
Producing Consensus: Reconfiguration of the Imperial City of Rome in the Satires of Horace, Petronius, and Juvenal

Sayantani Chowdhury

Department of English, University of Delhi
New Delhi, India
E-mail address: inacusp.sayantani@gmail.com

Abstract

“Juvenal’s Error”, Theodor Adorno’s fragment on satire, offers a remarkable provision to study the genre of satire against its grain. Adorno reflects on the “impossibility of satire” in the modern capitalistic world, where agreement has “given way to universal agreement of content” and the world has been flattened to an indifferent unanimity” (*Minima Moralia*, III, 134). This conclusion is based upon the distinctive argument that traditionally satire (from ancient Rome to Enlightenment France) had targeted impostors and thrived by exposing the differences between claims and truth, ideology and reality; but itself satire was fuelled by its own conservatism, rather than a subversive intention.

In order to expose, satire had to be and was anchored in a certain ideological consensus or agreement that was always already present in the society waiting to be harnessed. Adorno calls this the “antinomy”; and this is nowhere clearer than in case of the Roman satirist where his relationship with the city of Rome was guided by an obvious paradox: he resided in and benefitted from the same city that he satirized. Far from being an occasion for conundrum, this paradox, in fact, stimulates their satire and the hypothesis that channelizes this paper.

With specific reference to Horace, Petronius and Juvenal’s satires, this paper studies how they are interlaced in the fabric of the Roman city as well as with the project of the empire, in which the city features prominently. It entertains the hypothesis that the Roman satirists probably never challenged the status-quo, but in seeking or producing the consensus, or at least the semblance of it as it were, these satires engendered the Roman imperial city as much as they inhered in it. This was done, of course, by the genre’s self-conscious realisation of its target, scope and readership.

What ensues in this paper, therefore, is a detailed discussion of the geographical, political, social and economic dimensions of the ancient city of Rome, its reconstruction for the Roman empire and the dynamics of its reconfiguration in the hands of the three satirists.

Keywords: Roman satire; Roman empire; consensus or agreement; city; periphery; *civitas*; *rus-in-urbe*; *romanitas*

Roman satire and Adorno

This paper begins with an ambitious anachronism, for I consider Theodor Adorno's brief but illuminating exposition on satire in *Minima Moralia* (1951) as an entry point to the study of Roman satire based in the ancient city of Rome. In the section titled "Juvenal's Error" (III.134), Adorno identifies what he calls the "antinomy of satire": the fact that while it derides pretentiousness of all kinds, it conceals its own fundamental reliance on some sort of "consensus" or "agreement". This, in turn, quashes the very possibility of satire being a subversive genre. Satire uses the force of irony to expose but since agreement is "the formal *a priori* of irony", Adorno says, satire has historically subscribed to the status quo and maintained an overt kinship with the established order.

This is not news to scholars of Roman satire for they have on most occasions already attested to its conservative underpinnings. However, my research takes off from Adorno and looks into how Roman satire creates/employs the 'compelling consensus' in dialogue with Rome's imperial project. In this paper I attempt to adumbrate that this nexus has a particular ramification: not only was Roman satire deeply embedded in the city of Rome (satire *contra pastoral lyric* is veritably an urban genre) but it also self-consciously participated in corroborating, criticizing, re-configuring and perhaps even re-constructing the imperial city.

The satirists under discussion in this paper are Horace, Juvenal and Petronius which implies that its spatiotemporal range lies within the formative hundred and fifty years of the Roman empire.¹ The longer first half of the paper situates the satires within the city of Rome and the brief latter half focusses on how the satirists generate the consensus and among whom. These concerns are actually more interrelated than distinguishable—an initial hypothesis that my research entertained. The arguments are then channelized to vet a certain juxtaposition that I see as fundamental to the conclusion of this paper. The city that these satirists observe and pillory is juxtaposed with the one that they construct for their 'consensual readers'.

The Centre and the Peripheral

The crowded worlds of Horace's and Juvenal's satires are populated by the people of Rome, and Petronius' *Satyricon* closely mirrors the tenets of that city. Juvenal's *indignatio*—that almost reflexively motivates his satires—proceeds from this “monstrous city” (1.31), except that the city that is so pilloried and parodied by these satirists was not merely a city. It was the prominent political and administrative centre of a growing empire. The wider the bounds of the empire expanded, the more its nucleus grew in command and significance. Doubtlessly then, the three satirists speak to imperial concerns as they make the city their bread and butter—literary and political.

Augustus began building Rome as an imperial centre with the dregs of Republic still present and all the later emperors invested in its upkeep. The emphatic idea was to meticulously carve a central city that exuded a proud *romanitas* (Roman-ness) to the rest of the world, highlighted by contrast and reflected in the architectural, political, social and economic aspects of the city. But *per virtutem* a centre comes into being by designating and demarcating its peripheries. The power of the city of Rome lay not only in being able to identify itself as the centre but also in delineating its margins or peripheries and then dictating the terms of its relationship with the same². The urban project, the imperial project and the literary project merged to carry out this circumscription: assignment and reassignment of what were to constitute the periphery and how they would (be made to) stand in relation to the centre. To consider this tripartite negotiation, I shall now mark out three ways of looking at the margins of Rome: physical-landscaped, politico-demographic, and socio-economic. They are separately addressed in the next three sections but are eventually more reticular than not.

Rus-in-urbe

A Roman city (*urbe*) could be clearly told apart from the country (*rus*). The city boasted of the important administrative buildings and public infrastructure that would flag *romanitas* through its *urbanitas* and vice-versa. It was marked by a social life with myriad political and administrative engagements of significance. In contrast, the country was a site of agricultural production and serene social life. Roman satire has amply explored this antithesis while clearly siding with the country.

The Horatian and Petronian city of Rome is a place of excesses: hollow flattery, unruly ambition, lechery and deception. Horace moans that “There's no middle way” (*Satires*,

II.2.28). Likewise, Juvenal's Rome is a place of widespread political corruption and moral-cultural corrosion. Ancient Rome had the Sacra Via, the Forum, the Domes, the Baths, the Colosseum³ and others as its landscape markers; but these are the very places that bear the mark of the city's shortcomings. Horace describes these public places as breeding grounds of malaria and summer illnesses (*Epistles*, I.7.5-9); while Juvenal indicates how ethical corruption has infiltrated the city's infrastructural emblems:

So farewell Rome, I leave you
to sanitary engineers and municipal architects, fellows
who by swearing black is white find it easy to land
contracts for a new temple, swamp-drainage, harbour-works,
river-clearance, undertaking, the lot – then pocket the profit
and fraudulently file their petition in bankruptcy. (3.28–33)

In many of their poems, Horace and Juvenal seem to be singing in praise of the country while scoffing at the city and its many people. In *The Roman City and its Periphery* (2007), Penelope Goodman mentions that the awareness “of a sharp antithesis between city and country, particularly on moral grounds” was part of the intellectual-ideological make-up of an “well-educated member of the metropolitan elite at Rome” (11).

Indignant and miffed as they were at the city, these satirists however could not and did not ever move away from the city.⁴ The country certainly complemented the city and was part of the imperial hinterland from which Rome derived its food through agricultural surplus turned in as taxes and tributes.⁵ But technically speaking, the *Ager Romanus* lay outside the precincts of the *Urbs Roma*, taking one entirely out of the city and its opportunities. Nor was the country-life without its share of troubles:

But after his sheep were stolen, and his goats died of disease,
and his crops let him down, and his ox was worked to death at the plough,
he was driven to despair by his losses. And so, in the middle of the night,
he grabbed a horse and rode to Philippus' house in a rage. (Horace, *Epistles*, I.7.86–89)

This orchestrated antithesis—itsself of deep administrative and literary significance—led to the construction of a separate zone in the urban landscape that would have peripheral (and not antithetical) relationship with Rome. This was the suburb, which has been variously termed as “periurban” zone (Goodman 2), “immediate hinterland” (Morley 91), and others. The suburb combined elements of the city and the country but was distinguished by its proximity to the city and its imperial businesses.

Firstly, this peripheral zone provided the elite city-people with just the retreat they needed without taking them away from the city:

the immediate hinterland of the city was characterised by particular forms of production (like horticulture), but there was also a distinctive suburban form of consumption. The *suburbium* was a place of *salubritas*, *otium* and *amoenitas*. It was a refuge from the heat, crowds and insanitary conditions of the city; a place of leisure, for writing, reading and conversing with one's cultivated neighbours; a place of delightful beauty. (Morley 91)

Secondly, as I argue, it is precisely these distinctive modes of production and consumption that implicate the suburb within the empire and adumbrate the centre-periphery relationship I have been discussing. This can be illustrated in the light of Maecenas' Esquiline Hill gardens and Horace's Sabine farm—two different suburban locations described in two Horatian satires.⁶

Maecenas, counsellor to Augustus and patron to many poets, had built his own garden-estate at the outskirts of Rome in the place of an erstwhile graveyard on the Esquiline Hill. The farm-villa on Sabine Hills was, on the other hand, a gift to Horace from Maecenas. Horace wrote two seemingly innocuous satires about them—one laden with a gross joke (I.8) and the other with grave thankfulness (II.6). In the latter poem, Horace stages the movement from his own Sabine farms to Maecenas' Esquiline abode as one that is from a country-like retreat to the centre of all important administrative activities. Upon reaching Esquiline he is caught up not only with a string of substantial appointments and paperwork, but also with people's disdain, mockery and flattery (very similar to what he encounters in downtown Rome in Satire 9 of Book I). This antithetical presentation is again deliberate and misleading. Scholars have scratched the surface off Maecenas' *horti* and Horace's poem to reveal a different reality: Sabine farms is as much an integral part of imperial Rome as Esquiline is. It has gained scholarly credence that

The satire (I.8) is not just a celebration of the new gardens as an urban amenity, much less a simple fart joke. It is also and more significantly a part of the proto-Augustan program of renewal and, concomitantly, the assignment of the memory of the civil wars to oblivion. (Higgins 140).

Maecenas' garden estate is a grim concealer as well as reminder of past violence and loss, while standing in as a symbol of Augustus' proclaimed imperial vision based on renewal and restoration. (Was the irony lost on Horace's contemporaries?)

Similarly, as a gift from the patron Maecenas, Sabine farms is already a benefaction from the city and the empire at large. Karen Dang recalls Phebe Lowell Bowditch's reading of the Sabine Farm satire:

Horace's poems invoke and participate in the economy of patronage via the gift of the farm. On her reading, the value of the farm resides in the *otium* (leisure) it secures for poetic production, a production that is constrained by patronal benefaction in a system of quid pro quo exchange—estate for poems—that is not presented as such. Paradoxically, the gift that obligates also enables Horace to negotiate his debts and reconfigure his relationship with Maecenas. He does so by transforming the material gift of the farm (*munus*) into an aestheticized poetic landscape that is not for profit (*locus amoenus*), and aligns the poet with the aristocratic elite in their appreciation of aesthetic and philosophical *otium*. (103)

At a later point, I shall highlight how Bowditch's concerns adds up to the production of consensus that is the cynosure of this paper. What is interesting here is that all these important developments and consolidations take place not on the city-streets of Rome, but in its suburban periphery.

Pura Romana

A fascinating detail about Maecenas' garden-estate on the Esquiline that is often overlooked is, as Higgins points out, the presence of "plundered Greek art, placed there totally out of its original context, to serve a new function for the Augustan elite" (141). Commensurate with the garden's—and statue of Priapus'—espousal of fertility, the Greek art in Esquiline has an added emblematic value. It represents Rome's cultural dependence on Greece and more importantly the City's wilful self-presentation as a cosmopolitan imperial centre. With Juvenal, however, we see this Augustan incorporation giving way to a mass insecurity bordering on a "xenophobic sneer" (Williams 527). In Augustan Rome portrayed in Horatian satires, Greece is no more than an emblem and Jews are no more than a simile (1.4.140–44); whereas they are copiously present as threats in Juvenal. Although Juvenal starts off by saying that his anger is directed at the irrevocable corruption of Roman social milieu and moral fabric, it is gradually

apparent that Juvenal's problem is, in fact, demographic. His satires are verbose manifestations against an infiltration and profusion of the 'foreigners' in Rome.

The city of Rome was being swarmed by Greeks and Jews and this was a bone of contention because, according to Juvenal, they were robbing the Romans of the opportunities in Rome. The immigrating population was making inroads into the houses, jobs, positions and culture that were supposed to be inhabited by the Romans only.

all of them lighting out for the City's classiest districts
and burrowing into great houses, with plans to take them
over. (3.71-72)

This however is not corroborated by the current conjectural analyses on Rome's population during the day. Historians say that Rome indeed had a whopping population of around a million people, but between Augustan era and Hadrian era, the population could not have increased any more than by a margin of about 300,000 people (which would obviously include the huge influx from Rome's own countryside).

Understandably, Juvenal's main concern is that the foreigners were fomenting a cultural pollution of Rome. The gay marriage that takes place in Rome's downtown (2.132-35) and the prevailing sexual perversion that Rome is apparently witnessing is blamed upon a Greek influence.⁷ While departing from Rome, Umbricius minces no words and complains "I cannot, citizens, stomach/ a Greek Rome"; quickly following it with another scathing remark: "Yet what fraction of these dregs is truly Greek?" (3.60-61).⁸ This is of crucial import because it highlights the underlying concerns of purity and impurity. His puritanism should not have been incongruous with the ground reality of his times because although the post-Nero Flavian and Adoptive emperors had managed to rise through the ranks by dint of their military prowess or political acumen despite not being from the deified Augustan dynasty, they were routinely accused of being 'outsiders' for being born in the foreign lands of Spain or for their foreign predilections.⁹ Juvenal's scythe falls on these emperors and the general people alike, but I contend that his satires assuage more than attack. The rife xenophobic fears are harnessed into reinforcing the centre-periphery dynamics and the case in point is Juvenal's portrayal of the Jews.

He delineates a Jewish threat even as the Jews occupy only a very marginal presence in the city and in a parenthesis of his own satire. They are found merely at the city boundary where Umbricius' waggon is being loaded before his departure from Rome:

(But these days Egeria's grove and shrine and sacred spring
are rented out to Jews, their gear a Sabbath haybox:
each tree's under orders to pay rent to the City,
the Muses have been evicted, the wood's turned mendicant.) (3.13-16)

In yet another satire Juvenal says: "Jews will sell you/ whatever dreams you like for a few small coppers" (6.546-47). This is of course said in disdain of their greed but should be more indicative of their immiseration. The "palsied Jewess" (6.542) should further illustrate the Jewish situation in Rome against the grain of Juvenal's portrayal. The Jews are visibly impoverished, carrying no more belonging than a Sabbath haybox. Yet, they are under compulsion of paying rent to the City, which implies and makes bare Rome's profitable relationship with its marginal or foreign elements. The periphery is thus as much a resource as a benign cultural threat—unwelcome and partially welcome at the same time.

Civitas

The outsiders being sheltered by Rome at and as its periphery gave rise to a new socio-economic stratum of people. They were the slaves who had been brought from distant lands across the empire beyond Italy and Greece. Being born into families of generations of slavery, many of them were no longer foreigners and had been very well co-opted into the city as its inhabitants; but their marginalization was done by the very organization of *civitas* in Roman law which subjected everyone—although unequally—but protected a few. Only freeborn adult males constituted the citizens of Rome, and this pushed all others—women, children and slaves—into the margins of civil life. In *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: The People and the City at the Height of the Empire*, Jerome Carcopino evinces that imperial Rome created and deepened the hierarchies within the city even as it flattened the distinctions outside as a part of its imperial strategy:

All free-born men (*ingenui*) whether citizens of Rome or elsewhere, were in principle a distinct category, radically separated by their superiority of birth from the mass of slaves who were originally without rights, without guarantees, without personality, delivered over like a herd of brute beasts to the discretion of their master, and like a herd of beasts treated rather as inanimate objects than as sentient beings (*res Mancipi*).
(65)

That Rome was a stratified society is echoed in Horace in the garb of the ethical articulation “We have each our position” (*Satires* I.9.51) as well as in Juvenal’s vitriolic reference to the Reserved Seat Act of 67 AD (6.159).

However, this scheme of seemingly balanced socio-economic hierarchy was complicated by the provision of manumission. Umbricius fumes that he, a freeborn Roman, has been “squeezed out onto the margins of a “free” existence by a massive influx of Greek freedmen and slaves” (Freudenburg 267). Horace himself and Trimalchio in the *Satyricon’s* *Cena* are proof enough that emancipation of slaves led to the re-arrangement of the divisions. Horace is the son of an ex-slave from Venusia who could send his son to Rome for a better education and help him turn himself into a client to the mighty Maecenas. Trimalchio too has climbed the social ladder and now boasts of a stupendous wealth. These should be instances of successful social mobility; except that they are not. Both Horace and Trimalchio’s stories come with certain caveats. While Horace, having been incorporated into Maecenas’ circle, is impelled to—ironically—condemn upward social mobility as opportunism (*Satires* I.9)¹⁰, the Neronian Trimalchio is presented as a hollow nouveau-riche replete with deceit, pretentiousness, mock-elegance and lack-erudition. It is impossible to keep status at bay and Trimalchio himself exhibits that with his own degrading and inhuman treatment of slaves throughout the *Cena* episode:

This prelude to the feast highlights the definitive characteristics of the *Cena*: topsy-turvy rules, the odd juxtaposition of refinement and vulgarity, the emphasis on bodily functions, an acute awareness of social status, the threat of violence, the display of erudition but not quite getting it right, and appearances being deceptive. (Morales, Introduction)

Trimalchio’s incongruity and asymmetry are consequences of his desperate and revengeful effort to belong where he was not born, the staple target of satire. But instead of and perhaps incapable of portraying manumission as an avenue of emancipation and reconfiguration of status, the satirists thus present another reinforcement—this time of social status.

The city *sine qua non*

Having looked at the three special cases of the Roman suburb, the Jews and the manumitted slaves that had vexed but also buttressed the centre-periphery relationship in the ancient city of Rome, I can now embark on the issue of the production of consensus in the satirists’

representation of their imperial centre. My contention is that this consensus was garnered by the satirists not through a simple ex-collusion of the satirized but through a meticulous nexus of denigration and extolment of the same city that they satirize.

In a short but erudite article, Tara S. Welch points out that “Like Socrates of Plato’s *Phaedrus*, Horace requires the city as a subject: “Forgive me, my dear friend, for I am a lover of learning. You see, the country places and the trees teach me nothing, but people in the city do” (181). The satirists’ embeddedness in the city is undoubted: he must stay put in the city that he scorns—almost wallow in its depravation—for, it is the fodder for his poetry and ground for personal growth. Horace must therefore continue to meander about the Fora, Juvenal must visit the downtown indulging in a gay marriage and *Encolpius-Eumolpus-Ascyllus* must uninhibitedly explore the urban underbelly. They observe, criticize, suffer, ridicule and return.

This is always the paradox at the heart of satire. My intervention is that the Roman satirists negotiate this paradox by creating a parallel city—very different from the one that they truly observe around them. This parallel city or alternate city is dedicated to a coterie of consensual readers who always already bring a certain agreement in their reception of the satire as well as take some away from the satires.

Horace makes it clear in so many words that his elite “friends” (I.2.73)—including his patron *Maecenas*—are the “few readers” of his satires:

‘I’m happy if the better classes applaud me,’ as the dauntless *Miss Tree* remarked when hissed on the stage – she had only contempt for the rest. (I.10.76–77) and to them he portrays a different Rome altogether. It is in this Rome that his father could bring up a good son by sending him to a good school and by pointing out “various vices by citing examples” (I.4.106). *Maecenas*’ circle is a mini-Rome so distinguished from the actual Rome that pests don’t come begging for introduction; everyone knows their place, yet people like Horace are not reminded of or mocked for their humble birth:

you don’t on that account curl your nostril, as most people do,
at men with unknown or (like myself) with freedmen fathers.
When you assert that a man’s parentage makes no difference
provided he himself is a gentleman (I.6.5–8).

In this microcosm of the capital city¹, status-quo sits firmly if only guised as opportunity and equality. Horace’s satires are indeed implicated in the *amicitia* that he shares with *Maecenas*

and must continue to demonstrate (recall Bowditch¹²). “The satirist achieves his own social ascent by decrying those who strive for social ascent”, observes Welch (167).

Located though they are in a very cosmopolitanised imperial centre, Juvenal’s (and Umbricius’) unequivocal address is to the “citizens” of Rome, already reinstating the *civitas* and opting for an established consensus within the city—that Rome belongs to the Romans. This helps him forthrightly assign women, slaves and homosexuals to the margins while he frets a possible threat to the consensus. Hooley’s argument regarding Juvenal in *Roman Satire* attests mine:

Between these and the reality on the streets there will be incidental correspondence; the breadth of types and caricatures assures that. But these characters inhabit an imagined Rome, imagined not only by the poet drawing upon his stock of generic resources, but by his readers as well. He plays on their fears, anxieties, prejudices, and disappointments. And so the satire works for that audience. (137)

In Petronius too, the consensus is produced by showing the city underbelly as the locus of eventual justice. The small snippet of action which sees Encolpius and Ascyltus face a country-couple at the market reveals a quick change of fortunes where first impressions quickly give way to a second. Eventually the city boys prevail but Petronius gestures towards a different city—perhaps already present in the squalid streets of Rome—where class, gender, citizenship, past and future are difficult to be pinned down. Grace Gilles’ observations on Petronius in her thesis pertinently talks about the motif of “comic reversal” as the marker of status-quo in the *Satyricon*.

The protagonists of the novel tour the city’s poorer haunts, which are imagined as fantastical spaces, full of opportunities for comic reversal, rather than a site of mundane life or grim poverty. In presenting this kind of landscape, Petronius offers his readers a tour of the city that has the veneer of risk, but ultimately presents no danger—what John Hannigan has called “riskless risk” (1998); this tour guide reinforces a hierarchy of urban space. (178)

This emphasis on sketching a status-quoist city ensconces Roman satire firmly within the empire. The other genres differ from satire in not having to rethink or reinstate the centre-periphery dynamics. Martial’s *Epigrams*¹³ or Statius’ *Silvae* or even Horace’s own *Epistles* can inscribe and describe the city more securely and indifferently.

Conclusions

The Roman satirists aligned their self-proclaimed task of calling out hypocrisies in Rome with the Roman imperial project. The moral and cultural corruption that make up the subject-matter of their critique reproduce and deepen the socio-political status-quo within the city-empire dynamics of Rome. The questions of consensus and ex-collusion are especially pertinent in this regard because they help us reckon why and how paradoxes get accommodated to foster status-quo. In the context of Roman satire, the city and empire of Rome is the provider of consensus and simultaneously the realm where satirical ex-collusion is enacted and enabled. The categories of the *rus-in-urbe*, the influence of Greeks and Jews, the slaves and ex-slaves pave the avenues, as we have seen, through which Rome—a conducive Rome purged of or having incorporated some marginal elements—is engendered and reconfigured strategically.

The arguments and conclusions adumbrated in this paper are intended to unpack the negotiations that go into the making of the genre of satire. Building on the critical lens provided by Adorno's reading of satire, this paper argues for ensconcing satire within an ideology of its own. This, in turn, has allowed the paper to venture not only into the unique modalities of satire as a genre but also into the various coordinates of the city of Rome as the seat of a nascent empire. In the absence of biographical information on the Roman satirists, this paper enables a provisional re-imagining of their world and occupation as one fraught with insecurities and negotiations, as well as deeply embedded in the project of empire-making and city-building as much as in literary pursuits.

Notes

¹ Petronius is often considered incongruous alongside Horace and Juvenal, for neither is *Satyricon* a verse satire nor does it present an authorial persona. He is central, nonetheless, to my area for his parody of life and streets—both elite and non-elite—of Rome although the action of the extant portions unfolds in the coastal city of Campania. See Klause (2016), where she talks about Statius' (another Roman poet) portrayal of Campania as a city distinct from but also similar to Rome in many aspects: "Rome has largely created its empire in its own image" (37).

² A recent doctoral dissertation by Grace Gillies (2018) of UCLA has looked at the satirists' depiction of the streets of Rome—literary and physical—with a Lefebvrian "production of space" approach. That, according to me, gestures towards production as a secure strategic act. This paper, on the other hand, embarks upon the question of peripheries in order to evince production as an insecure but strategic act of negotiation and circumscription.

³ These buildings/structures were built across the first hundred and fifty years of the Roman empire with the Colosseum being the latest installation by Claudius and the Forum by Augustus the first.

⁴In fact, in Book II, Satire 6, it is Horace's neighbour Cervius and not Horace himself who tells the country-mouse fable (79-117). In Juvenal too, the caustic farewell to Rome is presented not by Juvenal but by his friend Umbricius. Umbricius leaves the city, Juvenal stays back. This is a point I return to in a later section of the paper titled "The City *sine qua non*".

⁵ See Adkins 177 and Morley 6. Morley describes a symbiotic relationship between Rome and its hinterland, with Rome's imperial strategy benefitting and not only draining the hinterland.

⁶ After the death of Augustus, his widow Livia is also known to have stayed in a villa in the outskirts of Rome. For more on Roman villas and gardens, see Adkins 158-162.

⁷ See Williams, 'Greek Love at Rome' (1995). He argues that male homosexuality was already prevalent in Rome before a certain cultural Hellenization took place. Greek influence had only introduced pederasty to Rome and Petronius' *Satyricon* almost revels in it. Morgan says that "The thematic prominence of homosexuality (in *Satyricon*) is no doubt an aspect of the Roman representation of Greek ambience" (32).

⁸ Even though Juvenal puts himself at a distance from Umbricius by staying back in Rome, there is no doubt that Umbricius is his mouthpiece. What Umbricius says in Satire III is consonant with Juvenal's scathing attack on Rome in other satires. Umbricius echoes Juvenal when he presents himself as the quintessentially original Roman: "drew my first breath/ among these Roman hills, and was nourished on Sabine olives" (Juvenal, 3.84-85).

⁹ Domitian was exiled on accusations of following "atheism and ... Jewish customs" (qtd. in Peter Green's Notes in his translation of Juvenal's *Satires*).

¹⁰ See Henderson, Chapter 8. He close-reads the infamous ninth satire from the first book of *Satires* to argue that Horace identifies with the pest as an ex-pest himself but carefully differentiates himself from the current aspirer in a deliberate act of self-presentation and self-consolidation.

¹¹ See Welch 178.

¹² Quoted in Dang 103.

¹³ For more on the differences between Horace's and Martial's—both outsiders—representation of the city of Rome, see Dyson and Prior (1995). They however stop short of ascribing the differences to the difference in genres.

Works cited

- Adkins, Lesley, and Roy A. Adkins. *Handbook to Life in Ancient Rome*. Updated ed., Facts on File, 2004.
- Adorno, Theodor. "Juvenal's Error." *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life*, translated by E. F. N. Jephcott, Verso, 2005, section 134. PDF.
- Carcopino, Jerome. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: The People and the City at the Height of the Empire*. Translated by E. O. Lorimer, Penguin Books, 1941.

-
- Dang, Karen. "Rome and the Sabine 'Farm': Aestheticism, Topography, and the Landscape of Production." *Phoenix*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2010, pp. 102–127. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/23074781>.
- Dyson, Stephen L., and Richard E. Prior. "Horace, Martial and Rome: Two Poetic Outsiders Read the Ancient City." *Arethusa*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1995, pp. 245–263. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/26309612>.
- Freudenburg, Kirk. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Gillies, Grace. "Writing in the Street: The Development of Urban Poetics in Roman Satire." *University of California, Los Angeles*, UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2018.
- Goodman, Penelope J. *The Roman City and Its Periphery: From Rome to Gaul*. Routledge, 2007.
- Henderson, John. *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry*. Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Hibbert, Christopher. *Rome: The Biography of a City*. Penguin Books, 1985.
- Higgins, John. "Horace *Satires* 1.8: A Blast from the Past." *New England Classical Journal*, vol. 44, no. 3, 2017, pp. 139–149. *CrossWorks*, <https://doi.org/https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj/vol44/iss3/3>.
- Hooley, Daniel M. *Roman Satire*. Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Horace. *Satires and Epistles*. Translated by Niall Rudd, Penguin, 2005.
- Juvenal. *The Sixteen Satires*. Translated by Peter Green, Third ed., Penguin, 1998.
- Klaue, Amanda. "Rome Reproduced: Campania and the Imperial City in Statius' *Silvae* 3.5 and 5.3." *The Classical Outlook*, vol. 91, no. 2, 2016, pp. 37–41. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/43940310>.
- Morgan, J. R. "Petronius and Greek Literature." *Petronius: A Handbook*, edited by Jonathan Prag and Ian Repath, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 32–64.
- Morley, Nevillle. *Metropolis and Hinterland: The City of Rome and the Italian Economy, 200 B.C.-A.D. 200*. Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Petronius. *The Satyricon*. Translated by J. P. Sullivan, Revised ed., Penguin Classics, 2012.
- Welch, Tara S. "'Est Locus Uni Cuique Suus': City and Status in Horace's *Satires* 1.8 and 1.9." *Classical Antiquity*, vol. 20, no. 1, Apr. 2001, pp. 165–192. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ca.2001.20.1.165>.
- Williams, Craig A. "Greek Love at Rome." *The Classical Quarterly*, vol. 45, no. 2, 1995, pp. 517–539. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/https://www.jstor.org/stable/639540>.
-

Author's Bio-note:

Sayantani Chowdhury is a Junior Research Fellow at the Department of English, University of Delhi. Her doctoral research area is the print and literary culture of little magazines in India but as an avid student of literature she is broadly interested in looking out for the ways in which particular literary forms and genres produce distinct worlds and discourses. As an Assistant Professor on Guest Basis, she also teaches under-graduate curriculum in the constituent colleges of University of Delhi. Her non-academic endeavours as much as academic engagements often nudges towards the curious question of 'the self and the other'.
