

Open Bodies and Closed Minds? Persius' *Saturae* in the light of Bakhtin and Voloshinov

FRANCESCA D'ALESSANDRO BEHR
University of Houston

Persius' judgmentalism was codified in Anderson's article "Persius and the Rejection of Society." Anderson argues that the poet's Stoic impatience led him to condemn all vice harshly:

As a judge, [P.] can mete out penalties and discern guilt without bias, for he himself has no fault or temptation to crime. The satirist knows how to operate the scales and weigh exactly; he knows how to straighten the crooked; he can pick his way surely towards his destination. ... To put it simply, the satirist and his friend are all-competent because of their *sapientia* and *ratio*, whereas others, the *stulti* are totally incompetent, not human at all.¹

The poet/philosopher has learned how to distinguish good from evil and is ready to teach others the lesson through any necessary means.

According to some critics, Persius' alleged conservatism, manifested as a tendency to view the world as a landscape starkly polarized (and interpretable) around well defined categories (the good vs. the bad; the wise vs. the ignorant, the closed vs. the open), is visible in his use of the open body conceptualized as a negative symbol of reproachable exchange.

¹ Anderson 1982, 181; similar ideas in Bramble 1974; Conington 1874, XXI represents another traditional evaluation which keeps style and content separate: "though the form of the composition is desultory, the spirit is in the main definite and consistent." More recently and beyond Persius' superficial aggressiveness, Hooley 1997, 9: "There is a sense that the rhetoric directed against the bad, bad world is too complacent, too youthfully passionate, too self-indulgent."

Emphasis in this paper will be shifted from individually described bodies to the anatomy of the language itself, to what enters and leaves the body of the poetry, to the expansive and porous texture of its dense syntax. It is my goal to pay attention to how satirical discourse is narrated (mainly in *Satire* 3 and 4) and characterized by quoted discourse, how it tends toward a fluid form which is not easily classified according to established categories (e.g. monologue or dialogue, direct modes or indirect modes, etc.).

Persius in his poetry is sensitive to authority in discourse: who is speaking, in which circumstance, how, to whom, through how many intermediaries. Persius “visualizes voices, he senses their proximity and interaction as bodies. A voice ... is not just words or ideas strung together: it is a ‘semantic position,’ a point of view on the world, it is one personality orienting itself among other personalities within a limited field.”² Numerous citations from other texts confirm Persius’ interest towards multiplicity and contradictory perspectives.³ Linguistic variety makes this satire a good example of open text and polyphonic discourse, phenomena analyzed with great depth and insight by M. Bakhtin and V. Voloshinov.

Persius’ satire seems characterized by “pictorial style” as described by V. Voloshinov in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* and by dialogism as sketched by M. Bakhtin in *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*. The Russian critics have suggested that through pictorial style and active double-voiced words, we have the dissolution of the boundaries between reported speech and reporting context (i.e. the author’s speech). The erosion of speech contours, a feature which Bakhtin associates with the novel, characterizes also Persius’ poetry.⁴

² Bakhtin 1984(b), xxxvi: Emerson’s qualifications of Bakhtin’s style fit Persius’ quite well.

³ Crucial to my reading of Persius and to my emphasis on style are Peterson 1972–3, 205–209; Henderson 1991, 123–148; Hooley 1997; Reckford 1998, 337–355; other scholars analyze the problems connected to Persius’ diction without taking its implications to their logical consequences, e.g. Jenkinson 1973, 521–549; Wehrle 1992.

⁴ Bakhtin’s stern separation between poetic and novelistic discourse is certainly not satisfying. What he says about dialogism in the novel can be usefully applied to other genres as I hope to show here. For dialogic interplay in lyric poetry, see Miller 1993, 183–199, in the epic genre Felson-Rubin 1993, 159–171, Peradotto 1993 and 1990, 53 n.13; Nagy 2002, 71–99; Mcglathery 1998, 316 points out that Bakhtin himself does not endorse his rigid categorization when he writes: “The dialogic orientation of discourse is a phenomenon that is, of course, a property of any discourse ... On all its various routes toward the object, in all its directions, the word encounters an alien word and cannot help encountering it in a living, tension-filled interaction [Bakhtin 1981.279].” Discussion of this incon-

Persius' moralizing attitude and alleged rigidity should be reconsidered once we accept Voloshinov's idea of pictorial style as not congenial to an authoritarian or rationalistic environment in which the producer of the message wants to present his discourse as the only sensible one. Satire (at least that created by this author) is revealed as an exceptionally self-critical genre which through multiple perspectives, tonal diversity and laughter, confronts the closed self and univocal signification.

In the second part of this paper my focus will be on Persius' tendency to replace abstraction and dogmatism with dialogues between strongly embodied individuals.⁵ The body figures prominently in Persius' poetry where characters often become one thing with their instincts, appetites drive the plot from beginning to end and often the evocation of the body itself triggers the humor and the parody of philosophers' pretension to have a profound understanding of human nature, to separate the body from the mind. The black and white world of the healthy and the sick is materialized in Persius' satire only as a skin to be shed, as a misleading appearance. I will try to explain the reasons behind Persius' elusiveness.

Sick Bodies ... Open Bodies

The importance of boundaries and their transgression in Persius' *saturae* is underscored by the medical imagery. The satirist often speaks and acts like a doctor who needs to amputate a gangrened limb from the body politic.⁶ The relationship between body, soul and society was not only a Stoic elaboration:

sistency is in Todorov 1984, 80–93. Several essays in Bracht Branham 2002 also underline this problem. For instance the contribution by Batstone focusing on Catullus demonstrates how even lyric poetry can become dialogic and can be used to express dissension in the self. Similarly, in relationship to Romantic poetry and Ovid, G. Tissol observes on p. 141: "Romantic presuppositions prevent Bakhtin from accepting poetry into the dialogic fold, even though he was very aware of the limitations of Romantic theories" and that his own principles ruled out the possibility to perceive a text as strictly monologic discourse.

⁵ Essential to the understanding of Roman satirical representation of the body is Malamud et al. (eds.) 1998.

⁶ The classic reference is Lucilius 638 M: *animo qui aegrotat, videmus corpore hunc dare signum* (we see who is suffering in the soul to show it in the body). On medical terminology and descriptions in Persius, see Lackenbacher 1937, 130–141. About imagery of disease in the *Satire* 1 and how this imagery becomes standard for the moralist's metaphoric repertoire, Bramble 1974, 35–38.

in the ancient world, from the Hippocratic corpus on, the universe was often conceived as an intricate web of connected elements.⁷ In ancient Rome, satirists appropriated this discourse according to which body, soul and society are in osmotic relationship.⁸ Satire is often aimed at providing moral healing for the individual and the community, so it is not surprising to find the body represented as a map: a healthy body mirrors good habits and a virtuous conduct, while sickness is a symptom of a degenerate style of life.

Persius' grotesque use of the sick body can be seen in 3, 98–104. In this passage we have the description of a reckless individual who meets his doom while taking a bath in the middle of a banquet:

Turgidus hic epulis atque albo uentre lauatur,
 Guttare sulphureas lente exhalante mefites.
 Sed tremor inter uina subit calidumque trientem
 Excutit e manibus, dentes crepuere relecti,
 Uncta cadunt laxis tunc pulmentaria labris.
 Hinc tuba, candelae tandemque beatulus alto
 Conpositus lecto crassisque lutatus amomis
 In portam rigidas calces extendit.⁹
 (*Sat.* 3, 98–104)

Bloated with food and queasy in the stomach our friend goes off/ to his bath, with long sulphurous belches coming from his throat./ As he drinks his wine, a fit of the shakes comes over him, knocking/ the warm tumbler from his fingers; his bared teeth chatter;/ suddenly greasy savories slither from his slackened lips./ The sequel is a funeral march and candles. The late lamented,/ plastered with make-up, reclines on a lofty bed/ pointing his stiff heels to the door.¹⁰

⁷ General discussion in Nussbaum 1994, 388–393; for a more detailed examination of the Hellenistic sources Long and Sedley 1987, #65; Garland 1995.

⁸ Satirists were not the only ones to exploit these beliefs. Corbeill shows orators' (especially Cicero's) exploitation of physical deformity in their opponents. Orators counted on the Romans' inclination to view physical misshape as marking a deviation from humanity's natural status. The man with that deformity was considered guilty for it: Corbeill 1996, 14–56.

⁹ For the Latin text I have used Clausen 1992.

¹⁰ Unless indicated translations are from Rudd 1979.

The description is powerfully macabre and it induces fear of the consequences of physical intemperance and vice. The sick man does not listen to the advice of his doctor (3, 94–95), proceeds to take a bath, and dies. Persius depicts the sick man's breath with language drawn from Virgil's description of the *fons Albunea* (*Aen.* 7, 84) through which Faunus' oracular response is uttered.¹¹ The employed epic lexicon is at diametrical odds with the situation depicted: the *oracle* uttered by the sick man (instead of Faunus) in this satire consists of the fetid exhalation coming from the sick man's digestive tract, the foul breath is ironically and humorously, quite an accurate omen of what is going to happen to him.

The symposiast's fate is described further with powerful and irreverent details: a sudden trembling assails his jaw and pieces of food start dropping from his mouth; his lips, still greasy, relax; grotesquely 'our hero'¹² smiles in death. His funeral follows: it resembles a show given by the deceased himself.¹³ The language is kept comically elevated: trumpets are blown, candles are lit, and on the dead body we can see a thick layer of make-up (*crassisque lutatus*¹⁴ *amomis*)!

Drawing on Bakhtin's ideas in *Rabelais and his World*,¹⁵ P. Miller in his article eloquently entitled "The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility" argues that the incontinent body is strongly condemned in Ro-

¹¹ The connection with the *Aeneid* is visible in Virgil's and Persius' similar way of employing the word "*mephitis*" as a common name (not in reference with the *Dea Mephitis*). See Paratore 1981, *ad Aen.* 7, 84.

¹² It is the fit translation of Conington, catching the inconsistency created by the epic language and the realistic details, Conington 1983, *ad loc.*

¹³ Mancini 1950, *ad loc.*; Pasoli 1982, 213 compares the descriptive technique to a cinematographical zoom. Several details present in the recounting of this funeral can also be found in Petronius's *Satyrical* 42 where Seleucus describes the last hours of Chrysanthus, expressing his skepticism about doctors' ability to help and his appreciation for the funeral: "Not a crumb of bread or drop of water touched his [Chrysanthus] lips ... his doctors killed him — no, it was just plain bad luck. The doctors are just there to cheer us up on the way out. Anyway, it was a nice funeral — first-rate casket, nice lining and all. And what a loud crowd of mourners ..." (tr. by R.B. Branham and D. Kinney 1996, 37).

¹⁴ Reckford 1998, 348 reminds us "*lutatus*: not just 'smeared' with *unguentus*, but also, more literally 'turned to clay.' *Lutum* thou art, and unto *lutum* thou shalt return." The expression must be put in connection to the body, earlier in this poem (lines 20–4), compared to a pot made out of clay. Smearing the body with clay does not cover its true nature but, paradoxically, 'reveals' it.

¹⁵ Bakhtin 1984 (a).

man satire.¹⁶ In his book, Bakhtin had drawn a sharp distinction between the classical notion of the body and the pre-classical notion of the body in ‘grotesque realism.’ He explains that in grotesque realism, the body, praised above spiritual matters, is celebrated as the symbol of life, bodily functions are viewed as joyful and generative.¹⁷ This attitude towards the body is present in certain ancient genres (Greek old comedy, novel) and especially, during the Middle Ages, in carnivalesque literature.¹⁸ On the other hand, in satirical writing, the “genre of the purely negative exposé” the grotesque body not only is “ugly, monstrous, hideous from the point of view of ‘classic’ aesthetics, that is the aesthetics of the ready-made and completed,”¹⁹ it is also an icon for degradation and death.

After having analyzed several Roman satirical passages, Miller concludes:

Roman satire, through its deployment of the grotesque, privileges by negation the solid, and the finished over the open, the fluid and the boundless. As such, it is located firmly within the mainstream of traditional Roman morality that, as defined by C. Edwards, privileges the dry, the hard, and the masculine over the fluid, the soft, and the feminine.²⁰

Thus, satire shuns the relativizing dialectic of the body in Carnival. Satirical humor does not try to open up the world to difference and the other but instead reiterates the immutability of past and present by depicting the violation of boundaries as leading to lifeless degeneration.²¹ As we have seen in 3, 398ff., at first sight, Persius’ depiction of the body, seems to confirm Miller’s paradigm, the Stoic doctor has or seems to have “the last big laugh.”²²

Versus such a categorical reading of Persius, I do not think that the presence of the sick body in Persius’ satires, once and for all, condemns “open-

¹⁶ The negative grotesque of satire is underlined also in Gowers 1993, 30–31 and Richlin 1993, 70–72.

¹⁷ Bakhtin 1984, 25; on Bakhtin and satire see also the bibliography from McGlathery 1988, 313–336.

¹⁸ Miller 1998, 259; Bakhtin 1984, 126.

¹⁹ Bakhtin 1968, 28–29 and 37–39.

²⁰ Miller 1998, 277.

²¹ Miller 1998, *ibid.*

²² Reckford 1998, 347.

ness.” Rather, his use of the grotesque body analogizes how both the body and the mind are always irremediably subject to contagion. By concentrating on the structure of the poem itself as a body, and noting what enters and leaves it, we can see that our poet is interested in a portrayal not so much of bodies prone to get sick but especially of minds populated by contradictory ideas, assailed by doubts and the awareness of our limited access to categorical distinctions. Moral standards, while assumed by our Stoic poet, are not allowed to dominate, they are put to the test, rehearsed by the voices of different kinds of humanities. This is evident in Persius’ fluid presentation of words uttered by different characters animating the satirical exchanges.²³ Rather than upholding moral abstractions, Persius tries to give them a body, integrating moral concerns into the texture of life, the realm of change and mutability.

To convey his ideas, Persius uses a negative rhetoric of provocation and a critique of false understanding. This rhetoric of provocation entails multiple citations as well as the presence of fictional interlocutors, or different voices, through which the satirist’s argument in the text is allowed to proceed. At every turn in Persius’ poetry we must ask ourselves whether the normative stance of the satirist is privileged or whether “the compounded interlocutory medley so evident in this verse has and is intended to have its own disintegrative or compositive force quite apart from the stern, Stoic lectures usually foregrounded by Persius criticism.”²⁴

In practice, Persius plays with the readers’ difficulty in understanding by whom each sentence is pronounced and, more importantly, whose point of view is being endorsed. Certainly at times the satirist is commenting ironically on a character’s foolish behaviour, but in other instances it is not clear at all if, or to what degree, the narrator is criticizing his adversaries. Persius’ rhetorical strategy is built on a systematic subtraction of information.²⁵ Un-

²³ Sullivan 1985, 111 describes speech presentation in Persius’ satires in the following way: “Persius, however, instead of accepting the smooth, polished version of the *sermo pedestris* that Horace generally employed in his *Sermones* and *Epistulae*, harked back to the freer, rougher, and more anomalous diction of Lucilius; he tried to present a contemporary equivalent of Lucilius’ ‘improvisations’ in a careful amalgam of archaisms, vulgarisms, literary allusions, the clipped affectation of real dialogue, and the homely, sometimes vivid language of the household and the harbor.”

²⁴ Hooley 1997, 18.

²⁵ Pugliatti 1985, 203: “... *un percorso di senso ideologico non si definisce (o non si definisce sempre) a partire da posizioni semantiche esplicitamente valutative ma, e forse più*

derstanding where the narrator stands in a composition and who is his target are crucial hermeneutic strategies, but Persius does not allow the reader these interpretative supports. He constructs a loosely connected structure in which the reader, trying to understand what is happening, is called to fill in the gaps, placing himself in the hermeneutic texture.

Verbal Intercourse

In *Satire 3*, Persius complicates the setting with scenes and voices not easily organized. At 1–34 we have a waking character and his Stoic friend engaged in a dialogue, at 35–42 a reproach to tyrants (perhaps indirectly meant for the late sleeper?) comes from an unidentified voice, 44–52 are a childhood memory of the more diligent friend followed by remarks about the priorities of life. At 66–76 a disembodied voice gives a summary of Stoic teachings recalling that money should not matter, although the lesson is criticized by a centurion (77–97). The effects of vice are described at 88–106 when a sick man despite the advice of his doctor, takes a bath and dies (see above). Ultimately it is suggested that it is more important to worry about the diseases of the soul (the Stoic friend talking once again?) since it is possible, to have a healthy body and a sick soul (107–118). The conclusive scene, stressing once again the importance of internal states, vividly describes anger.

If we believe that Roman verse satire employs, for the most, monologues or dialogues,²⁶ a major dilemma arises in Persius' *Satire 3*: we must establish whether we are dealing with a monologue or a dialogue. As M. Coffey warns, our poet's concentrated manner of expression produces the critical problem of having "to decide which words in a satire are to be assigned to the poet himself and which to an imaginary interlocutor, whose intervention is not usually accompanied by any words of introduction."²⁷ Coffey tries to

caratteristicamente, si costruisce a partire da strategie di 'sottrazione' dell'informazione."

²⁶ Braund 1996, 53–54: monologues can be directed to a generalized audience or to a specific person. Sometimes they reproduce the form of autobiographical narrative. For instance, in Horace's *Satire 1*, 9 the narrator speaks in the first person and seems to recount an episode from the poet's life: "I was strolling down the Sacred Way." In the dialogic frame, on the other hand, we find the satirist directly engaged with an interlocutor as we can see in *Satire 2*, 4, where Catus repeats to Horace a lecture on gastronomy.

²⁷ Coffey 1976, 101; the lack of a declarative verb is a typical feature of free direct discourse, see Laird 1999, 90.

make sense of this tendency in Persius' writing by noting that it was a technique often employed in diatribe and that, in any case, unprepared changes of speaker did not trouble ancient audiences who were accustomed to the practice in ancient comedy.²⁸ The connection to comedy techniques brings me to my main point: in satire 3 Persius has written a *monologue* which borrows from comic *dialogues*, yet, by avoiding editorial intervention, the chaotic changes of speaker in the written medium, versus theatrical oral performance, create a very particular texture.

Let us consider the beginning lines when the poet's persona is found sleeping late in the morning. It is not clear whether we have an inner dialogue of self-reproach or the words of a Stoic companion who yells at the poet for his weakness and lack of will. For purposes of analysis, I divide the beginning lines of this satire (3, 1–9) into three sections:

- A) Nempe haec adsidue. Iam clarum mane fenestras
 intrat et angustas extendit lumine rimas.
 stertimus, indomitum quod despumare Falernum
 sufficiat, quinta dum linea tangitur umbra.
 B) “En quid agis? Siccas insana canicula messes
 iamdudum coquit et patula pecus omne sub ulmo est.”
 Unus ait comitum. C) Uerumne? Itan? Ocius adsit
 huc aliquis. Nemon? Turgescit uitrea bilis:
 findor, ut Arcadiae pecuaria rudere credas.
 (*Sat.* 3, 1–9)

- A) Constantly like that. The bright morning enters at the shutters, its light widening the narrow chinks: yet we go on snoring, enough to carry the fumes of the unmanageable red wine, while the shadow is crossing the fifth line on the dial.

²⁸ Coffey 1976, 236 n. 28 with bibliography on the topic and citing as an example the 3rd Century B.C. papyrus of Menander's *Sicyonius* in which names of speakers do not appear. As Handley 1965, 47 explains what is known of dramatic texts from the six century through the third and down to the Christian era suggests that the evidence for names or other methods of labelling parts is scant so that “the ancient readers were rarely given more generous guidance to the identity of the speakers than the intermittent labelling of parts.” Obviously, I believe that the identity of speakers was not problematic for the *viewers* of the performance but it could become problematic for the *readers* of the performance.

B) “What do you intend to do? The heat is already baking the crops dry, and the cattle have all got under cover of the elm.” Says one of the friends. C) Really? You don’t mean it? Hallo there, somebody, quick! Nobody? The bile is expanding: I explode, you would think that the entire stable of Arcadia is neighing.²⁹

Overall, the setting seems clear. Someone, probably Persius’ persona, is oversleeping and, awoken, starts complaining. Thus, we have the reversal of the typical satirical situation in which the poet criticizes someone else in the second person:³⁰ here, the satirist is the target and the scene is focalized through his opening eyes.

The presence of the neatly drawn details (sun, window, clock) and the characters briefly evoked in the dramatic structure suggest a concrete situation.³¹ The details seem to indicate a specific episode, a single scene. In fact, an individual scene emerges as soon as the specific, continuous details of time, place, action and dialogue begin to appear in what N. Friedman calls the narrative expanded scale.³²

Yet concreteness can be an illusion. In the passage under consideration, in spite of the setting and particulars, we cannot understand whether the oversleeping and the criticizing are performed by one and the same person or by several people. The problem is rooted in the first person plural *stertimus*, ‘we snore.’ Who is snoring? It might be someone talking to himself or, talking to himself and at the same time calling the attention of someone else (as if he were saying to a second person “Can you believe that I am still in bed?”). The voices mingle. It seems that the words bracketed by the quote “What do you intend to do ?” (*En quid agis...*) are pronounced by ‘one of the friends’ and indeed we wonder how many friends there are.³³

It is possible, following Housman’s interpretation, that the poem opens with the indication of the poet’s persona talking to himself when he is surprised in bed and rebuked by one of his friends (line 7).³⁴ If this puzzle is solved then there is another one that follows right after. Who speaks C)? It

²⁹ I have altered Rudd’s translation trying to follow as closely as possible Persius’ syntax.

³⁰ E.g. Persius 1, 15–23.

³¹ On Persius’ realism Bardon’s analysis is essential even if his belief in Persius’ dogmatism or presumed spontaneity are arguable: Bardon 1975 (a), 24–27 and Bardon 1975 (b).

³² Friedman 1975, 144.

³³ Jenkinson 1973, 521–549 reviews the problems and tries to find a solution.

³⁴ Housman 1913, 2–32.

might be the waking person: "Is it really so late? Please someone come to help, there is no one?" (*Verumne? Itan/ Ocius adsit huc aliquis. Nemon?*). The remark is important because it points out the fact that there is no one in the room, yet it could also mean that there is no one willing to help him.

Understanding who speaks the rest of section C) is complicated by the change in person: the text quickly slides from third to first to second person without any editorial comment.³⁵ I have already mentioned Housman's interpretation, for whom there would be in this poem, apart from the friend (the *comes* of line 7), only one character narrating and acting the entire sketch. This plausible explanation configures the text as an *ante-diem* interior monologue. Many modern texts have analogous narrative patterns: a first person buttonholes a second person who seems to be simultaneously inside and outside the fictional scene, inside and outside the speaking self.

If we accept the interior monologue as plausible frame for the passage in question, we find ourselves at times disturbed by the presence of the second person. If interior monologue is, by definition, a discourse addressed to no one, a gratuitous verbal agitation which requires no reply, why the constant interrogations?³⁶ For we do not have in this satire the kind of existential questions that require no answer, but rather practical questions that assume a real party (*Ocius adsit huc aliquis* "Will someone help me to get up?" at line 8). Furthermore Persius' crudeness, if there is no interlocutor, would be directed towards himself. Even this frame (the monologue) fails to acknowledge the ambiguous blurring of the voices imposing "a slightly false neatness."³⁷ Grammatical attempts to legislate the borders between authorial and reported speech, dialogue and monologue complicate matters rather than

³⁵ Dessen 1968, esp. 48, believes that Persius inconsistently identifies himself with the *comes*: "Persius here plays a friend of the adversary, a Stoic who tries to persuade him to resume his neglected study of philosophy. To the distress of several editors however, Persius does not maintain this role consistently in the beginning of the poem but, instead, alternates it with that of an impersonal narrator." Lines 7–8 echo Horace, *Sermones* 2, 7, 34–35: "*Nemon oleum feret ocius? Ecquis/ audit?*" "Won't someone bring me oil now? Does nobody hear?"

³⁶ About interior monologue, see Cohn 1983, 225. On the topic see also Todorov 1967, 265–278.

³⁷ Grimes 1972, 139. Grimes summarizes interpretations about this passage and very perceptively underscores that "Housman's analysis is immensely valuable in showing that no change of speaker is explicitly indicated or demanded by the sense, but it is perhaps unnecessary to be dogmatic about a single-ness of speaker There is then a genuine ambiguity lying not only in the identification of speakers ... but also in the very existence of different speakers."

making them clear: Persius has created, in the exchange above, a powerful reminder that “only the current of verbal intercourse endows a word with the light of significance.”³⁸ In addition, the lack of differentiation between characters suggests similarity between sinner and censor and it fittingly contributes to the satire’s main theme of self-awareness.

The first person plural (*stertimus*)³⁹ is apt to underline this similarity and to unsettle the reader. The verb, Housman’s hinge for the characterization of the satire as an internal dialogue,⁴⁰ is certainly a brilliant rhetorical maneuver to confuse boundaries (who is talking? Who is listening? Who is snoring? How many characters are present?). W.T. Wehrle describes the exchange as “an amalgam of voices, in turn creating a disjointed scene, its coherence dependent upon a subcurrent of theme rather than a coherent unifying persona.”⁴¹ G. Hendrickson defines the first person plural appropriate to a situation of general applicability.⁴² C. Dessen believes that the plural has the purpose to include the reader as a target of the criticism, “we become bystanders in a formal scene between the adversary and the Stoic” where we are encouraged “to relax our defenses in the belief that someone else is being criticized.”⁴³ Hooley reminds us that Horace 2, 3 is the obvious subtext of the composition but where Horace is describing the dialogue between his persona and Damasippus (accusing him of laziness) in a fairly well-drawn structure, Persius challenges his reader.⁴⁴

Persius does not let us understand exactly what it is happening. He seems more interested in piling up details and with that plural (*stertimus*) to drag us in the scene in order to sort out a situation that would remain otherwise obscure. Persius’ exploration of ethical choices (should we try to correct us and

³⁸ Clark and Holquist 1984, 234 quoting Voloshinov 1986.

³⁹ We must assume that the words/thoughts of A) belong to some character of the satire. It is as if Persius did not want to write: The sleeping man said to himself: “Constantly like that. The bright morning enters at the shutters ...” and instead leaves the relationship between words and who is pronouncing them latent. For a study of quoted monologue, narrated monologue and psycho-narration, see Cohen 1978, esp. 104–105: e.g. quoted monologue = (he thought:) I am late; narrated monologue = he was late; psycho-narration = he knew he was late.

⁴⁰ Housman 1913, 17–18.

⁴¹ Wehrle 1992, 39.

⁴² Hendrickson 1923, 335.

⁴³ Dessen 1968, 49.

⁴⁴ Hooley 1997, 212–214. My interpretation of Persius is indebted to Hooley’s perceptive reading of this satire.

others ?) is also an inquiry about the ethics of readings.⁴⁵ This satire, Hooley says in a language that sounds very Bakhtinian, is “an assertion of the boundedness of words to context and perspective, a statement of their fundamental contingency.”⁴⁶

Bakhtin, describing the specificity of utterance as language of communication, has perhaps indirectly given the best description of Persius' diction:

[it] is not a product or detachable attribute of a person; it is an energy negotiating between a person's inner consciousness and the outer world. How we talk, or write, is a trace not only of how we think but of how we interact.⁴⁷

Persius' diction is complicated by two more factors: it oscillates between written and oral language as well as between self-address and audience-address.⁴⁸ As in Dostoevsky's *Notes from the Underground*, the author poses as if writing to himself. In his so-called programmatic satire 1, 2–3 Persius, like Dostoevsky, suggests that no one will read his satires:

O curas hominum! O quantum est in rebus inane!
 “quis leget haec?” min tu istud ais? Nemo hercule. (*Sat.* 1, 1–2)

Alas human passions! The vast universal emptiness!
 “Who will read that?” You ask me this? For god's sake no one.⁴⁹

Echoing Lucretius and Lucilius, Persius claims that no one reads satiric poetry. Yet, in this poem as well as many others, he interrupts his train of thoughts by asking a question or interposing a doubt which seems to come from someone else.⁵⁰ Persius imagines his adversaries to be physically pre-

⁴⁵ Hooley 1997, 226.

⁴⁶ Hooley 1997, 221.

⁴⁷ Bakhtin 1984, xxxiv.

⁴⁸ Laird 1999, 107 highlights some features of Free Indirect Discourse (ambiguity between thought or spoken discourse; impossibility to determine “whether the discourse is the property of character or narrator”) which appear also in our example.

⁴⁹ My translation. For bibliographical references on these two lines and their programmatic allusion to the satirical genre, see Jenkinson 1980, 68.

⁵⁰ cf. Grimes 1972, 116: “Here we have a dramatic situation involving two speakers (although this has been questioned), one in the character of a satirist justifying his work, the other his critic.”

sent and having immediate reactions, as in C) discussed above where someone exclaims “you would think that the entire stable is neighing.”

In Dostoevsky’s case the ambiguity between writing and speaking, between audience-address and self-address, are resolved when the narrator himself reveals his audience as a fiction, a prop merely created for his soliloquy:

“if I write as though I were addressing readers, that is simply because it is easier for me to write in that way. It is merely a question of form, only an empty form ...”⁵¹

The quoted passage is crucial because in it Dostoevsky discloses the psychological clue for the contradictory form of his text. He can express himself “only when he takes on the dual roles of protagonist and antagonist.”⁵² Persius does something very similar when he admits his compositional technique at 1, 41–44. First he creates an interlocutor who declares that it is worthwhile to write poetry which will become immortal,⁵³ then he let us know that his interlocutor is purely fictional:

“An erit qui uelle recuset
os populi meruisse et cedro digna locutus
linquere nec scombros metuentia carmina nec tus?”
quisquis es, o modo quem ex aduerso dicere feci,
(*Sat.* 1, 41–44)

“Is there anyone who does not want to become famous and after having composed poems worthy of being on a bookcase is not afraid of leaving compositions that will be used as wrapping paper?”

*Whoever you are whom I made up just a minute ago to contradict me*⁵⁴

The revelation in both cases (Dostoevsky’s and Persius’) is extremely important. We have a narrator who writes as if he were thinking, but thinks as if he

⁵¹ Dostoevsky 1960, 35.

⁵² Cohn 1983, 177.

⁵³ The words used suggest “epic poetry” and Virgilian phrasing, cf. Harvey 1981, 29.

⁵⁴ My translation.

were addressing others.⁵⁵ Cohn's suggestions on Dostoevsky's narrative strategy are a key to understand Persius' satire. She writes:

The other-directedness of his thought, far from being an 'empty form,' is actually form filled with significance: shaping self-communion into a social posture ...

Society and the ego are in this poetry joined as voices that run after each other and respond to each other endlessly. Persius is unable to think without constantly addressing the objections and questions of people of different views. Dialogue is in Dostoevsky as well as Persius a necessity and a condition of form as well as of content. According to Bakhtin this is the most important feature of the polyphonic novel:

the process of coming to know one's own language as it is perceived in someone else's language, coming to know one's own conceptual horizon in someone else's horizon.⁵⁶

The novel is constantly "flaunting or displaying the variety of discourses ... which other genres seek to suppress."⁵⁷ Persius' satire behaves in the same way, it does not suppress the variety of discourses present in the world but includes them in the satiric texture.

Voloshinov's Dialogic Interference and Pictorial Style

This fusion of linguistic horizons, under the name of "dialogic interference," is studied by V. Voloshinov who dedicates to it the last part of his book *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*.⁵⁸ The Russian scholar uses some of the points already discussed by Bakhtin in his book on Dostoevsky and frames them into a larger perspective.

⁵⁵ Grimes 1972, 123–124: "the external dramatic situation has been absorbed into the speaker's thought process...there has been a progression from an externalised situation with spatial illusions to the expression of thoughts dramatically, and then to the use of this dramatic level in the dialogue structure." Thus the setting is similar to that of satire 3.

⁵⁶ Bakhtin 1981, 365.

⁵⁷ Holquist 1999, 95–107.

⁵⁸ Voloshinov 1986.

Both critics posit the utterance as the fundamental unit of communication as opposed to language. While language is a system composed and organized according to rules, communication employs and records the metamorphoses of those rules. While the concepts of law and equilibrium were fundamental for the Russian and Czech models of language history, Bakhtin and Voloshinov stress linguistic change as produced by the unforeseeable action of everyday speech. The socially composed nature of utterance, according to Voloshinov, becomes visible, above all, in “dialogic interference” the place in a text where words react to words and the precise boundaries of reported and reporting speech become blurred.⁵⁹

What is particularly interesting about Voloshinov’s approach is the idea that all forms of reported speech, more or less openly, manifest an active reception of the “the words of others.” Free indirect discourse represents only one instance in which, more intensely, we see reported speech as dialogue between ideological positions constitutive of the verbal interaction. While attempting to interpret free indirect discourse it is important to recognize its ‘built-in’ dialogism rather than to try to assign the content of discourse to a particular speaker.

The utterance thus conceptualized is considerably more complex and dynamic than when it is simply viewed as a tool to articulate the intentions of the person uttering it. Persius’ style can be seen as an illustration of this complex dynamism. Voloshinov believes that the more dogmatic an utterance, the less leeway is permitted in its reception and transmission. Dogmatic texts typically employ a very homogenous style: since they do not allow a blurring between truth and falsehood, they construct clear-cut, external contours for reported speech whose own internal individuality is minimized.⁶⁰ Dogmatic texts and ruling classes try to freeze meaning and univocalize the sign: they make visible, in their discursive practices, the prioritiza-

⁵⁹ Voloshinov 1986, 83–99. The book was originally published in 1929 the same year in which the first edition of Bakhtin’s Dostoevsky book came out. About *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*’s attribution to Bakhtin himself, not relevant in this study, see the translator’s preface in Voloshinov 1986, IX and Holquist and Clark 1984, 146–170: according to them, Bakhtin wrote the so called disputed texts entirely or almost entirely (p. 147). For Voloshinov’s authorship and a critique of Holquist and Clark 1984, see Morson and Emerson 1990, 101–119.

⁶⁰ Voloshinov 1986, 120.

tion of one kind of signification which “effaces its own socially-constructed character and aspires to the status of an ‘objective referential meaning.’”⁶¹

There is stylistic homogeneity in Persius’ style (characters and satirist speak in a similarly composite language) but this stylistic compactness does not correspond to the author’s diction and it is not an endorsement of a single point of view, rather it represents a fusion of linguistic registers and ideological horizons. As the narrator appropriates the language of his characters, his characters in turn describe the world with the narrator’s literary-layered diction. We do not hear a satirist who makes fun of others’ utterances but a satirist whose own utterance is losing authoritative weight and characterization. He is becoming just another character. The dissolution of the authorial context brings relativistic individualism in speech reception. This form of utterance called by Voloshinov ‘pictorial style’ is characterized by the development of mixed forms of speech reporting.

The discussion about ‘styles’ and how they show (or hide) boundaries of discourse is crucial because, as Voloshinov clearly argues, the problem of reported speech has to do with the larger context of a society’s politics of quotations:

[the] question of how much of the other’s meaning I will permit to get through when I surround his words with my own is a question about governance of meaning, about who presides over it, and about how much of it is shared. It has to do, in other words, with the relative degrees of freedom granted by speakers to those other speakers whose words they appropriate into their own.⁶²

The Care of the Body

I will try to illustrate Persius’ politics of citation with two examples. Citations (the words of other authors or characters) are accumulated in Persius creating a disharmonious discourse, they do not seem to be carefully and selectively arranged to advance the argument of the philosopher-doctor but to make it problematic.

⁶¹ Gardiner 1992, 90.

⁶² Clark and Holquist 1984, 236.

For instance, Persius' allusions often underscore his ideological alignment with the cited author⁶³ as well as a distancing from him:

Positum est argente catino
 Durum *holus* et populi cribro decussa farina:
Temptemus faucesque: tenero latet ulcus in ore
 Putre, quod haut deceat plebeia radere beta. (*Sat.* 3, 111–114)

A tough vegetable with meal shaken through a common sieve
 is served on a cold plate.

Let us try to open the mouth: in a delicate mouth
 is hidden a putrid wound which cannot be touched with a plebeian beet.⁶⁴

The scene is represented at the end of *Satire* 3. Obviously the sarcasm is against someone who refuses to eat rustic food. Yet the plural “let us open the mouth,” as an invitation to open the mouth is strange. Commentaries ascribe 107–118 to a positive character (Persius' better half? the *comes* of line 7, some other moralizing character present?). The expression *durum holus* is a shift from Horace *securum holus* (*Serm.* 2, 7, 30), it represents the unappetizing, rough, Stoic diet and departure from Horace's sweetened jokes.⁶⁵ In 2, 7 the odd expression is fittingly in the mouth of the slave Davus who, through his own rustic language, imparts to Horace his philosophical lessons.

In this context the presence of the “rough vegetable” as a metaphorical indicator of philosophical discourse is extremely significant. It reminds us of Horace's Nasidienus (*Serm.* 2, 8) able to express himself only through the medium of food. If in Horace's satire, as in the high tradition of Plato's *Symposium*, philosophical discourse triumphs over food,⁶⁶ in Persius the two

⁶³ E.g. Horace, *Serm.* 2, 3, 1–3 are alluded in the opening of Persius 3; Persius 1, 2 *quis leget haec? Min tu istud ais? Nemo hercule, nemo* (Who will read that? You ask me this? For god's sake no one) acknowledges Lucilius: Cf. Conte 1974, 56ff.

⁶⁴ My translation.

⁶⁵ Gowers 1993, 48. Ofellus, in Horace *Sermones* 2, 2, 117 only eats vegetables (*holus*) and ham. At 2, 1, 73–74 Lucilius and his friends rest while vegetables are cooking (*donec/decoqueretur holus*).

⁶⁶ Jeanneret 1987, 146–151. In *Satire* 2, 2, 3–7, according to Bramble 1973, 47 the “true insight into the virtues of the simple life, and the pleasures of the table are shown to be mutually exclusive.”

coexist side by side: the philosopher/doctor is reduced to employing the language of food, to employing the words of a tasteless host or those of a slave who turns philosophy into vegetables (*holus*). For better or for worse, the doctor/philosopher and the other characters not trained in philosophy are tied to the same discourse.

Tolerance is one of the hallmarks of Horace's satirical creed. He makes it clear that in satiric poetry *acritas*, bitterness, must be avoided and substituted with a more tactful jesting: "humor is often stronger and more effective than bitterness (*acri*) in cutting knotty issues" (*Serm.* 1, 10, 14–15).⁶⁷ Persius does not seem to follow the advice, he strives instead to be dexterous "in the crude combination of words," *iunctura callidus acri* (*Sat.* 5, 14). *Acer* should be read no so much as 'elegant, accurate' (on the base of Cic. *De Orat.* 3, 184 *acrem curam diligentiamque*) but as 'pricking, pointy' in opposition to *tener*.⁶⁸

If, on the one hand, Persius' emphasis on *acritudo* of his own style is perfectly in line with the employment of 'cutting' metaphors belonging to the sphere of medicine and put in the mouth of an intractable doctor, on the other we have an emphasis on mixing and combining words and ideas (*iunctura*).⁶⁹ *Iunctura* is an Horatian *hapax* and, an association of antinomic terms which, fighting each other, create a jumbled harmony.⁷⁰ Persius interprets *iunctura* in a special way, in that he tends to juxtapose lexical elements from the physical sphere with others from the incorporeal realm.⁷¹ For instance in *Sat.* 2, 74 we have a colorful portrayal of the honest man and his "heart stewed in noble honour" (*incoctum generoso pectus honesto*).⁷²

⁶⁷ See also Horace, *Ars Poetica* 46ff.: "*in verbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis/ dixeris egregie, notum si callida verbum/ reddiderit iunctura novum.*" ("Also in linking words you will speak with exceptional subtlety and care if a skilful connection renders a well-known term with a new twist.")

⁶⁸ A passage in Seneca, *Epist.* 114, 15: "*nolunt sine salebra esse iunctura: virilem putant et fortem, quae aurem inequalitate percutiat*" ("they do not want links without obstacles, they judge them [these uneasy links] strong and vigorous because they hit the ear with their dissonance.") seems to codify the opposition alluding to Persius. About it, see Scivoletto 1975, 48–50.

⁶⁹ The expression 'iunctura' itself notoriously belongs to Horace, *Ars Poetica* 46. For the meaning of *iunctura* in Horace, see Brink 1963, 138–140 C.

⁷⁰ e.g. *saniensis sapientiae, concordia discors*, etc.

⁷¹ Scivoletto 1975, 51.

⁷² Gower's translation in Gower 1993, 182.

Not only abstract and physical terms are joined together in Persius' poems, his style is inconceivable without Horace's *Sermones* which often function as an essential interpretative link: comprehension of Persius' message will depend on an awareness of the interplay between the two texts. Horatian notions are invoked by Persius and "brought into a dialogue."⁷³

The conclusion of *Satire 3* re-opens the problem of perspective and health and refers to Horace's *Serm.* 2, 3, 128–141: Persius alludes to Damascippus' bad argument according to which Orestes behaved better when he was sick than when he was sane. Why is the Stoic *comes*, if he really is the one talking, suggesting that the boundaries between sanity and madness are so fragile?⁷⁴ In which way sane and crazy people are different if they both behave badly? The composition ends without a real conclusion, with the suggestion that satire does not offer a precise formula to obtain health, an infallible cure or any firm perspective.

The satirist and his pupil speak in a similar language, share confused ideas about health and a tendency towards insanity and corruption. Perhaps Persius' propensity towards detailed pathological images underscores his lack of faith in a cure. A. La Penna is on the right path when he writes:

The phenomenology of vice is a necessary phase, as we said, in the process which leads to men's liberation; yet this phase remains predominant in Persius' satire: positive prescriptions leading to the *recte vivere* have in it a minor role. To a degree this is true for all Latin satire but a comparison, even superficial, between Horace and Persius, demonstrates that we can obtain from Horace much more (than in Persius) in terms of a positive didascalism (*precettistica positiva*).⁷⁵

The awareness of human fragility threatens the hope for a healing but it also reduces the distance between the doctor and the patient. Similarly, it is very hard to measure the distance (or vicinity) between Persius and his presumed

⁷³ Hooley 1997, 33; importance of Horace for the creation of Persius' technique is stressed by La Penna 1998, 45.

⁷⁴ Hooley 1997, 229.

⁷⁵ La Penna 1998, 28. Translation is mine. Fine and illuminating remarks about this feature as constitutive of satirical discourse are in Brill 1979, 36 "the dialogic nature of satirical discourse is underlined by the presence of a *pars destruens* that overcomes the *pars construens* of which only the echo of an absence remains ..."

targets (the man refusing the vegetable, Horace, Nasidienus, Davus, Orestes).⁷⁶

Allusions to several authors, reported speech, and the body are problematically present again in *Satire* 4. This satire was probably influenced by the Ps. Platonic *Acibiades* 1, one among the many *Socratikoi logoi*, composed after Socrates' death by his pupils and admirers.⁷⁷ Apart from those written by Plato and Xenophon, most of them are lost or fragmentary, yet, it seems that they took the form of a dialogue between Socrates and Alcibiades.⁷⁸ In *Sat.* 4, despite the clearly established setting of the first lines—in which Socrates is talking to Alcibiades—we cannot be sure of who is talking line 23 “no one attempts to retreat into himself” introduced without any editorial specification, and how this remark is illustrated by the vignette about Vetitidius, the greedy guy (25–33), and that of the oiled Sybarite.⁷⁹

At *Sat.* 4, 33–41 the young Alcibiades previously criticized by Socrates for his political ambitions,⁸⁰ seems to be newly chastised for his depraved customs:

At si unctus cesses et figas in cute solem,
 Est prope te *ignotus* cubito qui tangat et acre
 Despuat: “hi mores! Penemque arcanaque lumbi
 Runcantem populo marcentis pandere uuluas.
Tum, cum maxillis balanatum gausape pectas,
 Inguinibus quare detonsus gurgulio extat?
 Quinque palaestritae licet haec plantaria uellant
 Elixasque nates labefactent forcipe adunca,
 Non tamen ista filix ullo manuescit aratro.” (*Sat.* 4, 33–41)

But if, after an oil-rub, you relax, focusing the sun
 On your skin, a *stranger* appears beside you, digs you with his elbow,

⁷⁶ Squillante Saccone 1990, 166.

⁷⁷ The definition belongs to Aristotle's *Poetics* 1, 7–9, 1447B.

⁷⁸ The type probably arose as a response to the *Kategoria Sokratous* of Polykrates (Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1, 2, 12) pointing to Alcibiades as the most obvious example of Socrates' harmful influence upon young people: Dessen 1968, 97–105.

⁷⁹ Hooley 1997, 128–130.

⁸⁰ Dessen 1968, 66: Perhaps elaborating on *Alcibiades* 1, 132a Persius compares Alcibiades to a male prostitute: the sexual metaphor permeates the first part of the composition (4, 1–8).

And spits abuse: “What a way to behave weeding your privates
And recesses of your rump, displaying your shrivelled vulva to the public!

On your jaws you keep a length of rug which you comb and perfume;
So why is your crotch plucked smooth around your dangling worm?
Though half a dozen masseurs in the gym uproot this plantation,
Assailing your flabby buttocks with hot pitch and the claws
Of tweezers, no plough ever made will tame that bracken.”

These lines, according to Miller are a good illustration of the negative and degrading grotesque characterizing Alcibiades’ effeminate luxury and satirical discourse in general. Rotting and overgrown at the same time, the politician’s body is a jungle of uncontrollable and useless desires. Miller does not focus on the speech presentation. He does not observe that the person criticizing is not Socrates but an *ignotus* who directs his complaints to a person assumed to be Alcibiades. The text specifies that the *ignotus* is talking to a bearded man (line 337). What happens if suddenly we realize that we are not assured about who is the object of satirical reproach? Can we be confident that the *ignotus*’ target (and addressee) is Alcibiades? In the beginning of the poem it is Socrates, not Alcibiades, to be qualified as “bearded teacher” (*barbatum magistrum*, 4, 1) and the beard is by the time of Persius the conventional mark of philosophers.⁸¹

About this exchange R. Peterson remarks that the comments do not seem to have immediate relevance to the youthful Alcibiades but touch most directly the bearded sage himself and his postulated corrupting habits.⁸² Miller argues that Persius alludes to Cicero’s *First Catilinarian* to highlight the excellence of the past in comparison to the depravity of the present in which a “dissolute aristocrat is no longer threatening to overturn the republic, but has become emperor in the person of Nero.”⁸³ He also highlights Persius’ allusion to Catullus 49: while Catullus playfully immortalizes Flavius’ erotic adventures, the satirist’s tone is condemnatory. In Miller’s interpretation the citations would chorally reinforce the univocal blame directed to the object

⁸¹ Gildersleeve 1979, 142, ad loc.

⁸² Peterson 1972–73, 208 and Hooley 1997, 131 “The identity of the addressee cannot be determined.”

⁸³ Miller 1998, 269.

of grotesque degradation.⁸⁴ Yet, why would the conservative author introduce an unknown and non-authoritative character to voice the reproach? Why does he speak the language of Catullus, risking identification with a depraved Roman elite?

Hooley provides an indirect answer to these questions: he thinks that allusions to other writers in this satire do not univocally condemn the sybarite. Hooley underscores in the passage the unexpected presence of Vergil's *Georgics* (2, 238–241 and 2, 217–225) and the language of fruitful cultivation re-employed for the description of the fruitless cultivation of the body. Certainly the satirist approves the farmer's husbandry and blames the sybarite's tillage, yet, the inclusion of the language of agriculture reveals the desire to implicate philosophy, *par excellence* the Foucauldian art of cultivation of the self.⁸⁵ Hellenistic philosophies teach that the self-mastery obtained through the knowledge of the self is a complex but rewarding operation for "the individual who has finally succeeded in gaining access to himself is, for himself, an object of pleasure."⁸⁶ If this is the case, how is the task of the philosopher ultimately different from that of the Sybarite? Is the care of the body intrinsically different from that of the soul?

Stylization and Parody: Bakhtin's Passive and Active Double-Voiced Words

Persius' tendency to use "the words of others" is not limited to the passages above. Careful study of Persius' idiom confirms the composite nature of his peculiar diction. He is able to create a language that is colloquial, even vulgar at times, as well as extremely literary and rich in quotations. Not only does Persius use the syntax of a dialogue with a constantly dissenting other, he also employs a language woven with images and terms derived from multiple segments of society and from other writers.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Miller 1998, 271.

⁸⁵ Hooley 1997, 145.

⁸⁶ Hooley 1997, 151 quoting Foucault 1988, 66.

⁸⁷ For the relationship between Persius and Horace: Hooley 1997; Persius' style and technique have been studied, with excellent results, especially by Italian scholars who, nevertheless, rarely draw conclusions about how this style effects the overall 'satiric' lesson: Squillante Saccone 1985, 1781–1812 and by the same author 1980, 3–25; Pennacini 1969–70, 417–487; Bernardi Perini 1966–67, 233–264; Pasoli 1982 (a) and 1982 (b); Biondi 1978, 87–94; Scivoletto 1975; Castelli 1971, 42–60.

Bakhtin discussing dialogue provides a good theoretical model to understand Persius' diction. Dialogic emphasis, according to Bakhtin, is possible not only between enunciations uttered by different subjects but also inside the same utterance. He classifies parody and stylization as linguistic manifestations with the highest degree of "dialogism" where the sounding of a second voice is a part of the project of the utterance.⁸⁸

Bakhtin's double-voiced discourse can be active or passive. In the passive typology the author or speaker is in control of the "words of the others" which remain a tool in his hands. The narrator and the quoted utterance say *more or less* the same thing: the "more" the allusion reproduces the author's ideas, the "more" passivity it contains and vice versa, the "less" pliable the quote is to reproduce the intention of the originating context, the more "activity" it shows. It is crucial, according to Bakhtin, to emphasize the lack of perfect coincidence between the words of the speaker and the "quote" and to distinguish unidirectional from varidirectional discourse. While in the first kind the author and "the other" go in the same direction, in the second kind they want to go in different directions, the objectification of another's discourse decreases and we have a 'heightening of activity' on the part of the other's discourse:

In such discourse, the author's thought no longer oppressively dominates the other's thought, discourse loses its composure and confidence, becomes agitated, internally undecided and two-faced. Such discourse is not only double-voiced but also double-accented; it is difficult to speak it aloud, for loud and living intonation excessively monologize discourse and cannot do justice to the other person's voice present in it.⁸⁹

When the "words of the other" manage to challenge the intentions of the author, the double-voiced words become active. In the active typology, the "words of others" resist the author's purpose, they express a different idea and a separate stance.

Bakhtin explores dialogic potentials in stylization and parody. In stylization the mimesis of a character's speech is given to suggest emotional or ideological vicinity to that character(/author). Parody instead, borrows the

⁸⁸ According to Bakhtin, there are single-voiced and double-voiced speeches. He is particularly interested in the second type. For a summary see Bakhtin 1984 (b), 199 and 189.

⁸⁹ Bakhtin 1984 (b), 198.

words of a character and uses them against that character's semantic intention.⁹⁰ This is why parody can be viewed as "an arena of battle between two voices."⁹¹ When, within a single utterance, the target's voice is allowed to assert its rights and to reach equality with the voice of the parodist, we have an example of active double-voiced words. Earlier we saw how this actually happens in Persius' *Satire* 3 when Vergil's language is employed to criticize the narrator (the author's spokesman?) criticizing the Sybarite.

Bakhtin points out that the boundary between passive and active parody is fluid, he defines the opposite poles of an utterance "not in order to postulate an unbridgeable opposition, but in order to gesture toward the complexity of the space between."⁹² We observe the complexity of this "space," as a fluid continuum between passive and active discourse in Persius' satires where the line of demarcation between stylization and caricature is extremely subtle.

Contiguity between Active and Passive Parody (The Body against Philosophy)

In the evidence that I am about to examine (select passages from *Satire* 3 and 4) we can appreciate the thin divide between active and passive parody. I have tried to gather excerpts in which the parody against philosophical pretension is conducted using the body. Bodily images in this case are not icons of death but sources of laughter conducive to understanding of the point of view of the "other." G. Babb has pointed out, following some observations formulated by M. Merlau-Ponty and M. Johnson, that it is impossible to separate operation of the mind from embodiment: in the world, the body and the mind are both factors in the constitution of truths and values,⁹³ "our consciousness and rationality are tied to our bodily orientations and interactions in and with our environment."⁹⁴ Consequently it is necessary to analyze the

⁹⁰ The same observation pertains to stylization or parody of an author's style.

⁹¹ Bakhtin 1984 (b), 193. See also Hutcheon's Bakhtinian definition of parody which can fittingly describe serious/non-satirical parody as well as satirical demystification: parody according to Hutcheon can be a quite dialogic phenomenon, not simply a one-directional attack upon the original work, see Hutcheon 1985, 69–83.

⁹² Bakhtin 1990, 155.

⁹³ Merlau-Ponty 1964, 25.

⁹⁴ Johnson 1987, xxxviii.

body in any form of narrative not only as described and perceived from the outside (*körper*), but also as *Leib*, sensations arising from external and internal stimuli, visceral processes and habitual practices.⁹⁵ Reading a text, we should notice references to sight and sound as well as the impact of bodily urges on the overall *telos* and on the reactions of the audience.

At *Sat.* 3, 77–78 after a rather traditional exhortation to philosophy in which the narrator strongly recommends to take up the study of physics and ethics,⁹⁶ he lets a soldier articulate his complaints about philosophers:

Hic aliquis de gente hircosa centurionum
 dicat: “quod sapio, satis est mihi. non ego curo
 esse quod Arcesilas aerumnosique Solones
 obstipo capite et figentes lumine terram,
 murmura cum secum et rabiosa silentia rodunt
 atque exporrecto trutinantur uerba labello,
 aegroti veteris meditantes somnia, gigni
 de nihilo nihilum, in nihilum nil posse reuerti.
 Hoc est quod palles? Cur quis non prandeat hoc est?”
 his populus ridet, multumque torosa iuuentus
 ingeminat tremulos naso crispante cachinnos.
 (*Sat.* 3, 77–87)

Here a centurion -one of that smelly fraternity — /
 may say: “I know all I need to know. The last thing I want/ is to be like
 Arcésilas or a woebegone Solon — people who wander/ about with head
 hanging down, their eyes fixed on the ground,/ chomping their silent
 mutterings in rabid self-absorption,/ pushing their lips out to serve as a
 balance for weighing their words,/ repeating over and over the dreams of
 the sick old fool:/ nothing comes from nothing, nothing reverts to nothing.
 Is this why you are pale? Would this detain a man from his dinner?”/

⁹⁵ Babb 2002, 202–203.

⁹⁶ *Sat.* 3, 66–72 “Listen you poor unfortunates, and learn the purpose of human existence — what we are, what kind of life we are born to live; which lane we have drawn; where we lean into the turn for home; how much money’s enough, what prayers are right, what advantage are crisp notes, how much should be set aside for the state and for your nearest and dearest; what role the lord has asked you to play, what post you have been assigned in the human service.”

That gets a laugh from the crowd, and the lads with the big muscles/
send peals of merriment ringing through their contemptuous nostrils.

Notice the acrobatic speech presentation: the satirist quotes the centurion in direct speech, in turn the centurion describes individuals like Arcesilas and Solon meditating the fantasies of the sick Epicurus; Epicurus' words are rendered in free indirect speech (*gigni/ de nihilo nihil...* line 83–84) and suddenly interrupted by a question presumably directed by the centurion to the philosopher as if he were present.⁹⁷ Obviously the remark could also be directed to the satirist. K. Reckford observes that the soldier convicts himself and his ignorance, confusing Skeptics, Epicureans and Stoics: the soldier becomes the laughing stock of the mob (*populus*) as well as of the young people (*torosa iuuentus*).⁹⁸

In this portrayal, however, laughter and parody are also triggered by the vivid bodily representation of the Ivory Tower of philosophers who are, in public opinion, toilsome and proud creatures with futile and ridiculous concerns.⁹⁹ The imaginary philosopher is so real that the centurion talks to him. The language used in the depiction comes from literary sources (philosophical texts as well as Horace's *Serm.* 2, 3) and it is carefully arranged for comic effect. The well-read narrator lends to the centurion his rhetorical skills to help him to make fun of philosophers. The ignorant soldier and the lover of philosophy are both the butts of the joke,¹⁰⁰ and even those who

⁹⁷ This also happens in *Sat.* 2, 8–15 where a person is first described in the third person as an imaginary character (*murmurat* in line 8, etc.) and then apostrophized and forced to answer (line 15, *poscas ... mergis*).

⁹⁸ Reckford 1962, 496.

⁹⁹ e.g. Plato's *Republic* 487d: Adeimantus vents the people's belief that philosophers are mean or useless.

¹⁰⁰ In his *Rhetoric of Irony* (Chicago 1974) 133, W. Booth argues that satiric irony is, for the most "stable." According to the scholar, this quality of irony in satire allows the reader to reconstruct the precise hidden meaning of the message and the author's intentions. I do not think that satiric irony is stable. Persius 3, 377–87 is a case of "unstable" irony where we cannot securely recover the message. I agree with Griffin's definition which reminds us of Bakhtin's dialogic model: "irony should be understood not simply as a binary switch, either 'on' or 'off,' but more like a rheostat, a rhetorical dimmer switch that allows for a continuous range of effects between 'I almost mean what I say' and 'I mean the opposite of what I say.'" Griffin 1994, 66.

criticize the centurion are described with insolent realism while they grotesquely curl their nostrils to manifest disparagement.¹⁰¹

Persius the satirist-philosopher could have pushed his satire more closely in the direction of a serious discourse, of a dogmatic treatment of vices and virtues. Cornutus' disciple instead, follows, as it is clear from the vignette quoted above, the opposite path. He begins in the street with the objections of a centurion. The simultaneous employment of heterogeneous linguistic and stylistic elements (*sermo vulgaris*, philosophic jargon, etc.) produces a withdrawal from the norm and at the same time the deformation (estrangement) of the object in question. The operation forces the reader to look at the object (philosophers) in the new light obtained in the process. It is the abandonment of the norm that ensures a non-automatic reception of the object. 'Defamiliarization' is a phenomenon deeply studied among Russian Formalists. For example, V. Shklovsky argues that the function of the literary image "is not to make us perceive meaning, but to create a special perception of the object — *it creates a 'vision' of the object instead of serving as a means for knowing it.*"¹⁰² In the vignette described above, the problem indirectly tackled is that of philosophy's detachment from real life and material problems. Philosophy will not fill your stomach, in the eyes of the many it is quite an irrelevant undertaking. Persius transforms philosophers and their attackers into caricature because:

Parodic-travestying literature introduces the permanent corrective of laughter, of a critique on the one-sided seriousness of the lofty direct word, the corrective of reality that is always richer, more fundamental and most importantly too contradictory and heteroglot to be fitted into a high and straightforward genre.¹⁰³

The sermon of the ignorant soldier has become a vehicle to mock philosophical pretensions to understand the world in its fullness. We cannot avoid laughing and being baffled when we perceive the bitter, dissonant truth that filters through Persius' images and their voices.

¹⁰¹ Bernardi Perini 1966–67, 255–257 illustrates Persius' *polisemia* analysing, in the satires, passages that involve metaphors linked to the nose.

¹⁰² Shklovsky 1965, 18.

¹⁰³ Bakhtin 1981, 55.

The satirist in this poem resembles M. Douglas' joker as a 'minor mystic':

one of those people who passes beyond the bounds of reason and society and gives glimpses of a truth which escapes though the mesh of structured concepts. Naturally he is only a humble, poor brother of the true mystic, for his insights are given by accident. They do not combine to form a whole new vision of life, but remain disorganized as a result of the technique which produces them.¹⁰⁴

An inflexible Stoic would probably not have fashioned himself as a joker of this sort. He could not have tolerated the laughter present again at *Sat.* 3, 44–47 with the mention of Cato in the fiction of a childhood memory. In the passage the words of Cato, the Stoic paragon par excellence, are rejected by a young student:

saepe ... paruus ...
 grandia si nollem morituri uerba Catonis
 discere non sano multum laudanda magistro,
 quae pater adductis sudans audiret amicis.
 (*Sat.* 3, 44–47)

... As a youngster I often avoided learning the dying Cato's grandiose speech (I knew my moronic teacher would praise it highly, and my father would listen to it in a sweat of excitement with the friends he had dragged along.)

The remembrance is offered to the 'over-sleeping' character by the more diligent companion or by the satirist's better half. The humor in the sketch is built on the "moronic teacher" and "the sweating father." The cumbersome presence of this body realistically caught "sweating" is highlighted in order to criticize his pretentiousness and exhibitionism. Those who would find the words of Cato worthwhile and important are humorously painted through the eyes of a youngster completely unaware of the importance of philosophical learning. The mention of Cato's name in connection with the indolent young kid involves a thoroughly gratuitous risk of insulting Cato's name even if we

¹⁰⁴ Douglas 1999, 159.

suppose that this is an ironical utterance, which temporarily assumes the child's point of view.¹⁰⁵ Cato's death has become here the site of laughter.

Something similar happens at 3, 53–55 in the detailed description of those who have already been philosophically trained by the 'learned porch':

Quaeque docet sapiens bractis inlita Medis
porticus,¹⁰⁶ insomnis quibus et detonsa iuuentus
inuigilat siliquis et grandi pasta polenta;
(*Sat.* 3, 53–55)

The doctrines of the learned porch with its mural of breeched Persians — doctrines which sleepless, crew-cut students sustained by lentil soup and bowls of porridge are guarding.

Again the humorous remarks about philosophy are offered by the more diligent companion who gives a body to these aspiring-philosophers. We can visualize the Stoa Poikile crowded with dozens of students wearing the same kind of haircut and sustained by the same diet. The humor is triggered by the adjective *sapiens* attached to the building itself and by the description of the sleepless and vigilant pupils, opposed to the oversleeping character satirized in this composition or, perhaps, with a completely different intention, caught and ridiculed in their quite non-Stoic restlessness. In their inability to sleep, they comically resemble desperate lovers.¹⁰⁷ Even the information about their diet in connection with their philosophical activity and insomnia is humoristically double-edged. Are they hungry? Is Stoic doctrine not enough to satisfy them? Or perhaps "the big polenta" was hard to digest?

R.A. Harvey observes in his 1981 commentary:

The ironic description does not denote hostility to Stoicism, as is mistakenly argued by Jenkinson. Persius often inserts humor or grotesque touches where they are least expected.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Jenkinson 1973, 541.

¹⁰⁶ Harvey 1981, 93: he notices the allusion to Horace, *Sat.* 2, 3, 44–45 "*Chrysippi porticus et grex/ autumat ...*" ("Chrysippus' porch and his flock claim ...") and that in Horace the personification is eased by *grex*. *Inlita* is a contemptuous substitute for *picta*.

¹⁰⁷ E.g. Ovid's *Amores* 1, 9, 7 "*pervigilant*."

¹⁰⁸ Harvey 1981, 92.

Harvey's note is superficial. We want to know why Persius inserts humor and a point of view that is not his own if the operation has no purpose. Jenkinson's comment seems more reasonable. He wants to demonstrate that there is a real character who speaks these verses. He thinks that we are not dealing with a sort of interior monologue and that we should exclude parody of the victim's point of view reported in the interior monologue.¹⁰⁹ I do not think that it is possible to decide whether we have a real interlocutor seriously criticizing philosophy or a parodied interlocutor, the confusion of the boundaries of discourse very deliberately seems crafted to enhance the elusiveness of the satirical target.

Conclusions

It is a kind of pictorial style that Persius develops, a style appropriate for recording how another speaker's speech is received, how the life of another's utterance is captured in the consciousness of the recipient and how, in turn, it conditions the recipient's response.¹¹⁰ Persius' style as a result of its emphasis on *méssaliance*, like Carnival and the grotesque, plunges certainty into ambivalence. It is this style, above all, that should help us reject a view of Persius' satire as a genre where the satirist is projected as an unerring doctor. Instead, it should help us to see a satirist learning to think like his victim, a doctor who is reconsidering his own health. Overall what distinguishes the wise man in search of freedom from the foolish man is only the recognition (in the first) of his enslavement and of his weakness. Fragmentation, shock therapy, deconstruction and physical images are instruments employed by the satirist: the mind does not decay while engaged in this (self)didactic ex-

¹⁰⁹ Jenkinson 1973, 541: "It seems a tenable view that lines 53–5 take a hostile attitude to a school whose ideas the satire seems to be trying elsewhere, and in what immediately follows, seriously to communicate Might it not be that they, and the rest of this passage, are a statement of a point of view opposed to that of the satire as a whole *spoken by a different person?*"

¹¹⁰ Voloshinov 1986, 117. According to the Russian scholar it is possible through a systematic study of verbal interaction in the literature of an age to determine how open a certain society is towards different point of views: "Once we understand how to decipher the various forms of reported speech we have information not about accidental and mercurial subjective psychological processes in the 'soul' of the recipient, but about steadfast social tendencies in an active reception of other speakers' speech, tendencies that have crystallized into language form." (Voloshinov 1986, 117). It might be very interesting to "test" Voloshinov's belief against the literary tradition of the Neronian Age.

change. On the contrary, it thrives, it learns or relearns the tricks of real philosophy, Plato's myth of the Cave.¹¹¹

If Persius' satire is "a systematic dismantling of a perspectival structure that had been constructed for the reader,"¹¹² we can recognize in this formula Socrates' method as well as what Psychoanalysis calls "Transference."¹¹³ We are reminded of the anthropological model according to which prior to making any statement about a distant society, the observing subject must be as clear as possible about his attitude toward his own. Yet the observer soon realizes that:

He can accomplish this self-demystification by a (comparative) study of his own social self as it engages in the observation of others, and by becoming aware of the pattern of distortion that his situation necessary implies. The observation and interpretation of others is always also a means of leading to the observation of the self; true anthropological knowledge ... can only become worthy of being called knowledge when this alternating process of mutual interpretation between the two subjects has run its course ... every change of the observed requires a subsequent change in the observer, and the oscillating process seems to be endless. Worse, as the oscillation gains in intensity and in truth, it becomes less and less clear who is in fact doing the observing and who is being observed. Both parties tend to fuse into a single subject as the original distance between them disappears.¹¹⁴

So in trying to teach society a lesson about health the doctor becomes an anthropologist as well as an unorthodox therapist of the self. His "vile bodies" are part of the therapy, a sign of his concern about society or of indignant disappointment at the sight of his confused self.

I do not think that Persius goes too far in the characterization of the satirist as a pedantic doctor and of his patient/pupil as obstinately corrupted and sick and that in this satire "communication has failed because of an inherent defect in the communicator"¹¹⁵ who by using such rhetoric has undercut his

¹¹¹ About Persius' Socratic satires see Henderson 1991.

¹¹² About *Satire 4*, Hooley 1997, 130.

¹¹³ Henderson 1991, 124–125.

¹¹⁴ De Man 1983, 9–10.

¹¹⁵ Witke 1970, 109.

positive didactic intent. I have tried to show that it is a mistake to concentrate on the images of bodily corruption as isolated units without considering the wider context from which those images emerge: Persius' polyphonic canvas reveals a nuanced satirical discourse and multiple targets, among which there is satirical literature itself.

We should remember that not only the "sick bodies" share center stage with bodies who vitally make fun of philosophers and their enterprises, but also consider that even the fictional, sick "you" of the satirical score must be viewed as an aspect of the elusive satirical project. In this project, the real "pupil" does not coincide with the one described in the text: the external reader, as we have seen, brought into the scene to make sense of the whole, is Persius' privileged audience.

The employed technique is not foreign to didactic poetry where the direct (or internal) addressee (e.g. Perses in the *Works and Days*, Memmius in the *De Rerum Natura*) is often described as corrupted or dull beyond hope of redemption. Persius, in the satires, follows and amplifies the strategy employed by Lucretius in his *Rerum Natura*, he draws a lesson which is for all except Memmius:

Lucretius allows his implied audience to eavesdrop on a therapy session conducted between himself as teacher and Memmius as a pupil. This puts the wider audience in a privileged position: readers may perceive themselves as Lucretius' equals or partners in their self-conscious observations of the pedagogical process However, in inviting the wider audience to identify with himself, Lucretius may also be implicitly identifying himself with the audience, thereby acknowledging that he too is a disciple.¹¹⁶

This model of reception is important for my interpretation of Persius. The persona of the satirist describes his direct and not always specified addressee as foolish or sick because he knows that the first reaction of the reader will be to differentiate himself from him. Furthermore the poet's identification with his addressee, in the *De Rerum Natura* only a perplexing possibility, more like a byproduct of the didactic strategy than a consistent and conscious admission, is, in Persius' satires, a key factor in promoting the identification between teacher and student.

¹¹⁶ Konstan 1994, 14.

The emphasis on corruption and death does not compromise the didactic project but rather underscore the narrator's attraction and vicinity to that same corruption.¹¹⁷ Most of all, Persius' invective and pose as a cruel doctor, when it seems non-parodic, should be viewed as an extreme attempt to exorcise what dialogic interference and irony reveal, the erosion of difference between the poles of satire, the proximity between the satirist and the satirized.¹¹⁸ What this satire exposes are "grotesque bodies" and the minds within, stretched, seamless, chameleon-like and polyglot. While "power, repression and authority never speak in the language of laughter,"¹¹⁹ Persius certainly does and in the satire, "while voices 'do battle' they do not die out — that is, no authority is established once and for all."¹²⁰

Bibliography

- Anderson, W.S. 1982. *Essays on Roman Satires*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Babb, G. 2002. "Where the Bodies are Buried: Cartesian Disposition in Narrative Theories of Character", *Narrative* 10.3, 195–221.
- Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, ed. M. Holquist, tr. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- 1984(a) [tr. H. Iswolsky]. *Rabelais and His World*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- 1984 (b). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and tr. C. Emerson, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bardon, H. 1975 (a). "Perse et la réalité des choses", *Latomus* 34, 675–698.
- 1975 (b). "Perse, ou l'homme du refus", *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 53, 24–27.
- Batstone, W. 2002. "Catullus and Bakhtin: The Problems of a Dialogic Lyric", in R. Bracht Branham, 99–137.
- Bernardi Perini, G. 1966–7. "Suspendere Naso: Storia di una metafora", *Memorie dell'Accademia Patavina di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 79, 233–64.
- Biondi, C.G. 1978. "Persio fra poetica e poesia", *Bollettino di Studi Latini* 8, 87–94.
- Booth, W. 1974. *Rhetoric of Irony*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Branham, R Bracht ed. 2002. *Bakhtin and the Classics*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

¹¹⁷ Reckford 1998, 349–350.

¹¹⁸ Seidel 1983, 9–10: Seidel in his book on 'satiric inheritance' uses the work of Girard and Douglas to explore this proximity.

¹¹⁹ Bakhtin 1984 (a), 365.

¹²⁰ Bakhtin 1984 (b), xxxviii. I wish to express my gratitude to Daniel Hooley, Martha Malamud, and Richard Armstrong for comments on an earlier draft of this paper which was read at the 2001 Narrative Conference at Rice University.

- Branham, R. Bracht and D. Kinney eds. and trans. 1996. *Petronius, Satyrice*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bramble, J.C. 1974. *Persius and the Programmatic Satire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braund, S. 1996. *The Roman Satirists and their Masks*, London: British Classical Press.
- Brilli, A. ed. 1979. *La Satira. Storia, tecniche e ideologie*, Bari.
- Brink, C.O. 1963. *Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castelli, A. 1971. "La tecnica imitativa di Persio vista nelle sue caratteristiche e in riferimento alla II satira", *Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Bologna* 69, 42–60.
- Clark, K. and M. Holquist. 1984. *Mikhail Bakhtin*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Clausen, W.V. ed. 1992. *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuuenalis Saturae*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coffey, M. 1976. *Roman Satire*, New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Cohn, D. 1983. *Transparent Minds. Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Conington, J. 1998. *The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus*, London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Conte, G.B. 1974. *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario*, Torino: Giulio Einaudi Editore.
- Corbeill, A. 1996. *Controlling Laughter. Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- De Man, P. 1983. *Blindness and Insight. Essays in Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dessen, C. 1968. *Iunctura Callidus Acri: A Study of Persius' Satires*, London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Douglas, M. 1999. *Implicit Meanings. Selected essays in anthropology*, New York: Routledge.
- Dostoevsky, F. 1960 [tr. Matlaw]. *Notes from the Underground*, New York: Dutton.
- Felson-Rubin, N. 1993. "Bakhtinian Alterity, Homeric Rapport", *Arethusa* 26, 159–171.
- Friedman, N. 1975. *Form and Meaning in Fiction*, Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
- Gardiner, M. 1992. *The Dialogics of Critique. M. M. Bakhtin and the Theory of Ideology*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Garland, R. 1995. *The Eye of the Beholder: Deformity and Disability in the Graeco-Roman World*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Gildersleeve, B., 1979. *The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus*, New York: American book Company.
- Gowers, E. 1993. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Griffin, D. 1994. *Satire. A Critical Reintroduction*, Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky.
- Grimes, S. 1972. "Structure in the Satires of Persius", in D.R. Dudley (ed.), *Neronians and Flavians. Silver Latin I*, London: Routledge, 113–154.
- Handley, E.W. ed. 1965. *The Dyskolos of Menander*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, R.A. 1981. *A Commentary on Persius*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Henderson, J. 1991. "The Pupil as a Teacher: Persius' Didactic Satire", *Ramus* 20, 123–148.
- Hendrickson, G.L. 1923. "The Third Satire of Persius", *CP* 23, 332–342.

- Holquist, M. 1999. "Existence as Dialogue", in C. Emerson (ed.), *Critical Essays on Michael Bakhtin*, New York: G.K. Hall & Comp., 95–107.
- Hookey, D. 1997. *The Knotted Thong. Structures of Mimesis in Persius*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Housman, A.E. 1913. "Notes on Persius", *CQ* 7, 2–32.
- Hutcheon, L. 1985. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*, New York and London: Methuen.
- Jeanneret, M. 1987. *Des Mets et des mots: Banquets et propos de table à la Renaissance*, Paris: Corti.
- Jenkinson, J.R. 1973. "Interpretations of Persius' Satires III and IV", *Latomus* 32, 521–549.
- Johnson, M. 1987. *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Konstan, D. 1994. "Foreword", in A. Schiesaro, P. Mitsis and J. Clay (eds.), *Mega Nepios. Il destinatario nell'epos antico*, Pisa: Giardini Editori, 11–23.
- La Penna, A. 1998. "Persio e le vie nuove della satira Latina", in F. Bellandi (ed.), *Persio. Satire con un saggio di Antonio La Penna*, Milano: Bur, 5–78.
- Lackenbacher, H. 1937. "Persius und Heilkunde", *Wiener Studien* 55, 130–141.
- Laird, A. 1999. *Power of Expressions. Expressions of Power. Speech Presentation in Latin Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, A.A. and D.N. Sedley. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers: Vol. 1 and 2*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malamud, M. et al. eds. 1998. *Vile Bodies: Roman Satire and Corporeal Discourse, Arethusa* 31.
- Mancini, A. 1950. *Le Satire*, Firenze: Le Monnier.
- McGlathery, D. 1988. "Petronius' tale of the widow of Ephesus and Bakhtin's material Bodily Lower Stratum", *Arethusa* 31, 313–336.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 1964. *The Primacy of Perception And Other Essays on Phenomenological Psychology, the Philosophy of Art, History and Politics*, M. Edie (ed. and tr.), Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Miller, P. 1998 "The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility", *Arethusa* 31, 257–284.
- Miller, P., 1993. "Sappho 31 and Catullus 51: The Dialogism of Lyric", *Arethusa* 26, 183–200.
- Morson, G. and C. Emerson eds. 1990. *Mikhail Bakhtin. Creation of Prosaics*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Nagy, G. 2002. "Reading Bakhtin Reading the Classics: An Epic Fate for Conveyors of the Heroic Past", in R. Bracht Branham (ed.), 71–99.
- Nussbaum, M. 1994. *The Therapy of Desire. Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethic*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Paratore, E. 1981. *Eneide*, Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Arnoldo Mondadori editore.
- Pasoli, E. 1982 (a). *Tre poeti latini espressionisti: Properzio, Persio, Giovenale*, Roma.
- 1982 (b), "Attualità di Persio", in W. De Gruyter (ed.), *ANRW* 2.32.3, 1813–1843.
- Pennacini, A. 1969–70. "I procedimenti stilistici nella I satira di Persio", *Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 2, 417–487.
- Peradotto, J. 1990. *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 1993. "The Social Control of Sexuality: Odyssean Dialogics", *Arethusa* 26, 173–82.
- Peterson, R. 1972–3. "The Unknown Self in the Fourth Satire", *CJ* 68, 205–209.

- Pugliatti, P. 1985. *Lo sguardo nel Racconto. Teorie e prassi del punto di vista*, Bologna: Zanichelli editore.
- Reckford, K. 1962. "Studies in Persius", *Hermes* 90, 476–504.
- 1998. "Reading the Sick Body: Decomposition and Morality in Persius' Third Satire", *Arethusa* 31, 337–354.
- Richlin, A. 1993. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rudd, N. 1979. *The Satires of Horace and Persius*, London: Penguin Books.
- Scivoletto, N. 1975. *Poetica e stile di Persio*, Roma: editrice Elia.
- Schiesaro, A., P. Mitsis and J. Strauss Clay eds. 1993. *Mega Nepios: il destinatario nell'epos didascalico*, Pisa: Giardini editori.
- Seidel, M. 1983. *Satiric Inheritance: Rabelais to Sterne*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shklovsky, V. 1965 (originally 1917). "Art as technique", in L.T. Lemon and M.J. Reis (eds. and trans.) *Russian formalist criticism: Four essays*, Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 3–57.
- Squillante Saccone, M. 1990. "Parole d'altri in Persio", in A. Pennacini (ed.), *Retorica della comunicazione nelle letterature classiche*, Bologna: Pitagora editrice, 165–181.
- 1980. "Tecniche dell'ironia e del comico nella Satira di Persio", *Bollettino di Studi Latini* 10, 3–25.
- 1985. "La poesia di Persio alla luce degli studi più recenti (1964–1983)", in W. De Gruyter (ed.), *ANRW* 2.32.3, 1781–1812.
- Sullivan, J.P. 1985. In *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Tissol, G. 2002. "Heroic Parody and the Life of Exile: Dialogic Reflections on the Career of Ovid", in R. Bracht Branham (ed.), 137–161.
- Todorov, T. 1967. "Les Régistres de la parole", *Journal de Psychologie* 64, 265–278.
- 1984. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogic Principle*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Voloshinov, V.N. 1986 [tr. Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik]. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Wehrle, W.T. 1992. *The Satiric Voice. Program, Form and Meaning in Persius and Juvenal*, Hildesheim.
- Witke, C. 1970. *Latin Satire. The Structure of Persuasion*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.