

AGNIESZKA FRAN CZYK-CEGLA  
(WROCLAW UNIVERSITY)

## THE EPIC CHARACTER OF SPONDAIC VERSES IN JUVENAL

*The atypical rhythm of the versus spondiacus was used by some Greek and Latin poets to draw attention of the readers. Juvenal makes use of spondeiazon 34 times which puts him in the top three of Roman poets applying this metre in their poetry. The aim of this paper is to answer the question whether Juvenal makes use of the spondaic verse due to specific reasons, and, if so, in what manner these reasons are connected to the author's poetical intentions concerning epic as genre.*

**Key words:** Juvenal, satire, epic, hexameter, *versus spondiacus*

The *versus spondiacus*, although appropriate, as it seems, to the grand style works because of its solemnity and slowness<sup>1</sup>, was scarcely used by Latin and Greek poets<sup>2</sup>. In the early Latin poetry, i.e. in the poems of Ennius and Lucilius it was neither searched nor avoided<sup>3</sup> and their spondaic lines are considered to be rather a sign of the authors' awkwardness<sup>4</sup> than a conscious poetical creation<sup>5</sup>. The change was brought in Cicero's times

---

<sup>1</sup> The spondee owes its name to the rhythm characteristics. The name is taken from the Greek word *σπονδή* meaning 'libation'. WILKINSON (1963: 61) suggests that the wine-offerings to the Gods were accompanied by spondaic poetry because of "the solemnity of slowness and because the smooth regularity reflected the act of pouring". Cf. DION. HAL. *Synth.* 17.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. SCALIGER (1561: 532): "*spondiacum temere veteres praesertim Graeci*".

<sup>3</sup> NORDEN (1995: 443): "*spondeische Verse nicht gemieden, aber auch nicht gesucht werden (...)*".

<sup>4</sup> NOUGARET (1948: 46): "*Chez Ennius et Lucrèce ces vers dénotent peut être une certaine gaucherie*".

<sup>5</sup> The metrical theory according to which the metre – and especially the distribution of dactyls and spondees – could echo the poetical intentions of the author and underline the atmosphere and emotions of the poem (cf. HERMOG. *Id.* 11, 409) was well known

when the Neoteric poets, emulating the Alexandrian ones<sup>6</sup>, began to apply the *versus spondiacus* deliberately<sup>7</sup>. The atypical rhythm of the *spondeiazon*, considered unusual and dissonant to the traditional nature of dactylic hexameter, was used by the Greek poets<sup>8</sup> to draw the attention of a listener and to produce a striking impression. The same effects were intended by Catullus<sup>9</sup>, who, putting a spondee in fifth foot 42 times, set up a number of rules followed by the next generation of poets (e.g. quadrisyllabic word being a proper name, graecisms). The over-zeal of the Neoterics in applying the *spondeiazontes* was ridiculed by Cicero:

*Brundisium venimus vii Kalend. Decembr. usi tua felicitate navigandi; ita belle nobis 'flavit ab Epiro lenissimus Onchesmites'. hunc spondeiazonta si cui voles ton neoteron pro tuo vendito (Att. 7, 2, 1)*

Cicero's closure – *lenissimus Onchesmites* – contains everything which was thought to be scornful in the *versus spondiacus*: a graecism, a four-syllable ending word and an ironic allusion to the laxity of the *spondeiazontes* evoked here by the semantics of the superlative *lenissimus*. He probably also criticizes the effect of applying a multisyllabic word in clausula, i.e. a kind of mollification described by Quintilian:

*Est in eo quoque nonnihil, quod hic singulis verbis bini pedes continentur, quod etiam in carminibus est praemolle, nec solum ubi quinae, ut in his, syllabae nectuntur, 'fortissima Tyndaridarum', sed etiam quaternae, cum versus cluditur 'Appennino' et 'armamentis' et 'Orione' (Inst. 9, 4, 65)*

The same ending – *Appennino* – appears in Persius in a passage where the poet condemns authors for writing decorative, but emptied of any deeper sense verses:

---

in Rome, yet early poets did not always apply it in practice. And thus, out of five *spondeiazontes* found in preserved fragments of Ennius, the author could have purposely made use of the grand verse in two instances (fig. 31; 201 V.). CORDIER (1947: 34) finds 11 cases of *versus spondiacus* in Ennius but most of them are spurious; the certain are fig. 31; 191; 201; 255; 304 V.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. NORDEN (1995: 442–443); WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF (1924: 183–184).

<sup>7</sup> The phenomenon is strictly neoteric – Lucretius seems to apply such ending with precise poetical intention only in 7 out of 31 *spondeiazontes*.

<sup>8</sup> Yet, the practice was not common in Greek literature until the times of the Alexandrian poetry. In the Homeric epic, the spondaic verses are not always applied with any poetic intentions. Cf. NORDEN (1995: 409); GRAAF (1945: 53).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. NORDEN (1995: 444–445).

*claudere sic versum didicit 'Berecytius Attis'  
et 'qui caeruleum dirimebat Nerea delphin',  
sic 'costam longo subduximus Appenino'*(1, 93–95)<sup>10</sup>.

The satirist expresses his disapproval about choosing the form over the content which manifests itself in overuse of the Greek expressions<sup>11</sup>, lack of elision and rhymes<sup>12</sup>. The word *Appennino* was often linked with the *versus spondiacus*<sup>13</sup> being one of rare Latin proper names which fitted in the spondaic clausula. The long Latin or Greek words were very likely to possess a secondary accent on the first syllable<sup>14</sup> which weakened the main accent: *Āppenīno*. The fact could result in producing a sound which was offending to Roman ear, as one may deduce from Quintilian's words, and which is nowadays difficult to precise. The secondary accent weakened multisyllabic words more when the clausula could not be divided between two words. Namely, according to Quintilian (*Inst.* 9, 4, 97), the expression *criminis causa* is *forte*, the word *archipiratae* is *molle* and *facilitatis* is even *mollius*. The cause lays in the utterance of speech – the *archipirata* can be pronounced with the separation of the prefix *archi-* from the noun, so that we can avoid the secondary accent, but in case of the genitive *facilitatis* there is no such possibility. Thus, it must have been pronounced in the same breathe which

<sup>10</sup> According to the scholia *ad loc.*, the verses quoted by Persius were written by Nero: "*dicat hoc versus Neronis in haec nomina desinentes*". Yet, the scholiast ascribes most quotations in lines 93–102 to Nero; moreover, knowing how easily offended Nero was about his poetry, it would not be reasonable for Persius to criticize him openly. Thus, the scholiast's judgment is nowadays considered to be unconvincing. Cf. KISSEL (1990: 241): *spurius esse probat*; Morel 4: *spurium*; and COURTNEY (2003: 358) harshly: "*Clearly the scholiast has no first-hand knowledge; he shows a tendency to read Nero into this poem wherever he can (...). It is very unlikely that Persius would quote and ridicule verses of Nero, or that his posthumous editors would publish such ridicule (...)*".

<sup>11</sup> Cf. QUINT. *Inst.* 12, 10, 33. See as well: SCHOL. *Pers.* 1, 93–95: "*hi versus (...) non sunt Persii (...) sed poetae nescio cuius graecissantis (...)*". The different question is whether the emperor and his court considered using graecisms as fault. The satirist's complaints and Nero's fondness of the Greek culture allow us to suppose that this kind of Macaronic language was the fashion.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. QUINT. *Inst.* 9, 4, 42.

<sup>13</sup> NARDO (1975: 457–459) gathers all ending words which appear in the *spondeiazontes* from Ennius to Claudian. *Appenninus* is one of the most frequent (in various grammatical cases: HOR. *Epod.* 16, 29; OV. *Met.* 2, 226; LUCAN. 11, 396; SIL. 11, 314; 4, 742; AVIEN. *Orb. terr.* 478; 480; CORN. SEV. fig. 10 Morel, PETRON. 124, 35; PERS. 1, 95; RUTIL. NAM. 2, 33). See also HELZLE (1992: 590–600).

<sup>14</sup> See LINDSAY (1894: 159–161); WESTWAY (1913: 72); WILKINSON (1940: 36).

contributed to slurred articulation and to loosing of the rhythm<sup>15</sup>. This feature<sup>16</sup> is a subject of Persius criticism in 1, 95 together with another metrical issue – the verse resembles a leonine with its internal rhyme (*longo...Appennino*) and its appearance at this point of the satire could not be accidental as in the following lines (99–102) the satirist parodies a passage from a contemporary poet giving more examples of internal rhymes.

The contemporaries of Juvenal are more reluctant to use a *versus spondiacus* than their predecessors. While the Augustan poets (especially Vergil and Ovid) did not hesitate to put a spondee in the fifth foot either due to poetic reasons or simply as an ornament<sup>17</sup>, in Juvenal's times the *versus spondiacus* is scarce, even in the epic works: Statius has seven cases of such lines and Silius – six, limiting its use to proper names and Greek words. Juvenal distinguishes himself from other poets<sup>18</sup> not only by a high number of the *spondeiazontes*<sup>19</sup>, but also by his careful and intentional use of them. The structure of the grand verses is the same almost in all occurrences (except of 3, 273; 5, 38): there is a dactyl in the fourth foot<sup>20</sup> and a word which appears in the fifth foot has three or four syllables (in the first case it is

15 Cf. DIOM. gram. I 469: “*sane quotiens una pars orationis anapaestum et trochaicum receperit, mollem et quasi lubricam structuram dabit, ut archipirata et parricidarum. quamvis enim idem pedes eademque sint tempora, tamen ubi duae sunt partes orationis nescio quo modo in utriusque confinio retentus spiritus ac restitutus adfert quandam compositioni firmitatem; at in una parte orationis properare verba et continua spiritus celeritate labi videntur*”.

16 WINBOLT (1903: 128) proposed that “*quadrisyllabic (non-spondaic) endings seem to suggest something soft, supine, or effeminate, unsuited to Roman taste*”. Disputable as it were, the rule does not include spondaic endings and the *spondeiazontes* with their gravity and solemnness.

17 E.g. VERG. *Ecl.* 5, 58; 7, 53.

18 That includes other satirical writers. The *versus spondiacus* appears twice in Lucilius (the third case of *spondeiazon* is often quoted, the verse “*ibant qua poterant, qua non poterant non ibant*” (frg. 27 Morel), even though the authorship of Lucilius is spurious); Horace never makes use of the *spondeiazon* and Persius has one example, already discussed.

19 He puts a spondee in the fifth foot in 34 verses (one every 109, 1 line) which gives him the third place among Latin poets using the *spondeiazontes* (after Catullus and the author of *Ciris*). ESKUCHE (1985: 71) enumerates 33 cases of such ending, but one must add 15, 18 where a lection *et Cyclopas* (confirmed by *fragmentum Bobiense*) is preferred over *atque Cyclopas* (seen in *Codex Pithoeanus* and accepted by Friedlaender). See NARDO (1975: 440). Line 6, 156 is sometimes counted as *versus spondiacus* which gives 35 instances of *spondeiazontes* in total.

20 Differently e.g. from Greeks who applied easily a spondee in the fourth foot so that the line ended with three spondees. See NOUGARET (1948: 45).

preceded by a monosyllabic *aut* or *et*, a rarity among other writers<sup>21</sup>). Thus, many Juvenal's *spondeiazontes* are free from the "mollification" criticized with such zeal by Roman writers. Whole verses were supposed to be pronounced clearly, without slurring and muttering which will have its role in emphasizing the clausula and underlining the contrast between the clausula and its surroundings. The three- or four-syllable words are mostly of Latin origin which makes Juvenal similar to Catullus<sup>22</sup> and again puts him in opposition to other Latin poets<sup>23</sup>. The inclination of the Latin authors to link the *spondeiazontes* with the Greek vocabulary has been increasing since Catullus<sup>24</sup> – while he has ca 25% of graecisms in his spondaic verses, the later poets puts a Greek word in most of the cases of *versus spondiacus*. The pattern was changed by Juvenal, who applies it more rarely than the others, although, paradoxically, he was willing to make frequent use of the Greek vocabulary elsewhere in his satires<sup>25</sup>. Moreover, in Catullus, Vergil and Ovidius, even if the final word is not Greek, Greek terms appear in close co-text giving a Hellenizing trait to the passage<sup>26</sup>.

The deliberate<sup>27</sup> composition of the *spondeiazontes* manifest itself also on the semantic field. While most of the satirist's predecessors (except of Catullus and the author of *Ciris*) repeat the final word in the *versus spondiacus*<sup>28</sup>, Juvenal never puts the same term in the clausula. In every line with a

21 Ennius and Lucretius frequently ended the *spondeiazontes* with a quadrisyllabe being a proper name. The pattern has become a law since the Neoteric poetry. Cf. MÜLLER (1861: 223): "*claudendi verbis tetrasyllabis ut vulgatissima ita utilissima longest ratio, quippe quae et gravitatem habeant duplicato spondeo et mollitiem amplitudine spatii*". In several cases we can find a monosyllable in the final foot of the verse (ENN. frg. var. 201 Vahlen; LUCR. 2, 615; VERG. *Aen.* 3, 12; 6, 679; IUV. 3, 273).

22 Greek words appear 12 times; in Catullus the proportion is 12 to 42.

23 There are 19 Greek words in Vergil in his 32 *spondeiazontes*, 9 out of 15 in *Ciris*, 4 out of 5 in Horace, 3 out of 7 in Propertius, 41 out of 57 in Ovid and 11 out of 14 in Lucan. The tendency is higher in Juvenal's contemporaries: Martial has 11 Greek names in 14 *spondeiazontes*, Silius Italicus 5 out of 6 and Valerius Flaccus and Statius always apply Greek words in the spondaic clausula.

24 Before, the number of Greek words in the clausula of the *spondeiazontes* was scare, e.g. Lucretius has only one (4, 125: *centaurea*).

25 A Greek word appears 1194 times out of 3838 verses which means that it can be found in every third line. See THIEL (1901: 103–105).

26 NARDO (1975: 449, n. 42).

27 The satirist's skill was long neglected or not mentioned by scholars. See ESKUCHE (1895: 71): "*aus Muthwillen*"; VIERTTEL (1862: 802): "*quia ultro se obtulerunt*". It was NARDO (1975: 439–468) who first made a successful attempt to describe more extensively the functioning of the *spondeiazontes* in Juvenal's satires.

28 NARDO (1975: 457–459).

spondee in fifth foot, the word put in the last two feet is chosen intentionally so that it harmonizes with the subject treated in the passage and refers to the literary tradition from Ennius to Martial. The references can be of epic nature which each *spondeiazon* invokes *per se*, but in many cases the satirist does not play with the epic tradition, but employs the *versus spondiacus* to create certain impression, e.g. of artificiality, threat, fear (3, 17; 3, 273; 10, 332).

Juvenal has two different techniques of referring to the epic features. He always creates the tension between the *gravitas* (caused by the *spondeiazon's* rhythm) and *tenuitas* (caused by the semantic content of the word applied in the clausula) but since the semantic content determines the poetical intention of the satirists, the functioning of the *spondeiazontes* varies. In most grand verses or in their co-text Juvenal does not make any direct allusions to the epic works or mythological imagery. The tension based on the disharmony between trivial semantics and metrical grandeur of the verse results in mocking sarcasm and irony. Such are the instances in e.g.:

- 11, 138 *pygarus* to designate the objects of degenerate Greek luxury;
- 4, 53 *Armillatus* as a name the informer who can hardly be considered a hero of the elevated genre; probably it is a speaking name referring to someone who wears *armillia*, i.e. military distinctions given to the legionaries;
- 6, 246 *femineum ceroma* as undignified occupation;
- 6, 462 *Poppeana* paired with colloquial *pinguia*;
- 6, 620 *Agrippina* as a first element of the enjambment with contrasting *boletus*;
- 4, 87 (*nimboso*), 6, 429 (*intestino*), 11, 133 (*cutellorum*), where a Latin word denotes trivial themes or objects standing in contrast with a solemnity of the *spondeiazon*;

In some instances, it is hard to see any poetic intention; thus, it seems that the *spondeiazon* is used only because the satirist could not replace the final word by shorter one (6, 71 *Atellana*)

The decorative function which is followed by the expressive one (the effect of surprise, irregularity) can be observed in the following instances:

- 5, 38 (*inaequales berullo*) where the rarity of the verse stresses the rarity of the object;
- 3, 17 (*et speluncas*) which gives the effect of artificiality;
- 3, 273 (*ad cenam si*<sup>29</sup>) – where the *spondeiazon* underlines the menace and surprise;

<sup>29</sup> On the character of such verse-ending, see ESKUCHE (1895: 71): “*besonders gewichtig und doch so nichtig*”.

- 10, 88 (*hi sermones*) – the *spondeiazon* “followed by a line of heavy spondees<sup>30</sup>” emphasizes the menace of the muttering crowd;
- 10, 332 (*extinguendus*) – the gravity of *spondeiazon* reflects the gravity of death<sup>31</sup>;
- 6, 80 (*conopeo*); 14, 115 (*adquirendi*); 14, 326 (*quadringenta*); 14, 329 (*divitiae Narcissi*) – opulence.

In some *spondeiazontes*, the author extends the net of the epic references by bringing up directly or indirectly various stylistic and thematic characteristics of the epic poetry. The tone of the satirist’s voice can be ironical or sarcastic as well, but the role of such passages is of genological nature – they show how Juvenal re-shaped the grand line to suit it to his programmatic aims.

In Satire 11, the *spondeiazon* formed in the same way (*et* + trisyllable word) is repeated in close proximity:

*de Tiburtino veniet pinguissimus agro  
haedulus et toto grege mollior; inscius herbae  
necdum ausus virgas humilis mordere salicti,  
**qui plus lactis habet quam sanguinis, et montani**  
asparagi, posito quos legit vilica fuso.  
grandia praeterea tortoque calentia feno  
**ova adsunt ipsis cum matribus, et servatae**  
parte anni quales fuerant in vitibus uvae,  
Signinum Syriumque pirum, de corbibus isdem  
aemula Picenis et odoris mala recentis  
nec metuenda tibi, siccatum frigore postquam  
autumnum et crudi posuere pericula suci. (11, 65–76)*

The repetition is a common rhetorical device, and here, its rareness (the repetition is metrical not semantic) serves as an ornament, especially that they are both accompanied by the enjambment and the bucolic diaeresis. As Winkler points out<sup>32</sup>, Juvenal’s inspiration for this passage can be found in the epic poetry as its subject, i.e. the banquets and food, was very common both in epic and satire. The tension between *tenuitas* and *gravitas* appears at lines 11, 70–71 where the epic language (*grandia*) is employed in the epic-style description of a humble dinner. Such deflation serves to satirize

<sup>30</sup> COURTNEY (1980: 50).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Ov. *Met.* 6, 247 and 7, 581 where the *spondeiazon* is also linked with dying.

<sup>32</sup> WINKLER (1990: 375).

the traditional literary appropriateness of style and subject. Moreover, there is a direct verbal reference at lines 11, 70–71 to Vergil's *Aeneid* 1, 633–636:

*nec minus interea sociis ad litora mittit  
viginti tauros, magnorum horrentia centum  
terga suum, pinguis centum cum matribus agnos,  
munera laetitiamque dii.*

Before describing the dinner which Dido held in honour of Aeneas and his men, the poet notices the queen's compassion: she has sent food and drink for those men who stayed on the ships. Juvenal's *grandia ova ipsis cum matribus* echoes Vergil's *pinguis centum cum matribus agnos* (*grandia* reflects *pinguis* and *magnorum* in line 634; the intensifying pronoun *ipsis* has the same function as numerals in this passage<sup>33</sup>). The fact that Juvenal has in mind the passage from Vergil or its text before his eyes is confirmed by its construction. Vergil finishes his list of things which Dido has sent to Aeneas' men with wine (line 634). The same subject, i.e. wine, appears in Juvenal just after the analyzed section: *et servatae parte anni quales fuerant in vitibus uvae*. And another reference to the *Aeneid* appears just before the analyzed section in the epic periphrasis (lines 60–63). The number of epic references which occurred in the examined passage shows that the satirist purposely imitates the epic grand style. It has two functions: decorative (to make the description more expressive) and genological (to satirize the literary decorum and thus, to make a genological treat of this kind of satirizing).

In *Satire* 2, the satirist sketches a portrait of Gracchus who is presented as an example of the degeneration of Roman morals; the example which is even more shameful than a marriage between two men:

*vicit et hoc monstrum tunicati fuscina Gracchi,  
lustravitque fuga mediam gladiator harenam  
et Capitolinis generosior et Marcellis  
et Catuli Paulique minoribus et Fabiis et  
omnibus ad podium spectantibus, his licet ipsum  
admoveas cuius tunc munere retia misit. (2, 143–148)*

Gracchus, a member of the elite and a Salian priest and a man of nobler birth than the Capitolini, Marcelli and Fabii and the descendants of Catullus and Paulus shows off as a gladiator in the arena. The epic resonances in

<sup>33</sup> WINKLER (1990: 377).

this passage, except of *versus spondiacus* (2, 145), are of historical nature. The great names allude to Ennius who praised the noble families in *Annales* VIII-X<sup>34</sup>. Their mention brings into mind the heroic times which stand in vivid contrast with contemporary times and contemporary Roman aristocracy of which Gracchus is an epitome. The bathos is caused by the incongruous combination of the solemn verse and the picture of Gracchus. There is a sandy arena instead of an epic battlefield and a cowardly noble instead of an epic hero. The *versus spondiacus* reinforces the illocutive force of the anaphor (*et...et*) and the hyperbole (*generosior*), two figures of speech which *in se* do not determine the epic style, but they introduce, especially the anaphor, the hint of pathos which harmonizes with the solemnness of the *versus spondiacus*. The satirist's manner of presenting Gracchus, with alluding to the epic grandeur, creates a contrast between an epic ideal and trivial reality which serves to criticize severely the Roman morality<sup>35</sup>. Although the tone of the satirist's voice is sour, the solemnness of the rhythm of the grand verse is unmistakable. Its force is comparable to the hexameters of Ennius<sup>36</sup>:

*Olli respondit rex Albai Longai (Ann. 33 V.)*

*Dono ducite doque volentibus cum magnis dis*<sup>37</sup> (*Ann. 201 V.*)

The same event is evoked in *Satire 8*:

*et illic*

*dedecus urbis habes, nec murmillonis in armis  
nec clipeo Gracchum pugnantem aut falce supina;  
damnat enim talis habitus [sed damnat et odit,  
nec galea faciem abscondit]: movet ecce tridentem.  
postquam vibrata pendentia retia dextra  
nequiquam effudit, nudum ad spectacula voltum  
erigit et tota fugit agnoscendus harena.  
credamus tunicae, de faucibus aurea cum se  
porrigat et longo iactetur spira galero.*

<sup>34</sup> CIC. *Arch.* 9, 22.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. NARDO (1975: 448): "il richiamo alla tradizione epica assume qui il tono di un aspro e amaro rimprovero (...)".

<sup>36</sup> On the Ennian hexameter, see e.g. SKUTSCH (1985); DUCKWORTH (1966).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. VERG. *Aen.* 3, 12; 6, 679.

*ergo ignominiam graviorem pertulit omni  
volnere cum Graccho iussus pugnare secutor.* (8, 199–210)

Yet, this time the satirist did not create an epic net of references to criticize the behavior of the noble, but he makes use of the reality. Gracchus is presented as a Salian priest, i.e. he is wearing a Salian priest's outfit while being on the arena which is even more dishonorable than being on the arena as a *retarius*.

The condemnation of Roman morals is an aim of another passage where the *spondeiazon* is found:

*nullum crimen abest facinusque libidinis ex quo  
paupertas Romana perit: hinc fluxit ad istos  
et Sybaris colles, hinc et Rhodos et Miletos.* (6, 295–297)

The metrical and stylistic grandeur is interrupted by the subject raised in the passage – the satirist regards the Greek cities as source of the corruption in Rome. While Sybaris was indeed a proverbial den of debauchery<sup>38</sup>, neither Rhodes nor Miletus was traditionally associated with *facinus* and *crimen libidinis*. Instead of these two cities, the satirist could have chosen any another Greek towns – the sense of his statement would have not been changed. Thus, the trisyllable *Miletos* was put in the clausula due to metrical reason so that the *versus spondiacus* could be composed creating once again the contrast between the solemn verse and its content and underlining the Greek character of the vices<sup>39</sup>. Yet, the city which is presented in the most unflattering way is personified Tarentum granted with such adjectives as *coronatum*, *petulans*, *madidum*. Tarentum could have had some negative associations in the Roman world due to historical (the city betrayed Rome during the Second Punic War; Roman ambassadors were insulted by the people of Tarentum in 281 BC) and moral reasons (cf. HOR. *Sat.* 2, 4, 34: *molle Tarentum*). The historical references are direct – during the Pyrrhic war the Tarentinens insulted the Roman ambassadors at the festival of Dionysus in the theatre wearing garlands (thus *coronatum*) as if for drinking. The Second Punic War is raised in the previous lines (6, 290–293) when the satirist brings up the topic of Hannibal and the military episode from 211 BC<sup>40</sup>. Tarentum, a city which lost then is winning now: the luxury and

<sup>38</sup> For Sybaris see SUDA s.v. Συβαρτικαῖς; Rhodes – PLUT., *De cup.* 5, 525b; Miletus – ATH. 12, 523e and cf. proverbial “ἦσαν ποτ’ ἦσαν, ἀλκιμοὶ Μιλήσιοι” (AR. *Pl.* 1002).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. NADEAU (2011: 173): “A Greek line-ending for a Greek vice”.

<sup>40</sup> See LIV. 26, 10.

decadence of the world conquered by Romans in the past is responsible for the decline of Roman virtues. The Greek corruption and effeminacy are soaking the Roman world, thus taking revenge on the Romans:

*unde haec monstra tamen vel quo de fonte requiris?  
praestabat castas humilis fortuna Latinas  
quondam, nec vitiis contingi parva sinebant  
tectae labor somnique breves et vellere Tusco  
vexatae duraeque manus ac proximus urbi  
Hannibal et stantes Collina turre mariti.  
nunc patimur longae pacis mala, saevior armis  
luxuria incubuit victumque ulciscitur orbem.* (6, 286–293)

The motif of vengeance appears allusively when Hannibal is mentioned. His deeds and the *metus Punicus*, the Roman fear (*proximus Hannibal urbi*) regarded traditionally as a force for preserving good morals<sup>41</sup>, brings into mind the Virgilian *topos* of Hannibal-*ultor* (*Aen.* 6, 625)<sup>42</sup>. Paradoxically, he helps to maintain the *Paupertas Romana* whose death (6, 295) is caused by the long peace enabling the Greek cities (especially Tarentum) to start their attack. The imaginary<sup>43</sup> is military but the form of the attack possess hints of effeminacy<sup>44</sup>.

The epic treats present in the passage, preceding the grand verse helps Juvenal to sketch a positive portrait of Roman virtues. It is opposed to Greek decadency symbolized by the Greek cities whose enumeration starts with the mocking *spondeiazon* and crowns by the picture of Tarentum. The similar idea (aversion to Greeks) presented with the same technique (the *spondeiazon* with a tri-elemental sequence) appears in *Satire 3*:

*Non est Romano cuiquam locus hic, ubi regnat  
Protogenes aliquis vel Diphilus aut Hermarchus* (3, 119–120)

The Greek name *Hermarchus* was instinctively associated with a slave or a freedman. Here, he is one of the despised Greeks who take place of old clients in the Roman aristocratic mansion. Again, Juvenal shows his

<sup>41</sup> Cf. SALL. *Iug.* 41, FLOR. *Epit.* 1, 31; 47. For more detailed description of this recurring theme see NADEAU (2011: 167).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. the motif of *ultor* in Silius Italicus: Hannibal-*ultor* – *Pun.* 1, 114–119; Scipio Africanus-*ultor* – *Pun.* 16, 593.

<sup>43</sup> Supported by a military word *incumbere*.

<sup>44</sup> NADEAU (2011: 170–173).

contempt of the Greek conquering the Roman world using the contemptuous rhythm of Greek origin. Just as in 6, 297, the grand verse is preceded by some epic imagery. In this case, the satirist builds an “*epic-style paraphrastic allusion*<sup>45</sup>” whose pathos dissolves with the appearance of non-epic *caballus*:

*Stoicus occidit Baream delator amicum  
discipulumque senex ripa nutritus in illa  
ad quam Gorgonei delapsa est pinna caballi* (3, 116–118)

The example of Hannibal is reintroduced in another passage where the *versus spondiacus* is applied:

*expende Hannibalem: quot libras in duce summo  
inuenies? hic est quem non capit Africa Mauro  
percussa oceano Niloque admota tepenti  
rursus ad Aethiopum populos aliosque elephantos.  
**additur imperiis Hispania, Pyrenaeum**  
transilit. opposuit natura Alpemque niuemque:  
diducit scopulos et montem rumpit aceto.  
iam tenet Italiam, tamen ultra pergere tendit.  
'acti' inquit 'nihil est, nisi Poeno milite portas  
frangimus et media uexillum pono Subura.'  
o qualis facies et quali digna tabella,  
cum Gaetula ducem portaret belua luscum!* (10, 147–158)

The *spondeiazon* becomes more understandable when compared with the following lines 153–158. They all possess a spondee in fourth foot with a diaeresis which makes the rhythm of the verse flow more slowly. The meter is adapted to the importance of the deeds of Hannibal who is once again presented through the motif of *ultor*, here ironically transformed. The allusion is announced cataphorically:

*exitus ergo quis est? o gloria! vincitur idem  
(...)  
finem animae quae res humanas miscuit olim,  
non gladii, non saxa dabunt nec tela, sed ille  
Cannarum vindex et tanti sanguinis ultor  
anulus.* (10, 159; 163–166)

<sup>45</sup> COURTNEY (1980: 173).

The signet ring in which the poison was kept is the *vindex Cannarum* which is fitting revenge as after the victory over Rome at Cannae, Hannibal sent home rings taken from the Roman dead soldiers. Thus, the *spondeiazon* (together with the grand meter and *quasi*-epic catalogue of Hannibal's achievements in lines 151–153) is applied in fact not to praise Hannibal's victories, but to emphasize the contrast between his doings and tragic ending.

The war in connection with the *spondeiazon* is presented in *Satire 14* – again, the satirist stresses bitterly the poor ending of those who were once victors:

*mox etiam fractis aetate ac Punica passis  
proelia uel Pyrrhum inmanem gladiosque Molossos  
tandem pro multis uix iugera bina dabantur  
uulneribus; merces haec sanguinis atque laboris  
nulli uisa umquam meritis minor aut ingratae  
curta fides patriae.* (14, 160–165)

The *spondeiazon* with the adjective *ingrata* (referring to *patria*) which is put in the distinctive clausula reveals the injustice of the native country towards its soldiers.

The Juvenal's inclination to connect the idea of vengeance to *spondeiazon* can be observed in two other instances:

*quod enim dubitant componere crimen  
in dominos, quotiens rumoribus **ulciscuntur**  
baltea?* (9, 110–112)

*Quippe minuti  
semper et infirmi est animi exiguique voluptas  
**ultio**. Continuo sic collige, **quod vindicta**  
nemo magis gaudet quam femina* (13, 189–192)

In the first example, the motif of revenge is evoked by the final verb *ulciscor* in the clausula of the *versus spondiacus*. COURTNEY (1980: 50) does not see a deeper sense in applying the grand verse in this context accusing the satirist of a laxity. Yet, Juvenal may be giving a certain grandeur and epic flavor to the idea of vengeance by contrasting the grand verse and the motif itself with trivial tools of the vengeance (gossips instead of battles) and its performers (slaves instead of heroes). The contrast is well stressed by the enjambment. Similarly, in *Satire 13*, the *spondeiazon* begins and ends with words semantically referring to the vengeance: *ultio* and *vindicta*.

The first one is an accented element of the enjambment, the second forms an ending of the *spondeiazon*; therefore, it is stressed as well (the secondary emphasis is owned to the bucolic diaeresis). Just as in 9, 111, the sentence has gnomic character and treats about the non-heroic vengeance, undertaken from vicious reasons. This kind of avenging has its place in the epic tradition as well. In *Ciris*, the idea of vengeance has the same attributes as mentioned by Juvenal; moreover, the *versus spondiacus* also appears:

*At levis ille deus, cui semper ad ulciscendum  
quaeritur ex omni verborum iniuria dicto.* (CIRIS 158–159)

The *spondeiazontes* in the analyzed passages are accompanied by anaphor or asyndeton, figures which are not features of the epic grandeur, but as they are used to bring the attention of the listener, the satirist applies them deliberately with the *versus spondiacus* so that it differentiates more clearly from the co-text. Yet, the main allusive role lies on the semantic and not stylistic traits. In two such cases, Juvenal refers directly to the epic works. In *Satire I* the *versus spondiacus* appears in the sequence of rhetorical questions, just after some *exempla* revealing the immorality of Roman inhabitants:

*Haec ego non agitem? Sed quid magis? Heracleas  
aut Diomedas aut mugitum labyrinthi  
et mare percussum puero fabrumque volantem* (1, 52–54)

The comparison between everyday life subject-matters and epic themes, critical for the author's poetical intention, is contained in three verses (52–54) of which the first one is a *spondeiazon*. The four-syllable verse-ending word, clearly stressed not only by a spondee in the fifth foot, but by a bucolic diaeresis as well, begins the tri-elemental sequence in which the satirist enumerates the most hackneyed mythological subject-matters: the labors of Heracles, the fates of Diomedes and the story of Daedalus and Icarus. The *spondeiazon* introduces the solemn tone and the grand themes, but, since he rejects them, the grandeur is mocked. Yet, it is the third element which deflates immediately the bombastic style.

The deflation in tone, rather unusual as it is provoked by the use of epic elements themselves, is provoked by depersonification (*mugitum labyrinthi* to describe Minotaur), passive voice (*mare percussum puero*) and the depreciation of the mythological hero (Daedalus as *faber volans*). The examples serve Juvenal to state what the poetry should not become and what themes he does not want to bring up. The motif and the technique are recurrent in *Satire I* due to its programmatic role:

1, 1: *numquamne reponam?* – 1, 52: *haec ego non agitem? sed quid magis?*

1, 2–14: hackneyed subject-matters of poetry – 1, 52–54: hackneyed subject-matters of epic

1, 15–21: *apologia*

1, 22–50: *exempla* – 1, 55–78: *exempla*

In consequence, the *spondeiazon* in line 52 has an additional function. It makes Juvenal's questions concerning his choice of the satire's themes more solemn and formal; the rhythm reflects the satirist's seriousness and perhaps, his little too big ego. From the structural point of view the spondaic line seems to be well chosen – after a set of examples which are shocking *per se*, the listener's attention starts to diminish. The appearance of the unusual meter brings his notice back<sup>46</sup> and the repetition of the question, essential from the point of view of the justification of his generic choice, reinforces the apologetic aim of Juvenal. The technique departs from practice of the previous authors, but the antithesis between the real satire and the mythological and epic literature was already introduced by Lucilius<sup>47</sup> and appeared e.g. in Martial (as opposition between real-world and mythological themes) whom Juvenal may imitate<sup>48</sup>.

Another *spondeiazon* with a direct reference to the epic subject appears in *Satire 15*:

*attonito cum*

*tale super cenam facinus narraret Ulixes  
Alcinoo, bilem aut risum fortasse quibusdam  
mouerat ut mendax aretalogus. 'in mare nemo  
hunc abicit saeva dignum veraque Charybdi,  
**fingentem inmanis Laestrygonas et Cyclopas?** (15.13–18)*

The *spondeiazon* serves to emphasize the monstrosity of the cannibals and is a part of the epic story itself which serves as an element of com-

<sup>46</sup> MAROUZEAU (1962: 312) notes the metrical conflict in Juvenalian satires between the exigency of metrical rules to raise the satire as a genre and the necessity to exonerate from them to avoid the monotony. The *versus spondiacus*, with its grand style origin and irregular rhythm manifesting itself especially in the clausula to which Juvenal had a special fondness (cf. his use of the monosyllable), agrees these two sides of the conflict giving an original flavor to his poetical discourse.

<sup>47</sup> LUCIL. 587 Marx.

<sup>48</sup> MART. 10, 8–12: *Hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'Meum est / Non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque / Invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit / Sed non vis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores / Nec te scire: legas Aetia Callimachi.*

parison with another story (15, 33 ff.) from contemporary times narrated in mockingly elevated style. These *gesta miranda* which took place in Egypt treat about religious feud and cannibalism; the themes are therefore hardly suited to the epic style used by Juvenal. The epic references varies from grand style (e.g. lines 15, 33–35), epic motives (e.g. *furor*, 15, 36) and epic meter (*spondeiazon*, 15, 36: *inde furor vulgo, quod numina vicinorum*) to direct allusions to the Homeric and Virgilian epic<sup>49</sup> (15, 66 ff as a reference e.g. to *Il.* 8, 264–265, *Aen.* 12, 896–901<sup>50</sup>). The *versus spondiacus* helps bring the epic-mocking tone of the story.

Despite Juvenal's negative attitude towards mythological themes, he employs them to reinforce his voice, such as in the case of the myth of Orestes (again with the motif of *ultor*):

*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 scena numquam cantavit Orestes,  
Troica non scripsit (8, 216–221)*

The fact that Juvenal equals poisoning with writing epic and makes Orestes a positive hero explain his attitude towards the mythical world and the epic stories – they should not be disregarded *in se*; it is the poetry treating about them which should be avoided. Similarly, the myth of Iphigenia is used in the passage where two *spondeiazontes* appear in proximity:

*alter enim, si concedas, mactare vovebit  
de grege servorum magna et pulcherrima quaeque  
**corpora, vel pueris et frontibus ancillarum**  
inponet vittas et, si qua est nubilis illi  
Iphigenia domi, dabit hanc altaribus, etsi  
non sperat tragicae furtiva piacula cervae.  
**laudo meum civem, nec comparo testamento**  
mille rates (12, 115–122).*

The structure of the passage may have been a trace of the Neoteric tradition – in one of the Catullian epyllia (64, 76–83), the accumulated *spon-*

<sup>49</sup> Cf. SCOTT (1927: 61).

<sup>50</sup> Other possible epic passages where similar themes are raised are quoted by NARDO (1975: 453, n. 47).

*deiazontes* of non-epic content containing non expressive ending words are surrounded by the Greek mythological imagery<sup>51</sup>. It means that they were employed due to their metrical value to harmonize the rhythm with the content. Here, the technique is transformed – the myth of Iphigenia is an *exemplum* of antithetical value stressing the hypocrisy of legacy-hunters described in the grand verses.

The epic imagery appears in twelve passages which contain the *versus spondiacus* revealing some genological features of the Juvenalian satire. From the formal point of view, the number of grand verse containing the final word of epic or mythological origin is less than the number of passages in which the epic ideas appear in cataphoric or anaphoric position giving an elevated or mock-elevated trait to the passage (through contrasting metre and imagery, i.e. plain metre – epic imagery vs. grand metre – everyday subject), yet their programmatic value is unmistakable. The satirists proves that his distinction between epic and satire is different from the one accepted by other satirists. While Horace and Persius stress the difference in style between satire and epic, Juvenal, as we may conclude from his own words, concentrates on the difference in themes (1, 52). Thus, in the *spondeiazontes* and their co-text, he employs the features of grand style such as anaphors, enjambment, asyndeta, repetition, periphrasis, *contentio*<sup>52</sup>. Yet, despite his scornful attitude towards the hackneyed mythological subject-matters, he makes use of them without any derisive intention (6, 329; 8, 218; 15, 13–18; 10, 151; 9, 111; 13, 191). It allows us to make an assumption that it was not the mythological and epic-like subjects and motives which were to avoid entirely according to Juvenal<sup>53</sup>, but the *way* in which the epic authors were using them while writing the poems – without Virgilian wit and poorly imitating their predecessors. That kind of poetry is mocked by the satirist (3, 120; 15, 36); the *spondeiazontes* in these passages contribute to the derisive voice of the satire. The accusation of mediocre *aemulatio* and monotony is not a threat for Juvenal's *spondeiazontes*. He re-models the metrical, syntactic and semantic rules and patterns of the grand verse in such a way that his fear of being hackneyed of which the epic subject-matter is an epitome is completely unjustified as he obtains the measured balance between the tradition and originality.

<sup>51</sup> NARDO (1975: 447).

<sup>52</sup> For the latter, see CIC. *De orat.*, 3.177, 203 ; *Orat.* 85.

<sup>53</sup> The idea is supported by the fact that rejecting epic was a part of the *recusatio*, a common *topos* of Roman poetry. Moreover, from the sociological point of view, it would be hard to avoid all epic and mythological elements in the satire as they were part of Roman everyday life (e.g. having proverbial function) which was the main interest of the genre.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- CORDIER, ANDRE. 1947. *Les débuts de l'hexamètre latin*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique.
- COURTNEY, EDWARD. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London: Athlone Press.
- COURTNEY, EDWARD. 2003. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DUCKWORTH, GEORGE E. 1966. Studies in Latin hexameter poetry. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 97, 67–113.
- ESKUCHE, GUSTAV. 1895. Juvenals Versbau. In: FRIEDLAENDER, LUDWIG [ED.]. 1985. *D. Junii Juvenalis Saturarum Libri V. Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*, Leipzig, 57–80.
- FRIEDLAENDER, LUDWIG [ED.]. 1985. *D. Junii Juvenalis Saturarum Libri V. Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- GRAAF, CORNELIS VAN DER. 1945. *The Dirae, with translation, commentary and an investigation of its authorship*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- HELZLE, MARTIN. 1992. Σπονδειαύζοντες bei Lucan. *Latomus* 51, 590–600.
- KISSEL, WALTER [ED.]. 1990. *Aules Persius Flaccus. Satiren*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- LINDSAY, WALLACE M. 1894. *The Latin language. An historical account of Latin sounds, stems, and flexions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MAROUZEAU, JULES. 1962. *Traité de stylistique latine*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- MUELLER, LUCIAN. 1894. *De re metrica poetarum latinorum praeter Plautum et Terentium libri septem*. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner.
- NADEAU, YVAN. 2011. *A Commentary on the Sixth Satire of Juvenal*. Bruxelles: Éditions Latomus.
- NARDO, DANTE. 1975. Σπονδειαύζοντες in Giovenale. *Lingua e stile*, 10, 439–468.
- NORDEN, EDUARD. 1995. *Vergilius. Aeneis Buch VI*. Stuttgart und Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- NOUGARET, LOUIS. 1948. *Traité de métrique latine classique*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- JAHN, OTTO [ED.]. 1843. *Scholiam antiqua in Persium*. Lipsiae.
- SCALIGER, JULIUS C. 1561. *Poetices libri septem*. [Geneva]: Apud I. Crispinum.
- SCOTT, INEZ G. 1927. *The grand style in the satires of Juvenal*. Northampton: Collegiate Press.
- SKUTSCH, OTTO. 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- THIEL, AUGUST. 1901. *Iuvenalis Graecissans sive de vocibus Graecis apud Iuvenalem*. Wratislaviae: Preuss & Juenger.
- WESTWAY FREDERIC W. 1913. *Quantity and accent in the pronunciation of Latin*. Cambridge: University Press.
- WILKINSON, LANCELOT P. 1940. The Augustan Rules for Dactylic Verse. *The Classical Quarterly*, 34, 30–43.
- WILKINSON, LANCELOT P. 1963. *Golden Latin Artistry*. Cambridge: University Press.
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF, ULRICH VON. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- WINBOLT, SAMUEL E. 1903. *Latin hexameter verse. An aid to the composition*. London: Methuen & Co.
- WINKLER, MARTIN M. 1990. A Virgilian Echo in Juvenal's Eleventh Satire. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 133, 375–378.
- VIERTTEL, ANTONIUS. 1862. De versibus poetarum Latinorum spondiacis. *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, 12, 801–811.