

REVUE
DE
PHILOLOGIE
DE LITTÉRATURE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNES

TOME L
1976
FASCICULE 1

PARIS

ÉDITIONS KLINCKSIECK

JUVENAL 1.80 : CLUVIANUS?

Cluuienus appears only once in extant classical Latin literature, at Juvenal 1.80¹. The context there calls for a poet (or a poetaster) :

« si natura negat, facit indignatio versum
qualemcumque potest, quales ego vel Cluuienus. »

Unhappily, no such Cluuienus is otherwise known; in fact, not a single noteworthy figure is recorded for the *gens Cluuiena*².

1. F. W. Schneidewin, in « *Variae Lectiones* », *Philologus* 3 (1848) 131, noting the ms. variants *Calvianus* and *Culvinius* for the generally accepted *Calvinus* at Mart. 7. 90, proposed reading *Cluuienus* there :

Iactat inaequalem Matho me fecisse libellum :
si verum est, laudat carmina nostra Matho.
aequales scribit libros Cluuienus et Umber :
aequalis liber est, Cretice, qui malus est.

Although his emendation is metrically allowable, and the status of Cluuienus/Calvinus in the epigram coincides with the traditional interpretation of Juv. 1. 80 (i. e., that C. is at best a mediocre poet), Schneidewin's suggestion has been unfavorably received (cf. A. Stein, *PIR*²C1201; G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* [New York : 1954] 290).

Ennod. *Carm.* 1. 7 praef. contains a reminiscence of Juv. 1. 18 and 80 : *ad Camenalem ignominiam, quibus numquam Gluvidenus [Gluvidinus, Gludivinus] deest, versus adieci et periturae, ut dictum est, chartae prodigus non peperci*. Cf. Ennod. *Epist.* 5.8.5 (*Gluvidenum*). Gronovius emended the name to *Cluuienus* in both passages, a conjecture approved by Heinecke, *Animadversiones in Juvenalis Satiras* (Halle : 1804) 54 f, and Ribbeck, « *Glossa* », *RhM* 39 (1884) 315. Comparing the Ennodius passages with several late glosses studied by G. Loewe (« *Glossematica* », *RPh* 7 [1883] 198, and cf. *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* 6, p. 224), Ribbeck demonstrated that the glosses (*Cluvidenus [Cludendinus, Cluvidenus, Cludidemus] : imperitus*) were corrupt excerpts from the schol. on Juvenal 1. 80 (*Cluuienus : delirus poeta vel indoctus*).

The name has received more recent attention in articles by L. A. MacKay, « *Notes on Juvenal* », *CPh* 53 (1958) 236-240, L. Herrmann, « *Cluuienus* », *Latomus* 25 (1966) 258-264, and B. Baldwin, « *Three Characters in Juvenal* », *CW* 66 (1972) 101-104. It is a rare *nomen gentilicium*, attested in inscriptions from Rome and transpadane Gaul (despite Baldwin, p. 103; MacKay also overlooked the epigraphic evidence) : *Cluuienae Severai* (*CIL* 5. 3600, Verona), *L. Cluuienus L. f. Ani. Cilo* (5. 5136, Bergomi), *Cluuienae L. f. Cornelianae* (6. 15863), *Cluuienus T. f. Pal. Priscus* (6. 34972). The etymology is uncertain : perhaps ultimately related to *clueo*, but more immediately derived from the gentilicial *Cluuius* (as, e. g., *Cluvidenus* [*CIL* 11. 4454] from *Cluuius*; see note 6, below); associated names are *Cluuienia Philumene* (*CIL* 6. 13432), *Cluvidienus* (n. 2, below), *Cluuienus, Clu(v)entius, Clovatus, Kluiweer* (Umbr.), *Cluuianus* (n. 12, below), and the place-name *Cluuiiae* (n. 7) : see esp. the *Onomastica* in *TLL* and Forcellini, s. v.; Walde-Hoffman, « *clueo* »; MacKay, *op. cit.*, 237 f; the name appears neither in Schulze's *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin : 1904, though see on *Cluuius*, p. 483, 560) nor in the papyri indexed by Preisigke, *Namenbuch* (Heidelberg : 1922), and Foraboschi, *Onomasticon alterum* (Milan : 1971).

2. None in *MRR*; only Juvenal's poet in *RE* and *PIR*; an otherwise unknown Cluuienus Quietus was exiled by Nero in 65 (Tac. *Ann.* 15. 71. 10).

Curiosity over the identity of this obscure character was rekindled twenty years ago by a footnote in *Juvenal the Satirist* (p. 290 f) where Gilbert Highet proposed his now well-known theory of « cover-names » in the Satires. Certainly there was precedent among the Latin poets for the use of such an onomastic device, and the possibility that Juvenal followed that precedent on occasion ought not to be denied. However, it seems a needless restriction to suppose, as Professor Highet has done, that the satirist's only criteria in his selection of pseudonyms were metrical equivalency and assonance, and that Juvenal's sole motivation must have been precautionary³. Yet, on the basis of these criteria, and with a curious certainty that the poet of Satire 1.80 must be someone known to *us*, Highet suggested that *Cluvienus* is a cover-name for Decianus or Julius Cerialis⁴. Both these men, however, are known only from Martial, and so one could no less easily surmise that — if the characters are not altogether fictional — either *Decianus* or *Cerialis* might be a pseudonym for Cluvienus, rather than the opposite (especially as Martial has advised his audience that disguised names do appear in the Epigrams: 2.23 and 10.33.10). And since Highet regarded fear as the sole motive for resorting to such a device, it is quite proper to ask, as Baldwin has, « Why fear? » in the specific case of Cluvienus/Decianus/Cerialis, if he was the petty poetaster Highet and so many others take him to be.

In 1958 L. A. MacKay modified Highet's theory. He argued first (against the scholiast, Highet, and most commentators) that the reference at 1.80 need not be to a bad or mediocre poet, that « *qualiscumque* is rather deprecatory than depreciative », and that Cluvienus might therefore have been a poet whom Juvenal genuinely admired and one whose work was satiric in tone⁵. MacKay concurred with Highet's judgement that the character was not a total fiction and that *Cluvienus* probably is a cover-name; but he discarded some of his predecessor's restrictions, quite justifiably noting the possibility « that the real name would not fit into hexameter verse at all ». After testing the chance of a connection with the *gens Fulvia* or the

3. Juvenal might use the real name of a particular target in private readings, Highet surmised, but for publication he would substitute cover-names « which have merely a metrical correspondence (and perhaps also a faint similarity in sound) to the name of the real person known to Juvenal and his audience » (*op. cit.*, 291); thus Highet explains the name-doublets in the transmission of Juvenal's text, Gallus/Cossus 7. 144, Tutor/Numitor 8. 93, Lateranus/Damasippus 8. 167, and Ponticus/Regulus 8. 179; thus he supports his conjecture that the Pollitta of 2. 68 was really Gallitta (Pliny *Ep.* 6. 31. 4-6). Baldwin's objections are valid: *op. cit.*, 103, and « Cover-names and Dead Victims in Juvenal », *Athenaeum* 45 (1967) 304-312.

4. Decianus: *PIR*² D 20 (see Mart. 1. 8. 4, 1. 24. 1, 1. 39. 8, 1. 61. 10; 2 praef., 2. 5. 1); Cerialis: *PIR*² I 261 (Mart. 10. 48. 5; 11. 52). While failing to clarify his position, Baldwin seems willing to allow the correctness of either of these two identifications, though he favors Cerialis (*CW* 66, p. 103). But the evidence is much too flimsy. And if the pages of Martial are to be ferreted in this way, more likely candidates than Decianus or Cerialis exist: e. g., Calvinus, Mart. 7. 90 (see above, n. 1).

5. *Op. cit.* (n. 1) 236 f; for this sense of *qualiscumque* MacKay compares Catull. 1. 8-10 and Hor. *Sat.* 1. 10. 81-90.

gens
refere
sion v
father
his at
cipio

Bor
Helvi
as for
virtut
Tacit
execu
he all
the m
scaen
taxas
famil

No
rely p
Prisc
indig
the fi
at 1.7

6. D
make
of nob
is perh
more l
RE, P
A. D. 1
20, 14
C 1206

7. T
(*CIL* 9
munic
Sanni

8. F
Agr. 4
the Sa
lends
is no s
still, t
p. 238
recent

9. A
of Tra
propos
to hav
A His
inform

satirist's purposeful indirection here actually strengthens and (for audiences then) clarifies his allusion to this recent young writer, who (if Domitian's suspicions were justified) himself employed disguised personal allusions in his work. The very omission of Priscus' name is partially designed to suggest the dangers of personally abusive satire (even Priscus' use of « cover-names » failed to save him) — this, of course, is the subject to which Juvenal turns abruptly and dramatically at the conclusion of his program (l. 150-171).

Furthermore, if this interpretation is correct, I suspect that what Juvenal wrote was *Cluvianus* (not *Cluuienus*), and that his motive for the disguise was artistic, not precautionary. Even MacKay preferred *Cluvianus*, but, reluctant to hazard an emendation, he attempted to justify the manuscript reading through a series of ultimately unsuccessful arguments¹⁰. His most valid observation was that the form in *-enus* « may have been preferred... because it sounds more like a personal name, not a mere local designation ». But that logic might perhaps have been better attributed to some too clever scribe than to Juvenal himself : for a « mere local designation » seems precisely what is called for in this line, as I should like to suggest. It might be argued¹¹ that *Cluvianus* is the *lectio difficilior* : a scribe who knew the gentilicial *Cluuienus*, or who, more likely, knew *-enus* as a common gentilicial termination, and felt the need for a personal name in 1.80, could have been enticed to the alteration¹². However, it may be that an early,

10. The form *Cluuienus* « may be a deliberate indirection », MacKay suggests, « exemplifying the caution Juvenal professes in this satire. The caution may have been relaxed later; the elder Helvidius is mentioned by name in 5. 36; but in the first Satire Juvenal parades an ostentatious caution in the use of proper names that might give current offense. » I am not convinced of the accuracy of this observation. What of *Gillo*, for example, at Juv. 1. 40? While this name may not have been selected principally as an attack on Q. Fulvius Gillo, still the context surely might have offended him, given the rarity of the cognomen (see I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* [Helsinki : 1965] 344); Gillo (*PIR*² F 544) was *praef. aerar.* under Domitian and Nerva, *cos. suff.* in 98, *procos.* of Asia as late as 115, and therefore, as Highet suggested (*op. cit.*, 293), almost certainly living when book one of the Satires was published : cf. R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford : 1958) 78 n. 5, 499, 777 f.; Baldwin, *op. cit.* (*Athenaeum*) 304, 308 n. 23, has misconstrued Syme's understanding of Juvenal's use of names and his patently negative reaction to Highet's theories. Despite all, the offense *may have been intentional*, but protected by the poet's disclaimer at 170 f (his hedging proclamation that only the dead will be assailed in the Satires : cf. C. Lutz, « Any Resemblance... Is Purely Coincidental », *CJ* 46 [1950] 115-120), for this Gillo was the colleague, friend, and defender of Publicius Certus, who had been somehow intimately involved in the prosecution of Helvidius Priscus the younger (cf. n. 9, above). Regardless, when one accepts the view that the Cluvian is Priscus, it is difficult to see any reason for caution in the disguise : Domitian is dead, and the satirist's allusions to him in an earlier Satire (Two) are much more inflammatory. In his remarks concerning a relaxation of caution from the first satire to the fifth, MacKay seems to have overlooked the near certainty that Book One was published as a unit and that Satire One, program to this book, was composed last. MacKay's second argument, that « the younger Helvidius, probably born and brought up at Rome, was not precisely a Cluvian », does not support *Cluuienus* over *Cluvianus*; besides, there should be no real difficulty in labelling a city-born youth with a tag reflecting the immediate origin of his family.

11. Against Baldwin, *op. cit.* (*CW*) 104.

12. *Cluvianus* is also attested as a name (cognomen), but is extremely rare : *CIL* 5. 3798,

unintentional pre-date the when the te

One of the coordination the section d (lines 22-80) (22-50) is p question thr birth (*magn* by a line all likewise thr poet has des *komodein* tr: names and individuals, wrote (most the Domitia second divis dual attack¹ early comm and Maecen to reinforce dental to th *potens*.

If the fin ethnic adject like those in that author logically pr *alumnus* /Lu

9. 6083. 147. K adoption from

13. There is (see Ruperti's but the cognor 31. 3) and from *Stabianus* from

14. Cf. J. G ser. 16 (1969) 1 21, but he not Juvenal's reas

15. This wa thirties; Prisc as a grim rem

16. For a w see N. Rudd, Satires », *CQ*

unintentional scribal error accounts for *-enus* from *-anus*. The error must pre-date the scholia and Ennodius, and therefore be a product of that period when the text of Juvenal suffered some of its most serious corruptions¹³.

One of the most remarkable features of Satire One is the poet's deliberate coordination of his techniques in structure and personal reference. Thus the section detailing Juvenal's answer to the question « Why write satire? » (lines 22-80) falls into two divisions of twenty-nine lines each : the first (22-50) is preceded by a transitional passage (19-21) which poses that question through a reference alluding to Lucilius by naming his place of birth (*magnus... Auruncae... alumnus*); the second (52-80) is preceded by a line alluding to Juvenal's other major predecessor in the genre, Horace, likewise through reference to his birthplace (*Venusina... lucerna*). The poet has designed the first division as an imitation of the mode of *onomastikomodein* traditionally ascribed to Lucilius¹⁴ : as many as twelve of the names and personal allusions found there may refer specifically to real individuals, some of whom could still have been living when Juvenal wrote (most, in any case, were drawn from recent history, particularly the Domitianic period, as a glance at the commentaries will show¹⁵). The second division (52-80) is more Horatian in its absence of virulent individual attack¹⁶. None of the allusions there, despite the arguments of several early commentators, should be associated with any single person ; Lucusta and Maecenas are named only as *exempla* and, in the case of the latter, to reinforce the general reminiscence of Horatian satire, and both are incidental to the satirist's prime targets, the typical *signator falsi* and *matrona potens*.

If the final, enigmatic word of this passage was in fact *Cluvianus*, an ethnic adjective bearing an allusion to some satirical author's provenance like those in lines 20 and 51, and especially if the younger Helvidius was that author, then the reference neatly completes a frame that is chronologically progressive and almost perfectly symmetrical : *Auruncae... alumnus* / Lucilius (then twenty-nine lines of personally abusive satire) —

9. 6083. 147. Kajanto, *op. cit.* (n. 10) 144, considers it local, from Cluviae, but it may indicate adoption from the *gens Cluvia*.

13. There is further confusion here in some later mss. : *Cluviennus*, *Cluvious*, *Clivienus* (see Ruperti's *apparatus*, ed., Leipzig : 1819). Herrmann, *op. cit.*, 259, argues for *Cluviaenus* ; but the cognomen is *Cluvianus* (above, n. 12), and so is the adjective from *Cluviae* (Livy 9. 31. 3) and from *Cluvius* (Cic. *Att.* 13. 46. 3 ; as a substantive : 14. 9. 1, 14. 10. 3) ; and cf. *Stabianus* from *Stabiae* (Sen. *Q. N.* 6. 1. 1).

14. Cf. J. G. Griffith, « Juvenal, Statius and the Flavian Establishment », *G & R* 2nd ser. 16 (1969) 147-148 : Griffith has also suggested the significance of the gallery following 19-21, but he notes the « more generalized » targets that appear in 55-80 without explaining Juvenal's reason for the alteration in technique or the reference to Horace.

15. This was the age in which Juvenal and the younger Priscus together entered their thirties ; Priscus, of course, did not survive the reign, of which fact 1. 80 may be intended as a grim reminder. Cf. n. 8, above.

16. For a well-balanced survey of Horace's methods in the satiric use of personal names, see N. Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* (Cambridge : 1966) 132-159 (or « The Names in Horace's Satires », *CQ* new ser. 10 [1960] 161-178).

R

engthens and (for audiences ; writer, who (if Domitian's disguised personal allusions me is partially designed to atire (even Priscus' use of urse, is the subject to which e conclusion of his program

I suspect that what Juvenal his motive for the disguise preferred *Cluvianus*, but, ed to justify the manuscript sful arguments¹⁰. His most may have been preferred... t a mere local designation ». ttributed to some too clever local designation » seems dd like to suggest. It might or : a scribe who knew the *-enus* as a common genti-sonal name in 1.80, could e, it may be that an early,

ion », MacKay suggests, « exem- caution may have been relaxed ; but in the first Satire Juvenal that might give current offense. » What of *Gillo*, for example, at incipally as an attack on Q. Ful- given the rarity of the cognomen) ; Gillo (*PIR*² F 544) was *praef.* Asia as late as 115, and therefore, ; when book one of the Satires . 5, 499, 777 f ; Baldwin, *op. cit.* derstanding of Juvenal's use of ies. Despite all, the offense *may* e at 170 f (his hedging proclama- C. Lutz, « Any Resemblance... lo was the colleague, friend, and ately involved in the prosecution less, when one accepts the view r caution in the disguise : Domi- er Satire (Two) are much more caution from the first satire to ty that Book One was published oposed last. MacKay's second l brought up at Rome, was not *Cluvianus* ; besides, there should reflecting the immediate origin

is extremely rare : *CIL* 5. 3798,

Venusina... lucerna / Horace (then twenty-nine lines of impersonal satire) — *Cluvianus* / Helvidius Priscus. This progression represents the incipient satirist's alternatives : the fiery and unrestrained boldness of Lucilius, the relative temperance of Horace, the fatal indignation of Priscus. Implicit then throughout lines 19-80 is the crucial problem which Juvenal explicitly confronts and resolves at 159-171, where Lucilius is again alluded to and finally named. Juvenal's ultimate proclamation at 170f that he will wage war (but only against the dead) reflects the persistency of his wish to be identified with Lucilius *ardens*, tempered by a quite understandable determination to avoid the fate of that similarly inspired « Cluvian ».

Richard A. LAFLEUR.
University of Georgia.
