

agent, but as those of an agent of her husband. This may make her a less romantic figure, but no less interesting.¹⁸

Cardiff University

SHAUN TOUGHER
toughersf@cardiff.ac.uk

¹⁸ And perhaps more realistic as a late antique empress: see R. W. Burgess, 'The accession of Marcian in the light of Chalcedonian apologetic and monophysite polemic', *BZ* 86/87 (1993–94), 47–68, esp. 68, who concludes that Pulcheria was in fact manipulated by Aspar and, 'far from being a proto-Irene', Pulcheria was 'in reality, one of the last of the Roman aristocratic wives and daughters, mere tools in the dynastic plans of the men who married them and gave them away'.

A NOTE ON JUVENCUS 4. 286

Huemer's text:

At vos, iniusti, iustis succedite flammis
et poenis semper mentem torrete malignam, 285
quas pater horrendis barathri per stagna profundis
Daemonis horrendi sociis ipsique paravit.

286 horrendi AK₁K₂T baratris R¹ profundi R²TBHl

The confusion of the MSS is well justified; something has gone very wrong here. Even if 'horrendis . . . profundis' could be plausibly construed, the repetition 'horrendis . . . horrendi' is impossibly clumsy, and it seems obvious that one or the other does not belong here. I suggest that the interloper is the 'horrendis' of line 286, which probably derives from a simple eye-skip to '*horrendi sociis*' below.¹ The likely corollary is that the correct reading at the end of the line is 'profundi', later altered in an attempt to accommodate the intrusive 'horrendis'. This approach would seem to be confirmed by the frequency of the clausula 'stagna profundis' in the Latin hexameter (cf. Lucan 2.571, 8.853, 9.305, Sil. 7.282, 378, 10.590, Avien. *Arat.* 991, Claud. 8.596, Coripp. *Ioh.* 6.23).²

If this diagnosis is correct, one is inevitably led to ask what word 'horrendis' has ousted in line 286. It is tempting to try to supply an epithet for 'pater', and an appealing candidate would be 'aeternus'.³ Juvencus uses the word eighteen times (six times in this metrical position); it modifies 'pater' at 3.203. Alternatively, one might try 'aeternas'.⁴ The collocation with 'poenae' appears elsewhere in our poet (4.677, cf. 4.304f.), and might be defended by reference to the passage Juvencus is paraphrasing, *Matth.* 25.41: 'discedite a me maledicti in ignem *aeternum* quem paravit pater meus diabolo et angelis eius'.⁵ Against this, it might be argued that the sense of 'aeternum' in the original is already rendered adequately by 'semper' in 285. But the redundancy

¹ Alternatively, one might hypothesize a supralinear correction of 'horrendi' in 287 to 'horrendis', which was then mistakenly absorbed into the line above.

² In all these cases, admittedly, 'profundi' is the substantive (= 'maris,' 'aquae').

³ Juvencus does use 'pater' alone in this sense (e.g. at 1.365), so that an epithet is not absolutely demanded.

⁴ For the separation of 'quas' and 'aeternas' cf. e.g. 1.35 'ego quem Dominus . . . ante suos vultus voluit parere *ministrum*'.

⁵ A. Jülicher, *Itala I²* (Berlin, 1972); *sim.* Vulgate.

has a rhetorical point: the damned will suffer in perpetuity, for the torments that await them are more than merely temporal ones.

Whatever the true reading may be, it seems clear that ‘profundi’ should be read, and ‘horrendis’ obelized.⁶

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Munich/University of Illinois

GREGORY HAYS
hays1@uiuc.edu

⁶ I am grateful to Dr Heyworth, and to my colleagues Drs Nigel Holmes and Manfred Flieger, for comments on earlier drafts.