

Denis Keyer

CERTUM EST DARE LINTEA RETRO:
JUVENAL 3. 205; 5. 141, 143–144; 6. 195, 197–198
RECONSIDERED

This article re-examines five problems in three passages of Juvenal, defending earlier interpretations neglected in modern scholarship in four cases and proposing a new solution in the fifth.¹

1. A Luxury Table Owned by a Pauper? (3. 205)

Among the many hardships of life in Rome for a poor citizen, Umbricius mentions the risk of fire, which is especially acute for those who rent a room in the attic. This is illustrated by the story of a pauper who loses all his meager possessions in a fire and receives no offer of food, clothing, or shelter. By contrast, a rich and noble man who suffers the same misfortune comes to possess even greater luxuries than before, thanks to the generous donations of his friends. The pauper's possessions are described as follows (3. 203–209):²

lectus erat Codrus³ Procula minor, urceoli sex
ornamentum abaci, necnon et parvulus infra
cantharus et recubans sub eodem marmore Chiron, 205
iamque vetus Graecos servabat cista libellos

¹ I am deeply indebted to Vsevolod Zeltchenko for his sound criticism, insightful comments, and generous willingness to engage with my interpretations of Juvenal.

² Text and apparatus here and below are based on Willis 1997 and Clausen 1959 with minor corrections, additions, and abridgements.

³ I leave aside the choice between *Codrus* or *Cordus* here and in 1. 2; see the survey of the discussion in Gallia 2016, 319–323. Since Griffith 1951, most scholars opt for the Roman name (Courtney ²2013, 153: “Umbricius would not feel sympathy for anyone with the Greek name Codrus”); cf., however, Gallia 2016, 321–322, who refers to the poet Codrus in Verg. *Buc.* 5. 11 and 7. 22 (shortly above, in v. 199, an Ucalegon is mentioned).

et divina opici rodebant carmina mures.
 nil habuit Codrus – quis enim negat? – et tamen illud
 perdidit infelix totum nihil...

203 Cordo *U*, Codro *VΦ*, Priscianus, *GL Keil II. 219, cf. 1. 2 et v. 208* | **205** cantharus et *codd.*, Centaurus *Markland probante Braund 2004* | sub eo de marmore *C. Valesius*, sub eodem <e> marmore *Matthias, Housman probante Courtney*, ab eodem marmore *Markland probante Braund 2004*, rupto de marmore *dub. Nisbet 1989 probante Willis*, sub eodem marmore echinus *Manso (ex Hor. Sermon. 1. 6. 117)* | Chiron *PV*, Chiron *cett.* **208** Cordus *U*, Cordrus *V*, Codrus *PRΦ*

It is essential for the discussion of the text that the schol. vet. ad 205 read:

quemadmodum solent e marmoribus facere sigilla diversa.

Thus, the scholiast saw Chiron as a marble statuette and seemingly thought the mention of marble referred to it; hence the emendation of *C. Valesius sub eo de marmore Chiron* (improbable, due to the unpoetic form *eo*)⁴ and *Matthias'* and *Housman's* elegant improvement *sub eodem <e> marmore Chiron*.

However, the mention of a marble statuette in the scholion does not necessarily suggest a divergence from the manuscript tradition in v. 205. It is equally possible that the scholiast read *sub eodem marmore* (i.e., *abaco*), taking *eodem* not as 'aforementioned', but as a reference to the material of Chiron's statuette (~ '*sub eodem marmore, scil. de quo ipse Chiron factus est*').⁵

⁴ *C. Valesius* in *Achaintre 1810*, 143. Besides, in this case *sub eo* must refer not to the *abacus*, but to the *cantharus* (rightly noted by *Scholte 1873*, 27 and *Kissel 2013*, 246 objecting to *Monti 2004*, who adopts this in the text; *Deroux 2009*, 680–692, also adopting *sub eo de marmore*, reconstructs *abacus* as a multi-shelf sideboard, Chiron being displayed below the *cantharus*).

⁵ Thus also *Farnabius 1642*, 31; he understands *Chiron* as a table support, but takes *marmore* ironically and believes that both the table and its support sculpture were of clay. *Killeen 1964*, 213 refers *eodem* to the material Chiron is made of, interpreting *sub marmore* as '*de (e) marmore*'; *Kissel 2013*, 246 rightly objects that this usage is confined to inscriptions of late antiquity and inconceivable in *Juvenal*.

Most surprisingly, the vast majority of scholars interpret Chiron as a sculptural table support, a *τραπεζοφόρον*.⁶ This interpretation, however, involves two crucial difficulties: (1) it would be somewhat odd for the table support, as an integral part of the table, to be mentioned separately from the tabletop alongside an object placed beneath it (*cantharus*); (2) more importantly, Codrus' (or Cordus') possessions are described as downright beggarly and 'literally nothing' (208–209 *nil habuit* <...> *illud totum nihil*).

Mice gnawing at the scrolls in a worn-out wicker box etc. point to absolute poverty, which is clearly inconsistent with a sculptural table support: regardless of its material, it would be an item of some luxury.⁷ Moreover, the same would apply to a marble statuette or even to a marble tabletop, which would still reveal, if not luxury, then at least a certain, albeit modest, degree of affluence.⁸

Thus, Chiron must be a cheap statuette⁹ (most likely, of terracotta), and the words *sub eodem marmore* must refer to the *abacus* in the sense of 'under the same (i.e., aforementioned) marble'. Therefore it

⁶ E.g., Duff 1898, 151 (with reservations), Marache 1965, 75; Courtney 2013 [1980], 154; Rudd–Barr 1991, 21; 158; Adamietz 1993, 340, Braund 1996, 209; Lorenz 2017, 414 (hesitantly). The idea is as early as Farnabius (see n. 5 above); Grangaeus in Casaubon 1695, 76; Ferrari 1679, 120 (cf. n. 7 below). It has been discussed whether a recumbent centaur could, in theory, serve as a sculptural table support. Courtney 2013, 154, objecting to Friedländer 1895, 219 and others, may be right that it could, since such supports could be designed as a continuous base running across the full diameter of the tabletop. In view of other, more serious problems, however, this question is irrelevant.

⁷ It has been assumed that the marble *abacus* and/or its sculptural support are contrasted with those made of citrus wood and supported by ivory sculpture (Ruperti 1820, 148, with reference to Ferrari 1679, 120; likewise Braund 1996, 209, Courtney 2013, 154, et al.) – yet, what is described here is not merely a lesser degree of luxury, but sheer beggary.

⁸ This table is usually compared to *lapis albus* in Hor. *Serm.* 1. 6. 116 (Porph. ad loc.: *marmoream delphicam significat, quae scilicet pretii non magni est*); thus, recently, Grazzini 2016, 164 n. 60. Yet, the objection raised above in n. 7 applies here as well: Horace is describing a relatively modest lifestyle, not extreme poverty: after all, he has his own house and servants.

⁹ Thus Matthias 1875, 36; Friedländer 1895, 219, Dimatteo 2023, 53; 421. Friedländer l.c. objects to Welcker 1850, 261 and Iahn (precise reference not found), who interpreted Chiron as a dog name (thus already Tixier de Ravisi 1560, 358), and Bücheler 1893, 247, who believed that the figure of Chiron in question served as the handle for the lid of a wicker box. Other uncommon interpretations of *Chiron* include '*opus compositum de Chirone*' (Calderini

seems natural to impute the mention of marble to a jocular mock-epic tone of the description (cf. *necnon* in v. 204).

Along these lines, the passage in question may be compared to Ovid’s famous joke about the utensils of Philemon and Baucis (*Met.* 8. 668–670):¹⁰

...omnia fictilibus, post haec caelatus eodem
sistitur argento crater fabricataque fago
pocula... 670

Still, this meets with the difficulty, because *eodem argento* in Ovid is preceded by the mention of clay, while no material is mentioned in Juvenal to be taken up by *eodem marmore*, and in this case the text would convey the improbable idea that the table, as the *cantharus*, was of clay.¹¹ If one suspects here Ovid’s joke and believes that it is Chiron who was made of the same ‘marble’ (i.e., clay) as the *cantharus* and *urceoli*, then *sub* should be emended.¹²

A more plausible and natural solution has already been proposed by a few older scholars,¹³ namely to take *sub eodem marmore* as

1487, 12v.; Joh. Britannicus in Casaubon 1695, 473) and ‘*opus Chironis de arte chirurgica*’ (Lubinus 1619, 154, ascribing this to Calderini).

¹⁰ Thus, older scholars, who were rightly puzzled by the presence of a marble in a pauper’s hands. Cf. Farnabius 1642, 31 (n. 5 above); Markland (published in Willis 1996, 63): “*unde marmor in suppellectili Codri?*”; Ruperti ²1820, 148 (rejecting this view, cf. Ferrari 1679, 120): “*marmore vulgo ironice dictum et de argilla capiendum putant, quia Codrus pauperrimus fuerit...*”. Douza (in Burmann 1727, 608) cites Juvenal’s passage in question defending *eodem argento* in Ovid vs. *eadem argilla*, but it remains unclear how exactly he understood *sub eodem marmore*.

¹¹ Cf. n. 5 above.

¹² Markland (in Willis 1996, 63): “*Totum sic lego: nec non et parvulus infra / centaurus recubans, ab eodem marmore, Chiron. Facete, ab eodem marmore: figlinus enim erat quemadmodum urceoli isti sex. Sic aurum ad fin. Sat. VII*”; Grazzini 2011, 341; cf. idem 2016, 164 n. 60 rightly objects to emending *cantharus* et and points out the weakness of *ab* as indicating provenance rather than material.

¹³ Lubinus 1619, 154: “*quem abacum marmoreum ironice et ioculariter dicit. Fuit enim Codrus pauperrimus*”; cf. Juvencius ³1697, 43 (alongside the usual view of it as “*pes abaci*”, and referring *eodem* to *cantharus*): “*Fictilis effigies centauri Chironis, Achillis magistri, jacens sub eodem marmore, quo cantharus, id est, infra eundem vilem abacum, quem ironice marmor appellat, quia solebant divites marmoreis abacis uti*”; Lemaire 1825 (see n. 16 below);

referring to the tabletop ('under the aforementioned marble'), but to take *marmore* ironically, as if it were in quotation marks.¹⁴ The meager utensils placed on and beneath the tiny wooden stand for vessels are described in a mock-elevated register (*necnon, ornamenta*¹⁵), as though it were a marble display table bearing precious cups. A nice parallel to such usage is *coccina* in Mart. 2. 43. 8 that is ironically employed to denote cheap clothing by contrast with its luxurious analogues:¹⁶

misit Agenoreas Cadmi tibi terra lacernas;
non vendes nummis coccina nostra tribus.

It seems tempting to go further and extend this ironic usage to *abacus* in v. 204 as well.¹⁷ The crucial question here is whether this term invariably implied a luxurious display table¹⁸ (in which case its usage in v. 204 is certainly ironic) or whether it could also denote an ordinary 'sideboard', as is generally assumed.¹⁹

Peerlkamp 1861, 33 ad Verg. *Buc.* 7. 35 (on the statue of Priapus; he interprets *marmoreum pro tempore fecimus* as 'ligneum'): "*Sub eodem marmore, ex quo abacus ligneus, quem divites marmoreum habebant*".

¹⁴ Pace Courtney ²2013, 154, supported in this by Deroux 2009, 682, I do not see any difficulty "...in the clumsy way in which the explicit information that it is of marble is dragged in at the last moment": the *abacus* is referred to again as "marble" ironically: in imitation of an elevated style, the precise name of the object is replaced by a synonym that, by metonymy, refers to its (alleged) material.

¹⁵ *Ornamentum* in v. 203 is paralleled by *ornamenta deorum* in v. 218 (of statues taken from the temples in the East); cf. n. 25 below.

¹⁶ Lemaire 1825, 212 (ad. loc.): "*Martialis mens intelligatur e Juvenal. III. Sat. III., vs. 204 <...> Quemadmodum marmor in his versibus pro ligno abaci sumitur, ita coccina pro vilibus pannis minime coccineis*".

¹⁷ Thus Binder 1996, 4 (*DNP* s.v. *Abacus*).

¹⁸ Over 20 examples in *ThLL* s.v. ("*mensa pretiosa ad cenas lautas et sim.*"; in most of the passages cited, the table serves to display vessels rather than to function as a dining table).

¹⁹ Richter 1966, 116 translates *abacus* as "sideboard" and observes that its aim was "to display the many ornaments highly prized by the Romans". Yet the item from a sarcophagus she identifies as an *abacus* (*ibid.* Fig. 586) appears rather utilitarian. Ulrich 2007, 224 inclines to reinterpret it as *urnarium*; however, in his view "*abacus* encompassed both utilitarian and high-status objects" (*ibid.* 223). In *schol. vet.* ad v. 204 *abacus* (as well as *lapis albus* in Hor. *Serm.* 1. 116 in Porph., cf. n. 8 above) is identified with the *delphica*, which seems to have three legs and a round top. The reason for this may be that it was also used to display ornaments.

Although the latter view is widely accepted, the arguments for it are not entirely secure. Apart from the passage in question (where *abacus* may well be used ironically), the meaning ‘*mensa simplex, cui urceoli vel vasa imponebantur*’ is supported in *ThLL* s.v. only by two mentions in Cato,²⁰ where *abacus* is listed among items necessary for olive gardens (*Agr.* 10. 4²¹) and vineyards (*ibid.* 11. 3²²). Its meaning there remains uncertain: it has been understood as a kneading trough²³ and as a stand for vessels.²⁴

Whether *abacus* is used here ironically, like *marmore*, in the sense of ‘display table’, or neutrally, in the sense of ‘stand for vessels’, it is noteworthy that the verb *ornare* was sometimes used for adorning display tables with luxury items.²⁵ It is therefore very likely that this is what is hinted at by *ornamenta abaci* in v. 204, which also supports a playfully ironic interpretation of *marmore*.

The mention of a recumbent Chiron is somewhat obscure. It is true that, as is generally believed, a statuette of Chiron holding a lyre, as the teacher of Achilles, might symbolize Codrus’ (or Cordus’) interest in poetry. If so, some explanation is required for *recubans*. Although it is usually taken to imply a Sphinx-like pose, it is noteworthy that *LIMC* s.v. offers no parallels for that, and on the whole it is difficult to imagine a centaur lying on his side or back, since in that case the human part would be tilted towards the ground. There are examples of Chiron with a lyre recumbent on its hind legs, and it is this pose that is suggested by *schol. vet. ad loc.*²⁶ and even by an attempt at reconstruction;²⁷

²⁰ The fourth example, Tert. *Idol.* 8. 3 *qui signum describit, quanto facilius abacum linit!* can be discarded, as Waszink – Van Winden 1987, 149 ad loc. convincingly explain that it refers not to the luxury tables, but to a wall decoration, namely marble slabs imitated in stucco (cf. Fiechter 1918, 3–4).

²¹ ... *molae asinarias unas et trusatilis unas, Hispaniensis unas, molilia III, abacum I, orbes aheneos II, mensas II...*

²² ... *scamnum I, mensas II, abacum I, arcam vestiariam I...*

²³ Saglio 1875, 4, citing Hesych. μ 138 μάκτρα· ἄβάκιον, ἐνθα μάσσουσι τὸ ἄλευρον); Mau 1893, 5 (*RE* s.v. *Abacus* 4.).

²⁴ Fiechter 1918, 2–3. Indeed, in *Agr.* 11. 3 *abacus* is listed among items of furniture.

²⁵ Varro *Ling. Lat.* 9. 46 *abacum argento ornari*; Cic. *Tusc.* 5. 61 *abacos. . . compluris ornavit argento auroque caelato*; cf. Aus. *Epigr.* 2. 1. 2 (by paradox) *abacum Samio saepe onerasse luto*; Act. *Petr.* 17 *omnia ornamentaria in delfica exposuisti*.

²⁶ “*recubans*” enim e<s>t a posteriore parte recubens.

²⁷ Kelsey 1908, 30–38.

nevertheless, I am not sure that this pose could properly be described as *recubare*. Thus, the meaning of the words *recubans* <...> *Chiron* may remain open.²⁸

In any case, the interpretation of Chiron as a *τραπεζοφόρον* must be rejected; instead, *marmore* in v. 205 ought to be understood ironically, hinting at a luxurious display table in contrast with a tiny, cheap wooden stand. Full sail astern toward Lubinus, Lemaire, and Peerlkamp!

2a. Fertile Mycale / Mygale:
Matron or Concubine? (5. 141)

At a banquet, the wealthy and arrogant Virro subjects his poor client Trebius to every possible humiliation; yet if Trebius were suddenly to become rich, matters would be quite different (5. 132–145).

quadringenta tibi si quis deus aut similis dis
et melior fatis donaret homuncio, quantus
ex nihilo, quantus fieres Virronis amicus!
'da Trebio, pone ad Trebium. vis, frater, ab ipsis 135
ilibus?' o nummi, vobis hunc praestat honorem,
vos estis frater. dominus tamen et domini rex
si vis tu fieri, nullus tibi parvulus aula
luserit Aeneas nec filia dulcior illo.
iucundum et carum sterilis facit uxor amicum. 140
sed tua nunc Mycale pariat licet et pueros tres
in gremium patris fundat semel, ipse loquaci
gaudebit nido, viridem thoraca iubebit
adferri minimasque nuces assemque rogatum,
ad mensam quotiens parasitus uenerit infans. 145

137 frater *Colon. 199, Paris. 8291, ita cj. Markland, fratres cett.* 138 tu Φ , tunc *PRFO*, tum *Housman 1931 probante*

²⁸ If Chiron was a dog (see n. 9 above), it would explain *recubans*, but the name is not a typical one for a dog. Could *recubans* imply that a small statuette (in contrast with *mediamque Minervam* in v. 219, whatever is meant by *mediam*) was laid sideways under a low sideboard (elsewhere in the passage the stress is laid on the lack of space and small size of the furniture and utensils)? Yet even a low sideboard would perhaps allow one to place a small terracotta statuette beneath it vertically. Scholte 1873, 27 likewise suggests, by analogy with *parvulus cantharus*, that the point is the unusually small size of what is normally a large statue; yet it is far from evident that images of Chiron were typically large.

Braund 2004 139 luserat *P*, iusserat *R 140 del. Jahn 141* tua codd., sua *Weidner 1989* | *Mycale Φ*, *Mygale PR*, *Migale* schol., *Megale Markland*, *Buecheler 142* semel *PR*, simul *Φ 143* gaudebis ... iubebis *Hendry 1998*

Up to v. 140 the logical sequence is clear: ‘If you were to inherit a large fortune, you would at once become Virro’s intimate friend. The real object of his friendship is the money he hopes to inherit. Yet, if you wish to be the patron’s boss, you must not have a young son or daughter at your house (since otherwise he will have no prospect of the legacy)’.

The word *nunc* in v. 141 contains a problem that is crucial for reconstructing the further train of thought of the passage. It divided the scholars into two camps.

The first interpretation understood fertile *Mycale* (or *Mygale*)²⁹ as a concubine in contrast with *Trebius*’ childless wife:³⁰ ‘But your concubine (*Mycale* / *Mygale*) may give birth to as many as three children at once (i.e., as long as the children are not legitimate heirs): the patron will rejoice at your brood and indulge the small guests at the table’. Logically and contextually, this train of thought appears impeccable and self-evident.³¹ The Achilles’ heel of this interpretation is *nunc* in v. 141. It has been objected that *nunc* is regularly used after unreal conditionals, often with *at* or *sed*, as a marker of return to the real-life situation: ‘as it is now’ (cf. *ut nunc est*).³²

²⁹ The schol. vet. read *Migale* and suggest a hint at *μῆνυσθαί* (*ex ipsa coitione etymologia*); the reference to *Mycale* in *Ov. Met.* 12. 263 is unlikely.

³⁰ Thus *Ruperti* ²1820, 234–236 and *Friedländer* 1895, 274 (both at length); *Heinrich* 1839, 215–216; *Weidner* 1873, 113; *Scholte* 1873, 41; *Rose* 1936, 12–13, *Marache* 1965, 137; *Labriolle–Villeneuve* ⁹1967, 52; *Viansino* 1990, 187; *Adamietz* 1993, 352 n. 68. *Scholte* 1873, 45 agrees that *Mycale* / *Mygale* is a concubine, but takes *tua* as a generic second person rather than as a direct address to *Trebius*.

³¹ *Duff* ²1975 [1898], 198 objects that a concubine with children and a wife mentioned earlier in v. 77 cannot live under the same roof, but this need not be the case. As I see it, *Virro* is visiting *Trebius* at *Mycale*’s house, and it is there that the children appear before the guests (the phrase *parasitus <...> infans* is merely a joke); it is less likely that small children could attend a dinner at *Virro*’s house together with *Trebius* and *Mycale*, as is often assumed. Cf. n. 39 below.

³² *OLD* s.v. *nunc* 11 (“introducing a fact or consideration opposed to a previous speculation, wish, or sim. ‘(But) as it is’ (often w. adversative conjs. or advs.’.); *Kühner–Stegmann* ⁴1962, 399; cf. *vōν δέ*; examples are abundant; for *sed nunc* (less usual in this sense than *nunc*, *at nunc*, *nunc vero*) cf. *Verg. Aen.* 4. 345, *Ov. Trist.* 4. 1. 29.

Consequently, most recent scholars interpret *nunc* in opposition to *casus irrealis* in v. 132 f. and *tunc* in v. 138³³ as “now, when you are poor”; in this reading, Mycale / Mygale is Trebius’ wife and a freedwoman.³⁴ This shift in interpretation results, however, in fundamental difficulties.

1) Although it is not theoretically impossible that Trebius married a freedwoman and Juvenal chose to omit her first official name, this detail would be highly odd: how is the reader to understand that Mycale / Mygale is Trebius’ mistress and why stress her low origin?

2) Even more surprising is Virro’s attention to Trebius’ newborn children; suppose that the contrast between his reaction to the hypothetical offspring of a rich friend and a poor client is implied; still, it strongly contradicts his character. The man is repeatedly shown as mistreating and despising Trebius; why would he fuss over his children?

3) Virro’s insistent obsequiousness in v. 135–136 (when serving Trebius) and v. 135–136 (when indulging his children) suggests a parallelism, which is ruined if v. 141–145 are regarded as a digression.

Attempts to overcome these problems have born little fruit.

– V. 141–145 have been admitted to be difficult³⁵ and blamed as “irrelevant”³⁶ – true, yet precisely this invites us to rethink the interpretation.

– Presents of little value (on which, see section 2b below) have been explained as showing Virro’s meanness³⁷ or simply occasional courtesy that stresses his lack of interest in Trebius’

³³ This reading is, however, not certain: many editors, especially the older ones, print *si vis tu* (Weidner, Iahn, Bücheler, Mayor, Duff, Pearson, Housman [1905], Ramsay, Vianello, Willis, et al.), perhaps precisely because most of them thought *nunc* in v. 141 referred to the imaginary wealth, which does not sit easily with *tunc* in v. 138; *tunc* came to be preferred after Leo’s edition (Leo, Labriolle–Villeneuve, Knoche, Clausen, Martyn, Adamietz, Santorelli, Lorenz, Dimatteo et al.). Housman 1931, XLVI “the divergence points to *tum*”.

³⁴ Mayor ⁴1889, 266 supported at length by Duff 1898, 198; Courtney 2013 [1980], 213; Tennant 1993, 83–89; Braund 1996, 299; Santorelli 2013, 170; Kissel 2013, 270; Lorenz 2017, 181; 183; Dimatteo 2023, 91; 466; et al. Braund 2004, 226–227 hesitates between the two options.

³⁵ Housman 1905, XXXII “V. 140 <...> its context, the most obscure in Juvenal”.

³⁶ Duff 2013 [1898], 198: “...strikingly irrelevant; but such irrelevance is common in Juv.”; Courtney 2013, 213: “not fully relevant”.

³⁷ Ullman 1966, 281; Hopman 2003, 561.

legacy³⁸ – both possible, but that does not make Virro’s fussing over the poor client’s children and rejoicing about them³⁹ less puzzling.⁴⁰

- Virro’s attention to Trebius’ children has also been interpreted as calculated efforts to hook future parasites⁴¹ or ensure the status of Trebius himself⁴² – yet, again, any ingratiating is alien to his character.
- Recourse has been taken to emendations, but implausibly.⁴³

In view of the numerous and frustrating problems raised by this line of interpretation, one may wonder whether it is possible to discard it altogether and return to the safe and reassuring harbor of the previous interpretation. The question, then, is whether *nunc* can still be understood within the counterfactual *irrealis* discourse as meaning ‘now, when you are (hypothetically) rich’.

The first argument for this option is that *nunc* is here not quite in the initial position (as it is, for example, in *sed nunc...*). If we take *sed* with Mycale (*sed Mycale* <in contrast with the wife>) rather than with *nunc* (*sed nunc* <in contrast with *si [...] donaret* in v. 132 f.>),⁴⁴ this instance will differ from the numerous examples in which *nunc* marks a transition from imaginary situation to the present, real state of affairs.

³⁸ Morford 1977, 242; Braund 1996, 299; Kissel 2013, 270.

³⁹ A similar picture is given in Theophr. *Char.* 5. 5 (Ἀρεσκος, cf. 2. 6 [Κόλαξι]): the man invites his host’s children to the table, proclaims their close resemblance to their father, kisses them, and plays with them.

⁴⁰ Hight 1954, 145 offers a surprising explanation: “Juvenal, even at the cost of breaking the consistency of his character-sketch, cannot bear to think of any man’s being cruel to a child”.

⁴¹ [Rudd–]Barr 1991, 168; Jenkyns 1982, 195–196.

⁴² Tennant 1995, 86–87.

⁴³ Hendry 1998, 252–255 (cj. *gaudebis* <...> *iubebis*) writes that *ipse* refers to Trebius himself being not invited out and making parasites of his own children (Kissel 2013, 270 rightly objects that this falls out of the context and besides elsewhere in the satire *ipse* is Virro); likewise Manso 1821, 233–234 writes that *ipse* and *gaudebit* <...> *iubebit* refer to Trebius (Hendry 1998, 252–255 rightly objects that such a shift from the second person [*tua*] to the third is hardly possible). Along similar lines, Weidner 1887a, 290–291; 1887b, 6; ²1889, 88 emended *tua* in v. 141 to *sua*, thus making Mycale Virro’s wife.

⁴⁴ This may serve as an argument against the deletion of v. 140, since without the mention of a wife the transition to Mycale / Mygale would be somewhat abrupt.

Second, the what-if clause that begins in v. 132 expands into an extended descriptive passage, and its *irrealis* discourse is further actualized by the indicative forms *praestat honorem* and *estis fratres* in the address to the money (v. 136–137). That is, Virro’s imaginary remark is commented upon as if it were real. One could therefore posit the same deictic shift for *nunc* in v. 141.

Third, and most importantly, a similar example of *nunc* within a comparable long passage introduced by a *casus irrealis* – notably, again with two actualizing present indicatives in the middle – can be found in Iuv. 10. 43, where Democritus is imagined watching the *pompa circensis*:⁴⁵

quid si vidisset praetorem curribus altis
 extantem et medii sublimem pulvere circi
 in tunica Iovis et pictae Sarrana ferentem
 ex umeris aulaea togae magnaеque coronae
 tantum orbem, quanto cervix non sufficit ulla? 40
 quippe tenet sudans hanc publicus et, sibi consul⁴⁶
 ne placeat, curru servus portatur eodem.
 da nunc et volucrem, sceptro quae surgit eburno,
 illinc cornicines, hinc praecedentia longi
 agminis officia et niveos ad frena Quirites, 45
 defossa in loculos quos sportula fecit amicos.

This understanding encounters a problem if one adopts *tunc* instead of *tu* in v. 138: it would be strange, if not altogether impossible, for the hypothetical situation of sudden wealth to be referred to as *tunc* in v. 138 and then as *nunc* in v. 141. This serves as an argument in favor of following (Φ) and printing *tu* with the earlier editors.⁴⁷

In any case, with regard to v. 141–145 one should change course and steer in the wake of the interpretation defended by Ruperti and Friedländer.

⁴⁵ Referred to already by Scholte 1873, 45: “*Nunc*: hic non magis temporali sensu accipiendum est quam *Sat. X, 43*”.

⁴⁶ The transformation of a *praetor* in v. 36 into a *consul* in v. 41 poses a problem that still requires a solution.

⁴⁷ See n. 33 above; among the editors who accept *tunc*, only Labriolle–Villeneuve adhere to the interpretation defended here. *Tu* may emphasize the reversal of roles: “if you want to be Virro’s *dominus*, like he was yours...”.

2b. Presents for Baby Parasites? (5. 143–144)

It is universally accepted that Virro's gifts to the triplets, hypothetically born to Mycale / Mygale and now grown enough to attend the table, consist of three items: a green waistcoat (mostly interpreted as imitating those of the popular chariot-drivers' faction, cf. 11. 198; but sometimes as a military toy);⁴⁸ the smallest nuts (explained either by Virro's parsimony or as convenient for the children's small hands); and pennies, which are specifically modified as "begged for". This unusual set of presents, however, raises a whole series of problems that are seldom discussed.

1) *assemque rogatum* and, possibly, *minimas nuces* seemingly stress the low price of the presents. This would display Virro as mean, but it contradicts the train of thought defended in section 2a above: Virro is here pretending to adore Trebius' babies in hope for his legacy and should, on the contrary, show generosity.

2) Even if Virro is displayed as a miser, the green waistcoat must be a much more expensive item than nuts and pennies, which seems inconsistent.⁴⁹

3) The presents should be meant not for one child, but for all three of them. Nuts and pennies (*assem* taken collectively) could be distributed among the three, but only one waistcoat is mentioned, and it is not easy to understand it in a collective sense.

A compelling reinterpretation of v. 143–144 was put forward by Rose almost a century ago.⁵⁰ Surprisingly – and unfairly, – it has remained virtually unnoticed.⁵¹ In what follows, I restate Rose's solution and adduce several indirect arguments in its support.

⁴⁸ Markland in Willis 1996, 66 ("quaere de *thoraca*") was probably puzzled by the detail. Scholte 1873, 41–45, rightly objecting to Iahn's emendation *cito rhaga* (instead of *thoraca*), piled up a highly implausible set of corrections in order to associate all the presents with races: *viridem thoraca iubebit / adferri miniosque equulos axemque rotatum ad thensam...*

⁴⁹ Ullman 1966, 266 absurdly thinks of *viridem thoraca* as made of old, green-patinated bronze (in his view, Virro is a disrespectful host; as indicated above, he should be an obsequious guest). Hopman 2003, 557–574, even more nonsensically, seeks to prove that "the *viridis thorax* <...> is a perverse gift that endows the child with un-Roman and feminizing character".

⁵⁰ Rose 1936, 12–13.

⁵¹ It is registered in Lommatzsch 1938, 104 and objected to by Hopman 2003, 565–566 (see n. 54 below).

Rose noticed that *schol. vet.* ad v. 143 (*viridem thoraca*) mention a monkey:

armilausiam prasinam, ut simiae.

Normally this is ignored or explained by some confusion with the v. 153–155 shortly below,⁵² where a creature that gnaws rotten apples on the Servian Wall is periphrastically described as “trained by the whip to throw a spear from a she-goat, while wearing a helmet and a shield”; *schol. vet.* ad loc. helpfully identify it as a monkey: *quale[m] simia manducat*.

Rose, however, ingeniously suggested that *viridem thoraca* in v. 143 is a metonymy for a tamed monkey, and took *rogatum* as a supine governing the pair *minimasque nuces assemque*: a monkey is trained to perform some tricks and beg for a small reward of nuts and coins, which adds to the amusement. Virro must have bought it to please his new patron’s illegitimate children (so Rose), or else some street performer’s monkey was sent for.⁵³

This suggestion eliminates a number of difficulties and suits the context perfectly. The dubious distribution of pointedly cheap presents to the triplets of the rich man’s potential *rex* (v. 137) turns into a lively scene that serves as a parallel to v. 135–136: Virro as a host does his best to please Trebius himself, while as a guest he endeavors to amuse Trebius’ illegitimate offspring. The obscure scholion is thus explained. Syntactically, the construction with the supine is possible.

Rose himself admitted two difficulties:⁵⁴ (a) there is no evidence that would associate a green waistcoat with monkeys; (b) “Juvenal seldom uses a pair of *que*’s in this fashion, and all the certain examples seem to be on the ends of lines”.

The absence of evidence for a monkey in a green waistcoat⁵⁵ does not rule out a metonymy of this kind: it would be sufficient, if some

⁵² Thus Hopman 2003, 565.

⁵³ On monkeys in antiquity in general, see McDermott 1935; 1936; 1938 (esp. 131–146, “The Ape As a Pet and a Performer”; 135, 243–246 no. 343, 345, 349 on representations of monkeys as musicians at banquets); Toynebee 1973, 55–60, 354–355.

⁵⁴ Rose 1936, 13 n. 1. Both taken up by Hopman 2003, 565–566 with n. 30 with the verdict “many problems”.

⁵⁵ Most often a cloak is attested as a garment (McDermott 1938, 185–188), often with a hood (a Pompeian fresco with a boy teaching an ape to dance [ibid. 280 n. 479]; Gallo-Roman figurines, ibid. 187–188, no. 156–163,

monkeys could perform in a waistcoat, not necessarily green: the reader, then, could infer that a monkey is meant from the mention of nuts and coins to be begged for.

The pair of *-que*'s, otherwise rare in Juvenal, may add here an epic flavor.⁵⁶ It most often occurs at the end of lines, but regularly appears at the beginning or in the middle of Latin hexameters as well. However, if *rogatum* is a supine, the second object (*assem*) is left without an epithet, while the first one (*nuces*) is not, which seems to be avoided in such cases.⁵⁷ Stylistically and syntactically, it would be easier to take *rogatum* as an epithet.⁵⁸

However, the following speaks in favor of the supine: the perfect participle *rogatus* very rarely modifies an inanimate object ('[a thing] begged for'); in fact, I could not find a single example:⁵⁹ it almost always refers to a person asked for something. On the contrary, *rogatum* as a supine occurs fairly often.⁶⁰ Grammatically, therefore, supine is preferable.

cf. idem 1936, 153–154 with n. 35; Mart. 14. 128 [*bardocucullus* worn by *cercopitheci*? the sense is obscure]. In Luc. *Pisc.* 36 monkeys at the Egyptian court perform Pyrrhic dance in purple robes (*ἀλουργίδαί*). In Claud. *In Eutrop.* 1. 304–307 a boy dresses a monkey in silk garments, leaving its back and buttocks uncovered, in order to amuse the guests. The ape representing Aeneas wears a thorax and a cloak on the Pompeian fresco that parodies the scene of Aeneas' flight (McDermott 1938, 278–280 no. 478).

⁵⁶ Within the same passage *loquaci* <...> *nido* (v. 142–143) is taken from Verg. *Aen.* 12. 475 and *...tibi parvulus aula / luserit Aeneas* (v. 138–139) from *Aen.* 4. 328–329.

⁵⁷ In the rare examples I could find, it is either the second object of the two that is modified (Pers. 2. 6 *murmurque humilisque susurrus*, Ov. *Met.* 15. 590 *populumque gravemque senatum*; 14. 775 *Tatiusque patresque Sabini*; 12. 363 *pectusque umerumque sinistrum*; 7. 373 *volucrisque ferumque leonem*) or else, if the first object is modified, the modifier is postposed and tacitly goes with the second object, too (Verg. *Aen.* 9. 302 *matrique tuae generique*; Ov. *Met.* 13. 751 *patrisque sui matrisque*; 6. 716 *Calaisque puer Zetesque*; 3. 414 *faciemque loci fontemque*; *Trist.* 2. 1. 37 *genitorque deum rectorque*); cf. Cat. 57. 2 *Mamurrae pathicoque Caesarique*.

⁵⁸ If so, nuts and coins might be meant for playing with a monkey.

⁵⁹ In Ov. *Met.* 3. 653 *non haec mihi terra rogata est* it is a verbal form; in Ov. *Ibis* 641 *sed di dent plura rogatis* and *Priap.* 37. 14 *rogata fecit* it is a neutral plural used substantively. The next fascicle of *ThLL* when it sees print, will make things clear.

⁶⁰ Cic. *Verr.* 4. 63; Caes. *BG* 1. 11; 5. 36; 7. 5; Varro *R. r.* 2. 11. 12; Sall. *Iug.* 77. 3; Pompon. *Atell.* 160; Quintil. *Decl. min.* 247 pr. 2; Hygin. 45. 1.

Another indirect argument in Rose’s favor is that baboons begging for coins after performance are attested in Ael. *NA* 6. 10:

ἐπὶ τῶν Πτολεμαίων οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τοὺς κυνοκεφάλους καὶ γράμματα ἐδίδασκον καὶ ὀρχεῖσθαι καὶ αὐλεῖν καὶ ψαλτικὴν. καὶ μισθὸν κυνοκέφαλος ἐπράττετο ὑπὲρ τούτων, καὶ τὸ διδόμενον εἰς φασκώλιον ἐμβαλὼν ἐξηρημένον ἔφερεν, ὡς οἱ τῶν ἀγειρόντων δεινοί.

Finally, as mentioned before, this view removes the problem of distributing one green waistcoat among the three kids. *Parasitus infans* in v. 145 is to be taken in a collective sense: it would be strange if the children would come to the table and receive presents one at a time.

Thus, the *viridis thorax* in 5. 143 is very likely a monkey. A beacon must be raised for Rose’s ingenious explanation, unfairly long left in the shadows.

3a. “Things Left Under the Blanket” (6. 195)

In 6. 185, Juvenal mocks women for their excessive use of Greek (*omnia Graece*, v. 187). He devotes particular emphasis to the use of affectionate Greek expressions in intimate relations, a practice that appears to have been both fashionable and erotically stimulating, yet at the same time regarded as wanton – probably because of its associations with Greek-speaking prostitutes. An old woman is castigated for employing such expressions in public (191–199):

concumbunt Graece. donec tamen ista puellis:
tunc etiam, quam sextus et octogesimus annus
pulsat, adhuc Graece? non est hic sermo pudicus
in vetula. quotiens lascivum intervenit illud
ζωή καὶ ψυχή, modo sub Iodice relictis 195
uteris in turba. quod enim non excitet inguen
vox blanda et nequam? digitos habet. ut tamen omnes
subsident pinnae, dicas haec mollius Haemo
quamquam et Carpophoro, facies tua computat annos.

195 relictis *codd.*, ferendis (> *ferelictis) *Housman probante Lorenz*, loquendis *Nisbet probante Willis et Watson–Watson*, pudendis *Watt 1996*, peractis *Delz 1998*, receptis *Delz in Watt*

2002, *relatis* (i.q. ‘vocem referre’) Zago 2025 194–195 in *vetula*, *quotiens ... ψυχή*. modo *interp. Casaubon, Vianello* 195 modo *codd.*, mihi *Leo* 195–196 *relictis* / *verteris Francken* 195–197 modo ... *turba del. Heinrich* 195–198 modo ... *subsident pinnae del. Knoche* 195–198 *corruptelam vel lacunam susp. Vianello* 196–197 ‘quod enim ... habet?’ *vetulae tribuunt Markland et Vianello* 197 vi tamen *PR*, et tamen *H. Valesius probante Högg* 1971, attamen *Heinecke*

Scholarly attention with regard to this passage has for the most part focused on v. 195,⁶¹ where Housman pointed out a difficulty in *relictis*. Indeed, *relictis* is difficult to reconcile with the train of thought of the passage, since, apparently, in this case the wanton speech that the old woman is using in public would be described as abandoned.

The sense anticipated by Housman (“such expressions can only be tolerated in bed”); likewise Nisbet’s *loquendis* and Delz’s *receptis*) was based on a close parallel from Martial;⁶² besides, Housman was puzzled by *enim* in v. 196: in his view, the woman, being 85 years old, “*iam nec Graece concumbit, nec Latine*”.

However, strong arguments have been put forward against his view, namely (1) *modo* should mean ‘recently’, as in the meaning of ‘only’ it is normally used in a postposition;⁶³ (2) this would imply that the use of Greek expressions in intimate contexts is regarded as acceptable, whereas the preceding lines make it clear that Juvenal objects to women speaking Greek altogether.⁶⁴

⁶¹ See Zago 2025, 423–27 for a detailed analysis of the discussion and the emendations proposed. My summary here draws on this balanced and well-argued article and presents, in abridged form, the principal views and arguments surveyed there.

⁶² 10. 68. 5–8: *κύριέ μου, μέλι μου, ψυχή μου congeris usque, / pro pudor! Hersiliae civis et Egeriae. / lectulus has voces, nec lectulus audiat omnis, / sed quem lascivo stravit amica viro.*

⁶³ Watt 1996, 284–285, joined by Delz 1998, 123–124 and Zago 2005, 424, objected that of the other 18 instances of *modo* in Juvenal, 17 mean ‘recently’ (in fact, 15: 14. 86 *modo... nunc... nunc...* and 15. 119 *quis modo...?* should be set aside – *D.K.*) and just one, in postposition, ‘only’ (2. 135 *liceat modo vivere...*).

⁶⁴ Zago 2005, 424 is right that the mention of young girls serves rather to underscore how particularly absurd these affected expressions sound in the mouth of an old woman; it is hardly likely that Juvenal intended to suggest that, under certain circumstances – in bed and when uttered by young girls – the use of Greek expressions should be accepted.

Another line of interpretation proceeds from the assumption that the old woman, even at the age of eighty-five, is, pace Housman, satirically portrayed as sexually active.⁶⁵ The train of thought is then reconstructed as follows: her use of lascivious language in public merely reproduces what she has recently uttered in bed; that is, her licentiousness is not confined to words but reveals actual – and *ipso facto* disreputable – sexual activity.

In this case *relictis* should be either emended to mean ‘uttered’, ‘employed’ etc.,⁶⁶ or else be defended in a weakened sense (‘left lying after use’, like *(de)ponere*).⁶⁷ The latter option is not without difficulty, since, unlike *(de)ponere*, *relinquere* appears to retain the general notion of ‘abandoning, forsaking’.

This line of interpretation also gives rise to objections:

1) The adverb *modo*, if understood in the sense of ‘recently’, would imply that the old woman regularly resorts to this practice, whereas the following lines suggest that it is doomed to failure.

2) The line of reasoning appears overly complicated: the statement that the old woman’s speech is shameless is followed not by an argument that substantiates this claim, but by a further accusation of improper sexual desire.⁶⁸ Yet, whether or not the old woman has sexual relationships is irrelevant for assessment of her speech.

3) The bedroom in this case would serve a different function than in Martial 10. 68 (n. 62 above), thus undermining the otherwise strong similarity between the two texts.

⁶⁵ Delz, 1998, 124; Zago 2025, 5 with n. 29.

⁶⁶ Delz 1998 *peractis*; Zago 2005, 423–427 argues for *relatis*.

⁶⁷ Thus already Lubinus 1619, 246; also, e.g., Friedländer 1895, 305–306; Högg 1971, 93; Santorelli 2011, 79 and Dimatteo 2023, 117. Pace Zago 2025, 1 (“no more logical than saying ‘you play on the playground with the ball lately left at home’”), it is not outright absurd, as the verb may encode separation from a prior locus. One could say, e.g., “You’re stepping outside in a night cap that you only recently left under your pillow” (i.e., it was left there only a short while ago, and now, behold, you are wearing it again).

⁶⁸ Zago 2025, 427: “Greek endearments are shameless and disgusting when they come from a *uetula*, because they reveal her repulsive appetite for sex; in fact, when she uses lascivious expressions such as ζῶη καὶ ψυχὴ in public, one senses that she is lustful and has lately uttered them in the bedroom to arouse her partner, because (196 *enim*) alluring Greek words are a powerful tool of seduction”.

Thus the *consensus codicum* may be preserved, the Latin is satisfactory (*modo* means ‘recently’, not ‘only’), the close parallel with Martial 10. 68 (n. 62 above) is maintained (conveying the general idea that such words, if at all, might be conceivable only in the bedroom⁷²), and the train of thought is smooth (Greek expressions are condemned even in bed, and the claim of the indecency of the old woman’s speech is substantiated):

Such language is indecent in an old woman’s mouth. Whenever those wanton words, ζῶη καὶ ψυχή, crop up, you use in public words that were but lately⁷³ refrained from (even) under the blanket.

We may set sail on a new course in the direction mapped out (although later rejected) by Watt.

3b. Whose Feathers Droop? (6. 197–198)

Another problem within the same passage lies in the words *ut tamen omnes subsidunt pinnae* (v. 197–198). The general sense of this rarely attested idiom is clear: like Eng. *to let one’s feathers droop*, it should convey dejection, a loss of spirit or a downcast appearance. A similar metaphor with an opposite sense is found in Iuv. 4. 69–70 (of Domitian puffed up by straightforward flattery):

...quid apertius? et tamen illi
surgebant cristae. nihil est quod credere de se 70
non possit, cum laudatur dis aequa potestas.

‘*vitam non attigisse, vita abstinuisse*’ and quoting Hor. *Serm.* 2. 6. 89 *esset ador loliumque, dapis meliora relinquens* and *AP* 149–150 *et quae / desperat tractata nitescere posse relinquat* (likewise Harvie 1981, 145; Kissel 1990, 635–637).

⁷² The change from *in lecto* to *sub lodice* may be explained as reinforcing the idea of modesty: when covered by the blanket, one might be expected to behave even more wantonly than generally in bed, yet even there such words were refrained from.

⁷³ Cf. Iuv. 14. 298, where *modo*, in the sense of ‘but lately’, is contrasted with the present state of affairs.

However, the syntax and meaning of v. 197–198 require elucidation.⁷⁴ Surprisingly, recent scholarship came to agreement⁷⁵ in taking *ut tamen omnes subsidant pinnae* as addressed to the old woman: ‘to flatten all <your> feathers’ (as if it were ...*tibi subsidant*), i.e., “so that you would not display any confidence”.⁷⁶

This view suggests that here the *ut* clause represents a peculiar form of *ut finale*, the essence of which has been excellently formulated by Courtney as expressing not the purpose of the subject of the main clause, but “the purpose of Juvenal in reporting it” (“So that you don’t become over-excited <I must point out to you that> *facies tua computat annos*”).⁷⁷

Syntactically, this explanation is possible, and such an *ut* can be defended by parallels. Yet it does not fit into the context and meets with major logical difficulties:

1) *Omnes* in this case would be superfluous and psychologically improbable.⁷⁸ ‘So that all your feathers lie flat’ is stronger than the sense requires. Normally, in such warnings, one tends, on the contrary, toward understatement, e.g., “...to curb your arrogance...; do not become too conceited...” etc.

2) It would be very strange if the frustrating effect of ugliness indicated by *tamen* – namely the failure to arouse – were omitted from the objection and left for the reader to infer. The sense “yet, to disappoint you: your face is old and ugly” is not sufficient: it should read “...too old and ugly to arouse anyone”.

3) Finally, the omission of the dative (*tibi*) seems harsh.

⁷⁴ As in the case of v. 195 (see n. 62 above), these lines bear a close resemblance to Martial (6. 23): *stare iubes semper nostrum tibi, Lesbia, penem: / crede mihi, non est mentula quod digitus. / tu licet et manibus blandis et vocibus instes, / te contra facies imperiosa tua est.*

⁷⁵ Courtney ²2013 [1980]; Richlin 1986, 46; Rudd[–Barr] 1991, 43; Adamietz 1993, 102, 360; Braund 2004, 251, 246; Watson–Watson 2014, 137; Lorenz 2017, 199; Dimatteo 2023, 117.

⁷⁶ The *schol. vet.* ad loc. refer the metaphor to the old woman’s looks (*quia vetulae flaccescant*). This explanation is untenable, since *subsidere* is used of something previously in active motion or in an upright position; it cannot denote sagging skin or a shabby appearance (in such a case one would say that the feathers fall out, not that they sink).

⁷⁷ Courtney ²2013, 246 ad loc.; 533 (ad 15. 89), comparing 6. 87 and 197, 12. 93; Kühner–Stegmann ⁴1962, 233–234; Hofmann–Szantyr 1965 (²1972), 642. Cf. also Pinkster 2021, 299.

⁷⁸ Högg 1971, 94 rightly notes that *omnes pinnae* should correspond to *quod non... inguen?* (= *omnia inguina*).

In view of these objections, it appears fairly certain that the phrase *ut omnes subsidant pinnae* should refer not to the old woman, but to *excitet inguen* in v. 196. The contraposition indicated by *tamen* largely suggests itself: a wanton Greek expression arouses every male organ like fingers, but (*tamen*) due to the old and ugly face, “all feathers droop” (the opposite of *excitet*).

This view was put forward by some early scholars, who rephrased the passage and conveyed its general sense correctly, but failed to offer an adequate explanation for the syntactical role of *ut*.⁷⁹ It cannot be concessive, like *quamquam dicas haec mollius...*,⁸⁰ and the sense requires that *tamen* should refer to the fact that the old and ugly face exerts a fundamentally dejecting influence on the organ to be aroused.

In all likelihood, the drooping of all feathers should be an outcome of *facies tua computat annos*. The problem is, however, that *ut consecutivum* can hardly precede the main clause. In addition, the concessive clause *quamquam dicas haec mollius...* separates the proposed *ut* clause from its matrix clause, so that *ut consecutivum* is here out of the question.

H. Högg reconstructed the train of thought correctly, but he saw the only solution in accepting H. Valesius' emendation *et tamen*.⁸¹ Along the same lines, Heinecke emended *ut tamen* to *attamen*.⁸² In this case, however, *subsidant pinnae* must be the main clause, and the meaning of the subjunctive remains unclear to me: both *coniunctivus potentialis* and *coniunctivus iussivus* (‘may all the feathers droop’) would be problematic.

Meanwhile, the problem is easily solved once we understand *ut omnes subsidant pinnae* as a form of a pseudo-final *ut* that formally

⁷⁹ Grangaeus in Casaubon 1695, 145: “...*tunc videntium omnes pennaе subsidunt; vel, ut ait Martialis, tunc illis – ‘mentula mensque cadit’* [7. 18. 12], ‘*nec possunt putidam arrigere ad vetulam*’ [cf. 4. 5. 6]”; Lubinus 1619, 246. Likewise, e.g., in the translations of Siebold 1858, 117 and Ramsay 1918, 99.

⁸⁰ Prateus 1684, 164 took *ut* as concessive, while referring it to the preceding *digitos habet* (“*etsi quiescat libido*”) – but this is incompatible with *tamen*.

⁸¹ H. Valesius in Achaintre 1810, 163–164; Högg 1971, 93–95 “Und dennoch dürften sich alle Flügel senken, denn magst du derlei auch zärtlicher sagen als der beste Schauspieler, dein Gesicht verrät deine Jahre!”. He emphasizes the formal similarity between the passage in question and *et tamen illi / surgebant cristae* in 4. 69–70 quoted above.

⁸² Heinecke 1804, 87–88.

presents the outcome of an action as an intended purpose.⁸³ This allows to dispose of both difficulties: (a) the meaning of the pseudo-final *ut* clause may be similar to that of a consecutive one,⁸⁴ and (b) pseudo-final clauses, just like normal final clauses, can be preposed (most often with negative conjunctions,⁸⁵ but also with *quo*⁸⁶ and *ut*⁸⁷).

In this case the pseudo-final *ut* would express not just a fate-determined outcome (the so called “*voluntas fati*”, type: *He left the country to die in an accident*), but, more specifically, a consequence of an ironically adverse circumstance (cf. *But to ruin all our plans, the rain started again*), or else a motive ironically attributed to the ugly old face, as if making objects of arousal ‘droop their feathers’ were its spiteful purpose.

The preposing of a final or a pseudo-final sentence, as shown in n. 87 above, is not a problem. Moreover, the sentences starting with *ut tamen* can well, pace Högg,⁸⁸ be final,⁸⁹ or even pseudo-final, as in Iuv. 10. 354;⁹⁰ cf. a similar word order (with *ne non* = *ut*) in Ov. *Met.* 9. 735–736):

⁸³ Nisbet 1923, 27–43; Hofmann–Szantyr 1965 (21972), 642; Pinkster 2021, 302–304; cf. *OLD* s.v. *ut* 28f: “introducing an unlikely motive ironically suggested by the speaker; also a purpose ascribed to destiny”.

⁸⁴ Cf. Pinkster 2021, 302 “Some scholars take these clauses as result clauses, with the negator *ne* equivalent to *ut non*. Others use the label ‘pseudo-final’...”.

⁸⁵ Liv. 8. 10. 10 *Decii corpus ne eo die inveniretur, nox querentes oppressit*; 44. 44. 1 *consulem <...>, ne sincero gaudio fruereetur, cura de minore filio stimulabat*; 7. 1. 7 *...ne quando a metu ac periculis vacarent, pestilentia ingens orta* (cf. 7. 27. 1: *ne nimis laetae res essent*...).

⁸⁶ Curt. Ruf. 8. 3. 3 (Spitamenes’ wife implores him to surrender to Alexander): *...et quo efficaciores essent preces, haud procul erat Alexander*.

⁸⁷ Luc. 7. 596: *vivat et, ut Bruti procumbat victima, regnet*; Liv. 26. 41. 8: *pater et patruus intra triginta dierum spatium, ut aliud super aliud cumularetur familiae nostrae funus, interfecti sunt*; Tac. *Ann.* 4. 52. 1: *at Romae commota principis domo, ut series futuri in Agrippinam exitii inciperet, Claudia Pulchra sobrina eius postulatur accusante Domitio Afro*.

⁸⁸ Högg 1971, 93–94.

⁸⁹ Ov. *Met.* 6. 83; *Pont.* 3. 3. 77; Tac. *Ann.* 11. 20. 2.

⁹⁰ Högg 1971, 93–94 surprisingly understands Iuv. 10. 354 *ut tamen et poscas aliquid voveasque sacellis / exta*... as concessive, but no doubt it is a form

... ne non tamen omnia Crete
monstra ferat, taurum dilexit filia Solis.

Thus, the drooping of feathers refers to *inguen*, and *ut subsidant* is best explained as an ironic pseudo-final clause that presents the result of the old woman's ugliness as a purpose:

After all, what organ would fail to be aroused by a soft and wanton expression? It has fingers. Yet, in order to let every feather droop – even if you could speak in tones more tender than those of Haemus and Carpophorus – your face keeps tally of the years.

Sail should be turned astern toward Grangaeus and Lubinus.

Denis Keyer
University of Bern
deniskeyer@gmail.com
denis.keier@unibe.ch

Bibliography

- N. L. Achaintre (ed., comm.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Satirae* II (Paris 1810).
 J. Adamietz (ed., tr., comm.), *Juvenal. Satiren. Lateinisch–deutsch* (Munich–Zurich 1993).
 G. Binder, “Abacus”, *DNP* I (1996) 4.
 S. M. Braund (ed., comm.), *Juvenal, Satires: Book I* (Cambridge 1996).
 S. M. Braund (ed., tr.), *Juvenal and Persius* (Cambridge, Mass. – London 2004).
 F. Bücheler (ed.), *A. Persii Flacci, D. Iunii Iuvenalis, Sulpiciae saturae. Rec. O. Iahn* (Berlin ³1893).
 P. Burmann (ed., comm.), *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV* (Amsterdam 1727).
 D. Calderini (ed., comm.), [*Commentarii Iuvenalis*] (Venice 1487).
 I. Casaubon, M. Casaubon (eds.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Aquinatis satyrae... Accedit Auli Persii Flacci satirarum liber* (Leiden 1695).
 W. V. Clausen (ed.), *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis saturae* (Oxford 1959 [21966]).
 E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, California Classical Studies 2 (Berkeley, Calif. ²2013 [London ¹1980]).

of pseudo-final: “But so that you might demand something (from the gods) and dedicate entrails to shrines – <I suggest the following...>”; see n. 77 above.

- J. Delz, “Bemerkungen zu Juvenal”, *MH* 55 (1998) 120–127.
- C. Deroux, “Le dressoir de Cordus et son Chiron (Juvénal, *Sat.* III, 203–207)” *Latomus* 68 (2009) 680–692.
- Dimatteo G. (ed., comm., tr.), R. C. Melloni (tr.), *Giovenale. Satire (testo latino a fronte)* (Santarcangelo di Romagna 2023).
- J. D. Duff (ed., comm.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis saturae XIV = Fourteen Satires of Juvenal* (Cambridge ²1975 [¹1898]).
- T. Farnabius (ed., comm.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis et Auli Persii Flacci satyrae* (Amsterdam 1642).
- O. Ferrari, *Electorum libri duo* (Padua 1679).
- E. R. Fiechter, “Abacus 3.–5.”, *RE Suppl.* III (1918) 1–4.
- C. M. Francken, “Ad Iuvenalem”, *Mnemosyne* 21 (1893) 202–210.
- L. Friedländer (ed., comm.), *D. Junii Iuvenalis saturarum libri V. I* (Leipzig 1895).
- A. Gallia, “‘Some of my Best Friends...’: Reading Prejudice in Juvenal’s Third Satire”, *CLJ* 111 (2016) 319–346.
- S. Grazzini, “Simona M. Manzella: Decimo Giunio Giovenale, *Satira* III, trad. e comm. Napoli 2011 (rev.)”, *Athenaeum* 104 (2016) 338–342.
- S. Grazzini, “Poetica e ideologia nella terza satira di Giovenale”, in: A. Stramaglia, S. Grazzini, G. Dimatteo (eds.), *Giovenale tra storia, poesia e ideologia*, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 357 (Berlin–Boston 2016) 149–168.
- J. G. Griffith, “Varia Iuvenaliana”, *CR* 1 (1951) 138–142.
- R. A. Harvie, *A Commentary on Persius* (Leiden 1981).
- J. R. Aug. Heinecke, *Animadversiones in Iuvenalis satiras, sive censura editionum Rupertianorum* (Halle [Saale] 1804).
- C. Fr. Heinrich (ed., comm.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Satirae... Accedunt scholia vetera* II (Bonn 1839).
- M. Hendry, “Three Cruces in Juvenal”, *CQ* 48 (1998) 252–261.
- G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford 1954).
- J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich 1965 [²1972]).
- H. Högg, *Interpolationen bei Juvenal?* Inaug.-Diss. (Freiburg i. Br. 1971).
- M. Hopman, “Satire in Green: Marked Clothing and the Technique of Indignatio at Juvenal 5.141–45”, *AJPh* 124 (2003) 557–574.
- A. E. Housman (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis saturae: Editorum in usum* (London ¹1905, ²1931).
- A. E. Housman, *The Classical Papers, vol. 2: 1897–1914*, ed. by J. Diggle, F. R. D. Goodyear (Cambridge 1972).
- A. E. Housman, “Notes on Persius”, *CQ* 7 (1913) 12–32.
- R. Jenkyns, *Three Classical Poets* (London 1982).
- J. Juvencius (ed., comm.), *D. Junii Iuvenalis et Auli Persii satyrae* (Rouen ³1697).
- F. W. Kelsey, “Codrus’s Chiron and a Painting from Herculaneum”, *AJA* 12 (1908) 30–38.

- J. F. Killeen, “Juvenal III 203–205”, *Glotta* 42 (1964) 213–214.
- W. Kissel (ed., tr., comm.), *Aules Persius Flaccus: Satiren* (Heidelberg 1990).
- W. Kissel, “Juvenal (1962–2011)”, *Lustrum* 55 (2013) 1–431.
- U. Knoche, *Handschriftliche Grundlagen des Juvenaltextes*, *Philologus Suppl.* 33. 1 (Leipzig 1940).
- U. Knoche (ed.), *D. Iunius Iuvenalis. Saturae* (Munich 1950).
- R. Kühner, C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Tl. II: Satzlehre II* (Hanover 41962).
- P. de Labriolle, F. Villeneuve (eds., trs.), *Juvénal: Satires* (Paris 91967).
- [N. E. Lemaire] (ed., comm.), *M. V. Martialis epigrammata* (Paris 1825).
- Fr. Leo (ed.), *A. Persii Flacci, D. Iunii Iuvenalis, Sulpiciae saturae. Rec. O. Iahn. Post F. Buechelers iteratas curas ed. quartam...* (Berlin 1910).
- E. Lommatzsch, “Römische Satiriker (außer Horaz)... 1930–1936”, *Bursians Jahresberichte* 260 (1938) 89–105.
- S. Lorenz (ed., tr., comm.), *Juvenal. Satiren / Saturae. Lateinisch–deutsch* (Berlin–Boston 2017).
- E. Lubinus (ed., comm.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis satyrarum libri V... Praeterea A. Flacci Persii satyrarum liber unus* (Hanover 1619).
- J. C. F. Manso, *Vermischte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze* (Breslau 1821).
- R. Marache (ed., comm.), *Juvénal, Saturae III, IV, V* (Paris 1965).
- J. R. C. Martyn (ed.), *D. Iuni Iuvenalis saturae* (Amsterdam 1987).
- E. Matthias, *De scholiis Iuvenalianis*. Diss. Inaug. (Halle, Saale 1875).
- A. Mau, “Abacus 4.”, *RE I* (1893) 5.
- J. E. B. Mayor (ed., comm.), *The Thirteen Satires of Juvenal I* (London 41889).
- W. C. McDermott, “The Ape in Greek Literature”, *TAPA* 66 (1935) 165–176.
- W. C. McDermott, “The Ape in Roman Literature”, *TAPA* 67 (1936) 148–167.
- W. C. McDermott, *The Ape in Antiquity* (Baltimore 1938).
- S. Monti, “Iuv. III 205, III 322, VIII 57–59: due problemi critico-testuali ed uno esegetico”, in: U. Crisculo (ed.), *Societas studiorum. Per Salvatore d’Elia* (Naples 2004) 281–291.
- M. Morford, “Juvenal’s Fifth Satire” *AJPh* 98 (1977) 219–245.
- R. J. Nisbet, “*Voluntas Fati* in Latin Syntax”, *AJPh* 44 (1923) 27–43.
- R. G. M. Nisbet, “On Housman’s Juvenal”, *IllClassStud* 14 (1989) 285–302.
- C. H. Pearson, H. A. Strong (ed., comm.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis saturae XIII = Thirteen Satires of Juvenal* (Pearson 21892)
- P. H. Peerlkamp, “Ad Vergilium”, *Mnem.* 10 (1961) 1–49.
- H. Pinkster, *The Oxford Latin Syntax. II: The Complex Sentence and Discourse*. (Oxford 2021).
- L. Prateus (ed., comm.), *D. Junii Iuvenalis et A. Persii Flacci satirae* (Paris 1684).
- G. G. Ramsay (ed., tr.), *Juvenal and Persius* (London–New York 1918).
- A. Richlin (ed., comm.), *Juvenal, Saturae VI* (Bryn Mawr [PA] 1986).
- G. M. A. Richter, *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (London 1966).
- H. J. Rose, “Some Passages of Latin Poets”, *HSCPh* 47 (1936) 1–15.

- N. Rudd (tr.), W. Barr (comm.), *Juvenal: The Satires* (Oxford 1991).
- G. A. Ruperti, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Aquinatis satirae XVI. II* (Leipzig 21820).
- E. Saglio, “Abacus V”, *DAGR I* (1875) 4.
- B. Santorelli (ed., tr., comm.), *Giovenale, Satira V*, Texte und Kommentare 44 (Berlin–Boston 2013).
- A. Scholte, *Dissertatio literaria continens observationes criticas in saturas D. Iunii Iuvenalis* (Utrecht 1873).
- E. C. J. von Siebold (tr.), *Die Satiren des D. Iunius Iuvenalis* (Leipzig 1858).
- P. M. W. Tennant, “‘Uncle’ Virro and Trebius’ Offspring: The Relevance of Juvenal ‘Satires’ 5, Lines 141–145”, *Acta Classica* 36 (1993) 83–89.
- I. Tixier de Ravisi (Ravisius Textorius), *Officinae epitome* (Lyon 1560).
- J. M. C. Toynbee, *Animals in Roman Life and Art* (London 1973).
- B. L. Ullman, “Miscellaneous Comments on Juvenal”, in: L. Wallach (ed.), *The Classical Tradition: Literal and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan* (Ithaca, NY 1966).
- R. B. Ulrich, *Roman Woodworking* (New Haven–London 2007).
- N. Vianello (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis satirae* (Turin 1935).
- G. Viansino, “Note a Giovenale”, in: L. Nicastrì (ed.), *Contributi di filologia Latina* (Naples 1990).
- J. H. Waszink, J. C. M. Van Winden (eds., tr., comm.), *Tertullianus: De idololatria*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 1 (Leiden a. o. 1987).
- L. Watson, P. Watson (eds. and comm.), *Juvenal: Satire 6* (Cambridge 2014).
- W. S. Watt, “Notes on Juvenal”, *Eikasmos* 7 (1996) 283–289.
- W. S. Watt, “Notes on Juvenal”, *Hermes* 130 (2002) 299–305.
- A. Weidner (ed., comm.), *D. Junii Iuvenalis saturae* (Leipzig 1873, 21889).
- A. Weidner, “Zu Juvenalis Satiren”, *Neue Jahrb. Phil. Päd.* (1887a) 279–296.
- A. Weidner, “Emendationes Iuvenalianae”, in: *Gymn. zu Dortmund, Jahresber. über das Schuljahr 1886/87* (Dortmund 1887b).
- F. G. Welcker, *Alte Denkmäler II: Basreliefe und geschnittne Steine* (Göttingen 1850).
- J. Willis, “Markland’s Notes on Juvenal”, *Antichthon* 30 (1996) 58–84.
- J. Willis (ed.), *D. Iunii Iuvenalis saturae sedecim* (Stuttgart–Leipzig 1997).
- G. Zago, “A Crux in Juvenal (6.105)”, *CQ* 75 (2025) 423–427.

The article re-examines five problems in three passages of Juvenal. In 3. 205 *recubans sub eodem marmore Chiron* cannot imply a sculptural table support, since the personage lives in extreme poverty. Instead, *marmore* must be taken ironically (cf. *coccina* in Mart. 2. 43. 8) and *eodem* as ‘aforementioned’: a tiny cheap stand for vessels is described as if it were a marble display table for precious cups.

Mycalē in 5. 141 is Trebius’ concubine: her triplets cannot be Trebius’ legitimate heirs, hence Virro indulges their children. *Nunc* in v. 141 is to be understood within the *irrealis* discourse: “now, when you are (hypothetically) rich” (cf. 10. 43). In v. 138 *tu* (Φ) is to be preferred to *tunc* (PRFO). In 5. 143–144

a waistcoat, small nuts, and pennies cannot be gifts to the triplets. Rose was right in taking *viridem thoraca* as a metonymy for a tamed monkey (hence *schol. vet. ad loc. ...ut simiae*), *rogatum* as a supine and the pair of *-que*'s as mock epic style: the monkey begs for pennies and small nuts in reward for the performance.

In 6. 195 *relictis* must be retained in the sense of 'refrained from' (cf. Pers. 5. 61; Hor. *Serm.* 2. 6. 89; *AP* 150) and taken impersonally as referring to the Romans in general: 'you use in public words that but lately were refrained from (even) under the blanket'. In 6. 197–198 the words *ut tamen omnes subsidant pinnae* are not addressed to the old woman ('to flatten out all <your> feathers'), but express the opposite of *quod enim non excitet inguen* in v. 196; the *ut* clause is pseudo-final: the effect of the old woman's ugly face is presented as a purpose.

В статье разбираются пять трудных мест из трех пассажей Ювенала. В ст. 3, 205 *recubans sub eodem marmore Chiron* не может подразумевать скульптурную ножку стола, потому что герой живет в нищете. *Marmore* надо понять в ироническом смысле (ср. Mart. II, 3, 48 *soccina*), а *eodem* – как 'вышеупомянутый': крохотная дешевая подставка для утвари описывается как мраморный сервант для дорогих сосудов.

В ст. 5, 41 *Микала* – сожительница *Требия*; *Виррон* любезничает с ее тройней, поскольку они не могут стать законными наследниками *Требия*. В ст. 141 *punc* надо понять в рамках ирреального дискурса: 'сейчас, когда ты (гипотетически) богат'. В ст. 138 чтение *tu* (Φ) следует предпочесть варианту *tunc* (*PRFO*). В ст. 143–144 *жилет*, маленькие орехи и гроши не могут быть подарками для тройняшек. *Роуз* был прав, поняв *viridem thoraca* как метонимическое обозначение обезьяны (отсюда *...ut simiae* в схолиях к ст. 143), *rogatum* – как супин, а соединение *-que ... -que* – как элемент эпического стиля. Обезьяна выпрашивает орехи и гроши в награду за представление.

В ст. 6, 195 *relictis* надо сохранить, поняв его безлично (т.е. применительно к римлянам вообще) в смысле 'воздерживаться от ч.-л.' (ср. Pers. 5, 61; Hor. *Serm.* 2, 6, 89; *AP* 150): 'ты на людях пользуешься выражениями, которых еще недавно избегали (даже) под одеялом'. В ст. 6, 197–198 слова *ut tamen omnes subsidant pinnae* не обращены к старухе ('чтоб пропал весь <твой> задор'), а выражают противоположность ст. 196 *quod enim non excitet inguen*. Союз *ut* здесь псевдофинальный: следствие уродливости старого лица представлено как цель.

CONSPECTUS

А. И. ЗАЙЦЕВ	
Древнейшее место культа Эдипа	197
[Alexander Zaicev, The Oldest Location of Oedipus' Cult]	
ZOIA BARZAKH	
Sophocles <i>OT</i> 809: The Response of the Defense	203
WALTER LAPINI	
Note ad alcuni scoli ad Aristofane	
(<i>Ach.</i> 794; <i>Eq.</i> 478b, 781b, 1034b; <i>Nub.</i> 144c, 421d, 450b. α, 1017;	
<i>Lys.</i> arg. I; <i>Ran.</i> 775a; <i>Plut.</i> 550c)	219
ANTON V. KOROLENKOV	
On Some Triumphs in the Epoch of Civil Wars	
in the Roman Republic	234
PHILIP BOSERUP-LEMIRE	
A Critical Note on Servius' <i>Commentary</i> on Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 6. 1–2	249
DENIS KEYER	
<i>Certum est dare lintea retro</i> : Juvenal 3. 205; 5. 141, 143–144;	
6. 195, 197–198 Reconsidered	252

ARCHAEOLOGICA ET EPIGRAPHICA

NATALIA PAVLICHENKO, VIKTOR VAKHONEEV	
New Funerary Lead Urns with Inscriptions from the Necropolis	
of Tauric Chersonesos	281
NATALIA PAVLICHENKO	
Marble Plaques in Tombstones from the Southern Suburb	
of Tauric Chersonesos	315
Keywords	342

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке
Summary in Russian and English