REVUE

DF

PHILOLOGIE

DE LITTÉRATURE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNES

TOME L

1976

FASCICULE 1

PARIS

ÉDITIONS KLINCKSIECK

JUVENAL 1.80 : CLUVIANUS?

Cluvienus 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 Cluvienus. »

Unhappily, no such Cluvienus is otherwise known; in fact, not a single noteworthy figure is recorded for the gens Cluviena².

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

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

Although his emendation is metrically allowable, and the status of Cluvienus/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, PIR2C1201; 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 (Glovidenum). Gronovius emended the name to Cluvienus 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 (Cludidenus [Cludendinus, Cludidenius, Cludidenius]: imperitus) were corrupt excerpts from the schol. on Juvenal 1. 80 (Cluvienus: 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, «Cluviaenus », 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): Cluienae Severai (CIL 5. 3600, Verona), L. Cluvienus L. f. Ani. Cilo (5. 5136, Bergomi), Cluvienae L. f. Cornelianae (6. 15863), Cluienus T. f. Pal. Priscus (6. 34972). The etymology is uncertain: perhaps ultimately related to clueo, but more immediately derived from the gentilicial Cluvius (as, e. g., Clodienus [CIL 11. 4454] from Clodius; see note 6, below); associated names are Cluvienia Philumene (CIL 6. 13432), Cluvidienus (n. 2, below), Cluvenius, Clu(v)entius, Clovatius, Kluvieer (Umbr.), Cluvianus (n. 12, below), and the place-name Cluviae (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 Cluvius, 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 Cluvidienus 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 Cerialis 4. 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 tone ⁵. 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

gens refere sion v father his au cipio

Bon

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

Norely I Prisco indig the fi at 1.7

6. In

make of nob is perl more 1 RE, P A. D. 4 20, 14. C 1206 7. T (CIL 9 munical Samni 8. F Agr. 4

the Salends a is no s still, t p. 238 recent 9. A of Tra

propos

to hav

A Hist

^{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.

scure character was rekindled e Satirist (p. 290 f) where Gilbert of « cover-names » in the Satires. Latin poets for the use of such hat Juvenal followed that pre-.. However, it seems a needless t has done, that the satirist's ms were metrical equivalency ivation must have been precaua, and with a curious certainty known to us, Highet suggested s or Julius Cerialis 4. Both these and so one could no less easily altogether fictional - either for Cluvienus, rather than the d his audience that disguised id 10.33.10). And since Highet ng to such a device, it is quite ? » in the specific case of Cluetty poetaster Highet and so

heory. He argued first (against ors) that the reference at 1.80 « qualiscumque is rather deprenus might therefore have been nd one whose work was satiric judgement that the character probably is a cover-name; but ctions, quite justifiably noting ot fit into hexameter verse at on with the gens Fulvia or the

r target in private readings, Highet names « which have merely a metrical sound) to the name of the real person is Highet explains the name-doublets 7. 144, Tutor/Numitor 8. 93, Late-79; thus he supports his conjecture . 6. 31. 4-6). Baldwin's objections are ms in Juvenal », Athenaeum 45 (1967)

1. 39. 8, 1. 61. 10; 2 praef., 2. 5. 1); ulling to clarify his position, Baldwin two identifications, though he favors flimsy. And if the pages of Martial han Decianus or Cerialis exist : e. g.,

ue MacKay compares Catull. 1. 8-10

gens Cluvia⁶, MacKay decided that Juvenal had intended in Cluvienus a reference to someone from the Samnite town of Cluviae 7. MacKay's conclusion was that Juvenal alludes in 1.80 to Helvidius Priscus the younger, whose father at least was from that town (of this Tacitus had carefully reminded his audience, Hist. 4.5: Helvidius Priscus regione Italiae Carecina e municipio Cluviis).

Born sometime before A. D. 56 and serving as consul suffectus before 87, Helvidius enjoyed a reputation illustrious as much for his own qualities as for his parentage: Pliny, a close friend, spoke of his nomen ingens paresque virtutes ($\hat{E}p.$ 9.13.3). A friend also of Tacitus, and a man who clearly shared Tacitus' and Juvenal's anti-imperial sentiments, the younger Priscus was executed by Domitian in 93 for having composed a satiric exode in which he allegedly ridiculed the recent divorce of the emperor and his wife under the mythical names of Paris and Oenone: occidit et Helvidium filium, quasi scaenico exodio sub persona Paridis et Oenones divortium suum cum uxore taxasset (Suet. Dom. 10.4). That the satirist was sympathetic toward this family (and its circle, including Thrasea Paetus) is attested at 5.368.

Now I am more and more inclined to accept MacKay's view9. It is entirely possible that Juvenal did intend an allusion to the younger Helvidius Priscus, whose satiric afterpiece must have been inspired by the sort of indignatio over Domitian's scandalous behavior that so often surfaces in the first book of the Satires — an indignatio which Juvenal himself says at 1.79 f he shares with that « Cluvian ». I should even propose that the

6. In searching among the Fulvii, MacKay was speculating that Juvenal's audience could make the association, « Cluvienus derives from clueo, like cluvior; cluvior is the equivalent of nobilior (from a late gloss); Nobilior is a common cognomen in the gens Fulvia. » This is perhaps expecting too much of even the most acute audience. The gens Clusia, while a more likely source, provides no satisfactory candidate. Of the many Cluvii catalogued in RE, PIR, and the TLL Onomasticon, the most plausible choice is Cluvius Rufus, cos. before A. D. 41 and the eloquent author of histories of the late Julio-Claudian period (Tac. Ann. 13. 20, 14. 2, Hist. 4. 43; Pliny Ep. 9. 19. 5); but again the evidence is too meagre (see PIR² C 1206; RE «Cluvius» no. 12). There is no apparent connection with the Cluvia of Juv. 2. 49.

7. The precise location of Cluviae remains uncertain, though it was located near Anxanum (CIL 9. 2999); occupied by a Roman garrison as early as 311 B. C. (Livy 9. 31. 2-3), this municipium was the birthplace of Helvidius Priscus the Elder (see below). Cf. E. T. Salmon, Samnium and the Samnites (Cambridge: 1967) 13 n, 26, and 43.

8. For the younger Helvidius see PIR2 H 60, RE « Helvidius » no. 4; note esp. Tac. Agr. 45. 1, where also the Massa and Carus of Juy. 1. 35 f are mentioned : this passage in the Satires is replete with references to figures from the Domitianic period, a fact that lends additional support to the conjecture that Priscus is the Cluvian of 1. 80. While there is no sure evidence for the younger Priscus' birthplace (perhaps Cluviae, perhaps Rome), still, thanks to Tacitus, the family would have been thought of as Cluvian; cf. MacKay, p. 238: « The rise of the Helvidian family was sufficiently remarkable, and sufficiently recent, to make the allusion intelligible to contemporaries.

9. Also attracted are Herrmann, op. cit. (n. 1), K. H. Waters, « Juvenal and the Reign of Trajan », Antichthon 4 (1970) 68 n. 23, and Baldwin, op. cit. (CW) 103 f. Herrmann further proposed that the magni delator amici of Juv. 1. 33 was Publicius Certus, whom he supposes to have been the accuser of Helvidius; but cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary (Oxford: 1968), on Ep. 9.13.2. If Juvenal had a specific informer in mind at 1.33, it was more likely M. Aquilius Regulus (PIR² A 1005). 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 a cover-names a 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 Cluvienus), 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 arguments ¹⁰. 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 argued ¹¹ that Cluvianus is the lectio difficilior: a scribe who knew the gentilicial Cluvienus, 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 alteration ¹². However, it may be that an early,

10. The form Cluvienus « 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 (PIR2 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 \cdots 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 Cluvienus 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,

unintentiona 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 tra names and individuals, wrote (most the Domitia second divis dual attack1 early commo and Maecen to reinforce dental to th potens.

If the fin ethnic adjec 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 rengthens and (for audiences; writer, who (if Domitian's lisguised 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 arguments 10. His most may have been preferred... t a mere local designation ». ttributed to some too clever local designation » seems ald like to suggest. It might r: a scribe who knew the r-enus as a common gentisonal name in 1.80, could r, it may be that an early,

ion », MacKay suggests, « exemcaution 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. Fulgiven the rarity of the cognomen ; Gillo (PIR² F 544) was praef. Asia as late as 115, and therefore, 3 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 r 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 : Domier Satire (Two) are much more caution from the first satire to ty that Book One was published omposed last. MacKay's second I brought up at Rome, was not luvianus; besides, there should reflecting the immediate origin

is extremely rare : CIL 5. 3798,

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 corruptions ¹³.

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 onomasti komodein traditionally ascribed to Lucilius 14: 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 show 15). The second division (52-80) is more Horatian in its absence of virulent individual attack 16. 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.

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.

^{13.} There is further confusion here in some later mss.: Cluviennus, Cluvieus, 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.

^{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 », *CO* new ser. 10 [1960] 161-178).

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.