VI.—Claudian's *In Rufinum* and the Rhetorical Ψόγος

HARRY L. LEVY

HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Claudian's panegyrics have been shown to be strongly influenced by the rhetorical σχῆμα of the ἐγκώμιον. This paper studies the extent to which the closely related σχῆμα of the ψόγος (*vituperatio*) influenced Claudian in his composition of the invective *In Rufinum*. It is found that the poem as a whole is not a rhetorically patterned ψόγος, but a brief historic epic containing a preponderance of vituperative material; that Claudian's treatment of this material betrays the influence of the ψόγος pattern; that the interpretation of certain portions of the *In Rufinum* is aided by studying them with reference to that pattern.

Claudian's panegyrics have received considerable study as examples of the ἐγκώμιον constructed according to the rules and patterns prescribed by the rhetoricians of the Second Sophistic.[1] Both Struthers and Fargues have found in the panegyric *De Quarto Consulatu Honorii Augusti*, taken in its entirety, an almost perfect example of a rhetorically constructed ἐγκώμιον.[2] The encomiums on Honorius' third and sixth consulships follow the traditional pattern with almost as great fidelity; Claudian's remaining panegyrics, though less markedly patterned, still display ample evidence of their construction on the basis of the same rhetorical σχῆμα.[3]

Now in the teachings of the rhetoricians, the ψόγος or *vituperatio* is treated in close connection with the ἐγκώμιον or *laus*.[4] The patterns prescribed for the two genres are identical, save that in the ψόγος each τόπος is to be treated as an occasion for revilement instead of as a theme of eulogy. The question naturally arises, to what extent was Claudian influenced in the composition of his

---

[1] L. B. Struthers, "The Rhetorical Structure of the Encomia of Claudius Claudian," *HSPh* 30 (1919) 49–87; P. Fargues, *Claudien* (Paris, 1933) 191–218. Cf. T. C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," *Chicago Studies in Classical Philology*, 3 (1902) 113–37.

[2] Struthers, "Rhet. Str." 86; Fargues, *Claudien* 214 f.

[3] In addition to the poems on Honorius' consulates, both Struthers and Fargues analyze the panegyrics on Probinus and Olybrius, on Manlius Theodorus, and on Serena; Struthers also studies the pseudo-Claudianean *Laus Herculis*, while Fargues analyzes as a panegyric the first two books *De Consulatu Stilichonis*.

[4] Cf. Quint. 2.4.20, 3.7.19; L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* (hereafter cited as *RG*) 2.11.28–30 (ps.-Hermogenes); 2.40.10 f. (Aphthonius); 2.112.17 f. (Theo); 2.505.2 f. (ps.-Aristides); 3.3.20–23 (Alexander); 3.482.11 f. (Nicolaus). Cf. also W. Stegemann in *RE* s.v. "Nikolaos (Rhetor)" 436.37–41.

invectives by the very patterns and rules which he followed so closely in writing his panegyrics? As regards the invective *In Rufinum*, the question is briefly discussed by Fargues in an interesting and instructive paragraph.[5] The French scholar himself, however, elsewhere[6] calls for further study of the *In Rufinum* along the same lines. The present paper is the result of such a study.

Let us first consider the rhetorical pattern to which reference has several times been made. Though the various rhetoricians differ somewhat as to the main divisions of the ἐγκώμιον (and hence of the ψόγος), the headings enumerated by Aphthonius may be taken as fairly representative of the traditional scheme.[7] Aphthonius' τόποι are six: 1. προοίμιον, or Prologue; 2. γένος, or Race and Genealogy; 3. ἀνατροφή, or Nurture and Education; 4. πράξεις, or Deeds; 5. σύγκρισις, or Comparison; and 6. ἐπίλογος, or Epilogue.

It is a great temptation to analyze the entire *In Rufinum* as a ψόγος in accord with the foregoing pattern. The poem has a well defined προοίμιον (1.1–24) and ἐπίλογος (2.454–527); as we shall see presently, three of the remaining four τόποι (ἀνατροφή, πράξεις, and σύγκρισις) are represented, while the absence of a section corresponding to γένος may be accounted for without too much difficulty·

There are, however, two unavoidable obstacles which preclude such an analysis of the poem as a whole. The first arises from the very considerable portions of the *In Rufinum* which cannot, without Procrustean violence, be subordinated to any of the traditional headings; the second has to do with the general structure of the poem.

I. Any analysis of the *In Rufinum* under the τόποι of the ψόγος must leave out of consideration three important parts of the poem:

(A) The Fury episode: 1.25–175. The verses cited, comprising almost half the first book, narrate a conspiracy of the Furies against the peace and happiness of mankind. It was as a direct result of this conspiracy, according to Claudian, that Rufinus was brought to his position of power in the Roman world. There is no place in the traditional scheme of the ψόγος for such a narrative.

---

[5] Fargues, *Claudien* 220 f. On the question of a similar study of the *In Eutropium*, cf. note 31, below.

[6] *REA* 38 (1936) 371.

[7] *RG* 2.36.7–19 (Aphthonius; cf. 2.40.14–17). Cf. *RG* 2.12.7–13.5 (ps.-Hermogenes); 2.111.11–112.8 (Theo); 3.413.10 f., 420.11–421.3 (Menander); 3.479.27–481.27 (Nicolaus). Cf. also Burgess, "Epid. Lit." 122–28; Struthers, "Rhet. Str." 50–52; Fargues, *Claudien* 197–209.

(B) The elements of a panegyric on Stilicho: 1.259–300, 332–53, 372–87, 2.1–6, 101–29, 171–292.[8] Though the first group of verses cited (1.259–300) may, as we shall see, be regarded as constituting the σύγκρισις of a ψόγος, the rest, comprising over 175 verses, would have to be considered extraneous.

(C) The famous account of Rufinus' murder and dismemberment: 2.384–453. This account provides the poem with its emotional climax. As is the case with the Fury episode, these verses could not be classified under any of the six τόποι without doing wholly unwarranted violence to their interpretation.

II. In addition to these specific difficulties, there is a more general one. The rhetorical σχῆμα, by its very nature, envisages a topical treatment,[9] while the *In Rufinum* is constructed for the most part along chronological lines. Even where, as in 1.176–353, Claudian departs in his presentation of events from the strict order of their occurrence,[10] he maintains the effect of a chronological account through the use of narrative tenses (1.220: Crescebat, 1.256: Deiecerat) and of the temporal adverb *iam* (1.305, 308). In the second book, the treatment is genuinely chronological from start to finish. Thus the *In Rufinum*, like the *De Bello Gildonico* and the *De Bello Gothico*, has the general structure of a historical epic.[11]

Does this necessarily mean that the rhetorical ψόγος pattern is completely to be disregarded in our study of the *In Rufinum?* If we may be guided by the analogy of the *De Bello Gildonico* and the *De Bello Gothico*, we shall answer that question in the negative. Each of the poems last mentioned, though planned along epic lines, contains a great deal of encomiastic material. Fargues' analysis of this material shows clearly that Claudian was influenced in its composition by the traditional pattern of the ἐγκώμιον, even to the point of introducing into one passage a topic called for by the σχῆμα,

---

[8] A. Kurfess, *Hermes* 76 (1941) 94, discusses Claudian's abrupt transition from vituperation to eulogy.

[9] *RG* 2.112.3–5 (Theo): τὰς πράξεις . . . παραληψόμεθα οὐκ ἐφεξῆς διηγούμενοι· λέγοντες γὰρ ἄλλα προστίθεμεν κατὰ μίαν ἑκάστην ἀρετήν; Burgess, "Epid. Lit." 116.

[10] Thus Stilicho's campaign of A.D. 392 at the River Hebrus (cf. E. Stein, *Geschichte des Spätrömischen Reiches* [Vienna, 1928] 301) is narrated in verses 316–53, while the murder of Lucianus, which took place either in the next year or in 395 (cf. H. L. Levy, *The Invective In Rufinum of Claudius Claudianus* [Geneva, N. Y., 1935] 21, note 133), is referred to in verses 240 f. The civil disqualification of the Lycians figures in an earlier passage (232 f.) than the execution of Proculus and the banishment of Tatianus (246–49): for the reverse historical sequence of these events, cf. Stein, *op. cit.* 327.

[11] Fargues, *Claudien* 216.

but otherwise quite unrelated to the subject at hand.[12] There is
nothing inherently improbable, then, in the theory of a rhetorical
sub-pattern, so to speak, operating within the general framework
of a brief historic epic. Let us then examine the vituperative
material of the *In Rufinum* with a view to discovering whether its
composition betrays the influence of the six rhetorical τόποι which
we listed above.

I. προοίμιον. The *In Rufinum* has, as we mentioned before, a well-
defined exordium (1.1–24). However, the specific influence of the
ψόγος pattern at this point cannot be measured, since the rhetoricians
do not assign particular topics for the προοίμιον of the ἐγκώμιον or of
the ψόγος.[13] The mere existence of a προοίμιον, of course, proves
nothing.

II. γένος. This is the one τόπος of Aphthonius' ψόγος pattern
which is entirely unrepresented in the *In Rufinum*. Nowhere in
the poem does Claudian disparage Rufinus' ethnic or genealogical
background. This omission does not in itself, however, necessarily
constitute a departure from rhetorical precept. The rhetoricians
expressly sanction the omission (παράλειψις) of a τόπος for which
material is either unsuitable or lacking.[14] Such a situation appar-
ently occurs here. Ethnically, Rufinus was a Gaul, and Claudian
was bound to treat the Gauls with respect as constituting an im-
portant element in Stilicho's army, as well as at the court of Hono-
rius.[15] The omission of an attack on genealogical grounds might
perhaps be explicable in a similar manner, for it is possible that
Rufinus was related to some of the Gallic courtiers just mentioned.
It is more likely, however, that Claudian lacked the information
which would have enabled him to deal in detail with Rufinus' family
connections. Such was the predicament — from the opposite point
of view — of the sophist Libanius, who declares himself hampered
in his projected panegyric on Rufinus by the lack of data on the
latter's genealogy, among other things.[16]

---

[12] *Ibid.* 217.

[13] Cf. *RG* 2.36.9, 40.14 (Aphthonius); 2.111.12 f. (Theo); 3.450.18–22, 479.27–30
(Nicolaus). Menander (*RG* 3.368.8–17) gives more specific suggestions for the
προοίμιον of the βασιλικὸς λόγος but they are not such as can be reversed for use in a ψόγος.

[14] Cf. *RG* 2.505.17–27 (ps.-Aristides); 3.370.9–13 (Menander). Cf. also Struthers,
"Rhet. Str." 64, 69, 81; Fargues, *Claudien* 216.

[15] Cf. *In Ruf.* 2.105, 110–14; *4 Cons. Hon.* 582 f.; *Cons. Manl. Theod.* Pr. 8; *Epith.*
119 f.

[16] Liban. *Ep.* 1025 (= Foerster 11.214.7–11): ὃ δὲ ᾔτησα μὲν . . . πολλάκις, . . .
τοῦτο καὶ νῦν δέομαι δοθῆναί μοι, τίνων τε ἐγένου γονέων καὶ τὰν τοῖς διδασκαλείοις ἔργα

III. ἀνατροφή.   Thus far our results have been entirely nega-
tive.   It is in the consideration of the third τόπος that our investiga-
tion first bears positive fruit, for the *In Rufinum* does contain a
section devoted to Rufinus' nurture and education (1.92–111).
We are told (1.92–95) that the new-born child was nurtured on the
milk of the Fury Megaera, and also (1.97–111) that he went to
school to the same Megaera to learn from her all the *dolos artesque
nocendi*.   In this account we can certainly discern the prescribed
vituperative inversion of the encomiastic τόπος, for the rhetoricians'
stock example under this head of the ἐγκώμιον is the nurture of
Achilles on the marrow of lions' bones, and his education at the
hands of the wise old Centaur Chiron.[17]   Nor is this all.   Claudian
(1.101–11) makes a point of Rufinus' ready absorption of Megaera's
instruction, and of his natural aptitude (1.110: ingenio) for evil.
Now Aphthonius mentions as a sub-topic under ἀνατροφή the re-
cital of ἐπιτηδεύματα, or favorite pursuits.[18]   Menander says that
this recital should provide an indication of character as revealed by
preference (ἔνδειξις τοῦ ἤθους καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως),[19] which is exactly
what Claudian accomplishes in the eleven verses last cited.

IV. πράξεις.   An account of the subject's deeds forms, according
to Aphthonius,[20] the most important section of the ἐγκώμιον, and
hence, presumably, of the ψόγος.   A major portion of the *In Rufinum*
is in fact devoted to the misdeeds of Rufinus, starting with the
intrigues which he is said to have commenced immediately upon his
arrival at Theodosius' court (1.176–78), and ending with the vain
attempt at usurpation which just preceded his death (2.381–83).
However, we find no such elaborate topical schematization as that
which Aphthonius prescribes, with its three sub-topics, each further
divided into two or three subordinate headings.[21]   On the other
hand, this portion of the poem is not altogether lacking in indica-

δι' ὅσων πεπόρευσαι.   Note that the subjects mentioned correspond to the topics
γένος and ἀνατροφή.   Cf. *Ep.* 1029 (= Foerster 11.218.12–14): βοηθήσατ' οὖν οἱ εἰδότες
τῷ οὐκ εἰδότι καὶ γράψαντες ἐπιστείλατε καὶ φεύγοντα τὴν τούτων διδασκαλίαν τὸν ἄνδρα
(*sc.* τὸν 'Ρουφῖνον) ἐπαναγκάζοντες.   Cf. O. Seeck, *Hermes* 41 (1906) 482 f.; Levy,
op. cit. (see note 10) 16 f.

   [17] Cf. *RG* 2.12.10 f. (ps.-Hermogenes); 3.371.24 (Menander); 3.481.9 f. (Nicolaus).
Cf. also Liban. *Progymn.* 8.3.2, 9.1.3 (= Foerster 8.236.5–10, 283.4 f.).

   [18] *RG* 2.36.11 f. (Aphthonius).   Cf. also *RG* 3.384.20 f. (Menander); 3.481.10–12
(Nicolaus); and Quint. 3.7.15.

   [19] *RG* 3.384.20 f.

   [20] *RG* 2.36.12 f.   Cf. also *RG* 2.12.18 f. (ps.-Hermogenes).

   [21] *RG* 2.36.12–16.

tions of rhetorical patterning. Menander and others counsel a dichotomy of πράξεις into (1) those concerned with peace and (2) those concerned with war. They also recommend that the πράξεις be treated with reference to the four virtues of ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη, σωφροσύνη, and φρόνησις: the last three, says Menander, belong particularly to ὁ λόγος ὁ περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης.[22] Rufinus' misdeeds with regard to civil affairs (his πράξεις κατ' εἰρήνην) are indeed all treated in a continuous series (1.176–258), though from the standpoint of chronology a passage dealing with military events should have interrupted the recital.[23] A grouping of the πράξεις κατ' εἰρήνην with reference to the three prescribed virtues (here in the antithetical sense, of course) may also be discerned. First the order is that given by Menander, then there is a chiastic repetition of δικαιοσύνη and σωφροσύνη, as follows:

(1) δικαιοσύνη: 1.176–82. Rufinus' injustice is shown by the immediate departure of righteousness (1.177: ilicet ambitio nasci, discedere rectum) upon his arrival at Theodosius' court; righteousness is replaced by ambition, venality, the betrayal of secrets, and the exaggeration of minor frictions.

(2) σωφροσύνη: 1.183–95. At the opposite pole from a wise moderation is Rufinus' insatiable lust for wealth. He is like an ocean, absorbing the flow of countless tributaries without ever feeling the increase; jewels and landed property, the fruits of the soil, the wealth of the living and the dead, the spoils of the inhabited world, all pour into his mansion to enrich his private empire.

(3) φρόνησις: 1.196–219. Rufinus' intelligence is impugned by the charge that he is insanely lacking in comprehension of the proper ends which the material possessions of mankind should serve.

(2a) σωφροσύνη: 1.220–29. The acquisition of loot serves only to whet Rufinus' thirst for more; he bursts forth in uncontrolled fury at any refusal of his exorbitant demands.

(1a) δικαιοσύνη: 1.230–58. Rufinus is guilty of a cruel and wanton perversion of judicial process.

So much for the πράξεις κατ' εἰρήνην. I suggest that it may fairly be maintained that both the agglomeration of these deeds into a single section and their arrangement within the section betray the influence of the rhetorical ψόγος pattern.

[22] *RG* 3.372.25–376.31 (Menander). Cf. also *RG* 2.112.2–8 (Theo); 3.481.12–20 (Nicolaus). Note especially *RG* 3.375.6–8 (Menander).

[23] Cf. the first sentence of note 10, above.

The remaining misdeeds of Rufinus which Claudian recounts may, with some latitude, be classified as πράξεις κατὰ πόλεμον, for they are all more or less connected with military affairs: 1.301–31, 354–67, 2.7–99, 130–70, 293–383. Implicit throughout is the imputation of a lack of ἀνδρεία, the virtue especially appropriate to these πράξεις; the charge is explicitly made in two places. In 2.50–53, Rufinus is branded as the craven betrayer (proditor . . . iners) of an empire won by generations of valorous Romans; in 2.130–40 he is portrayed as pallid with fright at Stilicho's approach.

V. σύγκρισις. A single over-all comparison, as distinguished from incidental comparisons ornamenting the various parts of the work, is a set feature of the pattern prescribed by Aphthonius and by Menander.[24] In a different connection, Aphthonius distinguishes two types of σύγκρισις: (1) a double laudation (διπλοῦν ἐγκώμιον), a comparison, that is, of two praiseworthy subjects,[25] and (2) a vituperation compounded of praise and blame (ψόγος ἐξ ἐγκωμίου καὶ ψόγου συγκείμενος).[26]• In 1.259–300 we find a lengthy comparison between Stilicho, the hero of the poem, and Rufinus, its villain, a comparison in which terms of praise for the former and of revilement for the latter are interlaced throughout. On the one hand we have such expressions as 1.259: magnanimi virtus Stilichonis, 1.264 f.: cunctis optata quies, . . . sola pericli / turris . . . clipeusque; 1.266: profugis sedes; 1.267: servandis . . . castra bonis; 1.275: sidus ceu dulce; 1.283 f.: Taceat superata vetustas, / Herculeos conferre tuis iam desinat actus; on the other, 1.261: letiferos rictus; 1.261 f.: rapacem / . . . `feram; 1.265: trucem . . . hostem; 1.266: furori; 1.268: fuga . . . inerti; 1.291–93: Hoc monstrum . . . tremebat / . . . Latia quidquid dicione subactum / vivit. The continuous implicit contrast between Stilicho as the embodiment of virtue and Rufinus as the personification of vice culminates and becomes explicit in the last four verses (1.297–300): Certamen sublime diu, sed moribus impar / virtutum scelerumque fuit.

[24] *RG* 2.36.17 f., 40.16 f. (Aphthonius); 3.376.31–377.9, 420.31–421.3 (Menander). Aphthonius' sample ἐγκώμια and ψόγος illustrate this concept of the σύγκρισις: *RG* 2.38.7–11, 40.1–3, 42.13–17.

[25] *RG* 2.42.25. In practice Aphthonius recognizes an analogous διπλοῦς ψόγος: cf. *RG* 2.42.23 f.: παραθεῖναι . . . φαῦλα φαύλοις; cf. also the διπλοῦς ψόγος of Philip and Echetus (Hom. *Od.* 18.85), *RG* 2.42.13–17, and that of a tyrant and a murderer, *RG* 2.34.15–20.

[26] The words καὶ ψόγου (which Spengel, following two codices, omits) are rightly included in the text by H. Rabe in his Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1926) 31.11 f. (= *RG* 2.42.25 f. I have elsewhere used the page and line numbers of *RG* for ease of multiple reference): cf. *RG* 2.42.24: χρηστὰ πονηροῖς.

Iugulare minatur, / tu prohibes; ditem spoliat, tu reddis egenti. /
Eruit, instauras; accendit proelia, vincis. The entire passage is
readily classified as a σύγκρισις embodying a ψόγος ἐξ ἐγκωμίου καὶ ψόγου
συγκείμενος; moreover, it exactly fulfills the requirement for the main
σύγκρισις of an ἐγκώμιον or ψόγος, namely that it encompass the entire
theme of the work.

In addition to the main σύγκρισις just referred to, Menander
recommends the use of partial συγκρίσεις, which he calls μερικαί,
appropriate to the several main divisions of the epideictic piece.[27]
At least eight examples of the latter type of σύγκρισις may be dis-
cerned in the *In Rufinum*. Five of these take the form of a ψόγος
διπλοῦς, comparing Rufinus with some other abomination.[28] One,
an ἐγκώμιον διπλοῦν glorifying Stilicho (1.278–96), forms part of the
main σύγκρισις. Another (1.200–216), like the main σύγκρισις itself,
has the form of a ψόγος ἐξ ἐγκωμίου καὶ ψόγου συγκείμενος, for it contrasts
the evil magnificence of the greedy Rufinus with the noble sim-
plicity of Fabricius and other Romans of the old stamp. Still
another (2.440–53) compares the regal splendor of Rufinus' life
with the horrid degradation of his death. The multiplicity of these
comparisons, which we might be disposed to characterize as "rhe-
torical" on general grounds, is perhaps traceable specifically to the
insistence of the rhetoricians on the σύγκρισις as an ornament of the
ἐγκώμιον and of the ψόγος.

VI. ἐπίλογος. Aphthonius and Menander suggest that this τόπος
of the ἐγκώμιον conclude with a prayer for future welfare.[29] In a
sense the antithesis of such a prayer is provided by the concluding
episode of the *In Rufinum*, 2.454–527. The verses cited describe
Rufinus' κατάβασις εἰς ῞Αιδου, his appearance before the judgment-seat
of Minos, and his final and eternal banishment to an abyss below
the foundations of Night.

The foregoing discussion may perhaps best be summarized by
drawing up a tabular analysis of the *In Rufinum* like those which
Struthers and Fargues provide for Claudian's panegyrics.[30]

The conclusions derived from the foregoing study are these:

(1) The *In Rufinum* as a whole is not to be regarded as a rhe-
torically patterned ψόγος, but rather as a brief historic epic con-
taining a preponderance of vituperative material.

[27] *RG* 3.377.2–9, 421.1–3; cf. 2.13.3–5 (ps.-Hermogenes); 3.481.18–25 (Nicolaus).
[28] 1.89–91, 226–28, 251–56, 291–96, 2.513–15. Cf. note 25, above.
[29] *RG* 2.36.18 f. (Aphthonius); 3.377.28–30, 422.2 f. (Menander).
[30] Struthers, "Rhet. Str." 86; Fargues, *Claudien* 214.

THE INVECTIVE *IN RUFINUM*

Elements Corresponding to the σχῆμα of the ψόγος	Other Elements
I. προοίμιον: 1.1–24 II. γένος (lacking)	A. Fury Episode: 1.25–175

III. ἀνατροφή: 1.92–111 (part of Fury Episode)
        ἐπιτηδεύματα: 1.101–11
IVa. πράξεις κατ᾽ εἰρήνην   : 1.176–258
    (1) δικαιοσύνη : 1.176–82
    (2) σωφροσύνη: 1.183–95
    (3) φρόνησις   : 1.196–219
    (2a) σωφροσύνη: 1.220–29
    (1a) δικαιοσύνη : 1.230–58	

V. σύγκρισις: 1.259–300	B. *Laus Stilichonis:*
	   (1.259–300: see col-
	   umn at left)

IVb. πράξεις κατὰ πόλεμον: 1.301–31	
1.354–87	1.332–53
2.7–100 ἀνδρεία: 2.50–53	2.1–6
2.130–70 ἀνδρεία: 2.130–40	2.101–29
2.293–383	2.171–292

	C. Murder and Dismem-
	   berment of Rufinus:
	   2.384–453

VI. ἐπίλογος: 2.454–527	

  (2) Claudian's treatment of this vituperative material displays the influence of the rhetorical pattern of the ψόγος.

  (3) The interpretation of certain portions of the *In Rufinum* is aided by studying them with reference to the appropriate τόποι of the ψόγος pattern.   This is particularly true of the passages above denoted as the ἀνατροφή, the πράξεις κατ᾽ εἰρήνην, and the σύγκρισις.

  It is hoped that these conclusions will be deemed both to be supported by and to justify the discussion upon which they depend.[31]

  [31] It has been suggested that the present study is incomplete without a similar analysis of Claudian's other invective poem, the *In Eutropium*. A study of the *In Eutropium*, however, discloses no indication that its composition was influenced by the ψόγος pattern.   That Claudian should have been guided by that pattern in one of his invectives and not in the other is scarcely remarkable in view of the great difference in the nature of the two works: cf. T. Birt, *Zwei Politische Satiren* (Marburg, 1888) 38; A. H. Weston, *Latin Satirical Writing Subsequent to Juvenal* (Lancaster, 1915) 117; Fargues, *Claudien* 231. Cf. also Fargues' edition of the *In Eutropium* (Paris, 1933) 2 f.