

*FRUSTULA IUVENALIANA*

- i. 69-72.      occurrit matrona potens, quae molle Calenum  
porrectura viro miscet sitiēte rubeta,  
instituitque rudes melior Lucusta propinquas  
per famam et populum nigros efferre maritos.

70 rubeta *R* (Par. 8072) *W* (Vind. 111/107): rubeta *P* (Montpell. 125): rubetam *rell.*

Elsewhere at line-end the scribe of *P* writes the accusative termination in *-am* in full (as at 1. 44, 124, 2. 32, 49, 104, *al.*). From inspection of *P* I was not able to satisfy myself about the status of the abbreviation mark over the *-a* of *rubeta*.

THE truth about line 70 was public property as far back as Plathner, who is quoted by Ruperti (ad loc. in his edition of 1818), but modern editors shy away from it and, with a perverse unanimity, print the accusative *rubetam*. Not only must *viro* then be taken with *sitiente* as an ablative absolute, in spite of the proximity of *porrectura*, but there is no internal coherence in the relative clause. R. Beer (*Spicilegium Iuvenalis*, 1885, pp. 59–60) put his finger on the nerve of the matter: ‘possumus quidem miscere vinum, miscere venenum, sed si mulier vinum porrigit interea venenum miscet, non vino immiscet, nihil inest periculi viro.’ All is resolved once the proper force of *sitiente* is recognized: it qualifies *rubeta* and means *sitim faciente*, ‘parching’. For this common idiom, see (for example) Ovid, *A. Am.* 2. 231 *nec grave te tempus sitiensve Canicula tardet* (where there is no question of the Dogstar’s developing a thirst) or Calp. Sic. 5. 49 *cum longa dies sitiens adferat aestus*. The ablative inflexion in *-e* for the participle in adjectival function is no bar: it recurs at 1. 152 (below) and at 12. 45 *cratera . . . dignum sitiente Pholo* and is not infrequent elsewhere, as at Virg. *Ecl.* 3. 39, Ovid, *Met.* 11. 694, *et al.*

Any who think that *sitiente* here more naturally looks back to *viro* rather than forward to *rubeta* should spare a thought for the ancient truth that Latin writers ‘assumed that their readers would suspend judgement until the end of the sentence before jumping to grammatical conclusions’.<sup>1</sup>

I mention, for completeness' sake, a gloss reported by E. Lommatzsch, *Quaestiones Iuvenalianae*, Leipzig, 1896, p. 394, which may reflect an independent tradition for taking *sitiente* with *rubeta*, besides confirming the case of the noun: *haec rubeta .i. rana unde Iuvenalis: miscet sitiente rubeta*.

1. 81-7. ex quo Deucalion nimbis tollentibus aequor  
navigio montem ascendit sortesque poposcit  
paulatimque anima caluerunt mollia saxa  
et maribus nudas ostendit Pyrrha puellas,  
quicquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas, 85  
gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est.  
et quando uberior vitiorum copia? . . .

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. P. Postgate, 'Flaws in Classical Research', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* iii (1908), 167: '... such arrangements [*sc.* the hyperbata at Ter. *Ad.* 917 and Lucan 8. 342 f.] almost shriek at us the warning *respicere finem*.'

Familiar as this passage is, it will not do—at least, not in the form printed above. In *C.R.* li (1937), 55–6, E. Harrison pointed out that 81–6, as we read them, are no sort of description of Juvenal's subject-matter. He is not setting out to write a Universal History of men's doings and emotions ever since the Flood: though he draws his *exempla* from the past, his themes are bound up with his own times. In fact he relies mostly on historical illustrations, and where he does draw on mythology, as at 13. 38 f., it subserves, as likely as not, an ironical or whimsical purpose.

Harrison thought the couplet 85–6 was not spurious (it could not possibly be that) but misplaced. He therefore suggested reading *ecquando* in 87, which would then follow immediately on 84, so that Juvenal would be saying 'Since the beginning of time, when has there ever been a ranker crop of vices?' Since neither Harrison nor anyone else has thought of an alternative place to put 85–6, this suggestion has been quietly forgotten, except in so far as Knoche in his apparatus (ad loc.) laconically says '85–6 *del Harrison, vs. 87 scribens Ecquando*', where *del.* is not perhaps quite what Harrison intended. There is, however, no need for the emendation *ecquando* in 87, once lines 85–6 are mentally or actually enclosed in parenthesis and *et* in 87 is given its idiomatic function of introducing an indignant question, which looks back to the *ex quo* clause. Of *et* so used, Mayor's note on *Cic. Phil.* 2. 39 gives a sufficiency of prose examples (*Livy* 2. 38. 5; *Cic. Phil.* 2. 110); Juvenal has a good instance at 6. 342 and verse examples abound, as at *Virg. Aen.* 1. 48 *et quisquam Iunonis numen adorat?*

This is hardly the place for a disquisition on Juvenal's habit of parenthesis, which often passes unrecognized. Sufficient to note, *inter alia*, 3. 232b–234a; 140b–141a; 6. 90b–91; 10. 183–4, to name only some of the more obvious specimens that come to mind.

1. 150–4.

dices hic forsitan: 'unde  
ingenium par materiae? unde illa priorum  
scribendi quodcumque animo flagrante liberet  
simplicitas: "cuius non audeo dicere nomen?  
quid refert dictis ignoscat Mucius an non?"'

Is the pronoun *cuius* in 153 relative or interrogative? Accidental preconceptions generated by modern practices of punctuation need to be set aside and the possibilities reviewed *seriatim*.

- (a) if *cuius* is relative, is its antecedent (i) *simplicitas*, in which case the question which opens at *unde illa* . . . will close with *nomen?* and the sense is 'directness, whose very name I dare not mention'; or is it (ii) *Mucius* in 154? In this event, the question-mark will come after *simplicitas* and the relative will, as not uncommonly in Latin, precede the noun to which it refers.
- (b) if *cuius* is interrogative, what is the point of the two questions *cuius* . . . *nomen?* and *quid refert* . . . *an non?*?

Both a (i)<sup>1</sup> and a (ii)<sup>2</sup> have been seriously canvassed. Of the former it may be granted that it gives acceptable sense down to the end of 153, but at the expense of the logical link with the following line (154), which is thus left in the air. As to a (ii): it may not matter that Juvenal does not seem elsewhere to affect this anticipatory position of the relative; more serious, perhaps, in at

<sup>1</sup> By E. G. Hardy, in his note ad loc., edn. of 1909.

<sup>2</sup> By H. W. Garrod, *C.R.* xxv (1911), 240.

least 11 places<sup>1</sup> where *non* immediately or closely follows a pronominal word of this kind (as, for example, 9. 24 *nam quo non prostat femina templo?*) the context clearly demands the interrogative function, with the sense amounting to *prorsus omnes*, 'absolutely every', and so most readers (*plerique omnes*, if not *prorsus omnes*) would naturally take it, at first sight anyway. What is fatal, however, is surely that if *cuius* really refers forward to Mucius, point can only be extracted from the whole phrase from *cuius* down to *an non?* if it is regarded as an interjection of Juvenal himself, countering the two *unde*-questions posed by an imaginary *alter ego*, who will then resume his opposition to Juvenal's attitude with 157-9. This shatters the delicate but well-marked 'five-fold pattern of apology', which, as E. J. Kenney has shown,<sup>2</sup> runs through the whole of this coda-section (147-71), precisely as it does, with variations in the fifth element, through the concluding parts of the programmatic satires of Horace (*Sat.* 2. 1. 57 f.) and Persius (1. 103 f.). To Juvenal's manifesto stating his mission (147-50a), the *alter ego* utters the first of his two objections in 150b-7; the second follows at 160 f. To preserve the unity of 150-7, the most promising expedient that occurs to me is to treat the 12 words from *cuius non* down to *an non?* as a pointer to the particular sense of *simplicitas* here by a phrase in apposition, expressed in the form of two direct questions, which a modern text might make clear by recourse to inverted commas in the manner shown above. This is to ask no more of the reader than Juvenal requires of him in 9. 38-9, where the *mollis avarus* is defined *ex ore suo* in terms of three short complaints:

'haec tribui, deinde illa dedi, mox plura dedisti.'

Horace offers an example equally good: he likes a girl who is *parabilem* . . . *facilemque* (*Sat.* 1. 2. 119), while he leaves to others the less compliant:

illam 'post paulo', 'sed pluris', 'si exierit vir',

the "'wait-a-moment, my-fee's-gone-up, yes, if-my-husband's-away" girl'. Ancient readers, accustomed to recited poetry and relying on the ear to help the understanding more than we do, could catch this kind of idiom 'on the wing' without artifices of punctuation.

The sense required for *simplicitas* here is that more usually carried by *libertas*, 'outspokenness', 'directness'.<sup>3</sup> Juvenal could not use *libertas* in 153 because he had written *liberet* at the end of 152; that *simplicitas* is capable of this meaning may not appear from casual consultation of the standard dictionaries, but is sufficiently assured by passages such as Pliny, *Epp.* 6. 12. 5 *rogo ut mihi semper eadem simplicitate quotiens cessare videbor, convicium facias* (cf. Ovid, *A. Am.* 1. 241-2, *al.*).

7. 134.                    spondet enim Tyrio stlattaria purpura filo.

The advocate's finery includes *amethystina* (sc. *vestimenta*, 136), but what is to be made of the unusual epithet qualifying *purpura* here? The archaic form of the adjective *latus* serves to denote a type of ship\* (*stlatae*, nominative feminine plural) in a list of such words in Aulus Gellius 10. 25. 5, while the adjective

<sup>1</sup> Other instances are 2. 25, 75; 3. 309; 4. 101; 6. 41, 196, 247, 345, 617; 13. 235.

<sup>2</sup> *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* clxxxviii (new series viii) (1962), 36 f.

<sup>3</sup> For *libertas* verging on *παρρησία* see Sall. *Jug.* 30. 3, Quint. 3. 8. 48, *al.* For a systematic

presentation of the other uses of *simplicitas* see J. P. Sullivan, *Petronius, The Satyricon, a Literary Study*, 1968, p. 99 n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> See too Paulus-Festus, Lindsay, *Gloss. Lat.* iv (Paris, 1930), 408, and cf. Auson. *Epist.* 32. 31.

*stlattaria* (*stlattaris*) had, according to the glossators, associations with piracy; thus Caper, *GLK* vii. 107 gives *stlattaris* . . . *rate piratica*, to which may be added *CGL* ii. 188, line 49 *stlata*: *πειρατικοῦ σκάφους εἶδος*. It is curious that *navis lata* should carry this specific sense, as if in implied contrast to *navis longa*, a warship. The fact, however, is beyond doubt, and explanation of Juvenal's verse must take account of it, as the current views do not. Thus Duff, with Forcellini and others, understood *stlattaria* to mean no more than 'imported'; Heinrich suggested 'delusive', relying on the flimsy support of a note in Valla (*illecebrosa*). Juvenal does not, however, use unusual words pointlessly. P. Ercole (*Riv. Fil.* xlv [1916], 221–34) thought that the advocate wore 'contraband' purple which he had got 'on the cheap', but this is false to the argument here, for the whole point is that Tongilius is straining his resources by overspending in order to keep up appearances.

A passage from Quintilian, not previously cited in this connection, dissipates the mist. Referring to an unscrupulous practice whereby lawyers bargained in advance with prospective clients about the terms they demanded before undertaking a case, he writes (12. 7. 11):

paciscendi quidem ille *piraticus mos* et imponentium periculis pretia procul  
abominanda negotiatio etiam a mediocriter improbis aberit, cum praesertim  
bonos homines bonasque causas tuenti non sit metuendus ingratus.

Thus *piraticus mos* (a 'piratical system of chaffering', to use R. G. Austin's translation, *ad loc.*, p. 116) is a jargon term for such unprofessional conduct, and Juvenal's point is clear. Tongilius has acquired his purple finery out of the illicit proceeds of this *piraticus mos*, by bargaining with his clients in the way Quintilian deprecates. That such bargaining went back to earlier times (though not under this name) emerges from Cicero, *Parad. Stoic.* 46 (2. 2) *qui videt . . . tuas mercedum pactiones in patrociniis*.<sup>1</sup>

7. 124–8.      'Aemilio dabitur quantum licet, et melius nos  
                         egimus.' huius enim stat currus aeneus, alti 125  
                         quadriiuges in vestibulis, atque ipse feroci  
                         bellatore sedens curvatum hastile minatur  
                         eminus, et statua meditaturoelia lusca.

In contrast to the impecunious *causidici*, the prosperous Aemilius is proof that nothing succeeds like success. Out of his fees (or possibly by way of a gift from a grateful client<sup>2</sup> seeking to evade the legal maximum, *quantum licet* 124), Aemilius has acquired some impressive pieces of statuary in his front porch, including a mounted representation of himself. No wonder his rivals, Pedo and the rest, go bankrupt in their futile efforts to match such ostentation (129 f.).

The curious fondness of lawyers in Rome for such equestrian statues is guaranteed by Martial 9. 68. 6 *causidicum medio cum faber aptat equo*. So far, so good; but on the received view the spear is warped and the statue itself has

<sup>1</sup> The earliest instance of *stlattarius* is in Ennius, *Annales* (fr. 226 Vahlen<sup>2</sup>; Bk. 6, fr. 5 Steuart):

et melior navis quam quae stlattaria portat  
multisonans.

If the adjective is neuter plural there, as seems likely, the meaning will presumably be

'than a ship which carries goods stolen by pirates'. In default of the context in Ennius one can go no further.

<sup>2</sup> This would, however, weaken the point of *sic* in 129: Pedo and the rest cannot find the money to commission these status symbols out of the fees they earn, as Aemilius can.

only one eye. To explain this last detail, it has even been suggested that the coloured stone representing the eyeball had fallen out (so Friedländer, ad loc.). This, however, is no antique, where signs of wear would be a commendation rather than otherwise, but a portrait of a living man, intended to impress his clients, and would fail of its effect if in a state of disrepair. And further, what is the point of *eminus*, carrying a double emphasis, being first word in line 128 and last word in the clause to which it belongs?

All difficulties evaporate once it is seen that *hastile* in 127 does not mean a spear but a bowshaft, so that Aemilius is represented as a ἵπποτοξότης. For *hastile* in the sense required see Amm. Marc. 22. 8. 37 *cum arcus omnium gentium flexis curventur hastilibus*. This gives an obvious point to *eminus* (128), as well as to *lusca*: the rider has one eye closed to aim. Admittedly, I can point to no extant artefacts of the motif of the mounted archer in the Early Empire, but experience of Parthian tactics would have made the concept familiar enough to Juvenal's contemporaries. In so far as *sagittae* is, on the evidence of 7. 156, a technical jargon-term of the Roman Bar, the appropriateness of the representation is not open to question, and Juvenal would only be availing himself of the satirist's privilege if he selected an unusual or even a unique object to illustrate his point.<sup>1</sup>

7. 175-7.

. . . tempta

Chrysogonus quanti doceat vel Polio quanti  
lautorum pueros: artem scindes Theodori.

177 scindes *B* (Leid. F 64, tenth century) *Mon.* 14466 (thirteenth century) *Vall.* 66 (written 1439), as Jahn conjectured: scindens *fr. Antin.* (circa 500), *PS rel.* The gloss *dividens* occurs both in the Antinoe-fragment and in the P-scholia ad loc. (p. 131 Wessner).

The paratactic conditional sentence introduced into the text here by Jahn in 1851 is so firmly entrenched that efforts to eradicate it may prove to be as futile as they may seem to be presumptuous. Nevertheless, in face of the evidence, δέῃ με τὸν Αἰθίοπα σμήγχειν ἐπιχειρεῖν. As manipulated by Jahn, the passage yields the sense '(if you) make trial of the sum for which Chrysogonus or Polio teaches the sons of the affluent, you will tear up (your copy of) the Art of Rhetoric by Theodorus (of Gadara)'. Editorial duty has not been shirked: the paratactic construction is fortified by reference to 1. 155-7 or 10. 147-8; Chrysogonus' ability as a singer is documented by 6. 74 (where he is contrasted with Quintilian, who recurs in 7. 186) and Pollio's musicianship by 6. 387. That *scindere* can carry the postulated sense is assured by Mart. 9. 73. 9 *frange, miser, calamos et scinde, Thalia, libellos*; and the title of Horace's *Ars Poetica*, reinforced, if need be, by Juv. 6. 452 (*Palaemonis artem*) vouches for *ars* in the meaning of 'manual' or 'handbook'. How then shall the defences of this *ars inexpugnabilis* be breached?

First: what is known of this 'Manual' of Theodorus? One imaginative modern encyclopedist will tell us what it contained; the only ancient testimony we have to Theodorus' writings is silent. I transcribe the relevant part of the entry in the Suda (Θ 151, vol. 1, part 2, pp. 695-6 Adler):

<sup>1</sup> This interpretation occurred independently to Mr. J. D. P. Bolton, of The Queen's College, while correcting translations of this passage when it was set in Honour Moderations in 1953, and, a short

time previously, to Mr. J. E. C. Palmer, an undergraduate of Hertford College, who was sitting the examination that year. I have their goodwill in publishing it along with my own contributions to Juvenal.

βιβλία δ' ἔγραψε· Περὶ τῶν ἐν φωναῖς ζητουμένων γ', Περὶ ἱστορίας α', Περὶ θέσεως ἐν, Περὶ διαλέκτου ὁμοιότητος καὶ ἀποδείξεως β', Περὶ πολιτείας β', Περὶ Κοίλης Συρίας α', Περὶ ῥήτορος δυνάμεως α', καὶ ἄλλα.

The last two words might cover a great deal, and recall Quintilian's uncharacteristically vague *plura scripsit Theodorus* (3. 1. 18), but the omission of so central a work as a *Techne*, if it really existed, is not to be lightly overlooked. It is easy to discredit the authority of the Suda elsewhere, for example in its list of writings as difficult to classify as Pindar's, where the information does not add up right.<sup>1</sup> I relegate to a footnote<sup>2</sup> some strictures on irresponsible statements about Theodorus in the article on him in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.* (s.v. 'Theodorus' (39), cols. 1847 ff.) and record my own suspicion, which here verges on conviction, that the *Manual* is a myth, perpetuated for all we can tell, by misinterpretation of this very passage of Juvenal.

This bastion proves brittle, though perhaps capable of a last-ditch defence in emergency. More serious: how to explain the explicit gloss *dividens*, found in one of the most generally reliable witnesses to the text (see Wessner's edition of the scholia, 1931, p. 131), as well as in another manuscript and that the most ancient by some 400 years, the parchment fragment from Antinoe? Apart from guaranteeing the participle against the future tense as the reading known in late antiquity, it is in effect an unequivocal warning against taking *scindens* as meaning 'tear up'. For an alternative sense one need look no further afield than the entries s.v. *scindo* in Lewis and Short to find a clue in a passage of Seneca supported by another in Quintilian. In Seneca, *Epp.* 89. 16 we read: *naturalis pars philosophiae in duo scinditur, corporalia et incorporalia; utraque dividuntur in suos, ut ita dicam, gradus*. Similarly Quintilian, *proem.* 1. 13 (p. 5 Radermacher): *scidit deinde se studium, atque inertia factum est ut artes esse plures viderentur*. Can it be, then, that what the musicians Chrysogonus and Pollio are doing is to 'subdivide' what in Theodorus' day was the unified 'art of rhetoric' (with a small *a*, as it were) by exploiting the current emphasis on the musical side of oratorical delivery, at the expense of honest teachers of declamation who have to stick to the wearisome and poorly rewarded drudgery of instruction in style, composition, and similar basic matters, as described by Juvenal himself in Satire 7 (lines 152 f.)?

There is no need to cite detailed evidence for the exaggerated importance placed on vocal modulation in Roman oratory. In Cicero's day it was most

<sup>1</sup> Even here the possibility that the Suda contains traces of a tradition older than that of the Ambrosian Life of Pindar has to be taken seriously: see A. E. Harvey, *C.Q.* xlix (n.s. 5) (1955), 161.

<sup>2</sup> Stegemann's enumeration of Theodorus' writings (*R.-E.*, cols. 1848 f.) begins: 'A. Rhetorical writings. 1. The *Techne* of T. began with definitions and brought in the division of the parts of rhetoric, the doctrine of status (*στάσις*), and finally treated of the partes orationis and the virtutes dicendi . . .' Of ancient evidence to support this, οὐδὲ γὰρ. All this and more—too speculative to merit transcription—seems to derive from an unfortunate article by G. Kowalski in *Eos*, xxxi (1928), 160 f., esp. 166–8.

Stegemann's own unreliability shines out from his remark (*R.-E.*, col. 1857) that Theodorus' adherents translated the master's *Techne* into Latin: for this he relies on Quint. 2. 15. 21, and I wish him joy of it. The point under discussion there is whether rhetoric is an *ars* (with a small *a*) or a *virtus*; the reference in Quintilian to translation concerns a Latin rendering of a famous definition of *techne* in this connection. I cannot repress an uncomfortable feeling that the 'Manual' was foisted on to Theodorus of Gadara by a confused recollection of Arist. *Rhet.* 2. 23. 1400<sup>b</sup>16 καὶ . . . ὅλη ἡ πρότερον Θεοδώρου τέχνη, which has to do, of course, with the earlier Theodorus (of Byzantium). *sed hactenus haec.*

noticeable in 'Asiatic' practitioners (*e Phrygia et Caria rhetorum epilogus paene canticum*, *Or.* 57). Later it became universal, as the passages amassed by Norden (*Antike Kunstprosa*, i. 294-5) and others certify. That ambitious parents should be prepared to go to great expense over the musical side of their children's rhetorical education is only to be expected in an age of debased values such as Juvenal here deplores.

If this note causes some heart-searching among those who have regarded Jahn's emendation here as beyond challenge, it will perhaps have served its purpose.

12. 60-1. . . . mox cum reticulis et pane et ventre lagoenae  
aspice sumendas in tempestate secures.

61 aspice] accipe Housman: prospice vel respice vel arripie templaverunt edd.

Although *aspice* is the reading of all manuscripts with no significant exception, since Housman wrote his note on 61 editors have either obelized (as Knoche) or emended. Certainly *aspice* cannot mean 'provide for oneself'—but there is no need that it should. The well-attested sense 'take stock of', 'inspect' suits well enough: what the prudent passenger should do after embarkation (hence *mox*, the next thing to do after entrusting oneself to the *ligno dolato*) is to find out the whereabouts of the ship's life-saving equipment, an iron ration of bread (cf. *Hor. Sat.* 1. 1. 47, of a land traveller's *reticulum panis*), a wine flask, and axes, not for use in cutting down the mast (this would have been done at an earlier stage in the marine emergency, before the time came for abandoning ship, and has already been mentioned at 54), but to hack away a spar or other serviceable bit of timber in the *sauve qui peut* as the ship breaks up, whereon a survivor might, Odysseus-wise, float to safety. This would be a common-sense procedure in an age that knew nothing of full-scale provision of life-rafts and the like.<sup>1</sup>

This is a normal meaning for *aspicere*, and is frequent in Livy, as at 42. 5. 8: the best of the other passages cited in *T.L.L.*, s.v., col. 831, lines 31 f. seems to be Livy 26. 51. 8 in that it has a nautical reference: '... dux cuncta pari cura obibat, nunc in classe ac navali erat, nunc cum legionibus decurrebat, nunc operibus *aspiciendis* tempus dabat, quaeque in officinis quaeque in armamentario ac navalibus ...'

In any event, *accipe*, if it yielded a desirable sense, would be contrary to Juvenal's usage. He has it six times in situations where A is about to give B something (as at 4. 65 or 7. 165); in three other places it serves as a transition formula, 7. 36 (with Madvig's certain repunctuation), 13. 120, and 15. 31.

<sup>1</sup> On dinghies (*scapha*, *cumba*, λέμβος, σκάφη) as lifeboats see the elaborate collection of material by E. Zinn, in *Festschrift für Hildebrecht Hommel* (1961), pp. 185 ff. Passages such as Demosth. 32. 5-6 show that one might suggest taking to the λέμβος even 2 or 3 days' sail from land, but elsewhere the smallness of the dinghy is evident, and it suits in-shore rescue, as in Acts 27: 16 and 31-2. It might even be so small that two girls could propel it, as Palaestra and Ampelisca do in Plautus, *Rudens*, 75 f., where the wreck has happened

within swimming distance of the shore. Petronius, *Sat.* 114. 7 leaves the reader in no doubt of the danger of trusting to so unseaworthy a craft: when her faithful slaves put Tryphaena on board the *scapha*, they 'led her off to most certain death'. The crew's knowledge of seamanship would entitle them to priority on the limited space in the *scapha* and passengers in antiquity could thus count on having to fend for themselves in emergency. (I owe the reference to Zinn's article to Mr. D. A. Russell.)

14. 265-9. an magis oblectant animam iactata petauro  
 corpora quique solent rectum descendere funem,  
 quam tu, Corycia semper qui puppe moraris  
 atque habitas, coro semper tollendus et austro,  
 perditus †acullis† sacci mercator olentis . . . ?

269 acullis *fragm. Ambros.* (sixth century): ac vilis *PU, Vat Reg.* 2029: a siculis *rell.*: ac similis *Housman*: alii alia

To satisfy the craving for luxury goods, traders take absurd maritime risks to import them: in amusement-value they are as good as funambulists and acrobats. The sense of 269 is complete, and the only possibilities that call for serious consideration in filling it up are either a point of departure or a second epithet parallel to *perditus* to define its force more precisely. Mention of Corycia in 267 has covered the place of origin for the cargo, Corycian saffron being noted for its quality. Housman easily disposed of *vilis* as a qualification for *mercator*: it would not be Latin for a trader in cheap goods, and, if it were, that thought would be alien to the context. His own conjecture, *similis* in the sense of *concolor* (the trader is as yellow from nausea as the saffron of his cargo) is even more easily dealt with, now that we know that the corruption goes back to the sixth century, when such an intervocalic abbreviation as he presupposed was quite undreamed of (*siilis* = *similis*). Scarcely less disabling is the fact that in both passages of Martial on which Housman relied for this sophisticated meaning of *similis* there is a colour-word immediately adjacent: *quaeque vehit similem belua nigra Libyn* at 6. 77. 8 and *quaeque gerit similes candida turris aves* at 12. 31. 6. Nevertheless an adjective is fairly certainly what is wanted: *perditus* can carry several senses, and where it occurs at v. 130 with the meaning 'irresponsible' it is made specific by the epithet *temerarius* in parallel. So here: one starts by looking for a 3rd-declension *i*-stem adjective ending in *-ilis* to fit the hints in the letters of the earlier manuscripts, such as *agilis* or *facilis*. The former would require *atque*, not *ac* before it; the latter, if it meant 'easy-going', would not add much to the idea already expressed by *perditus*. Diplomatically, now that more is known about the kind of book-hand likely to have been used for Latin papyri before the transcription into codex-format,<sup>1</sup> a word ending in *-uus* must be allowed to have a good claim to be considered: such a word could well leave *-ullis* or *-uilis* behind, if its first syllable had been swallowed up by haplography from *ac* preceding. The epithet *fatuus* would meet the case well: the letters *fat-* could quite easily have vanished in view of *-sac* preceding, in an undivided text. The sense is apposite: Juvenal uses *fatuus* in 9.8 in connection with an unbusinesslike borrower: Crepereius Pollio offers three times the normal interest-rates, but finds no *fatui* (anglice 'mugs') to accommodate him. In Cicero *fatuus* is coupled with *amens* (*Deiot.* 21) and in a context not remote from ours in *Fin.* 2. 70 (the life of the luxurious is not to be criticized) *nisi plane fatui sint*. So explained, this corruption would be on all fours with that hard core of passages where the textual damage is present in all our extant manuscripts and as such must go back to the earliest stages of the transmission: I have listed the more notable of these in *Museum Helveticum*, xxv (1968), 108.

<sup>1</sup> See J. Mallon, *Paléographie romaine*, Madrid, 1952, *passim*, but especially pp. 77f.



15. 84-7.      hic gaudere libet quod non violaverat ignem,  
                  quem summa caeli raptum de parte Prometheus  
                  donavit terris; elemento gratulor et te  
                  exultare reor . . .

The rioting fellahin have eaten uncooked the prisoner they had captured in the foray, whence Juvenal's wry comment: at least the sanctity of fire was not violated. *te* (86) has provoked a head-on clash of opinion: Friedländer, following Kiaer and Mayor, referred it to 'fire', to be understood from the context in some mysterious way known only to themselves. Duff took it to apply to Volusius, the addressee of the piece, manfully looking in the face the disconcerting fact that that worthy had not been mentioned since the first line. Others, sailing in the wake of Orelli and Hermann, eliminate 86<sup>b</sup> to 87<sup>a</sup> (*elemento . . . reor*), although there is nothing suspicious about the words, apart from the difficulty of *te*. That *te* is the surviving relic of an effaced apostrophe has not, it seems, occurred to anybody, notwithstanding the clue offered by *Pac*. In that MS. *Promethea* once stood as the last word in 85, and looks suspiciously like a miswriting of the vocative *Prometheu*. The verb that went with it will have been *donasti*, so that Juvenal wrote:

. . . ignem  
 quem summa caeli raptum de parte, Prometheu,  
 donasti terris; elemento gratulor, et te  
 exultare reor . . .

The syncopated form of the second person singular of the perfect indicative is supported by *locasti* at 8. 185, whatever may be the truth about other syncopated forms at 2. 30 or 8. 233. The trouble arose, I suspect, because at an early stage in the transmission the syncopated form was spelled out in full. This has happened in the medieval tradition of Catullus at 14. 14;<sup>1</sup> there the Veronensis had *misisti*, giving one syllable too many for the hendecasyllable. The correct *misti* occurs as a conjecture in a text ( $\eta$  in Mynors's sigla) predating 1460. In Juvenal events took a turn for the worse: *s* and *t* were confused early on, as the corruption at 16. 24 shows to have been possible, and so once *donavisti terris* had painlessly shrunk to *donavit terris*, as it so easily could, the preceding vocative was turned into a nominative, by the addition of a final *-s*, to serve as subject for the verb. Only *te* survived, an inarticulate signpost to the submerged truth.

*Jesus College, Oxford*

J. G. GRIFFITH

<sup>1</sup> It would not be difficult to adduce further examples of unmetrical *scriptio plena* in the traditions of other verse authors.