



3 1761 05057137 1

PA
6448
T7
1912
c. 1
ROBA



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

JUVENAL AND THE ROMAN EMPERORS

THE EVIDENCE IN HIS SATIRES COMPARED
WITH THAT IN THE EXTANT WORKS OF
CONTEMPORARY HISTORIANS

BY

HELEN BELL TRIMBLE, A.M.

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA IN PARTIAL FUL-
FILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

1912

TO
MY DEAR PARENTS.

PREFACE.

I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to the University of Pennsylvania for the award of the Frances Sergeant Pepper Memorial Fellowship, 1910-1912. My grateful appreciation for kindly interest and encouragement, for helpful criticisms and careful proof-reading, I wish to express to my friends, Professors J. C. Rolfe and W. B. McDaniel, Assistant Professors R. G. Kent and G. D. Hadzits, and Dr. E. S. McCartney, of the University of Pennsylvania.

H. B. T.

CONTENTS.

I.	INTRODUCTION: SATIRE AND HISTORY.....	1
II.	JULIUS CAESAR.....	9
III.	AUGUSTUS.....	14
IV.	TIBERIUS.....	19
V.	CALIGULA.....	27
VI.	CLAUDIUS.....	31
VII.	NERO.....	42
VIII.	GALBA.....	59
IX.	OTHO.....	65
X.	DOMITIAN.....	72
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	78
	TABLE OF PASSAGES COMPARED.....	80

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

THE ANCIENT AUTHORITIES.

- JUVENAL. *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturarum Libri V*: recensuit Ludwig Friedlaender, 2 vol. Leipzig, 1895.
Thirteen Satires with a commentary by J. E. B. Mayor, 2 vol. New York, 1893.
D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturarum Libri V cum scholiis veteribus: recensuit Otto Iahn, Berlin, 1851.
- SUETONIUS. *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Opera*, I, *De Vita Caesarum Libri VIII*: recensuit Maximilianus Ihm, Leipzig, editio maior, 1907; editio minor, 1908.
- TACITUS. *Cornelii Taciti Annalium ab excessu divi Augusti Libri*: recognovit C. D. Fisher, Oxford, 1906.
Cornelii Taciti Historiarum Libri: recognovit C. D. Fisher, Oxford, 1910.
- VELLEIUS PATERCULUS. *Veleii Paterculi ad M. Vinicium Libri duo*: edidit Robinson Ellis, Oxford, 1898.
- VALERIUS MAXIMUS. *Valerii Maximi Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium Libri Novem cum Iulii Paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani Epitomis*: iterum recensuit Carolus Kempf, Leipzig, 1888.
- PLUTARCH. *Plutarchi Vitae inter se comparatae*: edidit Immanuel Bekker, editio stereotypa, Tauchnitz, Leipzig, 1855.
- H. PETER. *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig, 1883.

MODERN AUTHORITIES.

- W. T. ARNOLD. *Studies of Roman Imperialism*, Manchester, 1906.
- W. W. CAPES. *Roman History: the Early Empire from the assassination of Julius Caesar to that of Domitian*, New York, 1893.
- W. VON CHRIST. *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, 5 Auflage, München, 1911.

- O. CLASON. Tacitus und Sueton, eine vergleichende Untersuchung mit Rücksicht auf die beiderseitigen Quellen, Breslau, 1870.
- J. DE DECKER. À propos d'une épigramme contre Néron, Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique, II/III (1910), 124-132.
- W. DENNISON. The Epigraphic Sources of the Writings of Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, A. J. A. Second Series, II (1898), 26-70.
- J. DÜRR. Das Leben Juvenals, Prog. Ulm, 1888.
Die Zeitgeschichtlichen Beziehungen in den Satiren Juvenals, Prog. Cannstatt, 1902.
- G. FERRERO. Characters and Events of Roman History from Caesar to Nero, the Lowell Lectures of 1908, trans. by Frances Lance Ferrero, New York and London, 1909.
The Women of the Caesars, New York, 1911.
- L. FRIEDLAENDER. Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine, 2 vol. Leipzig, 1901. (Preferred to 7th ed. because of references.)
- J. A. FROUDE. Caesar, a Sketch, New York, 1879.
- O. HAENIKE. Kritische Untersuchung über die Echtheit der 12. Satire von Juvenal, Prog. Putbus, 1877.
- B. W. HENDERSON. The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero, London, 1903.
- G. L. HENDRICKSON. Satura, the Genesis of a Literary Form, C. P. VI (1911), 129-143.
- A. KRAUSE. De C. Suetonii Tranquilli Fontibus et Auctoritate, Berlin, 1831.
- L. KRAUSS. De Vitarum Imperatoris Othonis Fide Quaestiones, Prog. Zweibrücken, 1880.
- H. LEHMANN. Claudius und Nero und ihre Zeit, Bd. I: Claudius und seine Zeit, Gotha, 1858.
- U. LINNERT. Beiträge zur Geschichte Caligulas, Jena Dissertation, Nürnberg, 1909.
- A. MACÉ. Essai sur Suétone, Paris, 1900.
- C. MARTHA. Les Moralistes sous l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1866.
- C. MERIVALE. History of the Romans under the Empire, 7 vol. New York, 1892.

- TH. MOMMSEN. Étude sur Pline le Jeune, trans. by C. Morel, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, XV, 1873.
The History of Rome, trans. by Wm. P. Dickson, New York, 1900.
- NAPOLÉON III. Histoire de Jules César, 2 vol. New York, 1865.
- H. NETTLESHIP. Lectures and Essays, second series, Oxford, 1895.
- H. NISSEN. Die litterarische Bedeutung des Monumentum Ancyranum, Rh. M. XLI (1886), 481-499.
- H. F. PELHAM. The Early Roman Emperors, Quarterly Review, CCII (1905), 521-545.
- G. PINZGER. De versibus spuris et male suspectis in Iuvenalis Satiris, Breslau, 1827.
- F. PLÉSSIS. La Poésie latine, Paris, 1909.
- J. REGENT. De C. Suetonii Tranquilli vita et scriptis, Breslau, 1856.
- O. RIBBECK. Der echte und der unechte Iuvenal, Berlin, 1865.
- M. SCHANZ. Geschichte der römischen Litteratur, 2 Auflage, II, 2, 1901; III, 1896, München.
- F. A. L. SCHWEIGER. De fontibus atque auctoritate vitarum XII Imperatorum Suetonii, Göttingen, 1830.
- F. STRAUCH. De Personis Iuvenalianis, Göttingen, 1869.
- C. SYNNERBERG. De temporibus vitae carminumque D. Iunii Iuvenalis rite constituendis, Helsingforsiae, 1866.
- J. C. TARVER. Tiberius the Tyrant, Westminster, 1902.
- W. S. TEUFFEL. Geschichte der römischen Litteratur, 5 Auflage, Leipzig, 1890; for II, §§ 219-329, 6 Auflage, Leipzig, 1910.
- M. THAMM. De fontibus ad Tiberii historiam pertinentibus, Halle, 1874.
- G. J. VOSSIUS. De Historicis Latinis Libri III, editio altera, Lugduni Batavorum, 1651.
- R. H. WEBB. On the Origin of Roman Satire, C. P. VII (1912), 177-189.
- A. WEICHERT. Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti operum reliquiae, Grimmae, 1846.

- TH. WIEDEMANN. De Tacito, Suetonio, Plutarcho, Cassio
Dione scriptoribus Imperatorum Galbae et Othonis,
Berlin, 1857.
- H. WILLRICH. Caligula, *Klio* III (1903), 85-118, 288-317,
397-470.

JUVENAL AND THE ROMAN EMPERORS.

I.

INTRODUCTION: SATIRE AND HISTORY.

The full significance of historical events is not to be grasped without a complete understanding of those underlying motives which explain their causes and effects. It is only by analyzing the original impetus of the political strife leading up to revolutionary changes that we can fathom them. For the germ of tumult is to be found in popular feeling, in the natural tendency to favor or to disfavor rulers or their methods of administration. Into this mere records and chronicles give no insight. Where, then, is the expression of contemporary prejudice to be found? In the work of the poet who voices the joyful exultation or the mournful distress of his people, and in the work of the satirist who bespeaks their attitude toward folly and corruption. Indeed "a single passage of the satirist or poet will sometimes throw more light over the character of historical events than whole pages of research and discussion."¹

For the task of filling in the bare details of Roman history the work of the Roman satirist is of unique value, because in satire alone is to be found the expression of the peculiar genius of the Roman people. Other forms of Roman literature bear the marks of foreign influence, especially of Greek, which prevent detection of purely Roman instincts. Satire, on the other hand, is a distinctly Roman literary form,² free from limitations set by Greek models. As such it presents a clear mirror, reflecting the distinctly Roman attitude toward life

¹ Thomas Wright, ed. *The Anglo-Saxon Satirical Poets and Epigrammatists of the Twelfth Century*, i, Introd. x, *Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages*, lix.

² Quintilian, x, 1. 93: *Satira quidem tota nostra est*; Hor. *Serm.* i, 10, 48; Hendrickson, *Satura, the Genesis of a Literary Form*, C. P. vi (1911), 141; Webb, *On the Origin of Roman Satire*, C. P. vii (1912), 187-189.

without any lights and shadows due to the impression of other than native characteristics. An adequate analysis of Roman ideas, then, is impossible without a close study of Roman satire. It is to the exponents of Roman thought and action through the medium of satire that we look for information regarding the social, political and religious ideals and prejudices of the Romans, which should rightly accompany a chronicle of events.

From the historical point of view the *Satires* of Juvenal are of particular interest, especially the passages that deal with the early emperors. The force of prejudices, of opinions based rather upon admiration and hatred than upon due consideration of facts, has taken possession of men of all ages. Roman writers have for this reason cast over the early empire an obscurity which can be penetrated only by a clear conception of the prejudices peculiar to that era of history. It is important to understand just what were the popular ideas about the Roman rulers and about the results of the imperial administration, that we may compare the two and modify our characterization of the Caesars accordingly. The attitude of the Roman people toward general conditions is scarcely to be differentiated from their attitude toward the emperors, from whose initiative those conditions arose. On the other hand their conception of the personality of the Caesars is an indication of their feelings and opinions regarding the policies carried out by them. By the combination of a knowledge of political systems with an understanding of the inclinations of the people for or against the individuals responsible for them the student may arrive at a less one-sided estimate of the Roman emperors.

It may be that Juvenal relied almost solely upon oral tradition, which presented a characterization of the emperors identical with the final judgment pronounced upon them by the weight of historical evidence. Whatever sources of information the satirist or the historians of his age may have used represent the bias of the period in which they were written or repeated from memory. If it is possible to show to what degree Juvenal was inclined to accept or to reject prejudicial

accounts, to what extent he exercised historical judgment in his choice, and how he compares in this respect with Suetonius, Tacitus, Plutarch, Velleius and Valerius Maximus, the value of his historical allusions can be fairly estimated.

The lines within which such a study is drawn naturally suggest, first, a comparison between Juvenal, the satirist, and Suetonius, the avowed biographer, through which the value of the *Satires* as a source of information for the biographies of the Roman emperors may be in part determined. Not only because they both dealt with the special period of history at present under consideration, but because as contemporaries they must have been more or less familiar with one another, it is peculiarly fitting to place these two men and their works side by side. Whether or not they were very closely connected by friendship on personal or on literary grounds, they were destined to be inseparable for all future students of literature.³

The most scholarly work on the sources for the life of Juvenal is by Dürr, who arranges the Mss. of what are known as the *Vitae* into five groups according to a new method. He includes not only the seven given by O. Jahn, but also seven others, among which is the previously unedited *Vita* of the Ms. called *Anonymus Barberinus*. In the light of his new material Dürr hypothetically constructs a common original with evident correctness.⁴ His work settles the long disputed date of Juvenal's birth.⁵ In the newly discovered Codex Barberinus is found the statement, Iunius Iuvenalis Claudio Nerone et L. Antistio consulibus natus est. Such a definite dating phrase is evidently a survival from the archetype, and the year 55 A.D. agrees with another passage read in several of the *Vitae*, temporibus Claudii Neronis. Dürr places

³ Scholars have for centuries attributed to Suetonius the authorship of the only biography of Juvenal, later adaptations of which have come down to us. We have no proof that Suetonius ever wrote such a biography; for his extant works end with Trajan, cf. Pléssis, *La Poésie latine*, 633. Since we have not the original biography and the copies are full of textual errors and contradictions, we cannot give them much credence. If the biography had been written by Suetonius, even these imperfect copies would have a certain authority.

⁴ Cf. E. G. Hardy, *C. R.* iv (1890), 216, for a brief review of Dürr's work.

⁵ Dürr, *Das Leben Juvenals*, I, n. 2; cf. Pléssis, 631.

Juvenal's death at 138 A.D., the beginning of the reign of Antoninus Pius.⁶

As the question of dates is most important for our comparison, it is likewise necessary to determine when the poet wrote and published his five books of *Satires*. The following table of approximate dates of publication will be helpful for reference in this study:

Books.	Satires.	Dates of Publication. A.D.
I.	i-v	100 (at earliest). ⁷
II.	vi	116 (at earliest). ⁸
III.	vii-ix	118-121. ⁹
IV.	x-xii	121-127. ¹⁰
V.	xiii-xvi	128 (or later). ¹¹

A general conclusion may be drawn from the various conjectures offered by scholars concerning these dates: Juvenal published his *Satires* between the years 100 A.D. and 130 A.D., i. e., during the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian.

Before considering the question whether or not Juvenal depended upon Suetonius for biographical details, it is necessary similarly to define with some clearness significant dates in the life of Suetonius. His birth has been variously placed between the years 69 A.D. and 77 A.D.,—the former date being given by Macé, who discusses other conjectures,¹² the latter by Mommsen.¹³ According to Teuffel he died in 160 A.D.,¹⁴ while Macé thinks it was about the year 141 A.D.¹⁵ As Macé's work on Suetonius appears to me most scholarly, and his arguments seem both exhaustive and convincing, we may accept his conclusions, which place the life of Suetonius between 69 A.D. and 141 A.D. The publication of the *Lives of the Twelve Caesars* was about 121 A.D.¹⁶ If we com-

⁶ *Ib.* 9, 28.

⁷ Pléssis, 65-67; cf. Friedl. SG. 3⁶, 495, for date 112-116 A.D.; Dürr, 8, for suggestion of 105-108 A.D.

⁸ Pléssis, *ib.*; cf. Friedl. *ib.* for date 116-118 A.D.; Schanz, *Geschichte der röm. Lit.* ii, 2, 419.

⁹ Friedl. *ib.*; cf. Pléssis, *ib.* for date 116-128 A.D.; Dürr, 21, for date of the first part of Juv. vii.

¹⁰ *Ib.*

¹¹ Friedl. *ib.*; Pléssis, *ib.*

¹² *Essai sur Suétone*, 34, 35.

¹³ *Étude sur Pline le Jeune*, 13.

¹⁴ *Geschichte der röm. Lit.* iii, 347.

¹⁵ Macé, *ib.* 226-236.

¹⁶ *Ib.* 199-207.

pare this date with the table of dates for the *Satires*, we see clearly that the possibility of Juvenal's use of Suetonius as a source of information is confined to the fourth and fifth books of the *Satires*.

Born in 55 A.D. Juvenal must have had at least a faint memory of the reigns of Nero, Galba, Otho and Vitellius, and an intimate knowledge of the reigns of Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian, under whom his last book was published. For knowledge of the emperors from Julius Caesar down to the accession of Vespasian he must have relied mainly upon literary sources and oral accounts given by men old enough to remember the first rulers of the Empire.

Suetonius, on the other hand, born about 69 A.D., doubtless had at least a vague remembrance of Vespasian and Titus and a clear idea of Domitian, Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian, in whose reign he published his *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*. For the period from Julius Caesar to Domitian he was mainly dependent on literature and on oral tradition handed down by his elders. These sources were superseded by a personal knowledge of events in the case of Domitian's reign.

Our comparison does not extend to the "five good emperors,"¹⁷ of whom Suetonius says nothing. For Vespasian and Titus, Juvenal would be a better witness than Suetonius, who was not old enough to remember them very clearly; but as no references to these two emperors occur in the *Satires*, they also are eliminated from this study. Both authors must have had access to the same literature and heard the same rumors. Where Domitian was concerned they could both give correct accounts independently.

In the next place Juvenal might have drawn upon the historical works of Tacitus. The *Histories* were published before 115 A.D., the *Annals* between 115 A.D. and 117 A.D.,¹⁸ so that the former might have served Juvenal for

¹⁷ Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius.

¹⁸ Schanz, ii, 2, 436, gives 104-109 A.D. as the date for the *Histories*, following Asbach, *Hist. Taschenb.* 6F., 6 Jahrg. 1887, 145-Röm. Kaisert. und Verf. bis auf Traian, Köln, 1896, 151. For 116-117 A.D. as date of the *Annals*, cf. ii, 2, 437; for 115-117 A.D., cf. Teuffel, ii, 337-338.

all the *Satires* except the first book, the latter for the third, fourth and fifth books. It is difficult to make a comparison here, as we are limited to the portions of Tacitus' works still extant, covering in the *Histories* only the years 69-70 A.D., and in the *Annals* the reign of Tiberius, the beginning of Claudius' reign up to the year 47 A.D., and the years 66-68 A.D. of Nero's reign. Tacitus, who was born about the same time as Juvenal,¹⁹ very likely had, as did the satirist, a more or less vague memory of the reigns of Nero, Galba, Otho and Vitellius, and a fuller knowledge of Vespasian's reign. The same sources were available to both men.

Juvenal might also have been familiar with Plutarch's *Lives*, which were probably written during the period 105-115 A.D. under Trajan.²⁰ The satirist could scarcely have had the *Lives* in mind before the second book of *Satires* was published, but it is not impossible that he knew them before the third, fourth and fifth books were ready for the public. The famous Greek biographer was born during the reign of Claudius, 41-54 A.D. If the date of his birth was early in the reign,²¹ then his memory of Nero's times would have been much clearer than Juvenal's. Unhappily his biographies of Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero and Vitellius are lost²² and we are able to compare Juvenal's references only with Plutarch's accounts of Julius Caesar, Galba and Otho.²³

For a limited period the satirist might have availed himself of the *Roman History* of Velleius Paterculus, a contemporary of Augustus and Tiberius. Of the author's life we know nothing except the few details gathered from his *History*.²⁴ The second book of this work deals with Julius Caesar, Augustus and Tiberius, and has the special value usually attached to a narrative written by a contemporary of the events which he relates. We must be on our guard, nevertheless, against

¹⁹ Schanz, ii, 2, 427, who follows Borghesi, *Oeuvres*, vii, 322, in choosing 55 or 56 A.D. as the most probable date for the birth of Tacitus.

²⁰ Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Lit.* ii, 1, 576.

²¹ *Ib.* 566, where the date 46 A.D. is given for Plutarch's birth and 120 A.D. for his death.

²² Christ, ii, 1, 576, n. 2; cf. Plut. *vit. Galb.* 2; *vit. Oth.* 18.

²³ *Ib.* 576.

²⁴ Schanz, ii, 2, 420 b.

accepting with too hasty credulity his history of the Caesars on account of its purely subjective character. This characteristic of Velleius's work precluded the extensive use of it by Juvenal, whose office was not to praise, but to censure, or by Suetonius, who sought a more vivid description of these emperors than could be given by a staunch advocate of their cause.

Another contemporary of Augustus and Tiberius²⁵ was Valerius Maximus, author of a collection of anecdotes for rhetorical purposes, *Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium Libri Novem*. The work is dedicated to Tiberius and is to be read with caution, especially where mention of the emperor is made. His intolerably insipid flattery²⁶ of Tiberius is in striking contrast with the scandalous accusations made by Tacitus and Suetonius. For this reason the passages referring to Tiberius are chiefly valuable in that they afford us a means of balancing the adverse judgment of later writers against an earlier favorable opinion.

Fortunately the eight books of Suetonius' *Lives of the Twelve Caesars* are all extant, with the exception of the first part of the *Life of Julius Caesar*,²⁷ so that these biographies offer a more satisfactory basis for comparison with Juvenal's *Satires* than do the works of Tacitus, Plutarch, Velleius Paterculus, and Valerius Maximus. The completeness of the *Lives* makes it possible to indicate parallel passages to all the allusions cited from the *Satires* regarding the Roman emperors. Although we are limited to a partial comparison with the other historical works mentioned, the parallel passages which we are able to quote are none the less valuable. In fact they express important personal opinions of Augustus, Tiberius, Nero, Galba and Otho in the same way that the passages from the *Life of Domitian* record the personal impressions received by Suetonius. It is clearly possible, then, to compare all of Juvenal's allusions to the emperors, first with strictly primary sources, the observations personally made or heard expressed

²⁵ Teuffel, ii, 279, n. 1.

²⁶ *Ib.* n. 2; Schanz, ii, 2, 424.

²⁷ Schanz, iii, 529, quotes Lydus, *de magistr.* 2, 6, 102, as proof of the loss of a title and dedication, and perhaps of a genealogy of the Julian-Claudian house and the beginning of Suet. *Jul.*

by Velleius, Valerius Maximus, Tacitus, Plutarch and Suetonius, and then with secondary sources, where the use of the latter is indicated or suggested by these historians.

Regarding matters in which equal opportunity for personal observation was afforded to both the satirist and one or more of the historians, if the comparison should reveal a difference in the accounts, then Juvenal would seem to have worked and written independently of these historians. In cases where both Juvenal and the historians must have relied upon the same written or oral sources of information, any differences that we might find between them would arise from the exercise of independent historical judgment in their interpretation of sources. As for the historical accuracy of such independent statements, that we cannot discern. What we can clearly perceive is that in allusions to the emperors Juvenal voiced popular impressions and prejudices in his *Satires*, and through them has handed down to us the national, Roman, imperial tradition.

II.

JULIUS CAESAR.

“The Vanity of Human Wishes,” as Samuel Johnson entitles his masterly imitation, is the theme of Juvenal’s *Tenth Satire*. Musing upon his subject and asking himself the question,

Sed quae praeclara et prospera tanti,
Ut rebus laetis par sit mensura malorum?¹

the poet very naturally called to mind the famous Julius Caesar. He mentioned those whose rise to power and tragic fate were perfectly familiar to his readers, since he wished them to recognize at once the aptness of his illustrations. It is likely that he had often listened to tales of the dictator’s inordinate ambition, told by old men who had heard them in youth from their grandsires. It is, then, the popular idea of Julius Caesar, handed down from one generation to the next, that he voices in these pregnant lines:

Quid Crassos, quid Pompeios evertit et illum,
Ad sua qui domitos deduxit flagra Quirites?
Summus nempe locus nulla non arte petitus
Magnaque numinibus vota exaudita malignis.
Ad generum Cereris sine caede ac vulnere pauci
Descendunt reges et sicca morte tyranni.²

Such must have been the dominating impression left by Caesar upon the Roman people at large, the audience whom Juvenal expected to nod in assent to his characterization of the great triumvir. The man who had won a victory for monarchy³ was in their eyes a tyrant who lorded it over the citizens of Rome and subjected them to the strokes of his lash; he

¹ Juv. x, 97-98.

² Juv. x, 108-113.

³ Mommsen, *History of Rome*, 5, 312; Arnold, *Studies of Roman Imperialism*, 13, 14.

treated them as slaves,⁴ and therefore merited a violent death, which few kings and tyrants escape.

Our question is, was there any good historical basis for this conception? Looking to Suetonius for the answer, we find there a passage which might have almost directly supplied the theme of Juvenal's *Tenth Satire*, and certainly could have suggested the use of this illustration in developing it.

Praegrauant tamen cetera facta dictaque eius, ut et abusus dominatione et iure caesus existimetur. non enim honores modo nimios recepit: . . . sed et ampliora etiam humano fastigio decerni sibi passus est: . . . ac nullos non honores ad libidinem cepit et dedit.⁵

Insatiable curiosity or scholarly conscientiousness⁶ led Suetonius to collect all sorts of information, including many details that are vulgar and disgusting to us. Yet this very tendency led him to tell everything he could find out, the good and the bad indiscriminately. We are therefore enabled to make a just estimate for our own benefit, having the testimony before us. Sometimes, as in the present passage, the judgment of the historian himself is more or less directly expressed or hinted.

Suetonius appears to have had sufficiently reliable witnesses of Caesar's moderation, both as general and as dictator in civil affairs. Certainly Caesar showed marvelous control and clemency in his management after his victory in the Civil War and in his censure of conspiracies.⁷ Plutarch and Velleius also agree that Caesar's conduct was irreproachable at this point in his career. If Suetonius consulted Caesar's *De Bello Civili*⁸ alone, we are not surprised at the statement of the victor's moderation; but he had also read the *Historia de Bello Civili inter Caesarem ac Pompeium Gesto* by C. Asinius Pollio,⁹ the *Vita Caesaris* by Aulus Hirtius,¹⁰ and doubtless

⁴ Cf. Mayor, note to Juv. x, 109.

⁵ Suet. *Jul.* 76.

⁶ Cf. *Gai Suetoni Tranquilli de Vita Caesarum Libri Duo*, ed. H. T. Peck, New York, 1893, Introd. ix, x.

⁷ Suet. *Jul.* 75. 1, 5; cf. Plut. *vit. Jul.* 57; Vell. 2, 55; 56; Merivale, *History of the Romans under the Empire*, ii, 343-345; Froude, *Caesar*, 474, 475, 478.

⁸ Suet. *Jul.* 56.

⁹ *Ib.* 30; 55; 56; *Aug.* 29; 43; Voss. *de hist. Lat.* 80.

¹⁰ Suet. *Jul.* 56; cf. Krause, *De C. Suetonii Tranquilli Fontibus et Auctoritate*, 66.

other histories of the period,¹¹ besides the works of writers who reflected with special severity upon Caesar, such as the virulent libel by Aulus Caecina and the *Carmina* of Pitholaus.¹² For knowledge of Caesar's treatment of conspiracies he used an edict of Caesar and either a written or oral account of a public speech delivered by Caesar on the subject.¹³

Yet Suetonius does not accept these excellent authorities without question, but in addition gives abundant testimony to Caesar's display of arrogance, which, strangely enough, Velleius does not mention. For a quotation from one of Caesar's speeches he refers to Titus Ampius (so Ihm, for Amprius of the mss.), an author mentioned by no other writer. He probably wrote a book on the deeds of great men.¹⁴ According to him the dictator said:

Nihil esse rem publicam, appellationem modo sine corpore ac specie . . . debere homines consideratius iam loqui secum ac pro legibus habere quae dicat.¹⁵

Suetonius writes also of the popular hatred aroused by an unprecedented insult to the Senate:

adeuntis se cum plurimis honorificentissimisque decretis uniuersos patres conscriptos sedens pro aede Veneris Genetricis exceptit. quidam putant retentum a Cornelio Balbo, cum conaretur assurgere; alii, ne conatum quidem omnino¹⁶
 . . .

The vague phrase *quidam putant* may refer either to written accounts or to oral tradition. Again he says of Caesar:

quo gaudio elatus non temperauit, quin paucos post dies frequenti curia iactaret, inuitis et gementibus aduersaris adeptum se quae concupisset, proinde ex eo insultaturum omnium capitibus.¹⁷

¹¹ Cf. Krause; Schweiger, *De Fontibus atque Auctoritate Vitarum XII Imperatorum Suetonii*; Macé, 360, 361. For the opinion that Suet. did not use Vell. cf. Schweiger, 10, 11; Krause, 26, n. 20.

¹² Suet. *Jul.* 75.

¹³ *Ib.*

¹⁴ Cf. Krause, 17; Schweiger, 9; Voss. 726.

¹⁵ Suet. *Jul.* 77.

¹⁶ Suet. *Jul.* 78; cf. Plut. *vit. Jul.* 60; cf. Arnold, 14.

¹⁷ Suet. *Jul.* 22.

Here the taunt sounds ominous of servitude. As no witness to Caesar's words is mentioned, we cannot determine whether the source of information was written or oral. Disregard of the Senate and of the people, and a public declaration that men should consider his word as law,—could such display of arrogance fail to outweigh in the public mind the fact that Caesar was more clement than the Romans had expected after the Civil War?¹⁸

If Plutarch, who must have had access to the same sources as Suetonius and to other sources also,¹⁹ is right in his estimate of Caesar's motives, the great dictator was pitifully unsuccessful. The honors he received were, according to the Greek historian, forced upon him by flatterers who vied with one another in their extravagance and so rendered him odious to the people; whereas his chief desire was to gain their affection and to secure their willing submission to his power. Velleius writes as though Caesar's assassination were the evidence of ingratitude to a peaceable ruler.²⁰ It was the people who were responsible for creating a complete tyranny, for they made Caesar dictator for life. To absolute power they added perpetuity.²¹

We have such scanty material for events of the absolute dictatorship that we can scarcely form any clear idea of Caesar's policy during that period, but must make the most of such scattered references as we find in Suetonius, Velleius, and Plutarch.²² Yet, in this connection we cannot ignore an ominous reading of Caesar's character by his contemporary, Cicero, who writes of his earlier career that he showed an inclination to tyranny in all that he projected and executed.²³

Perhaps Juvenal's use of the epithet *Quirites* was especially designed to bear out the idea of subjection to Caesar's will. On two different occasions it is known that Caesar quelled mutiny among his legions by using this form of address. At Placentia, declaring that he would release from his oath any

¹⁸ Suet. *Jul.* 76; cf. Vell. 2, 55; 56; 57.

¹⁹ Cf. Schweiger, II, 12.

²⁰ Plut. *vit. Jul.* 57; 58; Vell. 2, 57; cf. Froude, 491-493.

²¹ Plut. *vit. Jul.* 57.

²² Cf. Pelham, 524.

²³ Cf. Plut. *vit. Jul.* 4, where Cicero is quoted; Suet. *Jul.* 9, 2; 30, 5.

of the rebellious soldiers who wished to leave the army, he at once substituted for *Romani*, or *milites*, the word *Quirites*, at which implication of dishonor their fury abated. Caesar may have told this story in the missing part of the second book of his *Commentaries on the Civil War*. A second time he employed this mode of rebuke when the revolting legions from Campania pitched their tents in the Campus Martius. To their demand for discharge he answered by calmly addressing them as *Quirites*: at that word they fell into shame and confusion before him, as if overcome by magic.²⁴

The final sentence upon the great master of the Roman world was uttered by Suetonius in the phrase *abusus dominatione et iure caesus existimetur*.²⁵ After all is told, one impression remains dominant, and it is this which Juvenal gives in a single passage full of meaning.²⁶ It is true he may have come to the same conclusion as Suetonius after following all the evidence given in the biographies, or after studying independently the historical writings used as sources for them, as well as other sources used by Plutarch but not employed by Suetonius. It is equally possible that Juvenal relied solely on oral tradition, which presented a characterization of Caesar identical with the final judgment pronounced upon him by the weight of historical evidence.²⁷

An indication that Juvenal may have founded his opinion of the dictator upon written sources is afforded by an allusion to Julius Caesar as author of two big volumes, *duo Caesaris Anticatones*.²⁸ These political pamphlets, published after the battle of Munda,²⁹ were directed against Cato. They were written in a spirit of rancor long felt by Caesar towards his enemy; as we are led to suppose from an account of a conflict between the two in the Senate.³⁰ It is not unlikely that they had their origin in motives of political ambition.³¹

²⁴ Suet. *Jul.* 69; 70; cf. Merivale, 2, 177, 282.

²⁵ Suet. *Jul.* 76.

²⁶ *Jul.* x, 108-113.

²⁷ For the less biased modern view of Julius Caesar, cf. Mommsen, 5, 312, 330; Merivale, 2, 173-185, 270, 281, 306-308, 340-341.

²⁸ *Juv.* vi, 338.

²⁹ Suet. *Jul.* 56. 5.

³⁰ Suet. *Jul.* 14. 2.

³¹ *Plut. vit. Jul.* 54.

III.

AUGUSTUS.

We are accustomed to dwell, as did Velleius, upon the career of Augustus after he emerged from the period of civil conflict, and to meditate upon the golden age of peace¹ celebrated by the foundation of a great altar in 13 B.C. Lately, attention has been especially directed to this aspect of Augustus' reign by the reconstruction of the Altar of Peace from fragments of its reliefs scattered through various museums.² But the series of struggles leading up to the era of peace established in his principate should not be forgotten amid the glory of his triumph. It is to this earlier period, when the sword of Octavian reeked with the blood of continual slaughter, that Juvenal refers in the lines,

Tantum igitur muros intra toga contulit illi
Nominis ac tituli, quantum *vix*³ Leucade, quantum
Thessaliae campis⁴ Octavius abstulit udo
Caedibus adsiduis gladio, sed Roma parentem,
Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit.⁵

There were certain accounts of this period available to Suetonius and to Juvenal also. Most important were the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, cut on bronze tablets and set up before his mausoleum;⁶ the *Autobiography* of Augustus in thirteen

¹ Cf. Vell. 2, 92.

² Cf. Mrs. Arthur Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, London, 1907, 39-58; Platner, *The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*, Boston, 1911, 361, 362.

³ In corrupte P: ñ sive non *pw* Jahn²: sub Leucade S: quantum *sibi*? Jahn² q *vix* Mayor: q *tum in* Munro: *vix* K. F. Hermann, followed by Mayor, is rejected by Friedlaender; cf. infra, note 17.

⁴ *Thessaliae campis* and *Leucade* refer to two of the five civil wars enumerated by Suetonius, who called these *Philippense* and *Actiacum*, Aug. 9. It was a popular error to confuse the battle of Philippi with that of Pharsalia, and likewise to locate the scene of the battle of Actium off a promontory at the southern end of the island of Leucas; cf. Mayor and Friedl. notes to Juv. viii, 241, 242.

⁵ Juv. viii, 240-244.

⁶ C I L. iii, 2, 774-785.

books brought down to the date of the Cantabrian War, 27 B.C.; *De Augusti Rebus Gestis* by Cremutius Cordus; the histories of Titus Livius and of Velleius Paterculus; *De Bello Civili* by Aufidius Bassus; *Augusti Caesaris Gesta* by C. Cilnius Maecenas; and verses on the battle of Actium by C. Rabirius.⁷

For some details of the events of Augustus' life Suetonius referred to the *Res Gestae*, or to a documentary copy of it which he found in the imperial archives, to which he had access in his capacity as *ab epistulis* under the Emperor Hadrian.⁸ He may have drawn from some or all of the works just mentioned as well as from stories orally transmitted. The general impression he leaves us is that Octavian met and overcame tremendous odds before arriving at the height of his power. He recounts, for instance, as do Velleius and Valerius Maximus, that in the war called *Philippense*⁹ Augustus was both sick and weak. Nevertheless he was victorious in a double battle, a victory of which Augustus leaves the simple record preserved in the *Monumentum Ancyranum*:

postea bellum inferentis rei publicae vici b[is] a]cie.¹⁰

The biographer adds that in the first of the two conflicts the general with difficulty (*vix*) escaped, fleeing to the wing commanded by Antony. The narrative runs thus:

Inita cum Antonio et Lepido societate Philippense quoque bellum, quamquam inualidus atque aeger, duplici proelio transegit, quorum priore castris exutus uix ad Antoni cornu fuga euaserat.¹¹

Valerius Maximus lays special stress upon the grievous illness from which Octavian was suffering at the time of this battle:

eius medico Artorio somnum capienti nocte, quam dies insecutus est, quo in campis Philippiis Romani inter se exercitus

⁷ Cf. Voss. 112, 113, 105, 106, 111; for the references to Suetonius cf. Krause, 31 ff.; Schweiger, 12 ff.

⁸ Cf. Macé, 150-163.

⁹ Suet. *Aug.* 13; cf. Vell. 2, 70; Val. Max. 1, 7. 1.

¹⁰ i, 10-12.

¹¹ Suet. *Aug.* 13; cf. *Aug.* 80, 81, which show that Aug. suffered from bodily weakness and ill-health throughout his life.

concurrerunt, Mineruae species oborta praecepit ut illum graui morbo implicitum moneret ne propter aduersam ualitudinem proximo proelio non interesset. Quod cum Caesar audisset, lectica se in aciem deferri iussit. Ubi dum supra uires corporis pro adipiscenda uictoria excubat, castra eius a Bruto capta sunt.¹²

Vellius gives the following account:

cornu, cui Brutus praerat, impulsis hostibus castra Caesaris cepit (nam ipse Caesar, etiamsi infirmissimus valetudine erat, obibat munia ducis, oratus etiam ab Artorio medico, ne in castris remaneret, manifesta denuntiatione quietis territo), id autem, in quo Cassius fuerat, fugatum ac male mulcatum in altiora se receperat loca.¹³

The victory at Actium is recorded by Augustus as follows:

Iuravit in mea verba tota Italia sponte sua et me be[lli], quo vici ad Actium, ducem deposcit.¹⁴

Suetonius adds to a simple statement of the victory a description of the troubles that followed it. Augustus was anxious about rumors of sedition among the soldiers:

nec multo post nauali proelio apud Actium uicit . . . ab Actio cum Samum in hiberna se recepisset, turbatus nuntiis de seditione praemia et missionem poscentium, quos ex omni numero confecta uictoria Brundisium praemiseraat.¹⁵ . . .

Even the elements violently opposed the general's return to Italy, for he was twice driven back by storms upon the coast of Greece and almost wrecked:

repetit[a I]talia tempestate in traiectu bis conflictatus, primo inter promunturia Peloponensi atque Aetoliae, rursus circa montes Ceraunios utrubique parte liburnicarum demersa, simul eius, in qua uehebatur, fuis armamentis et gubernaculo diffracto.¹⁶

¹² Val. Max. 1, 7. 1.

¹³ Vell. 2, 70.

¹⁴ Mon. Anc. v, 3, 4; cf. Vell. 2, 84; 85.

¹⁵ Suet. Aug. 17. 2, 3; cf. Vell. 2, 79.

¹⁶ Suet. Aug. 17. 3.

Perhaps it was knowledge of these very difficulties and appreciation of the physical endurance and of the moral and mental force required to overcome them, that aroused the admiration and confidence of the Romans and laid the foundation of Augustus' power over his subjects. No series of victories easily won secured him a triumph. Whether or not it is worth while to speculate upon the psychological effect produced upon the Romans as one of the secrets of the lasting influence of Augustus, there is no doubt that the mastery of obstacles in his path made a deep impression upon the populace. For we cannot fail to note the tone used by Suetonius, Velleius and Valerius Maximus in the passages quoted, and in the light of the information which the historians afford us, to read the full meaning into Juvenal's lines.

The stress laid upon the difficulty of Octavian's rise to power through war seems to substantiate the conjecture that Juvenal used the word *vix* in *Sat.* viii, 241, as did Suetonius in the passage regarding the victory at Philippi.¹⁷ The satirist could scarcely have read the account given by the biographer, because it is probable that the *Lives* were not published before the *Eighth Satire*; but it is not unlikely that Juvenal should have chosen *vix* independently, as did Suetonius, in giving expression to the thought naturally called up by mention of the battles fought by Octavian.

Augustus was universally proclaimed *pater patriae* according to his own statement: [. . . senatus et equ]ester ordo populusq[ue] Romanus universus [appellavit me patrem p]atriae.¹⁸ Suetonius quotes the very words of Valerius Messala which, on behalf of all the Romans, he addressed to Augustus on this occasion:

quod bonum, inquit, faustumque sit tibi domuique tuae, Caesar Auguste! sic enim nos perpetuam felicitatem rei p. et laeta huic precari existimamus: senatus te consentiens cum populo R. consalutat patriae patrem.¹⁹

This speech reveals, even thus early in the history of imperial

¹⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 13; cf. supra, note 3.

¹⁸ *Mon. Anc.* vi, 24, 25.

¹⁹ Suet. *Aug.* 58.

rule, the intuitive discernment of the people at large that the prosperity of the commonwealth was henceforth to be inseparable from that of its head. They could no longer regard the state as independent of a dominating influence, the force of which they had learned to feel during the dictatorship of Julius Caesar. The decisive battles of Philippi and Actium had given the death-blow to the republic. It was natural that the satirist, meditating upon the circumstances of conferring a significant title upon Cicero of the republican age and upon Augustus of the imperial epoch, should mark the contrast by the one word *libera*. For the very speech which Messala made in offering the honor to Augustus, showed that Rome was no longer *free*.

In his reference to Octavian Juvenal sounds the dominant note of the written and oral tradition. It is probable that he had read the histories of the civil wars by the various authors mentioned above,²⁰ and he certainly had heard whatever stories were told by old men who had heard them in turn from their grandsires. He thought of Octavian as a man who struggled to supremacy through bloody wars and against heavy odds: his expression of this idea represents the final judgment of the people, as do the fuller prose narratives of Suetonius, Velleius and Valerius Maximus. Juvenal recognized that the subjection of the Romans by Julius Caesar had permanently weakened the power of independent government which they enjoyed under the republic, and he deplored the absence of freedom under the imperial administration. Here again he represents the popular, and probably the correct, tradition.²¹

²⁰ *Supra*, note 7.

²¹ Juv. makes one other reference to Augustus in *Sat.* v, 4, which might lead to an interesting discussion regarding imperial court banquets and entertainments, but it contains no significant allusion to the personality of the emperor.

IV.

TIBERIUS.

The only passage in which Juvenal mentions Tiberius contains a masterly account of the tragic turning-point in the emperor's career, his revolt from the tutelage of Sejanus.¹ The influence which his favorite exerted upon Tiberius showed the weakness of the emperor, who allowed it to develop into a sort of guardianship. Sejanus became the *tutor principis*, in reality the regent of the empire and the true ruler, while its nominal head retired to the seclusion of Capri. Certainly Juvenal does not fail to show the contrast between the power of Sejanus and the impotence of his master:

Visne salutari sicut Seianus, habere
Tantumdem atque illi summas donare curules,
Illum exercitibus praeponere, tutor haberi
Principis angusta Caprearum in rupe sedentis
Cum grege Chaldaeo?²

The picture of Tiberius sitting on the narrow crag at Capri in voluntary exile is indelible.³ He has seen too late the danger of heaping the highest state honors next to the imperial dignity upon a single head, and finds himself dominated by a favorite minister, into whose hands he has unwittingly resigned the reins of government.⁴

In tracing the cause of Tiberius' retirement to Capri Juvenal might have followed either Tacitus or one or more of the eminent historians whom Tacitus professes to have used as authority in this matter.⁵ Tacitus does not refrain from a conjecture that possibly the effects of vicious immorality

¹ Juv. x, 56-107.

² Juv. x, 90-94; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 40; 41.

³ Cf. Mayor, note to Juv. x, 93.

⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 55; Tac. *Ann.* 4, 41.

⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 4, 57.

obliged the emperor to hide himself from the eyes of men,⁶ as he did not emerge from his retreat during the six years following the death of Sejanus.⁷ Juvenal could scarcely have accepted this hypothesis as a truer indication of the real cause of Tiberius' retirement than the statement of several reliable historians who held that it was due to the influence of Sejanus.⁸ For the satirist was prone to seek out every well-known illustration of vicious tendencies, especially among those in high circles of society, and would not have allowed such a patent example to have escaped him.

Indeed Juvenal suggests that Tiberius led quite a different sort of life at Capri. The emperor spent the time *cum grege Chaldaeo*,⁹ "with his Chaldean train," a phrase probably designed to call up some very familiar tales about Tiberius; for according to Suetonius there were many such. Numerous experiences in his childhood and youth confirmed Tiberius' belief in astrology,¹⁰ to which he continued to give credence in matters of great concern to himself and to the state. He took into his family a certain astrologer, named Thrasyllus, after he had given excellent proof of proficiency in philosophical researches.¹¹ Indeed not only did this man's shrewdness save his own life, but it enabled him to exercise a restraining influence upon the cruelties practiced by the maddened emperor after the death of his son Drusus, which had been brought to pass by the machinations of Sejanus.¹² It was study of the science under this teacher which, it was supposed, gave Tiberius a knowledge of the miserable end that must come as a punishment for his alleged infamous life.¹³ Not only the emperor's remorse for sin but also his disregard of religious observances are attributed by Suetonius to his knowledge of astrology.

We learn also from Suetonius that in his beautiful retreat at

⁶ Cf. Suet. *Tib.* 43-45.

⁷ Suet. *Tib.* 42; cf. Pelham, 534, 535.

⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 4, 57; cf. Plut. *Moralia*, 2. 602 E, F, where he attributes the cause to desire for quiet and repose, though Tiberius could nowhere escape the cares of the empire.

⁹ Juv. x, 94.

¹⁰ Suet. *Tib.* 14.

¹¹ Cf. Juv. vi, 576; Suet. *Cal.* 19.

¹² Suet. *Tib.* 62.

¹³ Suet. *Tib.* 67.

Capri Tiberius did not limit himself to a study of the *Manual of Astrology* by Thrasyllus,¹⁴ but pursued researches in his chosen realm of mythology. Not only did he compose Greek poems in imitation of ancient writers of fabulous stories, but he also made exhaustive inquiries into the history of such tales, by which he spurred on the grammarians to further investigation.¹⁵ Suetonius adds that his questions were absurd.¹⁶ Perhaps it was of Tiberius that Juvenal was thinking when he took occasion to ridicule exhaustive researches.¹⁷

The aspect of the emperor submitting, in his weakness, to the rule of a subject is made prominent in a passage of Suetonius also, where he says that even after the conspiracy of Sejanus had been successfully put down, Tiberius was still haunted by fears and apprehensions, and never stirred from the Villa Iovis for nine months. Such was the enervating effect of the period of Sejanus' supremacy.¹⁸

The period of domination was suddenly ended by the supreme effort to revolt, the effect of which was almost to throw the aged emperor into a state of insanity.¹⁹ The tragic scene of the imperial vengeance is sketched in a few powerful verses by the satirist.²⁰ Here, in the account of the ruin of Sejanus, we have a definite indication of the vacillation of public sentiment at Rome, of the tendency of the mob to follow the line of least resistance, to court the favor of the powerful, and to scorn the mighty in their fall. When Tiberius discovered the conspiracy headed by Sejanus²¹ the people were ready to confess that they had always suspected him of treachery.

Sed quid

Turba Remi? Sequitur fortunam ut semper et odit
 Damnatos. idem populus, si Nortia Tusco
 Favisset, si oppressa foret segura senectus
 Principis, hac ipsa Seianum diceret hora

¹⁴ Cf. Juv. vi, 576.

¹⁵ Cf. Mayor, note to Juv. vii, 234.

¹⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 70.

¹⁷ Juv. vii, 229-236.

¹⁸ Suet. *Tib.* 65.

¹⁹ Cf. Juv. x, 84.

²⁰ Juv. x, 56-107.

²¹ Tac. *Ann.* 4, 3; 7; 10; 11; 12; 60.

Augustum . . .

Quam timeo, victus ne poenas exigat Ajax

Ut male defensus. curramus praecipites et

Dum iacet in ripa, calcemus Caesaris hostem.²²

The same fear of power that the Romans had felt in the case of the great praetorian prefect now arose towards his executioner, to whom they hastened to show their allegiance by pouring down still greater insults upon the dead body of his former favorite.

Adherence of the people to the emperor, however, was the result not simply of intimidation, but also of a moral force that compelled them to recognize the justice of the imperial revenge. Tiberius was not alone in his suspicion of Sejanus; it was shared by many who had watched him advance from honor to honor until he was "second only to the world's great lord."²³ Now, relieved by his death from the necessity of silence, they no longer concealed their hatred of his arrogance.

Sejanus ducitur unco

Spectandus, gaudent omnes. ' quae labra, quis illi

Vultus erat. numquam, si quid mihi credis, amavi

Hunc hominem.'²⁴

The emperor's action was justified even in the opinion of the throng, who bore witness that the pride of Sejanus was deservedly sunk in the dust.²⁵

The righteousness of Tiberius' rage, let loose against his enemy, seems to be indicated by his self-justification in the memoirs of his own life, quoted by Suetonius:

Sejanum se punisse quod comperisset furere adversus liberos Germanici filii sui.²⁶

Suetonius, however, charges Tiberius with deception in this written accusation and states, without giving his authority,

²² Juv. x, 72-77, 84-86; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 61. 4; Val. Max. 9, 11, ext. 4.

²³ Juv. x, 63; Tac. *Ann.* 4, 2; 7; Suet. *Tib.* 55.

²⁴ Juv. x, 66-69.

²⁵ Cf. Mayor, note to Juv. x, 68.

²⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 61.

that Tiberius himself murdered one of the sons of Germanicus, when suspicion was first aroused against Sejanus, and the other, after Sejanus had been put to death. Tiberius is thus accused of using his favorite as a screen for his own heinous crimes,²⁷ of raising him with preconceived malice to the pinnacle of power, in order that he might hurl thunderbolts of destruction upon the innocent obstacles in his path to the throne.

Tacitus, though he does not go so far as to charge Tiberius with the murder of his own grandsons, says that the emperor was pleased at the news that they had been put out of the way and wondered at the motive of Sejanus in scheming to remove them.²⁸ If Tacitus had given any credence to the rumor that Tiberius himself was the instigator of these murders, as Suetonius states without any reservations,²⁹ or even if he had considered this accusation widely spread, it is possible that he would have refuted it, as he did an equally outrageous story regarding an attempt made by the emperor to poison his own son, Drusus.³⁰ In a sweeping condemnation of Sejanus, Tacitus acquits Tiberius of the murder of his son: Sejanus facinorum omnium repertor habebatur.³¹ The truth is, according to Tacitus, that Sejanus was known to be capable of every species of villany, however atrocious. It is not unlikely that the historian dismissed in a similar manner rumors that Tiberius was responsible for the death of his grandsons.

The incredible series of murders connected with the name of Tiberius began, if we are to believe Tacitus,³² with the detection of the great conspiracy against the heirs to the imperial throne. It was natural to seek out all the conspirators and to subject them to the same dishonorable death as that suffered by the ringleader.³³ Justice demands such vengeance even in our own day. The Romans recognized that there would inevitably be a pursuit of all the accomplices of Sejanus, and whispered the fear to one another:

²⁷ *Ib.*

²⁸ *Tac. Ann.* 4, 12; 60.

²⁹ *Suet. Tib.* 55; 61.

³⁰ *Tac. Ann.* 4, 10; 11.

³¹ *Ib.* 4, 11.

³² *Tac. Ann.* 4, 1.

³³ *Ib.* 6, 19; *Suet. Tib.* 61. 4.

'Perituros audio multos.

Nil dubium, magna est fornacula.'³⁴

Tacitus tells us, however, that not only accomplices but all the friends, relatives and followers of Sejanus were put to death. There was a wide-spread, imperial inquisition; Tiberius, being naturally inclined to cruelty, when once started on the path of bloodshed, was powerless to stay his hand. The bonds of self-control were loosened in a laudable effort to put down a conspiracy against the royal family; but Tiberius could not tighten them again. The innate tendency developed into a monomania and, as Tacitus says, he no longer valued the lives of citizens.

Suetonius, on the contrary, does not suggest that the discovery of the conspiracy and the execution of the instigator was a turning-point in the emperor's career. In his opinion Sejanus was only one of a host of those who came near the emperor only to become sacrifices to his savage cruelty.³⁵ It is easily understood how Suetonius, with the idea of the blood-thirsty tyranny of Tiberius in mind, gave no credence to the testimony of the imperial memoirs, and scorned the monstrous audacity that could try to turn against Sejanus the accusation, which in the biographer's eyes so palpably belonged to the emperor himself. Tiberius' autobiography³⁶ was probably not examined by Suetonius in the archives.³⁷ It is not impossible that, for the whole of the *Life of Tiberius*, Suetonius used as a principal source the *Annals* of Servilius Nonianus. Tacitus also, for the most part, followed this source, and at the same time made extensive use of the *acta senatus*.³⁸

Comparison between the details in Tacitus' account of the fall of Sejanus with those in Juvenal's *Tenth Satire* can scarcely fail to make the reader think that the poet had the *Annals* of

³⁴ Juv. x, 81, 82.

³⁵ Suet. *Tib.* 55.

³⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 61:

³⁷ Cf. Macé, 172-175.

³⁸ Schanz, ii, 2, 438; Thamm, *de fontibus ad Tiberii historiam pertinentibus*; cf. Weidemann, *die Quellen der ersten 6 Bücher von Tacitus' Annalen*, Prog. Clever Gymnas. 1868, 22-38, for the opinion that Tac. and Suet. had different sources; cf. Clason, *Tacitus und Sueton*, 75, 76, for the opinion that the principal source used by Tac. was the *History* by Aufidius Bassus; Voss. 144.

Tacitus close at hand. If so, it would be sufficient explanation of the satirist's characterization of Tiberius at this point in his career. He was not, at the moment the satirist chooses to depict him, known as a blood-thirsty tyrant, though a certain reserve in his life and manner led people to believe that he was of a surly disposition.

The parallelism between Juvenal and Tacitus in the Sejanus episode precludes the hypothesis that the poet drew upon Suetonius for his material. He might have read Suetonius' *Life of Tiberius* without accepting the biographer's opinion of the emperor as he appeared at a moment which both Juvenal and Tacitus chose to regard as a crisis in his development. For it is most unlikely that Juvenal would have failed to mention the fact, had he believed Tiberius to be a savage tyrant, as did Suetonius.³⁹

Since the poet practiced oratory until he reached middle age, there can be little doubt that he knew the collection of illustrative stories made by Valerius Maximus for the use of rhetoricians, but it is not to be supposed that he would accept without reservation their flattering adulation of Tiberius.⁴⁰ Neither could he credit as unbiased the statements made by Velleius, who surrounds Tiberius with a halo of perfection the rays of which penetrated to every part of the imperial administration and cast a golden hue over the Empire.⁴¹ Such unbounded admiration for a ruler, however insipid it may be at times, indicates at least some foundation for its existence. A thinking man like Juvenal would naturally reject unrestrained expressions of devotion, such as Valerius Maximus and Velleius habitually used when mentioning Tiberius. He would also hesitate to accept the equally subjective narratives of Suetonius and Tacitus, whose talent drew a picture of Tiberius the despot, imposing, it is true, but obviously unrealistic.⁴²

If Juvenal read Tacitus' *Annals*, which is undoubtedly

³⁹ Suet. *Tib.* 61.

⁴⁰ Val. Max. 2, 9, 6; 5, 5, 3; 9, 11, ext. 4.

⁴¹ Vell. 2, 126; 129.

⁴² Cf. Schanz ii, 2, 439, who quotes Ranke, *Weltgesch.* 3. 2, 293, 300, as giving the correct view regarding the credibility of Tacitus.

suggested by the *Tenth Satire*, or Suetonius' biographies, which he seems not to have used to any extent in the Sejanus episode, he certainly did not join the authors of these works in giving credence to scandalous libels against the character and life of Tiberius. He evidently exercised historical judgment by weighing the later narratives, such as those of Tacitus and Suetonius, against the earlier accounts written by contemporaries of Tiberius, such as Valerius Maximus and Velleius Paterculus.

Our primary object is not to rehabilitate Tiberius, but to call attention to the absence of bitter hostility against him in Juvenal's *Satires*, in which the student of Latin literature would naturally expect an exposure of criminal tyranny. Nero and Domitian, as we shall see, could not escape the fire of his indignation, and surely he would not have let Tiberius go free, if he had considered him to be a good illustration of degeneracy brought about by cruelty and licentiousness. This noticeable avoidance of invective seems to point to a vein in contemporary literature which probably represented the popular attitude toward Tiberius. It was quite different from the attitude of Tacitus and Suetonius, whose animosity painted a gloomy portrait of Tiberius that has withstood the destructive influence of time and the elements.

V.

CALIGULA.

Not satisfied with the explanation offered by the old Latin proverb, "Whom the Gods would destroy they first strike mad," the Romans were constrained to seek a less mysterious reason for the inexplicable fury of their young emperor, Caligula. Their superstition suggested that he had been inoculated with the germs of insanity which according to their belief existed in Thessalian love philters. To such drugs the ancients attributed effects which, by the light of modern science, are perceived to arise from heredity, environment, lack of opportunity for mental and moral development, and in general from a preponderance of influence designed to accentuate rather than to obliterate innate tendencies. Accordingly Suetonius and Juvenal resorted to the popular solution of the problem.

Suetonius writes on this subject: *creditur potionatus a Caesonia uxore amatorio quidem medicamento, sed quod in furorem uerterit.*¹ The word *creditur* raises the question of the biographer's source of information. The fact that he gives quotations from the writings of Caligula, from epistles, edicts, etc., in a brief, indirect form, precludes the idea that he used the archives. In the *Life of Caligula* the indications are that he followed the work of some historian, probably a contemporary of that emperor.² According to Mommsen the greatest weight of probability lies with Cluvius Rufus.³ In the passage under consideration the author may have relied either upon a written or upon an oral account. In either case that Caligula had been poisoned by a love philter appears to have been the generally accepted explanation of his madness; for Juvenal also expresses it in the following lines:

¹ Suet. *Cal.* 50.

² Macé, 175; Linnert, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Caligulas*, 29, 30.

³ Hermes, iv (1870), 295 ff.

Hic magicos adfert cantus, hic Thessala vendit
 Philtra, quibus valeat mentem vexare mariti

 Inde animi caligo et magna oblivio rerum
 Quas modo gessisti. tamen hoc tolerabile si non
 Et furere incipias ut avunculus ille Neronis,
 Cui totam tremuli frontem Caesonia pulli
 Infudit; quae non faciet quod principis uxor?
 Ardebant cuncta et fracta conpage ruebant,
 Non aliter quam si fecisset Iuno maritum
 Insanum. minus ergo nocens erit Agrippinae
 Boletus.⁴

To what unbridled fury the emperor was aroused we read in one pregnant line of Juvenal,

Haec lacerat mixtos equitum cum sanguine patres.⁵

According to Suetonius it is placed beyond question that shortly before his death Caligula was meditating crimes still more monstrous than those he had hitherto perpetrated. Many had been doomed to death by his purely arbitrary judgments;⁶ but his despotic temperament could not be sated. He now planned to execute the flower of the equestrian and senatorial orders. Among his private papers were discovered after his death two little books, entitled *Gladius* and *Pugio*, which proved to be lists of the names of those marked out for slaughter.⁷

These documents were not examined by Suetonius in the imperial archives. The style of his account indicates that he quoted from an historian whom, as we have said above, he follows for the most part throughout this biography.⁸ Juvenal very probably gained his knowledge from the same source or from stories he had heard of proscriptions under Caligula, especially of the one planned against the knights and senators.⁹

⁴ Juv. vi, 610-621.

⁵ Juv. vi, 625.

⁶ Suet. *Cal.* 28, 29.

⁷ Suet. *Cal.* 49; cf. Linnert, 61, for the attitude of the Senate towards Caligula.

⁸ Macé, 175; Linnert, 27.

⁹ Suet. *Cal.* 28; 29; 49.

The publication of the *Sixth Satire* antedated that of the *Lives of the Twelve Caesars* and most probably that of the *Annals* of Tacitus also. Unfortunately the lost portion of the latter covers the reign of Caligula, so that we are unable to compare it with the account of that emperor by Suetonius, or with the details touched upon by Juvenal. There are extant only a few passages of the *Annals* dealing with Caligula; these tell something of his savage disposition before his accession to the throne. Were the missing books accessible to us, we might discover in them a sufficient resemblance to Juvenal's lines to warrant the opinion that the satirist used the work of Tacitus for the *Sixth Satire*, as we feel almost sure he used it for the *Tenth*. If proof of this were possible, it would help to settle more closely the date of the *Sixth Satire*. The earlier historian, who may have served as a common source both for Juvenal and for Suetonius, and doubtless for Tacitus also, is unknown, and the details referred to by Juvenal are confirmed by Suetonius. Therefore, as we are unable to decide the points of Juvenal's dependence upon Tacitus for information about Caligula, we may consider that the passage quoted above from the *Sixth Satire* has for us the value of a primary source.

The epithet by which Juvenal designates Caligula, *avunculus ille Neronis*,¹⁰ seems rather significant of the general attitude towards him assumed by the contemporaries of the satirist. It was quite different from that of the deluded Romans who hailed him emperor upon the death of Tiberius. According to Suetonius the people expressed extraordinary joy and satisfaction upon the accession of Caligula, and were enkindled to devoted allegiance by all the acts and benefices designed by him to gain popularity.¹¹ They thought of him as son of their beloved hero, Germanicus, who had been ruthlessly murdered, they believed, by order of the jealous Tiberius.¹² Germanicus had married Agrippina; their eldest son, Nero,¹³ had been killed, probably by the dire machinations of Sejanus;¹⁴ and now the youngest son, Gaius Caesar, alone

¹⁰ Juv. vi, 615.

¹¹ Suet. *Cal.* 14; 15; 16; 18; 21; 27; 47.

¹² *Ib.* 2.

¹³ *Ib.* 7.

¹⁴ *Ib.*

remained to whom they might show their regard for his father.

The sister of Gaius Caesar, Agrippina the younger, had married Domitius and had a son, Nero, who afterwards became emperor.¹⁵ Juvenal, born in 55 A.D., had some remembrance of this erratic ruler, and there were many men but slightly older than himself whose memory of Nero's reign was very clear indeed. Some may have been able to recall Caligula also.¹⁶ To those who had Nero fresh in mind the reference to his uncle would be peculiarly pertinent. Unlike his contemporaries, who were as yet ignorant of his true character, they thought of Caligula not as the son of a great general, but as the uncle of a notorious tyrant. In the blood of both flowed the same stream of insanity. Suetonius traces the genealogy of each emperor, it is true, but he gives no indication pointing to the significant association of these two rulers in the minds of the people, such as the satirist reveals.¹⁷

¹⁵ Suet. *Nero* 5.

¹⁶ Suet. *Cal.* 19.

¹⁷ Cf. Linnert, 85, for a brief characterization of Caligula according to a study of all the sources for his life; cf. also 5, 6, 44, 47, 55, 56; for an excellent attempt at historical reconstruction cf. Willrich, *Klio*, iii (1903), 85-118, 288-317, 397-470.

VI.

CLAUDIUS.

The uncle of Caligula succeeded to the imperial throne. Tiberius Claudius Drusus was son of the Drusus who was the brother of Tiberius, and he was brother to Germanicus.¹ Juvenal calls the tree of the Julian-Claudian imperial house *Drusorum stemma*.² Before he became emperor Claudius was commonly known as Drusus, as was Nero, his grand-nephew and son by adoption, and probably his nephew Caligula also. It is the familiar name, Drusus, which Juvenal applies to Claudius in the *Third Satire*.

Inde caput morbi. raedarum transitus arto
Vicorum inflexu et stantis convicia mandrae
Eripiunt somnum Druso vitulisque marinis.³

Here the name is used almost as a by-word to designate a man with somnolent propensities. All knew from memory or from hearsay the stories of the emperor's after-dinner naps and would readily understand the significance of the satirist's allusion.⁴

Juvenal was familiar with popular tales and needed no literary source of information on this subject. He wrote the *Third Satire* too early to draw from Tacitus or from Suetonius. He may have read of the emperor's habits from the autobiography of Claudius himself,⁵ from the books of Fabius Rusticus, or of Servilius Nonianus, which were extant at the time and were probably used as well by Tacitus and Suetonius, or from some other source.⁶

¹ Suet. *Claud.* 2.

² Juv. viii, 40; cf. Martial, viii, 52, 3.

³ Juv. iii, 236-238; Mayor, note to iii, 238.

⁴ Cf. Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*, 12. 1; J. S. Speyer, *Rh. M.* xlvii (1892), 638, for the reading *surdo* instead of *Druso*.

⁵ Suet. *Claud.* 41.

⁶ Cf. Vossius, *de hist. Lat.* 129, 144; Tac. *Ann.* 13, 20; Schanz, ii, 2, 438; Lehmann, *Claudius und Nero und Ihre Zeit*, i, 24, 25; Clason, *ib.* 47-51, for the opinion that for Claudius' reign Bassus was probably the source used by Tac. and Nonianus the one used by Suet.; Krause, 65, 66, for the opinion that Suet. used Fabius Rusticus.

That the emperor's habit was a matter of general knowledge is confirmed by a statement of Suetonius that in youth Claudius was subjected to all sorts of indignities and especially was made the object of jest and ridicule after meals, when he was in the habit of falling into a profound sleep. He says also that these slumbers after eating did not last very long.⁷ On the other hand Claudius, like Caligula, was subject to sleeplessness. He would usually wake up at midnight and could not sleep again, though sometimes during the day he would fall into a doze even while transacting important business.⁸ This habitual drowsiness the biographer attributes to intemperance in eating and drinking, of which he gives disgusting details.⁹ He probably accepted the popular explanation.

Truly the student of history must needs be loath to give credence to what seem distorted amplifications of the facts. We know that Claudius was treated with scorn and contempt by many of his contemporaries,¹⁰ who had no scruples against weaving webs of fiction about him. We may be helped to unravel them by a letter which the emperor Augustus wrote to his wife Livia on the subject of her grandson Claudius:

si est artius, ut ita dicam, holocleros, quid est quod dubitemus, quin per eosdem articulos et gradus producendus sit, per quos frater eius productus sit?¹¹

He goes on to say that if the youth is mentally and physically deficient, they must beware of subjecting him to public derision. In another letter he expresses regret at the young man's choice of companions, but cannot refrain from declaring that, after all, where his mind does not run astray he shows a noble disposition. Augustus writes nothing that gives us reason to credit a characterization of Claudius that is revolting. He simply questions the full development of his mentality.¹²

⁷ Suet. *Claud.* 8; 33.

⁸ *Ib.* 33.

⁹ *Ib.*

¹⁰ *Ib.* 9.

¹¹ *Ib.* 4.

¹² *Ib.*

From evidence regarding the emperor's health and from his literary achievements we are inclined to discredit the popular belief that gluttony was the cause of his tendency to drowsiness. During almost the whole of his minority and for some time after he attained the age of manhood, he was afflicted with a variety of obstinate disorders, insomuch that, his mind and body being greatly impaired, he was even after his arrival at years of maturity never thought sufficiently qualified for any public or private employment.¹³ That he did not even with advanced years reach a normal state of health is suggested by a statement of Suetonius regarding the physical condition of Claudius in later life. He says that after he became emperor, at fifty years of age,¹⁴ he enjoyed good health on the whole, except only that he was subject to a pain in the stomach.¹⁵ The trouble from which he had evidently always suffered was so serious that it could not be eradicated as he grew older.

It is incredible that a man whose mind was altogether subject to his body should be capable of such extended literary efforts as was the emperor Claudius.¹⁶ From an early age he was an assiduous student, published specimens of his skill in the liberal sciences,¹⁷ and surprised his grandfather, Augustus, by his clear declamation.¹⁸ Like other men of literary attainments Claudius was not suited to hold public offices, though the equestrian order and the Senate treated him with considerable respect.¹⁹ He lived in great privacy, "in the lowest society," says Suetonius.²⁰ Yet we find that one of his friends was the great historian, Titus Livius, who encouraged him to attempt the composition of a history, of which he published two books on the period following the death of Caesar and forty-one books on the period after the Civil Wars. He also wrote an autobiography and several smaller books,

¹³ *Ib.* 2.

¹⁴ *Ib.* 10.

¹⁵ *Ib.* 31.

¹⁶ *Ib.* 2; 33; 38-42.

¹⁷ *Ib.* 3.

¹⁸ *Ib.* 4.

¹⁹ *Ib.* 28.

²⁰ *Ib.* 5.

especially a recommendation of three letters which he proposed to add to the Latin alphabet. His devotion to Greek he showed by writing twenty books in that language on Etruscan history and eight on Carthaginian.²¹ In justice, then, we must conclude that it was mere popular prejudice that gave him the nickname *Somnolentus*, and spread abroad gross exaggerations of his gluttony and of the dullness of his intellect. The extreme expression of this contemptuous ridicule on the part of contemporaries of Claudius is to be found in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, a satire on the apotheosis of the emperor which effectually blackened his character for succeeding ages.²²

We must, however, give some credence to tales of the moral weakness that made Claudius an easy prey to scheming women. Preoccupation with material for his histories was perhaps the chief cause of his apparent blindness to the disgraceful intrigues of his wife, Messalina.²³ Of these we have a graphic description in Juvenal's *Sixth Satire*. Though a rival of the gods, the long-suffering Claudius was doomed to domestic infelicity.

Respice rivales divorum, Claudius audi
Quae tulerit.²⁴

It may have been that his love for Messalina was so ardent that he was willing to endure all sorts of indignities to his honor, and was finally forced to punish them only when he saw it was necessary for his self-defense.²⁵

The story of the flagrant defiance of law by Messalina and Silius and the consequent execution of the empress is told by Juvenal.²⁶ Suetonius gives practically no details of the scandalous affair. Tacitus says that the graces of Silius' form and manner eclipsed all the Roman youth; his description *iuventutis Romanae pulcherrimum*²⁷ is strikingly similar to Juvenal's

²¹ *Ib.* 41; 42; cf. Macé, 176-178.

²² A. P. Ball, *The Satire of Seneca on the Apotheosis of Claudius, commonly called the Apocolocyntosis*, New York, 1902.

²³ *Suet. Claud.* 26; 37.

²⁴ *Juv.* vi, 115, 116; cf. Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*, which may have suggested the expression *rivales divorum* to *Juv.*

²⁵ *Suet. Claud.* 36.

²⁶ *Juv.* x, 329-345; xiv, 328-331.

²⁷ *Tac. Ann.* II, 12.

Optimus hic et formississimus idem
Gentis patriciae.²⁸

When Messalina urged him to divorce his wife, Silius was blind neither to the crime nor to the danger of not complying. Juvenal forcibly describes his state of mind in the lines,

Quid placeat dic.

Ni parere velis, pereundum erit ante lucernas;
Si scelus admittas, dabitur mora parvula, dum res
Nota urbi et populo contingat principis aurem.²⁹

This was the precarious situation of the handsome bridegroom according to the satirist, who represents Messalina as the wooer, leading him on to a disgraceful climax which he cannot avoid. Tacitus, on the contrary, says that the marriage proposition came from Silius and was not at first relished by the empress.³⁰ There may remain the question as to which of the two was responsible for their mutual sin, but Juvenal, Tacitus and Suetonius all agree that the marriage ceremony was actually performed in public with all the accustomed rites. Suetonius says:

C. Silio etiam nupsisse dote inter auspices consignata,³¹

confirming thus the details given by Juvenal,

et ritu decies centena dabuntur
Antiquo, veniet cum signatoribus auspex.³²

As Tacitus says, these facts have the air of romantic fable, but are to be credited as well-attested by writers of that period and by grave and elderly men, who lived at the time and were informed of every circumstance.³³

With the facts in mind, then, the execution of Messalina assumes the aspect of a just punishment for guilt, rather than

²⁸ Juv. x, 331-332.

²⁹ Juv. x, 338-341.

³⁰ Tac. *Ann.* II, 26.

³¹ Suet. *Claud.* 26.

³² Juv. x, 335, 336.

³³ Tac. *Ann.* II, 27.

that of a foul murder, plotted by the court favorite, Narcissus, and connived at by the weak-minded emperor under his control. The latter explanation is the one suggested by Juvenal in the lines,

Nec Croesi fortuna umquam nec Persica regna
Sufficient animo nec divitiae Narcissi,
Indulsit Caesar cui Claudius omnia, cuius
Paruit imperiis uxorem occidere iussus.³⁴

If we would interpret the satirist's meaning correctly, we must consider the question, who gave the order to put Messalina to death? The freedman Narcissus, private secretary to the emperor, it is true, had a great influence over his master, who was inclined to follow his advice. It was at his instigation that Claudius put to death Appius Silanus, and now he exerted every effort to ruin Messalina, who had been his accomplice in the plot against Silanus.³⁵ Tacitus says that if Narcissus had not hastened the execution, there is no doubt but the blow aimed at her would have recoiled upon himself. The vacillation of the emperor, his tendency to yield to natural affection, and his intention of hearing Messalina's self-defense are dwelt upon at length by the historian. Filled with apprehension the freedman finally gave orders to the centurions and to the tribune on duty to execute Messalina immediately.³⁶ Tacitus seems to acquit the emperor of the charge of murder and to put the burden of the blame upon Narcissus.³⁷

The irresolution of Claudius made him appear to obey the commands of his freedman.³⁸ This is, as we have said, the version of the story accepted by Juvenal, who recognized it as the popular belief.³⁹ The Romans knew how easily Claudius was influenced by the women and freedmen of his household. They resented the impotence of their ruler and the rising importance of men who had once been slaves in the palace.⁴⁰

³⁴ Juv. xiv, 328-331.

³⁵ Suet. *Claud.* 37.

³⁶ Tac. *Ann.* II, 32-35; 37.

³⁷ *Ib.* 38.

³⁸ Tac. *Ann.* II, 38.

³⁹ Juv. xiv, 331.

⁴⁰ Seneca, *ib.* 13; Suet. *Claud.* 28; cf. Pelham, *ib.* 537.

Contempt for what seemed to them subservience on the part of the emperor might readily have expressed itself in a circulation of the rumor that Narcissus, who they knew had dealt the blow, had also given the command to Claudius to have the empress put to death. Intense prejudice against the ruler prevented their construing the facts, as did Tacitus, to justify the action taken against Messalina.

Though Tacitus does not charge the emperor with the murder of his wife, either directly or through Narcissus, he cannot refrain from dwelling upon what he considers a hard-hearted acquiescence in the deed. Here appears an inconsistency with his previous statements about Claudius' love for Messalina.⁴¹ He says that the emperor's barriers of self-control were not to be broken, that no expression of anger, or of joy, or of grief escaped him.⁴² Neither does Suetonius tell of any outburst of feeling, but he repeats a part of the public speech delivered before the praetorians, in which Claudius touched upon the pitiful misfortune of his married life and resolved not to repeat such sad experiences.⁴³

From a reading of Tacitus alone we receive the impression that Claudius was either too dull to realize what had happened, or was as indifferent as adamant. If we supplement the *Annals* by the emperor's own words, the attitude of Claudius upon hearing of the death of his wife seems the normal one of a man whose feelings are well controlled. Neither his silence nor his words condemn him. The latter are quoted by the biographer as the emperor's self-justification of an action, the responsibility for which rested upon his shoulders. Suetonius does not mention Narcissus in this connection. Certainly Claudius' speech gives no evidence of stupidity nor of imbecility, to which Tacitus attributes his apparent blindness to the atrocious immorality of the empress.⁴⁴

In the Messalina episode Suetonius characterizes Claudius much more favorably than does either Tacitus or Juvenal, because he merely states the facts, adding the testimony of

⁴¹ Tac. *Ann.* II, 34.

⁴² Tac. *Ann.* II, 38.

⁴³ Suet. *Claud.* 26.

⁴⁴ Tac. *Ann.* II, 28.

the emperor's own words concerning the affair. He does not proceed to distort the facts by his own or by the popular interpretation, with which he must have been as familiar as was Tacitus or Juvenal.

Suetonius tells us that the drain upon the royal treasury by extraordinary rewards presented to the private secretary, Narcissus, and to Pallas, the accountant, urged Claudius to complain of a deficit. In answer someone remarked that he would have enough if these two freedmen would take him into partnership with them.⁴⁵ The amount of such wealth was multiplied as the tale of it passed from mouth to mouth, until the expression "as rich as Narcissus" became a by-word for fabulous wealth. For Juvenal, we notice, refers to his golden hoard in the same breath with the "fortune of Croesus" and "the treasures of the Persian Kingdoms," both familiar expressions to designate great riches. So in Juvenal's day "rich as Narcissus" must have had the same meaning that we attach even to-day to the phrase "rich as Croesus."⁴⁶

Blind to the real significance of his position, the people were jealous of Narcissus. One of their number Suetonius makes their spokesman, from which we judge that they openly expressed their envy of this influential courtier, at least as far as his wealth was concerned.⁴⁷ Narcissus was one of those members of the imperial family whom Claudius raised to the dignity of state officials. This was a new departure in the imperial administration which, like all new things, the people were loath to accept without flinging criticism broadcast, until they had had time to reflect that, after all, this novel method of procedure may have in it the elements of a much-needed governmental reform.⁴⁸

The facts are stated by Tacitus without allusion to the idea of the people concerning them. He concludes his account by a remark concerning the recognition accorded to Narcissus for his services in the execution of Messalina: *decreta Narcisso quaestoria insignia, levissimum fastidii eius.*⁴⁹ Suetonius also

⁴⁵ Suet. *Claud.* 28.

⁴⁶ Juv. xiv, 328, 329.

⁴⁷ Suet. *Claud.* 28.

⁴⁸ Cf. Pelham, *ib.* 538.

⁴⁹ Tac. *Ann.* II, 38.

mentions that Narcissus and Pallas were honored by the quaestorian and praetorian insignia, but he does not imply that either was the reward for action in the case of the empress.⁵⁰

We may draw the conclusion that Claudius rewarded Narcissus for his services, but gave him no more than they deserved,⁵¹ and that the popular envy of the imperial ministers, Narcissus among them, exaggerated into enormous sums the recompense justly due to a trusted adviser of the administration.

Unfortunately Narcissus fell a victim to the hatred of Agrippina, whose overbearing pride and boundless ambition he had the courage to condemn.⁵² For in spite of his resolve to the contrary Claudius renewed the marriage bond, taking as wife his niece Agrippina,⁵³ sister of the emperor Caligula⁵⁴ and already mother of Nero, who succeeded Claudius, his adopted father.⁵⁵ The breaking of his resolution not only gave the emperor cause to repent,⁵⁶ but proved his ruin. It is this Agrippina to whom Juvenal refers in the lines,

Minus ergo nocens erit Agrippinae
Boletus, siquidem unius praecordia pressit
Ille senis tremulumque caput descendere iussit
In caelum et longa manantia labra saliva.⁵⁷

By the words *Agrippinae boletus* Juvenal does not commit himself to any one of the many rumors concerning the death of Claudius. For Suetonius says that there was much difference of opinion as to where the emperor was poisoned and by whom.⁵⁸ Tacitus states that Agrippina was responsible for the plot and that she engaged the famous Locusta to compound the ingredients, which were to be administered by Halotus, the taster at the imperial table.⁵⁹ According to

⁵⁰ Suet. *Claud.* 28.

⁵¹ Tac. *Ann.* 12, 65.

⁵² *Ib.* 12, 57; 13, 1.

⁵³ Suet. *Claud.* 26.

⁵⁴ Suet. *Cal.* 1.

⁵⁵ Suet. *Claud.* 27; 39; 43.

⁵⁶ *Ib.* 43.

⁵⁷ Juv. vi, 620-623.

⁵⁸ Suet. *Claud.* 44.

⁵⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 12, 66.

Suetonius some people said that Halotus gave the fatal dose, but others said that Agrippina herself handed to her husband a dish of mushrooms which had been previously mixed with the poison.

However these details may be, there is no discrepancy regarding the vehicle of the deadly mixture. Tacitus says that writers of the day all attested this fact about the mushrooms, and Suetonius tells us that Nero, who was privy to the plot, quoting a Greek proverb in jest, praised mushrooms *quasi deorum cibum*.⁶⁰ Juvenal certainly believed that Agrippina took the initiative in the murder, but the grammatical construction of *Agrippinae boletus* and of *uxoris*⁶¹ in the *Fifth Satire*, where also he refers to Claudius' death by a mushroom, leaves us in doubt as to whether he thought her guilt ended with the plan or included the execution of it.

Tremulumque caput . . . et longa manantia labra saliva,⁶² might very well allude to the dire effects of the fatal drug. But from a description of the personal appearance of Claudius given by Suetonius,⁶³ we judge that Juvenal was describing well-known physical peculiarities of the emperor, which naturally made themselves manifest when his system was undergoing the effects of the poison. *Tremulum caput* is an indication of palsy; we know from Suetonius that Claudius suffered as does a victim of this disease: *linguae titubantia caputque cum semper tum in quantulocumque actu uel maxime tremulum*.⁶⁴ *Longa manantia labra saliva* refers to a sort of affection which Suetonius says accompanied unrestrained mirth or wrath, *risus indecens, ira turpior spumante rictu*,⁶⁵ but which may well have been a symptom of the epileptic disorder to which several of the Roman emperors were subject. As any good physician would declare, it is often difficult to judge by external effects whether they are symptoms of certain diseases or of poison. Foaming at the mouth,

⁶⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 12, 67; Suet. *Nero*, 33; cf. Ball, *ib.* 17; cf. Juv. vi, 115; Martial, i, 20.

⁶¹ Juv. vi, 620; v, 148.

⁶² Juv. vi, 622, 623.

⁶³ Suet. *Claud.* 30.

⁶⁴ *Ib.*

⁶⁵ *Ib.*

for instance, might indicate more than one sort of physical disorder. In such cases it is essential for the detection of poison that the patient be examined with extreme medical care. Science had not developed far enough for this under the Roman Empire. That Juvenal did not intend to suggest these bodily infirmities as effects of the poison is also borne out by the statement, made by Suetonius, that accounts of what followed after Claudius took the poison differed, and by the fact that none of the tales he mentions has any connection with the palsy nor with epileptic fits.

Juvenal's remarkable characterization of Claudius in these two pregnant expressions seems on the other hand to raise up such a picture of physical impotence, that we are ready with the satirist to condone the crime of murdering the emperor and to agree for the moment that it was not so bad as Caesonia's act in administering the love philter which maddened Caligula and started him on a career of reckless slaughter.⁶⁶

That the ancient mind was prone to look for the cause of sudden death in poisoning is well-attested by the long list of men and women said to be thus disposed of, which fills the pages of the ancient historian. Modern science first searches for a natural cause. That Claudius' physical condition was always below normal we have noticed in mentioning his habits of eating and sleeping. Is it not highly probable that the chronic stomach disorder from which he suffered was the cause of his death?⁶⁷ Indeed it is hard to find any logical motive for Agrippina's poisoning her husband. We may well believe that he died soon after eating mushrooms, for that theory rather confirms the idea that his digestion was imperfect and easily disordered. He might have been taken off by a sudden acute attack of illness brought on by any sort of food which in itself is known to prove injurious to one in a precarious state of health.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Juv. vi, 614-626.

⁶⁷ Suet. *Claud.* 31.

⁶⁸ For this theory cf. Ferrero, *Characters and Events of Roman History*, 104; for his view of the character of Claudius, cf. *The Women of the Caesars*, 249 ff.

VII.

NERO.

Of the emperor Nero we have a still more distorted view than of his grand-uncle, Claudius, and we have a more difficult task to unravel the woof of contemporary prejudice from the warp of truth. Certainly he was descended from an illustrious line of ancestors, from the family of the Aenobarbi of the Domitian gens.¹ But his father was a degenerate product of it, and Nero seemed to the Romans to inherit not only the vices of his father, but an accumulation of all the vicious propensities of individual members of the gens from its foundation.²

His grandfather on his mother's side was Germanicus, from whom the Romans might well have hoped that Nero would possess by nature the noble traits rightly to be looked for in their imperial head. There was some foundation, then, for the pride of Rubellius Plautus in his near relationship to Nero.³ Unfortunately the virtues of the people's hero were submerged in the sea of iniquity on which, in the eyes of his subjects, Nero was wrecked beyond hope of salvation.

Juvenal turns the pride of Plautus into ridicule by demonstrating the futility of noble birth when divorced from virtue. The satirist has doubly enforced his illustration by associating the name of Nero with that of Plautus. Both were equally good examples by which to develop the theme,

Nobilitas sola est atque unica virtus.⁴

That Nero was the degenerate offspring of families held in high esteem even earlier than the generation immediately preceding him was doubtless true, but whether there was sufficient ground for representing him entirely without redeem-

¹ Suet. *Nero*, I; 9; 50; Juv. viii, 228.

² Suet. *Nero*, I.

³ Juv. viii, 72.

⁴ Juv. viii, 20.

ing qualities, as Juvenal appears to do,⁵ raises a discussion not without profit.

By a study of the passages in which Juvenal, Tacitus and Suetonius deal with the same details we may be able to reach a fuller understanding of the personality of Nero and of the view of contemporary Romans regarding him. Tacitus and Juvenal must be regarded from the same point of view, so far as the details which they give about Nero are concerned, since they were practically of the same age during his reign and may reasonably be thought to have had about the same mental development. Consequently we may suppose that they would remember events and rumors with equal accuracy and fullness.⁶ Of course it cannot be proved that the satirist had not read the work of the annalist before writing the *Satires*⁷ in which we have the principal references to Nero. Even if he had become perfectly familiar with the work of Tacitus, it is more likely that he would have relied upon his own memory of Nero rather than upon that of the historian.⁸ Suetonius' knowledge of Nero was not first-hand, but was derived for the most part from his elders and from whatever written accounts had been published before the *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*.⁹ The biographies are to be read side by side with the *Annals* and the *Satires* to serve as confirmation, refutation or correction of the work of the contemporaries of Nero.

It is not unnatural that the Romans should place the responsibility for their young emperor's folly and wickedness upon the shoulders of those charged with the task of educating him. In consequence popular odium was roused against Seneca, who was chosen as tutor for her son by Agrippina.¹⁰ The people criticised him severely for very much the same

⁵ Juv. iv, viii, x, xii.

⁶ For literary sources of Tacitus, cf. Clason, *ib.* 4-15, where he concludes that the principal source for Nero's reign was the work of Cluvius Rufus, which was supplemented by that of Fabius Rusticus and of Plinius Maior; cf. Schanz, ii, 2, 438; Tac. *Ann.* 13, 20; Voss. *de hist. Lat.* 129, 144.

⁷ Juv. viii, x, xii.

⁸ Dürr, *die zeitgeschichtlichen Beziehungen in den Satiren Juvenals*, 22; cf. Clason on sources used by Tacitus. Possibly the same literary works were familiar to Juvenal.

⁹ Cf. Clason, 27, for the conclusion that Suetonius used the work of Fabius Rusticus as a source for Nero; Voss. *de hist. Lat.* 129.

¹⁰ Suet. *Nero*, 7.

things which they considered such serious faults in his pupil. Tacitus says, *hi variis criminationibus Senecam adoriuntur*.¹¹ What in that age seemed unlimited wealth¹² was associated by the Romans with the quality of avarice; his preeminence in eloquence and his skill in the writing of poetry were to them the outcome of a rage for popularity. Luxury, avarice and ambition, the traditional vices of Roman society,¹³ Seneca developed and nurtured, they said, in the hope of vying with the imperial splendor and intellectual attainments.¹⁴ The "prince of scholars"¹⁵ was thus mentally and morally debased in popular estimation to the level of a stripling who had been raised to the height of power at a premature age. The charges against him were due to popular envy and jealousy of his wealth and power and to a natural tendency of the Romans to include in similar guilt all those living within the shadow of the emperor.

By the light of what Tacitus tells us of the ill repute of one of the most erudite of Romans¹⁶ we perceive that his contemporaries compared Seneca and Nero as two despicable characters. We, on the contrary, are accustomed to think of Seneca as an exalted philosopher, not to say martyr.¹⁷ Consequently modern readers, who are unfamiliar with the passage from Tacitus, would be inclined to think that Juvenal intended to present a contrast rather than a comparison in the following lines:

*Libera si dentur populo suffragia quis tam
Perditus ut dubitet Senecam praeferre Neroni?*¹⁸

In spite of the fact that Nero soon showed the cruelty of his disposition,¹⁹ there must have been some compensation to Seneca in his pupil's manifestation of ability. Especially successful was he in declamation. If it be true, as Suetonius

¹¹ Tac. *Ann.* 14, 52.

¹² Juv. x, 16.

¹³ Cf. Ferrero, *Characters and Events of Roman History*, 13, 14, 26.

¹⁴ Tac. *ib.*

¹⁵ Pliny, *N. H.* 14, 51.

¹⁶ Tac. *ib.*; cf. Henderson, *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero*, 67, 68, 123, 138-142.

¹⁷ Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 10, 1, 129; Pelham, 543.

¹⁸ Juv. viii, 211, 212.

¹⁹ Suet. *Nero*, 7.

says, that to secure deeper devotion to himself Seneca discouraged Nero's reading of the ancient orators,²⁰ it was, according to the results, an excellent method to pursue. It is not unlikely that early experiences in public oratory²¹ engendered in Nero the desire for appearing in public, which unfortunately was later developed irregularly, like all his desires. Even thus early in his career the public knew something of the wild oats which the youth was sowing and were loath, it may be for this reason, to give him credit for his talents. For it was observed that his funeral oration for Claudius had been written by Seneca.²² The people could not refrain from laughter at the point where the young orator praised the political wisdom of Claudius. As they had not appreciated that emperor's administrative ability, perhaps they were overcome by the absurdity of what seemed to them such obvious insincerity. But the lack of respect to Nero, of which this is an illustration, may have been partly to blame for his later plunge into recklessness.

From this time on Nero's studies took a different turn, and he began to devote himself to accomplishments of which he had always been especially fond, to pursuits for the most part artistic and intellectual.²³ These the Romans were not yet ready to appreciate, since they were the products of Hellenistic influence and conflicted with the ancient Roman military ideal of what a ruler should be.²⁴ Both Juvenal and Suetonius express the opinion of the ordinary Roman on the subject of Nero's devotion to music. Juvenal writes,

Res haut mira tamen citharoedo principe mimus
Nobilis.²⁵

Suetonius ridicules the ardor with which Nero cultivated his voice and his preoccupation with a wonderful hydraulic organ built in his palace.²⁶

²⁰ *Ib.* 52; *Tac. Ann.* 14, 52.

²¹ *Suet. Nero*, 7; 9; 10; *Tac. Ann.* 12, 58.

²² *Suet. Nero*, 9; *Tac. Ann.* 13, 3.

²³ *Tac. ib.*

²⁴ *Cf. Tac. Ann.* 16, 5; Ferrero, *ib.* 107-110, 138, 139.

²⁵ *Juv. viii*, 198, 199; *cf. Tac. Ann.* 14, 14.

²⁶ *Suet. Nero*, 20; 41.

Enthusiasm for art impelled Nero to make trial of his creative faculty.²⁷ To crown his varied efforts²⁸ in the realm of poetry, he wrote an epic poem. Suetonius tells us that Nero, dressed in the tragic garb which he wore upon the stage, sang a poem, entitled *The Ruin of Troy*, while he viewed with pleasure the great fire that destroyed a large part of the city of Rome in 64 A.D.²⁹ Doubtless this was the poem composed by Nero himself to which Juvenal refers in the lines,

in scaena numquam cantavit Orestes,
Troica non scripsit.³⁰

In poetry as in oratory common rumor coupled Nero's name with Seneca's. This time Seneca is said to have dabbled in poetry because the emperor did.³¹ Nero is no longer accused of drawing from Seneca, as in the case of his speeches; nor yet is he given the credit for the ability to compose his songs and poems himself. Tacitus tells us that Nero formed a society of young, inexperienced wits, who scribbled off amateur verses to be recited at their meetings. They even waited sometimes until the company had gathered before thinking out what they should write. Such scraps they tried to piece together into a sort of poem, being careful always to put Nero's essays of genius in a prominent place. That the result was nothing like the work of one creative fancy could easily be judged, as Tacitus says, from a careful perusal.³²

By contrast with this depreciation of Nero as a poet we have an interesting chapter by Suetonius,³³ which compels us to agree with him that the emperor certainly practiced the art of poetical composition himself. Suetonius happened to come across some memoranda and little note-books containing some very well-known verses in Nero's own handwriting. An examination of them proved that they were not copied nor taken at dictation; for many erasures, insertions and inter-

²⁷ *Ib.* 52.

²⁸ *Suet. Dom.* 1; *Nero*, 24; 43; *Tac. Ann.* 15, 33.

²⁹ *Suet. Nero*, 38, 2; cf. *Tac. Ann.* 15, 38; 39; 44.

³⁰ *Juv.* viii, 220, 221.

³¹ *Tac. Ann.* 14, 52.

³² *Tac. Ann.* 14, 16.

³³ *Suet. Nero*, 52.

lineations showed that they had been composed by Nero himself. Suetonius must have found these manuscripts in the imperial archives, as he expressly insists on their authenticity, which he could not otherwise have done so valiantly. With the manuscripts before him he decidedly refutes the implication of some critics that these verses were plagiarized.³⁴

We conclude that the satirist accepted the common estimate of Nero's poems. This being the case, his readers must have found an added meaning in the lines quoted above.³⁵ Of course the climax appears absurd to us; Juvenal perhaps intended it to be so. With the thought of Nero's poetical compositions the Romans must have associated all those ideas that naturally accompany reference to a plagiarist. These would not at first thought, if at all, occur to a modern reader. For this reason the anti-climax must have seemed much more affective to the Romans than to us.³⁶

The utter frivolity of an emperor, who accompanied himself upon the harp while he sang songs which they believed were not of his own composition, was shameful enough. But the disgrace of it was surpassed when Nero mounted the stage.³⁷ To the Romans this act was in itself a crime; how great a one Juvenal shows in the lines:

Quid enim Verginius armis
Debit ulcisci magis aut cum Vindice Galba,
Quod Nero tam saeva crudaque tyrannide fecit?³⁸

Surely this outrage demanded the vengeance which Galba took when he usurped the throne of the despised and wretched Nero.

Not at first bold enough to appear in public alone, Nero established the *Juvenalia* in the Vatican gardens. These were sports in which Romans of all degrees strove to excel in dramatic arts.³⁹ After he had thus hardened the people to

³⁴ Cf. Macé, *ib.* 178-180.

³⁵ *Juv.* viii, 220, 221.

³⁶ Cf. Mayor and Wilson, notes to *Juv.* viii, 221.

³⁷ *Juv.* viii, 220; *Suet. Nero*, 20.

³⁸ *Juv.* viii, 221-223.

³⁹ *Juv.* viii, 220, 228-230; cf. Fabia, *Néron Acteur*, *Bulletin de la société des amis de l'université de Lyon*, XIX (1906), 27-52.

the public performances of nobles, he threw off all restraint. "With harp in hand he advanced upon the stage; he tuned the chords with a graceful air and with delicate flourishes gave a prelude to his art."⁴⁰ So Tacitus describes Nero's sensational début.

Some thought that the new mode of pressing the citizens of Rome into the service of the stage had ruined all decorum, and that under color of promoting poetry and eloquence the patricians openly disgraced themselves.⁴¹ Juvenal shows himself to be among those who held this opinion: he writes,

Nec tamen ipsi
Ignoscas populo; populi frons durior huius
Qui sedet et spectat triscurria patriciorum,
Planipedes audit Fabios, ridere potest qui
Mamercorum alapas.⁴²

Others, "the apologists of vice," according to Tacitus, considered that these contests would raise a spirit of emulation and promote the cause of literature. Though he inclined to the first of these two opinions, Tacitus is sufficiently just to acknowledge, in the interest of fairness, that the celebration was conducted without offence against decency or good manners, and that the rage of the people for theatrical entertainments did not break out into any kind of excess.⁴³ The inclination of both satirist and annalist, then, is to represent the popular prejudice against innovations introduced by Nero. Suetonius also throughout his *Life of Nero* uses a contemptuous tone in making mention of his artistic attainments.

The radicals who suggested that Nero would give an impulse to artistic and literary production evidently fell so far into the minority that their theory was lost in that of their opponents. Among them perhaps were to be found those who showed their deep affection for the emperor by strewing spring and summer flowers upon his grave for long after his death.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 14, 15; 15, 33; Suet. *Nero*, 20.

⁴¹ Tac. *Ann.* 14, 20.

⁴² Juv. viii, 188-192.

⁴³ Tac. *Ann.* 14, 21.

⁴⁴ Suet. *Nero*, 57.

It is the view of the majority, therefore, which Juvenal, Tacitus and Suetonius represent, that has come down to us as a part of the imperial tradition. To discover the truth it is necessary to take into consideration the causes of that prejudice and to correct it by giving due weight to the more liberal opinion which we who are living in a modern age much more thoroughly understand.

Nero's public performances included the acting of tragedies. According to Juvenal the emperor had played the parts of Thyestes, Antigone and Menalippe.⁴⁵ While still a very little boy he acted his part in the *Trojan play* with considerable firmness and in a very pleasing manner.⁴⁶ When he grew older he took part in spectacles both private and public, for which he was offered pay.⁴⁷ Suetonius gives a list of several plays in which Nero sang and acted:

inter cetera cantavit Canac[h]en parturientem, Oresten matricidam, Oedipodem excaecatam, Herculem insanum⁴⁸ . . . obseruatam etiam fuerat nouissimam fabulam cantasse eum publice Oedipodem exulem.⁴⁹

Shortly before his death Nero planned a series of spectacles. He said that he intended taking, on the last day of these games, the part of Turnus as represented in Virgil.⁵⁰

So famous did Nero become for his skill in music, in acting and in driving the chariot, that a deputation from Greece was sent to Rome to offer him the crowns belonging to those who had won them in contests held in the various Greek cities.⁵¹ Flattered by the homage of a race of men who, he said, had an ear for music and were the only good judges of him and of his attainments, he undertook a tour of Greece in 67 A.D., the year before his death.⁵² It is to this visit that Juvenal refers in the lines,

⁴⁵ Juv. viii, 228, 229.

⁴⁶ Suet. *Nero*, 7.

⁴⁷ Ib. 21.

⁴⁸ Ib.

⁴⁹ Ib. 46.

⁵⁰ Ib. 54.

⁵¹ Suet. *Nero*, 22. The missing part of Tac. *Ann.* 16 probably contained an account of Nero's tour of Greece.

⁵² Suet. *ib.*

Haec opera atque hae sunt generosi principis artes,
 Gaudentis foedo peregrina ad pulpita cantu
 Prostitui Graiaequae apium meruisse coronae.⁵³

Sending an order ahead that all Grecian public games falling in different years should be held during the one year of his stay, Nero set out from Italy with a numerous retinue of attendants. In the rôle of strolling player the Roman emperor appeared at the four great Greek festivals, the Olympian, the Pythian, the Nemean and the Isthmian. At Olympia a special musical contest was introduced at his command.⁵⁴ A victor in all trials of skill, he won many crowns.⁵⁵ The crown of parsley which Juvenal especially mentions⁵⁶ was won at the Isthmian⁵⁷ or at the Nemean games.⁵⁸ When Nero entered the triumphal procession at Naples, Antium, Alba and Rome, he wore upon his head the wreath won at Olympia; in his right hand he carried the one won at the Pythian games.⁵⁹ These trophies the emperor placed about his bed-room.

In earlier days, when he had been awarded a crown for a contest in harp-playing, he was so elated that he ordered it to be carried to the statue of Augustus.⁶⁰ It was the remembrance of this offering, perhaps, that suggested to Juvenal these lines, in which he holds up to contempt and ridicule a Roman emperor who could stoop so low as to appear upon a foreign stage:

Maiorum effigies habeant insignia vocis,
 Ante pedes Domiti longum tu pone Thyestae
 Syrma vel Antigonae aut personam vel Menalippae,
 Et de marmoreo citharam suspende colosso.⁶¹

Granted that Nero was the victim of an age of transition

⁵³ Juv. viii, 224-226.

⁵⁴ Suet. *Nero*, 23.

⁵⁵ *Ib.* 25.

⁵⁶ Juv. viii, 226.

⁵⁷ *Scholia vetera* on Juv. viii, 226, states that it was the custom at the Isthmian games to crown the victor with a parsley wreath.

⁵⁸ Cf. Wilson, ed. Juv. *Sat.* 91, note 2.

⁵⁹ Suet. *Nero*, 25.

⁶⁰ *Ib.* 12. 3.

⁶¹ Juv. viii, 227-230.

from ancient military ideals to the more intellectual tendencies that were creeping into Rome from more highly civilized nations,⁶² we must nevertheless admit that there were causes for prejudice against Nero, the man, as well as against Nero, the artist. The young prince showed elements of character that no good citizen could tolerate in a ruler of the Roman world.⁶³ The darkness of midnight was used as a cloak for every act of licentiousness. When it was finally drawn away, to reveal the perpetrator of innumerable crimes, he let loose his fury in a still more terrible vengeance.⁶⁴ Feasting and merry-making were begun at noon and protracted till the middle of the night⁶⁵ with every variety of indulgence that an adept in the gastronomic art could provide. Juvenal could not more vividly describe to a Roman the experiences of an epicure than by the following lines:

noverat ille
Luxuriam inperii veterem noctesque Neronis
Iam medias aliamque famem, cum pulmo Falerno
Arderet. nulli maior fuit usus edendi
Tempestate mea.⁶⁶

Midnight riots became the fashion. In the garb of a slave, with a bodyguard of soldiers and gladiators, Nero ransacked the city of Rome and filled it with tumult and disorder.⁶⁷ They broke open the shops, seized the merchandise, and offered it at auction in the palace, where the booty was divided.⁶⁸ To such lawless acquisition Juvenal was making allusion when he wrote

Possideat quantum rapuit Nero, montibus aurum
Exaequet.⁶⁹

An impostor raised false hopes of digging up the vast treasure which Dido had left hidden in a cave near Carthage.

⁶² Cf. Ferrero, *ib.* 107-110.

⁶³ Suet. *Nero*, 26.

⁶⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 16, 20; 13, 25.

⁶⁵ Suet. *Nero*, 27.

⁶⁶ Juv. *iv.* 136-140.

⁶⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 13, 25.

⁶⁸ *Ib.*; Suet. *Nero*, 26.

⁶⁹ Juv. *xii.* 129, 130; cf. *x.* 308.

With such immense wealth in view Nero launched out into reckless profusion.⁷⁰ Nothing came of the scheme. He fell into despair as deep as his hopes had been high, and resolved upon a campaign of false accusations and plunder. Orders were issued with the express purpose of ministering to his infamous extravagance at the expense of others.⁷¹ Certainly those were times full of dread of the order of Nero; no one dared hoard a fortune:

Temporibus diris igitur iussuque Neronis
 Longinum et magnos Senecae praedivitis hortos
 Clausit et egregias Lateranorum obsidet aedes
 Tota cohors: rarus venit in cenacula miles.⁷²

Worst of all was the mad avarice that prompted his offer to guard and clear the ruins after the terrible fire at Rome; he hoped to enrich himself from the plunder.⁷³

Let us delay a moment to consider whether the Romans might not have looked upon Nero's foolish passion for the arts, and even upon his midnight roving and his extravagant expenditure, as the youthful sowing of wild oats. Notice how Juvenal checks himself⁷⁴ in the midst of a fierce invective against vice,

Indulge veniam pueris.⁷⁵

These words remind us of a similar sentiment expressed by Suetonius in connection with Nero. He says that first the emperor abandoned himself to the lowest vices, as if prompted to them by the spirit of youth, but even then the world divined that they were innate and not merely the faults that pass with the coming of maturity.⁷⁶ Certainly as he grew older and no longer took pains to conceal his evil propensities, Nero confirmed the general opinion that he was vicious by nature, for then he broke out into still greater crimes.⁷⁷

⁷⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 16, 1-3.

⁷¹ Suet. *Nero*, 32.

⁷² Juv. x, 15-18.

⁷³ Suet. *Nero*, 38. 3.

⁷⁴ Juv. viii, 163-167.

⁷⁵ Ib. 167.

⁷⁶ Suet. *Nero*, 26.

⁷⁷ Ib. 27.

As a check upon Suetonius we must again quote the satirist, who writes,

Omne animi vitium tanto conspectius in se
Crimen habet, quanto maior qui peccat habetur.⁷⁸

These lines we instantly recognize as the expression of a universal truth by the light of which we may perhaps modify some of the exaggerated statements concerning Nero's crimes. If there was any tendency among the Romans to pass over the emperor's profligacy as though it were the natural recklessness and folly of youth, which Suetonius suggests, it seems strange they should so soon discover that this was not the case.⁷⁹ For Nero died at thirty-two,⁸⁰ an age even now considered young and in Roman times far below the limit set for youth, which was forty. The emperor scarcely had time to outgrow those follies which traditionally accompany the beginning of life and give place later to steadier qualities of character. If we hear that Nero sinned more than many others of his time, we cannot help wondering whether his conspicuous position as ruler of the Roman Empire did not magnify to the public eye the details of his private life, while many in lower circles who were as bad, or worse, escaped notice entirely. Indeed the vulgar mind would be likely to dwell upon the slightest tale of infamy in court circles, until Dame Rumor was decked with feathers so large and peculiar that she could no longer be recognized.

Bearing this warning in mind we may proceed to consider the tales of murders attributed to Nero. The methodical amplification of this subject, so enticing to the curious mind of Suetonius, can scarcely fail to arouse distrust in his statements. There was no person at all connected with the emperor who escaped his deadly cruelty; he destroyed all who were related to him by blood or by marriage;⁸¹ then he murdered without distinction, for the slightest reasons, any whom his wild caprice suggested.⁸²

⁷⁸ *Juv.* viii, 140, 141.

⁷⁹ *Suet. Nero*, 26.

⁸⁰ *Ib.* 57.

⁸¹ *Suet. Nero*, 33; 34; 35; *Claud.* 44; 45; *Tac. Ann.* 13, 15; 14, 10; 11; 15, 69; 16, 6.

⁸² *Suet. Nero*, 36; 37. 1; 35. 5; *Tac. Ann.* 14, 51.

In meditating upon this tale of wide-spread destruction of human life, it is impossible for the student not to question the manner in which Suetonius tells of each murder. He states in each case that Nero ordered slaughter or poisoning and yet he inserts words or clauses that suggest other causes for the death of the victim and possibly an acquittal of Nero. Suetonius appears to follow a set of rumors that suits his purpose of vilifying the emperor. Whether or not it would be possible to vindicate Nero by an exhaustive study of the problems in connection with his alleged murders, it is worth while to place ourselves on guard against accepting such a general indictment as Suetonius serves upon the emperor. He holds the popular view of his age which finally became the settled one among the Romans, whereas Tacitus voices a variety of contemporary rumors, such as Juvenal also heard and judged.

The satirist considers no justification offered by Nero himself or suggested by conflicting rumors in his defense. Rather he thinks is the emperor to be compared with Orestes, whom he far surpassed in guilt.

Par Agamemnonidae crimen, sed causa facit rem
 Dissimilem. quippe ille deis auctoribus ultor
 Patris erat caesi media inter pocula, sed nec
 Electrae iugulo se polluit aut Spartani
 Sanguine coniugii, nullis aconita propinquis
 Miscuit, in scaena numquam cantavit Orestes,
 Troica non scripsit.⁸³

The son of Agamemnon slew his mother, Clytemnestra, to avenge the murder of his father, who was cruelly slaughtered at the banquet that celebrated his return from the Trojan War. This he did after consulting the oracle at Delphi and receiving from Apollo authority to punish his mother for her unspeakable crime. The god afterwards purified him and defended his action before the court of the Areopagus.

Nero, by contrast, could offer no adequate defence for the slaughter of his mother,⁸⁴ by which to acquit himself before

⁸³ Juv. viii, 215-221.

⁸⁴ Cf. Suet. *Nero*, 34, 2; Tac. *Ann.* 14, 10; 11.

the tribunal of posterity. Moreover Orestes added no other crimes to that of matricide, as did Nero. He did not stain his sword with the blood of his sister, Electra, as did Nero with that of Octavia.⁸⁵ Nor did he take the life of his wife, Hermione. Nero, on the other hand, was responsible for the death both of Octavia, his first wife, and of Poppaea, his second.⁸⁶ Orestes did not poison any of his relatives, whereas we can scarcely give a complete list of all those connected with Nero by blood or by marriage who are said to have died by this means.⁸⁷

In the comparison between Nero and Orestes Juvenal was probably not original, but adopted a simile used by contemporaries of Nero who nailed up in public places scandalous invectives and lampoons against the emperor. The idea may have been suggested to them by the words of Nero himself. Suetonius states that the emperor frequently affirmed that he was haunted by his mother's ghost and was persecuted with the whips and burning torches of the Furies, though it is quite likely that this is only a fanciful touch added by the biographer.⁸⁸ Several of the libels are preserved by Suetonius, who says that they were written in Greek and in Latin⁸⁹ and were generally known; if Juvenal did not actually see them nailed up in public places about the city when he was a little boy, he had probably heard them repeated. There is no doubt that whatever difference of opinion there may have been regarding his slaughter of others, it was universally believed that Nero was guilty of the murder of his mother.⁹⁰ Insinuations to this effect were common and were expressed even on the stage. A comic actor, Datus, when he came to the line

"Farewell father, farewell mother,"⁹¹

used appropriate gestures, to intimate the drinking of poison

⁸⁵ Cf. Suet. *Nero*, 35. 3; Tac. *Ann.* 16, 6.

⁸⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 16, 6.

⁸⁷ *Supra*, note 80.

⁸⁸ Suet. *Nero*, 34. 4.

⁸⁹ *Ib.* 39.

⁹⁰ Suet. *Nero*, 34. 2; Tac. *Ann.* 14, 10; 11; cf. Henderson, 124, who says that those of this opinion were in the minority; Cf. Martial iv, 63.

⁹¹ Suet. *Nero*, 39. 3.

by the father and swimming by the mother, in illustration of the deaths of Claudius and Agrippina.

Nor did Nero transgress all known moral laws with impunity. To be despised by his subjects, who did not scruple to publish bold invectives against his character, or audaciously to represent his foul deeds upon the stage, must have been an unspeakable humiliation to their emperor and a sure prophecy of his fall. Epigrams were being hung upon his statues, the contents of which showed the inability of the Romans to dissociate his art from his criminality. The punishment he deserved was darkly suggested in these libels. On the top of one of his statues was fastened a lock of hair with a Greek inscription, the words of which are quoted as follows by Suetonius, *Nunc demum agona esse et traderet tandem*.⁹² About the neck of another statue was hung a little bag with a ticket tied to it, on which was written a dialogue between Nero and an accuser,

Ego quid potui?
tu culleum meruisti.⁹³

The record of these epigrams preserved by Suetonius is of importance for the interpretation of Juvenal.⁹⁴ The satirist probably saw this scurrilous abuse of the emperor, of which Suetonius later heard accounts, and he agreed with the writer of it that Nero should have suffered the ancient penalty for parricide. In early times the custom was to flog the victim and then to enclose him in a sack together with a dog, a cock, a snake and a monkey, and to cast him into the sea. Even such cruel treatment was not enough for Nero in the opinion of Juvenal, who says,

Cuius supplicio non debuit una parari
Simia nec serpens unus nec culleus unus.⁹⁵

More terrible than public vilification and dark threats of

⁹² *Ib.* 45. 2; cf. J. de Decker, *à propos d'une épigramme contre Néron*, *R. I. P.* liii, 1910, 124-32.

⁹³ *Suet.* *ib.*; J. de Decker, *ib.*

⁹⁴ *Juv.* viii, 214, 215.

⁹⁵ *Juv.* viii, 213, 214; for interpretation of *Digest*, xlvi, 9. 9, cf. *Cic. Rosc. Am.* 71 ff; Howard in *Harv. Studies in C. P.* vii, 208 f.

barbarous punishment were the sharp stings of his guilty conscience. Such vengeance was far greater torture than even Juvenal was able to imagine.⁹⁶ According to Suetonius, as we have noticed, the emperor himself confessed that he paid this penalty for the murder of his mother.⁹⁷ Whether he did so in words we have only this report of the biographer by which to judge, but certainly his actions while on the tour in Greece go to prove that all his artistic triumph could not cast into oblivion the ghastly scene of his mother's death. He was afraid to go to Athens, for he dreaded to approach the temple of the Eumenides. These avenging goddesses probably did their part to goad him on to suicide. A letter from the Senate threatened him with the declaration, *se hostem a senatu iudicatum et quaeri, ut puniatur more maiorum*.⁹⁸

The real cause of Nero's fall was not abandonment to Hellenistic culture; for many of the nobility with more modern inclinations approved and followed it. Nor was it the crime of matricide; else why did the senate allow him to live so long after the deed was committed?⁹⁹ It is rather to be looked for in one of those libels already mentioned, that were scribbled on columns throughout the city of Rome, which declared: *etiam Gallos eum cantando excitasse*.¹⁰⁰

We cannot help thinking that Juvenal remembered the deep impression made upon him in boyhood by these scurrilous words. The worst of Nero's crimes were, according to the satirist, his singing on the stage and his writing the *Troica*:

in scaena numquam cantavit Orestes,
Troica non scripsit. quid enim Verginius armis
Debutit ulcisci magis aut cum Vindice Galba,
Quod Nero tam saeva crudaque tyrannide fecit?¹⁰¹

Whatever opposition Nero's profligacy had stirred up earlier in his reign was probably limited to the old aristocratic and

⁹⁶ Juv. xiii, 199-226.

⁹⁷ Suet. *Nero*, 34. 4.

⁹⁸ *Ib.* 49. 2.

⁹⁹ On Agrippina's unpopularity, cf. Ferrero, *Char. and Events of Rom. Hist.* 117-119, 126, 127; *The Women of the Caesars*, 315-320.

¹⁰⁰ Suet. *Nero*, 45. 2.

¹⁰¹ Juv. viii, 220-223.

conservative element among the Romans. The conflagration of 64 A.D.,¹⁰² and the absurdities of the Grecian tour¹⁰³ that followed, raised a storm of condemnation so wide-spread that the emperor was forced to commit suicide.¹⁰⁴ The leaders of the revolt were Verginius, Galba and Vindex, governors of Germany, Spain and Gaul with their poorly paid provincial armies. These took vengeance upon Nero for his cruel tyranny. His downfall was due to the rising power of the praetorian cohort in the city and of the military garrisons on the frontiers of the Empire.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Juv. i, 155.

¹⁰³ Juv. viii, 224-226.

¹⁰⁴ Suet. *Nero*, 47; 48; 49; 57.

¹⁰⁵ Juv. viii, 220-223; Suet. *Nero*, 40; cf. Ferrero, *Char. and Events of Rom. Hist.* 134, 135.

VIII.

GALBA.

Plutarch tells us that, when Galba was invited to accept the imperial power, the rebellion headed by Vindex became a Civil War, because a man of princely talents was then at the head of it.¹ Such it appeared in the eyes of Juvenal also, who recognized the justice of the avengers and attests the excellent reputation and honorable life of the new emperor.² He was a great citizen, of whom posterity could be as justly proud as he was of his forefathers. As he was not content with a long line of illustrious ancestors, his imagination conjured up a mythological origin.³ But he was proudest of his connection by birth with Quintus Catulus Capitolinus,⁴ and, according to Suetonius, always had the statement inscribed on his statues that he was the great grandson of this famous citizen.⁵ As there are no such inscriptions extant, we cannot be sure of the truth of Suetonius' assertion.⁶ No fanciful pedigree was necessary to prove Galba's nobility to Suetonius, to Tacitus, or to Plutarch, so that Juvenal's high estimation of the venerable emperor was well-grounded so far as family was concerned.

It was also justified from other points of view. According to Plutarch Galba was a leader worthy of ancient Rome in all military affairs, even if he did become the tool of his ministers in the civil administration.⁷ Tacitus, though he cannot celebrate the emperor's virtues, declares him free from vice,⁸—negative praise, to be sure, but none the less valuable, since most writers are loath to give even this to the rulers of the

¹ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 29.

² Juv. *viii*, 5, 221–223; *vi*, 559.

³ Cf. Tac. *Hist.* *i*, 49; Suet. *Galba*, 2.

⁴ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 3.

⁵ Suet. *Galba*, 2.

⁶ Cf. Dennison, 50, 66.

⁷ Suet. *Galba*, 6, 14; Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 29.

⁸ Tac. *Hist.* *i*, 49.

Roman Empire. It is natural to conclude that the estimate of Galba's character which was held in common by Tacitus, Suetonius, Plutarch and Juvenal, was the usual one among the Romans. At least it cannot be said to be so unusual that, in the case of the satirist, the student must attribute it to opposition to the Flavian dynasty.⁹

It was Galba's illustrious birth and high credit with the legions that pointed him out as the proper person to depose a prince whose cruelty made him detestable and whose folly rendered even tyranny itself ridiculous. Therefore it appeared to Juvenal that it was the duty of Galba to join with Vindex in exacting punishment from the blood-stained Nero, while Suetonius judged Galba's motive to be something between hope and fear.¹⁰ Juvenal asks

quid enim Verginius armis
Debit ulcisci magis aut cum Vindice Galba,
Quod Nero tam saeva crudaque tyrannide fecit?¹¹

The reign of Galba had been variously foretold by portents, omens and prophecies. When Galba as a little boy came to pay his respects to Augustus, the emperor said to him, pinching his cheek, "And thou, too, child, shalt taste our imperial dignity."¹² There was a still more mysterious foreboding of Galba's death, which Juvenal suggests in the lines,

Chaldaeis sed maior erit fiducia; quidquid
Dixerit astro'ogus, credent a fonte relatum
Hammonis, quoniam Delphis oracula cessant
Et genus humanum damnat caligo futuri.
Praecipuus tamen est horum, qui saepius exul,
Cuius amicitia conducendaque tabella
Magnus civis obit et formidatus Othoni.
Inde fides artis, sonuit si dextera ferro
Laevaue, si longo castrorum in carcere mansit.¹³

⁹ Cf. Friedl. note to Juv. vi, 559, in which he gives the opinion of Lewis.

¹⁰ Suet. *Galba*, 9. 2.

¹¹ Juv. viii, 221-223.

¹² Suet. *Galba*, 4.

¹³ Juv. vi, 553-561.

Not infrequently does the fortune-teller by the very suggestion of possibilities for the future give the impulse to their realization. Such was the effect of a prophecy that Otho would be raised to the office of emperor. Otho's accession and Galba's death are alike the results of the Chaldaean's inspiration. With superstitious credulity Otho had always listened to promises of a year of glory made to him by Chaldaean astrologers. But his friend, Ptolemy, who accompanied him to the province of Lusitania, of which Nero had made him governor, had especial influence upon him and urged him on to treason by inculcating in him hopes of future elevation. Added weight was given to Ptolemy's words, because a former prophecy that Otho would survive Nero had been fulfilled.¹⁴ Suetonius tells the same tale as Tacitus and Plutarch, differing only in the name of the astrologer, whom he calls Seleucus.¹⁵

If *Sat.* vi, 558 and 559 are genuine, the direct reference to Ptolemy is clearer; if they are spurious, there seems no reason why we should not accept them as a correct explanation of the meaning of lines 557-561.¹⁶ Certainly the clause *qui saepius horum* may have had its foundation in the fact that a Chaldaean astrologer of importance accompanied Otho to Spain when he was appointed governor of that province,—an appointment which was well-known to be a sort of honorary exile inflicted by Nero upon a rival. Juvenal knew this at first hand, as did Tacitus, so that the two authors confirm each other in this detail, particularly if lines 558 and 559 are to be accepted as genuine.

Juvenal's use of an epithet instead of a proper name is unfortunate, in that he might have settled the question whether the astrologer was Ptolemy or Seleucus. This might naturally have been decided with the help of Tacitus, Plutarch and Suetonius, by the author who composed lines 558 and 559, if they were added as a gloss. For this reason the absence of the name is a point in favor of their genuineness.

¹⁴ Tac. *Hist.* i, 22; Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 23.

¹⁵ Suet. *Otho*, 4.

¹⁶ Cf. Friedl.'s note; 558, 559 *om. P in margine add. p.*; O. Ribbeck, *Der echte und der unechte Juvenal*, 166-168, where he gives his reasons for not accepting these lines; Haenike, *Kritische Untersuchung über die Echtheit der 12. Satire von Juvenal*, in which he criticises Ribbeck's theory and method.

In writing these lines of the *Sixth Satire* Juvenal might have been thinking of Tacitus' account, but it is not at all likely that he had access to it before writing the *Second Satire*, in which he directly refers to the murder of Galba by Otho:

Res memoranda novis annalibus atque recenti
 Historia, speculum civilis sarcina belli.
 Nimirum summi ducis est occidere Galbam
 Et curare cutem.¹⁷

It will be remembered that this *Satire* was published in 100 A.D. at the earliest, and we know that the *Histories* were published some time during the reign of Trajan. Since Tacitus included the year 96 A.D. in his work, he would scarcely have had it ready for the public very soon after that date, though he may have finished it about the time that Juvenal wrote or published the *Second Satire*. Whether or not the *Histories* were completed and generally known at that time, we cannot help reading a reference to them in a passage dealing with the very period of the Civil War which Tacitus treated in such detail. The poet knew, it seems, that the historian's task was under way, even if he had not yet seen the results. It is, however, not unlikely that Juvenal in these lines alludes to the historical work, entitled *A Fine Aufidi Bassi*, by C. Plinius Secundus, which included the period of Galba and Otho, and from which he drew, as did also Tacitus, Suetonius and Plutarch.¹⁸

The brutality of the men who assassinated Galba is almost incredible. Juvenal refers to it in the opening lines of the *Eighth Satire* on the vanity of noble birth:

Stemmata quid faciunt, quid prodest, Pontice, longo
 Sanguine censeri, pictos ostendere vultus
 Maiorum et stantes in curribus Aemilianos

¹⁷ Juv. ii, 102-105.

¹⁸ Schanz, ii, 2, 438, 494. 6; Clason, ib. 98, 99; cf. Lehmann, 40, for opinion that Suet. drew from Tac. *Hist.*; cf. Th. Wiedemann, *de Tacito, Suetonio, Plutarcho, Cassio Dione, scriptoribus imperatorum Galbae et Othonis*, 54-58, for the conclusion that for information about Galba Tac. drew from Pliny, Suet. from Cluvius Rufus, Plut. from both; cf. Voss. ib. 154, 144.

Et Curios iam dimidios humerosque minorem
Corvinum et Galbam auriculis nasoque carentem.¹⁹

The soldiers demolished the statues of Galba, and then, after overturning the chair in which he had been carried to the forum, proceeded to put the emperor to death.²⁰ Accounts differ as to the name of the chief murderer. Suetonius does not choose anyone for mention. Tacitus says that Camurinus cut Galba's throat and then the rest in brutal rage severed the limbs from the body, after which the head was fixed upon a pole and exposed to public view.²¹ Suetonius tells us that a common soldier found the dead body lying near the Lacus Curtius, cut off the head, put it into his bosom, as there was no hair by which to hold it, and then, thrusting his thumb into the mouth, delivered it thus to slaves, who fixed it on a spear and paraded with it about the camp.²²

Plutarch seems to combine these accounts. Though he did not have access to Suetonius, he may have used the work of Tacitus for some points. In any case he probably drew from sources common to himself and these historians.²³ He repeats that, after the soldiers had inflicted many wounds upon Galba's arms and legs, Fabius cut off the head and wrapped it up, because it was so bald he could not take hold of it by the hair; but afterwards he was forced by his companions to fix it on the point of his spear and swing it about so that all could see it.²⁴

On the day following the murder, according to Tacitus, the head was added to the ashes of the body.²⁵ Plutarch says that it was given to the servants of Patrobius and Vitellius, who after treating it with the utmost insolence threw it into a place called Sestertium, where were cast the bodies of those

¹⁹ Juv. viii, 1-5. Lines 5 and 6 were considered spurious by Hermann, but are accepted as genuine by Friedlaender and Mayor. On the difficulties in lines 4-8, cf. Hermann, *Rh. M.* vi, 454.

²⁰ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 22; 26.

²¹ Tac. *Hist.* I, 41; 49.

²² Suet. *Galba*, 20.

²³ Cf. Schanz, ii, 1, 438; Wiedemann *ib.* for conclusion that Plut. used Plinius and Cluvius Rufus.

²⁴ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 27.

²⁵ Tac. *Hist.* I, 49.

that had been put to death by the emperors.²⁶ Suetonius tells us that a freedman of Patrobius, who himself had belonged to Nero's family, purchased the head for one hundred gold pieces, and threw it into the place where by Galba's order his patron had been put to death; finally after some time his steward Argivus buried it with the rest of his body.²⁷

All three historians agree that Galba's head was subjected to outrageous indignities. The facts would certainly have been known to Juvenal, even if he had not had the opportunity to read the *Histories* of Tacitus, with which he was no doubt familiar by the time he wrote the *Eighth Satire*.

When he wrote the lines quoted above, Juvenal may have been thinking of the destruction of Galba's statues which, as we have seen, were overturned and broken by his enemies.²⁸ In this condition they might very well be thought of as representing the emperor without a nose and with mutilated ears. Yet it seems more natural that the name of Galba, or the conception of a figure of him, would call to the poet's mind the picture of his outraged corpse, and especially of the wounded head, which had been severed from the body. With the memory of the Civil War still fresh, Juvenal could scarcely help dwelling upon the bloody scenes of carnage. According to the *Scholia*²⁹ Galba's nose and ears were cut off before he was killed: there is certainly no evidence for this to be found in the extant works of the historians.

²⁶ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 28.

²⁷ Suet. *Galba*, 20.

²⁸ Cf. Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 22; 26.

²⁹ Cf. *Scholia vetera*, viii, 4.

IX.

OTHO.

The ardor with which Otho was inflamed by the preternatural knowledge of his friend, Ptolemy,¹ was increased by jealousy of Piso, a youth of excellent character, whom Galba had wisely chosen as his heir and successor.² Many who had desired the adoption of Otho urged him to revenge, and prepared a revolt within so few days that it proves they had been extremely disaffected for a long time, and simply chose Galba's slight of Otho as a convenient pretext for open rebellion.³ Indeed, on the sixth day after Piso's adoption their opponents had slain both Galba and Piso and had saluted Otho as emperor.⁴

Otho's character presents such unusual contradictions, that we are at a loss to reconcile the various qualities attributed to him by the historians. An analysis of the warring elements in his nature is essential not only to a conception of the man himself, but to an understanding of the varied emotions he roused in others. Juvenal mentions Otho with decided contempt.⁵

Ille tenet speculum, pathici gestamen Othonis,
 Actoris Aurunci spoliū, quo se ille videbat
 Armatum cum iam tolli vexilla iuberet.
 Res memoranda novis annalibus atque recenti
 Historia, speculum civilis sarcina belli.
 Nimirum summi ducis est occidere Galbam
 Et curare cutem, summi constantia civis
 Bebriacis campis spoliū adfectare Palati
 Et pressum in facie digitis extendere panem.⁶

¹ Juv. vi, 558.

² Tac. *Hist.* I, 4-16; 21; Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 23.

³ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 24; Suet. *Galba*, 17.

⁴ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, l. c.; Suet. *Galba*, l. c.; *Otho*, 5; Tac. *Hist.* I, 27.

⁵ Cf. Friedl. notes to vi, 559 and ii, 99; cf. Dürr, *die zeitgeschichtlichen Beziehungen*, 9.

⁶ Juv. ii, 99-107.

Juvenal's attitude may be explained by comparing it with that of Galba, who followed his own judgment rather than party inclination in the choice of a successor. Personal considerations he entirely ignored in a matter so important to the Roman state. As character and ability alone should decide the question, Otho, in Galba's opinion, stood no chance of appointment. A reputation for profuse expenditure of money, and the fact that he was then loaded with an enormous debt, were sufficient reasons against it.⁷ Even from his infancy he had been more conspicuous than others for a remarkable inclination to luxury and pleasure.⁸ These he had followed to the point of vice, which had made him a peculiarly suitable companion and agent for the emperor Nero.⁹ It was in this capacity that he appeared in the public eye, as in Juvenal's, for he was generally known as "the husband of Poppaea,"¹⁰ an appellation especially designed to insinuate the base means by which he secured that lady for his patron.

Relationship to Nero is cast up as a special charge against Otho in a speech delivered by Piso.¹¹ Political motives, it is true, often lead a man to vilify the character of his opponent, but Piso's allusion at least shows that his audience was perfectly familiar with this accusation, and that many considered it well-founded. Among these were Juvenal, who expresses his thought in the *Second Satire*,¹² and Tacitus who, writing later and independently, puts his own opinion into the mouth of Piso.¹³

The degenerate tool of Nero Juvenal presents as an effeminate weakling, in contrast with Turnus, the famous warrior of the age of Aeneas. Otho is as proud of his mirror as was Turnus of the spear taken from his foe, the Aruncan Actor.¹⁴ In the character of a very great general he is victor over Galba and at the same time is conquered by colossal vanity. With

⁷ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 21; Suet. *Otho*, 5.

⁸ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 19.

⁹ Juv. ii, 99; Suet. *Otho*, 2; Tac. *Hist.* I, 13; 30.

¹⁰ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 19.

¹¹ Tac. *Hist.* I, 30.

¹² 99.

¹³ Tac. *Hist.* I. c.

¹⁴ Cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 12, 94 for exact quotation by Juv. ii, 100.

like inconsistency he fights for his position as emperor and preserves his complexion by a poultice. Let us examine the historical basis for such a double characterization.

Among the particular charges brought against Otho by Piso are "that effeminate air" and "that soft solicitude for gay apparel."¹⁵ Suetonius goes into further detail describing him as "effeminately nice" in the care of his body, which he kept smooth by plucking out the hair by the roots according to a well-known custom among the ancients. He never had any beard, because from earliest youth he formed the habit of shaving daily and of smearing his face with a bread poultice.¹⁶ With such tales Juvenal was familiar, for he expressly mentions Otho's care of his skin and the use of the poultice.¹⁷ Writing much later the biographer confirms the words of the satirist. These in turn serve as added information to the general account given by Tacitus, who mentions without particulars that Otho's body was "soft." The fact that Tacitus makes only general remarks in this connection¹⁸ and that Juvenal gives detail confirmed later by Suetonius is a good argument against Juvenal's use of the *Histories* for his knowledge of Otho¹⁹ and points to a source common to Juvenal and Suetonius.

Indeed Tacitus goes so far as to say that this very elegance of exterior, combined with mild and courtly manners, contributed not a little to the success of Galba's cause, of which Otho was at first a faithful partisan, and that it gained for Otho himself no small degree of popularity.²⁰ Plutarch also refers to Otho's general affability and politeness.²¹ Some of his contemporaries, then, rather admired than ridiculed Otho for excessive attention to personal appearance and courtliness of manner, whereas others despised him for these same characteristics, and considered them evidence of lack of virile

¹⁵ Tac. *Hist.* I. c.

¹⁶ Suet. *Otho*, 12.

¹⁷ Juv. ii, 105, 107.

¹⁸ Tac. *Hist.* I, 22.

¹⁹ Cf. Dürr, *ib.* 9, n. 24 for the suggestion that Juv. ii, 104, 105 point to a use of Tac. *Hist.* 2, 47 because of the use of *constantia* by Juv. and *constantiam* by Tac.

²⁰ Tac. *Hist.* I, 13; 30.

²¹ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 20.

qualities. The former were those with whom he was popular: the latter appear to be his enemies, such as Piso and his adherents.²² Among them we must class Juvenal, whose scathing invective leaves no room to doubt his opposition to Otho and his adherence to Galba.²³

In his capacity as general Otho seems to have shown no trace of that spirit which the effeminacy of his life would lead one to expect. On the contrary he was, as Plutarch tells us, firm and resolute in time of danger, so that it was surprising and unusual, rather than natural, that he became intimidated at the moment of seizing the power from Galba. Let us remember that he was followed at first by only a handful of men, not more than twenty-three soldiers,²⁴ and must have realized that the move they were making was too precipitate. Besides, the father of Suetonius said that Otho hated civil war and would never have interfered with Galba, if he had thought it would be necessary to resort to arms.²⁵ The rapid addition of supporters and their immediate success were so much more the proof of his popularity. If the father of Suetonius read Otho's character aright, it is not unlikely that he was carried along on the tide of popular insurrection.

Once elevated to the imperial dignity, Otho rose to the occasion and surprised his subjects by assuming a spirit, as Tacitus says, "becoming to the majesty of Empire."²⁶ It is true that the historian states in the same breath that of course everyone knew that the virtues displayed were false! Yet there is nothing from this time on to indicate that he put off the mask of dissimulation, if such it was. The position of emperor was not enviable at that period, especially to one who abhorred civil warfare.²⁷ Otho was launched at once into a struggle with a rival claimant, Vitellius, who, saluted as emperor by the Germans, crossed the Alps with his forces. After an interchange of mild proposals for a compromise, the letters between the two generals became bitter charges of

²² Tac. *Hist.* I, 30.

²³ Juv. ii, 99-107; vi, 559.

²⁴ Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 24, 25.

²⁵ Suet. *Otho*, 10.

²⁶ Tac. *Hist.* I, 71.

²⁷ Suet. *Otho*, 10.

criminality, perhaps well-founded on both sides.²⁸ At this juncture Otho marched north to the scene of the war. After several battles the decisive one was fought at Bebricum,²⁹ near Cremona, where Otho's legions were defeated. Suetonius says that Otho was overcome by treachery. If so, there is nothing to indicate that he could not readily have rallied his troops.³⁰

Plutarch discusses at some length the action of the emperor regarding this engagement, and states that he relies for his account of it upon the orator Secundus, who was secretary to Otho. Calling his generals to a council of war, the emperor heard their various opinions. Some were in favor of awaiting reinforcements; others inclined to an immediate conflict. Otho decided upon the latter, doubtless for reasons which he considered cogent, of which Plutarch suggests several. The general wished relief from suspense, had a natural aversion to danger, and felt overburdened by his cares. We admit the possibility of any of these feelings in any general, but scarcely see why any or all of them should be sufficient to lead him to a precipitate movement.³¹ We have seen Otho in a dangerous situation before, when his policy of hesitation was misunderstood and attributed to intimidation, which, however, was surprising to his followers.³² The evidence in the present instance does not point to a lack of generalship and to a reckless desire to escape care and anxiety, regardless whether the outcome be victory or defeat. It is irrational to accept cowardly avoidance of danger as a motive both for hesitation and for precipitancy. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that the policy in each case was the result of definite consideration and of a decision which seemed reasonable, not only to Otho himself, but to many. Possibly the commander may have made a mistake in forcing battle, but the defeat is

²⁸ Tac. *Hist.* 1, 74; Plut. *vit. Oth.*, 4.

²⁹ Juv. ii, 106. For location, and the meaning and spelling of the word cf. Lucien Herr, *Rev. Phil.* 17, 208-212.

³⁰ Suet. *Otho*, 9; Tac. *Hist.* 2, 39-44; Plut. *vit. Oth.*, 10, 11, 12.

³¹ Ludwig Krauss, *de Vitarum Imperatoris Othonis fide quaestiones*, Prog. Zweibrüchen, 54.

³² Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 24, 25.

not to be attributed to error on his part, but to the misbehavior of the praetorian guards.³³

“The attachment of the soldiers to Otho exceeds all belief,” says Plutarch.³⁴ It is easily understood, however, if the speech of Otho’s which the historian quotes on this occasion be genuine. Expressing his profound emotion at the evidences of their fidelity, the emperor declared that he wished to avoid a recurrence of the horrors of such a battle as had just been fought. Therefore he would consider the conflict decided, would leave the field to Vitellius, and shed his own blood for his country. With the calm of a Stoic philosopher he prepared for death and committed suicide by falling on his sword.³⁵ Such self-sacrifice was rewarded by a remarkable demonstration of affection by his soldiers, which did not cease with his death.³⁶

In the light of historical evidence we find a reasonable explanation of Juvenal’s attitude toward Otho,³⁷ which it seems probable was that of all his opponents. Such a dual nature as his offered occasion for censure on the part of his enemies, and they could easily dwell upon his faults to the exclusion of those sterling elements in his character that commanded the respect and affection of his adherents. Otho was a young man whose private life was well known to be connected with that of Nero. No friend of that notoriously wicked emperor escaped from the scandalous atmosphere of the court with reputation unstained. Once put in a situation where he had a chance to show qualities that were virtuous, he proved himself equal to the emergency. At least we must confess that he gave promise of success in this direction for the short term of three months during which he reigned. Unhappily his enemies were prone to remember his past and, like Juvenal, being unable to reconcile it with the display of generalship and self-sacrifice, evident in Otho as soon as he became emperor, drew the conclusion that the latter was false.³⁸ The

³³ Tac. *Hist.* 2, 49.

³⁴ Plut. *vit. Oth.*, 15.

³⁵ Tac. *Hist.* 2, 46-49.

³⁶ Plut. *vit. Oth.*, 15.

³⁷ Juv. ii, 99-107; vi, 559.

³⁸ Tac. *Hist.* 1, 71.

very vagueness of the reports³⁹ of the Civil War made it easy to confirm an opinion derogatory to the commander.

For the events of Galba's and of Otho's reign Juvenal relied first of all upon himself, as he was old enough at the time to remember them clearly. Details of the battles in the north had to be learned from officers and soldiers of the legions, such as Suetonius Laetus,⁴⁰ from whom Suetonius, the biographer, later received his account.⁴¹ Juvenal, like Tacitus, is especially valuable for this period, as his memory could confirm or reject the details of oral and literary narratives, whereas Suetonius had to rely on these alone. The biographer seems to have followed Pliny the Elder in the main, and gives no indication of personal research in connection with this stirring period.⁴²

³⁹ Plut. *vit. Oth.*, 15.

⁴⁰ Suet. *Otho*, 10.

⁴¹ On sources for this period, cf. *supra*, chap. viii; cf. Plut. *vit. Galb.*, 9; cf. Macé, *ib.* 367, and L. Herr, *ib.*, who refer to M. Fabia, *Les Sources de Tacite*; cf. Wiedemann, *ib.*; Krauss, *ib.*

⁴² Cf. Macé, *ib.* 364.

X.

DOMITIAN.

Passing over Vitellius, Vespasian and Titus, to whom Juvenal does not allude, we come now to Domitian, the last of the Flavian Emperors.¹ Juvenal gives him the name of *Nero*, doubtless to designate his cruel disposition,² which was to be compared only to that of the last of the Julian-Claudian family. The same appellation was given to Otho by the mob who flocked about him with congratulations upon his becoming emperor. According to Suetonius it was intended as a compliment, and as such was received by Otho, who used it in official acts and letters.³ If he desired the allegiance of the lower classes, he must needs show respect to the memory of one whose popularity with them remains a fact, however inexplicable. Vitellius followed his example. It was only with the foundation of a new dynasty that the disparagement of the last of the old line began, which entirely obscured his true lineaments.⁴ Consequently the allusion to Domitian as *Nero* by Juvenal is full of sinister associations. *Calvo serviret Roma Neroni* was an insult surpassing all that the satirist could have imagined. Indeed the writer of one of the old *scholia* uses this line as an explanation of the oft-disputed question of Juvenal's banishment,⁵ perhaps relying upon Suetonius' statement that Domitian suppressed scandalous libels, that had been published to defame persons of rank, and inflicted upon their authors a mark of infamy.⁶ The biographer tells us that the emperor was so disturbed by his lack of hair, that he was insulted even at mention of another's baldness in his presence. Indeed he brooded upon his deformity to such an extent, that he addressed to a friend a

¹ Juv. iv, 38.

² Cf. Mayor, note to Juv. iv, 38.

³ Suet. *Otho*, 7.

⁴ Cf. Henderson, *ib.* 418, 419.

⁵ *Schol. vet.* Juv. iv, 38; cf. Mayor, note to iv, 38.

⁶ Suet. *Dom.* 8; 10.

pamphlet entitled *de Cura Capillorum*.⁷ In this he quotes Homer's words,

οὐχ ὄρασις, οἷος καὶ γὰρ καλὸς τε μέγας τε,⁸

and adds eadem me tamen manent capillorum fata, et forti animo fero comam in adulescentia senescentem. Scias nec gratius quicquam decore nec brevius.⁹

As Juvenal included *Sat.* iv in his first book, published during the reign of Trajan, it is not unlikely that he composed it while Domitian was living.¹⁰ For he writes in a spirit of irony that it is hard to believe was the result of emotion remembered after the cause of it no longer existed. Of the Emperor's annoyance concerning his baldness Juvenal certainly knew, and perhaps the little book *de Cura Capillorum* had come to his hands. Whether knowledge of the *Satire* came to the ears of Domitian is another matter. It seems more natural for the satirist to keep in the background any lines likely to be fraught with danger to himself, until the object of his scorn could wreak no bloody vengeance. Besides, he expressly says that he writes only of the guilty dead, and he appears to have kept his resolve.¹¹ The scholiast evidently did not take this promise as genuine and, believing that the *Satires* were written when those mentioned in them were still alive, he considered that the punishment inflicted upon writers of libels must have been visited upon the satirist. If we did not think it to be proved beyond a doubt that Juvenal satirized only men and women who were already sleeping peacefully along the Latin and the Appian ways,¹² we should find interesting the conjecture that he was banished to Egypt or elsewhere for such a heinous offence against the emperor's vanity.¹³

⁷ Suet. *Dom.* 18.

⁸ *Il.* 21, 108.

⁹ Suet. *Dom.* 18.

¹⁰ Cf. Dürr, *ib.* p. 13.

¹¹ *Juv.* i, 170, 171; cf. Strauch, *De Personis Iuvenalianis*; Dürr, *ib.* 3, 4; for a suggestion of reference to the present, 9.

¹² Strauch, *ib.*; Dürr *ib.*

¹³ Another important reason for not accepting the scholiast's conjecture is that Martial escaped punishment, though he wrote several epigrams alluding to baldness, especially i, 72; v, 49; x, 83.

Indeed, since the scholiast thought that Juvenal referred to the living, as well as to the dead, he need not have read as far as *Sat. iv* to find a fit reason by which to explain Juvenal's exile. In *Sat. ii*, 29-33, Domitian is ranked with hypocrites of the deepest dye. While restoring ancient laws destined to strike terror into the hearts of many who had hitherto practiced hideous crimes with impunity, the strict judge was himself guilty of the vilest immorality in his private life. The tale of his relations with his niece, Julia, and of her death, is well attested by Suetonius, whose curiosity never missed a scandal in imperial circles.¹⁴

There is another ground on which we hold that Juvenal reserved his ridicule and censure of Domitian until after the latter's death. Well did the satirist know the necessity of paying fulsome flattery to Domitian. *Sat. iv* is filled with the most subtle irony upon the attitude of his courtiers toward the emperor, a tone of sarcasm well-suited to the description of the Fish Council.¹⁵ It is doubtful whether any author ever succeeded so well in writing a solemn farce. All the actors are well acquainted with the countersign admitting them to the emperor's favor. Even the fisherman, who comes in haste to the palace with the immense turbot he has caught, presents the gift with a speech of grossest flattery. The favoring fates have reserved this fish for the imperial board. Domitian is mightily pleased:

Itur ad Atriden. tum Picens 'accipe' dixit
 'Privatis maiora focis. genialis agatur
 Iste dies, propera stomachum laxare sagina
 Et tua servatum consume in saecula rhombum.
 Ipse capi voluit.' quid apertius? et tamen illi
 Surgebant cristae; nihil est quod credere de se
 Non possit cum laudatur dis aequa potestas.¹⁶

Domitian's arrogant assumption of divinity was a common cause of complaint and, as Suetonius says, became so

¹⁴ Suet. *Dom.* 22; cf. Dürr, *ib.* 8, 9.

¹⁵ Cf. Dürr, *ib.* 12, 13, 14, n. 51.

¹⁶ *Juv.* iv, 65-71.

odious to the people that it led to a conspiracy against him. Upon re-marrying his divorced wife, Domitia, he issued a proclamation, reuocatam eam in puluinar suum. He was delighted when the people shouted out in the amphitheatre, domino et dominae feliciter! He dictated the form of a letter to be used by the procuratores, worded Dominus et deus noster hoc fieri iubet.¹⁷ Juvenal twice uses the epithet *dominus* in mentioning the emperor Domitian.¹⁸

Nor did the cruelty of the tyrant escape the burning touch of Juvenal's scathing denunciation. Few could temporize like Crispus, who saved his life by sacrificing the truth and so had reached the good old age of eighty.¹⁹ Acilius too was well on in years, but his son met an early death at the hands of the jealous ruler.²⁰ As Juvenal writes,

sed olim
Prodigio par est in nobilitate senectus.²¹

Domitian drained the city of its best and noblest blood with impunity until finally the Romans were roused to take vengeance upon so cruel a tyrant:²²

Atque utinam his potius nugis tota illa dedisset
Tempora saevitiae, claras quibus abstulit urbi
Inlustresque animas impune et vindice nullo.
Sed periit postquam cerdonibus esse timendus
Coeperat. hoc nocuit Lamiarum caede madenti.²³

Suetonius confirms the tale of Domitian's savage disposition. He tells us that at the time of his accession he abhorred the shedding of blood, was just and merciful.²⁴ But he soon departed from the course of virtue and fell into cruelty, which was at the same time terrible, cunning and unexpected. He

¹⁷ Suet. *Dom.* 13.

¹⁸ Juv. iv, 52, 96; cf. Dürr, *ib.* 13; cf. Martial, v, 8; vii, 34; x, 72; Friedl. note to Mart. v, 8.

¹⁹ Juv. iv, 83 ff.

²⁰ Juv. iv, 94-96.

²¹ Juv. 96, 97.

²² Suet. *Dom.* 14, 15.

²³ Juv. iv, 150-154.

²⁴ Suet. *Dom.* 9.

killed many senators, among them several of consular rank. Aelius Lamia was punished for most trivial offences.²⁵

For the biography of Domitian Juvenal and Suetonius are independent sources, for in writing the *Lives* of the three Flavian Emperors Suetonius relied upon primary sources, such as we judge were also for the most part accessible to Juvenal. One may say that the biographer composed this part of his work at first hand, drawing his material from hearsay and from his own memory.²⁶ In the capacity of *ab epistulis* to the emperor Hadrian, it is true, he had access to the imperial archives, but in the last six biographies, it seems, he did not use them. As it is likely that the *Lives* were almost entirely completed before he was appointed to the office of secretary, the imperial documents which he examined were most likely employed only in the process of revision. Either because he was more interested in the first six Caesars, or because there were actually more documents to be found concerning them, Suetonius certainly revised the first six biographies in the light of his new material with more thoroughness than he did the last six.²⁷ Possibly they did not merit revision in his judgment, though it is quite as likely that he felt his own personal knowledge of the events of the later period to be sufficiently complete without supplementing it by any written sources of information. The only history of the times that he could have followed, so far as we know, was the one written by Tacitus. As the part of that work dealing with the Flavians is unfortunately not extant, we cannot compare the account of Domitian's reign with the *Life* by Suetonius. But since he seems not to have used as a primary source the section of the *Histories* which has been preserved, we conclude that the biographer did not follow any part of that work. The writings of the Elder Pliny he may have employed for the first part of the *Life of Vespasian* alone.²⁸

The sources of Suetonius' information, therefore, were the same as those which Juvenal used. Both were old enough to

²⁵ Suet. *Dom.* 10; cf. Juv. iv, 154.

²⁶ Cf. Macé, *ib.* 369.

²⁷ Cf. Macé, *ib.* 182-185.

²⁸ *Ib.*

remember Domitian, so that memory in each case served as a corrective for rumor. But Juvenal was at least fourteen years older than Suetonius and wrote and published the first book of *Satires*, in which he refers to the last Flavian Emperor, at a date much nearer to the events than the year in which Suetonius published his biographies. We may therefore accept the allusions which Juvenal makes to Domitian as almost exactly contemporary with that emperor's life.²⁹ He wrote when his memory of the reign was perfectly fresh and clear, before time had clouded it, and before there was much opportunity for exaggerated rumors to develop into a narrative generally accepted by credulous posterity as settled fact. On the other hand the relation by Suetonius of tales that had gathered around Domitian for the twenty or twenty-five years since his decease represents to us how the tyrant appeared in retrospect and serves as confirmation of contemporary references or as indication of popular prejudice in them.

²⁹ Cf. Dürr, *ib.* 13.

XI.

CONCLUSION.

In the person of Juvenal we have watched the emperors make their appearance upon the Roman stage. It is the power of the poet that has made this possible; for he has visualized the *dramatis personae* for us with surpassing vividness. If he has at times been guilty of exaggeration, we can pardon the fault, if indeed that can be a fault which produces the marvelous effect that he has secured by it. Through Juvenal's eyes we have seen Julius Caesar, the tyrannical dictator; Augustus, the general, who overcame with difficulty all the odds of war and the elements, until peace was firmly established; Tiberius, the haughty, intellectual ruler, laboring under the dominance of a favorite and traitor; Caligula, the mad tyrant; Claudius somnolentus, an uxorious and unhappy prince; Nero, the artist and matricide; Galba, the great and noble citizen; Otho, the general conquered by vanity; Domitian, dissimulator, glutton and savage tyrant.

The poet does not represent these as a long line of detestable rulers; he does not vilify them indiscriminately. His intense opposition to tyranny arouses his just wrath, but does not unbalance his judgment nor his regard for the truth. Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius and Galba are rulers with human faults, as he depicts them; they are not savage despots. Passionate, unsparing ferocity he reserves for Caligula, Nero, Otho and Domitian. He even explains Caligula's destructive rage by the theory of his madness. Unrestrained animosity he lets loose against Nero, Otho and Domitian alone.

Juvenal takes us with him into the past. He unseals the treasures of his memory, a precious mine of information stored up from various sources. The oral tradition handed down by his elders included what they had seen and heard; many could well remember as far back as the later years of the reign of Augustus. His own personal knowledge the

satirist could rely upon from at least the time of the great fire at Rome in 64 A.D. Hearsay and memory he may have supplemented by literary sources, such as are known to have been available in his time and to have been used by other writers. Fortunately, in the case of the period from Nero to Domitian, upon which he, especially, dwells, his own judgment could be raised up as a tribunal for Rumor, who, changing like the wind, daily appeared in a new dress and with new charges of infamy and cruelty. Where obscurity prevented knowledge of the truth, personal opinion doubtless swayed the satirist, as it does the historian.

The importance of understanding Juvenal's attitude towards the Roman emperors appears from a comparison of the *Satires* with the works of the historians. It is evident that the satirist represents the prejudices of his contemporaries. The study shows that Juvenal wrote independently of Suetonius and of Plutarch, and relied upon Tacitus for the Sejanus and the Messalina episodes alone. With these exceptions the *Satires* have the value of an original source in passages where allusion is made to the emperors. As such they present the facts sometimes merely attested by other writers, sometimes colored by Juvenal's own personal views. We have shown, therefore, that the satirist was often the interpreter of public opinion, the powerful spokesman of dominant Roman ideas and prejudices, accustomed to express thoughts well-known and current. He represents the traditional ideas of the ancient citizen against corruption and change of customs.¹ Without a clear perception of these it is impossible to judge the historical significance of the traditions inherited by the Roman people from age to age regarding their emperors.

¹ Cf. Martha, *Les Moralistes sous l'Empire Romain*, 265, 266.

TABLE OF PASSAGES COMPARED.

	Juvenal.	Suetonius.	Plutarch.	Velleius.	Valerius Maximus.	Mon. Anc.	Tacitus.	Martial.
Julius Caesar.	Sat. x, 108-113.	Jul. 76; 77; 22. 78. 75. 1, 5. 76. 9.2; 30. 5. 56. 5.	vit. Jul. 60. 57. 57; 58. 4. 54.	2, 55; 56. 2, 57.				
Augustus.	vi, 338. viii, 240-244.	Aug. 13; 80; 81. 17. 2, 3. 58.		2, 70. 2, 79. 2, 84; 85.	1, 7. 1.	I, 10-12. V, 3, 4. VI, 24, 25.		
Tiberius.	x, 56-107. x, 92-94. x, 94; vi, 576. vii, 220-236. x, 84; 56-107. x, 63. x, 66-69. x, 81, 82.	Tib. 40; 41; 43-45; 55. 41; 42; 43-45. 14; 62; 67; Cal. 19. 70. 61. 4. 55. 55; 61. 4. 61. 4; 55.	Moralia, 2. 602 E.F.	2, 126; 129.	2, 9, 6; 5, 5, 3; 9, 11, ext. 4.		Ann. 4, 41. 4, 41; 57.	
Caligula.	vi, 610-621. vi, 625. vi, 615.	Cal. 50. 28; 29; 49. 19; Nero 5.			9. 11, ext. 4.		4, 3; 7; 10; 11; 12; 60. 4, 2; 7. 4, 12; 60; 10; 11. 6, 19.	

	Juvenal.	Suetonius.	Plutarch.	Veileius.	Valerius Maximus.	Mon. Anc.	Tacitus.	Martial.
Claudius.	viii, 40. iii, 236-238. vi, 115, 116; x, 329-345. xiv, 328-331.	Claud. 2. 8; 33. 26; 36; 37. 37; 26.					ii, 12; 26; 27. ii, 32-35; 37; 38; 28. ii, 38; 12, 65. 12, 66; 67.	viii, 52. 3.
Nero.	xiv, 328, 329. vi, 620-623, 115; v, 30; 44; Nero 33. 148. viii, 228. x, 16; viii, 211, 212. viii, 198, 199. viii, 220, 221. viii, 220, 221-223; 228-230. viii, 188-192. viii, 228, 229. viii, 224-226. viii, 227-230. iv, 136-140; xii, 129, 130; x, 15-18, 308. viii, 140, 141.	28. Nero I; 9; 50. 7; 52. 7; 9; 10. 20; 41. 24; 43; 52; Dom. I. 38. 2; 52. 20. 7; 21, 46; 54. 22; 23; 25. 12. 3. 26; 27; 32; 38. 3. 26; 27.					12, 58; 13, 3; 14, 52. 13, 3; 16, 5; 14, 14. 15, 33. 15, 38; 39; 44; 14, 10. 14, 15; 15, 33. 14, 20; 21. 16, 20; 13, 25; 16, 1-3.	

	Juvenal.	Suetonius.	Plutarch.	Velleius.	Valerius Maximus.	Mon. Anc.	Tacitus.	Martial.
Nero.	viii, 215-221.	33-37; 39; Claud. 44; 45.					13, 15; 14, 10; 11; 51; 15, 69; 10, 6.	
Galba.	viii, 214, 215; 220-223.	40; 45, 2; 49, 2.						
	viii, 5, 221-223; vi, 559.	Galba 2; 6; 14.	vit. Galb. 29; 3.				Hist. 1, 49.	
	viii, 221-223. vi, 553-561. ii, 102-105.	9, 2. Otho 4. Galba; Otho.	23. vit. Galb.; vit. Oth.				1, 22. Hist.	
Otho.	viii, 1-5.	Galba 2; 20.	vit. Galb. 22; 26-28.				1, 41; 49.	
	vi, 559; ii, 99-107.	Galba 17; Otho 5.	vit. Galb. 19; 21; 24.					
	ii, 99. ii, 105, 107. ii, 104-106.	Otho 2. 12. 9; 10.	19. 20. 24; 25; vit. Oth. 10- 12; 15.				1, 13; 30. 1, 13; 30; 22. 1, 71; 2, 39- 44; 46-49.	
Domitian.	iv, 38.	Otho 7; Dom. 18.						i, 72; v, 49; x, 83.
	ii, 29-33. iv, 52, 96.	Dom. 22. 13.						v, 8; vii, 34; x, 72.
	iv, 96, 97, 150-154.	9; 10; 14; 15.						

