JUVENALIA

Convinced as I am that the text of Juvenal is not as sound as many would like to think, I offer an assortment of conjectures and interpretations, some of them diagnostic.[1]

1.40-41　　　　　　*unciolam Proculeius habet, sed Gillo deuncem,*　40
　　　　　　　　　　　partes quisque suas ad mensuram inguinis heres.

As Courtney says, the sense is «each inheriting a share proportionate to the size of his penis». Explaining the point of a joke is a thankless task, all the more so when it is as filthy and tasteless as this one. Nevertheless, it seems to me that there is a bit more to it than that. Besides the comic (and comically precise) exaggeration — a disproportion of 11:1 is far beyond anything likely to be found in nature — Juvenal surely expects us to be amused by the idea that someone so preternaturally ill-endowed as Proculeius can make a living as a gigolo,[2] despite his lack of the most basic qualification for the job.[3]

---

[1]　Text and apparatus are quoted from the Oxford text of W. V. CLAUSEN, 1992[2], omitting variants not pertinent to my argument. Other editors and commentators consulted, and referred to by surname: G. A. RUPERTI (Glasgow 1825), C. F. HEINRICH (Bonn 1839), O. JAHN (Berlin 1851), J. E. B. MAYOR (London 1877-78), A. WEIDNER (Leipzig 1889[2]), L. FRIEDLAENDER (Leipzig 1895), J. D. DUFF (Cambridge 1898), A. E. HOUSMAN (Cambridge 1931), U. KNOCHE (München 1950), J. FERGUSON (London 1979), E. COURTNEY, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London 1980) and *Juvenal, the Satires: a Text with Brief Critical Notes* (Rome 1984), J. R. C. MARTYN (Amsterdam 1987), and S. M. BRAUND, *Juvenal, Satires I*, Cambridge 1996. References to these are *ad loc*, unless specified otherwise, and «COURTNEY», when not further defined, refers to his commentary, not his text. If I find myself arguing most often with COURTNEY, that is because his commentary provides a sort of baseline: in interpreting Juvenal, one must always begin there. Other works referred to by the author's surname are P. T. EDEN, *Juvenalia*, «Mnemosyne» 38 (1985) 334-352, F. R. D. GOODYEAR's review of COURTNEY, «PACA» 16 (1982), 51-60, reprinted in *Papers on Latin Literature*, London 1992, 61-69, and R. G. M. NISBET, «Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Juvenal», in N. Horsfall (ed.), *Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus, Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch's Eightieth Birthday* («BICS» Supplement 51, 1988), 86-110, reprinted in *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford 1995), 227-260. As I write, the Teubner of J. A. WILLIS has not yet appeared. I wish to thank Prof. WILLIS for his encouragement and advice: he is not, of course, responsible for any of my errors or omissions.

[2]　Perhaps not a very good living, unless the estate is large enough to make even a one-twelfth share substantial.

[3]　Of course, he may have other talents, but the text suggests that the unnamed *uetula* thinks that size is everything when it comes to lovers.

1.160-64   '*cum ueniet contra, digito compesce labellum:*   160
accusator erit qui uerbum dixerit "hic est."
securus licet Aenean Rutulumque ferocem
committas, nulli grauis est percussus Achilles
aut multum quaesitus Hylas urnamque secutus:
                      . . . .'

161 *uerbum* man. recentior in **P**, codd. Vallae : *uersum* **PR** : *uersu* **V** : *uerum* **Φ**,
cf. Pers. i. 107

I am not concerned here with 163, where Nisbet (88-89 = 231) impugns *percussus* as insufficiently witty,[4] but with the crux in 161. Since *"non est"* is obviously two words, not one, Nisbet (88 = 230-231) suggests *uerbo* or *uerbis*. It seems to me that the variant *uersum* (**PR**), being both nonsensical and well-attested, makes *uerbum*, *uerum*, and *uersu* look like patches: the search for a solution should start from *uersum*. Although I have doubts about the meter, I would like to think that Juvenal wrote *qui **aduersus** dixerit "hic est"*: «the man who **turns around and says** 'There he is'». As with the modern «don't look now, but isn't that [X] over there?», where X is a famous mobster or corrupt politician, or an actor or athlete known for having curious bystanders beaten up, being seen to have noticed the famous criminal might well cause offense. Being seen to be pretending **not** to have noticed might be equally dangerous, so *qui **auersus*** is also tempting.

---

4   He proposes *excussus*, «which would refer to the hero's exposure when he was disguised as a girl on Scyros». In *Juvenal 1.163: an Alternative Solution*, «LCM» 18 (1993) 152-53, I argue for *pertusus*, «drilled, perforated».

2.47-50   *magna inter molles concordia. non erit ullum*
               exemplum in nostro tam detestabile sexu.
               Tedia non lambit Cluuiam nec Flora Catullam:
               Hispo subit iuuenes et morbo pallet utroque.   50

(Laronia is the speaker, and *nostro . . . sexu* (48) refers to women in general.) Though *pallet* in 50 is perfectly appropriate, it is possible that Juvenal wrote *callet*. This would provide a nice double-entendre: Hispo is «skilled or practised in» either vice (*OLD* s.v. *calleo* 2), but he is also «calloused» in all the wrong places (*OLD* s.v. *calleo* 1).

3.223-25　　　*si potes auelli circensibus, optima Sorae*
　　　　　　　aut Fabrateriae domus aut Frusinone paratur
　　　　　　　quanti nunc tenebras unum conducis in annum.　　　225

224 *paratur* **PRV** : *paretur* **Φ**

Ferguson paraphrases: «For the annual rent of a single dark, filthy attic in Rome you can buy a cottage in the country». This adds a little something to the Latin, since *tenebras* (225) implies only that the attic is dark, not filthy. However, it seems to me that this something is well worth adding, and that Juvenal quite likely wrote *latebras*: a Roman attic, like an animal's burrow or hole, is dark, but it is also disgusting in other ways. Of course, the context emphasizes the sunniness of the country house, but darkness is included in the meaning *latebras*, along with constriction and generalized nastiness — perhaps also constant danger from predators outside, either attacking when one goes out, like the lout of 278-301, or trying to break in.

4.75-81   *primus clamante Liburno*   75
                          'currite, iam sedit' rapta properabat abolla
                          Pegasus, attonitae positus modo uilicus urbi.
                          anne aliud tum praefecti? quorum optimus atque
                          interpres legum sanctissimus omnia, quamquam
                          temporibus diris, tractanda putabat inermi   80
                          iustitia.

        79   *quamquam* **VΦΣ** : *quamque* **PRK** : mendum subesse censuit Housman

Here I agree with Goodyear's interpretation (55 = 64) against Courtney's:

> «Neither C. nor Housman sees how *quamquam* may best be defended. Of course *temporibus diris* = 'a dreadful time' and has nothing to do with corruption. And 'unarmed justice' is lenient, merciful justice. Pegasus, though a scrupulous interpreter of the law, preferred always to exercise leniency, when, under Domitian's tyranny, sternness would have been entirely acceptable: witness the Vestal's punishment. The *praefectus urbi*, it appears, had discretion, like the senate, *et mitigare leges et intendere* (Plin. *Epist.* 4.9.17). In the circumstances Pegasus was courageous to temper them.»

If Goodyear is right, Axelson's *tamquam* and Housman's *quippe* and *nempe* are wrong. However, we are not therefore left with *quamquam*, and I suspect that Juvenal wrote **quamuis** in 79: «**however** terrible the times». It appears that the paradosis is *quamque*. If the *-que* of *quamque* came from *atque* just above, then *quamuis* is no less likely than *quamquam*, and slightly preferable in meaning.[5] Even if *quamquam* is the paradosis, *quamquam* and *quamuis* are often confused, like other pairs of near-synonyms.[6]

---

[5]   COURTNEY notes that the scholium is too confused to prove that it refers to a text with *quamquam*.

[6]   For instance, in Ovid, *quamquam* has been corrupted to *quamuis* at *E.P.* 3.5.17 and 4.3.11, *quamuis* to *quamquam* at *Met.* 8.814. In *Improving the Alliteration: Ovid, Met. 6.376*, forthcoming in «Mnemosyne», I propose emending the famous line *quamuis sint sub aqua, sub aqua maledicere temptant* to read **quamquam sunt**.

6.306-317 *i nunc et dubita qua sorbeat aera sanna*
Maura, Pudicitiae ueterem cum praeterit aram,   308
Tullia quid dicat, notae collactea Maurae.   307
noctibus hic ponunt lecticas, micturiunt hic
effigiemque deae longis siphonibus implent   310
inque uices equitant ac Luna teste mouentur,
inde domos abeunt: tu calcas luce reuersa
coniugis urinam magnos uisurus amicos.
nota bonae secreta deae, cum tibia lumbos
incitat et cornu pariter uinoque feruntur   315
attonitae crinemque rotant ululantque Priapi
maenades.

316 *ululantque Priapi* **PSR** : *ululante Priapo* **Φ**

I see two possible improvements here:

1. In 311, should we read *nullo teste*, with an obscene pun? They do these things without any male **witness**, but they are also «sexually aroused» (*mouentur*) without the aid of male **genitals**.[7] Juvenal makes the standard Latin pun on *testis* in 2.76 (so Ferguson and Braund).

2. In 316, should we read *ululantque* **Priapum**, they «howl for Priapus», that is, they howl «*Priape! Priape!*»?

[**Note:** This second suggestion was anticipated by Ruperti.]

---

[7]   GOODYEAR (56 = 65) asks «does *mouentur* mean *crisant* or is it entirely vague?». HEINRICH is surprisingly (and pleonastically) explicit for his century: «Diese Weiber sind sogenannte Tribaden, tribades, frictrices, Lesbiades.»

6.349-51   *iamque eadem summis pariter minimisque libido,*
             nec melior silicem pedibus quae conterit atrum   350
             quam quae longorum uehitur ceruice Syrorum.

                   349   om. Flor. Ricc. 612, del. Ribbeck

After 349 (assuming it is genuine), we might have expected something more antithetical in the next two lines. Women who ride in litters are certainly the *summae*, but those who walk on the pavement would be nearly all the rest, not just the *minimae*, at least in Rome, where private wheeled vehicles were not permitted in the day-time.[8] I suggest that we read *atris* in 350: «she who wears out the pavement **with her black feet**»: the feet are black because they are bare and very dirty. This is a much more vividly nasty idea, the *lectio sordidior*, as it were.[9]

     Corruption of *atris* to *atrum* would have been encouraged by the tendency of Latin hexameter poets to make the word before the caesura agree syntactically with the last word in the line. Any reader who thinks that such an agreement is necessary or desirable here should note that some manuscripts read *nec melior **pedibus silicem** quae conterit atrum*.[10] It is possible that this word order is correct, and a survival of a manuscript that read *atris*. Once that had been corrupted to *atrum*, the tendency to expect agreement would have encouraged scribes to swap *pedibus* with *silicem*.

---

[8]   Those carried in small litters by short slaves who are not from Syria would not be sufficiently differentiated from the *summae*.

[9]   Even if the lower classes generally wore shoes, the very poorest of the poor would surely have provided occasional exceptions: Martial jokes on barefoot poverty in 12.87.

[10]   In KNOCHE's notation, these are «r Par 7906 ? *Valla PRISC.* I 164, 13».

6.O.21-22   *oculos fuligine pascit*
                                     distinctus croceis et reticulatus adulter.

I had been toying with the idea of ***discinctus*** *croceis* in 22, but have been anticipated by
C. Edwards.[11] She has informed me *per litteras* that the conjecture was entirely uncon-
scious on her part. It was also almost inevitable, given the direction of her argument in
chapter II, subtitled «*Mollitia*: Reading the Body» (63-97). As she says in analyzing an-
other passage (Dio 43.43.1-4), «[t]o be ill-girt (*discinctus*; κακ?ς ζωννύμενος) was as
much a sign of *mollitia* as scratching one's head with one finger» (90). Awkward as it
sounds when translated, *discinctus* is used with an ablative tunic in Justin's Trogus: *pro-
cedit imperator . . . sordida seruilique* ***tunica discinctus*** (19.3.1).

---

[11] *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge 1993, 83.

6.562-564   *nemo mathematicus genium indemnatus habebit,*
sed qui paene perit, cui uix in Cyclada mitti
contigit et parua tandem caruisse Seripho.

<div align="center">563 *cyclada* **PSG** : *cyclade* **Φ**</div>

As Courtney says, «the idea of getting off the island spoils the humour, which would be preserved by *iacuisse* (Prof. Nisbet) or *latuisse* (Schrader)». I would prefer *emeruisse*, if it can stand without an object: he has «served his time» on Seriphos, like a veteran soldier. Loss of *em-* by haplography after *tandem* would have left *eruisse*, and *caruisse* might have been a plausible patch.

8.240-44   *tantum igitur muros intra toga contulit illi*   240
                  nominis ac tituli, quantum †in† Leucade, quantum
                  Thessaliae campis Octauius abstulit udo
                  caedibus adsiduis gladio; sed Roma parentem,
                  Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit.

                  241 *in* **PSGU** : *non* **Φ** : *sibi* Jahn. 'sub Leucade' Σ

For the crux in 241, Knoche lists Weidner's *unda*, Hermann's *uix*, and *iam* and *uel* from unnamed others («alii»). To these, Martyn adds Robertson's *igni* and de Ruyt's *ui*, while Eden (349) proposes *ima*. Only the last three are at all tempting, though *igni* and *ui* introduce inappropriate contrasts.[12] I see two further possibilities:

1. We could read ***infra Leucada***, to match the scholiast's *sub Leucade*. Note V's *in Cyclade* for *in Cyclada* in 6.563 (quoted just above): Juvenal's copyists were sometimes stumped by Greek accusatives. The only problem I can see is that *infra* sounds a bit cacophonous with *intra* in the previous line.

2. Another possibility would be *extra*, either adverbial or with *muros* understood. That would avoid the cacophony, and introduce a neatly matched pair of opposites: to paraphrase, «the toga brought Cicero as much glory **inside** the walls of Rome, as Octavius won **outside, at Leucas** and at Philippi». If *extra* were misunderstood as a preposition, a scribe who knew that Leucas was not a town and that *extra* cannot take the ablative might have been tempted to alter the preposition, despite wrecking the meter in the process.

---

[12]   The fact that Octavian burned the ships captured at Actium is hardly the most important thing about that battle, while *ui* would imply that Cicero's achievements were entirely bloodless, which ignores the execution of the Catilinarian conspirators. On the other hand, I find EDEN's *ima* as attractive as either of my proposals, far more so than any of the other proposals he lists: *uix* (HERMANN), *in se* (POLSTORFF), *tum in* and *unda* (mentioned by DUFF) — he attributes *ui* to S. G. OWEN.

9.8-11   *unde repente*
                        tot rugae? certe modico contentus agebas
                        uernam equitem, conuiua ioco mordente facetus   10
                        et salibus uehemens intra pomeria natis.

Are the jokes of line 11 the equivalents of modern «inside-the-Beltway» jokes? I suspect that Juvenal wrote *salibus . . . intra pomeria **nati***, «the witty remarks of one born within the pomerium». In that case, we have an urban(e) person equipped with the appropriate jokes, not just someone with a supply of urban(e) jokes, which might be taken from joke-books, or repeated from wittier acquaintances.

9.40-46   *ponatur calculus, adsint*   40
                cum tabula pueri; numera sestertia quinque
                omnibus in rebus, numerentur deinde labores.
                an facile et pronum est agere intra uiscera penem
                legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae?
                seruus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum   45
                quam dominum.

It is possible, though not probable, that Juvenal wrote *niger* rather than *miser* in 45: the slave who plows his master's field does not get as **dirty** as the one who plows his master. This would better suit the immediate context — filthy in more ways than one — and reinforce the gross obscenity of the previous line.

[**Note:** This should be probably be deleted as utterly unlikely, but it was published so I include it here for completeness.]

10.203-209   *non eadem uini atque cibi torpente palato*
                gaudia; nam coitus iam longa obliuio, uel si
                coneris, iacet exiguus cum ramice neruus   205
                et, quamuis tota palpetur nocte, iacebit.
                anne aliquid sperare potest haec inguinis aegri
                canities? quid quod merito suspecta libido est
                quae uenerem adfectat sine uiribus?

Should not 207 read *anne **aliud** sperare potest?* — «can you hope for anything **different** (at your age)?». With *quid* just below — or rather *quid quod*, which increases the possibilities for error — corruption of *aliud* to *aliquid* would have been easy enough. Courtney notes that *aliquid* is often used as a sexual euphemism, and that meaning is certainly appropriate here, but *aliud* seems slightly more so. Juvenal uses *anne aliud*/*aliam* in 4.78, 7.199, and 15.122. In the second of those passages, some manuscripts (Knoche's **BgV**) corrupt *aliud* to *aliquid*.[13]

---

[13]   The same error is found in Tacitus, *Annales* 1.4.4, where **M** reads *aliquid* and Tacitus must have written either *aliud* or *aliud quid* — so GOODYEAR in his commentary (Cambridge 1972). The error is again probably encouraged by *quidem* just above. Of course, in Tacitus, as in prose generally, we do not know that the *quidem* would have been **directly** above the *aliud* when the corruption occurred, as it is in most modern texts, but it was certainly close by.

10.217-226   *praeterea minimus gelido iam in corpore sanguis*
            febre calet sola, circumsilit agmine facto
            morborum omne genus, quorum si nomina quaeras,
            promptius expediam quot amauerit Oppia moechos,   220
            quot Themison aegros autumno occiderit uno,
            quot Basilus socios, quot circumscripserit Hirrus
            pupillos, quot longa uiros exorbeat uno
            Maura die, quot discipulos inclinet Hamillus;
            percurram citius quot uillas possideat nunc   225
            quo tondente grauis iuueni mihi barba sonabat.

Courtney says of Maura in 223 that *longa* «implies her physical stamina» and adduces as a parallel the tall (and no doubt sturdy) Syrian *lecticarii* of 6.351 (quoted above). It is easy to see how above-average height, as long as it is accompanied by proportionate bulk of a muscular nature, would help to qualify one for carrying litters, but it is much harder to see how height (or bulk) would be any help at all in fellatio.[14]

It seems to me likely that Juvenal wrote *larga*: Maura is «generous» in that she provides so many men with sexual services of a kind degrading to herself, at least by ancient standards, and does so (it is implied) free of charge.[15] Martial provides two kinds of pertinent parallels. First, he uses *largus* in a sexual context in 12.65.1-2: *Formosa Phyllis nocte cum mihi tota / se praestitisset omnibus modis* **largam**. The passage is not entirely parallel, in that Phyllis is generous in the number of different things she is willing to do for one man, Maura in the number of men she is willing to do one thing for, but the resemblance seems close enough for my purposes. Second, Martial also provides evidence (e.g. 10.75, 11.62, 12.55) that a woman who provided sexual services *gratis* was then considered lower than a prostitute, where the modern attitude is (to simplify greatly) exactly the reverse.[16]

---

[14] So GOODYEAR (58 = 67): «How does *longa* 'imply physical stamina'? There is no inevitable connection.» If anything, one would think that height would be a positive disadvantage for a *fellatrix*, who would have that much further to bend over.

[15] In his note on 14.25-26, *rusticus expectas ut non sit adultera* **Largae** / *filia*, FERGUSON suggests that the mother's name is significant: «*Largae*: not otherwise mentioned: she is 'generous' in her favours.»

[16] When Beavis says of his mother (on MTV's «Beavis and Butthead» show), «she's not a whore, she's a slut — she doesn't charge for it», he is defending her character, up to a point.

12.1-4   *Natali, Coruine, die mihi dulcior haec lux,*
                    qua festus promissa deis animalia caespes
                    expectat. niueam reginae ducimus agnam,
                    par uellus dabitur pugnanti Gorgone Maura; . . . .

Another *Maura*, this time adjectival. Courtney says:

«MAURA is here probably merely an ornamental epithet, cf. 1.22, 8.15.»
However, the Tuscan boar of 1.22 and the Euganean lamb of 8.15 are particular breeds of
animals, defined by their place of origin, like Hyrcanian tigers: not at all the same sort of
thing as a Moorish Gorgon.[17] I see two possible interpretations here, one original but un-
likely, the other not entirely new, but worth restating:

   1. If this were Vergil, I would suspect an instance of pseudo-etymological word-
play, linking the Mauri with Greek μα?ρος, «dark», and μαυρόω, «darken, blind». The
adjective provides the standard ancient etymology for Mauretania and the Mauri,[18]
though the verb would be more appropriate for Juvenal, given the Gorgons' *modus
operandi*. The problem is that Juvenal, unlike Vergil, does not go in much for this sort of
Hellenistic word-play.

   2. It is more likely that *Maura* is a racial slur. The Gorgons lived in North Africa,
and turned men to stone, and thus were presumably very ugly.[19] The Mauri also lived in
North Africa, and Juvenal found them repulsive and no doubt expected most of his
readers to feel the same.[20] The implication of *Gorgone Maura* is that the Gorgons are
ugly **because** they are African. This interpretation is implied by Duff and Ferguson: I
am merely spelling out the implications of their rather telegraphic statements.[21]

---

[17] Juvenal might have constructed a joke suggesting that there are flocks of gorgons in various countries,
with the North African breed the most admired. However, he would have needed more than a bare
adjective to do so.

[18] R. MALTBY, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Liverpool 1991, s.v. *Mauretania*, quotes Isidore
(*Orig.* 14.5.10): *Mauretania uocata a colore populorum; Graeci enim nigrum* μαὰron *uocant.*» The
same etymology is implied by Manilius' *Mauritania nomen / oris habet titulumque suo fert ipsa colore*
(4.729-30). Isidore repeats his etymology s.v. *Mauri*, as an alternative to Sallust's statement (*Iug.* 18)
that it is a corruption of *Medi*.

[19] No living person would know, and there are rare exceptions to the rule that Gorgons are ugly, such as
the marble mask in the Munich Glyptothek, the so-called Medusa Rondanini.

[20] In Satire 5 alone, racial slurs are directed at North Africans in 52-54, 59, and 88-91.

[21] DUFF: «**Maura:** legend placed Medusa in Libya: the epithet is sarcastic here, 'the negress'.» FER-
GUSON (mislabelled as a note on line 5): «The Gorgons' home was in Libya: hence *Maura*, 'black'.»

The two interpretations I have outlined are not utterly incompatible, but have nothing much to do with each other. The first would be more socially acceptable today, but seems unlikely, except as a secondary implication.

13.34-37   *nescis*
                    quem tua simplicitas risum uulgo moueat, cum   35
                    exigis a quoquam ne peieret et putet ullis
                    esse aliquod numen templis araeque rubenti?

Courtney has objected to *ullis* in 36:[22]

> «The sentence 'you ask anyone to think that there is some divinity in *any*
> temples' is nonsense in any language; 'some temples' (that is *aliquibus*)
> would be sense. So for *ullis* read *altis*; the corruption was easy both
> palaeographically and, after *quoquam*, psychologically.»

Not all are convinced that *ullis* is corrupt, but it seems awkward to me.[23] However, *altis*
is not the only possible solution: I prefer *imis*. This presumes a very easy error in terms
of minims and what we might call 'maxims': *ullis* for *uuis*. Usually equivalent to *infi-*
mus, *imus* in some cases approximates to the meaning of *intimus*. A good example is
Ovid, *Met.* 8.458, where Althaea's brand has been *penetralibus abditus imis*: there is
surely no implication that she kept the fatal brand in the lowest sub-basement of the
palace — rather the innermost closet or storeroom. Forms of *imus* are not listed in
Dubrocard's *index verborum*,[24] but have been convincingly restored in three other
passages:[25] it was obviously quite a vulnerable word. Finally, *imis*, unlike *altis*, is not
merely ornamental, since it provides an *a fortiori* argument: no one should believe that
the gods are present even in their innermost sanctuaries.

---

[22] *Juvenaliana*, «BICS» 13 (1966) 38-43, at 42, briefly summarized in his commentary.

[23] M. D. REEVE, in his review of COURTNEY, «CR» 33 (1983) 27-34, at 33: «I see nothing wrong with
ullis in a question tantamount to a denial that anyone believes there is any divinity *ullis templis*.»

[24] M. DUBROCARD, *Juvenal-Satires, Index Verborum, Relevés Statistiques*, Hildesheim 1976.

[25] Although CLAUSEN confines it to his apparatus, SCHOLTE's *in **imo** [illo* Φ] */ pectore* (6.250-51) seems
near certain. The same goes for 13.49-50, where HOUSMAN's *nondum **imi*** [*om. P Vat. Pal.* 1701 :
aliquis Φ] *sortitus triste profundi / imperium Sicula toruos cum coniuge Pluton* is printed by CLAUSEN
and MARTYN, and recommended by COURTNEY, who also prints it in his 1984 text. As mentioned
above, EDEN's *ima Leucade* in 8.241 is also very tempting. The fact that I am proposing to introduce
another form of *imus* just 13 lines before the second of these passages is a possible objection to my
argument. However, 13 is not 3, and the distance seems sufficient to permit the repetition.

14.59-63   *hospite uenturo cessabit nemo tuorum.*
            'uerre pauimentum, nitidas ostende columnas,   60
            arida cum tota descendat aranea tela,
            hic leue argentum, uasa aspera tergeat alter.'
            uox domini furit instantis uirgamque tenentis.

The first word of 61 is slightly surprising. Ruperti glosses: «*Aranea arida*, quae loca arida amat, vel macra, tenuis», while Duff paraphrases with a line of verse: «Down with the withered spider, web and all.» No doubt spiders are quite dry, at least until they are squashed. However, given the tendency of scribes to add and subtract aspirates and to double and undouble consonants more or less at random, I wonder whether Juvenal wrote ***horrida** cum tota descendat aranea tela*: a «hairy, bristly» spider would better suit the theme of cleanliness.[26]

---

[26] On the other hand, MALTBY (note 18, s.v. *aranea*) reports that some ancients derived *aranea* from *aridus*, so a pseudo-etymological allusion is possible, as in 12.4 (examined above).

14.77-80   *uoltur iumento et canibus crucibusque relictis*
ad fetus properat partemque cadaueris adfert:
hic est ergo cibus magni quoque uolturis et se
pascentis, propria cum iam facit arbore nidos.   80

It would be more pointed if *iumento et canibus crucibusque relictis* in 77 could mean «a (dead) pack-animal and (corpses on) crosses **abandoned even by the dogs**»: the corpses, animal and human, are so rotten that even the dogs have lost interest and left them to the less fastidious vultures. This has the advantage of putting the dogs on the side of the sca-vengers where they belong, while giving *et* a different meaning from *-que* in the same line. Unfortunately, the word-order will probably not permit my interpretation, and I mention it only as a stimulus to further thought.

16.43-47   *sed tum quoque mille ferenda*
                    taedia, mille morae; totiens subsellia tantum
                    sternuntur, iam facundo ponente lacernas   45
                    Caedicio et Fusco iam micturiente parati
                    digredimur, lentaque fori pugnamus harena.

From a description of an adjourned lawsuit. Both *iam* and *parati* in 46 seem otiose, and the latter in particular looks like glossator's language summing up the preceding vivid picture: when Caedicius is laying aside his cloak and Fuscus is either going out to relieve himself or feeling the need to do so (depending on how we take *micturiente*: cf. Courtney), they are *iam parati*. If we ask who (or rather what) in the courtroom would have felt an urgent need to be relieved of a liquid burden, the obvious answer is the water-clock. Consequently, I wonder whether Juvenal wrote *Caedicio et Fusco **clepsydra** micturiente* in 46. In that case, *Fusco* is dative, not ablative: «when Caedicius is already laying aside his cloak and Fuscus' water-clock is full-to-overflowing». This has the advantage of putting the vulgarity at the end of the line, wrapped up in a mock-epic pentasyllabic word.