

THE EARLIEST SCHOLIAST ON JUVENAL

AMONG classical Latin poets, Juvenal is unusually richly provided with ancient scholia; at the same time, the scholia exhibit an unusual degree of ignorance and sheer stupidity. What is perhaps most surprising, however, is the extent to which these commentators appear to have been worse informed than we are today concerning the identity of individuals who appear in the satires. We may be puzzled about the choice of Corbulo as one able to carry heavy burdens (3. 251), even when we note that Tacitus describes him as 'corpore ingens' (*Aun.* 13. 8. 3). But it takes a scholar of rare ignorance to observe 'alii dicunt athletam . . . alii genus navis'. Likewise it seems amazing that anyone who could say, in explanation of *Flavius ultimus* (4. 37), 'ut quidam dicunt, delator fuit', or, on *ante pedes Domiti* (8. 228), 'senatorem, qui a Nerone coactus est mimum agere', should have ventured even to read Juvenal, let alone comment on him. In general, the errors are so immense and the gaps so frequent that Wessner must be right, in the introduction to his edition of the scholia,¹ to conclude that the collection cannot date from the period of Juvenal's own life nor shortly after his death; when in any case tastes were turning much too firmly towards the early Republic for any scholar to concern himself with the details of one whom Wessner describes as 'neotericus poeta'.

The evidence is strong that interest in Juvenal began to develop only in the fourth century, reaching a peak in the last twenty years or so of the century, when Ammianus (28. 4. 14) comments on the devotion of certain trivial characters to the satirist and to Marius Maximus the biographer. The latest datable detail in the commentary is a reference at 10. 24 to 'Cerealem praefectum', whom we can securely locate in A.D. 353. This cannot in itself prove that 'the scholia are subsequent to 353', as Syme asserts;² for no one could claim that they form a coherent whole. Nevertheless, a date about 380 seems acceptable for the main work of compilation, when literary echoes and actual quotations in Servius confirm Ammianus' statement of Juvenal's popularity. Only in such circumstances would scholars so poorly equipped have undertaken to explain what they could of the problems in the text.

In any attempt to assess the erudition of the scholiasts, one type of note is easily explained. As Wessner points out,³ the reference to Tibullus on 8. 29 is almost identical with Servius' use of the same passage on *Georg.* 1. 19, and is no proof that the scholiast had read Tibullus himself. Likewise Tacitus is quoted on 14. 102, but the passage, explaining the identity of Moses (*Hist.* 5. 3-4), is one of the few cited verbatim by Orosius (1. 10. 1-5). The coincidence is sufficient to cast doubt on the scholiast's direct use of Tacitus, if not on

¹ Teubner, 1931, p. xxxviii.

² *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (1968), p. 87; likewise Clausen in his Oxford text, p. xii. Two references (10. 95, 11. 50) to 'Diocletianae' (sc. thermae) support a general fourth-century date; and other evidence is collected by Mommsen, *Ges.*

Schr. vii. 509-11. A. Gercke, *Seneca-Studien* (1895), p. 191, is prepared to consider an earlier stratum of information. His claim that the reference to Cerealis indicates the actual date of compilation goes well beyond the evidence.

³ pp. xxxix-xl.

Orosius'. The question of the relationship between Tacitus and the scholiast will be considered below.

Some of the supposed scholarship in these notes is genuine enough, but belongs to a much later date. Many of the more apposite references to ancient authorities appear only in Valla's version of the commentary, printed in 1486 and related in a very questionable manner to the supposed authority of 'Probus', to whom most of the more significant notes are attributed. Sometimes 'Probus' appears to have lost material which is found in the main tradition; sometimes he alone has material which must go back to antiquity;¹ occasionally Valla, with or without the name of Probus, quotes passages which there is no reason to suppose were available to the fourth-century scholiast. He is able to quote Tac. *Dial.* 8 in partial correction of the mistaken note on Crispus in 4. 81—first by providing the correct *nomen*, Vibius, and then by claiming him as a native of Placentia (his own birth-place, as Wessner, p. 250, points out) instead of Vercellae, although he acknowledges Tacitus' authority for the latter. He makes more valid use of Tacitus, as of 'Tranquillus', at 1. 71, where he adds their names as witnesses to the activities of Lucusta, although he does not quote from either. In such places Valla is plainly exploiting his own reading of classical writers in a typically humanistic manner. These examples, however, account for only a small part of the historical information preserved by one version or another of the scholia.

Wessner is probably right to recognize one further stratum of post-classical accretions, when he draws attention² to the note at 9. 37, 'quem magister Heiricus scire non potuit', and argues that certain items in the ΦX tradition can be attributed to this Carolingian scholar or his school. Little in this category is of value to the understanding of the satires. It is noticeable, however, that these scholia alone quote Martial (albeit inaccurately) to explain 6. 7, on Lesbia's *passer*, which the main tradition grievously misunderstood. Again, the main tradition knows nothing about Marius in 1. 49, and at 8. 120, *Marius discinxerit Afros*, can only say 'quia ibi bella finierat', as if from some vague memory of C. Marius. Valla is no better informed. The Φ scholium, on the other hand, notes that this is Marius Priscus and that he was condemned 'accusante Plinio Secundo'. It is possible that this relevant information was derived in the fourth century from the third-century biographer Marius Maximus, who is apparently attested as the source of the account of a rather similar prosecution, that of Palfurius Sura (4. 53) during the reign of Nerva. If so, the reference remained only in one stream of the tradition. It is more probable that the note is due to Heiric's own reading of Pliny.³ Pliny is likewise quoted to good effect on Isaeus (3. 74), although this note belongs to the main tradition; and Valla's note here contains the puzzling addition 'cuius et

¹ Thus he alone preserves the explanation of *cadureo* in 6. 537 (where the main tradition has nothing at all, being entirely at sea on 7. 221), with the citation of the one extant fragment of Martial's contemporary Sulpicia (Morel, *Frag. Poet. Lat.*, p. 134). There is no trace of her works in the grammarians or elsewhere, and this note must probably be taken with the group of historical references to be considered below.

² pp. xxviii-xxix.

³ Pliny was certainly accessible to Carolingian scholars, being quoted by Einhard a clear generation before Heiric (Manitius, *Gesch. der lat. Lit. des Mittelalters*, i. 644). Likewise Martial was known to Theodulf and Lupus (*ibid.* 488), as Catullus himself (who might better have been quoted) was not. Other references to Martial in the common tradition (on 11. 162 and perhaps on 8. 86) look more like examples drawn from grammarians.

Tranquillus meminit'. There is no trace of Isaeus in the surviving fragments of Suetonius' *de viris illustribus*, although Roth (p. 272) accepts Valla's authority; nor is the biography likely to have included an orator who survived well into Trajan's reign. Since Valla in the same note confuses Isaeus with his Athenian homonym, his evidence here must be suspect.

It is nevertheless possible that both references to Pliny were attached to the text of Juvenal at a date considerably earlier than the fourth century. They are then to be classed with a small number of historically significant notes derived from works which are now lost and which are most unlikely to have been extant when the main body of scholia was put together.

Prominent among these are three verbatim citations from poets of Juvenal's own day: the four verses from Statius' *German War*, given by Valla only on 4. 94; the two verses of Turnus, the Flavian satirist, on 1. 71; and the elegiac couplet quoted on 4. 37 as the end of an epigram by Martial, though not found in the MSS. of the epigrams or elsewhere.¹ In addition, a note on 2. 99 quotes from one Pompeius Planta the statement that Bebricum was 'a Cremona vicesimo lapide', with the information, not preserved elsewhere, that Planta wrote about the wars of A.D. 69. It would be surprising if these works survived as late as the fourth century; and if they did, one would have expected the scholiast to have made greater use of them.

Quite apart from these references to named authors, the scholia often contain historical information which is clearly not derived from works extant today. On 1. 109 Valla (though not the main tradition²) has biographical notes on the freedmen Pallas and Licinus, both containing material which occurs nowhere else, particularly a pasquinade about the former in Greek. On 5. 34 he has a similar note on Helvidius Priscus' early career under Nero, again with a quotation in Greek. On 4. 77 the main tradition has an informative account of the career of Pegasus, including the statement that he governed several provinces, which has recently been confirmed in part by an inscription from Dalmatia.³ On 6. 638 there is a relatively coherent account of Pontia's murder of her sons and subsequent suicide while dancing, to which Valla adds the improbable, and presumably corrupt, detail that her husband's name was Drymio.⁴ On 5. 109 Valla's notes on Seneca and Piso appear not to be derived from extant authorities, although the idea of Piso's proficiency at *latrunculi* might have been taken from the *Laus Pisonis* 190-208; and the closing section on Seneca's death is rightly judged by Wessner to be Valla's own

¹ Friedländer, *Martial*, ii. 217, points out that the couplet underlies Ausonius' tetra-stich on Domitian (*Caes.* 12). In the preceding list of Caesars (2. 12), Ausonius quotes the same lines of Juvenal (4. 37-8) to which the scholium is attached. Writing in some year about A.D. 380, Ausonius evidently found the couplet already in position as a comment on this passage. Unfortunately, this provides no evidence as to whether the major collection of scholia had been compiled by this time.

² Where only a garbled recollection survives, linking the two as freedmen of Claudius. Valla's last sentence, comparing Licinus with Crassus and quoting Persius

(2. 36), is probably his own addition; though Persius was well enough known in the fourth century for the quotation to be inserted then and subsequently lost in most copies.

³ Wilkes, *Epig. Stud.* iv (1967), 119-21.

⁴ The main tradition places her father's death under Nero, which is likely enough if he is C. Petronius Pontius Nigrinus (*cos.* 37), as P.I.R.¹ iii. P. 218, and perhaps a relative of T. Petronius Niger (= Arbiter?). Her own suicide must fall well into the Flavian period, perhaps under Domitian, since Martial mentions the incident three times (2. 34. 6, 4. 43. 5, 6. 75).

paraphrase of Tac. *Ann.* 15. 61–4.¹ On 1. 155 both traditions have a surprisingly full account of Tigellinus' early life.

One group of notes of peculiar interest provides not notes on characters whom Juvenal clearly names, but attempted identifications of anonymous persons. On *magnus Auruncae alumnus* (1. 20), the main tradition has nothing; the scholium briefly and correctly names Lucilius. Valla has a long and confused note, starting with Lucilius (though he is pedantically erroneous about *Auruncae*), and then referring to Probus for further alternatives, Turnus, Lenaeus, and Silius, 'qui omnes, ut Probus refert, ex Aurunca fuerunt'.² Valla identifies Turnus correctly as brother to the tragic poet Memor, as shown by Mart. 11. 10 and, by implication, by Sidonius *Carm.* 9. 266;³ but is able to add the *nomen* Scaev(i)us, presumably for both men, and some rather uncircumstantial details of Turnus' career under the Flavians. There is clearly more material here than Valla could have produced from his own resources. On 6. 434, where Valla makes no attempt to identify the lady who garrulously praises Virgil and practises declamation, the main tradition has no hesitation: 'Statilium Messalinam insectatur', and goes on with a convincing account of that lady's career. Juvenal may not have had Statilia in mind, or any other specific individual, but the guess is certainly a shrewd one, especially in this world of blunders. Again, the *magni delator amici* in 1. 33 (who is presumably meant to be a real figure) is identified briefly by the main tradition with the words 'Heliodorum significat delatorem' and more fully in the Φ scholium and by Valla with the information that Heliodorus was a Stoic and had his own pupil L. Junius Silanus convicted on a charge of conspiracy. Both add as a possible alternative 'Demetrium causidicum, qui multos Neroni detulit', and Valla further suggests an individual described as 'philosophum Traiani' and responsible for the condemnation of Barea, who must in fact be Egnatius Celer, as in 3. 116, where Valla is equally confused. Egnatius is actually named in the scholia on 6. 552, *faciet quod deferat ipse*, with an account of his encouraging Barea's daughter Servilia to indulge in magic (as in Tac. *Ann.* 16. 30. 2, where there is no mention of Egnatius). He appears to fit the circumstances of this latter passage considerably better, although there is no suggestion that here Juvenal has any particular person in mind. In 1. 33, as Duff points out

¹ p. 253. Nevertheless, the original note which Valla quotes for Seneca's early career can hardly have broken off quite so abruptly with the prophecy of Nero's future savagery, when Juvenal's line is concerned only with Seneca's generosity to dependants. The attached note on Piso relevantly refers to his habit of subsidizing poor friends, and the note on Seneca might have been expected to do the same. It should be noticed that there is no note at all on Cotta (Messalinus?) in the same line. He would not have been dealt with in the same work of reference as the other two.

² This is presumably the Lenaeus mentioned in Suet. *Gram.* 15 as a freedman of, and author of an *acerbissima satira* against, Sallust. The fact that Valla credits this reference to 'Probus' does not prove that it is not his own embellishment; on the other

hand, Suetonius could have been exploited at almost any period. Silius, on the other hand, remains unexplained, unless he is Pliny's correspondent Silius Proculus (*Epp.* 3. 15, with a misleading note by Sherwin-White), who wrote libelli. The general confusion about Aurunca may be due to the fact that Juvenal's periphrasis is the only extant evidence for Lucilius' birth-place, unless Ausonius' evidence (*Epist.* 15. 9) can be held to be independent.

³ Sidonius, with his reference to Juvenal's exile in the same poem (272–4), appears to be familiar with a copy complete with *Vita* and scholia. His knowledge of this pair of brothers is more likely to be derived from the latter than from Martial or elsewhere, and his reference will show that this section of the note at least (presumably including the name Scaev(i)us) was already present.

ad loc., the context is entirely Flavian and can hardly concern the prosecutions of Silanus and Barea. There is much to be said for the suggestion mentioned by Ruperti that the arch-delator who frightens such lesser figures as Massa and Carus must be the notorious M. Regulus, notorious enough to be recognizable to readers in Trajan's reign. Nevertheless the scholiast has been able to support his conjecture with the evidence of some sort of document which he quotes. It is a safe inference that some historical source named Heliodorus in connection with the trial of Silanus, and Egnatius in connection with Servilia.

Two other attempts by the scholiast to identify anonymous characters are unquestionably wide of the mark. In 2. 29–30, the *tragico pollutus adulter concubitu* is identified by all the scholia as Claudius, with reference to his marriage to Agrippina—of whom the ΦX version asserts, truly enough, 'quae et Iulia dicta est', so as to explain the name in line 32. Valla, with Φ and μ adds the ingenious theory that Agrippina brought on abortions in order to avoid threatening the succession of the young Nero. The failure to recognize Domitian and Julia, Titi f., in the passage is remarkable; but the scholiasts tend to see Nero everywhere. The allegation of abortion is presumably deduced from Juvenal's words; but the scholium as a whole reveals considerably greater understanding of the complexities of the Julio-Claudian dynasty than is found elsewhere, and is probably based ultimately on some literary source. Likewise there is immense confusion in the notes on 6. 157–8, *hunc dedit olim barbarus incestae, dedit hunc Agrippa sorori*, which claim '*Iuliam neptem Augusti significat*', with accurate details of her marriage to Aemilius Paulus and of her brother Agrippa's banishment (though 'in Sicilia' is evidently wrong). Valla, with some of the minor versions, appears to state that Agrippa committed incest with her and was accordingly banished—the common tradition merely says 'propter morum feritatem'. The main note, which rightly refers *incestae* to Berenice (whose name also occurs in the other versions), reads unusually circumstantially, apart from the claim that Julia was banished twice, so that Syme¹ suggests a confusion with her mother. However wrongly applied, it is clearly based on some authority.

These passages illustrate the concern of the scholiasts rightly or wrongly to identify certain anonymous characters in the satires. Their efforts are not applied to all possible candidates: in the first satire, the married eunuch (22), the rich ex-barber (24), the forger (67), the female poisoner (69), and the Arabarch (103) have no annotation at all. In satires after the first six (where all the examples discussed above occur), there is virtually no more citation of authorities in support of these conjectures. Instead, there are simple notes correctly penetrating such simple disguises as that of *Arpinas* in 8. 245, *virgo* in 8. 264, *Pellaeo* in 10. 168 and *avunculus* in 14. 43. None of these, however, belongs to the same imperial period as the earlier examples. Nor does the Spartan in 13. 199, whom the scholiast is able to relate correctly to Herodotus 6. 86, from whom he actually quotes some words of Greek, nor the *Baptae* in 2. 92, correctly attributed to Eupolis, along with the fiction of his murder by Alcibiades. The one Julio-Claudian reference that he felt required explanation was that in 10. 330, *cui nubere Caesaris uxor destinat*. The name *Messalinae* in 333 made it easy for him; but he brings out the story of C. Silius very competently by quoting word for word a section of Suet. *Cl.* 29. 3.

¹ *Ammianus*, p. 86. The confusion need not be that of the scholiast, who does not seem to be in the habit of collating material from different sources.

Of the scholia containing historical material from sources unknown to us today, those on Agrippa (6. 157) and Licinus (1. 109)¹ belong to the Augustan period and provide no clues as to their origin. The rest are concerned with Neronian or early Flavian personages and contain material which is not to be found in Tacitus or Suetonius. Moreover, they are all attached to the first six satires, not even extending as far as 8. 198, where Valla's commentary dries up completely, with the sad remark 'hic nos iam deserit Probus'. The numerous characters in 7 and 8, on many of whom we are no better informed than the fourth-century scholiast, remain totally unexplained or have notes simply derived from the actual text, as on Rubellius Blandus (8. 39). And while a few of the annotated persons survive into Vespasian's reign or even, as Pegasus (4. 77) does, as late as A.D. 83, none of the truly Domitianic figures are explained at all. Such people as Crispinus, Montanus, Pompeius, Veiento, Catullus, and to all intents and purposes Cornelius Fuscus have no external matter attached to them. Only Palfurius (4. 53) has a note; and that is derived uniquely from Marius Maximus, who provides some biographical material on the occasion of Palfurius' execution under Nerva, with a reference to Armillatus, Demosthenes (?) and Latinus of which the major part has not survived.

For some reason, then, the scholia lack historical notes on the main figures of Domitian's reign, on which so much of the first six satires is based. The Neronian notes which we have, on the other hand, possess certain common features which ten years ago² suggested to me that they bore a close resemblance to the lost historian of whom traces remain in Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Cassius Dio, and whom I conjecturally identified as Cluvius Rufus. Whether that identification was correct or not (and it was confirmed in various ways by later studies of the evidence),³ it seems reasonable to conclude that the source of this group of scholia was a historian who covered the reign of Nero and the early years of Vespasian, and who was exploited by extant writers in the first third of the second century. Although there are ample traces of him in Dio, a century later, it is highly unlikely that he was still available for the compilers of the main commentary in the late fourth century, any more than Turnus was, or Statius' *Bellum Germanicum*, or Pompeius Planta. If such a range of authorities could have been drawn on at that date, it is remarkable that we have nothing on Corbulo (3. 251) or Bruttidius (10. 83) or Narcissus (14. 329), although the commentary on the later satires was still being assembled then, as shown above.

The hypothesis that Cluvius (as I shall call him for the purposes of this argument) and the other authors cited by name were exploited for historical notes at a considerably earlier date than that of the main collection of scholia, makes several features clear. The scholar who drew on them did so to explain problems in the first six satires only, either because he failed to complete the operation or because only the first two books had been published at the time. In either case, it is possible to explain why no direct reference was made to the *Histories* or *Annals* of Tacitus. The former work had appeared by the end of

¹ Likewise that on Sarmentus in 5. 3, with details (not in Valla) which are not found elsewhere (the scholiasts on Hor. *Sat.* 1. 5. 52 know nothing about him). Licinus attracts notes whenever the satirists mention him: viz. Hor. *A.P.* 301 (ps. Acro) and Pers. 2. 35,

though neither is as full as this or based on the same material.

² *Hermes* lxxxviii (1960), 984 ff.

³ *Ibid.* lxxxix (1961), 227 ff., xcii (1964), 467 ff., *A.J.Ph.* lxxxv (1964), 337 ff.

the first decade of the second century,¹ and must have contained the answers to many of the problems concerning the Flavian period that puzzle us today. A scholar annotating his copy of Juvenal perhaps ten years later failed to use the *Histories*, or any other work covering the same period, precisely because Tacitus' books had made the characters and situations described by Juvenal too well known for annotation to be required. They are cited here no more than they are by Suetonius a few years later, and no more than Cicero's *Catilinarians* are cited by Sallust. Commenting on the effeminacy of Otho before Bedriacum (2. 99-107) and directly reminded of the *recenti historia*, where the emperor's character is drawn in much more Roman lines, the scholiast mentions another account of the campaign, by Pompeius Planta (which had in most respects been superseded² by Tacitus) simply for the sake of a topographical detail, 'vicum esse a Cremona vicesimo lapide', which is markedly lacking in Tacitus' version. It should be noticed that the presence of this citation in the scholia, explaining the phrase *Bebriacis campis* in 106, is a sure guarantee of the authenticity of the whole phrase 'summi constantia civis Bebriacis campis', which Nisbet³ believes to be a later gloss.

The lack of reference to the *Annals* cannot be explained in the same way. The Julio-Claudians and their subjects were remote enough to require annotation, and the early scholiast does not appear to assume the same familiarity with them that he does with the Flavian period. Thus an explanation is required for *Lucusta* in 1. 71. Tacitus, who connects her with the poisoning of both Claudius and Britannicus (*Ann.* 12. 66. 2, 13. 15. 3), could have provided a comprehensive note. Instead, we find a version mentioning Britannicus alone, and describing *Lucusta* as a creature of Nero rather than of Agrippina, with details occurring neither in Tacitus nor in Suetonius (particularly *Lucusta's* Gallic origin), which appears to be derived from Cluvius Rufus,⁴ who seems to have portrayed Claudius as poisoned by Halotus with a drink. In addition, we have the one surviving fragment of the satirist Turnus, following the same account, as if to give it precedence over the alternative account, as given by the elder Pliny,⁵ whereby Agrippina engineered the death of Claudius with poisoned mushrooms. Suetonius (*Cl.* 44. 2, *Nero* 33. 1, 39. 3) is aware of both versions, referring to them independently; Tacitus (*Ann.* 12. 66. 2-67. 2) blends the two into a single complex story, which is unknown to, or ignored by, the author of the scholium. Only Valla mentions 'Tranquillus et Tacitus' as authorities for *Lucusta*, but he does not in fact modify the note of 'Probus' on that account. Likewise the *Annals* might have given convenient information on *Piso* (5. 109) or *Tigellinus* (1. 155), where the actual scholia clearly have another origin; and that on *Seneca* (5. 109) gives an account of the

¹ Syme, *Tacitus*, pp. 118-20. It is probably referred to in *Juv.* 2. 102-3 in connection with Otho's conduct in the field, with details which Tacitus does not relate.

² The main tradition says 'scripsit Cornelius, scripsit et Pompeius Planta'. Valla typically improves on this with 'post Cornelium vero (ut Probus ait) Pompeius Planta'. In fact, Planta was dead by about A.D. 109 (*Plin. Epp.* 9. 1. 1-4) and probably wrote considerably nearer the event. The drift of the original note appears to have been

'In addition to Tacitus' *Histories*, Planta described the campaign and reported . . .'

³ *J.R.S.* lii (1962), 234-5.

⁴ *Hermes* lxxxviii (1960), 110.

⁵ *N.H.* 22. 92, with *Mart.* 1. 20. 4, both attributing the murder to Agrippina without mention of *Lucusta*. Juvenal (5. 147, 6. 620) follows the same tradition; although where he mentions *Lucusta*, it is in connection with the poisoning of husbands (1. 72 *nigros efferre maritos*), rather than of stepsons.

philosopher's appointment as tutor to Nero which does not correspond to that in Tacitus (*Ann.* 12. 8. 2).¹ All that can be said in favour of the scholiast's choice of authorities is that, in an age without indexes or reliable lexicons, Tacitus would have proved an extremely difficult author from whom to extract the sort of brief summary which was suitable for inserting in the margin of an ancient codex.

More significant, perhaps, is the likelihood that the *Annals* would not have been particularly suitable to provide annotation on the satires, simply because Juvenal's treatment of Nero in particular does not accord with that which was to become canonical in the more or less common version of Tacitus and Suetonius. In the catalogue of Nero's crimes in 8. 211–20, showing the degeneracy of the aristocratic emperor, the emphasis is all on the murder of relatives and on the composition and performance of poetry. There is no hint of the charge of setting fire to Rome, first traceable in the *Octavia* (831), which Tacitus is more than half inclined to accept (*Ann.* 15. 38 ff.) and which Suetonius accepts without question (*Nero* 38. 1), so that in the later tradition (Eutropius 7. 14, Orosius 7. 7. 4–7) it tends to become the most notorious of all his acts. Again, in 2. 117 ff., Juvenal describes the marriage of an aristocratic Gracchus to a male bridegroom, with all the conventional trappings of a Roman wedding, such as the dress and veil (124), and emphasis on the public nature of the event. In Tacitus the same story is attached to Nero (15. 37. 8–9, with Suet. *Nero* 29); and again the details of bridal veil and publicity are stressed, although the prose writers go one better than Juvenal in respect of the latter. When Nero plays so prominent a part in Juvenal as the type of the degenerate tyrant, or specifically as the model for Domitian, it is extraordinary that the satirist should have detached the story from Nero and allowed it to belong to an ordinary *nobilis* such as Gracchus. The explanation can only be that he had never encountered the story of Nero's male marriage, or at least not in a writer who carried any weight.²

Details which Juvenal may have taken over from the later books of the *Annals* are very scanty, although Syme³ does his best to swell the number. Lateranus in 8. 146 ff. is clearly not the Plautius Lateranus portrayed in *Ann.* 15. 49: his tastes are quite different, he actually holds the consulship (8. 148), and he seems to be in line for a province which resembles the Flavian Capadocia (169) rather than any Julio-Claudian command. Camerinus (7. 90) is mentioned simply as an aristocrat and possible patron, without any reference to his doom in 67, which is, as Syme recognizes, not recorded in the *Annals* as we have them—and he would prefer to believe that it never was.⁴ The account of Barea's prosecution and death in 3. 116 vaguely recalls Tacitus' version in 16. 32, but there is nothing to suggest that Juvenal needed to wait for the last section of the *Annals* to appear before he completed his first book. All the evidence supports the view that nothing in the first nine satires displays any acquaintance with the Tacitean version. Satire 10 may be another matter, containing as it does a vivid account of the fall of Sejanus (58 ff.), which may owe something to the lost section of *Annals* 6. Syme draws particular attention to the name of Bruttidius in 83, and argues that so obscure a character must

¹ Cf. p. 379 n. 1 above.

² Nor does Juvenal notice the allegation of attempted incest with Agrippina, first made by Fabius Rusticus (*Tac. Ann.* 14. 2–3) and

taken up by Suetonius (*Nero* 28. 2), Dio (61. 11. 3) and the epitomators (*Vict. Caes.* 5. 8, *Epit.* 5. 5).

³ *Tacitus*, pp. 776–7.

⁴ p. 687.

have been mentioned in Tacitus' version (as he is already in 3. 66. 4) if he was to mean anything to a reader so many years after the event. This is plausible enough; but the event was described in the first hexad of the *Annals*, and it recurs in Juvenal's penultimate book. It could be argued that the reference to Silius, the lover of Messalina, in 10. 329 ff., would be comprehensible only to a reader familiar with Tacitus' second hexad, or that to Sporus (if it is to him) in 306-7 of the same satire to a reader of the now lost ending of the *Annals*; but there is nothing distinctively Tacitean about either.

It seems likely then that neither Juvenal, when he wrote his earlier satires, nor the scholar who wrote in notes to the first two books had read Tacitus' *Annals*, although they were both familiar with the *Histories*. The reason for this need not necessarily be one of chronology. It is noticeable that at least until the end of the fourth century references to the latter work far outnumber those to the former. Of all the testimonia and quotations from this period listed most conveniently by Mendell,¹ only two indicate any knowledge of the text of the *Annals*: Ptolemy's curious echo of 4. 73. 1 *ad sua tutanda*, which in 2. 11. 12 he takes to be the name of a town; and Sulpicius Severus' verbatim citation of 15. 37. 8 and 44. 6 within a chapter's length of his *Chronica* (2. 28. 2-29. 2). He, or his immediate source, has had his attention drawn to Tacitus' one reference to Christianity; and while perusing the account of the Fire (evidently in a full text of the fifteenth book at least) has noted in the immediately preceding chapter one of the most outrageous scandals concerning the persecutor, the marriage to Pythagoras. Otherwise it is noteworthy how often Orosius refers to the *Histories* and never to the *Annals*; which can hardly have been regularly attached to the *Histories* to form a single sequence of thirty books as suggested by Jerome (*Comm. Zach.* 14. 1. 2 = Migne, p. 1597). Perhaps because Tacitus did not live to complete his last work, or at least to see it reach the public, the *Annals* appear to have enjoyed a considerably smaller circulation than the *Histories*.

It is possible, therefore, that the reason why the *Annals* are nowhere referred to in the first series of notes is simply the fortuitous failure of the early scholar to come across a rare copy of that work. However that may be, his notes must still fall within a few years of the completion of Tacitus' last books, late in Trajan's reign or early in Hadrian's. The *Histories* must still have been familiar enough to justify the lack of quotation from them; the ephemeral² *German War* of Statius must still have been available, as well as the satires of Turnus and the history of Planta, of which no later traces are to be found. Moreover, the lack of annotations of this sort on any satire after the sixth is most easily explained if the work was undertaken before the appearance even of the third book. If Juvenal's reflection in 4. 103, *facile est barbato imponere regi*, is unlikely to have been made in that form after the accession of Hadrian, the first bearded emperor, a satisfactory date for the insertion of the first scholia will be a few years before or after the death of Trajan, followed shortly by the third book of the satires and the last books of the *Annals*, whether or not Syme is right³ in recognizing references to Hadrian in the latter. Such a date will have the advantage of accounting for the absence of a note on Corbulo in 3. 251, which was to cause such perplexity to the fourth-century compilers. Corbulo's

¹ Tacitus (1957), pp. 225-34.

² Yet the *Silvae*, often equally topical and equally defaced by flattery, were to survive

much longer (e.g. Sidonius, *Carm.* 22, *ep.* 6).

³ Tacitus, pp. 498, 771.

daughter Domitia, the widow of Domitian and supposed mistress of Titus, was certainly still alive as late as A.D. 126,¹ and was sufficiently well known (to judge from Suet. *Tit.* 10. 2, written presumably after her death) for her father's memory to be kept alive. There was no need to refer to *Annals* xiii–xvi to be reminded of his strength and generalship.

At some date in the fourth century, when one or more scholars set about elucidating the meaning of the now popular satires, there appears to have been only a single copy in existence:² a copy of which the last pages were already missing, so that 16. 60 breaks off in the middle of a sentence. At least, there was only one copy as complete as this—otherwise the deficient one would have been made good. There may still have been another codex available, containing the first two books alone, with their accompanying notes in the hand of the first owner, or a copy of that codex. Whether the notes were attached to the full text or to this partial one, they served as the basis of the new commentary, probably a predecessor rather than a successor of Servius' great commentary on Virgil.³ The scholiasts seem to have had little good material at their disposal, apart from the corpus of grammarians: perhaps they did not look very far. Marius Maximus' life of Nerva, much in vogue at that period, provided one or two details only,⁴ for Juvenal hardly draws on events after the death of Domitian, and Marius may have failed to mention in his *Trajan* the prosecution of that earlier Marius in A.D. 100—it is hard to see how the information given by the Φ scholium on 1. 49 could have fallen out completely if it had been incorporated at this date. A reference to Tacitus was pilfered from Orosius or his source, as if from the *Histories* directly. Suetonius, brought into prominence by the activities of the Augustan historians, was probably used directly for the muddled note on Posides in 14. 91, for that on Messalina in 10. 330 (a verbatim quotation, not acknowledged), and perhaps for some of the material on *Flavius . . . ultimus* and *calvo . . . Neroni* in 4. 37–8, as well as that on *Caprearum* in 10. 93.⁵ But while he was evidently read at this time, he is not an easy writer to exploit systematically, and the scholiasts were not systematic or discriminating.

Suetonius is likewise generally credited with the biographic material cited on Crispus in 4. 81, as an extract from his *de Oratoribus*, on the strength of Jerome's item under A.D. 41: 'Passienus filius fraude heredis suae necatur.' This appears to be derived from the same sentence as that on which the end of the scholium is based: 'periit per fraudem Agrippinae, quam heredem reliquerat.' Otherwise this note might be derived from Cluvius Rufus, or some similar writer, along with the other excerpts made by the first commentator. But it would be unusual for him to have bothered to explain the identity of a Domitianic figure so prominent as Vibius Crispus, and almost inconceivable that he would have been guilty of introducing material concerning Passienus Crispus,

¹ Syme in *J.R.S.* lx (1970), 39, *Tacitus*, p. 780.

² So Hightet, *Juvenal the satirist*, pp. 187, 300 n. 18.

³ Syme, *Ammianus*, p. 87.

⁴ Alan Cameron, reviewing Syme's *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* in *JRS* lxi (1971), 266, suggests that the statement in *SHA Marcus* 11. 4 that the emperor fixed the earnings of *scaenici* at five *aurei* is derived,

like the similar note on Juv. 7. 243, from Marius Maximus. J. Schwartz, in *Historia* xv (1966), 458 had argued that the *SHA* passage came from the Scholiast: but it is fuller and is firmly bedded in a continuous section on reforms.

⁵ The note on Caesonina (6. 615) may be derived directly from *Cal.* 25. 3 and 50. 2 or from one of the lost epitomators.

dead (as his source must have told him) early in Nero's reign and not available for the cabinet of Domitian.¹ This gross confusion is all too typical of the fourth-century scholiast, less capable of observing the improbability of a career stretching from Tiberius to Domitian and the anomaly of Crispus' date of demise. Suetonius' literary biographies were certainly available at this period, when Jerome drew on them for his chronological table.² It is a pity that the scholiast did not have occasion to quote anything else from them; unless the brief note on Palaemon in 6. 452, 'grammatici, magistri Quintiliani oratoris', derives from the biography, not of Palaemon himself (which, preserved in *Gram.* 23, contains no mention of pupils),³ but of Quintilian, of which two fragments are found in Jerome.⁴ There is no trace in the scholia of any of Suetonius' other *virī illustres*, unless the mysterious entry on Isaëus (3. 74) comes from a lost entry on him or on Quintilian. Quintilian himself was evidently still too well known to need annotation.

This appears to be the sum of the sources exploited for the main body of the scholia; and their paucity contrasts strikingly with the still not very ample resources of the first commentator. It may be impossible to assert with confidence to which stratum any particular item belongs, especially since the collection has evidently been subject to unpredictable accretions and losses right down to the time of Valla. This factor in particular makes the argument from silence vulnerable; but the contrast between the coverage afforded to Neronian figures and that to Domitianic is striking enough to be independent of the hazards of transmission. It appears safe to postulate two main periods when scholia were written in to the text: shortly after the appearance of satires 1-6, and towards the end of the fourth century. At neither period were the commentators particularly intelligent or well informed. Juvenal's contemporary chose his material with a curious lack of discrimination,⁵ apart

¹ Syme, *Amianus*, pp. 86-7, 185 (and independently J. Schwartz in *Ant. Class.* xxxiii [1964], 423) points out the curious coincidence of an apparently fictitious governor of Africa, Vibius Passienus in *Tyr. trig.* 29. 1, and attributes the conflation of the two Crispi to 'confused erudition', based on the appearance of both names in the more or less contemporary Juvenalian scholia. In the present state of the scholia, no version contains either name, until Valla adds the correct 'Vibius'. Presumably the Suetonian *Vita* contained 'Passienus', as shown by the fragments in Jerome, but this has fallen out. An earlier and more accurate annotation may simply have inserted 'Vibius' against either 4. 81 or the passage of Statius quoted on 4. 94. Such a bare key to identity, adequate for a reader in Hadrian's reign, would be empty enough in the fourth century to encourage the scholiast to welcome further information, however irrelevant, which would in due course squeeze out the original name.

² It is noticeable that the only scholium on Persius containing plausible historical information (apart from that on Licinus mentioned in p. 381 n. 1 above, and notes

of dubious validity on Cotta Messalinus in 2. 72 and Glyco in 5. 9) describes the death of Caesius Bassus (6. 1) during the eruption of Vesuvius, as if from Suetonius' life of that poet. This would be the only item from a post-Neronian poet to survive from that work, since Jerome mentions no poet later than Lucan; but cannot be taken as evidence that Suetonius carried his *de Poetis* down as far as this. The Juvenalian scholia have nothing at 7. 80 on the other Flavian poets, Serranus and Saleius, who do not occur in Jerome.

³ His other known pupil, Persius, is mentioned only in the biography of the satirist attributed to Probus.

⁴ Roth, p. 272. In the same way, Jerome's note on M. Antonius Liberalis (A.D. 50) states 'magnas inimicitias cum Palaemone exercet', although there is no mention of this, nor of any sort of disputes, in Palaemon's own biography. Suetonius clearly intended the *de Grammaticis* to be read as a whole, without continuous cross-references from one life to another.

⁵ The passages he quotes continually fail to throw any real light on the passage to

from the one moment of insight when he saw the relevance of Statius' account of Domitian's cabinet to Juvenal's in the fourth satire. His successors were the worse equipped for their task in that much material had been lost during something over two hundred years of declining scholarship, and they made poor use of what was still available, falling well short even of Servius, for all his shortcomings. It remains a marvel that a poet so badly understood, both in his basic meaning and in his satirical intentions, should have been so widely read in the ensuing centuries.

University of Durham

G. B. TOWNEND

which they are attached. Valla's note on Pallas (1. 109) breaks off his career with the intrigue with Agrippina and says nothing of his great wealth, though that of Licinus is duly recorded. The reference in 5. 36 to Thræsea and Helvidius drinking toasts to the tyrannicides is not amplified at all in the notes as Valla gives them. Likewise, it

would have been helpful on 1. 155 to be told something of Tigellinus' career after his first acquisition of influence over Nero. It is always possible that certain of the longer extracts (like that from Statius on 4. 94, which begins in the middle of a sentence) were simply curtailed early in the tradition for reasons of space.