

J. B. TORRES GUERRA (ED.)

VTROQVE SERMONE NOSTRO

BILINGÜISMO SOCIAL Y LITERARIO
EN EL IMPERIO DE ROMA
SOCIAL AND LITERARY BILINGUALISM
IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, "Reading Juvenal: Roman Satire in Claudianus's Invectives against Rufinus and Eutropius", 115-132.

EDICIONES UNIVERSIDAD DE NAVARRA, S.A.

PAMPLONA

2011

READING JUVENAL: ROMAN SATIRE IN CLAUDIANUS'S INVECTIVES AGAINST RUFINUS AND EUTROPIUS*

Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz

1. As a Greek master of Latin poetry, Claudius Claudianus was a singular, but exemplary figure of the social and literary bilingualism in the Late Antiquity. Born in Alexandria, he was a native speaker of Greek, the language in which he composed his first poems. Nevertheless, he is also widely acknowledged to have been the last great Latin poet of the Classical Age. Such artistic competence and the decision to compose literature in a second language are not the only features that define Claudianus's position as an outstanding literary figure whose work reflects the trends of his time. Not only did he reconcile Greek and Latin; he also reconciled the pagan tradition with a Christian audience, and drew on the resources of different traditional genres so as to adapt epic poetry to the communication of specific propagandistic messages¹.

In the context of his work as a whole, Claudianus's invectives against Rufinus (396-397) and Eutropius (399) together comprise an enabling case study of the ways in which a Greek writer could know, assimilate and deploy the specifically Roman literary tradition with all the ease and command of a

* This study was carried out in the context of the research project entitled "Graecia capta. El influjo de la literatura latina en la cultura y literatura de Grecia (II)", which is funded by the Department of Education and Science (Spain) (HUM 2007-60515). A preliminary version of this paper, "Latin Readings of Claudianus: Roman Satire and Greek Invective", was presented at the International workshop, "*Vtraque lingua*: Social and Literary Bilingualism in Imperial Rome", in Pamplona on 9 October 2009. I am grateful to workshop participants for their observations and suggestions. Any errors or oversights the paper may contain are my own.

¹ CAMERON (1970) is still an indispensable starting-point for critical reflection in this regard, although a number of critics – in particular, GNILKA (1976; 1977) – have articulated a more nuanced position. Both scholars have refined their arguments more recently, CAMERON (2000) and GNILKA (2007), re-issuing previous studies and including revisions and additions to shed further light on the discussion. An understanding of the issue may be further enriched by reference to DÖPP (1980); SCHMIDT (1976); and chapter 3.2 ("Approaching the Audience: The Problem of Propaganda") of LONG (1996 a).

virtuoso. Indeed, in light of the numerous instances of intertextual parallels, as well as similarities in satirical motives, types and tone, to assert that these two poems were consciously modelled on the work of Juvenal² has become a commonplace in critical discussion.

An initial reading could suggest that just as he had fused the genres of historical epic and prose encomium in his panegyrics, Claudianus succeeded in combining Greek invective and hexameter satire, an emblematically Roman genre, in the two *uituperationes*. However, imitation of the Roman satirical tradition is neither the prevailing trait nor the main ground of the literary architecture of the two poems. Thus, for instance, while the rhetorical framework of *uituperatio*, which is similar to that of panegyric³, is followed in *In Ruf.* I, *In Ruf.* II obeys a chronological order that is characteristic of historical epic. In the same way, *In Eutr.* I may be read as an uncompromising invective similar to satire in intent and tone⁴; and, by contrast, *In Eutr.* II combines elements of satire with a chronological framework⁵.

Hence, the overall objective of this paper does not encompass an exploration of the influence of satire on Claudianus's two invectives from the perspective of literary genre. Rather, the primary purpose is to explore in some depth and detail how Claudianus read the work of Juvenal in the context of the established literary trends and modes of reading of his time.

In relation to literary trends, that Claudianus's arrival in Rome in the final part of the 4th century coincided with two other significant developments is noteworthy. On the one hand, following two centuries of obscurity, Juvenal and his satires were in vogue once more in intellectual circles in the West: Servius's quotations in his *Explanatio Vergiliana*, the allusions that may be traced in the works of Ausonius, Prudentius, the *Scriptores Historiae Au-*

² Above all, on the basis of BIRT (1888; see, in particular, 52-63).

³ Whose masterstrokes are applied with deft and flexible skill: LEVY (1946; 1971); KIRSCH (1989, 156ff.).

⁴ Recited in Milan in early 399, the poem is structured around the *monstrum* that never before had a eunuch been consul; this allegation is reinforced with moral accusations that are typical of Roman satire: avarice, venality, cruelty and, in particular, lasciviousness.

⁵ Although the two books first circulated months apart and reflect different perspectives and tones, Book I is related to Book II, as is also the case with regard to Books I and II of *In Rufinum*: the first part recounts the increasing blindness of the minister and the second part is a narrative account ending in poetic justice. While signs of heaven remain, Eutropius is surrounded by debauchery in Constantinople, a situation that forces Mars and Bellona to intervene, provoking the rebellion of the Gothic leader, Tribigildus. For his part, Eutropius calls a *concilium* of his cronies, which comes to the conclusion that some action must be taken. Thus, his two lieutenants – Leo and Hosius – undertake a campaign that fails dramatically. At the close, the Aurora flies to Italy to ask Stilicho to come to the aid of the East.

gustae and Paulinus of Nola, among others, and the well-known reference in Ammianus XXVIII 4.14 are clear signs in this regard. On the other hand, during the same period, the satires of Juvenal were copied into a codex that was corrected in Rome by a *Nicaeus apud Seruium magistrum*, perhaps with critical annotations and commentary; this was to become the single source text for almost all the later, medieval manuscripts. However, the cause-effect relation that may have existed between these two phenomena is unclear; and a number of open questions remain, including the identity of the *Seruius* referred to above, the possible promoter of the new edition of Juvenal; whether that text was a decisive factor in the emergence of the new literary trend as such; and, in relation to Claudianus, whether his first experience of Juvenal's work came before or after *Nicaeus* brought out his emended copy.

With regard to modes and habits of reading in Late Antiquity, the fact that Latin literary texts were gradually being transferred from standard scroll form to the much more versatile codex form over the course of the 4th century is likewise pertinent in this regard. Among other consequences, this development had a transformative effect on the ways in which literary works were read⁶. The scroll favoured extensive reading of longer, complete units of text, which could be read aloud or listened to from beginning to end. In relation to Juvenal, such longer units were each of the satires or each of the books, which undoubtedly comprised a single volume or roll, respectively. Interestingly, (private or public) scroll-based reading of Juvenal could fulfil the expectations of both learned and uneducated readerships. Extensive reading of this kind required the reader to pay attention to the plot or argument as a whole; the audience did not need to remember any more than the sharpest or most provocative passages.

While the codex-form publication of a poetic text did not preclude extensive reading, the emerging format also enabled intensive reading of specific passages, of relatively short fragments, and even of individual verses. Thus, reader attention was tuned to understanding shorter units of text that could be returned to and reread over and over again – in private study or, more commonly, in the school setting. Moreover, the inclusion of annotations and scholarly commentary was facilitated by the codex format; and hence, the mode of reading as a fluid appreciation of the text as a whole yielded steadily to a notion of reading as the interpretation of individual verses removed from their original context.

The structure of this paper is as follows: First, insofar as they reveal different approaches to reading the original, the ways in which Claudianus re-

⁶ CAVALLO (1998²).

works the model afforded by Juvenal in *In Rufinum* and *In Eutropium* are briefly described. Second, the relations between the different genres of reading and the texts by Juvenal with which Claudianus may have been familiar are traced. Finally, Claudianus's work is compared and contrasted with the modes of reading and emulating the Juvenalian model reflected in Christian poetry of the time. Should this case of literary dependence be read as a representative instance of a general trend, this approach may provide a more detailed understanding not only of the artistic endeavours of a Greek author writing Latin verses to measure, but also of the modes of creative production prevalent in Roman literary culture at the end of the 4th century.

2. As has already been noted above, the imitation of Juvenal enacted in *In Rufinum* and *In Eutropium* is widely acknowledged and has often been highlighted. However, that Claudianus also imitates the expository structure of longer units, enabling him in turn to structure whole sections of his own poems, has received less critical attention. This fact suggests both that Claudianus came to know the model he adopted through an extensive form of reading and that he likewise presupposed a similar habit of reading among his audience. Nevertheless, each of the two invectives reflects this approach to reading in different ways.

On the one hand, *Ruf. I*, which was written at the beginning of 397, inverts the line of argument pursued in *Juv. 13*. The opening verses (*Ruf. I* 1-4) of this *uituperatio* supply the reader with a specific key to reading that is framed by an allusion to *Juv. 13.86-88*⁷, in which an *interrogatio* regarding the existence of divine justice and providence designed to punish the wicked is formulated. Whereas Juvenal had counselled resignation in the face of the injustice and sacrilegious impiety plaguing the city of Rome, thus amplifying a commonplace of the school *declamationes*⁸, the issue is resolved in *Ruf. I* when Justice foresees the death of Rufinus and the coming of a new Golden Age under Honorius. Thus, it may be concluded that Claudianus had read Juvenal's satires in an extensive way, seeing each composition as a complete

⁷ *Juv. 13.86-88: sunt in fortunae qui casibus omnia ponant/ et nullo credant mundum rectore moueri/ natura uolente uices et lucis et anni... Claud. Ruf. I 5-6: praescriptosque mari fines annique meatus/ et lucis noctisque uices.* On the basis of this parallel, CAMERON (1968) suggested a correction to Claudianus's text, which was accepted by HALL (1985).

⁸ *Juv. 13* continues the story wherein the satirist commiserates with his friend Calvinus on the loss of the 10,000 sesterces he had lent to a third party under oath. His friend's anger is out of all proportion: there were few gods in the Golden Age, their customs were simple, and evil a monstrous abnormality; now, the *monstrum* is that a friend would repay the money he was lent (vv. 38-70); some no longer believe in the gods, fearing no punishment, and the same crimes receive different just and unjust deserts or rewards.

unit of argument, and was able to reuse them occasionally as rhetorical rather than satirical pieces, as well as availing of verbal parallels with other satires⁹.

By contrast, the two books written against the chamberlain Eutropius in the spring and autumn of 399 draw on the imaginative repertoire and the characteristic *indignatio* of Juvenal. As Long has correctly pointed out¹⁰, Claudianus took Juv. 2 and 6 as models in the first book to underscore the lasciviousness and degeneration of the eunuch-consul. At the same time, the *concilium principis* of Domitianus in *Satire 6* furnishes the framework for the *concilium* described in the second book, and to emphasize further the epic parody of the subsequent story. In addition to these scenes and further textual parallels¹¹, other sections of this poem that reflect characteristic traits of Roman satire should also be noted (epic parody, moral reflection, character stereotyping¹²), although they show no specific textual borrowing from Juvenal.

To sum up, both in relation to the rhetorical emulation of *In Rufinum* and the satirical imitation of *In Eutropium*, Claudianus displays an acute understanding of Juvenal, and evidences his ability to articulate a complex and structured literary text for a demanding audience¹³. However, that the new literary status accorded to Juvenal in the second half of the 4th century, to which some reference was made above, was not a simple or straightforward phenomenon should be underlined.

3.1. Two different manuscript traditions of Juvenal¹⁴ emerged in Rome between 395 and 399, the years during which Claudianus is thought to have composed his invectives (or, at the latest, very soon afterwards). On one hand is the so-called "interpolated recension" (which Knoche refers to as Ω

⁹ Cf. *Ruf.* I 185 ~ Juv. 11.203; *Ruf.* I 213 ~ Juv. 5.21.

¹⁰ LONG (1996 a; 1996 b).

¹¹ Including, for instance, the joke at verse *Eutr.* II 363-364, which can only be understood by those who are very familiar with Juvenal, 7.87: *Esurit, intactam Paridi nisi uendat Agauen*: see CAMERON (1970, 284) and SCHWECKENDIEK (1992), *ad loc.*

¹² CASTILLO (1971); RUDD (1986); BRAUND (1996, 17-24; 2007, 51ff.)

¹³ Whether at the first recitations of the poems of Claudianus at the court in Milan or in reading their written versions, Claudianus's audience comprised high-ranking functionaries and members of the cultural elite in the West. One of the ways in which Stilicho carried favour in this audience was through Claudianus's poetry, which was demanding in literary terms and set an appropriate or desirable tone in the political context of the time.

¹⁴ KNOCHE (1926; 1940); COURTNEY (1967); TARRANT (1983). With regard to the issue of the early chronology (the final years of the fourth century) of the two recensions, see, in particular, KNOCHE (1940).

and Clausen as Φ) in which a large number of verses have been inserted arbitrarily, and the text levelled to make it more comprehensible to a non-scholarly readership. Given that its editor took the oldest variants of the scholia into account, it would not seem as though this text was deliberately drafted as a popular edition. Rather, it is more likely to have been the result of an unbounded tradition of readers and copyists whose approach was either too creative or too simple.

A second textual tradition, less widespread than Ω and referred to as Π by Knoche, was also in circulation¹⁵. This narrower group of manuscripts was free of the vulgar or popularizing interpolations that were typical of the other branch. Paradoxically, however, it passed down to the Middle Ages in a more corrupt form than the *tradio uulgata*, especially in terms of the insertion of particular words and the occurrence of specific errors. Nevertheless, in the beginning at least, the “ Π -Redaktion” would have been a more demanding, scholarly text than the version circulating in the majority tradition.

Given that both are abruptly interrupted at verse 60 in satire 16, that they do not contain the so-called “Oxford verses”, and that they share a significant number of spurious lines, these two manuscript branches clearly grew out of a common trunk. Knoche’s plausible argument in this regard was that the common trunk or archetype was a critical edition produced for scholarly purposes in the final third of the 4th century, which he referred to as Φ ; its editor would have been the *Nicaeus* mentioned in the subscriptions appended respectively to two manuscripts in the *uulgata* tradition. The name *Nicaeus* is associated with a master called *Seruius*¹⁶, who may have been the renowned *grammaticus* to whose work the renewed interest in Juvenal in the 4th century has often been attributed¹⁷, and in whose school the author of Φ may have been a scholar; however, the latter assertion is difficult to verify¹⁸.

That *Nicaeus* carried out his *emendatio* in a codex is a matter of some consensus, among other reasons because this might better explain the suppression of the “Oxford verses” in the sixth satire, which may have comprised a single column in one scroll, as well as the abrupt interruption of the

¹⁵ KNOCHE (1926; 1940); CLAUSEN (1992²); WILLIS (1997). Knoche’s held that both the *Pithoeanus* manuscript as well as the edition attributed to *Probus grammaticus*, produced between 352 and 399, and which we came to know through Valla’s editions, stemmed from this tradition.

¹⁶ K: *Legi ego Niceus apud M. Serbium Romae et emendau;* L: *Legi ego Niceus Romae apud Seruium magistrum et emendau.*

¹⁷ CAMERON (1964 a); however, see CAMERON (2000).

¹⁸ KASTER (1978, 208, n. 65).

text at 16.60¹⁹. While probable, it should be noted that it is not absolutely certain that this edition was designed for critical purposes or that it included textual variants, critical notes and information taken from the so-called *Commentum uetustum*, a wide-ranging corpus of annotations compiled in the 4th century²⁰, in which a series of not wholly systematic clarifications had been included.

This account should be rounded out with consideration of the fact that from the 5th century onwards particular commentaries and readings of Ω were exchanged and/or intermingled with those of Π in a significant number of eclectic manuscripts through a variety of channels of reciprocal contamination²¹. The extent of contamination in this regard renders the project of framing medieval manuscripts in relation to their putative archetypes, pre-archetypes and sub-archetypes as part of a really coherent or even relatively useful *stemma* a hopeless task²². Given that it is not designed to engage with controversial questions regarding the Juvenal manuscript tradition and because the use of the sigla Ω and Φ may be ambiguous, the nomenclature assigned by Knoche is followed here, with the addition of a clarifying suffix: Φ -Arch. (Φ Knoche, γ Courtney) for the hypothetical codex archetype; Ω -Vulg. (Ω Knoche, Φ Mynors) for the 'interpolated recension' or *uulgata*; and Π -Cult. for the group of manuscripts associated with the *Pithoeanus*.

It is clear that the strict two-pronged framework of the kind advanced by Knoche should be set aside. Rather, that Juvenal's text was circulating at the turn of the 4th/5th century in a minority tradition and, more commonly, in a heterogeneous set of vulgarized manuscripts should be acknowledged. The significance of this point for the purposes of the argument pursued in this study is not the extension or reach of either tradition but the very existence of both. Moreover, as in the case of Φ -Arch., that successive copies of Ω -Vulg. and Π -Cult. were also produced in codex form is likewise relevant.

Therefore, the two recensions in use in Claudianus's time (or their hypothetical archetype Φ -Arch.) comprised a set of manageable, annotated material due to the versatility of the codex form which facilitated intensive modes of reading – that is, forms of reading centred on specific passages relating to particular reader interests, which might vary from individual to

¹⁹ GRIFFITH (1963); COURTNEY (1967); LUCK (1972).

²⁰ WESSNER (1967); TOWNEND (1972); against, BARTALUCCI (1973).

²¹ On the complex nexus of annotations to Juvenal, see the 'Preface' in WESSNER (1967, especially XXXVI-XLV). KNOCHE (1940) came to the conclusion that there were four lines of manuscripts in a criss-crossed tradition (Ψ , Ξ , Γ y Λ).

²² COURTNEY (1967); see also the attempts to organize them in taxonomic terms by GRIFFITH (1968) and MARTYN (1987, xx-xxv).

individual. Indeed, the *traditio uulgata* enabled a form of intensive reading that focused on the sections of the satires which were most obviously designed for mere entertainment²³, above all the most caustic and lurid sections²⁴. Ammianus's comment²⁵ on the many Roman nobles of his time who lacked any taste or interest in literature and read only Juvenal and Marius Maximus is often cited in relation to such approaches to reading: *Quidam detestantes ut uenena doctrinas Iuuenalem et Marium Maximum curatiore studio legunt, nulla uolumina praeter haec in profundo otio contrectantes...* However, the significance of this observation for the interpolated recension of Juvenal's work is open to question, since it refers to private readings and copies in scroll-form from the period 380–390 – that is, it refers to a situation and time before the public distribution of Φ -Arch. and Claudianus's arrival in Rome.

In turn, the format and annotations to Π -Cult (and, to a lesser extent, the interpolated recension) may have enabled the forms of intensive reading associated with school *praelectiones* – that is, line-by-line study, as part of a renewed intellectual interest in the poets and prose-writers of the 1st and 2nd centuries. That the work of Juvenal had already been drawn on by a number of Latin masters from the middle of the 4th century onwards should not be overlooked: Ausonius, a rhetorician educated as Claudianus was in the school, quoted from and redeployed the *Satires* in Gaul a generation before the writings of the latter were to appear²⁶.

Moreover, if quotations or references to Juvenal began to appear gradually in the manuals from Servius's *Explanatio Vergiliana* in the year 400 onwards²⁷, that can only be because the satirist's writings were already being put to work for didactic purposes even earlier. A common argument in this regard is that Servius would have referred to writers from the 2nd century in their status as *neoteri*²⁸ – that is, merely as ancillary authorities rather than as authentic *idonei* for the purposes of teaching. However, his use of the term *idonei* neither defers to a strict taxonomy nor defines a closed corpus; rather,

²³ Although these might also enable more learned readings.

²⁴ In addition to knowledge based on collections of sentences, which would explain the indirect or second-hand use shown in St Jerome (questionable) and St Augustine: HIGHER (1954, 184–190); HAGENDAHL (1967, 477) and ADKIN (1994).

²⁵ XXVIII 4.14.

²⁶ SOSIN (1999; 2000). Traces of the satires of Juvenal may be found in the *Historia Augusta*; the works of Rutilius Namacianus, Sidonius Apollinaris and Sedulius would lead the exploration chronologically quite far from Claudianus.

²⁷ The latter contains more than 70 references to Juvenal. However, it is not clear whether this text was the cause of the renewed interest in Juvenal, or whether it was an effect of a prevailing aesthetic trend: CAMERON (1984).

²⁸ WESSNER (1929).

it is a flexible term to refer to the use of a specific citation in support of a particular argument²⁹. Thus, that there should be general recognition by the end of the 5th century of Juvenal as an author studied in the school, which is reflected in references contained in Phocas, Cledonius and Priscianus should come as no surprise. The *Fragmentum Antinoense* reveals the same state of affairs. It comprises two codex pages containing Juv. 7.149-198 with Latin and Greek annotations and glosses written in various hands, some of which are Greek³⁰. Its readings are eclectic or predate Φ -Arch.; in addition, several diacritical signs are included, among them a *diple obelismene* marking verse 7.192, of whose authenticity Jahn was already doubtful. What this fragment of parchment does show, however, is that by the end of the 5th century the work of Juvenal was being used in Egypt and/or Constantinople as an aid to learning literary Latin.

In contrast to this use of Juvenal in 5th-century grammar manuals, the absence of any such references in manuals dating from the 4th century indirectly imply that the writer was read more from an ethical, rather than satirical, perspective. Thus, for instance, Charisius, a Latin grammarian of Greek origin at work in Constantinople in c. 360 makes no reference to Juvenal as a satirist or poet, although his work is replete with references to the satires of Lucilius³¹, Horace and Persius. Likewise, Diomedes, another Greek who taught Latin in Constantinople in the period 370–380, is especially renowned for his passage on the four possible definitions of satire³²; that he makes no reference to Juvenal in his canon of satirists or in the examples he gives, referring instead to Lucilius, Horace and Persius, is also noteworthy³³. Finally, that St. Jerome, a pupil of Donatus though not a professional grammarian, takes a similar approach is relevant, too: while he cites the satires of Horace

²⁹ KASTER (1978).

³⁰ It may be dated to c. 500, and to Antinoe, although the ultimate origin may have been Constantinople itself: ROBERTS (1935), *CPL* 37.

³¹ Such references may be second-hand, as was common in the case of Lucilius in the fourth century. However, BIRT (1888) holds that a lost satire by Lucilius on the Punic Wars may have been a source for the invectives written by Claudianus.

³² Diom. *GL* I 485 [1]: *satira dicitur carmen apud Romanos nunc quidem maledicum et ad carpenda hominum uitia archaeae comoediae caractere conpositum, quale scripserunt Lucilius et Horatius et Persius. et olim carmen quod ex uariis poematibus constabat satira uocabatur, quale scripserunt Pacuuius et Ennius...*

³³ The peculiar reference regarding Juvenal in John Lydus, *De mag.* 41 (Τούρνος δὲ καὶ Ἰουβενάλιος καὶ Πετρώνιος, αὐτόθεν ταῖς λοιδορίαις ἐπεξεληθόντες, τὸν σατυρικὸν νόμον παρέτρωσαν) in the mid-sixth century requires further explanation that is not encompassed by the remit of this paper.

and Persius, he makes no reference to and seems wholly unaware of Juvenal³⁴.

3.2. The question of which edition of the Juvenalian text Claudianus may have availed of arises in light of the wide-ranging literary significance and multi-faceted tradition of the *Satires* of Juvenal outlined above. A detailed response to this question is a complex task for a number of different methodological reasons. First, no comprehensive list of the literary sources of the complete works of Claudianus yet exists, although significant material in this regard has been provided by the apparatus of Birt's edition (1892) and, in more recent times, through published commentaries on individual poems³⁵. Second, many of the relations of literary dependence between Claudianus and Juvenal are merely thematic or involve a revision of words in the original, and thus are tangential to the definition of the textual model. In addition, many of the apparent parallels or echoes need not be intentional references for the reader to note; rather, they may be formulaic linguistic coincidences determined by the fixity of Claudianus's hexameter³⁶.

Moreover, most of the close textual parallels between Claudianus and Juvenal are common to the readings found in the Π -Cult. and Ω -Vulg. traditions; that is, they pertain to the large part of Juvenal's text which is not subject to dispute, and thus provides no clues regarding which tradition Claudianus may have drawn on³⁷. Further textual connections between both

³⁴ CAMERON (1984; 2000, above all, 349-354).

³⁵ See, for example, KEUDEL (1970), one of whose express purposes is to address the issue of literary sources in a methodologically consistent way; see also SCHWECKENDIEK (1992) and GRUZELIER (1993), among others.

³⁶ The exact and refined metrics used by Claudianus are homogenous across the panegyrics, invectives and mythological epic, in marked contrast to the free dactylic verse used in Roman satires: DUCKWORTH (1967, 120-121) and CAMERON (1970, 290). The more literally they mirror the models, the less intentional they are likely to be; such allusions are normally indicated through modifications or inversions of the original formulae: GUALANDRI (1968; 2000; 2004); KEUDEL (1970, 157-159).

³⁷ *Prob.* 54 ~ *Juv.* 14.299; *Ruf.* I 4 ~ *Juv.* 13.86; *Ruf.* I 213 ~ *Juv.* 5.21; *Ruf.* II 28 ~ *Juv.* 10.176; *Ruf.* II 79 ~ *Juv.* 1.27; *Ruf.* II 135 ~ *Juv.* 7.182; *Ruf.* II 448 ~ *Juv.* 14.86; *Gild.* 83 ~ *Juv.* 6.291; *Gild.* 86 ~ *Juv.* 6.291; *Gild.* 137 ~ *Juv.* 6.490; *Gild.* 188 ~ *Juv.* 11.162; *Gild.* 192 ~ *Juv.* 6.600; *Eutr.* I 60 ~ *Juv.* 6.225; *Eutr.* I 71-4 ~ *Juv.* 2.138; *Eutr.* I 98 ~ *Juv.* 8.20; *Eutr.* I 110 ~ *Juv.* 10.190; *Eutr.* I 123 ~ *Juv.* 6.597; *Eutr.* I 380 ~ *Juv.* 13.164; *Eutr.* II 330 ~ *Juv.* 7.32; *Eutr.* II 364 ~ *Juv.* 7.87; *Eutr.* II 458 ~ *Juv.* 11.146; *Eutr.* II 486 ~ *Juv.* 13.22; *Eutr.* II 490 ~ *Juv.* 14.35; *Nupt.* 151 ~ *Juv.* 4.21; *IV Cons.* 197 ~ *Juv.* 13.41; *IV Cons.* 375 ~ *Juv.* 10.168; *IV Cons.* 522 ~ *Juv.* 14.250; *IV Cons.* 380 ~ *Juv.* 12.79; *IV Cons.* 446 ~ *Juv.* 13.164; *Stil.* 1.171 ~ *Juv.* 10.177; *Stil.* 3.380 ~ *Juv.* 13.164; *Get.* 160 ~ *Juv.* 6.300; *Get.* 200 ~ *Juv.* 10.151; *Get.* 202 ~ *Juv.* 10.1; *Get.*

writers stem from a common source; see, for instance, *Eutrop.* II 376-401: *Aiax... adsurgit* appears to be paralleled in *Juv.* 7.115: *consedere duces, surgis tu pallidus Aiax,/ dicturus dubia pro libertate bubulco/ iudice*; but the model for the passage was probably *Ov. Met.* XIII 1-2, which Juvenal himself unquestionably drew on: *Consedere duces et uulgi stante corona/ surgit ad hos clipei dominus septemplicis Aiax*³⁸.

Despite its complexity, however, this task of discernment is not wholly impossible. In at least two cases, Claudianus appears to follow readings from the Ω -Vulg. tradition that do not appear in later editions. The hexameter ending *Epit.* 35, *principe natus*, mirrors what most manuscripts give for *Juv.* 8.198, except G, U and perhaps P¹³⁹, which has *principe mimus*, a variant accepted as original in all the editions in use. The difference between one version and the other may be attributed to the fact that the majority tradition simplified the *difficilior* Π -Cult. text:

Juv. 8.198 (Π): *res haud mira tamen citharoedo principe mimus/ nobilis*
Juv. 8.198 (Ω): *res haud mira tamen citharoedo principe natus/ nobilis*
 Claudian. *Epit.* 35: *Sed certe mereor princeps hoc principe natus*

Eutr. I 280 offers a similar example, wherein Claudianus seems to draw on a variant which is not constant but that does appear in the Ω -Vulg. version of *Juv.* 2.116⁴⁰:

Juv. 2.116 (Π): *more superuacuam cultris abrumperne carnem?*
Juv. 2.116 (Ω)⁴¹: *more superuacuam cultris abscindere carnem?*
 Claudian. *Eutr.* I 280: *inguinis et reliquum Phrygiis abscidere cultris.*

This line of argument does not preclude the possibility that Claudianus's text had spread so widely by the beginning of the 5th century that it had a bearing on the work of editors in the Ω -Vulg. tradition, con-

597 ~ *Juv.* 15.74; *CM* 22.16 ~ *Juv.* 10.168; *Rapt.* I 148 ~ *Juv.* 10.152; *Pr. Rapt.* II 49 ~ *Juv.* 11.61.

³⁸ In turn, *IV Cons.* 197: *ab Idaeis primaevus Iuppiter antris* seems to have been taken directly from *Juv.* 13.41: *priuatus adhuc Idaeis Iuppiter antris* (Φ), but *Idaea antra* also appears in *Ov. Met.* IV 288, *Prop.* II 32.33 and *Stat. Silu.* IV 6.43. The *flaua caesaries* of the Sigambri is to be found in *Eutr.* I 380, *Stil.* 3.18 and *IV Cons.* 446, as well as in *Juv.* 13.164, but seems to have been simply a successful *iunctura* of Silver Epic: cf. *Lucan.* II 51, *Sil. Ital.* IV 200 and *Val. Flac.* VI 225.

³⁹ According to the apparatus given by WILLIS (1997): *mimus* G U *schol. et fort.* P¹ *natus* Φ , where Φ is by the *consensus* of the unmentioned codices, MARTYN (1987) included: *mimus* P¹ (*-imus* in ras.) G U A² I¹ k¹ q u² Σ *natus* Ω (Ω =*consensus codd. exceptis iis qui citantur*).

⁴⁰ KNOCHE (1940, 301, n. 2).

⁴¹ In WILLIS (1997): *abrumperne* P¹ *AGOTU* *abscidere* P² *abscidere* V *abscidere* KZ *et conii. Oudendorp* *excidere* H *abscindere* Φ .

tminating the text some time after that tradition had gradually begun to differentiate itself from the Φ -Arch tradition.

Nevertheless, at least two other verbal parallels between the two writers show that Claudianus was familiar with variants that appear only in the Π -Cult. text. There is an allusion to the text of Juv. 10.299 in its most correct form⁴² at *III Cons.* 3:

Juv. 10.299 (Ω): *Tradiderit domus et ueteres imitata Sabinas*

Juv. 10.299 (Π)⁴³: *Tradiderit domus et ueteres imitata Sabinos*

Claudian. *III Cons.* 3: *Festior annus eat cinctusque imitata Gabinos.*

Moreover, the accepted text for Juv. 15.145 is corrected in line with a reading that has relatively little textual support (only in U and O, and perhaps in P¹), but is confirmed by the parallel contained in Claudian. *Rapt.* III 32, which emulates the passage from Juvenal⁴⁴:

Juv. 15.145 (Π)⁴⁵: *atque exercendis pariendisque artibus apti*

Juv. 15.145 (Ω): *atque exercendis capiendisque artibus apti*

Claudian. *Rapt.* III 32: *utque artes pariat sollertia, nutriat usus*

All in all, that Claudianus's text includes textual variants from both the Π -Cult. and Ω -Vulg. traditions of Juvenal would appear somewhat contradictory. This incompatibility may be attributed to a subsequent contamination of the *traditio uulgata*, whereby Claudianus read different Juvenalian texts on different occasions, or because he availed of a version that came from a mixed tradition, which is very unlikely in chronological terms. A more likely explanation is that Claudianus read a text or a number of texts prior to the Φ -Arch. archetype which included variants that were not accepted in the latter edition. In other words, the work of Claudianus reflects the textual state of affairs before Φ -Arch., which may be traced in the material compiled in a number of scholia. The subsequent tradition may on occasion have incorporated some of these *uestustiores* readings, because it drew on the material in the annotations and notes or because versions prior to Φ -Arch., which disappeared later, acted as the standard control-copytext.

The fact that Claudianus imitates Juv. 11.203 in two different ways in two different places lends support to this thesis. On the one hand, in *Ruf.* I 185 (397), he drew on the version that exists only in one quotation from Pris-

⁴² KNOCHE (1940, 303, n. 5).

⁴³ In WILLIS (1997): *sabinos FG et P² litteris inos in rasura exstantibus*. MARTYN (1987): *sabinos P¹ G F I Valla¹ sabinas Ω* . All (P¹ G F I Valla¹) are relatively close to Π .

⁴⁴ KNOCHE (1940, 151).

⁴⁵ In WILLIS (1997): *pariendisque OU et coni. Buecheler (cf. Claud. raptu Pros. 3,32...), * * * iendisque P¹ capiendisque Φ schol.*

cian; and on the other hand, in *IV Cons.* 553 (398), Claudianus alludes to the version handed down through the *consensus codicum*:

Juv. 11.203 ($\Phi=\Pi+\Omega$): *nostra bibat uernum contracta cuticula solem*
 Prisc. III 106.5: *Combibet aestium contracta cuticula solem*
 Claudian. *Ruf.* I 185: *Hinc bibat aestium septeno gurgite Nilum*
 Claudian. *IV Cons.* 553-4: *uestis radiato murice solem/ combibit*

A further, very similar example might also be mentioned here, although it prompts some uncertainty in this regard. Claudianus uses the same hexameter ending (*post proelia turmas*) at both *Ruf.* II 343 and *Rapt.* II 55, thus imitating the variant of the end of verse Juv. 12.110 in *proelia turmam* found in A (*Monacensis* 408), an eclectic manuscript close to Π -Cult. As such, the A version is a *lectio facilior* of the original oxymoron (*euntem in proelia turrem*), passed on in the minority tradition Π -Cult. and simplified in Ω -Vulg. as *euntem in proelia turbam*⁴⁶:

Juv. 12.110 (Π)⁴⁷: ... *et euntem in proelia turrem*
 Juv. 12.110 (A): ... *et euntem in proelia turmam*
 Juv. 12.110 (Ω): ... *et euntem in proelia turbam*
 Claudian. *Ruf.* II 343: *Ipse salutatum reduces post proelia turmas*
 Claudian. *Rapt.* II 55: *Hippolyte niueas ducit post proelia turmas*

However, even assuming that *turmam* is a mistaken reading, independent of and prior to the drafting of Φ -Arch., which is recovered in the A version, the fact that Claudianus uses *turma* as a hexameter ending on five other occasions cannot be ignored: *CM* 27.83; 53.49; *Ruf.* II 101; *IV Cons.* 349; and *VI Cons.* 250. Thus, the evidential weight of the parallel is significantly weakened.

To sum up, the following conclusions may be drawn from the foregoing discussion: First, Claudianus had read in some depth a version of Juvenal prior to the Φ -Arch. archetype; although it was marked by a variety of specific variants, this version was not essentially different to the later archetype. Second, it is also very likely that Claudianus had access to other versions offering different readings that were in circulation in Rome and Milan in the period 395–405. Finally, the second conclusion does not call into question the idea that the Juvenalian manuscript tradition comes from a single text, broken at verse 16.60; rather, it suggests that Juvenalian texts were available in scroll-form for some time after the drafting of Φ -Arch. in the final third of the 4th century and at the start of the 5th century.

⁴⁶ KNOCHE (1940, 130 and 301, n. 1).

⁴⁷ In WILLIS (1997): *turrem* P¹ G U *turmam* A *turbam* Φ . MARTYN (1987): *turrem* P¹ G U c h k² *turrim* P² q² *turmam* A θ *turbam* Ω .

4. The hypothesis that different versions of Φ -Arch. were in circulation in scroll-form for a time at the end of the 4th century and the beginning of the 5th century may find some confirmation through an analysis of the influence of Juvenal on Christian hexameter poetry during that period. In particular, two invectives dating to the end of the 4th century⁴⁸, the *Carmen ad quendam senatorem*⁴⁹ (CS) and the *Carmen contra paganos*⁵⁰ (CP) draw on Juvenal's verses in a markedly different way to the approach taken by *Cyprianus Gallus*, author of the *Heptateuchos*, one generation later. However, notwithstanding any formal differences that may be noted, the most significant point for the purposes of this discussion is that both poems reflect almost entirely antithetical ways of reading the *Satires*.

On the one hand, that the two Christian invectives adopted the sarcasm of satire, as Claudianus himself was to do some years later in *In Eutropium*, should come as no great surprise. The 85-verse CS comprises a ferocious attack on a particular senator, a convert to Christianity who had reverted to the worship of the *Magna Mater* and Isis. Two sections of the poem, 28 verses in all, amounting to almost one third of the whole (vv. 6-20 and 21-34), focus on the most absurd and scandalous aspects of such mysteries; the model adopted by the author in this regard is verses 508-541 of Juvenal's *Satire 6*, which deals with themes the two texts share: transvestism; feminization; castration; the bloody rites of Cybele; the ridiculousness of Anubis; and the shaven-headed devotees of Isis⁵¹. Further thematic and structural parallels identified by Begley might also be listed: the priests of the *Magna Mater* in CS 6-20 are implicitly compared with the *pathici* in Juvenal's *Satire 2*; and the procession of the priests of Isis in CS 21-34 echoes the *pompa triumphalis*, modelled on Juv. 8.224-230⁵². With regard to characteristics that may be shared with Claudianus's invectives, the satirical *indignatio* in CS

⁴⁸ To my mind, the *Carmen aduersus Marcionitas* is not pertinent to critical discussions in this regard as it was influenced to a greater extent by didactic and apologetic poetry than by hexameter satire. Moreover, it was written between 420 and 450, since St Augustine furnishes it with the concept for *Ecclesia ab Abel* (cf. *Ciu.* XV).

⁴⁹ CSEL XXIII (1891, 227-230); WESTON (1915, 61-63); contemporaneous or slightly prior to Claudianus.

⁵⁰ *Anth. Lat.* I 17-23; WESTON (1915, 57-60).

⁵¹ A comparison with *De Sodoma* may provide an enabling counterpoint. The latter comprises 167 hexameters in the biblical epic mode, and may be dated to the 5th century; although its theme – Lot's escape – would appear to be amenable to the sharpest devices of Roman moral satire, it is a measured and elegant text indebted to both Virgil and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

⁵² BEGLEY (1984, especially 129-143).

may be significant. The structural imbalance may suggest that the longer section drew on pre-existing satirical material. To sum up, the connection between *CP* and Juvenal may be construed as a reasonably modest emulation, rather than an instance of literal citation or imitation.

By contrast to these two short satirical *carmina*, the author of *Heptateuchos* more frequently borrows from Juvenal literal phrases or word-for-word expressions that fit neatly into the metrical structure of fixed positions in the verse⁵⁶. Moreover, on at least two occasions, a whole verse from the *Satires* is cited, uprooted from its original context and replanted in a setting whose plot and tone is wholly contrary to the original: Cypr. Gall. *Iud.* 445 = Juv. 6.507 (*et leuis erecta consurgit ad oscula planta*); Cypr. Gall. *Iud.* 754 (*auolat et spreiti refugit consortia lecti*) ≈ Juv. 6.226 (*auolat et spreiti repetit uestigia lecti*). This approach, whereby the model is adopted but not adapted, resembles the technique of the Virgilian centos, and implies that the author carried out an intensive, line-by-line reading of the *Satires*. Although it may never be proven beyond doubt, more likely than not such reading was facilitated by a codex related to Φ -Arch. available in Gaul during the first half of the 5th century⁵⁷.

Unlike the 5th-century *Heptateuchos*, the authors of the late-4th century *carmina* carried out scroll-based extensive readings of Juvenal, and reflected the model afforded by such reading in the context and tone of their writings. However, such extensive readings appear to have been gradually replaced by intensive readings, enabled by the emergence of the codex format, following the distribution of the Φ -Arch. text. This does not mean that Christian authors from the 5th century onwards could no longer read Juvenal in extensive ways; rather, that at least some of them read annotated codices. Paradoxically, while the fashion for Juvenal in the 4th century had given rise to a codex text which was of higher quality than the then existing scroll versions, successive copies based on the codex yielded a more and more literal reading of the text that seemed to lose something of the genius of the original.

⁵⁶ Further examples in this regard include the following, among others: Cypr. Gall. *Gen.* 895 ~ Juv. 1.168 (*inde irae et lacrimae*); Cypr. Gall. *Gen.* 1076 ~ Juv. 13.206 (*tota pariter cum prole*); Cypr. Gall. *Gen.* 1136 ~ Juv. 8.161 (*regem dominumque*); Cypr. Gall. *Gen.* 1174 ~ Juv. 14.14 y 18; Cypr. Gall. *Ex.* 383 ~ Juv. 11.066 (*toto grege mollior*); Cypr. Gall. *Ex.* 0388 ~ Juv. 14.099 (*praeputia ponunt*).

⁵⁷ KNOCHE (1940, 75) is reluctant to concede the possibility that Cypr. Gall. *Gen.* 1200 (*a crimine sumit*) uses a version of Juv. 6.285 belonging to the Ω -Vulg. tradition, since in Π -Cult. the preposition is omitted (PQ) or the reading *de crimine* (R) is given. However, see Ov. *Met.* VI 472: *laudemque a crimine sumit*, which, to my mind, strips the parallel of any relevance.

5. Thus, although imitations of Juvenal comprised a literary trend among Roman intellectuals of the 4th century, there was no corresponding interrogation of the Roman satire as a literary genre. Claudianus successfully combined satire and invective, but only insofar as such combination met the immediate needs of each composition⁵⁸: to communicate a political message in an effective way and to respond to the demands of an educated audience. To figure Claudianus's work as the fruit of a through-going reflection on the Greek and Roman dimensions of his own tradition may be an instance of anachronistic criticism.

If Claudianus did read Juvenal extensively on the scrolls that predated the codex format at the end of the 4th century, a few more general conclusions might be drawn with regard to the way in which this poet appropriated Latin literary culture in such an extraordinary manner. First of all, not only are there no arguments to preclude the notion that Claudianus may have read the scrolls in Egypt before his arrival in Rome⁵⁹; rather, further support is discerned for the ever more widely accepted idea that these Roman writings were known and had an influence in the Greek world. Secondly, the existence of scrolls of Juvenal's satires in the Greek-speaking East would imply that his role in 4th-century literary culture cannot be limited to that of a single textual copy preserved by chance; but rather that he was known in Rome, in the West and in the East – more widely known perhaps than the extant manuscript record and literary and scholarly references might suggest. Thirdly, whether in specific details or in the arguments that shape the structure of his compositions, Claudianus's emulation of the original suggest that he continued to read the classical Latin writers relatively frequently over time, in Constantinople, Rome and Milan. To summarize, Claudianus was engaged in a dialogue with the Roman poetic tradition and read it as a dynamic system, a living code that could enable him to communicate with his own audience.

Finally, these preliminary conclusions regarding the Juvenal read by Claudianus as a specific instance of the modes of reading practiced by the poet from Alexandria in no way exhaust the potential for further understand-

⁵⁸ The distinctive admixture of genres in the poetry of the Late Antiquity was not accidental; rather, it was wholly intentional; this is confirmed by the counter-example of *Epithalamium de Nuptiis Honorii Augusti*, which, in line with generic conventions and expectations, is wholly pagan and traditional in form.

⁵⁹ The *Panegyricus dictus Probino et Olybrio consulibus*, his first work in Latin (395), contains at least two parallels with Juvenal, as well as many others with Virgil, Ovid, Statius and Lucanus; cf. *Prob.* 54 ~ *Juv.* 14.299.

ing of his poetic achievement. One field for further exploration, and by no means the least important, may be the Greek substrate of the prose invective, the Scoptic epigram, and the *spoudogeloion* which may run side-by-side with the Latin tradition in the two invectives⁶⁰. These ideas are noted in the conclusion to this paper as possible starting-points for future research.

Álvaro Sánchez-Ostiz
Universidad de Navarra
asostiz@unav.es

⁶⁰ In this regard, see KNOCHE (1940); NESSELRATH (1994), who argue that an awareness, if not influence, of Lucianus may be discerned in Claudianus.

References

- ADKIN (1994) N. Adkin, "Juvenal and Jerome", *CPh* 89 (1994), 69-72.
- BARTALUCCI (1973) A. Bartalucci, "Il Probus di Giorgio Valla e il *Commentum uetustum* a Giovenale", *SIFC* 45 (1973), 233-257.
- BEGLEY (1984) R. B. Begley. *The "Carmen ad quendam senatorem": Date, Milieu, and Tradition*, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1984 [Tesis doctoral].
- BIRT (1888) T. Birt, *Zwei politische Satiren des alten Rom*, Marburg 1888.
- BIRT (1892) T. Birt, *Claudii Claudiani carmina*, Berlin 1892.
- BRAUND (1996) S. M. Braund, *Juvenal. Satires. Book I*, Cambridge 1996.
- BRAUND (2007) S. M. Braund, *The Roman Satirists and their Masks*, Londres 2007.
- CAMERON (1964) A. Cameron, "Literary Allusions in the *Historia Augusta*", *Hermes* 92 (1964), 363-377.
- CAMERON (1968) A. Cameron, "Notes on Claudian's Invectives", *CQ* 18 (1968), 387-411.
- CAMERON (1970) A. Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*, Oxford 1970.
- CAMERON (1984) A. Cameron, "The Latin Revival of the Fourth Century", en W. Treadgold (ed.), *Renaissances before the Renaissance. Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Stanford 1984, 43-58.
- CAMERON (2000) A. Cameron, "Claudian Revisited", en F. E. Consolino (ed.), *Letteratura e propaganda nell'Occidente latino da Augusto ai regni romanobarbarici*, Roma 2000, 127-144.
- CASTILLO (1971) C. Castillo, "Tópicos de la Sátira romana", *CFC* 2 (1971), 147-163.
- CAVALLO (1998²) G. Cavallo, "Testo, libro, lettura", en G. Cavallo, P. Fedeli y A. Giardina (ed.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica. II: La circolazione del testo*, Roma 1998², 307-341.
- CLAUSEN (1992²) W. V. Clausen, *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae*, Oxford 1992².
- COURTNEY (1967) E. Courtney, "The Transmission of Juvenal's Text", *BICS* 14 (1967), 38-50.
- DÖPP (1980) S. Döpp, *Zeitgeschichte in Dichtungen Claudians*, Wiesbaden 1980.

- DUCKWORTH (1967) G. E. Duckworth, "Five Centuries of Latin Hexameter Poetry: Silver Age and Late Empire", *TAPhA* 98 (1967), 77-150.
- GNILKA (1976) C. Gnilka, "Dichtung und Geschichte im Werk Claudians", *FMSSt* 10 (1976), 96-12.
- GNILKA (1977) C. Gnilka, *Rec. Cameron* (1970), *Gnomon* 49 (1977), 26-51.
- GNILKA (2007) C. Gnilka, *Philologische Streifzüge durch die römische Dichtung*, Basel 2007.
- GREEN (1995) R. P. H. Green, "Proba's Cento: Its Date, Purpose, and Reception", *CQ* 45 (1995), 551-563.
- GRIFFITH (1963) J. G. Griffith, "The Survival of the Longer of the So-Called 'Oxford' Fragments of Juvenal's Sixth Satire", *Hermes* 91 (1963), 104-114.
- GRIFFITH (1968) J. G. Griffith, "A Taxonomic Study of the Manuscript Tradition of Juvenal", *MH* 25 (1968), 101-138
- GRUZELIER (1993) C. Gruzelier, *Claudius Claudianus, De raptu Proserpinae*, Oxford 1993.
- GUALANDRI (1968) I. Gualandri, *Aspetti della tecnica compositiva in Claudiano*, Milán 1968.
- GUALANDRI (2000) I. Gualandri, "Claudio e Prudenzio: polemiche a distanza", en F. Consolino (ed.), *Letteratura e propaganda nell'Occidente latino da Augusto ai regni romanobarbarici*, Roma 2000, 145-171.
- GUALANDRI (2004) I. Gualandri, "Claudian's Greek World: Callimachus", en W. W. Ehlers, F. Felgentreu y S. M. Wheeler (ed.), *Aetas Claudiana: Eine Tagung an der Freien Universität Berlin vom 28. bis 30. Juni 2002*, München 2004, 78-95.
- HAGENDAHL (1967) H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, Gotemburgo 1967.
- HALL (1985) J. B. Hall, *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*, Leipzig 1985.
- HIGHET (1954) G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist*, Oxford 1954.
- KASTER (1978) R. A. Kaster, "Servius and Idonei Auctores", *AJPh* 99 (1978), 181-208.
- KEUDEL (1970) U. Keudel, *Poetische Vorläufer und Vorbilder in Claudians De consulatu Stilichonis: Imitationskommentar*, Gotinga 1970.
- KIRSCH (1989) W. Kirsch, *Die lateinische Versepeik des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1989.
- KNOCHE (1926) U. Knoche, *Die Überlieferung Juvenals*, Berlin 1926.
- KNOCHE (1940) U. Knoche, *Handschriftliche Grundlagen des Juvenaltexes*, Leipzig 1940.
- LEVY (1946) H. L. Levy, "Claudian's *In Rufinum* and the Rhetorical $\Psi\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ ", *TAPhA* 77 (1946), 57-65.

- LEVY (1971) H. L. Levy, *Claudian's In Rufinum: an Exegetical Commentary*, Cleveland 1971.
- LONG (1996 a) J. Long, *Claudian's In Eutropium, or, How, when, and why to Slander a Eunuch*, Chapel Hill 1996a.
- LONG (1996 b) J. Long, "Juvenal Renewed in Claudian's *In Eutropium*", *IJCT* 2 (1996b), 321-335.
- LUCK (1972) G. Luck, "The Textual History of Juvenal and the Oxford Lines", *HSCPh* 76 (1972), 217-231.
- MARTYN (1987) J. R. C. Martyn, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*, Amsterdam 1987.
- MATTHEWS (1970) J. F. Matthews, "The Historical Setting of the 'Carmen contra Paganos' (Cod. Par. Lat. 8084)", *Historia* 19 (1970), 464-479.
- NESSELRATH (1994) H.-G. Nesselrath, "Menippeisches in der Spätantike: Von Lukian zu Julians 'Caesares' und zu Claudians 'In Rufinum'", *MH* 51 (1994), 30-44.
- H. ROBERTS (1935) C. H. Roberts, "The Antinoë Fragment of Juvenal", *JEA* 21 (1935), 199-207.
- RUDD (1986) N. Rudd, *Themes in Roman Satire*, Londres 1986.
- SCHMIDT (1976) P. L. Schmidt, *Politik und Dichtung in der Panegyrik Claudians*, Constanza 1976.
- SCHWECKENDIEK (1992) H. Schweckendiek, *Claudians Invektive gegen Eutrop (In Eutropium): Ein Kommentar*, Hildesheim 1992.
- SHANZER (1986) D. Shanzer, "The Anonymous Carmen contra paganos and the Date and Identity of the Centonist Proba", *REAug* 32 (1986).
- SOSIN (1999) J. D. Sosin, "Ausonian Allusions to Juvenal's Satires", *WS* 112 (1999), 91-112.
- SOSIN (2000) J. D. Sosin, "Ausonius' Juvenal and the Winstedt Fragment", *CPh* 95 (2000), 199-206.
- TARRANT (1983) R. J. Tarrant, "Juvenal", en L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, 200-203.
- TOWNEND (1972) G. B. Townend, "The Earliest Scholiast on Juvenal", *CQ* 22 (1972), 376-387.
- WESSNER (1929) P. Wessner, "Lucan, Statius und Juvenal bei den römischen Grammatikern", *PhW* 49 (1929), 296-303, 328-335.
- WESSNER (1967) P. Wessner, *Scholia in Iuvenalem vetustiora*, Stuttgart 1967.
- WESTON (1915) A. H. Weston, *Latin Satirical Writing Subsequent to Juvenal*, Lancaster 1915.
- WILLIS (1997) J. A. Willis, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae sedecim*, Stuttgart 1997.