing on the patron's sexual avidity and material avarice, I read him as embodying a counter-normative model of queer sex, gender, and kinship, as he finds a way to perform the kinship roles of husband and father in the context of his effeminate gender identity and his submissive sexual subjectivity.⁹⁵ Although he is not their biological father, the patron picks the newborn children up from the ground as a sign of formal recognition of his paternity (*tollis*, 84), and publicly proclaims his paternity in the record books (*libris actorum*, 84) as evidence of his manhood (*argumenta viri*, 85). He thus performs paternity (*iam pater es*, 86), which is simultaneously a performance of matrimony, since Roman law only recognized the legitimacy of children born of a father and mother in a legitimate marriage, and Roman fathers only acknowledged paternity of children born to their own wives.⁹⁶ This publicly acknowledged and advertised paternity, in principle at least, grants the patron immunity from the infamy that might ensue from any public perception of his effeminacy or sexual submissiveness.⁹⁷ In addition, the patron now enjoys the legal rights associated with paternity (*iura parentis*, 87) under the Augustan marriage laws, including the right to inherit an entire legacy (*legatum omne*, 88) and to claim an escheat (*caducum*, 88), that

⁹⁵ Cf. Cecchin 1982, which relies heavily on Bellandi 1974 but emphasizes the perspective of the patron rather than of Naevolus. Juvenal's intention, Cecchin claims, is to treat a homosexual relationship in purely economic terms. He sees the wealthy patron as a character comically divided between sex and greed, and Naevolus as so caught up in his utilitarian view of the world that he is incapable of recognizing the true nature of his relationship.

⁹⁶ Cf. Treggiari 1993: 8 *et passim*.

⁹⁷ Cf. Naevolus' assertion at 9.86, "I furnished you with a claim against ill repute" (*dedimus quod famae opponere possis*).

is, property that reverts to the state when there are no legal heirs. Apparently, however, these rights of inheritance are less important to the patron than his public reputation for manhood, since he has spurned Naevolus after the latter produced only two children for him, when full rights under the *lex Papia Poppaea* were extended only to fathers of three children (cf. 89-90).

Sympathy for the Donkey? (9.90-2)

Naevolus has spent 64 lines describing the general difficulties associated with his sexual *clientela* (27-46), his own mistreatment at the hands of his sexual patron (46-69), and his heroic efforts to save the patron's marriage and father his children (70-90). This leads to a brief exchange about the justice of Naevolus' complaint and the fickleness of the patron:

JUVENAL

iusta doloris,
Naevole, causa tui; contra tamen ille quid adfert?

NAEVOLUS

neglegit atque alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum. (90-2)

JUVENAL

You've got a just cause for complaint, Naevolus. What does he offer in his defense?

NAEVOLUS

He ignores me and seeks himself another two-legged donkey.

Most previous scholars have read Naevolus' complaint as an expression of indignation that is incongruous in the context of his own adultery and prostitution, and Juvenal's reply as an ironic expression of scorn. Anderson 1962: 155 writes:⁹⁸

⁹⁸ Note that Anderson takes Virro to be the name of the patron.

Naevolus attacks Virro and his type with the rhetoric of indignation--such devices as rhetorical questions, angry exclamations, savage apostrophes, and epithets. The word *monstrum*, which the satirist has not used since Satire 6, occurs now in Naevolus' mouth (cf. 38). The satirist specifically comments on these angry remarks with words which the reader quickly perceives as ironic.

Braund 1988: 151 takes a similar position on both Naevolus' complaint and Juvenal's response, elaborating on the perceived irony:

He responds with sympathy...false, ironic sympathy which conveys mockery. It is the word *iusta* which is ironic here: invert it and the speaker is saying that Naevolus' complaint is unjustified, that he deserves the treatment he has received, the same message, in short, as presented 'straight', without irony, in Satire 5, e.g. 170-3.

The passage Braund refers to from the fifth satire, its concluding lines, is as follows (the speaker is the satirist, the addressee is Trebius):

ille sapit, qui te sic utitur. omnia ferre
si potes, et debes. pulsandum vertice raso
praebebis quandoque caput nec dura timebis
flagra pati, his epulis et tali dignus amico. (170-3)

The man who treats you this way knows what he's doing. If you can put up with it all, then well you should. Any time now you'll be offering your head to be shaved and pummeled, nor will you be afraid to submit to harsh floggings, since you are worthy of such banquets and such a friend.⁹⁹

⁹⁹ Green 1967 translates *sapit* (170) as "has taste" and Braund 2004a renders it "has good taste." I find these translations surprising in context, and note that the OLD s.v. *sapio* lists Juv. 5.170 as an example of sense 6, "to be intelligent, show good sense," rather than of sense 5, "to have taste or discernment." Similarly, they both translate *debes* (171) as "deserve," which is not a sense listed in the OLD at all, and which, I would argue, misses the nuance of *obligation* included in many senses of the verb. Per Ferguson 1979: 184 *ad loc.* and others, the shaved head (*vertice raso*, 171) is the traditional sign of the buffoon who entertained at banquets.

I would hardly agree that 5.170-3 constitutes a message delivered “straight,” i.e., without irony.¹⁰⁰ Virtually every phrase of this passage, if not every word, can be read ironically. There are, however, different sorts of irony. Braund 1988 specifically appeals to the notion of irony that Theophrastus describes as characteristic of the “ironical man” (εἰρων).¹⁰¹ It is an oversimplification, though, to suggest that Theophrastan irony amounts to meaning the opposite of what one says (cf. “invert it” in the passage from Braund 1988: 151 quoted above). Theophrastan irony is less a matter of inversion of meaning than it is of insincerity with base intent: professing friendship to enemies, flattering those whom one in truth despises, etc.

To be sure, the primary definition of “irony” provided by the OED reflects a combination of Theophrastan irony with the notion of irony as inversion of meaning: “A figure of speech in which the intended meaning is the opposite of that expressed by the words used; usually taking the form of sarcasm or ridicule in which laudatory expressions are used to imply condemnation or contempt.”¹⁰² Camp irony, as we have seen, is based on incongruous situations or juxtapositions, not on inversion of meaning or damning with false praise. The camp notion of irony is reflected in the secondary definition provided by the OED: “A condition of affairs or events of a character opposite to what was, or might

¹⁰⁰ If in fact it constitutes a “message” at all. Certainly the Juvenalian speaker is expressing his opinion on a matter; but calling his opinion a message suggests a message intended for the reader, a kind of “moral” of the satire, and in general I resist moralistic readings of Juvenalian satire, for all the reasons discussed throughout this study.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Braund 1988: 143, 252n104 *et passim*.

¹⁰² OED Second Edition 1989, s.v. irony, sense 1.

naturally be, expected; a contradictory outcome of events as if in mockery of the promise and fitness of things. (In F. *ironie du sort.*)”¹⁰³

Some clarificatory examples:

(1) “My, but isn’t that a *lovely dress!*” when in fact you mean it is an absolutely hideous dress. This may sound like precisely the sort of thing a bitchy camp drag queen would say, but in taxonomical terms, this is an example of Theophrastan irony, not camp irony: the intended meaning is the opposite of that expressed by the words used, and the statement uses formal praise sarcastically to imply condemnation.

(2) “Come on, girls, put your dresses on and let’s go dancing!” when in fact the speaker and his addressees are all men who wear pants. This is an example of camp irony, based on the incongruity of males referring to themselves as females and referring to men’s pants as women’s dresses. The use of feminine references in a masculine context is the opposite of what might naturally be expected, making a mockery of the promise that gender identity will align with anatomical sex.

Camp irony, I would argue, is the type of irony with which the satirist speaks at Juvenal 5.170-3. The very notion of an abusive patron is incongruous, albeit represented in Juvenal’s satires as socially prevalent: the very basis of patronage (as of friendship, to which it is often assimilated rhetorically) is beneficial conduct toward friends. Generally speaking, friendship (*amicitia*; cf. Juv. 5.14) is praiseworthy, and abuse of friends is blameworthy; in Satire 5, however, Juvenal praises someone (*ille sapit*, 170) for abusing a friend (*te sic utitur*, 170). The idea that a client is obliged (*debes*, 171) to endure

¹⁰³ OED Second Edition 1989 s.v. irony, sense 2.

whatever he can (*potes*, 171) is likewise incongruous: it defies the normative expectation that friends ought to treat each other well, that a patron ought to respect a client, that no free Roman ought rightfully be required to submit to indignities. The final incongruity comes when Juvenal imagines the possibility of buffoonish (*pulsandum vertice raso*, 171) and slavish (*flagra pati*, 173) behavior in a man whom he nevertheless characterizes as “worthy” (*dignus*, 173). To be sure, we may say that someone is worthy of (or deserves) suffering or abuse or a bad reputation, but that is an inherently ironic usage: what it means is that the person *lacks* the kind of value normatively associated with *dignus* and its derivatives.

Contrary to Braund’s suggestion, we need not read Juvenal’s words at 5.170-3 as an assertion that Trebius’ complaint is unjustified or that he deserves the treatment he receives.¹⁰⁴ The emphasis in the Latin, I would argue, is rather on (1) the obligations of a client and (2) the extent to which a free Roman man’s worth is determined by the type of friends he has and how he is treated by them. Like Naevolus, Trebius is in the unenviable position of being the client (*clientem*, 5.16; *clienti*, 5.64) of an abusive patron. The biggest problem with Braund’s assertion about the “message” of Satire 5 is that Trebius does not complain at all; in fact, Trebius does not *speak* at all: the poem is a monologue, not a dialogue. Juvenal (the poetic persona, not the historical poet) describes *what Juvenal himself imagines* are the indignities suffered by Trebius, if in fact Trebius is a specific person at all, and not rather a generalizing moniker for the typical abused client. Trebius indeed is a strange sort of addressee, if he is an addressee at all. Although the

¹⁰⁴ Cf. the translation at Braund 2004a: 229, “If there is nothing you can’t put up with, then you deserve it all” (*omnia ferre / si potes, et debes*, 5.170-1).

pronoun “you” (*te*) appears in the first line of the poem and throughout, Trebius’ name does not occur until line 19, and never in the vocative case. Even in the final line, the adjective that stands in apposition to the second-person subject of the verb *praebebis* is *dignus*: in the nominative case, not the vocative.

Why have I discussed 5.170-3 at such length? Braund, a very influential reader of Juvenal’s ninth satire (indeed, of Juvenal’s satires generally), implies in her comments on Juvenal 9.90-2 that Trebius in Satire 5 complains about abuse at the hands of a patron; that the Juvenalian speaker denies the justice of Trebius’ complaint; and that the satirist’s opinion is that Trebius gets what he deserves. She argues explicitly that when the Juvenalian interlocutor in Satire 9 expresses sympathy with Naevolus’ complaint (that is, the entire passage from 9.27-90), his sympathy is ironic in the sense of meaning the opposite of what it literally says and having malicious intent: According to Braund, Naevolus’ complaint is unjust and he only gets what he deserves, just like Trebius in Satire 5. As I have shown, however, Trebius in Satire 5 does not complain at all; on the contrary, the Juvenalian speaker himself complains about the abuse of clients, with the experience of Trebius as his example. Moreover, the satirist does not seem to believe that abused clients get what they deserve, but rather that all clients are obliged to suffer whatever they are able to endure, and that if a client endures the kind of abuse that is the rightful due only of a buffoon or a slave, then his own worth becomes no more than that of a buffoon or a slave.

Considered in this context, why should one think that Juvenal the interlocutor at 9.90-1 means anything other than precisely what he says: that Naevolus, a client whose

meritorious deeds have been requited with abuse, has a just cause for complaint? Are Juvenal's words here ironic? On my reading, they are indeed ironic, but in the camp sense: the normative expectation would be for Juvenal to express outrage and indignation at everything Naevolus has just described about his relationship with his patron and the patron's wife and the fraudulent fathering of their children; but he does nothing of the sort, and in fact expresses sympathy. This is a camp incongruity indeed, but it is not a Theophrastan irony: on this reading, Juvenal's intended meaning is *not* the opposite of that expressed by the words used, *nor* does he employ laudatory expressions sarcastically to imply condemnation or contempt.

Juvenal's language does, however, gesture parodically toward a forensic and declamatory discourse that has been in evidence throughout the poem. Juvenal responds to Naevolus' complaint as if in response to a legal argument, using the words *iusta*, *causa*, *contra*, and *adfert*.¹⁰⁵ Earlier, Naevolus was affecting to plead one side of a *controversia*, an imaginary forensic debate, as signaled not only by the testimonial content of his speech, but also by specific words and phrases. For example, when Naevolus refers to the misfortunate alignment of his stars, he uses the word *cessant* (33), a frequentative of *cedo*, which may simply be a more emphatic way to say "walk," but

¹⁰⁵ I am not suggesting that *iusta doloris causa* is a legal term of art; only that it has unmistakable legal connotations. For example, at Julian *dig.* 40.9.7.1, *iustam causam* refers to a rightful cause for manumission, clearly a legal usage. At Cic. *Att.* 11.15.1, *iustas causas* refers to good reasons why Cicero cannot visit Atticus, clearly not a legal usage. On the other hand, Cicero could be using legalistic language in a non-legal context for rhetorical effect or simply because he has extensive legal experience. Cf. OLD s.v. *contra*, sense 6, for its usage in trials, arguments, or similar contexts. For example, *disputabant contra disertis homines* (Cic. *de. Orat.* 1.85). Cf. OLD s.v. *affero*, sense 13, to adduce (a circumstance) as reason or defense. For example, *ea...quae contra rationes defensionis afferuntur* (Cic. *Part.* 103).

also has the forensic connotation of failing to appear to give testimony;¹⁰⁶ thus, *si tibi sidera cessant* (33) might well be translated, “if the stars fail to testify on your behalf.” Legalistic language appears again when Naevolus uses the word *legitimum* (44) to describe the regulatory precision of the coital services he renders to his sexual patron.¹⁰⁷

At 9.92, however, Naevolus’ reply to Juvenal’s solicitous comment is decidedly neither forensic nor declamatory, but remarkably coarse, resigned, and even unguarded. Earlier I commented that this passage serves to assimilate Naevolus’ actual or hypothetical sexual rival to the elegiac role of rival lover within the context of Naevolus’ extended elegiac parody.¹⁰⁸ In addition, it serves to dehumanize the relationship between Naevolus and the patron, in two respects: first, the patron ignores him (*neglegit*, 92), hardly an exemplary response from a friend or patron; second, Naevolus describes both himself and his potential rivals in bestial terms (*bipedem...asellum*, 92). Ferguson 1979: 251 *ad loc.* comments, “he is frank about his own bestialisation.” True enough, but it is important to note that Naevolus is here representing the patron’s response to his complaints, and so presumably his (Naevolus’) own perception of how the patron

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Oxford Latin Dictionary s.v. *cesso*, sense 3b.

¹⁰⁷ The primary meaning of the adjective *legitimus* is “of or pertaining to the law,” but it can also mean “legally recognized, valid, permitted, etc.” It can refer to children born in lawful wedlock. An extended sense is “properly so called, genuine, real.” For example, *legitimum...flumen* (Ov. *Am.* 3.6.89); *legitimi gladiatores* (Petr. 117.5); *legitimam insaniam* (Plin. *Nat.* 21.178). Naevolus’ *penem / legitimum* (43-4) falls into this last category, and is consistent with his characterization of his genital endowment as “the unfathomable extent of your long member” (*longi mensura incognita nervi*, 34). Cf. OLD s.v. *legitimus*. Of course, a further irony resides in the fact that Naevolus’ penis is used to produce children that are passed off as legitimate (something the reader does not learn until later in the poem).

¹⁰⁸ Hendry 1999 argues that Naevolus’ characterization of himself as a two-legged ass at 9.90-92 refers both to his prodigious sexual endowment and to his reluctant endurance of near-intolerable burdens.

understands Naevolus and all the other sexually dominant, socially servile men whom he seeks out to penetrate him. Naevolus does not necessarily think of *himself* as a two-legged donkey; but he thinks that other men think of him that way. Nevertheless, as Althusser says, we are hailed into our subjectivity:¹⁰⁹ the text positions Naevolus as conscious that other men regard him as less than fully human. Thus, his subjectivity (a fictional construct, of course) is that of a despised object, an abject other, no less a stigmatized identity than that of his effeminate, sexually submissive patron.

Juvenal's Epistemology of the Closet (9.92-119)

After their brief exchange about the justice of Naevolus' complaint and the fickleness of the patron (90-2), Naevolus begs Juvenal to treat the information he has just shared with the utmost discretion. Naevolus suggests that Juvenal is the only person to whom he has divulged this sensitive information (*haec soli commissa tibi*, 93). Naevolus' use of *tacitus* (94) recalls Juvenal's own *quodque taces* at 9.26. For all its apparently sober and dire sentiment, however, this passage never really abandons its camp register. The sententious "A deadly thing is an enemy made smooth by pumice," (*res mortifera est inimicus pumice levis*, 95) is in the same declamatory mode as Naevolus' earlier assertions, such as "What is a greater portent than a stingy molly?" (*quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis avarus?*, 9.32) or "A slave who plows the field will be less wretched than a slave who plows his master (*servus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum / quam dominum*, 9.45-6). As we saw in Chapter Two, the use

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Althusser 2001: 117, "As a first formulation I shall say: all ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects, by the functioning of the category of the subject."

of declamatory language in Juvenalian satire functions similarly to the use of pop cultural references in pop art as an incongruous juxtaposition of high and low. In particular, the elevated diction and syntax of the *sententia* contrasts ironically and humorously with the deflationary suggestion of gender deviance in the phrase *inimicus pumice levis*, which refers to the practice of depilation among effeminate men.

Literary allusions, particularly epic or tragic ones, may contribute to the camp theatricality of the interlocutors' discourse. Naevolus' assertion that the exposed deviant "burns and hates" (*ardet et odit*, 96) arguably recalls Horace's "I hate and I keep at bay" (*odi...et arceo*, *Carm.* 3.1.1) or Catullus' "I hate and I love" (*odi et amo*, 85.1). There are other possible intertexts for this phrase as well, but the closest echo is of Seneca's identical formulation at *Medea* 582, which occurs at the beginning of an ode in which the chorus, describing the heroine's mental state, evokes the fury of a woman scorned:¹¹⁰

Nulla vis flammae tumidive venti
tanta, nec teli metuenda torti,
quanta cum coniunx viduata taedis
ardet et odit;

No power of flame nor of swollen wind nor of hurtling spear is to be feared so greatly as when a wife bereft of her wedding torches burns and hates.

Not only does the tragic reference to the *Medea* contribute to the camp theatricality of the text; the description of the effeminate, sexually submissive patron in terms used by the Senecan chorus to describe the tragic heroine constitutes an incongruous camp

¹¹⁰ For discussion of and debate over the possible intertexts, see Watts 1972 and Bishop 1976.

juxtaposition of male/female or masculine/feminine. (It must be noted that Seneca's tragedy may itself be read as a camp text, although arguing for such a reading is beyond the scope of the current study.) In a more oblique but no less noteworthy touch, Naevolus asserts that his patron would not hesitate to take up the sword in order to punish Naevolus for telling his secret (*sumere ferrum*, 97); the metonymy recalls the iron weapon (σίδηρος) displaced from Naevolus' Homeric parody at 9.37. The dramatic declamatory conclusion, "Therefore conceal my secrets like the council of Mars at Athens" (*ergo occulta teges ut curia Martis Athenis*, 101), with its plea to treat the arguably petty secrets of Naevolus with the reverence accorded the secret deliberations of the jurors at the court of the Areopagus, provides a final camp incongruity.¹¹¹

Juvenal, however, replies that the secrets of wealthy men are at the mercy of talkative slaves. Previous scholars have noted the incongruous juxtaposition of bucolic and satiric contexts in Juvenal's "Oh, Corydon, Corydon, do you think a wealthy man has any secret?" (*o Corydon, Corydon, secretum divitis ullum / esse putas?*, 102-3), a parody of Virgil, *Eclogues* 2. 69, "Oh, Corydon, Corydon, what madness has seized you?" (*a, Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit*), referring to Corydon's ill-fated love for Alexis. Like Lelièvre 1958, discussed above, virtually all argue that Juvenal's parody signals the contrast between the sordid degradation of Naevolus and Virgil's idealized conception of homosexual love. There is indeed something to this argument, but it is

¹¹¹ For the second person singular of the Latin future indicative as an imperative, see Sturgis 1916, which catalogues and categorizes all extant examples. According to Sturgis 1916: 49, *teges* at 9.101 is an example of a case in which the idea of a reason supporting the command is indicated by the presence of a conjunction or adverb, in this case *ut*.

flawed by earlier scholars' appeal to contrasting authorial conceptions of homosexuality, as if it were something that Virgil idealized and Juvenal condemned. As we saw in our earlier discussion of protocols of masculine sexual comportment in Rome, the issue is not one of a thumbs-up-or-down referendum on sexual relations between men. Rather, the contrast here is one between a bucolic setting and a satiric setting. In the bucolic setting, servile shepherds engage in *normative* performances of sex, gender, and kinship based on criteria including the age and status of the respective male partners.¹¹² In the satiric setting, Naevolus and the husband engage in *deviant* performances of sex, gender, and kinship, with the freeborn Roman husband confirming his effeminacy through his sexual submission, and Naevolus confirming his servility through his prostitution.

Juvenal goes on to describe why wealthy men have no secrets (103-17). Even if slaves claim to be discreet, they are not (103-4).¹¹³ No matter how hard a man tries to seal information leaks (104-6), his comings, goings, and doings will not only be broadcast almost immediately (107-8), but will also be enhanced by the fabrications of the household staff (108-10); for scandalous gossip is the slaves' chief means of revenge against abusive masters (110-2). Moreover, gossip mongers will insist on spreading rumors even to people who have no interest in listening (112-3). Therefore, Juvenal concludes, Naevolus should be seeking silence from the patron's household slaves rather

¹¹² See Mayer 1983 and Van Sickle 1987 for the debate over whether Corydon is a slave, like his beloved Alexis, or is rather free.

¹¹³ I take this to be the meaning of "Even if slaves are silent, pack animals will talk, and the dog, and the door posts, and the marble statues" (*servi ut taceant, iumenta loquentur / et canis et postes et marmora*, 103-4). The touch of personification is amusing, but ultimately, as this is not a fable, the speaker must be referring to human speech (as in the expression "A little bird told me").

than from him (114-5). Not that Juvenal thinks such a request would be to any avail, since they enjoy nothing better than betraying a secret (115-7). Juvenal sums up his speech with a *sententia* that nineteenth-century editors liked to cite as the satire's earnest moral message:¹¹⁴

vivendum recte, cum propter plurima, †tunc est†
idcirco ut possis linguam contemnere servi. (118-9)¹¹⁵

One must live correctly for many reasons, but especially so that you may scorn the tongues of slaves.

In effect, Juvenal's sententious remark is a variation on Cicero's famous maxim in the *de Amicitia* 98, "Not so many people want to be endowed with virtue itself as want to seem so" (*Virtute enim ipsa non tam multi praediti esse quam videri volunt*). It is less a sincere instance of moral didacticism or an earnest proposal for ethical reform than it is another camp incongruity, this time the incongruous juxtaposition of weak/strong: slaves who by virtue of their status should be relatively powerless, prove by virtue of their access to sensitive information to be remarkably powerful and even potentially dangerous to masters who earn their spite.¹¹⁶

While this entire section of the poem (9.93-123) is thus witty and ironic in a characteristically camp manner, exploiting incongruity and theatricality for humorous

¹¹⁴ Stocker 1839: 227 notes in his introductory comments, "This piece has many beautiful and many moral passages, exclusive of the grand and important lesson which it is our duty to gather from it; that a life of sin is a life of slavery."

¹¹⁵ My text is that of Clausen 1959, who obelizes *tunc est* (118) and deletes 119-23. See the Appendix for Ferguson's comment on 119-23.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Mart. 2.82, in which Ponticus cuts out his slave's tongue in order to keep him from telling secrets. In Mart. 11.70, 12.66, and 13.69, the poet uses forms of the word *dominus* to refer to slave boys who are the sexual partners of their masters. Cf. Williams 2010: 170-6, 258-62.

effect, its trope of silence and secrecy (*celare*, 93; *tacitus*, 94; *secretum*, 96; *occulta*, 101; *taceant*, 102 and 115; *arcanum*, 116) points to an important aspect of the sex, gender, and kinship deviance that it describes: namely, the pressure exerted by the dominant discourse and dominant social structures to conceal deviant forms of existence. Appealing to Althusser's distinction between ideological and repressive state apparatuses, we may note that this pressure to conceal deviance may assume either ideological or repressive forms.¹¹⁷

By *ideological*, I mean forms of pressure exerted by social and cultural rather than by legal or judicial institutions; that is, pressure exerted by moral and ethical beliefs broadly disseminated via the family, the educational system, popular philosophy, popular forms of worship, and similar institutions.¹¹⁸ The penalties imposed on deviance by these ideological forms of regulation may be relatively soft but nevertheless meaningful, such as communal disapprobation and damage to one's reputation.¹¹⁹

By *repressive*, I mean forms of pressure exerted by legal and judicial authorities. As Williams 2010: 214 notes, "the praetorian edict specified classes of people who were excluded from appearing before a magistrate to make an application on behalf of someone else (*postulare pro aliis*).” Among other groups, this list included men who had “submitted to womanly things with their body” (*qui corpore suo muliebria passus est*), the familiar formula for male sexual submission. Moreover, the *lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis* provided serious penalties for adultery, and the *lex Scantinia*, while shrouded

¹¹⁷ Cf. Althusser 2001: 85-126.

¹¹⁸ For popular morality as a means of social regulation, see Morgan 2007. For a comparable study of Greek popular morality, see Dover 1994.

¹¹⁹ For *stuprum* and reputation, see Williams 2010: 188-22.

in historical obscurity, arguably penalized forms of *stuprum* other than adultery whether committed with females or males.¹²⁰ Could the husband of our poem not only be subject to legal sanction for submitting to womanly things with his own body, but also compelled to prosecute his own wife for adultery or even prostitution, since the children produced by her coitus with Naevolus provide both her and her husband with material advantages?¹²¹ Indeed, could his own paternity of the children be challenged and ultimately invalidated, thus depriving him of the tangible benefits of fatherhood? Here I speculate somewhat, but only so as to suggest the basis for the husband's intense desire to maintain such strict secrecy around his deviant performances of sex, gender, and kinship.

We may thus say that Juvenal's ninth satire discursively constructs a world in which the dominant structure of normativity subjects deviant performances of sex, gender, and kinship to a range of penalties from the social and cultural to the legal and juridical imposed by both ideological and repressive state apparatuses. Let us not lose sight of the fact, however, that the poem constructs this world via a camp discourse which demands that this dominant regulation of deviance never be taken too seriously. As Newton 1979: 109 reminds us, "Camp humor is a system of laughing at one's incongruous position instead of crying." Thus, brooding too morosely over the potential disabilities one faces due to one's deviance would not be in keeping with a camp

¹²⁰ For this interpretation the *lex Scantinia*, see Williams 2010: 130-6. For bibliography on the *lex Julia*, see Williams 2010: 362n94.

¹²¹ For the crime of *lenocinium*, profiting from a wife's adultery, marrying a woman guilty of adultery, or failing to divorce a wife who has committed adultery, see McGinn 2003: 171-94. For the legal sanction associated with homosexual submission, as well as the practical difficulties associated with lodging or proving such an accusation, see Williams 2010: 214-16.

sensibility. I would argue, however, that the recurring trope of secrecy suggests an ancient Roman counterpart to what Sedgwick 1990 refers to as the epistemology of the closet. The closet in Sedgwick's formulation is subjective, not objective; that is, the epistemology of the closet is not one's knowledge of socially and culturally enforced secrecy about sex, gender, and kinship deviance, but rather that very enforced secrecy as a mode of both knowledge and denial: how the closet knows (or ignores), not how one knows the closet. In other words, the closet is a metaphor not only for secrecy, but for the socially enforced denial of forbidden knowledge, and for the fear that one's disavowal will be undermined by revelation or exposure. Indeed, Juvenal's speech at 102-19 includes many words that suggest forms of knowledge and avowal that threaten the secrecy of the closet: (*loquentur*, 104; *sciet*, 108; *audiet*, 108; *finxerunt*, 109; *crimen componere*, 110).

Note that knowledge and avowal as used here are not necessarily matters of justified true belief (the Platonic conception of knowledge), but rather refer to knowledge as a kind of socially constructed discourse. Thus, in the words and phrases cited, we see a gradual progression from communication of presumably factual knowledge via speaking and hearing (*loquentur*, *sciet*, *audiet*), to a notion of artful composition that allows for the possibility of fancy but does not quite insist on it (*finxerunt*), to a notion of outright fabrication of charges (*crimen componere*) which bears no resemblance at all to the Platonic conception of knowledge. This relatively abstract terminology culminates in the very concrete images of the ear drunk with gossip (*inebriet aurem*, 113) and the tongue of the slave (*linguam...servi*, 119).

To be sure, the specific metaphor of the closet is not evident in the corresponding Roman trope of secrecy; nevertheless, the frequent recurrence throughout this poem of words connoting secrecy and disclosure (cited above) suggests a similar epistemological structure. Moreover, many of the fruitless measures Juvenal lists for ensuring secrecy have to do with covering or sealing openings, reminiscent of the closet door and its potential chinks:

claude fenestras,
vela tegant rimas, iunge ostia, tollite lumen,
e medio fac eant omnes, prope nemo recumbat. (104-6)

Shut the windows, let sheets cover up the cracks, bolt the doors, blow out
the candles, see to it that everyone clears out, let no one recline nearby.

It should also be noted that the closet as a metaphor for latent or concealed homosexuality in widespread usage dates only to the 1960s, and always implies the possibility of “coming out” of the closet and publicly embracing and declaring one’s homosexuality.¹²² The trope of secrecy in Juvenal 9 is different in that (1) it does not refer to homosexuality but rather to sex, gender, and kinship deviance as defined in this study; and (2) there is no real option of coming out as a sex, gender, or kinship deviant, since there is no community to join, no advocacy movement to support, no liberatory discourse to embrace, etc.¹²³ On the other hand, what this study suggests is that there is in the world of Juvenal’s ninth satire *camp*, a performative mode that seems to have predated formal communities, advocacy movements, and liberatory discourses as a way for deviant

¹²² For examples of usage see the OED Second Edition 1989, s.v. closet, *n.*, sense 3c and d as well as sense 11b.

¹²³ In this connection, see Williams 2010: 239-45 on the question of a homosexual subculture in ancient Rome.

formations of sex, gender, and kinship to assert their own existence and encode their own deviant relationship to dominant structures of normativity.

Advice and Other Camp Declamations (9.124-9)

Beginning the final exchange of the poem, Naevolus observes quite aptly that Juvenal has been spouting truisms: “Sound advice you just gave me, but trite” (*utile consilium modo, sed commune, dedisti*, 124). Naevolus uses the word *commune*, “common” or “trite,” but also suggestive of the phrase *locus communis*, “commonplace,” a Latin translation of the Greek phrase κοινὸς τόπος, referring to standard topics of rhetorical invention or to one of the προγυμνάσματα, a set of rudimentary exercises used to prepare students of rhetoric for the composition and performance of more complex orations.¹²⁴ Indeed, the ninth satire may be read as a deliberate pastiche of standard rhetorical exercises. As we saw above, Naevolus’s extended complaint at 9.27-90 takes the form of a *controversia*. In declamatory training, the practice of *controversia* is complemented by the practice of *suasoria*, imagined advice to a specific historical or mythical character faced with a decision regarding a course of action or an ethical dilemma.¹²⁵ Thus, when Naevolus chides Juvenal for his trite counsel and requests further

¹²⁴ The OLD includes Juv. 9.124 as an example of *communis* in sense 6c, “made or expressed in general terms, of general application, general.” Sense 7, however, is “common, ordinary.” I would argue that common, ordinary advice expressed in terms of general applicability could well be called “trite.” For *locus communis*, cf. OLD s.v. *communis*, sense 4b, “a subject or topic that can be used equally well in different speeches (whether by accuser or defendant), a ‘commonplace.’” For the discussions of κοινὸς τόπος and the other προγυμνάσματα found in the rhetorical treatises by Theon, Hermogenes, Aphthonius, and Nicolaus, see Kennedy 2003. For an introduction to the history and practice of declamation at Rome, see Sussman 1978.

¹²⁵ See Kennedy 2003 and Sussman 1978.

advice, he uses the language of declamation: “How do you advise me now?” (*nunc mihi quid suades*, 125). Note in particular his use of the verb *suadere*, “to advise,” from which the noun *suasoria* is derived.

Naevolus expands upon his own question with a remarkable verbal display more lyrical than declamatory:

nunc mihi quid suades post damnum temporis et spes
deceptas? festinat enim decurrere velox
flosculus angustae miseraeque brevissima vitae
portio; dum bibimus, dum sarta, unguenta, puellas
poscimus, obrepit non intellecta senectus. (125-9)

How do you advise me now, after the loss of my time and the dashing of my hopes? For the swift little flower and the briefest portion of a narrow and wretched life hastens to depart; while we drink, while we demand garlands, perfumes, girls, old age creeps up unawares.

Here we see Naevolus elaborate upon a commonplace of his own, the *carpe diem* theme, named for the phrase at Horace, *Odes* 1.11.8, but prevalent in Roman poetry and in Archaic Greek lyric and epic.¹²⁶ Previous scholars have cited this passage as an incongruous use of elevated language that serves ironically to mark Naevolus as degraded. As Courtney 1980: 426-7 comments on 9.125-9,

This thought is expressed in terms of elevated and affected pathos with delicate imagery, all of which would be appropriate to an irreproachable

¹²⁶ The earliest example may be Homer, *Il.* 6.146-8:

οἴη περ φύλλων γενεὴ τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.
φύλλα τὰ μὲν τ' ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δὲ θ' ὕλη
τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ' ἐπαγίγνεται ὥρη.

Like the generation of leaves, so is that of men. The wind pours leaves on the ground, but the live branch sprouts leaves again when the spring returns.

Other oft-cited examples from Latin poetry include Verg. *G.* 3.284-5; Verg. *Aen.* 10.467-468; Ov. *Ars.* 57ff.

and sympathetic character; the fact that Naevolus, like Acanthis in Propertius [4.5.59-62] sees nothing incongruous in such language issuing from his mouth shows how insensitive he is to his moral degradation.

On a camp reading, by contrast, Naevolus is fully aware of the incongruous juxtaposition. Indeed, as Courtney suggests, the incongruity lies in the juxtaposition of an idealized lyric discourse of sensuous pleasure and Naevolus' own mundane need to earn a living through prostitution. Camp, however, encodes such dominant/deviant incongruities in solidarity with the deviant rather than with the dominant. Thus, on this reading, the incongruity conveys camp irony and humor, but it lacks the implicit moral judgment of a critique such as Courtney's.

The Consolation of Camp (9.130-4a)

Juvenal's very last words in the poem (130-4a) offer the counsel that Naevolus has sought, and while it may not satisfy him, it is certainly far from commonplace: Naevolus should not worry because Rome will continue to attract an endless supply of sexually submissive male friends to whose sexual needs Naevolus may minister and from whom he may receive compensation. Note the echo in "sexually submissive friend" (*pathicus...amicus*, 130) of Naevolus' sententious "an enemy made smooth by pumice" (*inimicus pumice levis*, 95). In this camp dialogue between two camp personalities, male sexual submissiveness is perfectly consistent with friendship; on the other hand, the pressure to conceal effeminacy, a stigmatized form of existence, promotes hostility, since the stigmatized deviant needs to be vigilant against harm to his reputation, which may have serious material as well as social consequences.

Previous readings have viewed these lines (130-4a) as part of Juvenal's ironic mockery of both Naevolus and his sexual patron, assuming that both characters embody forms of deviance that the satirist is morally bound to condemn. In particular, Juvenal's "Don't worry" (*ne trepida*, 130) has been read as an ironic assertion that is not a true consolation, but rather a corrosive snipe, a kind of scornful bookend to Juvenal's "Yours is a just cause for complaint, Naevolus" (*iusta doloris, / Naevoles, causa tui*).¹²⁷ Richlin 1992a: 202 cites this passage as evidence for her contention that "The satirist in effect rapes Rome with Naevolus as his agent—an agent at whom he jovially sneers." The sneer, it would seem, originates in the notion that the terms *pathicus* (sexually submissive male) and *amicus* (male friend) are mutually exclusive from the perspective of respectable Roman masculinity, since the sexually submissive male is an abject figure of derision and contempt unworthy of being a friend.¹²⁸

On a camp reading, by contrast, this is not a sneer but an incongruous juxtaposition expressed in highly stylized language for humorous effect. It is a joke, moreover, shared by Juvenal and Naevolus, not made by Juvenal at Naevolus' expense. Finally, it is a joke in solidarity with the the stigmatized identity of the marginalized, deviant other rather than with the stigmatizing, dominant structure of normativity. It suggests, however ironically, the possibility of a queer kinship model in which a masculine-gendered, sexually dominant male (*vir*) and an effeminate, sexually

¹²⁷ See Braund 1988: 154-5 for an example of this kind of reading (discussed in Chapter One).

¹²⁸ Roman ideals of friendship (*amicitia*) are very much based on parity and reciprocity between two men, whereas the term *pathicus* invokes phallogentric differentiations (dominant/submissive, penetrated/penetrating, etc.). See Craig Williams' monograph *Reading Roman Friendship* (forthcoming, Cambridge University Press).

submissive male (*pathicus*) might be friends (*amici*) or, with the slightest of nods to grammatical gender specificity, “boyfriends.”¹²⁹

Richlin’s leap from eager sexual submission to rape would seem to be based on the main contention of her study of sexual humor in Roman literature, which is that such humor always establishes an aggressive relationship between a penetrating male figure, who represents the normative masculine subject position of the dominant discourse, and a penetrated other who represents the marginalized, stigmatized, sexually objectified periphery of Roman existence. I greatly admire Richlin’s study and believe it provides an invaluable account of the rhetorical structure of ridicule based on sex and gender deviance in Roman sources. In a sense, my own study would not be possible without the foundation she has provided; for my contention is that Juvenal’s ninth satire is in fact a *parody* of precisely the kind of earnest ridicule of deviance and difference that Richlin has so deftly elucidated.

If anything, the phrase “while these hills stand safe” (*stantibus et salvis his collibus*, 131) positions Rome not as a rape victim, but as a sanctuary for sex, gender and kinship deviance: all (*omnes*, 132) effeminate, sexually submissive men will come from everywhere, by every means (*undique...carpentibus et navibus*, 131), in search of sexual service from masculine-gendered men like Naevolus, and prepared to offer adequate compensation. Moreover, Juvenal encourages Naevolus to keep munching on aphrodisiac

¹²⁹ For a comparative study of narratives featuring close male friendships in Babylonian, Old Testament, and Greek literary traditions, see Halperin 1990: 75-87. See Craig Williams’ forthcoming monograph, *Reading Roman Friendship*, the second chapter of which, “Love and Friendship,” discusses various kinds of overlap between *amor* and *amicitia*, sexual partners and friends.

salads (*tu tantum erucis inprime dentem*, 134a). Again, previous scholars have read this advice as scornful mockery; I read it as a camp incongruity, an insouciance about homosexual patronage that contrasts ironically with an expected normative indignation.¹³⁰

If we choose to read the ninth satire as earnest ridicule, then Rome may indeed be a rape victim. If, however, we choose to read the poem, as I have done, as a camp parody of the dominant discourse, as deviance catching dominance in the very act of ridicule and laughing at its moral pretense, then Rome becomes not a rape victim, but indeed a *pathicus amicus*, a sexually submissive friend, with all of the gender-bending, sexually subversive, kinship-transgressive deviance that that phrase implies.

Patriarchy Goes Down (9.135-50)

As I noted in the introduction to this chapter, the overriding irony of the ninth satire is that patriarchy, the type of social organization to which the dominant discourse of Roman normativity refers, works out just fine for the poem's effeminate, sexually submissive patron, despite the fact that he completely fails in his performance of male sex, masculine gender, and marital/paternal kinship and should by all rights be patriarchy's ultimate loser. By contrast, patriarchy works out disastrously for Naevolus, despite the fact that he is completely masculine in his gender performance, dominant in his sexual performance, and marital/paternal in his kinship performance (fraudulent

¹³⁰ Line 134a, appearing in only two manuscripts, reads "You will be a hot commodity; just chew your arugula" (*gratus eris, tu tantum erucis inprime dentem*). Characterizing Naevolus as *gratus* forms an intriguing contrast with his own apostrophe to the patron as *ingrate* (82).

though these latter performances may be, since he is a covert and fertile *adulter* rather than an avowed husband and father). This series of incongruous juxtapositions between the resounding success of the deviant patron and the abysmal failure of the dominant Naevolus forms the background for Naevolus' final words of complaint at 9.135-50.

Naevolus maintains that Juvenal's cheerful prescription for homosexual *clientela* at 9.130-4a does him no good in the face of his own unfavorable fortune (135).

Abandoning cunning euphemisms to denote his prostitution, like *hoc genus vitae* (27) or *operae pretium* (28), Naevolus here comes right out and says it: "My belly is fed by my crotch" (*pascitur inguine venter*, 136).¹³¹ Apostrophizing his household gods, he wonders when he will encounter a benefactor who will preserve him from an impoverished old age (137-40). He lists a set of requirements for a secure and comfortable retirements (140-6), which he seems to think are modest, since he suggests that their possession would barely raise his existence to the level of poverty (147).¹³² Indeed, he maintains that even his humble wish is without hope of fulfillment, because Fortune is against him (148-50). I read Naevolus' words here less as a display of exaggerated self-pity than as a camp

¹³¹ A comparable comment is made by the title character of Pomponius' Atellan farce "The Prostitute" (*Prostibulum*), about a male prostitute who penetrates his male clients (fr. 148 Frassinetti [=152 Ribbeck]): "I care little about gossip, so long as I can fill my gut" (*ego rumorem parvi facio, dum sit rumen qui impleam*). For discussion of the play, see Williams 2010: 12, 30-1, 42, 90-1. See Chapter Three for a discussion of Mart. 9.63, in which Phoebus receives dinners, or perhaps more, in exchange for penetrating *cinaedi*.

¹³² Of course, his requirements may be extravagant and he may be minimizing them for rhetorical effect; scholars are divided on the issue. The distinction does not make much of a difference for my reading, since I view the entire dialogue as a camp rhetorical display and not a social realist document: that is, I am not reading the poem as evidence for any kind of material reality, only as an example of discourse. If it turned out that Naevolus wanted a lot out of life and not a little, that would not affect my analysis.

incongruity based on the juxtaposition of aspiration and poverty: Naevolus, now existing below the level of poverty (or so he claims), aspires to rise to the level of pauper, when we usually associate poverty not with aspiration, but rather with dread, and not with mobility upward, but rather downward.¹³³

Naevolus' reference to a "pitiful wish" (*votum miserabile*, 147) recalls his earlier reference to a "wretched slave" (*servus...miser*, 45), and his final remark about Fortune echoes his earlier references to fate (*fata*, 31; *fatum*, 32) and the astrological stars (*sidera*, 33):

nam cum pro me Fortuna vocatur,
adfixit ceras illa de nave petitas
quae Siculos cantus effugit remige surdo. (148-50)

for when Fortune is summoned on my behalf, she has stuffed her ears with wax sought from that famous ship that fled the songs of Sicily with a deaf rower.

Just as Naevolus described the stars as failing to align for him in his first speech, here he describes Fortune as turning a deaf ear, borrowing imagery from the episode of the Sirens in Book 4 of the *Odyssey*, as his earlier reference to a single slave in terms of Polyphemus' one eye (64) borrowed imagery from Book 9.

¹³³ Cf. Mart. 11.32.4-8:

Tu tamen affectas, Nestor, dici atque videri
pauper et in populo quaeris habere locum.
Mentiris vanoque tibi blandiris honore.
Non est paupertas, Nestor, habere nihil.

You, Nestor, nevertheless aspire to be said and to seem a pauper, and you seek to have a place among the people (i.e., the citizenry). You lie and you flatter yourself with vain regard. It is not poverty, Nestor, to have nothing.

Naevolus is here borrowing from Homer only indirectly, however; his direct source is in fact Propertius 13.12, an elegy in praise of Postumus' wife Galla, through whose admirable faithfulness Postumus will be another Odysseus (*Postumus alter erit miranda coniuge Ulixes*, 23). Because Odysseus' wife at home remained true to him throughout his travels abroad, none of his trials were in vain (*nec frustra, quia casta domi persederat uxor*, 37). Propertius lists these trials, including the Cicones, Polyphemus, Circe, the lotus eaters, Scylla and Charybdis, Helios' cattle, Calypso, and Hades (25-33), until "he approached the pools of the Sirens with deaf oarsmen at the helm" (*Sirenum surdo remige adisse lacus*, 34).

Note, of course, the clamorous echo of Propertius' *surdo remige* in Naevolus' *remige surdo* (150). Thus, in the very last line of the poem, Naevolus reasserts the pattern of elegiac reference that has been in evidence throughout. Here, however, the object of elegiac desire is not a greedy girl, but a faithful wife! Indeed, says Propertius, Postumus' wife Galla surpasses Penelope in faithfulness (*vincit Penelopes Aelia Galla fidem*, 38). If I were a nineteenth century editor or a twentieth century critic, I might argue that Naevolus here incongruously, or even unwittingly, alludes to the ideal of a faithful wife that he himself can never hope to attain, so long as he pursues his career of homosexual prostitution.¹³⁴ On a camp reading, by contrast, we may argue that Naevolus creates a final incongruous juxtaposition, between the normative expectation of a faithful wife, and his own aspiration for a "something" (*aliquid*, 139) by which he "may have an old age safe from the beggar's mat and walking stick" (*quo sit mihi tuta senectus / a tegete et*

¹³⁴ I have never seen this interpretation in print; I was alerted to the Propertius parallel via a comment in Ferguson 1979: 252 *ad* 150.

baculo?, 139-40): that is, for a sexually submissive male friend who, like Postumus' wife Galba, will remain faithful to him.

These lines (135-50) have been read by previous scholars as Juvenal the poet's mocking, scornful, ironic indictment of Naevolus. My main points of contention with this reading, championed primarily by Hight 1954, Courtney 1980, and Braund 1988, are that (1) they read Naevolus as a clueless bumpkin whose rhetorical and declamatory skills are incongruous in his foul and debased mouth, while I read him as precisely the clever and mordant wit that Juvenal the interlocutor claims he is; (2) they read Juvenal's sympathy for Naevolus as feigned, while I read Juvenal's sympathy as genuine (camp readers generally avoid the word "sincere"); and (3) they read all of Juvenal's questions as incitements for Naevolus to reveal his own viciousness, while I read all of Juvenal's questions as (a) satisfying his own curiosity and (b) providing Naevolus with opportunities to engage in camp incongruity, theatricality, and humor.

Note that both readings appeal to incongruity. For the Naevolus detractors, however, the incongruity is between the *appearance* of urbanity and sophistication that Naevolus' language creates, and the *reality* of rusticity and degradation that Naevolus' words and actions allegedly reveal. That would indeed be a camp incongruity; so even on that reading, the ninth satire remains a camp text. For me, however, Naevolus' appearance of urbanity and sophistication is indeed the reality; where the incongruity lies is in the many juxtapositions that his badinage invokes: between masculine/feminine, high/low, strong/weak, and so on, all ultimately connoting the overarching camp incongruity of dominant/deviant, encoding solidarity with the deviant, and gesturing

toward the characteristic camp tension between parody and authenticity in queer forms of existence.

CONCLUSION

This Satire relates to that most execrable practice in which the ancients, to their eternal shame, so universally indulged. Juvenal's purpose was to impress the minds of others with the same loathing which he himself felt for this disgusting vice.

—Charles William Stocker, D.D., introducing the ninth satire in his 1839 edition¹

Juvenal's Ninth Satire (More) Fully Measured

While Juvenal's ninth satire is, like the prodigious endowment of Naevolus, a text of unfathomable extent (*mensura incognita*, 34), I hope I have taken its measure somewhat more fully. I began this study wishing to address two problematic aspects of scholarship on Juvenal 9. First, the poem was understudied; and second, most major extant studies of the poem were homophobic, either grossly or subtly. I viewed these problems as closely connected, since the scholarly neglect of the ninth satire was ultimately an effect of homophobia. As I have shown throughout this study, while Juvenal 9 represents not only sexual behavior between men but also adultery, prostitution, and fraudulent paternity, it is the perception of homosexuality that has most troubled moralistic editors and critics. My favorite piece of evidence for this claim is the scrupulously discreet characterization of the poem by a nineteenth century editor quoted in the epigraph above: "This Satire relates to that most execrable practice in which the ancients, to their eternal shame, so universally indulged." The prevalence of this sentiment--that Juvenal's ninth satire is primarily about homosexuality--underlies a reception history characterized by expurgation, bowdlerization, and scholarly reticence. When Victorian censoriousness gave way to academic license in the twentieth century,

¹ Quoted from Stocker 1839: 227 (orig. pub. 1835).

the handful of studies that addressed Juvenal 9 maintained much the same perspective. While the readiness of humanistic scholars to reproduce the vehement homophobia of nineteenth-century expurgators gradually waned, what persisted was a tendency to read the poem as an earnest attack on a vice of homosexuality that a morally sincere Juvenal abhorred. This state of affairs is what I explored in Chapter One, demonstrating the homophobic tendencies in the reception history of Juvenal 9 across various reception modalities, including expurgation, biographical criticism, and personal theory.

After demonstrating that homophobia was a problem in the reception of Juvenal 9, my next objective was to perform an anti-homophobic reading that was informed by queer theory and camp aesthetics. Why these two frameworks? The queer theoretical emphasis on performance and performativity allows us to move beyond the theoretical impasses of identity politics, such as that between essentialism and constructionism or between sexual orientation and gender identity. The camp aesthetic emphasis on incongruity, theatricality, and humor as strategies for embracing stigmatized identity allows us to move beyond the rarely questioned assumption that Juvenal's ninth satire implies a poet and a reader who identify with the dominant ideology and embrace the dominant structure of normativity. In effect, camp aesthetics give us the tools to demonstrate that Juvenal's attack on homosexuality in the ninth satire is not in fact an attack, and queer theory gives us the tools to demonstrate that it is not in fact on homosexuality.

Thus, in Chapter Two I provided historical and theoretical background on both queer theory and camp aesthetics. Doing so, however, led almost inevitably to the

question, if camp was such a prevalent cultural phenomenon in the latter part of the twentieth century, why does the scholarly literature of the period in the field of classics give virtually no indication of that? The answer, in short, is that when camp came to cultural prominence in the 1960s, it was widely considered “the gay sensibility,” and that very gloss virtually insured that camp would not make great inroads into classics. To paraphrase Shakespeare (*Hamlet* II.ii.518), what was camp to classics, or classics to camp? Camp was considered to be both modern and amoral, if not at times downright *immoral*; classics, by contrast, enshrined “the glory that was Greece, / And the grandeur that was Rome,” the very foundations of Western morality and ethics, including sexual ethics and normative standards of gender and kinship.² To propose a camp reading of a classical text was to insist that not all such texts support the dominant ideological discourse of Anglo-European modernity. Of course, the very tradition of expurgation that I discussed in Chapter One attests not only to the long-standing recognition that some classical texts included morally troubling representations, but also to the belief that a system of cultural regulation was required to protect the vulnerable sensibilities of women, children, and members of the underclass from texts that could undermine their commitment to virtue and encourage their participation in vice.³

Existing alongside that recognition, however, was a competing notion that the ancients merely took greater license in their modes of expression, but were not thereby to be deemed morally deficient. It is in this spirit, for example, that Dr. Stocker attests to

² Edgar Allan Poe, “To Helen,” lines 9-10.

³ For the concept of an “underclass” in the sense referred to here, see Welshman 2006.

Juvenal's intention to arouse in his reader the "loathing" that he himself felt for the "disgusting vice" depicted in the ninth satire.⁴ Others, however, were not so sure that moral discourse could handle vice directly and remain unstained by its filth. This, indeed, is the issue I took up in Chapter Three, where I explored the debate that raged in the twentieth century over Juvenal's morality. This debate was important to me for a couple of reasons. For one, if I were going to read the ninth satire as an embrace of stigmatized identity in solidarity with the deviant, I had to consider the evidence for and against a morally sincere and ethically earnest Juvenal. For another, I suspected that the debate over Juvenal's moralism served as a kind of proxy for a debate over camp aesthetics, because the arguments for and against a sincere and earnest Juvenal all turned on the nature and function of perverse wit in the satires. Could Juvenal really be deemed morally sincere, and earnest about ethical reform, if he indulged in witty banter about sexual deviance?

The verdict on this question seems ultimately to have been a resounding "No." The most interesting figure in this regard is David Wiesen, who in the space of a generation did a complete about-face on the question of Juvenalian moralism. In a 1963 publication, he argued strenuously that Juvenal's occasional descent into sexual humor did not compromise his moral sincerity or earnest ethical reformism. When he took a closer look at the satires, however, he found that Juvenal's ironic wit completely undermined any moral pretense or reformist ethical vision. Instead, what Wiesen found was a completely nihilistic satirist who was profoundly pessimistic about the prospects

⁴ Stockton 1839, *loc. cit.*

for ethical social reform. The greatest victim of this nihilism, Wiesen argued in a 1989 publication, was moral sincerity. Every moral exemplum that Juvenal appeared to proffer was instantly deflated by his withering irony and corrosive wit.

This indeed seems to have been the increasingly prevalent opinion of Juvenal at the turn of the current century, corresponding to evolving ideas about the nature and function of comic mockery in antiquity. In 2006 and 2007 respectively, Maria Plaza and Ralph Rosen published new studies of satiric humor that significantly augmented the bibliography on Juvenal.⁹ With distinctly different emphases, Plaza and Rosen each argue that the humor with which the satirist seduces his reader undermines the morality that is his generic *raison d'être*. In the case of Juvenal, Plaza in effect argues that what the satirist doesn't destroy, he tends to make stronger, so that the despised *cinaedi* of Satire 2 and the devalued women of Satire 6 gain a kind of perversely augmented stature in the course of Juvenal's attacks on them. Plaza seems less sure what to make of Naevolus in Satire 9. She notes flaws in the familiar premise that Juvenal the poet intends Naevolus to condemn himself with his own words, and concludes that Naevolus ultimately emerges as a perversely heroic figure due to the runaway power of satiric wit.⁵ Rosen's chapter on Juvenal addresses some of the very concerns that drove me to write about the ninth satire. In particular, he recognizes that the tendency of previous scholars to read the friendship between the interlocutors Juvenal and Naevolus as feigned, and Juvenal's sympathy for Naevolus as ironic, was based primarily on their own "moral baggage." He further argues that this reading does not bear up under an analysis that is sensitive to the tension

⁵ See Plaza 2006, esp. 53-7 and 105-66.

between comedy and didacticism that characterizes satire in general and Juvenal in particular. Moreover, he demonstrates that Naevolus is not a clueless bumpkin whose mythological references and literary parodies are clumsy attempts at urbane sophistication, but is rather the paradigmatic satirist whose wit, irony, and self-conscious abjection render him Juvenal's "ironized poetic alter-ego."⁶

Rosen's emphasis on what he calls "comic abjection" was particularly intriguing to me as I sought to locate Juvenal 9 in the context of queer theory and camp aesthetics.⁷ Rosen never explicitly defines abjection, but he suggests that its range of meaning approximates that of the Greek term *πονηρία*, which refers to one's own wretchedness or misery when used of oneself, and assumes pejorative moral connotations of baseness or wickedness when used of others.⁸ As a literary term, abjection derives from Julia Kristeva's notion of the abject as that which is neither subject nor object proper but is rather a "jettisoned object [that] is radically excluded and draws [one] toward the place where meaning collapses."⁹ Kristeva's paradigmatic example of the abject is the corpse, but the abject also includes blood, urine, feces, and other substances that are experienced as repulsive once they leave the confines of the body. As a property of persons, abjection suggests contempt and revulsion, precisely the qualities associated with deviant forms of existence in the Roman textual tradition, such as effeminate or servile men. In Rosen's analysis, comic abjection is what undermines the moral sincerity of satire: the satirist's

⁶ Quotes are from Rosen 2007: 236, 225 respectively.

⁷ Rosen 2007 elaborates on this concept throughout his study, but see esp. 117-171.

⁸ Cf. Rosen 2007: 65n55.

⁹ Kristeva 1982: 2.

frequent pose of abjection, whether signaled via his personal circumstances or via his scurrilous mockery and scandalous indulgence in sexual and scatological language, evacuates his personal attacks and social critiques of any moral credibility.

Abjection is also the nature of the stigma associated with what camp theorist Esther Newton calls stigmatized identity and what I more often call deviance.¹⁰ If normativity rests on the opposition of masculine subject and feminine object, then the effeminate *cinaedus* occupies the space of abjection where meaning collapses. If social meaning relies on the opposition of dominance and submission, then the servile Naevolus occupies an abject space despite his sexual insertivity: his performance of sex is submissive in its ministrations to effeminate desire, even as it is dominant in its anatomical insertivity. Thus, both the sexually insertive Naevolus and his sexually receptive patron are, albeit in different respects, submissive, effeminate, and abject. They are both stigmatized identities in the sense elaborated by Esther Newton's theory of camp subjectivity.

Moreover, human contact with the abject dehumanizes and renders the human subject an abject self. This is why many traditions require rituals of purification after contact with a corpse or with menstrual blood, to cite just two common examples. Abjection is thus not only a state but also a process. We see this vividly dramatized at Juvenal 9.43-4, a carnivalesque image of Naevolus penetrating his patron anally and encountering fecal matter in his rectum, wittily imagined as "yesterday's dinner" (*an facile et pronum est agere intra viscera penem / legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere*

¹⁰ Newton 1979: 111 *et passim*.

cenae?). This line is often read as an expression of Naevolus' own repulsion at the abject, an invective salvo against his effeminate, sexually submissive patron that only *unwittingly* reveals Naevolus' own abjection. This I think is a serious error: Naevolus is here fully, deliberately, and self-consciously embracing the abject, even at the cost of his own abjection. When he inveighs, he inveighs against his betrayal, not against his abjection.¹¹ He does not despise his patron for being effeminate (*mollis*, 38); he is, rather, angry at him for being stingy (*avarus*, 38). Nor does he give any evidence of despising either the bodily abject, figured in the image of contact with fecal matter during anal intercourse, or his own socially abject position as an adulterer (*moechus*, 25 [Juvenal speaking]; *adulter*, 80 [Naevolus speaking]) or a prostitute, a stigmatized identity that he embraces in a characteristically camp manner by ironically and humorously assimilating it to the more socially respectable discourse of patronage, calling himself a "client" (*clientis*, 59; *cliens*, 72) and rhetorically placing the man he penetrates in the role of patron.

Just as history informs the writing of a text, history informs its reading. This effect may be most acute when reading an ancient text, because so much history has intervened. On the other hand, the interventions of history may allow us to recover meanings that the passage of time has obscured; not to arrive at any one, true, correct reading of a text, but to make sense of a chord that may have seemed dissonant to an era accustomed to a different type of harmony. One very important reason why I read Juvenal's ninth satire as other than an attack on homosexuality is that I read "as a

¹¹ For a now-classic exploration of the relationship between anal intercourse and queer subjectivity, see Bersani 1987.

homosexual,” in the sense that Jonathan Culler writes about “reading as a woman.”¹² My queer subjectivity entails a sense of myself as constituted by counter-normative performances of sex, gender, and kinship that the dominant discourse of my culture and society consider deviant.

My queer subjectivity allows me to have a counter-normative response to the four behaviors I identified in Chapter One that have troubled many readers of Juvenal 9: sex between men, commercial sex, sex outside of marriage, and procreation outside of marriage. As a queer subject, I dignify the existence of (1) men who have sex with men, and women who have sex with women, regardless of sexual role; (2) sex workers and those who pay for sex; (3) people who have sex outside of marriage, whether married or not; and (4) people who become parents by means other than heterosexual procreation with a partner to whom they are married. While segments of my society are becoming increasingly tolerant of this set of values, other segments remain highly intolerant, and these assertions of dignity would have scandalized all but a small minority of sex, gender, and kinship deviants just a few decades ago. This transgressive set of counter-norms provides me with a perspective from which to challenge traditional assumptions about Juvenal’s ninth satire.

Historians of sexuality have demonstrated that we do injustice to ancient texts if we do not recognize the relatively wide latitude of male dominion in classical Athens or ancient Rome. Thus, we are apt to misread Juvenal’s ninth satire if we come to the text believing that abjection lay in such practices as (1) male homosexual insertivity, (2) male

¹² Culler 1982: 43-64.

patronage of prostitutes, or (3) male sexual activity before marriage or outside the confines of marriage, provided that a man's sexual object choice was in accord with certain protocols respecting the integrity and inviolability of the freeborn. On the other hand, historians of sexuality have also argued that abjection indeed lay in (1) male homosexual *receptivity*, (2) the *practice* (as opposed to the patronage) of prostitution, and (3) adultery and other forms of sexual violation (*stuprum*) as provided by law or custom. Thus, the effeminate man, the sexually submissive man, the male or female prostitute, and the adulterous man or woman might all be considered abject figures, and a reader who subscribed to the idea of satire as social guide (what we might call the *ethical imperative* of satire) might argue that Juvenal's ninth satire could not help but target Naevolus, his effeminate, sexually submissive male patron, and his adulterous female partners for satiric ridicule and moral condemnation.

From my position of queer subjectivity, however, I can respond differently to these instances of abjection as well as to these abject beings. For one thing, unlike nineteenth-century expurgators or many twentieth-century scholars, I can contemplate these abject selves with other than revulsion and contempt. Moreover, I can acknowledge identification with these abjects, based on my own experience of abjection. Reading from a queer subject position, however, I might nevertheless conclude, as so many other scholars have, that the text constructs both Naevolus and his patron as despicable, contemptible figures. That, however, is not in fact the way I respond to this text. Rather, the text as I read it accords dignity to both Naevolus and his patron, and for that matter to the patron's wife and to their unseen but memorably invoked children. What allows me to

read the text as an assertion of solidarity with the deviant is less my queer subjectivity than my camp sensibility, whereby the abjection of what I refer to as the poem's queer household is redeemed by the poem's camp embrace of their stigmatized identity. By making dominant Roman conceptions of masculinity, matrimony, and paternity objects of camp mockery, the poem reclaims the dignity and reasserts the humanity of queer formations of sex, gender, and kinship that the dominant discourse stigmatizes as effeminacy, adultery, and prostitution.¹³

As I noted in the general Introduction, Naevolus has scarcely if ever been championed by scholars approaching the text from a feminist or gay perspective, primarily because he is the penetrating subject of masculine-gendered male desire, not its penetrated object. And yet, as I have argued, Naevolus is a remarkable sex, gender, and kinship deviant. He may be irreproachably insertive in his sexual role, but he does not limit himself in his choice of sexual objects to his own wife, his own slaves, or prostitutes, instead choosing to have sex with free Romans of both sexes, including married women, and male partners who are well beyond the bloom of youth. His choice of sexual objects is thus both morally and aesthetically deviant, notwithstanding his consistently insertive sexual role. Naevolus himself, moreover, has only recently stopped engaging in practices of grooming and depilation that would mark him as effeminate, and has neglected his coiffure and complexion only due to the exigencies of his current stressful circumstances. Finally, while Naevolus penetrates wives and husbands alike and

¹³ See Rubin 1984 for a now-classic discussion of social constructions of "good sex" and "bad sex" that define which sexual subjects and activities are valorized and which are stigmatized as bad actors and bad acts.

fathers children, he is neither husband nor father but only adulterer, prostitute, and a kind of sperm-donor for which Latin does not even have a word beyond a massively ironic vocabulary of patronage that includes such terms as *cliens*, *adsecula*, *cultor*, and *amicus*.

Naevolus, then, is an abject creature indeed, as Richlin seems to recognize when she claims that Juvenal sneers at him even while employing him as an agent of discursive rape.¹⁴ John Henderson seems perversely ironic when he describes Naevolus as the paragon of male dominion in Roman satire:¹⁵

Faced with Naevolus the ‘Superstud’, *Egito* [the masculine-gendered male subject of Roman satire] meets his match, the Man with (too much of) everything: J must turn to wimpish (Horatian) irony. For here is a male who has taken as seriously as can be that ‘healthy’ simplicity of a ‘Penetrate-All’ male sexuality. *Naevolus* (‘Mr. Mole’, a natural endowment, the warts and all Truth of Satire) is its logical conclusion, Priapus-as-*homo*. [Emphases in original]

Henderson thus would seem to argue that Naevolus is not abject at all, but is rather the ultimate figure of Priapic male dominance. Naevolus is indeed Priapic, for while Priapus is an ideal representation of masculine insertivity, the garden god is a failure of manhood in most other respects, since he never marries, fathers children, or transfers his patrimony, if indeed he can be said to have any patrimony to transmit. Amy Richlin chooses Priapus as a synecdoche for male sexual aggression, and claims that Priapus, like the dominant Roman discourse, is obsessed with policing and controlling boundaries.¹⁶

¹⁴ Richlin 1992a: 202.

¹⁵ Cf. Henderson 1999: 173-201, originally published as Henderson 1989 with slight variation. The quote is from Henderson 1999: 2000.

¹⁶ Cf. Richlin 1992a: xvi, “I chose the figure of the ithyphallic garden god Priapus, who threatens to rape thieves who enter his garden, as a synecdochic embodiment of the sexuality consciously constituted in these Roman texts: male, aggressive, and bent on controlling boundaries.”

Priapus indeed preserves and maintains the boundaries of the garden; sex, gender, and kinship boundaries, however, do not in fact seem to matter to him at all: he will penetrate male or female, masculine or feminine, mother, father, son or daughter with equal abandon. In his utter disregard for heteronormative marriage and paternity, as well as for traditional standards of sexual availability or even desirability, Priapus, like Naevolus, is a queer figure indeed.

Some might object to my endorsement of Priapus as a queer symbol because he is rigid in his own sexual role and gender identity and he sanctions sexual violence. As for his sex and gender definition, his sexual dominance and hypermasculinity are perfectly consistent with a queer commitment to counter-normativity: queerness is by no means a disavowal of individual preferences, but rather a state of resistance to universal imposition of arbitrary sex, gender, and kinship norms. As I stated in Chapter Two, queer is not a synonym for gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. Queerness is consistent with both gender transitivity (gender identity *at variance* with anatomical sex by normative standards) and gender intransitivity (gender identity *aligned* with anatomical sex by normative standards). Queerness is also consistent with both rigid and fluid sex roles; that is, with individual preference for, or identification with, insertivity, receptivity, or versatility. What is not consistent with queerness is an insistence that there is any one or only one right way to perform sex or gender or, for that matter, kinship. As for sexual violence, that indeed is a matter of grave concern to queer theory and the queer community. But even in this regard, Priapus is paradigmatically queer, because he is after all a fantasy, not a reality, and the relentless sexual violence of the *Priapeia*, as well as

the perennial appeal those poems have had for queer readers, figures the powerful attraction of violence as an element of sexual fantasy, even as the value of violent fantasy continues to be contested within various communities.

In closing, I want to underscore that with my camp reading of this poem, I am not saying anything new about the the dominant discourse of sex, gender, or kinship normativity in ancient Rome. Well established is the notion that masculine gender was expected to align with male sex as part of a sex/gender system in which sexual penetration reproduces a social hierarchy of freeborn adult male citizens over other social actors within limits set by conventions of sexual role, social status, and sexual desire. What is new about my approach is the idea that some Roman textual representations of deviant sex, gender, and kinship performances, including but not limited to Juvenal's ninth satire, may be read not as morally sincere or socially earnest attacks on sex, gender, and kinship deviance, but rather as camp exercises of perverse wit in solidarity with the deviant. I am not suggesting that every instance of invective against sex, gender, or kinship deviance is ironic; indeed, if there were no tradition of earnest ridicule, there would be nothing for camp to parody. Rather, what I am suggesting is the existence of a Roman camp discourse that gestures toward the morally destabilizing potential of deviant sex, gender and kinship performances and the ever-present tension between parody and authenticity in queer existence. This discourse rhetorically represents an assortment of actors who engage in performances of sex, gender, and kinship that exceed the normative Roman boundaries of masculine virtue, feminine modesty, and public morality.

What I aspire to do for a queer reading of Roman textual representations of sex, gender, and kinship is what Judith Hallett did for the feminist reading of elegy with her 1973 article, “The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism.” In their introduction to a 1999 special issue of the journal *Classical World* on power, politics, and discourse in Augustan elegy, Paul Allen Miller and Charles Platter summarize Hallett’s groundbreaking contribution as follows:

Hallett argues that the elegists created a countercultural discourse that elevated women to a position that was directly antagonistic to the norms of Roman culture. The elegists can thus be seen as a group of poetic profeminists. Hallett’s text is clearly symptomatic of its age...tracing its theoretical roots to central texts of sixties radicalism such as Roszak’s *The Making of a Counter Culture* and Reich’s *The Greening of America*. Within the study of Roman elegy, however, there are no precedents for such an approach, and hence Hallett’s essay can be seen as emblematic of the feminist countercultural turn in elegiac criticism.¹⁷

In an analogous vein, I have argued that Juvenal’s ninth satire may be read as both a protoqueer and a protocamp text, since it instantiates a counter-normative discourse that represents deviant performances of sex, gender, and kinship in a way that challenges the dominant Roman discourse of sex, gender, or kinship normativity. As Hallett appealed to fundamental radical texts of the 1960s, I have appealed to germinal queer texts of the 1990s such as Butler’s *Gender Trouble*, Sedgwick’s *Epistemology of the Closet*, and Dollimore’s *Sexual Dissidence*, as well as classics of camp theory such as Newton’s *Mother Camp*, and central texts on the history of sexuality in antiquity such as Dover’s *Greek Homosexuality*, Halperin’s *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*, and Williams’ *Roman Homosexuality*. I hope that my study will become emblematic of a queer turn in

¹⁷ Miller and Platter 1999: 405.

classical literary criticism, a turn that I would argue has yet to occur, despite a foundation of work on the history of sexuality in antiquity built over more than thirty years, and well-established body of feminist and postmodern classical criticism.

As Ronnie Ancona and Ellen Greene note in the introduction to their 2005 anthology, *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*, “Hallett argues that the elegists indicated their nonconformity with traditional gender roles by portraying women as dominant and men as subservient.” Similarly, I have argued that Juvenal indicates his nonconformity with traditional notions of sex, gender, and kinship by portraying a sexually dominant male as socially servile; an effeminate, sexually submissive male as socially dominant; and both of these men engaged with each other, and with a woman, in bizarre forms of sexual patronage, invitational adultery, and paternal surrogacy.

While I have yet to determine how extensive the protoqueer and protocamp Roman textual archive is, I am certain that it extends beyond Juvenal’s ninth satire. At a minimum, I suspect that many satires of Juvenal and epigrams of Martial may be profitably subjected to queer and camp readings, a process that I began with my brief discussions of Martial 3.96, 11.47, 11.78, and 11.85 in Chapter One, and of Martial 7.24, 7.91, 9.63, and 12.18 in Chapter Three. As we saw in Chapter One, Wooten 1984 attempted a promising but ultimately unsatisfactory camp reading of Petronius’ *Satyricon*. I have no doubt, however, that Wooten was correct to identify the *Satyricon* as a camp text; what is needed is a more comprehensive analysis founded on a broader base not only of camp theory (Wooten referred only to Sontag) but also of queer theory, which barely existed in 1984, the same year that Gayle Rubin published the foundational essay

of sexuality studies, "Thinking Sex." Indeed, I strongly suspect that much of the amatory poetry that feminist classicists have mined for gender dissidence could be further mined by queer classicists for sexual dissidence and kinship dissidence, as well as for evidence of camp sensibility demonstrated via the exploration of incongruous juxtapositions represented in a theatrical style for humorous effect in solidarity with deviant forms of sex, gender, and kinship.

Finally, I want to clarify the relative urgency of my commitment to queer theory and camp aesthetics. Queer definitely takes precedence over camp. My discovery that Juvenal's ninth satire could be read as a camp text was an exciting insight, which I am very glad to have explored extensively in this study. Moreover, as I just noted, I would be eager to perform camp readings of other Roman texts and to make some attempt at determining which Roman texts may profitably be subjected to camp readings and which are simply straightforward ridicule of sex, gender, and kinship deviance. There is, however, much more that can be done with the application of queer theory to classical antiquity than simply the search for camp texts. Much of the work done to date on the history of sexuality has been focused on dominant discourses of sex and gender, often seeking to demonstrate either continuities or discontinuities with contemporary discourses. Queer theory, as I stated at the beginning of these concluding remarks, takes us beyond the theoretical impasses of identity politics. The deconstructive potential in notions of performance and performativity, not only of gender but also of sex and kinship, can lead us beyond dominant discourses to new insights about deviance and dissidence.

APPENDIX

*A Translation of Juvenal's Ninth Satire*¹

JUVENAL

Scire velim quare totiens mihi, Naevole, tristis
 occurras fronte obducta ceu Marsya victus
 quid tibi cum vultu, qualem deprensus habebat
 Ravola dum Rhodopes uda terit inguina barba?
 [nos colaphum incutimus lambenti crustula servo.]² 5
 non erit hac facie miserabilior Crepereius
 Pollio, qui triplicem usuram praestare paratus
 circumit et fatuos non invenit. unde repente
 tot rugae? certe modico contentus agebas
 vernam equitem, conviva ioco mordente facetus 10
 et salibus vehemens intra pomeria natis.
 omnia nunc contra, vultus gravis, horrida siccae
 silva comae, nullus tota nitor in cute, qualem
 Bruttia praestabat calidi tibi fascia visci,
 sed fruticante pilo neglecta et squalida crura. 15
 quid macies aegri veteris, quem tempore longo
 torret quarta dies olimque domestica febris?
 deprendas animi tormenta latentis in aegro
 corpore, deprendas et gaudia; sumit utrumque
 inde habitum facies. igitur flexisse videris 20
 propositum et vitae contrarius ire priori.
 nuper enim, ut repeto, fanum Isidis et Ganymedem
 Pacis et advectae secreta Palatia matris
 et Cererem (nam quo non prostat femina templo?)
 notior Aufidio moechus celebrare solebas, 25
 quodque taces, ipsos etiam inclinare maritos.

NAEVOLUS

utile et hoc multis vitae genus, at mihi nullum
 inde operae pretium. pingues aliquando lacernas,

¹ My text is that of Clausen 1959; but, for purposes of readability, I have added the speakers' names (which do not appear in the manuscripts).

² Deleted by François Guyet (1575-1655), although it is cited by Servius on *Georg.* iii.60 and *Aen.* vii.115 and is found in all MSS of Juvenal. According to Hight 1954: 275n6 and Ferguson 1979: 249 *ad loc.*, the German philologist and noted Juvenal scholar Günther Jachmann (1887-1979) argued that line 5 was meant to replace line 4 with something less objectionable. It is unclear what Guyet's basis for deleting the line was.

munimenta togae, duri crassique coloris
 et male percussas textoris pectine Galli 30
 accipimus, tenue argentum venaque secundae.
 fata regunt homines, fatum est et partibus illis
 quas sinus abscondit. nam si tibi sidera cessant,
 nil faciet longi mensura incognita nervi,
 quamvis te nudum spumanti Virro labello 35
 viderit et blandae adsidue densaeque tabellae
 sollicitent, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλλεται ἄνδρα κίναϊδος.
 quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis avarus?
 “haec tribui, deinde illa dedi, mox plura tulisti.”
 computat et cevet. ponatur calculus, adsint 40
 cum tabula pueri; numera sestertia quinque
 omnibus in rebus, numerentur deinde labores.
 an facile et pronum est agere intra viscera penem
 legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae?
 servus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum 45
 quam dominum. sed tu sane tenerum et puerum te
 et pulchrum et dignum cyatho caeloque putabas.
 vos humili adseculae, vos indulgebitis umquam
 cultori, iam nec morbo donare parati?
 en cui tu viridem umbellam, cui sucina mittas 50
 grandia, natalis quotiens redit aut madidum ver
 incipit et strata positus longaque cathedra
 munera femineis tractat secreta Kalendis.
 dic, passer, cui tot montis, tot praedia servas
 Apula, tot milvos intra tua pascua lassas? 55
 te Trifolinus ager fecundis vitibus implet
 suspectumque iugum Cumis et Gaurus inanis
 (nam quis plura linit victuro dolia musto?),
 quantum erat exhausti lumbos donare clientis
 iugeribus paucis! meliusne hic rusticus infans 60
 cum matre et casulis et conlusore catello
 cymbala pulsantis legatum fiet amici?
 “improbis es cum poscis” ait. sed pensio clamat
 “posce,” sed appellat puer unicus ut Polyphemi
 lata acies per quam sollers evasit Ulixes. 65
 alter emendus erit, namque hic non sufficit, ambo
 pascendi. quid agam bruma spirante? quid, oro,
 quid dicam scapulis puerorum aquilone Decembri
 et pedibus? “durate atque expectate cicadas”?
 verum, ut dissimules, ut mittas cetera, quanto 70
 metiris pretio quod, ni tibi deditus essem

devotusque cliens, uxor tua virgo maneret?
 scis certe quibus ista modis, quam saepe rogaris
 et quae pollicitus. fugientem saepe puellam
 amplexu rapui; tabulas quoque ruperat et iam 75
 signabat; tota vix hoc ego nocte redemi
 te plorante foris. testis mihi lectulus et tu,
 ad quem pervenit lecti sonus et dominae vox.
 instabile ac dirimi coeptum et iam paene solutum
 coniugium in multis domibus servavit adulter. 80
 quo te circumagas? quae prima aut ultima ponas?
 nullum ergo meritum est, ingrata ac perfide, nullum
 quod tibi filiulus vel filia nascitur ex me?
 tollis enim et libris actorum spargere gaudes
 argumenta viri. foribus suspende coronas: 85
 iam pater es, dedimus quod famae opponere possis.
 iura parentis habes, propter me scriberis heres,
 legatum omne capis nec non et dulce caducum.
 commoda praeterea iungentur multa caducis,
 si numerum, si tres implevero.

JUVENAL

iusta doloris, 90
 Naevole, causa tui; contra tamen ille quid adfert?

NAEVOLUS

negligit atque alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum.
 haec soli commissa tibi celare memento
 et tacitus nostras intra te fige querellas;
 nam res mortifera est inimicus pumice levis. 95
 qui modo secretum commiserat, ardet et odit,
 tamquam prodiderim quidquid scio. sumere ferrum,
 fuste aperire caput, candelam adponere valuis
 non dubitat. nec contempnas aut despicias quod
 his opibus numquam cara est annona veneni. 100
 ergo occulta teges ut curia Martis Athenis.

JUVENAL

o Corydon, Corydon, secretum divitis ullum
 esse putas? servi ut taceant, iumenta loquentur
 et canis et postes et marmora. claude fenestras,
 vela tegant rimas, iunge ostia, tollite lumen, 105
 e medio fac eant omnes, prope nemo recumbat;
 quod tamen ad cantum galli facit ille secundi
 proximus ante diem caupo sciet, audiet et quae

finxerunt pariter libarius, archimagiri,
 carptores. quod enim dubitant componere crimen 110
 in dominos, quotiens rumoribus ulciscuntur
 baltea? nec derit qui te per compita quaerat
 nolentem et miseram vinosus inebriet aurem.
 illos ergo roges quidquid paulo ante petebas
 a nobis, taceant illi. sed prodere malunt 115
 arcanum quam subrepti potare Falerni
 pro populo faciens quantum Saufeia bibebat.
 vivendum recte, cum propter plurima, †tunc est†
 idcirco ut possis linguam contemnere servi.
 [praecipue causis, ut linguas mancipiorum 120
 contemnas; nam lingua mali pars pessima servi.
 deterior tamen hic qui liber non erit illis
 quorum animas et farre suo custodit et aere.]

NAEVOLUS

utile consilium modo, sed commune, dedisti.
 nunc mihi quid suades post damnum temporis et spes 125
 deceptas? festinat enim decurrere velox
 flosculus angustae miseraeque brevissima vitae
 portio; dum bibimus, dum sarta, unguenta, puellas
 poscimus, obrepit non intellecta senectus.

JUVENAL

ne trepida, numquam pathicus tibi derit amicus 130
 stantibus et salvis his collibus; undique ad illos
 convenient et carpentis et navibus omnes
 qui digito scalpunt uno caput. altera maior
 spes superest, tu tantum erucis inprime dentem.
 [gratus eris, tu tantum erucis inprime dentem.] 134a

NAEVOLUS

haec exempla para felicibus; at mea Clotho 135
 et Lachesis gaudent, si pascitur inguine venter.
 o parvi nostrique Lares, quos ture minuto
 aut farre et tenui soleo exorare corona,
 quando ego figam aliquid quo sit mihi tuta senectus
 a tegete et baculo? viginti milia fenus 140
 pigneribus positis, argenti vascula puri,
 sed quae Fabricius censor notet, et duo fortes
 de grege Moesorum, qui me cervice locata
 securum iubeant clamoso insistere circo;
 sit mihi praeterea curvus caelator, et alter 145

qui multas facies pingit cito; sufficiunt haec.
 quando ego pauper ero? votum miserabile, nec spes
 his saltem; nam cum pro me Fortuna vocatur,
 adfixit ceras illa de nave petitas
 quae Siculos cantus effugit remige surdo. 150

JUVENAL

I should like to know, Naevolus, why you so often run into me in a sad state with a worried brow like Marsyas in defeat. What are you doing with a mug like Ravola when he was caught rubbing his wet beard in Rhodope's crotch? [We strike a blow to the slave who licks the pastries.] Not even Crepereius Pollio looks sadder than you when he goes around prepared to borrow at triple interest and can't find any dupes to take him up on it. Indeed, content with little, you used to go around playing the role of a homegrown equestrian, a clever dinner guest with a mordant wit, spouting the latest wisecracks springing up around town. Everything now is the opposite: Your face is grim; your dry hair is a bristling forest; gone is the gleam your complexion used to get from a bandage of hot Bruttian pitch. *Au contraire*, your legs are rough and sprouting a messy crop. Why so thin like a sick old man with a four-day fever that has long since taken up residence? You may detect the sorrows and the joys of a soul hiding in a sick body; from there one's appearance assumes either form. And so it seems to me you have changed course and to be going contrary to your previous way of life. For it was only recently, as I recall, that you were accustomed to frequent the shrine of Isis, the statue of Ganymede in the Temple of Peace, the shrine of the immigrant Mother on the Palatine, and the temple of Ceres (for in what temple does a woman not prostitute herself?), an adulterer more notorious than Aufidius, and (a fact about which you remain silent), you were accustomed to bend the husbands over as well.³

NAEVOLUS

Many men profit even from this sort of life, but I get no reward for my efforts. From time to time I get some cloaks, protections for my toga of a rough, hard quality, greasy and badly finished by the comb of the Gallic weaver, silver plate thin and from an inferior

³ The phrase *Ganymedem Pacis* (22-3) refers to a statue of Ganymede in the Temple of Peace which was in the Forum of Peace (cf. Middleton 1892: 14). The scholia on 9.22 note that the shrines of Isis and Ganymede were places where *cinaedi* gathered. The phrase *aduectae secreta Palatia matris* (23) more literally refers to the temple (*secreta Palatia* is a so-called poetic plural) of Cybele or Magna Mater; *aduectae* (23) refers to the fact that the image of Cybele was brought back from the Anatolian city of Pessinus by a Roman embassy in 204 BCE. Cf. Platner 1929: 324. The word *secreta* (23) may be read as an adjective or participle, but in either case probably suggests that the place is set aside for a special purpose. This is a double entendre, however, because the temple is reserved both as a holy site and as a place of assignations such as those described here and in other Roman texts (cf. references in Platner loc. cit).

vein. The Fates rule human beings, and even those parts hidden beneath the toga have a fate. For if the stars are not on your side, the unfathomable length of your massive penis will do you no good, even though some john with his foaming little lip sees you nude and his frequent coaxing letters beseech you continually, for the *cinaedus* himself attracts a man!⁴ And yet, what greater monstrosity is there than a stingy molly?⁵ “I gave you these, then I gave you those, then I gave you more.” He reckons his tab and pumps his butt. Let the calculator be set in place, let the slave boys stand by with his ledgers; tally 5000 sesterces paid in total, then let my labors be counted. Or do you think it is smooth and easy to drive a proper penis into the guts and there run into yesterday’s dinner?⁶ The slave who plows a field will be less wretched than the slave who plows his master. But you surely used to consider yourself to be a boy soft and pretty and worthy of the heavenly

⁴ Juvenal’s αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος (37) is a parody of Hom. *Od.* 16.294, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος. Cf. Hom. *Od.* 16.291-294:

πρὸς δ’ ἔτι καὶ τότε μείζον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θήκε Κρονίων,
μή πως οἰνωθέντες, ἔριν στήσαντες ἐν ὑμῖν,
ἀλλήλους τρώσητε καταισχύνητέ τε δαῖτα
καὶ μνηστύν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος.

This greater fear moreover has the son of Cronos put in my heart, lest perchance, getting drunk on wine and setting strife among yourselves, you may wound one another and bring shame upon your feasting and your courtship, for an iron weapon can’t help but attract a man.

Repeated at *Od.* 19.10-13, except ἔμβαλε δαίμων instead of θήκε Κρονίων

⁵ The English word molly is a slang term referring to an effeminate man or boy or a male homosexual (cf. OED s.v.), for which the OED cites a usage as early as 1708. Places known as molly-houses in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England were public houses, taverns, or other establishments used as meeting places by homosexual men (cf. Shapiro 2002; Trumbach 1989; Trumbach 1998: 7, 84, 202, and 432n4). It is possible, but by no means certain, that the English word “molly” in the sense cited here derives from the Latin *mollis*, which regularly referred to an effeminate man, often with connotations of sexual submissiveness. Arguing against this hypothesis is the fact that the English *molly*, like the English *moll*, also refers to a female prostitute, and in that sense is claimed possibly to derive from the name of Mary Magdalene (cf. OED s.v. *moll*). In any event, the homonymy between Latin *mollis* and English *molly* makes for a felicitous translation opportunity.

⁶ I have incorporated both *facile* (43) and *prorum* (43) into the English “easy,” although *prorum*, “leaning forward,” perhaps suggests an additional level of ease, as in the English phrases “a walk in the park” or “smooth sailing.” I have translated *legitimum* as “proper,” but the connotations of legality may suggest “doing it right,” “doing it the way it should be done,” and moreover contribute to a texture of legal language and juridical debate running throughout the text, as at 9.90-1, “You have a just basis for your complaint, Naevolus; what does he offer in his defense?” (*iusta doloris, / Naevole, causa tui; contra tamen ille quid adfert?*).

cup. Will you ever indulge a lowly hanger-on, a follower, now that you are no longer prepared to feed your sick need? Look, you send him a green parasol, large amber balls whenever his birthday comes around or rainy spring begins and lying on a blanket-strewn lounge chair he handles his secret gifts for the Ladies' First.⁷ Tell me, sparrow, for whom do you keep so many hills, so many farms in Apulia, for whom do you tire out so many kites within your pastureland?⁸ Your Trifoline field fills you with fertile vines as does the ridge looked up at by Cumae, and deserted Gaurus—for who seals more barrels of long-lasting vintage? How much would it have cost to endow the loins of your exhausted client with a few acres! Is it really better that this backwoods child with his mother and little houses and puppy playmate should be bequeathed to your friend who clashes the cymbals? “You are impertinent when you beg,” he says. But my rent shouts “Beg,” but my slave boy calls, one-and-only as Polyphemus' wide eye by which clever Ulysses escaped. Another will have to be purchased, for in fact this one is not enough, and both will have to be fed. What am I to do when winter starts blowing? What, I ask, what am I to say to the shoulder blades of the slave boys during the north wind of December and to their feet? “Hang in there and wait for the cicadas”? But, though you pretend, though you pass over the rest, at what price do you value the fact that, had I not been your dedicated and faithful client, your wife would still be a virgin? Surely you know how you asked for those things, how often you asked, and what you promised. Often I caught your wife in my embrace as she was trying to flee; she'd even broken the contract and already was sealing a new one; during the whole night I just barely redeemed the situation while you were sobbing outside the door. The bed is my witness and you, whom the sound of the bed reached and the voice of your lady.⁹ In many households an adulterer has saved a marriage that was shaky and falling apart and already almost dissolved. Where can you turn? What can you put first or last? Is it therefore worth nothing, you deceitful ingrate, nothing that a little son or a daughter is born to you from me? For you raise them and you delight in sprinkling the newspapers with announcements that prove you are a man. You hang wreaths from your doors: Now you are a father, I furnished you with a claim against ill repute. You have the privileges of a parent, on account of me you will be inscribed as

⁷ A reference to the Matronalia, Smith 2000: 142 writes: “The ancient rite of the Matronalia on the first of March (the beginning of the archaic year) is interpreted by Boëls-Janssen (1993: 309-19) as in essence a private ceremony for the celebration of marriage, when a husband gives presents to his wife, and a wife proclaims the praises of her husband.”

⁸ For a discussion of *milvos* (9.54) in the context of parallels in Petronius and Persius, see Ihm 2000.

⁹ The scholia to 9.78 offers the intriguing suggestion that the vocality of the wife in bed with Naevolus suggests either that she was still a virgin or that she was playing the virgin (*virginem imitatur*). The disclosure of his wife's virginity, the scholiast adds, would be to the greater disgrace of the husband (*ut sit mariti maior infamia*) than the mere fact of her adultery.

an heir; you take a legacy whole and even a sweet escheat.¹⁰ Many additional benefits will be joined to the escheats if I bring the number up to the full three.

JUVENAL

You've got a just cause for complaint, Naevolus. What does he offer in his defense?

NAEVOLUS

He ignores me and seeks himself another two-legged donkey. These things entrusted to you alone, make sure you hide them and quietly fix my complaints within yourself; for a deadly thing is an enemy smooth by means of pumice. For he who divulged his secret burns with hatred, as if I have betrayed everything I know. He does not hesitate to take up a knife, to open my head with a cudgel, to place a candle to my doors.¹¹ Nor should you disregard or scorn the fact that, for wealth like his, never dear is the price of poison. Therefore cover up my secrets like the council of Mars at Athens.

JUVENAL

Oh, Corydon, Corydon, do you think a wealthy man has any secret? Even if slaves are silent, pack animals will talk, and the dog, and the door posts, and the marble statues. Shut the windows, let sheets cover up the cracks, bolt the doors, blow out the candles, see to it that everyone clears out, let no one recline nearby; nevertheless, what that man does at the song of the second rooster the nearest shopkeeper will know before daybreak, and he will hear alike what the pastry chef, the head cooks, and the carvers made up. For what charge do they hesitate to fabricate against their masters, whenever they avenge beatings with rumors? Nor will there be lacking one who seeks you at the crossroads, unwilling though you may be, and he, drunk, will drench your wretched ear. Therefore you should ask those men for what you were seeking a little while earlier from me, that they be silent. But they would rather betray a secret than drink as much stolen Falernian wine as Saufeia used to drink when she was making a public sacrifice. One must live correctly for many reasons, but especially so that you may scorn the tongues of slaves. [Especially so that you may scorn the tongues of slaves; for the tongue is the worst part of a bad slave. Nevertheless he is worse who will not be free from those he wards off with bread and money.]¹²

¹⁰ Property that reverts to the state when there are no legal heirs, also referred to as a vacant inheritance or unclaimed property. The Augustan marriage laws limited the inheritance rights of persons who were unmarried and/or childless. Inheritances that were forfeited under these circumstances were called *caduca* (cf. OLD *caducus*, *-a, -um*, sense 10). These vacant inheritances could be claimed by persons named in the will who were married and had children. If there were no such persons, the property reverted to the state treasury. Cf. Sandars 1917: 197.

¹¹ For the purpose of committing arson.

¹² Ferguson 1979: 251 *ad loc.* comments, "These lines are clearly interpolated. They do not seem to have been known to the ancient commentators. 120-1 are mere repetition, 122-3 intolerably weak."

NAEVOLUS

Sound advice you just gave me, but trite. How do you advise me now, after the loss of my time and the dashing of my hopes? For the swift little flower and the briefest portion of a narrow and wretched life hasten to depart; while we drink, while we demand garlands, perfumes, girls, old age creeps up unawares.

JUVENAL

Fear not, you will never lack a sexually submissive male friend as long as these hills stand safe; from all sides they will come, both in carriages and in ships, everyone who scratches his head with one finger. Another greater hope there is besides, just chew your arugula. [You will be popular: just chew your arugula.]¹³

NAEVOLUS

These are examples for fortunate men; but my Clotho and Lachesis are happy if my belly is fed by my crotch. Oh, my little household gods, whom with a tiny bit of incense or grain and with a slender wreath I am wont to entreat, when shall I nail some opportunity by which I will have an old age safe from the beggar's mat and walking stick? An income of twenty thousand from investments on deposit,¹⁴ cups of pure silver, but the kind which Fabricius the censor proscribes, and two strong men from the flock of the Moesi to bear me carefree on their shoulders at the noisy racetrack.¹⁵ May I have moreover a stooped engraver, and another man who paints many portraits quickly; these things are enough.¹⁶ When will I be poor? A wretched wish, and there is no hope even for this; for when Fortune is summoned on my behalf, she has stuffed her ears with wax sought from that famous ship that fled the songs of Sicily with a deaf rower.

¹³ Arugula was considered an aphrodisiac. Cf. OLD s.v. *eruca*.

¹⁴ For a fascinating discussion of *faenus* at 9.140 and whether it refers to principle or interest, see Saller 1983.

¹⁵ In cultural context, it is to be understood that Naevolus imagines himself born on a litter, not sitting atop their shoulders like a child at the Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade. The Moesi were highly regarded as litter bearers (cf. Ferguson 1979: 252 *ad loc.*). Following Green and a number of earlier translators, I have simplified the English somewhat. Literally, "who, with neck having been hired out, may bid me to stand safely at the noisy circus."

¹⁶ The engraver is "stooped" (*curvus*, 145), presumably over his work. It is possible to read into this a salacious reference to bending over for anal penetration, but I see no need for that reading and nothing in the context to encourage it. I do not understand Naevolus as someone who necessarily wants to penetrate any and all possible sexual objects within reach. The poem never characterizes him as having that degree of sexual avidity. If anything, that is how the patron is characterized; Naevolus, by contrast, is characterized as proud of his generous genital endowment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J.N. 1982 *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore.
- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., and Sanford, R.N. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York.
- Alden, R. M. 1962. *The Rise of Formal Satire in England under the Classical Influence*. Hamden, Conn. Orig. pub. 1889.
- Althusser, L. 2001. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York.
- Ancona, R. 1994. *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes*. Durham and London.
- Ancona, R. 2005. "(Un)constrained Male Desire: An Intertextual Reading of Horace *Odes* 2.8 and Catullus Poem 61." In Ancona, R. and Green, E. *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore. 41-60.
- Ancona, R. and Greene, E., eds. 2005. *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore.
- Anderson W.S. 1954. "Juvenal 6: A Problem in Structure." *Classical Philology* 51: 73-94.
- Anderson, W.S. 1961a. "Juvenal and Quintilian." *Yale Classical Studies* 17: 3-93. Repr. in Anderson 1982.
- Anderson, W.S. 1961b. Review of Clausen 1959. *The American Journal of Philology* 82: 428-441.
- Anderson, W.S. 1962. "The Programs of Juvenal's Later Books." *Classical Philology* 57: 145-160. Repr. in Anderson 1982.
- Anderson, W.S. 1964. "Anger in Juvenal and Seneca." *Publications in Classical Philology* 19: 127-195. Repr. in Anderson 1982.
- Anderson, W.S. 1970. "'Lascivia vs. ira' Martial and Juvenal." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 3: 1-34. Repr. in Anderson 1982.
- Anderson, W.S. 1982. *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton Series of Collected Essays. Princeton.
- Arrowsmith, W. 1966. "Luxury and Death in the *Satyricon*." *Arion* 5: 304-31.
- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, MA.
- Babuscio, J. "The Cinema of Camp (AKA Camp and the Gay Sensibility)." In Cleto, F., ed. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 116-135. Orig. pub. in Dyer, R., ed. 1977. *Gays and Film*. London. Repr. in *Gay Sunshine Journal* 35, Winter 1978.
- Bacon, H. 1958. "The Sibyl in the Bottle." *Virginia Quarterly Review* 34: 262-76.
- Badham, C. 1841. *Juvenal*. New York.

- Baker, P. 2002. *Polari: The Lost Language of Gay Men*. London.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1984. *Rabelais and His World*. Bloomington, Ind.
- Baldick, C. 2004. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford.
- Barthes, R. 1977. *Image, Music, Text*. New York.
- Bartlett, N. 1999. "Forgery." In Cleto, F. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 179-184. Repr. From Bartlett, N. 1988. *Who Was That Man? A Present for Mr. Oscar Wilde*. London.
- Bartsch, S. 1994. *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Bartsch, S. 2006. *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire*. Chicago.
- Bayer, R. 1987. *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis*. Princeton.
- Beaty, B. 2005. *Fredric Wertham and the Critique of Mass Culture*. Jackson. Miss.
- Beaver, H. 1999. "Homosexual Signs (*In Memory of Roland Barthes*)." In Cleto, F., ed. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 160-78. Orig. publ. 1981. *Critical Inquiry* 8: 99-119.
- Bellandi, F. 1974. "Naevolus Cliens." *Maia* 26: 279-99.
- Bellandi, F. 1980. *Etica diatribica e protesta sociale nelle Satire di Giovenale*. Bologna.
- Benjamin, J. 1988. *The Bonds of Love: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and the Problem of Domination*. New York.
- Bennett, C.E. 1901. *Horace: Odes and Epodes*. Repr. 1981. New Rochelle, N.Y.
- Bennett, C.E. 1914. *Horace: Odes and Epodes*. Loeb Classical Library. London and New York. Repr. 1919.
- Bentham, J. 1978. "Offences Against One's Self: Paederasty." *Journal of Homosexuality* 3: 389-405 and 4: 91-107. Ed. by Louis Crompton from a previously unpublished manuscript.
- Berger, P. L., and Luckmann, T. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Harmondsworth.
- Bergman, D. 1993. *Camp Grounds: Style and Homosexuality*. Amherst.
- Bergson, H. 1914. *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*. New York.
- Bernstein, M. 2000. *Controlling Hollywood: Censorship and Regulation in the Studio Era*. London.
- Bersani, L. 1987. "Is the Rectum a Grave?" *October* 43: 197-222.

- Bessone, F. 1995. "Medea's Response to Catullus: Ovid, *Heroides* 12.23-4 and Catullus 76.1-6." *Classical Quarterly* 45: 575-578.
- Bishop, J.D. 1976. "Juvenal 9.96, a Parody?" *Latomus* 35: 597.
- Boëls-Janssen, N. 1993. *La vie religieuse des matrones dans la Rome archaïque*. Rome.
- Bolgar, R. R. 1954. *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries*. Cambridge.
- Booth, M. 1983. *Camp*. London and New York.
- Booth, M. 1999. "Campe-Toi! On the Origins and Definitions of Camp." In Cleto, F., ed. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 66-79. Repr. from Booth 1983.
- Booth, M. 1983. *Camp*. London and New York.
- Bornstein, K. 1994. *Gender Outlaw*. New York.
- Boswell, J. 1934-64. *The Life of Samuel Johnson*. Six vols. Ed. George Birkbeck Hill. Rev. and enl. L.F. Powell. Oxford.
- Boswell, J. 1980. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*. Chicago and London.
- Bovie, P. 1967. "Hightet and the Classical Tradition." *Arion* 6: 98-115.
- Bradley, K. 1991. "Remarriage and the Structure of the Upper-Class Roman Family." In Rawson, B., ed. *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*. Oxford.
- Bradley, K. 2000. "Fictive Families. Family and Household in the Metamorphoses of Apuleius." *Phoenix* 54: 282-308.
- Braund, S. H. 1995. "A Woman's Voice? Laronia's Role in Juvenal Satire 2." In Levick, B and Hawley, R, eds. *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*. 207-19. London.
- Braund, S.H. 1982. "Anger and Indifference in Juvenal." Review of Bellandi 1980. *The Classical Review* 32: 169-170.
- Braund, S.H. 1988. *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge.
- Braund, S.H. 1992. "Juvenal--Misogynist or Misogamist?" *The Journal of Roman Studies* 82: 71-86.
- Braund, S.M., ed. 1996. *Juvenal Satires Book I*. Cambridge.
- Braund, S.M., ed. and trans. 2004a. *Juvenal and Persius*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- Braund, S.M. 2004b. "Libertas or Licentia? Freedom and Criticism in Roman Satire." In Sluiter, I. and Rosen, R.M. *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden. 409.428.

- Britton, A. 1999. "For Interpretation: Notes against Camp." In Cleto, F., ed. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 136-142. Orig. pub. in *Gay Left* 7 Winter 1978/79.
- Brown, P., and Levinson, S.C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge and New York.
- Brownmiller, S. 1993. *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*. New York. Orig. pub. 1975.
- Bryce, J. "Teaching the Classics." *The Classics Journal* 96: 323-334.
- Bryson, D. 2008. "The Submitted Body: Discursive and Masochistic Transformation of Masculinity in Simon Njami's African Gigolo." *Research in African Literatures* 39: 83-104.
- Butler, J. 1988. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal* 40: 519-531.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York.
- Butler, J. 1993a. "Critically Queer." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 1: 17-32.
- Butler, J. 1993b. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York.
- Byron, G.G. 1809. *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers. A Satire*. London.
- Cantarella, E. 1992. *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*. Trans. Cormac Ó Cuilleain. New Haven. (Orig. pub. *Secondo natura. La bisessualità nel mondo antico*, Rome, 1988)
- Carter, D. 2004. *Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution*. New York.
- Case, S. 1999: "Toward a Butch-Femme Aesthetic." 185-200. In Cleto, F., ed. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. Orig. pub. in *Discourse* 11 and repr. in Hart, L. 1989. *Making A Spectacle: Feminist Essays on Contemporary Women's Theatre*. Ann Arbor. 282-99.
- Cecchin, S. 1982. "Mollis Avarus: Personaggi e Temi nella IX Satira di Giovenale." *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino 2, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche* 116: 123-137.
- Chase, T. 1885. *Selections from the Satires of Juvenal: To Which Is Added the Fifth Satire of Persius*. Philadelphia.
- Chauncey, G., Jr. 1991. "Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion? Homosexual Identities and the Construction of Sexual Boundaries in the World War I Era." In Duberman, M.B., Vicinus, M., and Chauncey, G., Jr., eds. *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*. New York. 294-317. Orig. publ. 1985. *Journal of Social History* 19: 189-212.

- Chodorow, N. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley.
- Clarke, M.L. 1996. *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey*. London and New York. Orig. pub. 1953.
- Clausen, W.V. 1959. *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae*. Oxford and New York.
- Clay, D. 1998. "The Theory of the Literary Persona in Antiquity." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 40: 9-40.
- Cleto, F., ed. 1999. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor.
- Cohen, E. 1993. *Talk on the Wilde Side: Towards a Genealogy of a Discourse on Male Sexualities*. New York.
- Colton, R. 1991. *Juvenal's Use of Martial's Epigrams: A Study of Literary Influence*. Amsterdam.
- Connolly, J. 2005. "Border Wars: Literature, Politics, and the Public." *TAPA* 135: 103-34.
- Copley, F. O. 1956. *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. Madison.
- Corbett, A. 1908. *The Use of the Subjunctive in Juvenal (Thirteen Satires)*. Thesis (M.A.), Florida State College for Women.
- Core, P. 1984. *Camp: The Lie that Tells the Truth*. Ann Arbor.
- Courtney, E. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London.
- Cromwell, J. 1999. *Transmen and FTMs: Identities, Bodies, Genders, and Sexualities*. Urbana.
- Cull, N.J. 2001. "'Infamy! Infamy! They've All Got It in for Me!': *Carry On Cleo* and the British Camp Comedies of Ancient Rome." In Joshel, S.R., Malamud, M., McGuire, D.T. *Imperial Projections: Ancient Rome in Modern Popular Culture*. Baltimore. 162-190.
- Culler, J. 1982. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. Ithaca.
- Cyrino, M.S. 2005. *Big Screen Rome*. Malden, MA; Oxford; and Carlton, Australia.
- Damon, C. 1997. *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage*. Ann Arbor.
- Davidson, J. 2001. "Dover, Foucault and Greek Homosexuality: Penetration and the Truth of Sex." *Past and Present* 170: 3-51.
- Davidson, J. 2007. *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece*. London.
- Davidson, J. 2009. *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Bold New Exploration of the Ancient World*. New York. (U.S. edition of Davidson 2007.)
- de Beauvoir, S. 1989. *The Second Sex*. New York. Eng. trans. orig. pub. 1952.

- de Decker, J. 1913. *Juvenalis declamans: Étude sur la rhétorique déclamatoire dans les satires de Juvénal*. Ghent.
- de Jong, I. J. F. and Sullivan, J.P., eds. 1994. *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*. Lieden.
- de Lauretis, T. 1991. "Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities." Special issue of *differences* 3(2).
- Derrida, J. 1978. *Writing and Difference*. London. Orig. pub. 1967.
- Derrida, J. 1997. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore. Orig. pub. Eng. 1974, Fr. 1967.
- Dibdin, T.F. 1827. *An Introduction to the Knowledge of Rare and Valuable Editions of the Greek and Latin Classics*. London.
- Dill, S. 1905. *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*. New York.
- Dilley, P. 2002. "Lesbian and Gay Studies." In Forest, J.J.F. and Kinser, K., eds. *Higher Education in the United States: An Encyclopedia, Volume 1*. Santa Barbara. 395-7.
- Dollimore, J. 1988. "Different Desires: Subjectivity and Transgression in Wilde and Gide." *Genders* 2 24-41.
- Dollimore, J. 1991. *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault*. Oxford.
- Dollimore, J. 1999. "Post/modern: On the Gay Sensibility, or the Pervert's Revenge on Authenticity." In Cleto, F. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 221-236.
- Dover, K.J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*. London.
- Dover, K.J. 1988. "Expurgation of Greek Literature." In *The Greeks and Their Legacy: Collected Papers. Vol. 2*. Oxford. 270-291.
- Dover, K.J. 1994. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Indianapolis. Orig. pub. 1974.
- Duff, J. D. 1957. *D. Junii Juvenalis Saturae XIV: Fourteen Satires of Juvenal*. Orig. pub. 1898. London.
- Duncan, A. 2006. *Performance and Identity in the Classical World*. New York.
- Dyer, J. 1999. "It's Being So Camp as Keeps Us Going." In Cleto, F., ed. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 110-116. Orig. pub. in *Playguy*, 1976, and repr. in *The Body Politic Review Supplement* 10: 36, 1977.
- Dynes, W. 2005. "Light in Hellas: How German Classical Philology Engendered Gay Scholarship." *Journal of Homosexuality* 49: 341-56.
- Eagleton, T. 1996. *Literary Theory*. Second Edition. Minneapolis.
- Eagleton, T. 2003. *After Theory*. New York.

- Edwards, A.T. 2002. "Historicizing the Popular Grotesque: Bakhtin's Rabelais and His World and Attic Old Comedy." In Branham R.B. Ed. *Bakhtin and The Classics*. Evanston, IL. (Originally published 1993. In Scodel R. Ed. *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. Ann Arbor: 89-117.
- Edwards, C. 1996. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge.
- Edwards, C. 2002. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge. Orig. pub. 1993.
- Ellis, H. 2007 "Newman and Arnold: Classics, Christianity and Manliness in Tractarian Oxford." In Stray, C., ed. 2007. *Oxford Classics: Teaching and Learning, 1800-2000*. London. 46-63.
- Enders, N. 2000. "Juvenal." In Murphy, T.F. *Reader's Guide to Lesbian and Gay Studies*. Chicago and London.
- Escoffier, J. 2003. *Sexual Revolution*. New York.
- Evangelista, S. 2007. "Walter Pater's Teaching in Oxford: Classics and Aestheticism." In In Stray, C., ed. 2007. *Oxford Classics: Teaching and Learning, 1800-2000*. London. 64-77.
- Fantham, E. 1991. "Stuprum: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offenses in Republican Rome." *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views* 35: 267-91.
- Fantham, E. 2005. "Liberty and the People in Republican Rome." *TAPA* 135: 209-229.
- Farrell, J. 2001. *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge.
- Farrell, J. 2005. "Eduard Fraenkel on Horace and Servius, or Texts, Contexts, and the Field of 'Latin Studies.'" *TAPA* 135: 91-102.
- Feeney, D. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*. Cambridge.
- Feinberg, L. 1963. *The Satirist: His Temperament, Motivation, and Influence*. Ames, Iowa.
- Ferguson, J. 1979 *Juvenal: The Satires*. New York.
- Fetterley, J. 1978. *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington.
- Fisher, N. 2001. *Aeschines: Against Timarchos*. Clarendon Ancient History Series. Oxford; New York.
- Fitzgerald, W. 2000. *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination*. Cambridge.
- Fitzgerald, W. 2001. "Oppositions, Anxieties, and Ambiguities in the Toga Movies." In Joshel, S.R., Malamud, M., McGuire, D.T., eds. *Imperial Projections: Ancient Rome in Modern Popular Culture*. Baltimore. 23-49.

- Flood, M. 2008. "Men, Sex, and Homosociality: How Bonds between Men Shape Their Sexual Relations with Women." *Men and Masculinities* 10: 339-359.
- Fögen, T. 2000. "Zwei Satiren Juvenals: Anmerkungen zur Homosexualität in der römischen Antike." In *Forum Homosexualität und Literatur*. Siegen. 63-74.
- Fone, B. 2001. *Homophobia: A History*. New York. Orig. pub. 2000.
- Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York.
- Foucault, M. 1978. *The History of Sexuality, Vol 1: An Introduction* New York.
- Fowler, D. 2000. *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford.
- Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.
- Fredericks, S.C. 1971. "Rhetoric and Morality in Juvenal's 8th Satire." *TAPA* 102: 111-132.
- Fredericks, S.C. 1974. "Juvenal: A Return to Invective." In Ramage, E. S., Sigsbee, D. L., and Fredericks, S. C. *Roman Satirists and Their Satire: The Fine Art of Criticism in Ancient Rome*. Park Ridge, N.J.
- Fredericks, S.C. 1979. "Irony of Overstatement in the Satires of Juvenal." *ICS* 4: 178-91.
- Fredrick, D. "Titus Androgynous: Foul Mouths and Troubled Masculinity." *Arethusa* 41: 205-33.
- Freud, S. 1953. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. London.
- Freudenberg, K. 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge.
- Friedländer, L. 1895. *D. Junii Juvenalis Saturae*. Leipzig.
- Frier, B.W. 2004. "Roman Same-Sex Weddings from the Legal Perspective." *Classical Studies Newsletter* 10. Available at <http://www.umich.edu/~classics/news/newsletter/winter2004/weddings.html>. Accessed on December 29, 2009.
- Fulkerson, L. 2005. *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing, and Community in the Heroides*. New York.
- Furia, S. R. 2009. "Military Women: Navigating Complicated Gender Boundaries in the Pursuit of a Career in a Masculine Gendered Organization." UC Los Angeles, Thinking Gender Papers, UCLA Center for the Study of Women. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/12x1c3fj>.
- Fuss, D. 1989. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature & Difference*. New York.
- Fuss, D. 1991. *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories*. New York.

- Gantar, J. 2005. *The Pleasure of Fools: Essays in the Ethics of Laughter*. Montreal; Ithaca.
- Gardner, J. 1988. *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*. Oxford and New York.
- Garrido-Hory, M. 1997. "‘Puer’ et ‘minister’ chez Martial et Juvénal." In *Schiavi e dipendenti nell'ambito dell'oikos e della familia: atti del 22. Colloquio Girea: Pontignano (Siena), 19-20 novembre 1995*. Pisa.
- Gifford, W. 1836. *The Satires of Decimus Junius Juvenalis*. London.
- Gleason, M.W. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- Goldberg, J. 1994. *Queering the Renaissance*. Durham.
- Gowing, A.M. 2005. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge.
- Grady, H. 1996. *Shakespeare's Universal Wolf: Postmodernist Studies in Early Modern Reification*. New York.
- Graff, G. 1987. *Professing Literature: An Institutional History*. Chicago.
- Grazzini, S. 1997. "Ravola: un moralista impudico nella nona satira di Giovenale (Sat. IX 1-5)." *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 15: 99-115.
- Green, J. 2004. *Becoming a Visible Man*. Nashville.
- Green, P. 1967. *Juvenal: Sixteen Satires*. London.
- Green, P. 1989. "Juvenal Revisited." In *Classical Bearings: Interpreting Ancient History and Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Griffin, D.H. 1994. *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. Lexington, KY.
- Griffin, J. 1987. *Homer, Odyssey*. Cambridge, UK; New York.
- Guck, M.A. 1994. "A Woman's (Theoretical) Work." *Perspectives of New Music* 32: 28-43.
- Gunderson, E. 2000. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor.
- Gunderson, E. 2003. *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity: Authority and the Rhetorical Self*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York.
- Günsberg, M. 2005. "Heroic Bodies: The Cult of Masculinity in the Peplum." In *Italian Cinema: Gender and Genre*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York. 97-132.
- Habinek, T.N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature. Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- Habinek, T.N. 2005a. "Latin Literature between Text and Practice." *TAPA* 135: 83-89.

- Habinek, T.N. 2005b. *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*. Baltimore.
- Halberstam, J. 1998. *Female Masculinity*. Durham.
- Halberstam, J. 2005. *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives*. New York.
- Hall, V. 1950. *Life of Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558)*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new ser., v. 40, pt. 2. Philadelphia.
- Hallett, J.P. 1973. "The Role Of Women In Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism." *Arethusa* 6: 103-24.
- Hallett, J.P. and Skinner, M.B., eds. 1997. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton.
- Halperin, D.M. 1989. "Is There a History of Sexuality?" *History and Theory* 28: 257-274.
- Halperin, D.M. 1990. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love*. New York and London.
- Halperin, D.M. 2002. *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*. Chicago and London.
- Halperin, D.M., Winkler, J.J., and Zeitlin, F.I., eds. 1990. *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Princeton.
- Hardie, P. 1992. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA and London.
- Hardwick, L. 2003. *Reception Studies*. Greece & Rome, no. 33. Oxford.
- Hardwick, L., and Stray, C., eds. 2008. *A Companion to Classical Receptions*. Malden, MA.
- Hardy, E.G. 1883. *The Satires of Juvenal*. London.
- Hark, I.R. 1993. "Animals or Romans: Looking at Masculinity in *Spartacus*." In Cohan, S. and Hark, I.R., eds. *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. London and New York. 151-72.
- Harvey, K. 2000. "Translating Camp Talk: Gay Identities and Cultural Transfer." In Venuti, L., ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York. 446-67. Orig. pub. 1998 in *The Translator* 4: 295-320.
- Henderson, Jeffrey. 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. New York. Orig. pub. 1975.
- Henderson, John. 1989. "Satire Writes 'Woman': Gendersong." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 215: 50-80. Repr. in Henderson 1999.
- Henderson, John. 1999. *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and other Offences in Latin Poetry*. Oxford and New York.

- Hendry, M. 1999. "Excluded Husband and Two-Legged Ass: Two Problems in Juvenal 9." *Echós du Monde Classique* 18: 85-90.
- Henry, A. 2004. *Not My Mother's Sister: Generational Conflict and Third-Wave Feminism*. Bloomington.
- Highet, G. 1941. "Petronius the Moralist." *TAPA* 72: 176-94.
- Highet, G. 1949. *The Classical Tradition; Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*. New York.
- Highet, G. 1954. *Juvenal the Satirist, A Study*. Oxford.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hinds, S. 2005. "Defamiliarizing Latin Literature, from Petrarch to Pulp Fiction." *TAPA* 135: 49-81.
- Hinshelwood, R.D. 1991. *A Dictionary of Kleinian Thought*. 2nd ed. Northvale, N.J.
- Holub, R. C. 1984. *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*. London.
- Holub, R. C. 1992. *Crossing Borders: Reception Theory, Poststructuralism, Deconstruction*. Madison, Wis.
- hooks, b. 1992. *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Cambridge, MA.
- Hooley, D.M. 2007. *Roman Satire*. Malden, MA.
- Houghton Mifflin Company. 2007. *The American Heritage Dictionary*. Boston.
- Housman, A.E. 1931. "Praefanda." *Hermes* 66: 404-12.
- Howsam, L., Stray, C., Jenkins, A., Secord, J., and Vaninskaya, A. 2007. "What the Victorians Learned: Perspectives on Nineteenth-Century Schoolbooks." *Journal of Victorian Culture* 12: 262-285.
- Hubbard, T. 2003. *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Hunter, R. 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. Cambridge.
- Hutcheon, L. 2002. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. Second Edition. New York.
- Ihm, S. 2000. "Quantum milvi volant—Der Milan als Landvermesser." *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 3: 47-53.
- Iser, W. 1974. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore. Germ. orig. 1972.
- Iser, W. 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore. Germ. orig. 1976.

- Isherwood, C. 1954. *The World in the Evening*. London.
- Jachman, G. 1943. "Studien zu Juvenal." In *Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse*. 187-266.
- Jackson, P.A. 2009. "Capitalism And Global Queering: National Markets, Parallels among Sexual Cultures, and Multiple Queer Modernities." *GLQ* 15: 357-395.
- Jagose, A. 1996. *Queer Theory: An introduction*. New York.
- Jahn, O. 1851. *D. Iunii Iuuenalis Saturarum Libri V*. Berlin.
- James, S. L. 2003. *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*. Berkeley.
- James, S.L. 2001. "The Economics of Roman Elegy: Voluntary Poverty, the Recusatio, and the Greedy Girl." *AJP* 122: 223-53.
- Jauss, H. R. 1982. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis.
- Jones, S.E. 1993. "Intertextual Influences in Byron's Juvenalian Satire." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 33: 771-783.
- Joshel, S.R., Malamud, M., McGuire, D.T., eds. 2001. *Imperial Projections: Ancient Rome in Modern Popular Culture*. Baltimore.
- Kallendorf, C. 2007. *A Companion to the Classical Tradition*. Malden, MA.
- Karras, R.M. 2000. "Active/Passive, Acts/Passions: Greek and Roman Sexualities." *The American Historical Review* 105: 1250-1265.
- Kaster, R.A. 2005. *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*. Oxford and New York.
- Keith, A.M. 2000. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge.
- Kennedy, D.F. 1992. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. Cambridge.
- Kennedy, G.A. 2003. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Leiden.
- Kernan, A.B. 1959. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*. New Haven.
- Klineberg, O. 1964. "Interracial Relations." *Encyclopedia Britannica* 12: 534B.
- Koestenbaum, W. 1996. "Wilde's Hard Labor and the Birth of Gay Reading." In Feedman, J., ed. *Oscar Wilde: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Upper Saddle River, NJ. 234-247.
- Koktvedgaard Zeitzen M.K. 2008. *Polygamy: A Cross-Cultural Analysis*. Oxford and New York.
- Konstan, D. 1993. "Sexuality and Power in Juvenal's Second Satire." *LCM* 18: 12-14.

- Konstan, D. 1995. "Patrons and Friends." *Classical Philology* 90: 328-342.
- Konstan, D. 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. Toronto.
- Kramer, L. 2009. "Queer Theory's Heist of Our History." *The Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide*. 11-13.
- Kristeva, J. 1982. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. New York.
- Lacan, J. 2004. *Écrits: A Selection*. New York and London. Orig. French pub. 1966.
- LaFleur, R.A. 1975. "Amicus and Amicitia in Juvenal." *The Classical Bulletin* 51: 54-8.
- LaFleur, R.A. 1979. "Amicitia and the Unity of Juvenal's First Book." *Illinois Classical Studies* 4: 158-77.
- LaFleur, R.A. 1984. Review (untitled) of *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* by E. Courtney and *Juvenal: The Satires* by John Ferguson. *CJ* 79: 257-262.
- Langlands, R. 2006. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.
- Larmour, D. H. 1991. "Juvenal, Ideology and the Critics: A Plan for Resisting Readers." *Pacific Coast Philology* 26: 41-50.
- Lathrope, A. E. 1911. *Juvenal and Social Life of the Roman People as Portrayed in Thirteen Satires*. Honors thesis (B.A. in Latin), State College of Washington.
- Leeper, A. 1882. *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*. London.
- Leff, L.J. and Simmons, J. 2001. *The Dame in the Kimono: Hollywood, Censorship, and the Production Code*. Lexington, KY.
- Lelièvre, F.J. 1958. "Parody in Juvenal and T. S. Eliot." *Classical Philology* 53: 22-26.
- Lewis, J.D. 1882. *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Satirae*. New York. Second Edition.
- Liddell, H.G., and Scott, R. 1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.
- Lifson, A. 2009. "BEN-HUR: The Book That Shook the World." *Humanities* 30: 15-19.
- Lilja, S. 1983. *Homosexuality in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Helsinki.
- Lively, G. 1999. "Reading Resistance in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In Hardie, P., Barchiesi, A. and Hinds, S., eds. *Ovidian Transformation: Essays on the Metamorphoses and Its Receptions*. Cambridge.
- Loades, D.M. 1974. "The Theory and Practice of Censorship in Sixteenth-Century England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fifth Series* 24: 141-57.
- Louis, P. 2006. *Ancient Rome at Work: An Economic History of Rome from the Origins to the Empire*. Abingdon, Oxon. Orig. pub. 1927.
- Macaulay, T.B. 1853. "Croker's Edition of Boswell's Life of Johnson." In *Critical, Historical, and Miscellaneous Essays and Poems*. Philadelphia: 135-151.

- Mack, M. 1951. "The Muse of Satire." *Yale Review* 41: 80-92.
- MacLeane, A. J. 1867. *Decimi Junii Juvenalis et A. Persii Flacci Satirae. With a Commentary*. London.
- Madan, M. 1829. *Juvenal and Persius*. London.
- Manley, L. 1995. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne.
- Marmorale, E. V. 1938. *Giovenale*. Naples.
- Martindale, C. 1993. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge.
- Martindale, C., and Hopkins, D. 2009. *Horace Made New: Horatian Influences on British Writing from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, UK.
- Martindale, C., and Thomas, R. F., eds. 2006. *Classics and the Uses of Reception*. Malden, MA.
- Martyn, J.R.C. 1979. "Juvenal's Wit." *Grazer Beiträge* 8: 219-238.
- Mason, A. H. 1962. "Is Juvenal a Classic?" *Arion* 1: 8-44; 2: 39-79. Reprinted in *Critical Essays on Roman Satire*, ed. J.P. Sullivan (London 1963) 93-176.
- Mayer, R. 1983. "The Civil Status of Corydon." *Classical Quarterly* 33: 298-300.
- Mayor, J.E.B. 1866. *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*. 4th ed., rev. London.
- McGinn, T.A.J. 2003. *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*. Second Edition. New York. Orig. pub. 1998.
- McKenna, N. *The Secret Life of Oscar Wilde*. New York.
- McManus, B.F. 1997. *Classics and Feminism: Gendering the Classics*. New York.
- McPherson, D. 1981. "Roman Comedy in Renaissance Education: The Moral Question." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 12: 19-30.
- Meyer, M. 1994. *The Politics and Poetics of Camp*. London and New York.
- Meyer-Zwiffelhofer, E. 1995. *Im Zeichen des Phallos: Die Ordnung des Geschlechtslebens im antiken Rom*. Frankfurt.
- Middleton, J.H. 1892. *The Remains of Ancient Rome*. Vol. 2. London and Edinburgh.
- Miller, P.A. 1998. "The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility." *Arethusa* 31.3: 257-283.
- Miller, P.A. 2004. *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton.

- Miller, P.A. 2004. "Beyond the Pleasure Principle in Horace Satires 1.2," Paper presented at the 2004 meeting of the American Philological Association. San Francisco, CA. January 3, 2004. Abstract available at <http://www.apaclassics.org/AnnualMeeting/04mtg/abstracts/miller.html>. Accessed on October 17, 2009.
- Miller, P.A. and Platter, C. 1999. "Introduction." Special Issue on Power, Politics, and Discourse in Augustan Elegy. *Classical World* 92: 403-7.
- Montefiore, J. 1987. *Feminism and Poetry: Language, Experience, Identity in Women's Writing*. London and New York.
- Morreall, J. 1983. *Taking Laughter Seriously*. Albany.
- Muñoz, J.E. 1999. *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics*. Minneapolis.
- Morgan, T. 2003. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge, UK and New York.
- Murray, S.O. 1979. "The Art of Gay Insulting." *Anthropological Linguistics* 21: 211-23.
- Murray, S.O. and Roscoe, W. 2001. *Boy-Wives and Female Husbands: Studies of African Homosexualities*. New York. Orig. pub. 1998.
- Mynors, R.A.B. 1958. *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*. Oxford.
- Namaste, V. K. 2000. *Invisible Lives: The Erasure of Transsexual and Transgendered People*. Chicago.
- Nappa, C. 2005. "Purchasing Manhood: Status and Virility in Juvenal's Ninth Satire." Paper delivered at the 101st Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. Madison, Wis. March 30-April 2.
- Nappa, C. 2008. "Juvenal's Eunuchs: Masculinity and Exclusion in the Sixth Satire." Paper delivered at the 104th Annual Meeting Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. Tucson, Ariz. April 16-19, 2008.
- Nettleship, R.L. 1880. "The Theory of Education in the *Republic* of Plato." In Abbott, E., ed. *Hellenica: A Collection of Essays on Greek Poetry, Philosophy, History, and Religion*. Oxford and Cambridge. 61-165.
- Newton, E. 1979. *Mother Camp: Female Impersonators in America*. Chicago. Orig. pub. 1972.
- Newton, E. 1999. "Role Models." In Cleto, F., ed. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 96-109. Repr. from Newton 1979.
- Nisard, D. 1834. *Études de moeurs et de critique sur les poètes latins de la décadence*. Paris.
- Niżyńska, J. 2001. "Marsyas's Howl: The Myth of Marsyas in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Zbigniew Herbert's 'Apollo and Marsyas.'" *Comparative Literature* 53: 151-69.

- Nussbaum, M. 2010. Foreword to Williams 2010.
- Nyberg, A.K. 1998. *Seal of Approval: The History of the Comics Code*. Jackson, Miss.
- O'Hara, J.J. 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*. Cambridge.
- Oliensis, E. 2009. *Freud's Rome. Psychoanalysis and Latin Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Ormand, K. 2008. *Controlling Desires: Sexuality in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Westport, Conn.
- Owen, S.G. 1924. *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*. Second edition; first published 1903. London.
- Parker, H.N. 1997. "The Teratogenic Grid." In Hallett, J.P. and Skinner, M.B., eds. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton. 47-65.
- Peacock, T.L. 1896. *Melincourt, or Sir Oran Haut-Ton*. London.
- Pearson, C. H., & Strong, H. A. 1887. *D. Junii Juvenalis Satirae XIII: Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*. Oxford.
- Perrin, N. 1969. *Dr. Bowdler's Legacy: A History of Expurgated Books in England and America*. New York.
- Peter, J.D. 1969. *Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature*. Folcroft, PA.
- Pharr, S. 1997. *Homophobia: A Weapon of Sexism*. Berkeley. Orig. pub. 1988.
- Platner, S.B. 1929. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London.
- Plaza, M. 2006. *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying*. Oxford.
- Prosser, J. 1998. *Second Skins: The Body Narratives of Transsexuality*. New York.
- Pryor, A.D. 1965. "Experiment and Sympathy in Juvenal 9." In *Aulla. Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of the Australasian Universities' Languages and Literature Association, Melbourne 19-26 August 1964*. Ed. Adams, M. M. 33-34.
- Purdie, S. 1993. *Comedy: The Mastery of Discourse*. Toronto; Buffalo.
- Rabinowitz, N.S., and Auanger, L., eds. 2002. *Among Women: From the Homosocial to the Homoerotic in the Ancient World*. Austin.
- Ramsay, G.G. 1965. *Juvenal and Persius*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. and London. Orig. pub. 1918.
- Ransom, J. C. 1941. *The New Criticism*. Norfolk, Conn.
- Reay, B. 2010. *New York Hustlers: Masculinity and Sex in Modern America*. Manchester.
- Reekmans, T. 1971. "Juvenal's Views on Social Change." *Ancient Society* 2: 117-61.

- Rich, A. 1980. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." *Signs* 5(4): 631-660.
- Rich, A. C. 1986. *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose, 1979-1985*. New York.
- Richardson, L. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.
- Richlin, A. 1992a. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. Oxford. Rev. ed. Orig. pub. 1983.
- Richlin, A., ed. 1992b. *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. New York.
- Richlin, A. 1992c. "Reading Ovid's Rapes." In Richlin 1992b. 158-79.
- Richlin, A. 1993a. "Not before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the Cinaedus and the Roman Law against Love between Men." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3: 523-573.
- Richlin, A. 1993b. "The Ethnographer's Dilemma and the Dream of a Lost Golden Age." In Rabinowitz, N.S. and Richlin, A., eds. *Feminist Theory and the Classics*. Ann Arbor. 272-303.
- Richlin, A. 2006a. *Marcus Aurelius in Love*. Chicago.
- Richlin, A. 2006b. "Fronto + Marcus: Love, Friendship, Letters." In Kuefler, M., ed. *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*. Chicago. 111-129.
- Ricoeur, P. 1970. *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. New Haven.
- Ricoeur, P. 1981. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action, and Interpretation*. Cambridge.
- Risman, B and Schwartz, P. 1988. "Sociological Research on Male and Female Homosexuality." *Annual Review of Sociology* 14: 125-47.
- Robert, J-N. 1997. *Eros romain: Sexe et morale dans l'ancienne Rome*. Paris.
- Roberts, D.H. 2008. "Translation and the 'Surreptitious Classic': Obscenity and Translatability." In Lianeri, A., and Zajko, V., eds. *Translation and the Classic: Identity as Change in the History of Culture*. Oxford.
- Robertson, G. 1979. *Obscenity: An Account of Censorship Laws and Their Enforcement in England and Wales*. London.
- Robertson, P. 1996. *Guilty Pleasures: Feminist Camp from Mae West to Madonna*. Durham, NC.
- Robertson, P. 1999. "Mae West's Maids: Race, "Authenticity", and the Discourse of Camp." In Cleto, F., ed. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 393-408. Repr. from Robertson 1996.
- Romano, A.C. 1979. *Irony in Juvenal*. Hildesheim and New York.
- Rosen, R.M. 2007. *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. New York.

- Rosen, R.M. and Baines, V. 2002. "I Am Whatever You Say I Am: Satiric Program in Juvenal and Eminem." *Classical and Modern Literature* 22: 103-27.
- Rubin, G. 1975. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." In Reiter, R.R., ed. *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. New York. 157-210.
- Rubin, G. 1984. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality." In Vance, C.S., ed. *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. Boston. 267-319.
- Rubin, L.D., Jr. 1974. "Susan Sontag and the Camp Followers." *Sewanee Review* 82: 503-10.
- Russo, V. 1987. *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality and the Movies*. Revised Edition. Orig. pub. 1981. New York.
- Salanitro, N. 1944. *Introduzione a Giovenale*. Naples.
- Salanitro, N. 1948. *Gli epigrammi di Marziale a Giovenale*. Naples.
- Saller, R. 1983. "The Meaning of *Faenus* in Juvenal's Ninth *Satire*." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 29: 72-76.
- Saller, R.P. 1984. "Familia, Domus and the Roman Concept of the Family." *Phoenix* 38: 336-55.
- Saller, R.P. 1994. *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York.
- Saller, R.P. 2002. *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*. Cambridge, UK and New York.
- Sandars, T.C. 1917. *The Institutes of Justinian*. London.
- Sanford, E.M. 1948. "Renaissance Commentaries on Juvenal." *TAPA* 79: 92-112.
- Sarkar, A.K. 1967. *The Law and Obscenity*. Bombay.
- Scarpetta, G, Houdebine, J.L, and Derrida, J. 1972. "Positions: Interview/Jacques Derrida." *Diacritics* 2: 35-43.
- Schertz, P.J.M. 2002. "Marsyas Augur: A Plebeian Augur in the Time of Sulla?" *American Journal of Archaeology* 106: 270-1.
- Schmitz, C. 2000. *Das Satirische in Juvenals Satiren*. Berlin.
- Schmitz, T.A. 2007. *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction*. Malden, MA.
- Schneider, D.M. 1984. *A Critique of the Study of Kinship*. Ann Arbor.
- Schneiderman, J. 2009. "In Defense of Queer Theory." *The Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide* 11-15.
- Scott, I.G. 1927. *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal*. Northampton, Mass.

- Searle, J. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. London.
- Sedgwick, E.K. 1985. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York and Chichester, West Sussex.
- Sedgwick, E.K. 1990. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley. Updated ed. 2008.
- Sedgwick, E.K. 1993a. "Queer Performativity." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 1: 1-16.
- Sedgwick, E.K. 1993b. "How to Bring Your Kids Up Gay." In Warner, M., ed. 1993. *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. Minneapolis.
- Sedgwick, E.K. 1993c. *Tendencies*. Durham, NC.
- Sedgwick, E.K. 2003. *Touching Feeling*. Durham and London.
- Sedgwick, E.K., ed. 1997. *Novel Gazing: Queer Readings in Fiction*. Durham & London.
- Seidman, S. 1993. "Identity and Politics in a 'Postmodern' Gay Culture: Some Historical and Conceptual Notes." In Warner, M., ed. 1993. *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. Minneapolis.
- Selden, D. 1992. "Caveat Lector: Catullus and the Rhetoric of Performance." In Hexter R. and Selden, D., eds. *Innovations of Antiquity*. New York. 461-512.
- Serafini, A. 1957. *Studio sulla Satira di Giovenale*. Florence.
- Shapiro, S. 2002. "Of Mollies: Class and Same-Sex Sexualities in the Eighteenth Century." In Chedgzoy, K., Francis, E., and Pratt, M., eds. " *In a Queer Place: Sexuality and Belonging in British and European Contexts*. Burlington, Vt. 155-76.
- Shugart, H.A., and Waggoner, C.E. *Making Camp: Rhetorics of Transgression in U.S. Popular Culture*. Tuscaloosa.
- Simcox, G.A. 1873. *Satirae XIII = Thirteen satires of Juvenal*. London.
- Sinfield, A. 1983. "Four Ways with a Reactionary Text." *LTP: Journal of Literature Teaching Politics* 2: 81-95.
- Sinfield, A. 1992. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Oxford.
- Sinfield, A. 1994. *The Wilde Century: Effeminacy, Oscar Wilde, and the Queer Movement*. New York and Chichester, West Sussex.
- Sinfield, A. 2005. *Cultural Politics--Queer Reading*. Philadelphia.
- Skinner, M.B. 2001. "Zeus and Leda: The Sexuality Wars in Contemporary Classical Scholarship." *Diotima: Materials for the Study of Women and Gender in the Ancient World*. Ross Scaife. Stoa Consortium. <http://www.stoa.org/hopper/text.jsp?doc=Stoa:text:2002.01.0006>. Orig. pub. 1996 in *Thamyris* 3: 103-23.
- Skinner, M.B. 2005. *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*. Malden, MA.

- Small, J. P. 1982. *Cacus and Marsyas in Etrusco-Roman Legend*. Princeton.
- Smith, C. 2000. "Worshipping Mater Matuta: Ritual and Context." in Bispham, E and Smith, C., eds. *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy: Evidence and Experience*. Edinburgh and Chicago.
- Solomon, J. 2001. *The Ancient World in the Cinema*. New Haven.
- Sontag, S. 1966. *Against Interpretation, and Other Essays*. New York.
- Sontag, S. 1999. "Notes on 'Camp.'" In Cleto, F. *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject*. Ann Arbor. 53-65. Orig. publ. 1964. *Partisan Review* 31(4): 515-30.
- Soulen, R.N. and Soulen, R.K. 2001. *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*. Louisville.
- Spisak, A.L. 2007. *Martial: A Social Guide*. Ann Arbor.
- Stein, E., ed. 1992. *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and the Social Constructionist Controversy*. New York. Orig. pub. 1990.
- Stocker, C.W. 1839. *The Satires of Juvenal and Persius*. London. Orig. pub. 1835.
- Stray, C. 1998. *Classics Transformed: Schools, Universities, and Society in England, 1830-1960*. Oxford.
- Stray, C.A. 1996. "Culture and Discipline: Classics and Society in Victorian England." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 3: 77-85.
- Stryker, S. and Whittle, S., eds. 2006. *The Transgender Studies Reader*. New York.
- Sturgis, J.W. 1916. *The Second Person Singular of the Latin Future Indicative as an Imperative*. Norman, Okla.
- Sullivan, J.P. 1967. "Petronius: Artist or Moralist?" *Arion* 6: 71-88.
- Sullivan, J.P. 2001. "The Social Ambiance of Petronius' *Satyricon* and *Fellini Satyricon*." In Winkler, M.M., ed. *Classical Myth & Culture in the Cinema*. New York. 258-71.
- Sussman, L. 1978. *The Elder Seneca*. Leiden.
- Taylor, C. 2004. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham, NC.
- Taylor, R. 1997. "Two Pathic Subcultures in Ancient Rome." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 7: 319-71.
- Tennant, P. 2003. "Queering the Patron's Pitch: The Real Satirical Target of Juvenal's Ninth Satire." In Basson, A.F. and W.J. Dominick, eds. *Literature, Art, History: Studies on Classical Antiquity and Tradition*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Thomas, D. 1969. *A Long Time Burning: The History of Literary Censorship in England*. New York.
- Thomas, R.F. 2001. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge.

- Tong, R. 2009. *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction*. Third Edition. Boulder.
- Too, Y.L. and Livingstone, N., eds. 1998. *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning*. Cambridge.
- Treggiari, S. 1991. *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. New York. Repr. 2002.
- Trumbach, R. 1978. *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*. Studies in Social Discontinuity. New York.
- Trumbach, R. 1989. "The Birth of the Queen: Sodomy and the Emergence of Gender Equality in Modern Culture, 1660-1750." In Duberman, M.B., Vicinus, M., and Chauncey, Jr., G., eds. *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*. New York. 129-40.
- Trumbach, R. 1998. *Sex and the Gender Revolution: Vol 1, Heterosexuality and the Third Gender in Enlightenment London*. Chicago.
- University of Chicago, The. *Theories of Media Keywords Glossary*. Online resource. <http://csmt.uchicago.edu/glossary2004/navigation.htm>
- Usher, M.D. 2002. "Satyr Play in Plato's *Symposium*." *American Journal of Philology* 123: 205-28.
- Van Sickle, J. 1987. "'Shepherd Slave': Civil Status & Bucolic Conceit in Virgil, 'Eclogue' 2." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 27: 127-129.
- Veyne, P. 1961. "Le Marsyas 'coloniel' et l'indépendance des cités." *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 35: 87-98.
- Veyne, P. 1978. "La famille et l'amour sous le haut-empire romain." *Annales (E.S.C.)* 33: 35-63.
- Veyne, P. 1985. "Homosexuality in Ancient Rome." In Ariès, P. and Béjin, A., eds. *Western Sexuality: Practice and Precept in Past and Present Times*. Trans. Anthony Forster. Oxford. 26-35.
- Wallace, L. 1922. *Ben-Hur: A Tale of the Christ*. New York. Orig. pub. 1880.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A., ed. 1989. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London and New York.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1991. "Houses and Households: Sampling Pompeii and Herculaneum." In Rawson, B., ed. *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*. Oxford.
- Walsh, P.G. 1974. "Was Petronius a Moralist?" *Greece & Rome* 21: 181-90.

- Walters, J. 1997. "Invading the Roman Body: Manliness and Impenetrability in Roman Thought." In Hallett, J.P. and Skinner, M.B., eds. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton. 29-43.
- Walters, J. 1998. "Making a Spectacle: Deviant Men, Invective, and Pleasure." *Arethusa* 31: 355-367.
- Warner, M. 1993., ed. *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. Minneapolis.
- Watson, L. and Watson, P.A., eds. *Martial: Select Epigrams*. Cambridge, U.K.
- Watts, W.J. 1972. "A Literary Reminiscence in Juvenal, IX, 96." *Latomus* 31: 519-520.
- Weidner, A. 1873. *D. Junii Juvenalis Saturae*. Leipzig.
- Weinbrot, H. D. 1988. *Eighteenth-Century Satire: Essays on Text and Context from Dryden to Peter Pindar*. Cambridge, UK.
- Welshman, J. 2006. *Underclass: A History of the Excluded 1880-2000*. London and New York.
- Wessner, P. 1967. *Scholia in Iuvenalem Vetustiora*. Stuttgart.
- Weston, K. 1991. *Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, and Kinship*. New York.
- Whistler, J.M. 1888. "Ten O'clock." New York. 1908 printing.
- White, E. 1988. *The Beautiful Room Is Empty*. London.
- White, P. 2005. "Poets in the New Milieu: Realigning." In Galinsky, K, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. New York. 321-39.
- Wiesen, D.S. 1963. "Juvenal's Moral Character, an Introduction." *Latomus* 22: 440-71.
- Wiesen, D.S. 1975. "Juvenal and the Blacks." *Classica et Mediaevalia Kobenhavn* 31: 132-150.
- Wiesen, D.S. 1989. "The Verbal Basis of Juvenal's Satiric Vision." *ANRW* II.33.1: 708-733.
- Wigmore, J.H. 1912. *Select Cases on the Law of Torts*. In 2 vols. Boston.
- Wilde, O. 1909. *Epigrams: Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young*. Boston and New York.
- Wilkinson, L.P. 1946. *Horace and His Lyric Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Williams, C.A. 1997. Review of Braund, S.M. 1996 in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 97.7.9.
- Williams, C.A. 1998. Review of Hallett, J.P. and Skinner, M.B. 1997. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 98.10.16.

- Williams, C.A. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Williams, C.A. 2004. *Martial Epigrams Book Two*. Oxford.
- Williams, C.A. 2009. Review of Langlands, R. 2006. *Classical World* 102: 341-342.
- Williams, C.A. 2010. *Roman Homosexuality*. Second Edition. Oxford.
- Williams, R. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford.
- Williams, R. 1980. *Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays*. London.
- Wilson, H.L. 1903. *D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturarum Libri V*. New York.
- Wilson, K. M. and Makowski, E. M. 1990. *Wykked Wyves and the Woes of Marriage: Misogamous Literature from Juvenal to Chaucer*. Albany.
- Wimsatt, W.K. and M.C. Beardsley. 1946. "The Intentional Fallacy." *Sewanee Review* 54: 468-488. Revised and republished in Wimsatt, W. K. 1954. *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. Lexington, KY.
- Winkler, J.J. 1990. *The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York and London.
- Winkler, M.M. 1983. *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal*. Hildesheim.
- Wiseman, 1988. "Satyrs in Rome? The Background to Horace's *Ars Poetica*." *Journal of Roman Studies* 78: 1-13.
- Wooten, C. 1984. "Petronius and 'Camp.'" *Helios* 11: 133-9.
- Wright, H.P. 1901. *Juvenal*. Boston and London.
- Wyke, M. 1997. *Projecting the Past: Ancient Rome, Cinema, and History*. New York and London.
- Wyke, M. 2001. "Shared Sexualities: Roman Soldiers, Derek Jarman's *Sebastiane*, and British Homosexuality." In Joshel, S.R., Malamud, M., McGuire, D.T., eds. *Imperial Projections: Ancient Rome in Modern Popular Culture*. Baltimore. 229-248.
- Wyss, E. 1996. *The Myth of Apollo and Marsyas in the Art of the Italian Renaissance: An Inquiry into the Meaning of Images*. Cranbury, NJ; London; Mississauga, Ontario.
- Zeitlin, F.I. 1971. "Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity." *TAPA* 102: 631-84.
- Žižek, S. 2006. *How to Read Lacan*. New York and London.