Current opinion in general, for example the last large-scale treatment of the sixth satire by W. S. Anderson, C.P. 51 (1956), 84-6, would appear to regard the Oxford fragment of Juvenal as spurious, basing itself mainly on the article by Professor Axelson in ΔΡΑΓΜΑ M. P. Nilsson (1939), 41 sqq. Influential as this has been, and salutary in toning down the intemperate criticisms of Professor Knoche, Philol. 93 (1938), 196 sqq., it is yet in my opinion not the best discussion, which is to be found in R. Clauss, Quaestiones criticæ Juvenalianæ (Leipzig 1912), 10-33. This work is only mentioned incidentally by Axelson, but I am deeply indebted to it in what follows, and much of what I say is at least suggested by it. I prefer to correct what seem to me misapprehensions by other scholars tacitly, and shall only enter on controversial refutations where that is unavoidable.

Anyone who wants to uphold the genuineness of the fragment must first show that 346-8 will not stand; nor is this a difficult task. In 286 Juvenal asks why Roman wives have degenerated since the days of early Rome: he answers that the reason is divitiae and consequent luxus. As one aspect of this luxus he singles out drunkenness and describes the orgies in which drunken women indulge, in particular the rites of the Bona Dea, which were exposed when Clodius was caught. This, he says, is nowadays, unlike then, no isolated event, and the most aristocratic woman is no different from the humblest (349-351, resuming the ideas of 320-3; notice how well iamque 349 picks up nunc 345). In 352-365 as another aspect of luxus he mentions the extravagance of women. None of this is on the topic of 1-285, which describe the miseries brought by marriage to husbands. Juvenal is now no longer describing, he is

1) My grateful thanks are due to Professors W. S. Maguinness and O. Skutsch for many helpful comments.
analysing, and the subject of his analysis is degeneracy, not marriage, to which there is no particular reference in this passage (the incidental reference to the husband in 312-3 does not invalidate this statement). But 346-8 disturb this train of thought. At a pinch we could imagine a husband barring his wife to prevent her from taking part in the rites of the Bona Dea, and a wife bribing her guards with her favours to let her out so that she can take part in these rites. But what is this marital interlude doing here at all? Depravity is the subject, not adultery.

With this obstacle cleared out of the way we can turn to the fragment itself. This, though it strays away towards the end, is also essentially on the subject of luxus, not of sexual immorality. As their general factotums women maintain cinaedi in their homes. There is an interesting parallel to this, mentioned incidentally by Clauss p. 12 n. 2, but deserving full quotation; Lucian, *de mercede condictis* 33 svyn (sc. Θεσσαλονίκης ὁ Στωίκος) πλουσίων τινα καὶ τροφωσία γυναικι τών ἐπιφανῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει. δεήσαι δὲ καὶ ἀποδημήσαι ποτὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἕκεινον παθεῖν ἥρη γελοιότατον, συγκαθίζεσθαι παρ᾽ αὐτῷ παραδεδομένου γιορτὸν ἐκ τῶν πεποίημένων τὰ σκέλη καὶ τὸν πώγονα περιεξουργιμένων· διὰ τιμῆς δ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐκείνη, ώς τὸ εἰκός, ἤ γε, καὶ τοῦνομα δὲ τοῦ κυναῖδου ἀπεμνημόνευσε, Χελιδίδιον γὰρ καλεῖσθαι. τοῦτο τοῦν πρῶτον ἥλικον, σκυθρωστῷ καὶ γέροντι ἀνδρὶ καὶ πολιτῷ τὸ γένειον . . . paraphantizesthai φύκος ἐντετριμμένον καὶ ὑπογεγραμμένον τοὺς ὀθοναύοις καὶ διασεσαλευμένον τὸ βλέμμα καὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἐπικεκλασμένον, οὐ χελιδόνα μᾶ Δία ἀλλὰ γυμνά τινα περιτετμένον τοῦ πώγωνας τὰ πεταρά, καὶ εἰ γε μὴ πολλὰ δεηθήναι αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν κεκρυφαλὸν ἐχοντα ἐπὶ τῇ κεφάλῃ ἀν συγκαθίζεσθαι· τὰ δ᾽ οὖν ἄλλα παρ᾽ ὅλην τὴν ὀδὸν μυρίας τὰς ἀράξεις ἀνασχέσατο ὑπάρξοντο καὶ τερτιοντος, εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐμπείξην αὐτοῦ, ἴσως ἀν καὶ δροχυμένου ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπήνης.

One of the uses to which such attendants could be put by women is indicated by Juvenal XIV 30, where *eisdem* implies a permanent post in the household, and that the husband feels revulsion from them is implied by o.14. The subject of *permittunt* and *iubent* o.5