

THE PARABLES IN JUVENCUS' EVANGELIORUM  
LIBRI IV

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements  
of the University of Liverpool for the degree of  
Doctor in Philosophy by Stephen James Rollins.

September, 1984.

	<u>Page</u>
<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	i
ABSTRACT .. .. .	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .. .. .	iv
ABBREVIATIONS .. .. .	v
LIST OF WORKS CITED IN ABBREVIATED FORM	vi
<u>Chapter</u>	
1: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS ..	1
a) Juvencus and his Poem ..	2
b) Critics Ancient and Modern ..	7
c) The Poet's Intention ..	18
d) The Parable .. ..	34
e) Interpreting the Parable ..	37
f) Juvencus and the Parable ..	44
g) Approach .. .. .	52
2: ALTERATION AND INTERPRETATION ..	54
The Parables of the Two Sons, the Tenants in the Vineyard, and the Wedding Feast	
a) The Context of the Two Sons ..	55
b) Parable of the Two Sons ..	62
c) Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard	76
d) Parable of the Wedding Feast ..	92
3: THE MEANS OF ALTERATION ..	130
a) Abbreviation .. ..	133
b) Amplification .. ..	144
c) Transposition .. ..	151
4: JUVENCUS AND EPIC .. ..	159
The Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard	
a) Temporal Expressions ..	166
A) The "Formula" .. ..	166
B) Other Temporal Expressions	175

b)	Speech	..	..	..	180
	A) Direct Speech	..	..	..	181
	B) Indirect Speech		..	..	190
	C) Concluding Comments		..	..	193
c)	Diction	..	..	..	196
d)	Imagery	..	..	..	204
e)	Epithets	..	..	..	210
5:	JUVENCUS AND THE BIBLE		..	..	213
	The Parables of the Two Houses and the Sower				
	a) The Two Houses	..	..	..	214
	b) The Sower	..	..	..	229
	c) Conclusions	..	..	..	237
6:	JUVENCUS AND SOTERIOLOGY		..	..	239
	The Parables of Going Before the Judge, the Workers in the Vineyard, and the Two Sons				
7:	JUVENCUS AND ESCHATOLOGY		..	..	254
	The Parable of the Talents				
8:	JUVENCUS AND CONTEMPORARY CONCERNS			..	281
	The Parable of the Ten Virgins				
	a) Introductory	..	..	..	281
	b) Narrative Level	..	..	..	283
	c) Spiritual (Allegorical) Level	..	..	..	294
	d) Sprit <del>u</del> al (Eschatological) Level			..	299
	e) Moral (Soteriological) Level	..	..	..	302
	f) The Parable and the Komos		..	..	304
	g) Conclusions	..	..	..	318
9:	CONCLUSION	..	..	..	323
	SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	..	..	..	328
	SELECT LIST OF TEXT EDITIONS USED	..	..	..	332
	APPENDIX: JUVENCUS - A CONCORDANCE				inside back cover.

THE PARABLES IN JUVENCUS' EVANGELIORUM LIBRI IV

by S.J. Rollins

The broad aim of the thesis is to continue and develop the re-evaluation and rehabilitation of the literary merits of the Evangeliorum libri embarked upon by recent critics. As a suitable corpus of material, the poem's parables are analysed from the viewpoint of alteration from the source to identify meaning and interpretation: where change is discovered, its implications for the interpretative meaning of the poem are considered.

The alterations in the parables are shown to be the result of a deliberate policy by the poet; the parables are allegorized to bring out various types of meaning. Paraenetic and eschatological elements are identified among the allegorical sense levels.

Once the principle of alteration is established through close analysis of the passage III 692-773, the methods and techniques of alteration in the poem are discussed. It is shown that the tendency is towards amplification and addition.

The influence of the birth of the Christian Biblical epic on the form of the poem is investigated. By study of typical Gospel and epic features it is indicated that the classical and Roman style dominate over Semitisms and Biblical Latin; the poet conforms to the rhetorical narratio rather than Oriental methods of story-telling.

Various kinds of allegorical levels of meaning are considered. It is demonstrated that Juvencus imparts a soteriological thrust, arising from his pastoral concern, to several parables. Eschatological features are also seen to be developed wherever possible. These sense levels are reminiscent of Origen's allegorizing Biblical exegesis, and are therefore closely considered to see whether there is any influence on the poet from the Alexandrian school. From detailed analysis of the numerous levels of meaning in the Juvencan parable of the Ten Virgins, it is demonstrated that the exegetic tradition is parallel to but separate from that of Biblical epic; any such influence is slight. Moreover, there are contemporary concerns among the sense levels of that parable, and these are examined for what they tell us about attitudes in the early fourth century.

Finally, the question of the work's intention and likely audience is considered. It is indicated, from consideration of the standard views, that any account of the purposes of the poem is no more than an informed guess; nonetheless some suggestions on this matter are made.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Fred Williams supervised my M.A. dissertation, Studies in Lygdamus (Southampton, 1979); and it was he, although he may not remember it, who first hinted to me that the Evangeliorum libri IV might prove to be suitable for treatment as a doctoral thesis. I should like here to express my gratitude to him for that suggestion: it was the germ of my happy years at the University of Liverpool. I owe a larger debt than I can say to Professor Francis Cairns.

I must further express my gratitude to Professor Tony Long for his advice and assistance during the early stages of this study, and to Professor John Davies for his patient attempts to explain Later Roman history to me.

I should like to pay tribute to the staff of the university Computer Laboratory who prepared the data for the concordance to Juvencus, helped me program it, and suffered my continual demands on their time: the concordance itself was generated on the university's ICL 1906S computer using the Oxford Concordance Project.

My grateful thanks go to Sue Hartney, for helping with the preparation of the various drafts.

Finally, the acknowledgements would not be complete without mention of Tom Hartney, who painstakingly read the final versions for me.

ABBREVIATIONS

This list includes works of reference, text series, and the more unfamiliar journal abbreviations. For other abbreviations used see The Oxford Classical Dictionary, the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae and L'Année philologique.

- AFLPer      Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università di Perugia
- ALLG        Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik
- BPhW        Berliner philologische Wochenschrift
- Cairns, GGRP    Francis Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1972).
- CSEL        Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
- Forbes, SAT     R.J. Forbes, Studies in Ancient Technology, 9 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1955-64).
- GCS        Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der drei ersten Jahrhunderte
- LL         Litterae Latinae
- PG         Patrologia Graeca, ed. J.P. Migne
- PL         Patrologia Latina, ed. J.P. Migne
- PLLS       Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar
- PP         La Parola del Passato
- PWRE       Pauly-Wissowa's Real - Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft
- RAC        Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum
- RScR       Revue des sciences religieuses
- SCO        Studi classici e orientali
- Smith, DGRA    W. Smith, A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, 3rd edn. 2 vols. (London: Murray, 1901).
- TLL        Thesaurus Linguae Latinae
- ZOEG       Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien
- ZWTh       Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie

LIST OF WORKS CITED IN ABBREVIATED FORM

- Arevalo = Faustinus Arevalus, C. Vetti Aquilini Iuveni presbyteri hispani Historiae Evangelicae Libri IV (Rome, 1792), reprinted as PL 19.
- Baynes = Norman H. Baynes, Constantine the Great and the Christian Church, 2nd edn. (London: OUP, 1972).
- Bugge = C.A. Bugge, Die Hauptparabeln Jesu (Giessen, 1903).
- Bultmann = Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (1921), trans. by John March (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963).
- Curtius = Ernst Robert Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).
- Dodd = C.H. Dodd, Parables of the Kingdom, 3rd edn. (London: Nisbet, 1936).
- Donnini = Mauro Donnini, "Annotazioni sulla tecnica parafrasistica negli Evangeliorum Libri di Giovenco", Vichiana 1 (1972), 231-49.
- Fenton = J.C. Fenton, The Gospel of St. Matthew, Pelican New Testament Commentaries (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963).
- Fiebig = Paul Fiebig, Die Gleichnisreden Jesu (Tübingen, 1912).
- Flury = Peter Flury, "Zur Dichtersprache des Juvenus" in Lemmata. Donum natalicium W. Ehlers sexagenario a sodalibus Thesauri Linguae Latinae oblatum (Munich: Marstallplatz 8, 1968), pp. 38-47..
- Fontaine, Isidore = Jacques Fontaine, Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne Wisigothique, 2 vols. (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1959).
- Fontaine, Naissance = Jacques Fontaine, Naissance de la poésie dans l'occident chrétien (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1981).
- Benedict Green = H. Benedict Green, The Gospel According to Matthew: introduction and commentary (Oxford: OUP, 1975).

- Hansson = Nils Hansson, Textkritisches zu Juvenecus mit vollständigem Index Verborum (Lund: Gleerup, 1950).
- Hatfield = James Taft Hatfield, A Study of Juvenecus, Johns Hopkins Univ. diss. (Bonn: Carl Georgi Univ. Press, 1890).
- Herzog = Reinhart Herzog, Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike: Formengeschichte einer erbaulichen Gattung, vol. 1 (Munich: Fink, 1975).
- Hudson-Williams = Alan Hudson-Williams, "Virgil and the Christian Latin Poets", PVS 6 (1966-67), 11-21.
- Huemer, Beiträge = Johann Huemer, "Kritische Beiträge zur Historia Evengelica des Juvenecus", WS 2 (1880), 81-112.
- Huemer, edn. = Johannes Huemer, Gai Vetti Aquilini Iuenci Euangeliorum Libri Quattuor, CSEL 24 (Vienna: Tempsky, 1891).
- Hunter = A.M. Hunter, Interpreting the Parables, 2nd edn. (London: SCM Press, 1964).
- Jeremias = Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, 6th edn. (1962), trans. by S.H. Hooke (London: SCM Press, 1963).
- Jülicher = Adolf Jülicher, Die Gleichnisreden Jesu, 2 vols. (Freiburg, 1888-9).
- Kartschoke = Dieter Kartschoke, Bibeldichtung: Studien zur Geschichte der epischen Bibelparaphrase von Juvenecus bis Otfrid von Weissenburg (Munich: Fink, 1975).
- Kievits = Herman Hendrik Kievits, Ad Iuenci Euangeliorum librum primum commentarius exegeticus, diss. (Groningen: de Waal, 1940).
- Kirsch = Wolfgang Kirsch, Die Anfänge der Entwicklung des spät- und der mittellateinischen Epos im 4. Jahrhundert, Martin-Luther-Universität diss. (Halle, 1981)
- Knappitsch = Antonius Knappitsch, Gai Uetti Aquilini Iuenci euangeliorum quattuor. In sermonem Germanicum transtulit et enarravit ... (Graz: Selbstverlag des fürstbischöflichen Knabenseminars, 1910-3).
- McClure = Judith McClure, "The Biblical Epic and its Audience in Late Antiquity" in PLLS 3, ed. Francis Cairns (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1981), 305-21.



- Manson = T.W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London, SCM Press, 1949).
- Marold, edn. = Carolus Marold, C. Vettii Aquilini Iuveni libri evangeliorum IIII (Leipzig: Teubner, 1886).
- Marold, Verhältniss = Karl Marold, "Ueber das Evangelienbuch des Iuvenus in seinem Verhältniss zum Bibeltext", ZWTh 33 (1890), 329-41.
- Marquardt = J. Marquardt, Privatleben der Römer, 2 vols. - vol. 7 of Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1886).
- Murru = Furio Murru, "Analisi semiologica e strutturale della praefatio agli Evangeliorum libri di Giovenco", WS 14 (1980), 133-51.
- van der Nat = Pieter Gijsbertus van der Nat, "Die Praefatio der Evangelienparaphrase des Iuvenus" in Romanitas et Christianitas. Studia I.H. Waszink a.d. Vikal. Nov. a MCMLXXIII XIII lustra complenti oblata (Amsterdam: North Holland, 1973), 249-57.
- Nestler = Hermann Nestler, Studien über die Messiade des Iuvenus, prog. (Passau: Aktiengesellschaft, 1910).
- Poinsotte = Jean-Michel Poinsotte, Juvenus et Israël: La représentation des Juifs dans le premier poème latin chrétien (Paris: Publications de l'Université de Rouen, 1979).
- Quadlbauer = Franz Quadlbauer, "Zur 'Invocatio' des Iuvenus", GB 2 (1974), 189-212.
- Roberts = Michael John Roberts, The Hexameter Paraphrase in Late Antiquity: Origins and Applications to Biblical Texts, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign diss. (1978) - to be published late this year (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1984).
- Smolak = Kurt Smolak, "Die Bibel als Dichtung", LL 33 (1978-9), 17-32.
- Thraede = Klaus Thraede, "Epos", RAC 5 (Stuttgart, 1962), coll. 983-1042.
- Weyman = Carl Weyman, Beiträge zur Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie (Munich: Hueber, 1926).

White = K.D. White, Roman Farming (London: Thames and Hudson, 1970).

Widmann = Hermann Widmann, De Gaio Vettio Aquilino Iuvenco carminis evangelici poeta et Vergili imitatore, diss. (Breslau: Nischkowsky, 1905).

de Wit = Jan de Wit, Ad Iuvenici Evangeliorum librum secundum commentarius exegeticus, diss. (Groningen: de Waal, 1947).

Witke = Charles Witke, Numen Litterarum: The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 5 (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

CHAPTER 1: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

When in 312 Constantine and his Labarum were triumphant over Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge, a theme was announced for the first time in the life of a Roman emperor: Christianity. After this event the theme is a continual undercurrent, and becomes prominent most notably in the Edict of Milan (313), which officially recognized the Christian religion,<sup>1</sup> the Donatist schism (313-20) and the Council of Nicea (325), where Constantine attempted to solve the Arian controversy. Though not an orthodox Christian by today's standards, Constantine was strongly affected, and even dominated, by Christianity.

Soon after Constantine crushed Licinius and effectively became master of the whole world in 323,<sup>2</sup> he founded his new strategic capital on the site of Byzantium. Major work on Constantinople began in 326, the consecratio took place in 328 and the dedicatio in 330 was celebrated with both traditional pagan rites and Christian ceremonies. It is said that he wanted his New Rome to remain untainted by Paganism;<sup>3</sup> and certainly the building of it is a rejection of the eternity of the Old Rome.

---

1. Doubtless the edict itself is a fiction but the toleration of Christianity for which it stood is a fact; cf. Baynes, p. 11.

2. Cf. Ev.IV 807-8 ... terrae regnator apertae/Constantinus ...

3. Eusebius, Vita. III 48.

In the same year as the "New Rome" was finally dedicated a poem was written to celebrate Christi vitalia gesta (pr. 19), the living deeds of Christ (i.e., when He was on this earth). The poem was a translation of the Gospel into Virgilian verse. The coincidence of dates is suggestive. It seems likely that Constantine would have been highly pleased by the publication of this poem at the time of the formal inauguration of his new Holy City on 11th May 330; perhaps, as Gregory of Tours says, he even commissioned it;<sup>4</sup> perhaps it was intended to celebrate the dedication of Constantinople. At all events, the poem, dedicated to Constantine, seems to have been written as a compliment to the pacifier and unifier of the world, the new Augustus.

a) Juvencus and his Poem.

This first section will give a brief account, first of what is known about Juvencus as a man and as a poet, then of the title, date and matter of his poem.

Constantine's new Virgil was Gaius Vettius Aquilinus Juvencus, a Spanish priest of patrician family. Our only source of biographical information is Jerome, who refers to the poet in four of his writings.<sup>5</sup> The most extensive of the notices is in the De viris illustribus, 84.

4. Greg. of Tours, Hist. I 36 Iuuenicum praesbiterum evangelia uersibus conscripsisse rogante supradicto imperatore.

5. Later notices depend on Jerome (cf. Huemer, edn. p. vi, n. 3); for considerations of the testimonia see Marold edn., p. iv, and Huemer edn., pp. vi-xxiv.

Iuencus, nobilissimi generis Hispanus, presbyter, quattuor Evangelia hexametris versibus paene ad verbum transferens quattuor libros composuit, et nonnulla eodem metro ad sacramentorum ordinem pertinentia. Floruit sub Constantino principe.

Apart from these meagre biographical details there is only the marginal note (found by Fontaine) to a manuscript of the same work just before the notice: Iuencus Eliberritanus.<sup>6</sup> It may be that Juvencus was a native of Eliberri, probably Elvira in Baetica, near Grenada, and the site earlier in the fourth century of the Council of Elvira which took measures against the apostasy that was creeping into Iberian Christianity.<sup>7</sup>

Nothing is added to these facts by Jerome's other references to Juvencus. In the letters he says that

Iuencus presbyter sub Constantino historiam domini saluatoris uersibus explicauit nec pertimuit euangelii maiestatem sub metri leges mittere.  
(Ep. LXX (ad Magnum) 5,3).

He repeats this in abbreviated form in the Chronicum ad annum Olymp. 278 (U.C. 2345 = A.D. 329-330):

Iuencus presbyter natione Hispanus evangelia heroicis versibus explicat.

Finally writing of the gifts of the Magi in his commentary Jerome notes that

Pulcherrime munerum sacramenta Iuencus presbyter uno uersiculo comprehendit:  
Tus aurum murram regique hominique Deoque  
Dona ferunt.

(In Math. 2, 11)

- 
6. Cod. 22 Leon; see J. Fontaine. Isidore. Vol. I. p. 18, n.3.  
7. For discussions of Eliberritanus see Fontaine. Isidore, Vol. I, p. 18. n. 3.

The quotation is from Ev. I 250-1 and this passage contains the only detailed criticism of the poem by Jerome.<sup>8</sup>

Of Juvencus' works it must be said that if he did write other poems, as Jerome states in the passage from De viris illustribus cited above, they have not survived.<sup>9</sup> Indeed it is not clear how much Jerome knew of any other poems because it is with the Evangeliorum libri IV that he always associates the name of Juvencus. Each reference to the poet connects him with evangelium or evangelia, the Gospels; the exception is the passage from the commentary on Matthew, where Jerome quotes directly from the poem. The Evangeliorum libri is Juvencus' great achievement in Jerome's eyes, and as far as we can tell it is the only one with which he is familiar.

The title of the poem is given by the manuscripts as the Evangeliorum libri or, more correctly, Evangeliorum libri IV,<sup>10</sup> and it therefore seems better to use this rather than the alternative title Historia evangelica or Historia, which probably dates back only to the end of the fifteenth century.<sup>11</sup>

---

8. The MSS read dabant where Jerome and Alcuin De div. off. 5 have ferunt. Marold, Huemer and Knappitsch all print dabant; for discussions see Huemer, Beiträge, p. 110, Knappitsch, ad loc., Weyman, p. 23, and Kievits, ad loc. McClure, pp. 318-9, n. 56, may well be right in suggesting that Jerome polished up the text himself.

9. Roberts, pp. 112-3.

10. See Huemer, edn., p. v, n. 1.

11. On the correct form of the title, see Marold edn., p. vi.

Poinsotte's claim (p. 10, n. 4) that Evangeliorum libri is not Juvencus's title, but one given by the poem's first readers, may well be valid; nevertheless it seems sensible to use the title sanctioned by custom in the absence of any information about the poet's own title for the work.

The date suggested by its inclusion in Jerome's Chronicon under 329/330 may well be correct. Marold's attempt to date the poem to 332 on the basis of a supposed reference in IV 807 to the defeat of the Goths in that year has not received support.<sup>12</sup> In the epilogue to the work, the "dedication", Juvencus says that the possibility of writing the poem was given to him by Christ and Constantine.<sup>13</sup>

Haec mihi pax Christi tribuit, pax haec mihi saeculi,  
 Quam fovet indulgens terrae regnator apertae  
 Constantinus, adest cui gratia digna merenti  
 Qui solus regum sacri sibi nominis horret  
 810 Inponi pondus, quo iustis dignior actis  
 Aeternam capiat divina in saecula vitam  
 Per dominum lucis Christum; qui in saecula regnat.  
 (IV 806-12)<sup>14</sup>

After Licinius' defeat in 323, and with his execution in 324, the peace of the empire was assured, and Constantine became the sole ruler of the world. As Knappitsch has pointed out, the allusion in line 809 is to Constantine's refusal to allow anyone to style him divus (ad loc.; cf. Herzog, p. 52, n. 1); Constantine is the first Christian emperor. These words, then, fit the date Jerome gives us, but they are appropriate to any year

---

12. Marold, Verhältniss, p. 329; cf. Nestler, p. 69 n. 137, and Weyman, p. 27.

13. For this interpretation of Haec ... haec, see Weyman, p. 27.

14. All citations of Juvencus from Huemer's text unless otherwise noted, with amendment of u semi-vowel to v for ease of reading. In line 809 Huemer misprints regnum for regum, as Knappitsch (ad loc.) noted; cf. Huemer, edn., p. vi (introduction) where the word is correctly printed regum.

of Constantine's reign after he became sole Augustus. The best that can be said concerning the date of the poem is that Jerome's assignment of it to 329/30 is reasonable.

The poem consists of 3184 dactylic hexameters, artificially divided into four books (=the four Gospels?); each book is virtually identical in length with the books of the Aeneid.<sup>15</sup> The whole is preceded by a praefatio of 27 lines, in which Juvencus sets out his manifesto. However, consideration of the preface must be postponed for a moment while the scope of the work is examined.

The poet follows Matthew as his source text verse by verse and calls on the other evangelists as and when he wants to supplement the Matthean account. Thus Luke furnishes the narrative of the nativity and its associated events, virtually whole, and the boyhood of Christ, and John provides the essential pericopes of the meeting of Jesus and Nathaniel; the wedding at Cana, the purgation of the Temple, the dialogues with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman; the healing of the son of the man in the king's service; the apologetic discourse in John 5 and the narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus. Mark is also used but to a lesser extent than the other evangelists: the only narrative clearly from Mark is that of the unclean spirit driven into the pigs.<sup>16</sup>

---

15. Poinsette (p. 10, n. 5) gives the following figures:-  
Bk. I: 770 verses (Aen I: 756 verses); Bk. II: 829 (Aen. II: 804); Bk. III: 773 (Aen. III: 718); Bk. IV: 812 (Aen. VII: 817, VIII: 818).

16. For detailed study of the sources used throughout see Widmann, pp. 15-32 and Hansson, p. 18.



Juvenius naturally follows a form of the Old Latin Bible as his source text but in places he seems to have consulted a Greek text as well.<sup>17</sup> There is no evidence that Juvenius employed a Gospel harmony (but see the examination of the parable of the Two Houses in chapter 5 for a possible conflation of Luke and Matthew),<sup>18</sup> nor does there seem to be systematic use of any particular commentary.<sup>19</sup> In general he follows the narrative line of Matthew.

b) Critics Ancient and Modern.

Now that the poet and his work have been briefly considered, some critical views of the literary merits of the poem must be discussed before proceeding into the main body of the thesis. This review of the secondary literature will represent the main currents of opinion, concentrating on the comments first of St. Jerome and then of the critics.

- 
17. Marold, Verhältniss, pp. 337-41; Widmann, pp. 1-12; Nestler, pp. 5-31. Widmann (p. 11) concludes that Juvenius used a Greek text as the basis of his poem and even added to it, when given an opportunity; Nestler (p. 29) concludes that Juvenius' Latin text was of the European rather than African group of manuscripts (but cf. W. Sanday's review of Marold's edition, CR 6 (1892), pp. 49-50).
18. See Widmann, pp. 23-4 and Nestler, pp. 31-8.
19. In II 754 the allegorical interpretation derived ultimately from Origen has been noted and discussed by Nestler, pp. 38-43 and Weyman, pp. 133-4; cf. further Kievits, pp. 11-12. Other interpretations derived from commentaries are noted below; there is no evidence, however, for the dominance of any commentary.

Among the notices by Jerome cited in the previous section, meagre as they are, there are yet hints of comment on the work. It seems likely that with the advantage of writing them some seventy years or so after the poet composed his manifesto the scholar saint may have been able to formulate useful criteria for judging it. As a pointer to his view of the Evangeliorum libri it should be noted that Juvencus is the only poet included in the De viris illustribus; clearly he is broadly to be approved of.

In two passages Jerome describes the work in almost the same words:

Iuencus presbyter, natione Hispanus. evangelia  
heroicis versibus explicat.  
(Chron. ad ann. 2345)

Iuencus presbyter sub Constantino historiam domini  
saluatoris uersibus explicauit nec pertimuit  
euangelii maiestatem sub metri leges mittere.  
(Ep. LXX 5, 3)

Explicare means "to unfold" and hence "to develop", translate freely (cf. Cic. de Or. I 155, Poinssotte, p. 27 n. 78; Fontaine, Naissance, pp. 70-71). Jerome recognises that Juvencus is faithful to his original but that his is a creative translation of the sense rather than the word, in line with Jerome's own views.<sup>20</sup> Roberts. (p. 114), surprisingly, claims that; in Jerome's view, Juvencus is not concerned with allegory or interpretation; surely, versibus explicare implies such a concern. However, to the versibus explicare clause in the second passage Jerome adds the words:

---

20. Jer. Ep. LVII 5 ... profiteor; me in interpretatione Graecorum ... non uerbum, e uerbo; sed sensum exprimere de sensu; but it should be noted that he makes an exception of Scripture ubi et uerborum ordo mysterium est.

nec pertimuit euangelii maiestatem sub  
metri leges mittere.

(Ep. LXX. 5, 3)

Apart from the echo of IV 804-5, versibus ... nostris divinae gloria legis ... caperet, in euangelii maiestatem sub metri leges mittere, there is the litotes of nec pertimuit.

Clearly these two words must be important because the rest of the clause is merely a periphrase for versibus explicare etc. Poinssotte (p. 27, n. 78) rightly understands it as "and Juvencus had the temerity", meaning that the versification of the Gospels was considered a bold undertaking even in Jerome's day (Roberts, p. 114). Nevertheless it seems clear that there is admiration in that litotes. Jerome may have had fears that the "majesty" of the Holy Scriptures might be diminished; he may have had reservations (Roberts, p. 114; Poinssotte, p. 27, n. 78); but he had no doubt that Juvencus was successful. That is why Juvencus is the only poet in the De viris illustribus; it is also why he is the only poet in Jerome's list of Christian writers well read in the pagan authors.<sup>21</sup> Jerome approved of Juvencus, as he did not of other Christian poets.<sup>22</sup>

- 
21. Jerome wrote Ep. LXX 5, 3, containing such a list, to Flavius Magnus, Professor of Rhetoric at Rome, in response to the latter's challenge to him to justify his practice of quoting from classical literature in his writings; McClure, p. 312.
22. He explicitly repudiated Proba's cento of c. 360 (Herzog, p. 3; McClure, p. 311) in Ep. LIII 7, 3, and if Comodian is third or fourth century then Jerome is (understandably) silent about his effusions.

The most extensive of the Jerome notices, the passage from De viris illustribus includes the following comment on the poem:

Iuencus ... quattuor Evangelia hexametris versibus  
paene ad verbum transferens quattuor libros con-  
posuit (84).

On versibus transferens Fontaine (Naissance, p. 71) comments that the verb corresponds to the substantive translatio, which is the usual Latin equivalent for the technical term expressing the "figurative" process fundamental to metaphora. It implies metaphorisation or transposition.<sup>23</sup> Poinsothe (p. 27, n. 78) points out that in the sense meant by Jerome, Juvencus is a true "translator" of the Gospel from prose to poetry. When the two views are put together it can be said that Jerome means that Juvencus "translated" prose to poetry by a figurative or imagistic process. Again this hints at the rendition of sense rather than word favoured by Jerome in translation.

---

23. Wright has recently shown in detail that transferre came to mean "transfer" or "use metaphorically", referring to Augustine's translato verbo, Donatus and Alcuin for support; Roger Wright, "Late Latin and Early Romance: Alcuin's De Orthographia and the Council of Tours (813 A.D.)", in PLLS III, ed. Francis Cairns, 1981), pp. 343-61 especially 355-7; Late Latin and Early Romance (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1983), pp. 120-1.

However, Jerome says paene ad verbum transferens of the Evangeliorum libri. Roberts (p. 114) and Poinsette (p. 27, n. 78) understand this as meaning "almost word-for-word", and McClure (p. 312) translates it by "almost verbal". Undoubtedly that is the usual meaning of the phrase ad verbum (cf. Cic. de Or. I 34, 157) but it is worth remembering that verbum had a special meaning among Christian writers. In Jewish tradition the Word of the Lord had come to be identified with the Torah.<sup>24</sup> When John began his Gospel with: In principio erat Verbum ... (I 1) he was saying that God became Man in fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets. Hence in Christian usage verbum came to mean the Word of God, the truth, the Scriptures. It is possible that Jerome uses the phrase paene ad verbum in this sense, to mean that Juvencus was very near to the Word of God, the meaning of the Scriptures. He may be qualifying the hint of interpretation in transferre by saying that he is close to the Gospel in all senses. Hence Jerome probably sees the Evangeliorum libri as a creative translation of the Word of God into verse; it is almost the Gospel itself but rendered in hexameters.

Jerome's approval sums up the general view of Juvencus from the fourth until about the tenth century, when there was something of an eclipse. The poem was rarely if ever mentioned until the Renaissance, and even in the modern period the poem has not met with unqualified approval.

Those few English critics who have noticed it

---

24. See C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: CUP, 1963, pp. 12ff.

have been unfailingly patronizing in their efforts to be kind. The embarrassed but haughty smile is plain in a comment such as this:

Of the poem itself we need only say that it is a faithful and simple narrative of the Gospel story, clear and unadorned, but thoroughly Virgilian even to the imitation of the great poet's characteristic archaisms.<sup>25</sup>

The scorn and slight regard of "we need only say" leads on to two clever and damning shafts: "faithful" implies that it is over-literal in its imitation of the source; "simple" implies that it is totally unsophisticated; while "clear and unadorned" restates and re-emphasises both points. The final dismissal of the poem as "thoroughly Virgilian" (i.e. derivative) is worked up to imply that the poem is a completely untalented and dreadful cento of Virgil: "Virgilian even to the imitation of the great poet's characteristic archaisms." The implication is that Juvencus is a fool to enter the ring with the great poet, and the final sneer in "archaisms" is masterly. This is hardly a sympathetic view of the first Christian epic.

Elsewhere we are told that "his verses are mere imitations of Vergil",<sup>26</sup> that "the literary interest of his work is small"<sup>27</sup> and that he is "aussi timoré comme classique

---

25. F.J.E. Raby, A History of Christian-Latin Poetry, (Oxford: OUP, 1927), p. 17.

26. Anne Stanislaus, "The Scriptures in Hexameter", CW 32 (1938), p. 99.

27. J.T. Hatfield, A Study of Juvencus, diss. (Bonn: Carl Georgi Univ. Press, 1890), p. v.

que comme chrétien."<sup>28</sup> He is dubbed the "brouillon" or rough draft of Prudentius, and it is claimed that nature had to have two attempts at producing for Spain her true poet, her Prudentius.<sup>29</sup> He is accused of walking between Matthew and Virgil without daring to separate himself from them even for a moment.<sup>30</sup> More recently Boissier, the author of the previous remark, has been taken to task for saying that Juvencus united but did not assimilate Christian matters to the ancient manner of poetry; this is considered too harsh: Juvencus' "own practice of poetry has been both overpraised and overvilified."<sup>31</sup> Overvilified, yes; when has it been overpraised?

Contemporary scholarly opinion is less peremptory. There has been a significant growth in interest in the Biblical epic over the last ten years, so that not only has Juvencus' technical virtuosity been recognised, but his place in the tradition of Christian poetry and the

---

28. P. de Labriolle, Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne, 3rd edn. (Paris, 1947), vol. 2, p. 472.

29. H. Leclercq, s.v. Hymns, DACL, vol. 6, 2, 2904.

30. G. Boissier, La fin du paganisme, 3rd edn. (Paris, 1898), vol. 2, p. 46.

31. Charles Witke, Numen Litterarum: The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 5, (Leiden: Brill, 1971), p. 203.

meaning of the poem itself have been better understood.<sup>32</sup> The recent works of Herzog, Roberts and Poinsothe have been more enlightened and have achieved some rehabilitation of the poem.

Above all this change in understanding of Juvencus is the result of Reinhart Herzog's seminal book Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike<sup>33</sup> in which he presents Juvencus' poem as a work of Christian devotion. Herzog argues that the Biblical epic is a uniquely Christian development, both in terms of genre and individual works; he sees the phenomenon as arising out of the practices of Christian apologetics.<sup>34</sup> In his opinion Juvencus' poem arises out of the early Patristic practice of citing passages from the pagan poets - especially Virgil - for apologetic and interpretive purposes; he finds support for this view in the parallels between quotation of poetry in prose works of apology and the Biblical poems

---

32. Cf. U. Moricca, Storia della letteratura latina cristiana (Torino et al., 1928), vol. 2, 2, pp. 831-9 (a pioneering work); Mauro Donnini, "Un aspetto della espressività di Giovenco: l'aggettivazione", Vichiana 2 (1973), 54-67; "L'alliterazione e L'omeoteleuto in Giovenco" AFLPer 12 (1974-5), 127-59; Andre Longpré, "Aspects de metrique et de prosodie chez Juvencus", Phoenix 29 (1978), 128-38.

33. Only vol. I on Juvencus and "Cyprianus Gallus" has appeared so far, and there are apparently no plans for subsequent volumes.

34. See Herzog, pp. lxx-lxxii, 60-9, 155-211.



and centos.<sup>35</sup> The guiding principles for the development of the Biblical epic are the concepts of Erbaulichkeit, edification, and Andacht, devotion, which two principles Herzog uses to assess its development from the point of view of chronology.<sup>36</sup> In his view these concepts are crucial in the original motivation of a Juvencus. The poet looks to edify his audience and express his own devotion.

Roberts has also studied Juvencus and the genre of Biblical epic in general, but this time from the point of view of the rhetorical exercise of paraphrasis. He disagrees with Herzog that Erbaulichkeit and Andacht are the only formative principles, on the grounds that these two concepts fail to take account of the rhetorical tradition of paraphrase. In Robert's view, a poet like Juvencus is attempting to write a literary paraphrase, one that is creative, with all the weight of centuries of rhetorical practice of the form behind it. Roberts (p. 120) finds that

Each poet recast his Christian subject in accordance with stylistic criteria derived from the traditional educational system - a system which was based on ancient literary theory.

The methodology employed by Roberts is to investigate the Evangeliorum Libri IV for the paraphrastic techniques employed.

---

35. Herzog, pp. 49-51, extends his arguments to the Biblical centos.

36. His methodology is expressed in pp. lxxv-lxxviii.

Poinsotte follows neither approach. He is interested only in the extraordinary anti-Semitic polemic of the poem. He points out that Juvencus maintains, as far as possible, a silence about certain aspects of the life, teaching and environment of Christ; and examines the ways in which he "de-Judaizes" the Gospel. Although Poinsotte's literary points are made en passant, they frequently involve valuable insights into the meaning of the poem and its poetics. Furthermore his is the lengthiest and most thorough modern work on the poem.

Each of these modern critics has his own idea of what Juvencus is about in writing this poem: to Herzog it is a work of edification and devotion; to Roberts it is a literary paraphrase not primarily interpretative but intended to stand as a separate work of literature (see Roberts, pp. 88-9); to Poinsotte it is primarily a work of anti-Jewish propaganda. These are bewilderingly different views and must be examined more closely.

Herzog's study of the spiritual and moral elements of the text (Erbauung) takes place in a work of literary theory. His primary interest is in the origins and development of the Biblical epic as a sub-genre; as such, he is more concerned to extract material from the poem to illustrate his theories about the genre than to study the text in detail from a literary critical standpoint. Because this is a feature of the later Biblical epic, he notes that Juvencus interprets the Biblical text in a few places but his study of the text is at the behest of his theories about the

original motivation of such works.<sup>37</sup> Roberts considers the poem insofar as it illustrates his theses about the rhetorical exercise of paraphrase and its influence on the Biblical epic. Just as with Herzog, Roberts's theories about the origins of the poems vitally inform his discussions of Juvencus and his successors. He too identifies a few interpretive expansions of the source, and some that he calls "poetic" expansions, but he studies very little of the poem in detail from this point of view, perhaps to avoid distortion of its importance in Juvencus as compared with later writers (see Roberts, p. 134).

If Herzog and Roberts both study the Evangeliorum libri only as it confirms their conflicting ideas about the origins and development of the sub-genre, the only recent work devoted exclusively to Juvencus is primarily concerned with his hostile representation of the Jews. Poinsothe's detailed study of Juvencus is in origin only a part of his study of anti-Semitism in ancient literature generally. His central idea is that Juvencus edits or interprets the Gospel whole-heartedly to make the Jewish nation the scape-goats for the execution of Christ. In the course of the argument several sections of the poem are studied in great depth; it is assumed that Juvencus interprets what he "translates" in places. However,

---

37. For example, Roberts (p. 143 n. 56) takes Herzog to task for attributing to "die Objektivierung der Erbauung" what are really the techniques of emphasis (cf. Herzog, pp. 150-4). Herzog too often ignores Juvencus' classicism.

no modern critic, not even Poinsette, really confronts the question "How much of the poem is interpretation?" Yet there are indications in Jerome's comments on the poem that he believes that it is an attempt to interpret the narrative of the Gospel story. If Jerome's suggestions are to be followed up, it seems sensible to look at what Juvencus says in the first Christian exordium.

c) The Poet's Intention.

If Juvencus is attempting to interpret for his reader as he renders the Gospel narrative, it seems likely that some hint of this aim will appear in the praefatio. The opening and the close of any poem or book of poetry in the ancient world is the likeliest place to find a poetic manifesto. Accordingly, the praefatio and the epilogue must receive close attention before further conclusions about the poem may be drawn.

Inmortale nihil mundi conpage tenetur,  
 Non orbis, non regna hominum, non aurea Roma,  
 Non mare, non tellus, non ignea sidera caeli.  
 Nam statuit genitor rerum inrevocabile tempus,  
 5 Quo cunctum torrens rapiat flamma ultima mundum.  
 Sed tamen innumeros homines sublimia facta  
 Et virtutis honos in tempora longa frequentant,  
 Adcumulant quorum famam laudesque poetae.  
 Hos celsi cantus, Smyrnae de fonte fluentes,  
 10 Illos Minciadae celebrat dulcedo Maronis.  
 Nec minor ipsorum discurrit gloria vatum,  
 Quae manet aeternae similis, dum saecula volabunt  
 Et vertigo poli terras atque aequora circum  
 Aethera sidereum iusso moderamine volvet.  
 15 Quod si tam longam meruerunt carmina famam,  
 Quae veterum gestis hominum mendacia nectunt,  
 Nobis certa fides aeternae in saecula laudis  
 Immortale decus tribuet meritumque rependet.

20 Nam mihi carmen erit Christi vitalia gesta,  
 Divinum populis falsi sine crimine donum.  
 Nec metus, ut mundi rapiant incendia secum  
 Hoc opus; hoc etenim forsan me subtrahet igni  
 Tunc, cum flammivoma discendet nube coruscans  
 Iudex, altithroni genitoris gloria, Christus.  
 25 Ergo age! sanctificus adsit mihi carminis auctor  
 Spiritus, et puro mentem riget amne canentis  
 Dulcis Iordanis, ut Christo digna loquamur.

Juvencus commences with the statement that there is nothing immortal on the earth, not the world, not man's kingdoms, not golden Rome, not sea, land or the fiery stars of heaven. For everything will be destroyed by fire according to God's will (1-5). Yet, he continues, countless men live on through their virtuous deeds, thanks to the praise of poets. And these poets also win themselves apparently eternal fame (6-14). But since they do so by interweaving the deeds of the men of old with lies, how much more, then, will this poem outlast time, since it will be the Gospel of Christ (15-20). It will not be snatched from him by the burning of the world; indeed he hopes it will save him from the fire on the Day of Judgment (21-4). He prays that the Holy Spirit will help him and cleanse his soul with the pure water of the Jordan, so that he can speak the Gospel in a manner worthy of Christ (25-7).<sup>38</sup>

---

38. Literature on the praefatio: Kartschoke, ad. loc.; Kievits, pp. 31-5; Curtius, p.454 ff.; Christine Mohrmann, p. 180; Thraede, 1022-3; van der Nat; Quadlbauer; Herzog, pp. xlv-xlix and 88 n. 102; Kartschoke, pp. 56-9; Murru; Kirsch, vol. 1 pp. 129-32 (plus notes vol. 2 pp. 138-45).

The prooemium<sup>39</sup> is in the form of an argument, in which Juvencus employs standard *topoi*.<sup>40</sup> The basic idea of the passage is contemplation of the Word of God that is not of this world but everlasting:

Caelum et terra transibunt, verba vero mea non  
praeteribunt,

(Mt. 24, 35)<sup>41</sup>

In considering the Gospel from this point of view he structures the praefatio in two parts. The first part (1-14) consists of criticism of the traditional view of writing epic and of the immortality of the poet. In part two (15-27) he develops out of this critique a theory of the epic that is in keeping with the Christian point of view.<sup>42</sup> These two almost symmetrical parts (14:13 verses) are bound together by internal repetition.<sup>43</sup> For example Inmortale in the same sedes at ll. 1 and 18 (early in the 2nd part; cf. Smolak, pp. 18-9. Murru, p. 146).

In the first five lines he formulates the Vergänglichkeitsgedanke, thoughts of the transience of all earthly things (van der Nat, p. 251). The political order will not endure (pr. 2):

Non orbis, non regna hominum, non aurea Roma.

39. Herzog, p. 69 n. 102, regards the praefatio as a prooemium; see Kirsch, vol. 2, pp. 138-41, n. 145 for discussion.

40. Kartschoke, p. 57.

41. All quotations of the Gospels from the Itala; all other scriptural citations from the Vulgate.

42. Smolak, p. 18.

43. Murru, p. 139 and passim; Kirsch, p. 130.

Here it is possible that the Roman Empire (aurea Roma, Ov. Ars Am. III 113; Kievits, ad loc.) is seen as preceding the millenium, as Smolak (p. 18) thinks. Parallel to the political order is the cosmic order (Smolak, p. 18):

Non mare, non tellus, non ignea sidera caeli.

The next couplet refers to the Stoic doctrine of Ekpyrosis, the burning of the World, which was adapted by the third century Christians to fit their view of the end of the World (Smolak, p. 18; cf. Ov. Met. I 256 ff.).

Nam statuit genitor rerum inrevocabile tempus,  
5 Quo cunctum torrens rapiat flamma ultima mundum. (4-5)

However, the Biblical phrasing here (Kartschoke, p. 59) and the explicit mention of the Father (genitor rerum) Christianize the Thoughts of Transience topos. In fact Juvencus has the second letter of Peter in mind, where the Day of Judgement (dies Domini) is described as that

in quo caeli magna impetu transient, elementa vero  
calore solventur, tersa autem et quae in ipsa sunt  
opera, exurentur (2 Peter III 10).<sup>44</sup>

The flames are those that will destroy all the works of this world. He completes the first part of the prooemium with the ancient topos of poetry as a memorial;<sup>45</sup> the poem commemorates those who have gone before, and through it the poet wins eternal fame.

Sed tamen innumeros homines sublimia facta  
Et virtutis honos in tempora longa frequentant,  
Adcumulant quorum famam laudesque poetae. (6-8)

44. Kievits, ad loc.

45. Curtius, pp. 468 ff.

Mortal fame is circumscribed by time, however long it endures: tempora longa (cf. Cic. Somn. Scip. 21).<sup>46</sup> The poetae, of course, are epic poets, such as he refers to in the following antithesis:

Hos celsi cantus, Smyrnae de fonte fluentes,  
10 Illos Minciadae celebrat dulcedo Maronis. (9-10)

The epic poets are represented by the outstanding poets of the two classical languages, Homer and Virgil. Cantus, Smyrnae de fonte fluentes is a periphrastic reference to Homer, for Smyrna is one of seven towns which claimed to be the birthplace of the great poet (Knappitsch, ad loc.; cf. Quadlbauer, p. 189 n. 3). The metaphor of Homer's fluency in epic (de fonte fluentes) allows the symbol of baptismal water to be set against the "fountain" at the end of the praefatio. Moreover he picks up the water metaphor with Minciades, "from the river Mincius (now Mincio)" (cf. Virg. Geo. III 14-5; Kartschoke, p. 59; van der Nat, p. 253; Smolak, p. 19; Kirsch, p. 131). Hence dulcedo functions both as the usual technical term of ancient literary criticism, and refers via the water symbolism to the sweetness of the water, literally and allegorically. Similarly discussit in l. 11 of the gloria vatum functions as in Lucan IV 574: discurrens Fama per orbem (Kievits, ad loc.), but it also refers to the water metaphor (Virg. Geo. IV 292 of the Nile; Smolak, p. 19).

---

46. Smolak, pp. 18-9.



The Christian limitation of the Memorial topos is that it is only apparently eternal renown, aeternae similis: it is bound to the material world. It is only

dum saecula volabunt  
Et vertigo poli terras atque aequora circum  
Aethera sidereum iusso moderamine volvet,

that the fame of even a Homer or Virgil will survive. This reference to the cosmic order closes the first part in a ring composition (Smolak, p. 19). It is worth noticing that the Memorial topos is altered by the Christian concerns of the author. Normally the form is similar to this in Horace's

Odes:

Non omnis moriar; multaque pars mei  
Vitabit Libitinam, dum Capitolium scandet ... etc.  
(III 30, 6-7)

However to the Christian mere worldly glory is worth nothing; the fact that fame is tied to the material world means that it is mortal, it does not partake of the everlasting life that Christ promised his followers and hence must be shunned.

The second part opens with a number of repetitions of words from the first:

15 Quod si tam longam meruerunt carmina famam,  
Quae veterum gestis hominum mendacia nectunt,  
Nobis certa fides aeternae in saecula laudis<sup>47</sup>  
Inmortale decus tribuet meritumque rependet. (15-18)

This sort of repetition for structural reasons is common in Juvenecus, as we shall see. The antithesis between mendacia and fides points to the contrast between the lies of the pagan poets and Juvenecus' firm Christian faith, i.e., the truth,

---

47. famam, 1.8; hominum, 2; aeternae, 12; saecula, 12; Inmortale, 1.

the Gospel. This is the first confrontation between the truth of Christian poetry and the lies of pagan poetry (for the topoi of truth and lies, see Kartschoke, p. 57). Furthermore the phrase aeternae in saecula laudis re-emphasises the "poetry as memorial" topos.<sup>48</sup> The expected statements here are:-

- (a) your poetry will survive almost forever
- (b) but because it is pagan, it will die with the end of the world
- (c) my poetry will live forever because it is Christian.<sup>49</sup>

The first two are present in lines 11 ff. but (c) is postponed as the poet varies the topos; it is his faith<sup>50</sup> that he says will bestow on him the immortal honour of everlasting praise forever (in saecula).<sup>51</sup> The poet's faith, instead of his poetry, will live forever. But, in a complex and paradoxical passage, his poem will not perish in the fires of this world (it is eternal) and he hopes it will save him from final damnation (21 ff). Statement (c) is implied here in a further variation.

- 48. Roberto Palla in "Aeterna in saecula in Giovenco, praefatio 17", SC026 (1977), 277-82, argues persuasively for the reading of R and H1, aeterna; he forgets, however, that in saecula means "for all eternity" (see n. 51) and therefore II 268 is not an exact parallel. The word goes better with laudis (cf. aeternae, l. 12).
- 49. This is the "alii-ego" topos (Smolak, p. 17), which is common in Horace.
- 50. Certa fides means firm faith (Smolak, p. 19). Kievits, ad. loc., is quite wrong in giving persuasio, opinio; equally van der Nat wants the words to mean both the firmness of faith and the total truthfulness of Juvencus.
- 51. In saecula signifies in Christian liturgical use "for ever and ever", (cf. IV 812), hence the contrast with the worldly saecula of l. 12; Smolak, p. 19.

Before leaving these lines, it is worth noticing that Juvencus describes the matter of the lying pagan epic poems as veterum gestis hominum. Horace in his Ars poetica (73) defines the subject of epic as res gestae regumque ducumque; clearly then Juvencus perceives classical epic in a similar way, but why veterum hominum, "men of old"? Smolak (p. 19) suggests attractively that this phrase indicates that the poet was influenced by euhemeristic interpretations of myth, in which the pagan gods were ancient (veterum?) heroes of great stature. Euhemerism was popular among Christian apologists; and a close contemporary of Juvencus, Lactantius, was particularly fond of this viewpoint in his anti-pagan polemic.

Juvencus' description of his own theory of the "true" epic follows in the next line:

Nam mihi carmen erit Christi vitalia gesta. (19)

Gesta links the new epic definition with gestis (16) of the false old epic (Smolak, p. 19). Redemption is to take the place of myth; the truth of God as man is to supersede the lies of the gods who were only men. But Juvencus goes further than that by identifying his poem with the word of God, the Gospel (it is worth noting that falsi sine crimine forms a contrast with mendacia):

Divinum populis falsi sine crimine donum. (20)

Kartschoke (p. 58) has commented how extraordinary this simple identification is; the truth topos is finely exploited

To the modern reader there is something vaguely blasphemous about saying that anything in this sublunary world is falsi sine crimine, without the stain of falsehood, and divinum populis donum, a divine gift to the peoples.

Juvencus' subject is more than the deeds of men, no matter how elevated (sublimia facta, 6); it is the works of Christ, that are life-bringing (vitalia gesta, 19).<sup>52</sup> Hence Juvencus' poem will not be destroyed by the fires that will burn this world, mundi incendia.<sup>53</sup> There is also a direct reference back to line 5 through the repetitions rapiat (5) ... rapiant (21) and mundum (5) ... mundi (21). Evidently the flame is that described in 2 Peter III 10, the fire that will burn the world on the dies Domini. He hopes that his poem (hoc opus) will save him from this apocalyptic fire, me subtrahet igni, at the parousia:

cum flammivoma discendet nube coruscans  
Iudex, altithroni genitoris gloria, Christus. (23-4).

This is the style of high epic (Quadlbauer, p. 192) but it is also a representation that is far from "gentle Jesus, meek and mild"; this is Christ the Judge, coming in all His majesty and power. He is the glory of the Father, altithroni genitoris gloria, a glory which contrasts with the glory of poets, gloria vatum (11). In early Christian theology the Father can only manifest this glory through Christ, the Word, as Smolak (p. 20) has pointed out; however here the meaning is at John I 14:

---

52. Van der Nat, p. 251; Kievits, ad loc., and Nestler, p. 44, think that vitalia gesta = vita, but the word means more than that.

53. Ov. Met. XV 871 also says that the fire cannot destroy his work; Smolak, p. 19.

Et vidimus gloriam eius, gloriam quasi unigeniti a  
 Patre plenum gratiae et veritatis.

The Word is the glory of God.

It is also worth noting that one reason why Juvencus' poem will not be destroyed by the fires is that it is eternal like the Gospel.

Mt. 24, 35: Caelum et terra transibunt, verba vero  
 mea non praeteribunt.

Haec tellus caelumque super solventur in ignes,  
 Sed mea non umquam solventur ab ordine dicta.  
 (IV 161-2)

In a sense this poem is the Gospel. Matthew was inspired by the Holy Spirit and so is Juvencus, as the last lines show.

The last three lines consist of an invocatio numinum (Kartschoke, p. 58). Juvencus prays to the Holy Spirit to inspire him and cleanse his soul with the River Jordan:

25 Ergo age! sanctificus adsit mihi carminis auctor  
 Spiritus, et puro mentem riget amne canentis  
 Dulcis Iordanis, ut Christo digna loquamur. (25-7)

This passage has been studied extensively by Quadlbauer and others and it is worth drawing out one or two additional points. The invocation is of the Holy Spirit, sanctificus spiritus, rather than of Apollo and/or the Muses as usual (Kievits, ad loc.; Quadlbauer, pp. 196-7),<sup>54</sup> and means that all three Persons of the Trinity are referred to in ll. 24-6 (Smolak, p. 20). This establishes an interesting pattern of allusions:- The Holy Spirit, one ref., sanctificus spiritus

---

54. Witke, p. 200, for later invocations of the Holy Spirit.

(25-6); the Father, two, genitor rerum (4) and altithroni genitoris (24); the Son, three, Christi (19), Christus (24) and Christo (27). There is a "1, 2, 3" pattern of direct references to the Three-in-One.

The River Jordan is another substitution of a Christian for a pagan element in the invocatio: the Muses' spring Hippocrene on Mount Helicon is what one expects to see invoked (van der Nat, p. 252; Quadlbauer, pp. 197-8). The Jordan is the river of Christ's baptism and the place where the Holy Spirit descended, so that the poet is obviously referring to the cleansing of sin that is baptism when he introduces the river at this point.<sup>55</sup> More importantly it contributes to the complex of water symbols (van der Nat, p. 253; Smolak, p. 20; Quadlbauer, pp. 200-6; Kirsch, p. 131), partly by the parallel dulcedo Maronis ... dulcis Jordanis, whereby the poetic inspiration of Virgil is set against the sacramental presence of the Spirit in Baptism (Smolak, p. 20). Hence there is a development in the water symbols from the simple metaphor Smyrnae de fonte fluentes through Minciadae dulcedo Maronis to puro amne dulcis Iordanis.<sup>56</sup>

Finally there is the clause ut Christo digna loquamur. The parallel with Virgil Aeneid.VI is well known:

quique pii vates et Phoebos digna locuti. (662)

55. The description of the spring of the Muses as flumen (here amnis) is studied by van der Nat, p. 253.

56. Epic was conventionally associated with the metaphor of the sea, rivers etc.; the idea is derived from Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo 105ff.

However, with this can be set the prayer before the Gospel in the Mass. The juxtaposition puro mentem (26) is a reminiscence of the opening of the Munda cor, and ut Christo digna loquamur is a clear imitation of its close. The relevant sections of the Munda cor, one of the oldest parts of the Mass, are as follows (Smolak, p. 20):

munda cor meum ... ut sanctum Evangelium tuum, digne  
valeam nuntiare.

Clearly the poet intends the praefatio to precede "the Gospel" as the prayer in the Liturgy is followed by the Gospel. This is another indication that Juvencus thinks of his poem as in some sense equivalent to the four books of "the Gospels", Evangeliorum libri IV.

What the poet understands by Christo digna loquamur is hinted at in the epilogue to the poem:

Has mea mens fidei vires sanctique timoris  
Cepit et in tantum lucet mihi gratia Christi,  
Versibus ut nostris divinae gloria legis  
805 Ornamenta libens caperet terrestria linguae. (IV 802-5)

The poet's soul is so full of the strength of faith and holy awe of God, the grace of Christ has shone on him so brightly, that sacred Scripture has adapted itself in his verse to the worldly ornaments of language.<sup>57</sup> The references back to the praefatio are clearly deliberate; mens, fidei and gloria all come from the second half of it. The grace of Christ has enabled Juvencus to write the poem because he has invoked the Holy Spirit (pr. 25). Nevertheless the

---

57. On this passage Knappitsch, ad loc.; Witke, pp. 201-2; van der Nat, pp. 254-5; Quadlbauer, p. 206, n. 50; Roberts, p. 110; Kirsch, p. 132.

central thought, that the "splendour of God's law" has taken the ornamenta ... terrestria linguae, is apparently absent from the praefatio. The point is that ut Christo digna loquamur refers to the linguistic form of the poem (van der Nat, p. 255), and the poet is elaborating on these few words to make a positive statement about his epic. The Gospel is treated with the (purely external) elaboration that was the taste of the time: the balance of divinae gloria legis with ornamenta ... terrestria linguae makes the point plainly (Roberts, p. 110).

It is useful at this point to sum up what Juvencus has to say about his poem. He sees himself writing epic, but not the epic of classical poetry in which the poet confers immortality on his subject through art; it is the subject, the truth of Christ, which will confer immortality on the work, and on the poet himself, but in a different sense. The immortality that pagan poets refer to is subject to the survival of this world; by immortality the Christian, and hence Juvencus, means the eternal life promised by Christ. Juvencus hopes to attain salvation and hence eternal life by writing the poem. Its subject is the deeds of Christ in this world, the Gospel story - and indeed the poet refers to the poem as if it were the Gospel. In telling this story in verse Juvencus has embellished it with terrene ornament.



His simultaneous admiration for and rejection of pagan epic is as impressive as his formulation of what amounts to a definition of a new sub-genre, that of Christian epic. He has entered the patristic debate over truth or not in poetry firmly on the side of truth, but only by rejecting all that has gone before him (at least, in theory). Juvencus, then, contrasts mendacia, the lies (fiction) which are the content of pagan epic, with Christi vitalia gesta, the living truth of Christ. This involves an inversion of the normal subject of epic; instead of fiction the Christian epic is to take non-fiction for its content.

It has been observed above that Juvencus refers to his poem in the same terms as the Gospel itself: his poem will be Christi vitalia gesta; it is divinum populis ... donum, a divine gift to the peoples; it is falsi sine crimine, without the stain of falsehood (as opposed to mendacia); it will not be destroyed by the fire on the Last Day (pr. 21-2), and is therefore eternal; it is inspired by the Holy Spirit; and the close of the praefatio imitates the Munda cor prayer before the Gospel in the Mass, so that the four books of the poem proper are like the Four Gospels, they follow the words puro mentem ... Christo digna. The poet is clearly convinced that he is true to the Gospels in more than narrative detail. Yet he does not imagine that his poem is superior to or even equal to his divinely inspired source (that is unthinkable for a Christian of this period):

Versibus ut nostris divinae gloria legis  
 805 Ornamenta libens caperet terrestria linguae.  
 (IV 804-5)

The splendour of God's law has willingly (libens) submitted itself in his verse to the worldly ornaments of language. Sacred Scripture has received the benefit of the highest achievements of human art (the language of Virgilian epic) in his poem, but the poet by implication recognises that even the style of Virgil is inferior to the divine language of the Gospels (terrestria is contrasted with divinae). Evangeliorum libri IV even in Juvencus' own eyes cannot match the Four Holy Gospels. How then can the poem be in some way equivalent to the Gospels themselves?

In my view the poet regards his creation as achieving the sense and spirit as well as the narrative detail of Christi vitalia gesta, and as interpreting the meaning of the Gospel story for his readers. This corresponds not only to the poet's own account but to the opinions both of Jerome and of the foremost modern critics. As noted above, Jerome regarded Juvencus' work as a "translation" of the Gospel texts, that is, a rendition of the sense rather than the word. Moreover, of recent scholars, Herzog, Roberts and Poinsothe in particular have noticed that in places Juvencus interprets the Bible as he versifies it. In comparison with his successors in the tradition of Biblical epic, of course, the amount of interpolated comment on the meaning of the Biblical text is miniscule; in no sense is the poem a commentary on the meaning of the Gospel. Nevertheless,

especially in the parables, Juvencus shows unmistakable signs of interpreting the meaning of his Gospel source. Little detailed work has been done on this subject, and it is the intention of this study to attempt to rectify this. The aims of this thesis, therefore, are as follows:- to establish that interpretation is present in the poem; to analyse how Juvencus' reading of the Biblical meaning affects his rendition; and to investigate the implications of Juvencus' interpretation for selected Gospel passages.

The parables of Jesus, in which Matthew's gospel is particularly rich, constitute a suitable sample of the work for investigation on these lines. Moreover scant attention has been paid by any of the commentators to them, yet as "stories within the story" they contain interesting problems for the paraphrast to solve. They must work on the narrative level from the point of view of character, plot and general cohesion; but they must also illustrate some aspect of Christ's teaching or Christian doctrine generally in a clear and concise way; furthermore there may be some indication in the homely everyday details of life found in the parables of the contemporary concerns of the early fourth century. In short, they are susceptible of interpretation; they have meaning to be drawn out. This study will consider all these aspects of the parables in Juvencus's poem in comparison with the originals in the source texts.

d) The Parable.

Several reasons for studying the parables in Juvencus' poem have been outlined, but before the parables themselves may be considered in detail a certain amount of definition is necessary. In this section some attempt will be made to describe and classify the parable.

What is a parable? It is a form of teaching by analogy, often comparing the unknown with the known in an attempt to explain that unknown. Hunter's definition (p. 8) is difficult to better:

A comparison drawn from nature or daily life and designed to illuminate some spiritual truth, on the assumption that what is valid in one sphere is valid also in the other.

Its popularity in Hellenistic Palestine probably arises from the Oriental's innate love of pictorial speech and the Semitic delight in a story.

The Greek word parabole means a comparison or analogy and is discussed by Aristotle (Rhet. II 20, 2ff). However, the antecedents of Christ's parables are in the Old Testament prophets, and, as Hunter (pp. 8-9) points out, the Eastern tradition does not distinguish between a proverb and a parable:

The Hebrew word mashal (with its Aramaic equivalent mathla), derived from a verb meaning 'be like', is a pretty wide label for any verbal image, from a figurative saying (e.g. Ezekiel's 'Like mother, like daughter') or a proverb ('Is Saul also among the prophets?'), up to a proper parable (like Nathan's famous one about the ewe-lamb), an allegory (like

Ezekiel's about the Eagles and the Vine) or even a long apocalyptic prediction (of which the 'parables' of Enoch are examples).<sup>58</sup>

The Septuagint renders mashal by parabole, and hence parabole attracted to itself most of mashal's meanings. Parabole therefore is used in the New Testament itself of proverbs like "Physician, heal thyself" and dark sayings like "The things which come out of a man are what defile him" as well as long stories like the Talents.

The basis of a parable in the Biblical sense is a figurative saying. Many of Jesus' sayings are highly figurative and pictorial, presumably because the pictorial mode of expression made the message more memorable among his followers. Dodd (p. 16) illustrates this feature by comparison with what Christ could have said:

Thus instead of saying, "Beneficence should not be ostentatious", He says "When you give alms, do not blow your trumpet"; instead of saying, "Wealth is a grave hindrance to true religion", He says, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God."<sup>59</sup>

In these imagistic expressions the parable is latent; indeed in the latter example it is arguable that the parable is already present.<sup>60</sup> The development of these figurative sayings into the parable is a natural one.

58. Hunter, p. 9.

59. Mt. 6, 2 & 19, 24.

60. Fenton, p. 316, considers it as a parable.

Bultmann has divided the Biblical parable into three classes. According to his classification the parable at its simplest is a metaphor or simile drawn from everyday or common-place experience, the Bildwort, which arrests the hearer by reason of its vividness or strangeness, and leaves him in sufficient doubt about its precise application to provoke him into active thought (Dodd, p. 16).

The Gleichnis is one of these simple metaphors or similes elaborated into a full picture by the addition of detail (Bultmann, p. 194; Dodd, p. 17). This type of parable is common in the gospels.

The Parabel, the parable proper, consists in the metaphor or simile which is elaborated into a story. The distinction is clear; the additional details serve to develop the situation into a narrative rather than a picture. Length is irrelevant in defining the Parabel, as the story may be very short, like that of the Leaven, or a full-length tale (Novelle), like the Talents.

This classification seems to me, as apparently it does to Jeremias, somewhat artificial.<sup>61</sup> I propose a usage closer to common speech: a parable is, in my meaning, a story-parable. The story-parables are of primary interest in the poem and therefore to this investigation, whereas the similitudes are only occasionally considered here. Where an extended image

---

61. For instance, Gleichnisse in the title means "parables" and Parabeln in the index (p. 247) means "parables" in exactly the same sense.

(Gleichnis) is alluded to, the term minor parable is used, and where a parable is to be differentiated from a minor parable the expression major parable is convenient and unambiguous.

e) Interpreting the Parable.

One of the major reasons for considering parables in this study is that they attract interpretation; if Juvencus is interpreting the meaning as he understands it of the Biblical source, this should be apparent in his versions of the parables. From the apostolic age to the present day Christian scholars have been engaged in interpreting them. In the present section of the chapter this tradition of interpretation is considered as a context in which Juvencus' understanding of the parable may be placed. The fruits of modern scholarship are briefly summarised in order to set in relief the practice of the ancients with regard to exegesis. It cannot be assumed that the Biblical scholars of antiquity viewed interpretation in the same light as those of today.<sup>62</sup>

Vitally important for the modern understanding of Jesus' parables is the work of Jülicher. He rejects all the allegorizing which has dominated their interpretation through the centuries. He states, first, that the parables of Jesus are similitudes, not allegories, and that therefore each of them has only one tertium comparationis (point of

---

62. The discussion in this section is drawn very largely from Hunter, ch. 2.

likeness) not several. Second, these similitudes Jesus employed to make his message clear and vivid to the multitudes, not to obfuscate it. Finally, one should concentrate on the one central point of comparison, usually a very general moral truth, and regard all other details as dramatic machinery necessary for the telling of the tale.

Jülicher's work is too sweeping, as Bugge and Fiebig have shown. Rabbinic parables do employ allegory, so that it is entirely possible that Jesus' parables contained allegorical elements. Furthermore, Jülicher claims that a parable exists to make one point of a general nature; yet the innocuous moral he sees as that point is not likely to have condemned its author to crucifixion. It is unclear that the parables of Jesus are merely picturesque stories told to enforce prudential platitudes.

The Form Critics, especially Bultmann, have suggested that in the period of oral tradition before the Gospels were written the parables circulated singly or in pairs as the raw stuff of early Christian preaching and teaching. As the Church leaders re-applied the parables to their own situation and needs, it is supposed that the original setting of many of them was inevitably forgotten.

Dodd takes up the implied challenge and, together with Jeremias, puts the parables of Christ back into their setting in His ministry. According to this view, which



is now accepted as standard, the parables, and indeed the miracles, are part of Christ's kerygma (proclamation) that the Kingdom of God had arrived in His person and mission of redemption. This amounts to a massive advance in exegesis; the parables may now be understood as they have not been since apostolic times.

This brief summary of modern Biblical criticism has indicated clearly that Christ's parables received accretions of allegory in the days of the early Church. They continued to do so until Jülicher, and it is only now after the work of Dodd and Jeremias that those allegorizing accretions have been removed. But if the modern trend is away from allegory in Biblical criticism, the ancient preference was towards allegorizing. Allegory was the chief key to the interpretation of the parables from New Testament times onwards.

Allegory was a Greek method of interpretation, older than Plato. Homer early received allegorical treatment, especially over the more shocking erotic behaviour of the Olympian deities, and it became common to find hyponoia (an under meaning) in his work. Later, the Stoics allegorized Homer so that the "elements" of the universe could be found in his work (Hunter, p. 23). Homer was a kind of Bible to the ancient world of course. With Philo of Alexandria, whose ingenuity in allegorizing enabled him to reconcile the Jewish religion and neo-Platonism, Greek

allegorizing found its way into the Jewish exegetical tradition during the first century.

In the New Testament itself allegory is not commonly employed (except in the Letter to the Hebrews). The first attempts, however, at applying it to the parables may be seen in the explanations added to the Sower, the Tares and the Seine-Net. Matthew of course also betrays signs of allegorical interpretation in the Wedding Feast (the king = God; the son = Christ) and the Ten Virgins (return of Christ the heavenly bridegroom). Nevertheless the only true allegories are the Tenants in the Vineyard and St. Paul's allegories of Sarah and Hagar (Gal. 4) and of the Olive Tree (Rom. 11).

In the second century allegory became increasingly popular. Irenaeus allegorized several parables. In his account of the Treasure, for example, he explains that the field represents the Scriptures, and the treasure is Christ Himself (Contra Haer. IV 26, 1). His reading of the Workers in the Vineyard is highly detailed (Contra Haer. IV 36,7). The first call to the workers represents the Creation, the second is the Old Covenant and the third is Christ's Ministry. The long lapse of time in which we now live is the fourth call, while the final call symbolises the end of time. The vineyard is righteousness; the householder, the Spirit of God; and the denarius is immortality.

Tertullian further developed the art of allegorizing.

His exegesis of the Prodigal Son is a good example (de  
Pudicitia  
Modestia 9). The elder son in the story is the Jew; the younger, the Christian. The patrimony of which the younger claimed his share is the knowledge of God which all men have by their birthright. The citizen abroad to whom he hired himself is the devil. The robe bestowed on the returned prodigal is that sonship which Adam lost at the Fall; the ring is the sign and seal of baptism; the feast is the Communion of the Lord's Supper; and the "fatted calf" of course is the Saviour Himself.

It was in Alexandria, (Philo's city), however, that this method of interpretation was developed into a powerful exegetical tool; first by Clement, then by Origen, his successor as head of the catechetical school. These scholars saw allegory as the primary exegetical technique of their time. As an example of Clement's exegesis the Mustard-seed will serve (Paid. I 11). The prolific nature of the seed represents Christ's manifold influence. But Clement extends this idea further:

τὸ δὲ κάρυ καὶ τῆς χολῆς ἐστὶ μελιωτικόν,  
τουτέστι τοῦ θυμοῦ. καὶ τοῦ φλέγματος  
διασκοπτικόν, τουτέστι τοῦ τῦφου, ἐξ  
οὗ λόγου ἢ ἀληθείας τῆς ψυχῆς  
ὑμείων, καὶ ἢ αἰδῖος εὐκράσια περιχίνεταί.

Origen, the greatest Biblical scholar of antiquity, systematised this form of exegesis. He considered that, just as a man is body, soul and spirit, Scripture might bear no less than three senses: a literal meaning, a moral one, and a spiritual one. To consider the Mustard-seed according to this system: its literal sense is the physical grain of mustard; on the moral level, it means faith; and on the spiritual level, it means the Kingdom of God. This is a clear and instructive interpretation. Origen's reading of the Workers in the Vineyard is more detailed and ornate. The first group of workers signifies the generations from Creation to Noah; the second, those from Noah to Abraham; the third, those from Abraham to Moses; the fourth, those from Moses to Joshua; the fifth, those up to the time of Christ. The householder is God and the denarius represents salvation.

What is impressive about this sort of exegesis is its confidence. At times perhaps Origen seems arbitrary in his interpretations but they always contain intelligent spiritual truths. He justifies his allegorizing by appealing to the example set by the evangelists and the allegorical elements in the Gospels (Hunter, p. 23). For Origen it is a moral duty to extract the spiritual sense from the literal Gospel, for it is in the deep things of this spiritual meaning that the real importance of the Gospels lies (Comm. in Ioh. I 10).

Jerome followed Origen in the lines of exegesis he had opened up, but it was left to Augustine to take allegorizing interpretation to its limit in antiquity. Augustine is too late to be of much interest in studying interpretations in Juvencus, but an example will show how far allegory had reached in the century and a half after Origen. Augustine's consideration of the Good Samaritan (Quaest. Ev. II 19) sees the wounded traveller as fallen man, half alive in his knowledge of God and half dead in his slavery to sin; the binding up of his wounds represents Christ's restraint of sin; the pouring in of oil and wine, the comfort of good hope and the exhortation to spirited work. The inn-keeper is St. Paul and the two pence are the two commandments of love. Exegesis went deeper in the Middle Ages but surely it was never more ingenious.

The drift of modern Biblical scholarship contrasts strongly with the exegetic tradition of antiquity. The hidden meanings and spiritual sense of the Gospel text was to be extracted from the literal, prosaic meaning by allegorizing the parables; in this way passages in the Bible which otherwise might have seemed "unworthy" of God could be accepted (Hunter, p. 27). This was the normal mode of exegesis in Juvencus' day.<sup>63</sup>

---

63. The Antiochene Fathers disagreed violently with allegorizing, but the great flowering of the Antioch School was with St. John Chrysostom (347-407), who is too late for our author.



- (ii) Mt. 13, 34: Haec omnia locutus est Iesus in parabolis ad turbas; et sine parabolis non loquebatur eis.
- 825 Talia tum populo perplexis condita verbis  
Promebat, (J. II 824-5)
- (iii) Mt. 13, 35: Aperiam in parabolis os meum, ructuabor absconsa ante constitutionem mundi.
- Os aperire meum dignabor, condita mundi  
Convolvet ructans varii sermonis imago.  
(J. II 826-7)
- (iv) Mt. 13, 36: ... et accesserunt ad eum discipuli eius dicentes: Enarra nobis parabolam tritici et zizaniorum agri.
- Discipuli rogitant, lolii quid quaestio vellet  
Et segetis; (J. III 2-3)
- (v) Mt. 15, 15: Respondens autem Petrus dixit ei: Narra nobis parabolam istam.
- 160 Tunc petit absolvi Petrus, quid quaestio vellet,  
Ipse Pharisaeis quam mox scribisque dedisset.  
(J. III 159-60)

Passages (ii), (iii) and (iv) here come from the sequence of short parables of the Kingdom in Mt. 13. Jesus tells the parables of the Tares, Mustard-seed and Leaven (Mt. 13, 24-33). Then follows (ii) and immediately afterwards (iii), which is the quotation from the Old Testament that Christ fulfilled by speaking in parables. Passage (iv) follows on at once as the disciples ask the meaning of the parable of the Tares. All three then are in close juxtaposition, even though (iv) is in Book III:

825 Talia tum populo perplexis condita verbis  
 Promebat, veteris quo possent dicta profetae  
 Ordine saeculorum iussis concurrere rebus;  
 Os aperire meum dignabor, condita mundi  
 Convolvēt ructans varii sermonis imago.  
 Bk. II 829 Inde domum repetit serus turbasque reliquit.  
 BK. III 1 Fuderat in terras roseum iubar ignicomus sol.  
 Discipuli rogitant, lolii quid quaestio vellet  
 Et segetis; (II 824 - III 3).

It is worth noting that this juxtaposition of periphrases for parabola points up the absurdity of the epic convention in II 829 - III 1. The Biblical text is continuous, and the disciples' question about the parable is all part of the same dialogue:

Mt. 13, 34: Haec omnia locutus est Iesus in parabolis ad turbas; et sine parabolis non loquebatur eis. (35) Ut impleretur quod dictum est per prophetam dicentem: Aperiam in parabolis os meum, ructuabor absconsa ante constitutionem mundi. (36) Tunc dimissis turbis abiit in domum; et accesserunt ad eum discipuli eius dicentes: Enarra nobis parabolam tritici et zizaniorum agri.

Juvencus' adherence to the optimum book length for the classical epic and the convention that each book starts with a new day mean that the explanation of the parable of the Tares is given on the morning following the telling of the story (Herzog, p. 103; see also below, p. 180).

There is an extraordinary concentration of references to the term "parable" at this point in the poem. In Mt. 13, 44-8, just after this passage, there is another sequence of three parables (the Treasure, the Pearl and the Seine-net) which is entirely omitted. The sequence of three parables in Mt. 21, 28-22, 14 (the Two Sons, Tenants in the Vineyard and Wedding Feast) includes two instances



of the word parabola (Mt. 21, 33 and 22, 1), both of which are omitted in the poem, evidently because the narrative is dealing not with Christ's teaching as exemplified by His use of parable but with the build-up to the Passion (which is particularly foreshadowed by the Tenants in the Vineyard).<sup>65</sup> If the idea of parabola is entirely omitted in Juvenecus' rendition of Mt. 21, 28-22, 14, why does it occur so frequently in II 824-III 3? A possible answer lies in the sequence of three short parables in Mt. 13, 44-8, which is wholly omitted. To avoid the repetition that would be caused by rendering these three parables, and yet to give the same impression as Mt. 13 (which contains seven parables in all) that a vital part of Jesus' teaching and ministry consisted in employing the parable form, the poet emphasises the latter by rendering the three parables of the Tares, the Mustard-seed and the Leaven and referring to the word parabola three times (with variation of course).

Passage (i) is similar to (ii) and occurs in the context of the parable of the Sower. Christ answers the question by saying:

"Vobis, qui firmo robustam pectore mentem  
 Ad capienda Dei penetralia constabilistis,  
 760 Concessum est aditis penitus consistere regni;  
 Illis pro merito clauduntur lumina mentis.

765 Idcirco obscuris coopertum ambagibus illum  
 Perstringit populum sermonis gratia nostri,  
 (II 758-61, 765-6).

---

65. For this passage of 3 parables see chapter 2 below.

The disciples, who have faith, are granted the ability to understand the parable but those who do not believe cannot understand (de Wit, ad loc. has noted that l. 761 is an addition by Juvencus). There is heavy emphasis on the inscrutability of the truth: penetralia, aditis, obscuris ... ambagibus. The latter phrase is intended as a parallel of Implicitis ... verbis in l. 756 above. A further parallel is found at the moment when the dumb Zechariah writes on the tablet that his son's name is to be John, and receives back the power of speech:

Sed, pro mira fides, tabulis cum scribere temptat,  
Implicitam solvit per verba sonantia linguam.

(I 113-4)

Just as no-one can understand Zechariah because his tongue is tangled up, so no unbeliever who has set his heart against understanding can understand the enigmatic words of Jesus.

Passage (v) refers to a saying that is rather different from the others that Juvencus has called parables:

Mt. 15, 11: Non quod intrat in os, inquinat hominem,  
sed quod procedit de ore, hoc inquinat hominem.

This is figurative and metaphorical and may be considered as a minor parable. But there is a considerable difference in Juvencus' rendition of the logion:

Non inlata homini fuerint quaecumque, pudendis  
Sordibus aspergent vitaeve animove sedebunt.  
150 Erumpunt hominum sed quae penetralibus oris,  
Internam misere maculabunt edita mentem."

(III 148-51)

This is not a parable in the modern sense at all. It is an enigmatic statement (quaestio, III 159) but it is not a parable. Juvencus did not have to render parabolam of v.15; the fact that he did, and that it is so obviously not a parable, means that quaestio cannot mean parable in our sense. It is worth noting, however, that quaestio here is significantly close to the Biblical understanding of parabole, as derived from mashal (see above, section d).

It is probable, therefore, that Juvencus did not regard the word parabola as meaning parable in the modern sense, contrary to Flury's opinion (p. 41). The ambiguous wording of each rendition of the word implies that the poet saw all logia from figurative sayings and proverbs to a full-length tale (Novelle) as "parables", containing hidden meanings. This in turn suggests that Juvencus, like the ancient exegetes, may have regarded Jesus' parables as requiring explication and exegesis. If that is so, then, as the previous section has made clear, the major tool of interpretation to hand was allegory; it is likely that Juvencus will allegorize in order to interpret the parables for his reader.

It remains to consider briefly what importance Juvencus placed on the various sorts of Biblical parable. The similes and metaphors (Bildwörter) are frequently omitted (e.g. the Trumpet image in Mt. 6, 2, or the Eagles and Carcass, Mt. 24, 28), whereas only three minor parables (extended

images, Gleichnisse) are omitted out of a total of thirteen in Matthew (Dodd, p. 17); they are the Lamp and Bushel (5,15), the Children in the Market-place (11, 16-7), and the Budding Figtree (24,32-3).<sup>66</sup> The only major parables (story-parables, Parabeln) omitted out of nineteen Matthean parables are the second sequence of three parables from Mt. 13 about the Kingdom, which repeat ideas expressed in the poem in the Sower, Tares, Mustard-seed and Leaven. Clearly, therefore, the poet is prepared to omit the less important images and minor parables at will, but he excises only three major parables. He understands parabola in the Biblical sense, yet he has a scale of values of logia; the more important the "parable", the less likely it is to be omitted and the more care the poet takes over its rendition. In giving the first importance to the full-length tales (Novellen), then to the other major parables, and finally to the minor parables, this study is guided by Juvencus' own views.

The fact that Juvencus pays more attention to the rendition of the parables than to the other aspects of Christ's teaching should not be surprising. As a writer trained in rhetoric, like all those of aristocratic family (Juvencus, nobilissimi generis Hispanus, Jer. Vir. Ill 84), he has no difficulty in treating the figure narratio in the story-parables rather than gnome in the hidden sayings.<sup>67</sup> A list

---

66. But What Leaves the Mouth (Mt. 15, 11) is changed to a dark saying.

67. For narratio and Juvencus see Reinhart Herzog, "Exegese-Erbauung - Delectatio: Beiträge zu einer christlichen Poetik der Spätantike" in Formen und Funktionen der Allegorie, Symposium Wolfenbüttel 1978, (ed.) Walter Haug (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1979), pp. 52-69; for the rhetorical prescription see Quint. IV 2, 1ff.

of the parables in the poem (together with the minor parables) is inserted at this point in the study for reference purposes.

Juvencus' Parables

	Juvencus	Matthew
*1. Going Before the Judge	I 511-8	5, 25-6
*2. Treasure; Eye as the Light of the Body	I 611-24	6, 19-23
*3. Two Ways	I 679-89	7, 13-4
*4. Wolf in Sheep's Clothing; Trees and their Fruit	I 690-700	7, 15-20
5. Two Houses	I 716-27	7, 24-7
*6. Bridegroom's Guests; Clothes; Wineskins	II 366-76	9, 15-7
*7. Sheep in a Pit	II 589-93	12, 11-2
*8. Strong Man's House	II 616-8	12, 29
9. Return of the Unclean Spirit	II 713-24	12, 43-5
10. Sower	II 733-54	13, 3-5
*11. Tares	II 794-811	13, 24-30
12. Mustard-seed	II 812-9	13, 31-2
13. Leaven	II 820-3	13, 33
14. Lost Sheep	III 410-8	18, 12-4
*15. Unmerciful Servant	III 437-58	18, 23-35
16. Workers in the Vineyard	III 550-83	20, 1-16
17. Two Sons	III 692-711	21, 28-32
18. Tenants in the Vineyard	III 712-36	21, 33-43
19. Wedding Feast	III 737-73	22, 2-14
*20. One Taken, the Other Not	IV 170-6	24, 40-1
*21. Householder and the Thief	IV 179-84	24, 43-4

	Juvencus	Matthew
22. Servant entrusted with Supervision	IV 185-96	24, 45-51
23. Ten Virgins	IV 197-226	25, 1-13
24. Talents	IV 227-58	25, 14-30
25. Last Judgement (Sheep and Goats)	IV 259-305	25, 31-46

\* denotes minor parables (extended images, Gleichnisse)

g) Approach.

Since the poem and the parable form have now been looked at, it is logical to proceed to detailed consideration of the parables in the poem. First, however, a few brief comments about methodology and objectives are necessary.

This study attempts to re-evaluate and rehabilitate the artistic standing of the Evangeliorum libri IV, following the recent works of scholarship by Herzog, Roberts and Poinsothe, but employing a different form of analysis. The parables in the poem will be studied in detail for what they may contribute to understanding of its merits. They form a useful corpus of material from the poem for close study and indicate in miniature and exaggerated form features typical of the whole. Detailed analysis will focus on alterations of the source texts in the Juvencan renditions of the parables. Alteration is the vital principle, for if changes show a pattern it may be assumed that the pattern is the result of deliberate alteration by the poet. The presence of such a pattern of alteration in the poem will establish that Evangeliorum Libri IV is a work of interpretation rather than mere putting into verse of the Gospels.

Chapter two will attempt to establish whether there is any alteration of the parables by Juvencus and whether the parables are interpreted. Detailed analysis of a number of parables will be necessary to establish and develop this fundamental principle. The third chapter will study and define the means of alteration in the poem - those techniques and procedures employed by the poet. Chapters four and five will investigate the alterations in parables that may be attributed to the creation of a new sub-genre, that of Biblical epic. The three subsequent chapters will study levels of interpretation in the parables. The final chapter will summarise and draw conclusions from the body of the thesis. Suggestions will also be made as to the reasons why the poem was written. The literary merits of the Evangeliorum libri IV as an independent composition will be reviewed. As far as is commensurate with both clarity and thoroughness, the material for each of these chapters will be drawn predominantly from a single parable.

CHAPTER 2: ALTERATION AND INTERPRETATION

The Parables of the Two Sons, the Tenants in the  
Vineyard, and the Wedding Feast

The standard view of the Evangeliorum Libri IV, as indicated in the previous chapter, is that it is a severely literal versification of the Gospels, of interest to us, if at all, only as a curiosity.<sup>1</sup> Recent works of scholarship by Herzog, Roberts, Poinsothe and others have demonstrated that this evaluation of the poem is unhelpful; indeed, one could go further and say that it is wholly misleading.

My thesis is that Juvencus wrote something more than a word-for-word translation of Matthew; that in fact he attempted to interpret the Gospel text for his readers. If my assessment of the poem is to be sustained, this will become apparent from a close comparison of the text with its Matthean source. The guiding principle will be alteration: where a change from the source can be identified, interpretation may fairly be suspected. On this basis it will be possible to suggest reasons for the alteration.

---

1. See for example Hudson-Williams' damning praise: "This poet (sc. Juvencus) has often been criticized for a timorous anxiety to adhere closely at the same time to the language of Virgil and to the text of the Gospel. The criticism is, I think, exaggerated. The contribution of Juvencus was that of a pioneer and had value. In his day the work was highly esteemed, and by none more than by Juvencus himself: to us his adaptation of pagan to Christian seems dull and pedantic." (p. 12.)



The passage III 692-773 has been chosen for the purposes of detailed comparison and close study. The advantage of this section of the poem is that its eighty-two verses have not yet received the benefit of much close scholarly attention, so that the principle that alteration indicates interpretation will emerge clearly, uncluttered by academic controversies. Furthermore, if the parables are rendered in internally coherent ways in the poem, this should become apparent in the rendition of three of the more problematic narrative fables Jesus told.

a) The Context of the Two Sons

Before considering these three parables in detail the circumstances in which they are recounted must be looked at. Apart from the obvious necessity of "placing" them in their narrative context, there is a significant alteration in Juvencus' version of this section of text, an alteration which has implications for the parable of the Two Sons and indeed the other two parables. Since the primary procedure in this chapter is to locate alterations and investigate them for what they yield in information about the poem's approach to the Biblical source, it is evident that examination of the Two Sons must be deferred until the narrative context has been considered.

After the incident in which Jesus curses the barren fig tree, the religious leaders ask Him by whose authority He acts. They are trapped by His counter-question about

the authority of John the Baptist, and Christ tells the Two Sons parable as an indirect answer to their question.

Mt. 21, 23: Et cum venisset in templum, accesserunt ad eum principes sacerdotum et seniores populi dicentes: In qua potestate haec facis et quis tibi dedit hanc potestatem? (24) Respondens Iesus dixit illis: Interrogabo vos et ego unum verbum quod dicite mihi, quod si dixeritis mihi, et ego vobis dicam in qua potestate haec facio. (25) Baptismum Iohannis unde erat, de caelo an ex hominibus? At illi cogitabant intra se dicentes: si dixerimus de caelo, dicet nobis: Quare non creditis illi? (26) Si autem dixerimus: ex hominibus, timeamus turbam; omnes enim habent Iohannem sicut prophetam. (27) Et responderunt ad Iesum et dixerunt: Nescimus. Ait illis et ipse: Nec ego vobis dico, in qua potestate haec facio. (28) Quid autem vobis videtur? Homo quidam habebat duos filios ... etc.

The equivalent passage in the poem is III 674-91, which contains several interesting points. The lines that are of importance for the parables are those that conclude this section and introduce the Two Sons:

Se nescire tamen respondit factio fallax.  
690 Tum Christus: "Non est iniustum claudere vocem,  
Cum mihi claudantur procerum responsa superba.  
"Nam geminae prolis genitor maioris in aures  
Talia dicta dedit ..." (III 689-93).<sup>2</sup>

The alteration of Christ's words is both large and significant. The poet has not simply followed his source. The Biblical text has: Nec ego vobis dico, in qua potestate haec facio (v. 27). Hence it is evident that Juvencus has put into Christ's mouth a logical justification (non est iniustum) of His decision not to tell them: since they will not tell

---

2. Punctuation of direct speech in Huemer, edn. has been regularized to English usage throughout.

Him, He will not tell them. While this idea is certainly implicit in the Matthean account, the poem expresses it directly, presumably in order to emphasise Christ's justice in dealing with men. The result is the vocem claudere ... responsa claudi figure, with its characteristic repetition claudere ... claudantur and sententious effect. And the sententia whose triple alliteration of procerum responsa superba, noticed by Knappitsch (ad loc.), reaches a climax at superba, further emphasised by the end-stop metrical sedes. It is undoubtedly an invention by the poet; there is no hint of superbus in the source. Evidently, there is a change here, an addition by Juvenecus, which receives so much stress that it seems to be the point of the whole alteration.

Now Poinsothe (p. 161 and n. 600) has rightly noted that the religious leaders, the scribes, the Pharisees and Caiaphas, are all designated superbi. This particular verse is an example he quotes, as are IV 53 (= Mt. 23, 2) Adspicite scribas sublimi sede superbos, IV 401-2 (= Jn. 11, 46) Ast alii repetunt urbem procerumque superbis/Cuncta Pharisaeis ..., and IV 555 (= Mt. 26, 24) Ille dehinc tali conpellat voce superbum. However Poinsothe's observation that superbus is used of the Jewish leaders may be taken a little further. Study of the other uses of the word suggests that the reader may be intended to associate the adjective superbus with the Jews throughout. There are six other occurrences of the word to be considered.

(i) I 101 (= Lk. 1, 51-2)

Sustulit ecce thronum saevis fregitque superbos,  
 is from the Magnificat. God had certainly taken away the  
 power of the Jewish leaders (saevis is worth noting) and  
 crushed the Jewish people by the time at which the Evangeliorum  
libri was written.

(ii) II 235 (= Jn. 3, 19)

Adventum lucis miseri fugere superbi ...

The Jews not only did not recognise the Light (Jn. 1, 10)  
 but actually rejected it.

(iii) II 550-1 (= Mt. 11, 25)

Celasti nunc quod sapientibus ista superbis  
 Parvulaque infantum vis haec comprehendere corda.

This example apparently sets a puzzle. In Mt. 11, 25 the  
 things which Jesus says have been hidden from the wise and  
 revealed to infants presumably concern the miracles wrought  
 in Chorazin, etc., as described in Mt. 11, 21-4. But the  
 passage 11, 16-24 is entirely omitted from the poem and  
 a three-verse addition (the longest single addition in the  
 epic) is substituted, apparently employing the idea of the  
 Metempsychosis of Elijah into John the Baptist's body.<sup>3</sup>  
 The passage is worth quoting in full.

---

3. See Arevalo, ad loc.

Mt. 11, 13: Omnis enim propheta et lex usque ad  
Iohannem prophetaverunt. (14) Et si vultis scire:  
Ipse est Helias, qui venturus est; (15) qui habet  
aures audiendi, audiat. (25) ... Confiteor tibi,  
pater Domine caeli et terrae, quia abscondisti haec  
a sapientibus et prudentibus et revelasti ea parvulis.

Lex omnis summan Baptistae ad tempora cepit  
Atque profetarum finis concluditur idem.  
Si vultis volucris penetralia noscere saeculi,  
Corpus Iohannis felix habitabile sumpit  
545 Helias, quondam quem turbine missa corusco  
Flammipedum rapuit simulatio quadriugorum.  
Audiat haec dictis pandens vitalibus aures.  
"Nunc tibi confiteor, genitor, cui gloria servit  
Fulgentis caeli et terrarum frugiferentum,  
550 Celasti nunc quod sapientibus ista superbis  
Parvulaque infantum vis haec comprehendere corda.  
(II 541-51)

This is a strange alteration of the original material.

Much here turns on ista and what it refers to. A clue  
here is Christ's logion before the passage just cited.

In Matthew we find

11, 11: ... non surrexit inter natos mulierum propheta  
maior Iohanne baptista; quia autem minor est in regno  
caelorum, maior eius est.

Chrysostom,<sup>4</sup> followed by Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose and  
others, interpreted verse 11 as referring to Jesus with  
the sense of "He who is the less in age and fame is greater  
than John in the kingdom".<sup>5</sup> Juvencus does not appear  
to adopt this view of the lines:

... genuit nec femina quemquam,  
Maior Iohannis nostri qui viribus esset.  
Sed minor hoc caeli fiet sublimior aula. (536-8)

---

4. In Matt., hom, 37 (38), 2 (=PG 57, 421). Cf. Hil.,  
Comm. in Matt., 11, 6 (= PL 9, 980-1).

5. See De Wit, ad loc.

De Wit (ad loc.) suggests that ista refers to Christ's ministry, but in view of the above passage it surely refers more naturally to John the Baptist. It is the mystery of Elijah taking John's living body that is meant in the poem.

Either way the sapientibus ... superbis must be the religious leaders of the Jews who did not believe in John and put Jesus to death. It is in that sense that they are superbus. They reject the truth and cast it from them.

(iv) III 33 (= Mt. 14, 1)

Interea ad regem volitabat fama superbum,  
is a reference to "Herod", one of the prime representatives of the furor Iudaicus. Poinsette shows that "Herod" is deliberately created by Juvencus out of Herod the Great and Herod Antipas in order to blacken the Jews further. Moreover the justice of the saint, John the Baptist (iustus Iohannes, III 39), is explicitly contrasted with the injustice of the tyrannus (III 52) in this passage.<sup>6</sup> It is hardly surprising to find "Herod" described as a regem ... superbum and the word superbia (III 54) applied to him in this passage (the only instance of the word in the poem).

(v) IV 58 (= Mt. 23, 6)

Adcubito primo cenae fastuque superbo,  
refers to the scribes in the same way as the direct reference a few lines above contained in scribas ... superbos (IV 53).

---

6. See Poinsette, pp. 205-12.

vi) IV 300-2 (= Mt. 25, 45)

His rerum dicet Dominus: "Cum vestra superbo  
Angustis rebus feritas sub corde tumbat  
Calcavitque humiles minimos, me spreuit in illis."

Poinsotte<sup>7</sup> has studied how Juvencus uses the word factio to describe the Jewish religious leaders, and though these words are described merely as addressed to the damnata ... actio (IV 294) it may be that he was thinking at least in part of the scribes and Pharisees. They oppressed their own truly pious followers (Calcavitque humiles minimos) and rejected Christ himself (me spreuit, IV 302). Superbo here may well refer to the leaders of the Jews.<sup>8</sup>

It has been seen that no occurrence of the words superbus and superbia in the epic is without some connection with the Jewish religious leaders, the scribes and Pharisees, Herod" or at least the Jewish people in general. Furthermore each instance is without parallel in the Latin Biblical texts, except for the first one; Juvencus has deliberately added the word superbus nine times and superbia once, and only once is he actually following his source in employing it.<sup>9</sup> It is clear that Juvencus has added superba to III 91 as a comment on the behaviour of the Jews towards John

1. See especially p. 190; cf. factio fallax (III 689), cited above from the introduction to the Two Sons.
2. Note the juxtaposition of feritas (IV 301), which also fits Poinsotte's theme of furor Iudaicus.
3. In the Magnificat: J. I 101, Sustulit ecce thronum saevis fregitque superbos (= Itala Lk. 1, 51, dissipavit superbos mente et corda eorum). All the texts have superbos here (Afra, supervo).

the Baptist. This has implications for the parable which follows; these will emerge from consideration of its treatment.

b) Parable of the Two Sons

Mt. 21, 28: Quid autem vobis videtur? Homo quidam habebat duos filios. Et accedens ad primum dixit: Fili, vade hodie operari in vineam. (29) Ille autem respondens ait: Nolo; postea paenitentia motus abiit in vineam. (30) Accessit autem ad alterum et dixit similiter. At ille respondens ait: Eo, domine, et non iit. (31) Quis ex duobus fecit patris voluntatem? Dicunt ei: Novissimus. Dicit illis Iesus: Amen dico vobis, quod meretrices et publicani praecedent vos in regno Dei. (32) Venit enim ad vos Iohannes in via iustitiae et non credidistis ei, publicani autem et meretrices crediderunt ei; vos autem videntes nec paenitentiam habuistis postea, quod non credidistis ei.

"Nam geminae prolis genitor maioris in aures  
Talia dicta dedit: 'Vitis mihi portio maior  
Semiputata iacet. Sed perge et robore forti  
695 Nunc scrobibus nunc falce premens vineta retunde.'  
Tum iuvenis sese tam sordida dicta laboris  
Nolle pati memorat. Post omnia iussa parentis  
Exsequitur damnansque sibi responsa coercet.  
Post alium natum simili sermone iubebat  
700 Ad vineta sui dependere iussa laboris.  
Adnuit his iuvenis nec dictis facta repensat.  
Dicite, quis potius genitoris iussa sequatur?"  
Olli conlaudant responsum posterioris.  
Prosequitur Christus: "Nunc vera advertite dicta.  
705 Iam magis hinc caeli sedem comprehendere possunt  
Corporis e vitiis quaerentes sordida lucra,  
Quam vestrum quisquam. Vobis nam venerat ante  
Iustus Iohannes, sed non est credere vestrum.  
Namque fidem potius meretricum pectora certam  
710 Hauserunt sordesque animi posuere pudendas.  
At vos tantorum scelerum nil paenitet umquam.

(III 692-711)

The most striking point about Juvencus' rendition of Matthew is how different it is. Few words are taken directly from his source: in the parable itself there are only the words Nolle (697) from Nolo (Mt. v. 29) and simili (699) from similiter (v. 30), though the latter example is not grammati-



cally identical; and in Christ's application of the parable Vobis, l. 707 (from ad vos, v. 32), Iohannes, l. 708 (from Iohannes, v. 32), credere, l. 708 (from credidistis, v. 32), meretricum l. 709 (from meretricas, v. 32) and paenitet, l. 711 (from paenitentiam, v. 32), are all close enough to say that Juvencus has taken them directly from his source.

These words are all significant in the application of the parable and it is understandable that he did not want to deviate from them. However a total of seven words in twenty lines does not show slavish word-for-word copying. The poet is more concerned with imitation by variation than direct quotation because he is ornamenting the Biblical text.<sup>10</sup> To take Mt. 21, 28 as an example, it is rendered by Juvencus in four lines (692-5). He omits Christ's opening words Quid autem vobis videtur?, which are a standard Matthean phrase,<sup>11</sup> and recasts the sentences following. Thus the words Homo quidam habebat duos filios. Et accedens ad primum dixit are rendered by one period:

Nam geminae prolis genitor maioris in aures  
Talia dicta dedit. (692-3)

Here the poet uses none of the words of the original directly but we have the following equivalences:

- 
10. J. IV 804-5: Versibus ut nostris divinae gloria legis/ Ornamenta libens caperet terrestria linguae. See above, pp. 29-30; Roberts, p. 118.
11. Cf. Mt. 17, 24; 18, 12; 22, 17 and 42; 26, 66. The phrase is implied by Dic in III 385 (= Mt. 17, 24) and Dic ergo in IV 5 (= Mt. 22, 17), but otherwise is omitted. Mt. 26, 66 falls within the passage Mt. 26, 57-58 which is omitted entirely.

Homo quidam	= genitor
habebat duos filios	= geminae prolis
ad primum	= maioris
dixit	= in aures/Talia dicta dedit.

Only the word accedens is clearly omitted since Juvencus uses the conjunction Nam ... of high style as a rough equivalent for the conjunction so characteristic of the Latin Bible Et ...

Much of the variation is purely stylistic. In the above example, Talia dicta dedit for dixit allows an imitation of Virgil Aen. V 852: talia dicta dabat in the same sedes (noted by Huemer and Knappitsch). Nam also brings with it a hint of epic style, certainly in comparison with the Biblical Et ..., and geminae is more elevated than duo.<sup>12</sup> There seems to be no other reason for the change of primum to maioris than the deliberate repetition in juxtaposition of maioris (692) ... maior (693); on the allegorical level (see below) the two are equivalent. Such repetitions are frequent in Juvencus, as we shall see, but are often no more than an emphatic stylistic device.

Other variations seem to have deeper purposes. Clearly genitor here is an improvement on Homo quidam<sup>13</sup> on the literal, allegorical, moral and perhaps eschatological levels. It

---

12. But notice that duo is used a total of 8 times to 7 times for geminus, of which 2 uses of duo are in parables to this single use of geminus (duo in IV 171 the minor parable of One Taken, the Other Not and IV 229, major parable of Talents). J. attempts stylistic variation.

13. J. only uses homo in the oblique cases (77 instances), whereas genitor in the nom. or voc. occurs 27 times out of a total of 50 instances.

expresses the idea of a father with sons, the Father of the Son who is speaking, the Creator and Father, and perhaps the Father who will judge us. Hence the repetition genitoris in 1. 702 after the parable has been told is not a merely stylistic device but a technique for driving home the message of the parable. Christ's question in 702 becomes "Who followed the order of the Father?" (obeyed God) and "Who follows the order of the Father?" (i.e. who obeys Him now), as well as "Who followed the order of the father?" (which son obeyed his father). Similarly prolis (692) is an improvement upon filius; on the literal level the word is a suitable one for expressing the idea of sons, with perhaps epic overtones<sup>14</sup>; on the allegorical level we think of the twin progeny of the Father, Jew and Christian; and on the moral level we are the children of the Father, Who in the eschatological sense will judge us according to our works on this earth.<sup>15</sup>

- 
14. Cf. Virgil Aen. VI 322 (of Aeneas) deum certissima proles.
15. Interestingly, though J. usually prefers natus (51 instances), suboles (21 instances) or proles (15 instances) to filius (6 instances), there is no instance of the later in an oblique case, all 6 are direct references to Christ and all but one are in the emphatic line-beginning sedes. They are II 554-5 genitorum mente videbit/Filius, III 5 Filius est hominis ..., III 271-2 Sed stabilis Petrus: 'Tu Sancti Filius, inquit, /Christus ..., III 311 Filius huc hominis ... III 587 Filius hic hominis ..., and IV 184 Filius huc hominis ...

Finally we find in aures/Talia dicta dedit for dixit. The epic expression Talia dicta dedit has been commented on above, but the phrase in aures/ ... dedit is more puzzling. It cannot have anything to do with actually listening, for the first son initially rejected his father's words, even though he later carried them out. A likely solution is that the poet means that the father spoke most directly to the first son; this would fit on the allegorical level, for the Father's mission is to sinners and that is why He sent the Son into the world, as Jesus says at Mt. 9, 13, Non veni vocare iustos, sed peccatores, which Juvencus has rendered:

Haut etenim iustos veni ad directa viantes,  
Sed revocare malos peccantum a limite gressus.  
(II 359-60)

The Father then speaks, in this case through John, more to sinners than to the Jewish leaders. Certainly the genitor gives very full instructions to the first son:

'Vitis mihi portio maior  
Semiputata iacet. Sed perge et robore forti  
695 Nunc scrobibus nunc falce premens vineta retunde.'  
(693-5)

As seen above, all this comes from the simple words of the Biblical text: Mt. 21, 28 Fili, vade hodie operari in vineam. What is actually happening here? The Virgilian parallels are well known (Arevalo, ad loc.): ll. 693-4 are an imitation of Ec. II 70 semiputata tibi frondosa uitis in ulmo est, and with l. 695 may be compared Geo. I

157 falce premes ... (Huemer, edn., ad loc.). It is evident nonetheless that a poet who merely fastens Virgilian tatters to a Biblical theme, though interesting in a sense, has very little to say to us. Viticulture was of interest to the civilised world; and one might suggest that Juvencus was conforming to the tastes and ideas of his time.

This may well be the case, as also in the detail of the storage jars (dolia; see below) added to the Tenants in the Vineyard, but the matter need not rest here. Jesus presumably intended his audience to understand the vineyard as Israel, but Juvencus' extension of the image into the details of harvesting and digging brings the conception closer to each individual reader wherever he lives. The vineyard then appears to be seen allegorically as the world in its fallen state. The Kingdom here on earth requires hard work in its building. However, the metaphor may also be allegorically developed to represent the soul of the Christian. All are sinners and must strive to put themselves in order. The reader must live a moral life, doing the things that Christ taught, before the Kingdom will come here on earth. Furthermore the image of the falx is present in the Apocalyptic visions of the harvest and the culling of grapes on the Last Day in Apoc. 14, 14-20. The angel with the sharp stick is commanded:

Mitte falcem tuam acutam, et vindemia botros vineae  
terraei quoniam maturae sunt uvae eius (Apoc. 14,18).

There is clearly an eschatological and apocalyptic reference in the additional detail of the falx. Juvencus is working on several levels at once, as the alterations show.

The lines which follow are recast from the original:

Mt. 21, 29: Ille autem respondens ait: Nolo;  
postea paenitentia motus abiit in vineam.

Tum iuvenis sese tam sordida dicta laboris  
Nolle pati memorat. Post omnia iussa parentis  
Exsequitur damnansque sibi responsa coercet. (696-8)

The one word of direct speech is transposed into indirect speech and the fact that the son goes into the vineyard to work is not stated but implied. Juvencus is more concerned with the idea of obedience to the father's command. The equivalences are revealing:

Ille	=	iuvenis
autem	=	Tum
respondens ait	=	memorat
nolo	=	nolle
postea	=	post
paenitentia motus =		damnans sibi responsa coercet.

It is noticeable how many details are added to the simple Biblical text. Only abiit in vineam has no approximate equivalent, but there are many extra words in Juvencus' three verses: tam sordida dicta laboris/ ... pati ... omnia iussa parentis/Exsequitur are all ideas developed out of the logic of the parable but without parallel in the source.

There is a textual problem over tam sordida dicta laboris (696), which is Huemer's reading. Sanday in his review<sup>16</sup> of Huemer's edition applauds his use of the Corpus Christi, Cambridge codex, where Marold follows the remainder of the MSS. in reading vincla. Knappitsch (ad loc.) also reads dicta on the grounds that it is both intelligible and the lectio difficilior. However Hansson's more recent and very extensive critical work on this text rejects dicta because it does not fit well with nolle pati, whereas vincla laboris does, and because "(es) hat auch im Text keine Analogie", whereas periphrastic vinc(u)la is found in II 260 (= Jn. 4, 11) Urceus est nullus nec sunt tibi vincula funis, and IV 678-9 (= Mt. 27, 42) Nonne alios quondam trucibus servare solebat/morborum vinclis.<sup>17</sup> Despite Hansson's arguments dicta seems to be correct because it creates a pattern of repetition dicta (693) ... dicta (696) ... dictis (701) ... dicta (704), with explicit parallelism between the two sons in iuvenis ... dicta (696) and iuvenis ... dictis (701), later picked up by Christ's opening words of explanation: Nunc vera advertite dicta (704). This is a technique characteristic of Juvenecus' versions of the parables and is often used to emphasise an allegory.

---

16. W. Sanday, CR 6 (1892), pp. 48-9.

17. Hansson, p. 103.

That is the case here. On the literal level the son is complaining of the "work so dirty that was commanded", where sordida refers to the dirt necessarily involved in the life of toil of the viticulturalist. But on the allegorical level the sinner is complaining of the hard life of the Christian ordained by the Lord, and sordida has an ironic ambivalence. It applies both to the way the sinner sees that life and to the actual life he leads as seen from a Christian point of view. This irony is stressed by Christ's words quaerentes sordida lucra in l. 706. Furthermore dicta are explicitly contrasted with facta (dictis facta repensat, l. 701) in Juvencus' reading of the parable.

The allegorical and moral context further illuminate pati and the words following it: Post omnia iussa parentis/ Exsequitur damnansque sibi responsa coercet (696-7). Juvencus deliberately undercuts the sinner's reaction to the commands of the Father by another irony. Pati expresses well the sinner's refusal of salvation since he sees the Christian life as one of suffering and therefore one to be avoided, but the Christian sees Christ's Passion as a great glory and the life of suffering as both a duty and a joy. Moreover in this world the sinner "suffers" in his rejection of Christ's way, for he can have no pleasure in his life of sin, and in an eschatological sense he will



suffer for his life of sin on the day of reckoning. In this case however the sinner later follows the Lord's commandments (Post omnia iussa parentis/Exsequitur), condemns his rejection of them (damnansque sibi responsa), and reforms himself (sibi ... coerces). Here too there is a level above the simple allegory, for all are sinners and must strive to follow Christ's way, confessing to God when they have rejected Him through sin, and perpetually amending their lives.

Mt. 21, 30: Accessit autem ad alterum et dixit similiter.  
At ille respondens ait: Eo, domine, et non iit.

Post alium natum simili sermone iubebat  
700 Ad vineta sui dependere iussa laboris.  
Adnuit his iuvenis nec dictis facta repensat. (699-701)

As with vv. 28-9 above, Juvencus omits the verbs of motion because they are irrelevant to the meaning of the parable. The additions here are to create a linguistic parallel between the two sons, bringing out the contrast between them in dicta and facta. Hence natum varies prolis (692); then Juvencus repeats a series of words from the account of the first son: vineta (695) ... vineta (700); iussa (697) ... iussa (700); laboris (696) ... laboris (700); ... iuvenis (696) ... iuvenis (701); dicta (693 and 696) ... dictis (701). This emphatic parallel is enhanced by the repetitions of iussa and laboris in the same sedes. The reader is led to contrast the words and actions on the literal and allegorical levels. Perhaps the key to

Juvencus' interpretation is expressed in the addition nec dictis facta repensat (701); in the context of the parable one thinks of John's words to the Pharisees and Sadducees, Mt. 3, 8: Facite ergo fructum dignum paenitentiae. The Jewish leaders' response to John's mission was in words without faith and therefore their facta did not match up to their dicta. This also has implications for the reader's own religious life; his response to God's commands to work in the world (vineta ... iussa laboris, l. 700) is often in words rather than deeds (nec dictis facta repensat, l. 701). The emphasis on these words comes from an allusion to Virgil noticed by Huemer, edn., (ad loc.); with 701, Adnuit his iuvenis nec dictis facta repensat, can be compared Aen. XII 841, adnuit his Iuno et mentem laetata retorsit. The poet underlines his message with a Virgilian reference.

Mt. 21, 31: Quis ex duobus fecit patris voluntatem?  
Dicunt ei: Novissimus.<sup>18</sup>

Dicite, quis potius genitoris iussa sequatur?  
Olli conlaudant responsus posterioris. (702-3)

Christ's question is emphasised by the repetition of genitoris from genitor (692) and iussa from ll. 697 and 700 with the echo genitoris iussa sequatur from iussa parentis/Exsequitur (697-8). The reader is intended to understand it on the allegorical level as well as the literal, as noted above.

---

18. This is the reading of codices Italae and the Afra, though the Colbertinus, Brixianus and Monacensis and of course Jerome's Vulgate give Primus.

The reply to this question apparently raises a problem.

Jerome considers it in the following way:

Novissimus, sciendum est in ueris exemplaribus non haberi nouissimum sed primum, ut proprio iudicio condemnentur. Si autem nouissimum uoluerimus legere, manifesta est interpretatio ut dicamus intellegere quidem ueritatem Iudaeos sed tergiuersari et nolle dicere quod sentiunt, sicut et baptismum Iohannis scientes esse de caelo dicere noluerunt. (In Math. III 1531-7)

Knappitsch was sufficiently concerned by this discrepancy between the text of Juvencus and the modern Biblical texts to amend conlaudant to non laudant, a conjecture which Hansson does not consider (see Knappitsch, ad loc.). It seems that Juvencus took the Itala novissimus and followed it with posterioris, trying to make sense of it in the context of the parable. The solution he found was to emphasise the verbal response by repetition; including the words of Christ before the parable proper we find responsa (691)... responsa (698) ... responsum (703), where the procerum responsa superba is contrasted with damnansque sibi responsa coercet. Evidently the procerum responsa superba is equivalent to responsum posterioris since the second son does not repent. This appears to make the contradiction worse. Once he has established that the listeners praise the second reply (Adnuit), however, he has Christ contradict them by saying Nunc vera advertite dicta (704); the audience has chosen the wrong son. The parable with its message about the importance of deeds has not been understood. This is significant, for the audience in Juvencus

consists of the proceres, the religious leaders of the Jews, whom John accused of not acting according to the Law that they preached (Mt. 3, 7ff.); Christ is attempting to reform them in the same way. They are not able to see the truth even when it refers to them so directly.

Mt. 21, 31: Dicit illis Iesus: Amen dico vobis, quod meretrices et publicani praecedent vos in regno Dei.

705 Prosequitur Christus: "Nunc vera advertite dicta.  
Iam magis hinc caeli sedem comprehendere possunt  
Corporis e vitiis quaerentes sordida lucra,  
Quam vestrum quisquam. (704-7)

It has been shown above that Christ is not agreeing with the opinion of his listeners when he says Nunc vera advertite dicta. Poinssotte's study of Juvenecus' treatment of the formula Amen dico vobis (pp. 78-83) shows that he reserves his rendering of it for a moment of doctrinal importance. Here it serves a double role as a sort of chastisement of His listeners and as an introduction to the idea that prostitutes will enter the kingdom of God before the Jewish religious leaders. It is worth noting that Iesus becomes Christus to increase the power of what He says and that line 706 Corporis e vitiis quaerentes sordida lucra really brings out the contrast in what Christ is saying. It is not a meaningless periphrasis. Sordida is the word that the first son ironically implied to the commands of his father; that is, allegorically the sinners before they repented called God's moral precepts sordida; but now Christ points

out that their lives were sordida then, and yet they will enter the kingdom of God (caeli sedem, 705) before the proceres.

Mt. 21, 32: Venit enim ad vos Iohannes in via iustitiae et non credidistis ei, publicani autem et meretrices crediderunt ei; vos autem videntes nec paenitentiam habuistis postea, quod non credidistis ei.

Vobis nam venerat ante  
Iustus Iohannes, sed non est credere vestrum.  
Namque fidem potius meretricum pectora certam  
710 Hauserunt sordesque animi posuere pudendas.  
At vos tantorum scelerum nil paenitet umquam. (707-11)

Poinsotte points to the abusive generalisation about the Jews which Juvencus creates:

On lit dans le poème: "Jean le juste est déjà venu à vous, mais croire n'est pas votre fait (...). Mais de si grands crimes ne suscitent jamais en vous nul repentir". Le passé, ponctuel, est devenu un présent, fortifié dans sa valeur atemporelle ... par un adverbe exprimant la permanence (jamais).<sup>19</sup>

Juvencus implies strongly that unbelief is in the nature of Jews. To some extent John the Just is contrasted with the Jews in the same way as he is with "Herod" in III 39 (discussed above, p. 60), and the Jews' lack of faith is stressed in contrast with his faith in God.<sup>20</sup>

Moreover it is worth pointing out that even while the faith of the prostitutes is being stressed the poet reminds us of their sins (sordesque animi posuere pudendas),

19. Poinsotte, p. 162.

20. Poinsotte, p. 209, n. 818, points to three occasions when J. forms the first hemistiche of a verse with Iustus Iohannes: II 510, III 263 and 708, but III 39 is also an example.

though he is not severe on them. He makes it clear once again that even the worst and most sinful of men is better than the proceres, if he will only repent.

It is clear then that Juvencus is not afraid to modify his source text extensively in the interests of bringing out its varieties of meaning. These meanings in the present instance consist of: a literal level of narrative, with a detailed and consistent allegory overlaid; perhaps a suggestion of a moral or pastoral concern for the reader in some details; and there are also hints of an eschatological level, which would show up better in other parables. It is true to say that the poet follows Matthew closely, even to the extent of rendering novissimus (as posterioris) when it does not appear to make sense, but he is interpreting the text too, and he finds an interpretation and a form of words that fits the text; that is, he makes sense of novissimus by making it the answer of the faithless proceres, the very group whose opinions and actions the second son represents. No wonder the proceres applaud his answer, it is their answer too.

The poet in this instance has clearly created something more complex than a simple verse translation of the Bible parable.

c) Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard

Mt. 21, 33: Aliam parabolam audite: Homo erat pater familias, qui plantavit vineam et saepe circumdedit ei et fodit in eam torcular et aedificavit turrem et

locavit eam colonis et peregre profectus est. (34)  
 Cum autem tempus fructuum adpropinquasset, misit  
 servos suos ad colonos, ut acciperet de fructibus  
 suis. (35) Et coloni adprehensis servis unum cecid-  
 erunt, alium vero lapidaverunt, alium vero occiderunt.  
 (36) Iterum misit alios servos plures prioribus  
 et fecerunt illis similiter. (37) Novissime autem  
 misit illis filium suum unicum dicens: Forsitan  
 verebuntur filium meum. (38) Coloni autem videntes  
 filium dixerunt intra se: Hic est heres; venite,  
 occidamus eum, et habebimus hereditatem eius. (39)  
 Et adprehensum eum occiderunt et eiecerunt extra  
 vineam. (40) Cum ergo venerit dominus vineae, quid  
 faciet colonis illis? (41) Aiunt illi: Malos male  
 perdet et vineam locabit aliis colonis, qui reddent  
 ei fructus temporibus suis. (43) Ideo dico vobis,  
 quia auferetur a vobis regnum Dei et dabitur genti  
 facienti fructum eius.<sup>21</sup>

"Sic quidam dives, cui iugera multa nitentis  
 Vineti saepes circum densata coerces,  
 In medio turrem prelumque et dolia fecit  
 715 Cultoresque dedit fructusque locavit habendos,  
 Inpositam statuens mercedis solvere legem.  
 Tum longinqua petit, sed fructus tempore certo  
 Actores famulos mittit, quis portio salva  
 Cultorum certa ruris mercede daretur.  
 720 Ecce colonorum rabies hos verbere saevo,  
 Ast alios lapidum proterrent undique telis;  
 Denique letali prosternunt vulnere multos.  
 Tum dominus ruris plures incedere servos  
 Praecipit et rursum mercedis pacta reposcit;  
 725 Maior at in plures audax iniuria surgit.  
 Ultima iam domino natum dimittere mens est,  
 Quod subolem partemque sui vis digna pudoris  
 Cultorum cordi venerandam posceret esse.  
 Sed contra illorum iam mens maculata cruore  
 730 Progenie extincta domini sibi post dominatum  
 Cedere credentum, crudeli vulnere fixum  
 Obtruncant iaciuntque foras trans saepta cadaver.  
 Post haec iam dominus veniet poenasque reposcet  
 Tantorum scelerum. Sed vobis tradita quondam  
 735 Fulgentis regni sedes translata feretur  
 Ad placidam gentem, possit quae reddere fructus.  
 (III 712-36)

---

21. Mt. 21, 42 is omitted (together with vv. 44-6), as  
 Widmann (pp. 28-30) has noted.

As with the parable of the Two Sons, few words are direct quotations from the Itala:

quidam, <sup>22</sup> v. 33	= quidam, l. 712
saepe, v. 33	= saepes, l. 713
turrem, v. 33	= turrem, l. 714
locavit... cultoribus, <sup>23</sup> v. 33	= Cultores ... locavit, l. 715
tempus fructuum, v. 34	= fructus tempore, l. 717
misit, v. 34	= mittit, l. 718
coloni, v. 35	= colonorum, l. 720
alios... lapidaverunt, <sup>24</sup> v. 35	= alios lapidum (proterrent ... telis) l. 721
servos plures, v. 36	= plures ... servos, l. 723
iecerunt, v. 39	= iaciunt, l. 732
venerit dominus, v. 40	= dominus veniet, l. 733
regnum, v. 43	= regni, l. 735
genti ... fructum, v. 43	= gentem ... fructus, l. 736

In that parable most of the direct borrowings are from Christ's application of it, and here there is a similar cluster of direct borrowings in ll. 733-6; in addition, however, a cluster of details is present in ll. 713-8 which is essential to the rendition of the narrative of the parable: thereafter Juvencus departs from direct reference to the source text until he reaches the section where the message of the parable is applied.

- 
22. This is the reading of f, and the Afra; the rest omit.
23. This is the reading of codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis alone and only at this point. In vv. 34, 35, 38, 40 and 41 we find coloni used.
24. The text of Corbeiensis alone reads (35) Et adpraehenderunt servos coloni, alios ceciderunt, alios occiderunt, alios autem lapidaverunt.



The Biblical introduction (Aliam parabolam audite)<sup>25</sup> is omitted for the more immediate link Sic, which refers directly to the previous line with its anti-Semitic generalisation. (711):

At vos tantorum scelerum nil paenitet umquam.  
 Juvencus suggests that we must read this parable in the light of Jewish faithlessness, lack of penitence and, most important, murder. John the Baptist was not of course murdered by the Jews but by Herod Antipas, yet it has been noted above (p. 60) that "Herod" was deliberately created by the poet as a prime representative of the furor Iudaicus.<sup>26</sup> Hence John's murder prefigures Christ's murder, and both are put to death by the "Jews". Poinsothe (p. 235) has noted the repetition of tantium scelerum in l. 734 from these words which immediately precede the beginning of this parable. There can be no doubt that the two parables are linked in the poem by more than textual juxtaposition.

Homo (quidam) erat pater familias is rendered by quidam dives without any hint of allegory. This simplification of the Biblical text is followed by an expansion of qui plantavit vineam et saepe circumdedit ei into

---

25. This formula is cognate with Mt. 13, 24 Aliam parabolam proposuit illis dicens, and 13, 31 Aliam parabolam locutus est (or proposuit) illis (or eis) dicens, and 13, 33 Aliam parabolam locutus est eis (only h, l, and q add dicens). J. omits the formula in each case; cf. Mt. 22, 1 and n. 45 below.

26. Poinsothe (p. 208) comments "nous sommes amenés à considérer les crimes d'"Hérode" comme la préfiguration de la Passion du Christ, et à faire d'"Hérode" le prototype des "Juifs" déicides."

cui iugera multa nitentis<sup>27</sup>  
 Vineti saepes circum densata coercet, (712-3)

where vineti echoes vineta (695 and 700) and coercet is repeated in the same sedes (698) from the previous parable. Knappitsch (ad loc.) compares the phrase nitentis vineti with III 622-3: culmina .../Ordinibus lucent ... glaucicomantis olivae, but the idea is a commonplace in the Georgics.<sup>28</sup> The emphasis in densata coercet may imply on the allegorical level the exclusivity and closed nature of the Jewish in comparison with the Christian religion. If Juvencus is thinking of Israel and the holy Land, this would also explain iugera multa for God was generous to his Chosen People. This possibility is suggested not just by the context of the parable but by the words In medio turrem ... fecit (714), for there is no hint of in medio in any of the Gospel texts. The words come from the prophecy of Israel to which Jesus was referring: Isa. 5, 1: Vinea facta est dilectomeo ... (2) ... Et aedificavit turrin in medio eius. Et torcular extruxit in ea ... (7) Vinea enim Domini exercituum, Domus Israel est. Hence Isaiah, and therefore also Jesus, speaks of Israel in terms of a vineyard; it is not surprising that Iuencus nobilissimi generis Hispanus, presbyter<sup>29</sup> should have known the quotation

---

27. Cf. beginning of parable of Workers in the Vineyard III 550-1, Sedulus ut ruris dominus, cui dulcia fundum/Pinguibus in campis late vineta coronant ...

28. Cf. Virg. Geo. I 153, nitentia culta.

29. Jerome Vir. Ill. 84.

and seen the parable in these terms. Prelum is a synonym for torcular and has Virgil's authority for its use in hexameter.<sup>30</sup> Dolia is not Virgilian but Horatian,<sup>31</sup> but nevertheless is a detail added by Juvenius presumably, like III 693-5 as a concession to contemporary and classical interest in viticulture, though without the allegorical level of that passage. The quotation from Isaiah that underlies the Gospel is "naturalised" to fit the Late Roman Imperial reader's experience. Moreover the winepress, like the falx of the previous parable, is a detail of the Apocalyptic vision of the grape-harvest on earth in Apoc. 14, 17-20.

In the continuation there is an interpretative addition of a line and a half. Cultoresque dedit is taken from Et locavit eam colonis.<sup>32</sup> But there is no parallel to fructusque locavit habendos, / Inpositam statuens mercedis solvere legem (714-5). This is evidently a reference to God's covenant (legem) with Israel under which Israel produced no "fruit" (fructus), in the poet's view. It was to establish the new covenant that Christ was sent by the Father: Mt. 26, 28, Hic est enim sanguis meus novi testamenti ...

Mt. 21, 34: Cum autem tempus fructuum adpropinquasset, misit servos suos ad colonos, ut acciperet de fructibus suis.

---

30. Cf. Geo. II 242, colaque prelorum.

31. Cf. Hor. Carm. I 11, 27.

32. The d-text alone gives cultoribus here; see above, n. 23.

sed fructus tempore certo<sup>33</sup>  
 Actores famulos mittit, quis portio salva  
 Cultorum certa ruris mercede daretur. (717-9)

The change of servi to actores famuli is appropriate on the literal level, since they were the servants charged with the administration of money. But it also applies allegorically, for the prophets sent by God were especially trusted servants. The repetitions certo ... certa, fructus (from 715), cultorum/cultores, also 715) and mercede (mercedis, 716), and the remarkable alliteration in l. 719 serve both to bind the passage together and call attention to portio salva. Portio is an echo of the parable of the Two Sons (portio maior, 692) but a closer parallel is mercedis portio salvae (III 578) in the parable cf. the Workers in the Vineyard.<sup>34</sup> The details of the transaction are not of course important; what the poet brings out is that the covenant was agreed unequivocally between the two parties (in the allegory, God and the "Jews") in order to focus the reader's moral eye on the breaking of that covenant. The violence of the tenants has even less justification because the terms of the tenancy are so clear. The fructus is all that is due to God from man.

---

33. Arevalo (ad loc.) compares Ov. Rem. 189, Temporibus certis maturam rusticius uvam/Colligit.

34. The word is used 15 times, in each instance as the fifth-foot dactyl; 9 are in the parables: I 518 portio nummi (Going Before the Judge), III 564 and 581 (also Workers in the Vineyard), IV 216 (Ten Virgins), IV 232 portio nummi and 250 (Talents), in addition to the 3 discussed here.

Moreover there is an eschatological application here. The images of harvest of the crops and grapes in Apoc. 14, 14-20 imply that fructus tempore certo is the Last Day. Hence the actores famuli are in an eschatological sense the angels that the Son of Man sends to gather in the grape-harvest. The angel with the sickle throws the grapes in lacum irae Dei magnum and the blood flows from the wine press for two hundred miles around up to the height of horses' bridles (Apoc. 14, 19-20).

Mt. 21, 35: Et adpraehenderunt servos coloni, alios ceciderunt, alios occiderunt, alios autem lapidaverunt.<sup>35</sup>

720 Ecce colonorum rabies hos verbere saevo,  
Ast alios lapidum proterrent undique telis:  
Denique letali prosternunt vulnere multos. (720-2)

The rabies ... verbere saevo is an addition by Juvencus to imply the identification of the coloni with the "Jews".<sup>36</sup>

The description of the treatment of the actores famuli recalls the persecution of the prophets in Israel; Mt. 23, 37 Hierusalem, Hierusalem, quae occidis prophetas et lapidas eos, qui ad te missi sunt, which Juvencus renders in IV 78-8:

O Solymi, Solymi, ferro qui saepe profetas  
Ad vestram missos vitam sine fine necastis ...

Martyrdom of the prophets is not well attested scripturally but they seem to have been early added to the catalogue of Christian martyrs; cf. Heb. 11, 35:

---

35. The Corbeiensis (ff') alone has plurals here but note that J. follows the order of the a-type of text lapidaverunt ... occiderunt; see above n. 29.

36. Poinssotte, p. 235.

alii autem distenti sunt, non suscipientes redemptionem, ut meliorem invenirent resurrectionem. (36) Alii vero ludibria, et verbera experti, insuper et vincula, et carceres: (37) lapidati sunt, secti sunt, tentati sunt, in occisione gladii mortui sunt.

The poet creates a better effect than the Gospel text by changing the singulars to more generalised plurals.

The variation of cultores to coloni helps to concentrate the reader's attention on these lines.

Mt. 21, 36: Iterum misit alios servos plures prioribus et fecerunt illis similiter.

.Tum dominus ruris plures incedere servos  
Praecipit et rursum mercedis pacta reposit;  
725 Maior at in plures audax iniuria surgit. (723-5)

The problem of the rather weak second application to the tenants for their dues is solved by Juvencus in several ways: he employs repetition "internally" of plures, as a parallel to the repetition certo ... certa in the first mission, and "externally" of ruris (from l. 719) and mercedis (from mercede, also l. 719), to link the two together; he employs rhotacistic alliteration in ll. 723-4 as a parallel to l. 719 and for the same reason; he uses variatio of dives to dominus and famulos to servos; he re-emphasises the covenant aspect by the word pacta; and he employs hyperbole in Maior ... audax iniuria surgit. The latter technique is simple but particularly effective because the reader's attention is given not to the details of the iniuria but to the violent state of mind of the tenants. The use of dominus here is interesting in that it shows

clearly that Juvencus is interpreting the parable. In the source texts the word is not employed until Jesus asks his audience what the Lord of the vineyard will do to the coloni; that is, not until the parable is being applied. Juvencus introduces the word earlier so that the reader will understand that the owner of the vineyard is the Father Himself while the parable is being recounted, an example of "impure" allegory.

Moreover it seems that the poet's differentiation of the actores famuli from the plures servi is intended to suggest the distinction between the former and the latter prophets. The former prophets were normally included in the books of the Old Testament from Joshua to 2 Kings inclusive (they were thought to be the works of Joshua, Samuel and Jeremiah) and the latter prophets were the books from Isaiah to Malachi, excluding Daniel. It may be that the variation is at least partially intended to suggest this division.

Mt. 21, 37: Novissime autem misit illis filium suum unicum dicens: Forsitan verebuntur filium meum.

Ultima iam domino natum dimittere mens est,  
Quod subolem partemque sui vis digna pudoris  
Cultorum cordi venerandam posceret esse. (726-8)

There is hardly a word here that does not have a theological justification and hence an allegorical meaning. Indeed the allegory only just avoids overwhelming the literal narrative. To take a few examples, it was God's (domino)

last (ultima) great plan (mens est) for mankind to send down (dimittere) His Son (natum). He was offspring (subolem) of the Father, but He already was before the Creation and is of one Being with the Father (partem sui). As such He is worshipped and glorified (venerandam). This is a real tour de force by the poet for in addition to this complex theological overlay each word carries an entirely natural meaning on the narrative plane. Partem sui, for instance, is both a rejection of the central tenet of the recent major challenge to the Church by a heresy (Arianism), which was by no means finally conquered at the time the poem was written (nor was it for many years), and carries an everyday sense; what son is not a part of his father in several ways? The repetitions of domino (dominus, 723) and cultorum (cultores, 715 and cultorum, 719; varied briefly by colonorum, 720) form a structure in which it is possible to explore different levels of meaning. Natum is an echo of the parable of the Two Sons (699).<sup>37</sup> The expression vis digna pudoris is a typically Juvenecan periphrasis with an abstract noun explained by a genitive of identity (here also abstract).

Mt. 21, 38: Coloni autem videntes filium dixerunt intra se: Hic est heres; venite, occidamus eum, et habebimus hereditatem eius. (39) Et adprehensum eum occiderunt et eiecerunt extra vineam.

---

37. For comparative frequencies of natus and suboles see above, n. 15.



Sed contra illorum iam mens maculata cruore<sup>38</sup>  
 730 Progenie extincta domini sibi post dominatum  
 Cedere credentum, crudeli vulnere fixum  
 Obtruncant iaciuntque foras trans saepta cadaver.  
 (729-32)

The poet is economical in recasting direct into reported speech, which allows him to introduce further details of sadistic cruelty by the tenants: mens maculata cruore/ ... crudeli vulnere fixum<sup>39</sup>/Obtruncant<sup>40</sup>... Again this is the furor Iudaicus, which causes the "Jews" to act in a murderous and inhuman fashion.<sup>41</sup> The irony of mens is savage, for the word is repeated from l. 726, where it refers to the creating intelligence of the Most High. The contrast between God's beneficence towards mankind and these men's inhumanity to man is emphasised by the use of the same word. Further than that, however, it has already been noticed that the coloni are in the grip of rabies (l. 720), and no one so described can possibly possess mens. Another irony may well be implicit in progenies extincta for though the "Jews" crucified the Son they could not "extinguish" him; there may be the slightest of hints here about the resurrection. Dominatum perhaps also has a less obvious sense. Clearly it jangles with domini in the same line, ironising the tenants' hopes of taking the

---

38. Perhaps J. takes illorum from the reading of Corbeiensis (ff') Illi, but it is unlikely since he would also have found the order iecerunt extra vineam et occiderunt.

39. Cf. Virg. Aen. II 561, crudeli uulnere uidi.

40. Notice that the repetitions mens and vulnere add to the effect.

41. Cf. Poinsette, p. 235.

son's inheritance (with allegorical overtones), but it may also imply Satan's hopes of dominating this world, which are also ultimately doomed to frustration. There is a sense in which the "Jews" of this epic have Satan inside them and this may be at least an unconscious expression of that idea.<sup>42</sup> The final detail of the treatment of the son is certainly almost fiendish in the hate it reveals in its perpetrators: iaciuntque foras trans saepta cadaver. Through the shock of that final word cadaver postponed to the end-stopped position, this clause works on the literal level, though it cannot on the allegorical<sup>43</sup> for several reasons. The men who did this can be shown no mercy. Cedere credentium crudeli with its triple alliteration and emphatic position of cedere focusses the attention of the reader on the semantic importance of cedere credentium.

Knappitsch (ad loc.) comments:

cedere credentium est figura, quae dicitur quasi scriptum esset: illi mentem habentes maculatam cedere credunt.

The point is of course that they do not have mens but rabies, the Son is not extincta but will rise again, and their hopes and "beliefs" are to be frustrated. Credentium is also ironic for they do not believe in the Son.

42. On the relationship between Satan and the Jews, see Poinsothe, pp. 227-34, esp. pp. 231-2.

43. Notice, however, that the order in which J. renders this verse, though it does not really work on the allegorical level, avoids the slightly forced allegory that Jesus was driven out of Jerusalem and then crucified, which fails on the literal level. It is possible that J. is rendering Mark here. (See below, n. 44); cf. Mk. 12, 8 Et adprehensum occiderunt et proiecerunt illum extra vineam.

Mt. 21, 40: Cum ergo venerit dominus vineae, quid faciet colonis illis? (41) Aiunt illi: Malos male perdet et vineam locabit aliis colonis, qui reddent ei fructus temporibus suis.

Post haec iam dominus veniet poenasque reposcet Tantorum scelerum. (733-4)

Juvencus entirely recasts these two verses in order to stress the punishment of the tenants. Tantorum scelerum has already been commented upon at the beginning of this study of the parable (above, p.79), but though the "crimes" are generalised, so is the lord's response to them. Poenas reposcet is Juvencus' rendition of malos male perdet, yet he apparently loses an opportunity for anti-Jewish polemic. To say that God's wrath against the Jews led him to "put these evil-doers to miserable death" is clearly much stronger than saying that "he will exact punishment", even though poena often implies the punishment of death, and the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 could be seen to be an actual instance of God's retribution. Furthermore this phrase has to stand also for vineam locabit aliis colonis, qui reddent ei ..., etc. One might anticipate that Juvencus would take this opportunity of implying that God will reject (has rejected) the Jews as his Chosen People and replace them with the Gentiles (again, this has already "happened"). But instead of suggesting that the Church and the faithful will inherit God's Kingdom, he omits the idea at this point.

His reason is presumably that it is stated in a more direct form in v. 43, which he renders at ll. 733-6, and moreover he is thus able to focus on the fact that the "Jews" are a criminal nation (tantium scelerum). Even so Juvencus' omission of any direct statement that the tenants will be put to death is a rare example of restraint by our author.<sup>44</sup>

Even more surprising is Juvencus' omission of v. 42 with the allegory of the stone which has become the head of the corner, referring to the resurrection of the Christ. Poinsette (p. 89) considers the omission and remarks that:

cette allégorie est enclavée dans la parabole des vigneronns homicides, et la fidélité au texte évangélique serait en l'occurrence d'autant plus dommageable au récit de celle-ci que le traitement poétique d'une image entièrement nouvelle en latin classique exigerait une longue amplification.

Doubtless he is right but one can well imagine that Juvencus thought long before he omitted such a vital piece of Christian doctrine, especially when the parable does not refer directly to the Resurrection.

Mt. 21, 43: Ideo dico vobis, quia auferetur a vobis regnum Dei et dabitur genti facienti fructum eius.

Sed vobis tradita quondam  
735 Fulgentis regni sedes translata feretur  
Ad placidam gentem, possit quae reddere fructus. (734-6)

---

44. J. may possibly follow Mark at this point; cf. Mk. 12, 9 Quid faciet dominus vineae? Veniet et perdet colonos et dabit vineam aliis colonis. Notice, however that ll. 733-6 must come from Mt. 21, 43 (see below, p. 91).

Poinsotte (p. 79 n. 258) has noted the omission of the introductory phrase, which is a Hebraism. Also of interest is the phrase Fulgentis regni sedes for regnum Dei and the final emphatic repetition of fructus (from 715 and 717), reminding the reader that he too must produce fruit or be visited with punishment (poenas) on the Last Day. Finally, it is worthy of note that God's Chosen are rejected and the Kingdom of God is given over to the Gentiles, here described as a placidam gentem in contrast to the rabies, audax and mens maculata cruore of the Jews. Placidus is a specifically Christian epithet, one which the reader must strive to earn.

In the parable of the Two Sons, Christ's words in the Gospel virtually dictate the allegory; one son repents and obeys his father, and the other pays lip-service to his father's commands but does not obey him; this is applied to the prostitutes who repented and obeyed the Father by following John's words, and the Jewish leaders (or the whole Jewish nation?) who did not.<sup>45</sup> Here Christ gives less guidance, for He says less in applying the parable, but from the details in the Gospel and the tradition of teaching in the Church Juvencus had little trouble in assigning a similarly complete allegory to the narrative: the

---

45. The religious leaders themselves recognise this in a verse which J. omits; Mt. 21, 45: Et cum audissent principes sacerdotum et Pharisaei parabolam eius, cognoverunt, quod de ipsis dicit.

vineyard is Israel, the servants are the prophets and the son and heir is Christ himself; the tenants are the "Jews" who persecute the prophets and put Christ to death; God will exact punishment from them and hand over the kingdom to the Gentiles, the faithful, the Church. All this is elementary theology but the important point is that Juvenius does incorporate these allegories into his poem, as has been shown. Moreover the moral imperatives of the fable are pointed up for the reader of the poem.

d) Parable of the Wedding Feast

<sup>46</sup>Mt. 22,1: Et respondens Iesus dixit illis iterum in parabolis dicens: (2) Simile est regnum caelorum homini regi, qui fecit nuptias filio suo. (3) Et misit servos suos vocare invitatos ad nuptias, et noluerunt venire. (4) Iterum misit alios servos dicens: Dicite invitatis: Ecce prandium meum paravi; tauri et saginata occisa sunt et omnia parata sunt; venite ad nuptias. (5) Illi autem neglexerunt et abierunt; alii in villam suam, alii vero ad negotiationem suam; (6) reliqui vero tenuerunt servos eius et contumelia adfectos occiderunt. (7) Ille rex cum audisset, iratus est et misit exercitum suum et perdidit homicidas illos et civitatem illorum succendit. (8) Tunc ait servis suis: Nuptiae quidem paratae sunt, sed qui erant invitati non fuerunt digni. (9) Ite ergo ad exitus viarum et quoscumque inveneritis, vocate ad nuptias. (10) Et egressi servi eius in vias congregaverunt omnes quodquod invenerunt, malos et bonos, et impletae sunt nuptiae discumbentium. (11) Intravit autem rex, ut videret discumbentes, et vidit

---

46. J. omits 21, 44, because it refers to the corner-stone prophecy (v. 42) (cf. Widmann, p. 35), and vv. 45-6 since the reaction of the proceres to the parables is made clear in IV 1ff. more economically. 22, 1 is omitted because the sequence of parables is undisturbed by other narrative. This verse is cognate with the Matthean formula: Aliam parabolam proposuit illis, dicens ...; cf. Mt. 13, 24, 31 and 33, and 21, 33 all of which are omitted by J. (see above, n. 25).

ibi hominem non vestitum vestem nuptialem. (12) Et ait illi: Amice, quomodo hoc venisti non habens vestem nuptialem? At ille obmutuit. (13) Tunc dixit rex ministris: Tollite illum pedibus et manibus et mittite in tenebras exteriores; ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium. (14) Multi autem sunt vocati, pauci vero electi.

"Ut rex, qui nato thalamorum vincula nectens  
 Praecipit, ut proceres convivia laeta frequentent,  
 Accitos famulis voti regalis honorem  
 740 Concelebrare simul; cuncti sed adire recusant  
 Regales thalamos, regalis pocula mensae.  
 Post alios mittit, sese largissima cuncta  
 Magnificasque dapes, convivia laeta parasse.  
 Illi neglectis opibus diversa petebant.  
 745 Hic aedes proprias, hic ruris tecta propinqui,  
 Ast alius merces potius ac lucra revisit.  
 Multi praeterea missos, qui ad laeta vocarent,  
 Insontes famulos rapiunt et corpora ferro  
 In mortem cruciant. Tum rex ubi conperit acta,  
 750 Milibus armatis cives cum moenibus ipsis  
 Subruit, effusi famulorum sanguinis ultor.  
 Tunc servis fatur: 'Nunc festa iugalia cenae,  
 Praelargis opibus quaecumque instruximus illi,  
 Contempsero meis proceres contingere mensis.  
 755 Ite igitur propere per publica saepta viarum,  
 Et quoscumque illic casus glomeraverit, omnes  
 Huc laetis nati thalamis adhibete vocantes.'  
 Progressi famuli per compita cuncta viarum  
 Inventos duxere simul. Iam denique cunctae  
 760 Conplentur mensae mixtae sine nomine plebis.  
 Hic iusti iniustique simul cubuere vocati.  
 At rex ingressus convivia laeta revisit.  
 Hic videt indutum pollutae vestis amictu,  
 Laetitia thalami fuerat cui dissona longe.  
 765 Isque ubi regalis sermonis pondere causas  
 Reddere pro vestis maculis et labe iubetur,  
 Oppresso tacuit non puri pectoris ore.  
 Et tum conversus famulis rex praecipit illum  
 Conexis manibus pedibusque et corpore toto  
 770 In tenebras raptum mox praecipitare profundas.  
 Illic stridor erit vasti sine fine doloris,  
 Et semper fletus. Multis nam saepe vocatis  
 Paucorum felix hominum selectio fiet."

(III 737-73)

The same pattern of diction as in the previous two parables can be traced here. The majority of words are suggested

by the Biblical text but very few are directly quoted from it.

Among the latter most are words of importance:

regi, v. 2	= rex, l. 737
vocarent, v. 3	= vocarent, l. 747 <sup>47</sup>
misit alios, v. 4	= alios mittit, l. 742
neglexerunt, v. 5	= neglectis, l. 744
rex, v. 7	= rex, l. 749
Tunc ait servis, v.8	= Tunc servis fatur, l. 752
Ite ergo ad exitus viarum et quoscumque ... v. 9	Ite igitur ... per ... saepta = viarum/Et quoscumque...l.755-6
vocate, v. 9	= vocantes, l. 757
omnes, v. 10	= omnes, l. 756
invenerunt, v. 10	= inventos, l. 759
rex, v. 11	= rex, l. 762
vidit, v. 11	= videt, l. 763
indutum vestem, v.11	= indutum ... vestis, l. 763 <sup>48</sup>
rex, v. 13	= rex, l. 768
pedibus et manibus, v. 13	= manibus pedibusque, l. 769
in tenebras, v. 13	= In tenebras, l. 770
illic erit fletus et stridor, v. 13	Illic stridor erit .../Et ... fletus, ll. 771-2 <sup>49</sup>
Multi enim ... vocati, pauci ..., v. 14 <sup>=</sup>	Multis nam ... vocatis/Paucorum, ll. 772-3 <sup>50</sup>

47. Corbeiensis (ff') alone has ut vocarent instead of vocare in v. 3. The correspondence is arguable because J. defers the word until the second time servants are sent. Notice however that the word is then used in a more dramatic and allegorically important context.

48. Bezae Cantabrigiensis (d) alone reads indutum instead of vestitum in 22, ll.

49. The Afra (e) has illic where the Italae read ibi.

50. Enim is the reading of d, f, ff<sup>1</sup>, ff<sup>2</sup>, q, the Afra (e) and Vulgate.



Of this list of exact correspondences only the one in l. 755, Ite igitur ... per saepta viarum from v. 9 Ite ergo ad exitus viarum, is without any great importance on both the literal, narrative, and allegorical levels; the rest are of considerable doctrinal significance, as we shall see. The remarkable collection of correspondences from vv. 13-14 (= 768-73) is particularly impressive and suggests that Juvencus regarded the end of the parable, because of its richness in eschatological content, as especially worthy of strict adherence to his source; a procedure which, as has been seen, he only rarely adopts.

Mt. 22, 2: Simile est regnum caelorum homini regi, qui fecit nuptias filio suo. (3) Et misit servos suos vocare invitatos ad nuptias, et noluerunt venire.

"Ut rex, qui nato thalamorum vincula nectens  
Praecipit, ut proceres convivium laeta frequentent,  
Accitos famulis voti regalis honorem  
740 Concelebrare simul; cuncti sed adire recusant  
Regales thalamos, regalis pocula mensae. (737-41)

The verbal identification of the triumph of Christ with the triumph of Constantine has been noted most recently by Fontaine (p. 68). In the dedication to Constantine (IV 806-11) the opening lines explicitly set the emperor side by side with Christ:

Haec mihi pax Christi tribuit, pax haec mihi saeculi,  
Quam fovet indulgens terrae regnator apertae  
Constantinus ... (IV 806-8)

Constantine is (terrae regnator apertae, IV 807) "ruler of the open earth" where Christ has already been described

as "ruler of the universe" (mundi regnator Iesus, II 265),<sup>51</sup> just as the "peace of this age" (pax haec ... saeculi, IV 806) corresponds exactly with "the peace of Christ" (Haec pax Christi, IV 806). There appears to be a temporal and contemporary reference in the use of rex as well as a spiritual and eternal sense. It is true that there was an enduring tradition of dislike of the term, connected with the expulsion of the kings, and that no document refers to the emperor as rex, though the East had long ago been accustomed to call the emperor "king" (*Basileus*). Nevertheless a panegyric to Diocletian and Maximian jointly in A.D. 289 uses the verb regitis and refers to their power as regia maiestas, and moreover the emperor by the time of Constantine forbade only the direct address as rex.<sup>52</sup> So that behind the rex of the literal narrative level one should be prepared to see Constantine himself.

The Matthean formula (Simile est regnum caelorum homini regi ...) is omitted, or rather it is reduced drastically to Ut rex, qui ... One possible reason is that Juvenius wishes to emphasise the association of the king with Constantine as well as allegorically with Christ. Another is that the contraction attempts to overcome the semantic

---

51. The correspondence of the phrases is emphasized by the fact that these two are the only instances of regnator in the poem.

52. Fergus Millar, The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337), (London: Duckworth, 1977), pp. 613-5.

problems of the formula and avoid banal repetition. The approach to the formula throughout the poem is to establish it in the reader's mind by rendering it literally on its first occurrence; the language is varied on subsequent appearances; finally, it is pared down for the last few instances, with one exception, so that it is represented by such a minimal introduction to the parable as is found here, Ut rex, qui ... Detailed consideration of each rendition of the formula reveals subtle nuances in this aspect of the poem. The full list of appearances of the Simile est regnum caelorum ... qui expression in Matthew is as follows:

- i. Tares: Mt. 13, 24 Simile est regnum caelorum homini, qui ...  
 (= J. II 795-6) Agricolae simile est regnum sublime Tonantis./Ille ...
- ii. Mustard-seed: Mt. 13, 31 Simile est regnum caelorum grano sinapis, quod ...  
 (= J. II 812-3) Haut aliter simile est, ... / ... grano regnum caeleste sinapis ...
- iii. Leaven: Mt. 13, 33 Simile est regnum caelorum fermento, quod ...  
 (= J. II 820-1) Fermento par est munus caeleste ..., / Quod ...
- iv. Treasure: Mt. 13, 44 Simile est regnum caelorum thesauro absconso in agro, quem ...  
 (omitted by J.)
- v. Pearl: Mt. 13, 45 Iterum simile est regnum caelorum homini ...  
 (omitted by J.)
- vi. Net: Mt. 13, 47 Iterum simile est regnum caelorum retiae missae in mari, quae ...  
 (omitted by J.)

vii. Unmerciful Servant: Mt. 18, 23<sup>3</sup> Ideo simile est regnum caelorum homini regi, qui ...

(= J. III 437-8) Nam caeli regnum domini praedivitis aulae/Consimile est, ... qui ...

viii. Workers in Vineyard: Mt. 20, 1 Simile est regnum caelorum homini patri familias, qui ...

(= J. III 550) Sedulum ut ruris dominum, cui ...

ix. Wedding Feast: Mt. 22, 2 Simile est regnum caelorum homini regi, qui ...

(= J. III 737) Ut rex, qui ...

x. Ten Virgins: Mt. 25, 1 Tunc simile est regnum caelorum decem virginibus, quae ...<sup>54</sup>

(= J. IV 197-8) Conferri possunt caelestia regna puellis/Bis quinis, ... quarum ...

In the introduction to the parable of the Talents, which immediately follows the last of these parables, Matthew departs from the formula with Sicut enim homo ... (Mt. 25, 14 = J. IV 227 Sicut enim, ... cui ...) but up to that point he uses it extensively, as can be seen. Juvenicus' reaction to it is quite different from his treatment of the Alium parabolam ... formula.<sup>55</sup> Instead of omitting it entirely he renders it into verse five times out of seven. Two of these translations of the formula, those in the parables of the Mustard-seed (Mt. 13, 31 = J. II 812-3) and the Leaven (Mt. 13, 33 = J. II 820-1), present

---

53. This is the reading of c, d and ff as well as the Vulgate.

54. Only g and q have simile est but aur, f, l, and the Vulgate have simile erit; the rest read simile aestimabitur or similabitur.

55. See above, nn. 25 and 46.

no problem since the kingdom of heaven is like a mustard-seed or a piece of leaven in the sense in which Jesus applies the parables; Juvencus can include the formula and not violate the meaning of the parable. The other five instances of the formula in the portions of Matthew which the poet uses are problematic however. In each case except that of the Ten Virgins (example x.) the comparison is with a man and is in the form Simile est regnum caelorum homini ..., but this results in nonsense for the kingdom is not like a man but like what that man does. The parable of the Tares for example compares the kingdom not with the man who sows the seed but the harvest that the seeds (wheat and tares together) produce; that is, the comparison is not with the Filius hominis (Mt. 13, 37) but with the situation at the consummatio saeculi (13, 39) when the fili regni (13, 38) will be taken into the kingdom and eos, qui faciunt iniquitatem (13, 42) will be thrown into the caminum ignis (13, 42). Similarly in the parable of the Ten Virgins we find simile est regnum caelorum decem virginibus, yet the meaning should not be that the kingdom is like the bridesmaids, but that the situation at the last judgement will be like the situation in which the bridesmaids find themselves: some ready for it, some not ready. The formula is a translation of an Aramaic formula used in the introduction of rabbinic parables,

and it means "it is the case with ... as with ...";<sup>56</sup>  
 the semantic problem is precipitated by the translation  
 of the Aramaic expression.

Juvencus appears to be conscious of this problem.

His position with regard to semitisms in general is clear:

Juvencus doit éliminer, ou recouvrir d'un manteau romain, les sémitismes de langue et de style qui imprègnent le grec néotestamentaire et ses traductions latines, et se garder d'exploiter, comme on le fera heureusement après lui, les ressources de la poésie biblique.<sup>57</sup>

This formula is not a gem of Biblical poetry, however, and could with little loss be omitted entirely, as Juvencus omits the Aliam parabolam ... formula; or its occurrence could be drastically reduced, as he reduces amen dico vobis (tibi), and its cognates, from fifty-four to seven.<sup>58</sup>

That the simile est ... formula is not so treated is difficult to account for.

Detailed consideration shows that Juvencus is scrupulous in his rendition of it. The formula is semantically acceptable in the parables of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven, and the comparison with the kingdom is essential in

56. Fenton, pp. 181 and 221.

57. Poinsothe, p. 57. See also pp. 57-83 for a study of his elimination of semitisms.

58. Ibid. pp. 78-83, has a study of the formula and its cognates dico autem vobis, etc. Amen dico vobis is rendered at III 314 (= Mt. 16, 28), 665 (= 21, 21) and 704 (= 21, 31) and IV 89 (= 24, 2); amen quippe dico vobis at I 486 (= 5, 18); dico autem vobis at I 754 (= 8, 11) and IV 453 (= 26, 29).

both: the poet is virtually obliged to render the formula in both parables and total omission of it is impossible. Moreover the five problem instances introduce five major eschatological parables, all of which are important doctrinally; the reader must be told at the beginning of the parable that it concerns the kingdom otherwise he will not understand the allegory. Juvenecus' solution is to establish the formula in the reader's mind by rendering it literally on its first appearance in II 795-6. He then varies the formulaic language while keeping the detail of it in the parables of the Mustard-seed and Leaven (though in the latter munus caeleste is not an exact translation of regnum caelorum - the poet is already allowing his paraphrases to become more free in an effort to avoid repetition that the reader will find tedious).

In the parable of the Unmerciful Servant he is presumably obliged to keep it because it is nearly 450 lines on from the previous occurrence; nevertheless since the narrative details of the parable itself are adaptable to its demands he is able to make an economical alteration and render the formula at the same time as he makes "better" sense of it. Thus the point of comparison is changed from the king himself (Mt. 18, 21 ... homini regi) to his court (I 437 ... praedivitis aulae), for the judgement which heralds the coming of the kingdom is like the situation at the court when

the accounts are settled.<sup>59</sup> By the time he comes to the parable of the Workers in the Vineyard just over a hundred lines later the formula is established in the epic and in the reader's mind, so that the words of comparison are pared down to ut and mention of the kingdom is omitted. The formula is suggested only by the echo of dominus<sup>60</sup> (III 550; domini, 437), from its previous rendition, and the relative cui. Less than two hundred lines later he uses a similar form of the pared-down formula in the parable of the Wedding Feast with Ut rex, qui ..., a remarkable contraction of Simile est regnum caelorum homini regi, qui ... but a phrase that in the context of previous instances means that it is at least implied.

Perhaps surprisingly after this policy of diminution and partial omission, the poet returns to a more literal translation of the formula in the parable of the Ten Virgins; its last appearance in the poem is in overt form:

Conferrī possunt caelestia regna puellis  
Bis quinīs, ... quarum ... (IV 197-8).

The assumption must be that the poet felt that the continuous sequence of eschatological parables in IV 197-305, containing the Ten Virgins, the Talents and the Last Judgement, required

- 
59. J. also regularizes the rex of the formula to dominus, since dominus is the word used elsewhere in the parable (Mt. 18, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32 and 34); perhaps ... homini regi ... (Gk. ἄνθρωπῳ βασιλεῖ ) is by analogy with Mt. 22, 2.
60. Again J. regularizes the homini patri familias of the formula to dominus used at Mt. 20, 8 in the parable; see previous note.



a full restatement of the formula to reinforce it at the beginning of a passage of great doctrinal significance.

It is now possible to return from this digression to the opening lines of the parable of the Wedding Feast. Rex is an important word in the poem; it is the first word of the epic (Rex fuit ... I1) and is used twenty-five times in all, very frequently in the doctrinally more important second half of the poem, and in nearly every instance it is used in the singular of Christ Himself.<sup>61</sup> Of the ten instances of rex in the nominative or vocative cases, except for the example<sup>62</sup> above in I 1 and the four instances in this parable, all refer to Christ directly and are at moments of doctrinal significance.<sup>63</sup> There is a reference to the Father as King in the Sermon on the Mount (I 538-41; Mt. 5, 34-5):

- 
61. Bk. I 1, 228, 250, 541; Bk. II 119, 531; Bk. III 33, 40, 385, 388, 634, 737, 749, 762, 768; Bk. IV 103, 103, 268, 592, 616, 647, 666, 680, 700, 809. Huemer's regnum (IV 809) is a misprint for regum; cf. his introduction, edn. pp. v-vi, and Knappitsch (ad loc.).
62. Cf. III 33 ad regem ... superbum and III 40 Herodem ... regem, both of "Herod".
63. Cf. II 118-20 vox Nathanahelis:/ "Progenies veneranda Dei, rex inclite gentis, / Tu populis manifesta salus vitaeque magister."; II 633 ... veteris ... vox ... vatis: (Zech. 9, 9 of Christ's entry into Jerusalem) / "Ecce venit placidus tibi rex, quem terga sedentem / Praemitis gestant asinae pullique sequentis."; IV 268-9 Sed rex ad dextros conversos talia dicet: / Huc veniant sancti ... (the separation of the sheep from goats by the hominis natum, IV 259 on the Day of Judgement); IV 591-3 Talia Pilati verbis excepti Iesus: / "Tu rex Iudaeae gentis, quod dicitur, adstas?" / Respondit Christus: "Vestris haec audio verbis."; IV 665-6 Et scriptum causae titulum meritique locarunt, / Quod rex Iudaeae plebis gentisque fuisset.

Nec fas est homini caelum iurare per altum,  
 Quod sedem Domini, nec quae vestigia gestat  
 540 Terra Dei, Solymaevae urbis venerabile nomen,  
 Quod regis magni propria est, iurabitur usquam.

But Christ's words about the temple-tax are more interesting because of Juvencus' alterations and more important for our passage because nearer in the text. The whole incident is related by Juvencus thus:

Convenere Petrum, quibus instat cura tributi,  
 Solvere poscentes solitum pro nomine Christi.  
 Ille sed ad Petrum conversus talia fatur:  
 385 "Dic," inquit, "reges quorum dependere nator  
 Externos propriosne sibi iussere tributa?"  
 Respondit Petrus: "Alienos solvere certum est."  
 "Cernis," ait Christus, "natum solvere regis: (III 382-8)

The poet makes many changes here which are unimportant but the last line is a rendition of Mt. 17, 26 Dixit illi Iesus: Ergo liberi sunt filii. Juvencus changes the plural filii to natus and this, together with the substitution of Christus for Iesus, shows that he means natum ... regis to be understood as Christ in the context of the passage. Clearly the Son is exempt from the tax and the rex is God the Father.

The same relationship of rex and natus is found in this parable. On the allegorical level Juvencus is referring to the Father and Son, and the marriage is the mystic union of Christ with his Church.<sup>64</sup>

---

64. Cf. the comparison of the Kingdom with a marriage feast in the parable of the Ten Virgins Mt. 25, 10 (IV 220-3) and Apoc. 19, 7ff.

Rex iste qui fecit nuptias filio suo Deus omnipotens est. Facit autem nuptias Domino nostro Iesu Christo et ecclesiae, quam tam ex Iudaeis quam ex gentibus congregata est. (Jer. In Math. III 1656-9).

The image thalamorum vincula nectens is a variation of Jesus's words to the Samaritan woman at the well: II 277 thalamorum vincula tollis, in the same sedes (see Arevalo, ad loc.); cf. Virgil Aen. IV 16 ne cui me uinclo uellem sociare iugali. Huemer edn., (ad loc.) compares this image with Virgil Ec. VIII 78, necte, Amarylli, modo et 'Veneris' dic 'uincula necto'; the image of the bonds of marriage is common in high poetry.

It has been observed that the parable of the Two Sons is told in the context of Jewish faithlessness and unbelief, especially by the proceres (the Jewish leaders). The same word occurs in l. 738; it is the proceres who are invited to the wedding feast. Poinsothe (p. 190) has shown how Juvencus uses generalisations such as proceres to describe the Pharisees and scribes, as prime representatives of furor Iudaiacus.<sup>65</sup> It may be suspected from the change of invitatos (Mt. 22, 3) to proceres (l. 738) that the poet is associating the Jews with those who were originally invited to the wedding.<sup>66</sup>

---

65. Others are factio, sacerdotes and vates; proceres is the most frequent.

66. See Poinsothe, p. 235.

Furthermore the word frequentent implies the throng of those invited to the wedding feast of the Lamb (Apoc. 19, 6-9). St. John's vision is of a great crowd: Et audivi quasi vocem turbae magnae ... (19, 6); the angel explains to the seer that the vast crowd consists of those who are called to the Lamb's wedding feast: Beati qui ad coenam nuptiarum Agni voca sunt (19, 9). The size of this turba magna may be judged from the description of those most dear to the Lamb earlier in the vision.... centum quadraginta quatuor milia, qui empti sunt de terra (Apoc. 14, 3). The irony of frequentent is that this throng of proceres refuses to attend convivia laeta, the apocalyptic wedding feast.

Convivia laeta becomes something of a Juvenecan formula in this parable since it is found at ll. 738, 743 and 762, a pattern of exact repetition in close juxtaposition that is apparently without parallel in the poem.<sup>67</sup> Convivium is evidently a key word in Juvenecan diction for it is used six times in the poem outside this parable, always in the form convivia. In the opening lines of the story of the Wedding at Cana the text reads ... thalamis conubia festa .../... clari mater Iesu/Nato ...

---

67. The epic first hemistich Haec ubi dicta dedit ... is found at II 561; III 176, 316, 674; IV 384, 390, 446. There is no phrase of similar importance repeated so often in such close juxtaposition.

convivia concelebrabat (II 127-9), with convivia in the subsequent line. This is important since the Wedding at Cana was regarded as a type of the Last Supper, a foreshadowing of the sacrament of the Eucharist.<sup>68</sup> The word also occurs at II 352 in the passage where Jesus dines with the tax-gatherers and sinners, regarded as a type of the Christian agape and the Messianic Feast (II 317-60). This episode culminates in Christ's words

Haut etenim iustos veni ad directa viantes,  
560 Sed revocare malos peccantum a limite gressus. (II 559-60)  
Christ's mission to call us to the Father (revocare) finds an echo in this parable with its emphasis on vocare (ll. 747, 757, 761 and 772).

There is a sort of parody of the Great Feast in "Herod's" banquet which ends in the horrible martyrdom of St. John the Baptist. Laeta ... convivia is an ironic comment in this context:

Natali sed forte die cum laeta tyrannus  
Heroden celsis strueret convivia mensis,  
Luxuriae quoniam coniuncta superbia gaudet ...(III 52-4)

This is the very opposite of Christ's eucharistic meal. A similar technique is employed in an extraordinary line from the eschatological parable of the Servant entrusted with Supervision:

---

68. This surely underlies Aug. Tract in Ioh. IX 5; see also Rudolf Bultmann, The Gospel of John. A Commentary, trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), p. 120, n. 1.

Luxuriosorum convivia concelebrarit. (IV 193)

The faithful servant who is put in charge of others will be rewarded at the return of his lord, but the wicked (infelix, 190) servant wastes his lord's possessions and maltreats his fellow-servants. He will be cast out when the Lord comes again. Convivia and concelebrarit set up an ironic comparison between the drunken revelries of the untrustworthy servant and the eucharistic feast that will be celebrated eternally in the Kingdom.

The final two examples of convivia are less significant. At III 80 there is perhaps some association with the sacramental feeding in the narrative of the Feeding of the Five Thousand. But Jesus' advice to sit in the lowest place at dinner at II 614 (= Mt. 20, 28 Itala, which is similar to Lk. 14, 7-10), though it has implications for the Christian life and reminds us that He washed the feet of the disciples at the Last Supper, carries little allegory.

Accitos famulis is from Mt. 22, 3 ... misit servos suos vocare invitatos. Accitos refers in this case to the proceres and is the only instance in the parable where Juvenius departs from the Biblical vocare (vocare at ll. 747, 757, 761 and 772; accitus also at I 235 and IV 52). It has been seen above how the poet alters servos of 21, 34 to Actores famulos in 718 of the parable of the Tenants; the same applies here, and in fact famuli is the word used in five places in the parable (ll. 739, 748, 751, 758

and 768), whereas the variation servis is only employed once.

On Voti regalis honorem Arevalo (ad loc.) comments that votum is a word of solemn import when used of marriage, and he compares II 366 Qui sponsi laetis comitantur vota choreis (= Mt. 9, 15) the minor parable of the Bridegroom's Guests who do not fast at the feast, where the Bridegroom represents Christ and the guests are the disciples. The parallel emphasises that the reader is to think of the messianic wedding at this point. Concelebrare develops the idea further. The occurrences have been observed above of ... convivia concelebrabat (II 129) in the Wedding at Cana and ... convivia concelebrarit (IV 193) in a parodic celebration of the eucharistic feast at the parousia in the parable of the Servant entrusted with Supervision. The association of the two words clearly implies that it is the sacraments to which reference is being made. Convivia has been discussed: concelebrare had religious overtones even in the Augustan age and was readily appropriated into Christian vocabulary.<sup>69</sup> Juvencus employs the verb here to suggest the idea that underpins the Nuptial Mass, that the sacrament of mortal marriage is an earthly manifestation of the mystic union between Christ and His Church

---

69. Cf. Tib. I 7, 49-50 genium ludis centumque choreis/ concelebra; Jer. Ep. XCVI 2 ... qui sic passionis dominicae festa concelebrent; Paul. Nol. Ep. I 11 ... ut sacras ferias me sacerdote concelebres.

and a way of approaching that perfect union.<sup>70</sup> As has been noted, Jerome certainly interpreted the parable in this light (In Math. III 1656-9, cited above). A marriage is celebrated in precisely the same way that the Daily Mass is celebrated; the harmonious union of man and wife does not simply remind us of the heavenly Marriage, it is an earthly manifestation of that Marriage in the same sense that Communion is the earthly sacrifice of Christ and not a mere representation of the heavenly eucharist. The proceres are summoned voti regalis honores/concelebrare; they are called to union with Christ in the eucharistic Perfect Union at the Last Day.

Once the "true" meaning of the invitation and the wedding banquet is established the poet is free to concentrate on the rejection of them by the guests:

740                    cuncti sed adire recusant  
                       Regales thalamos, regalis pocula mensae. (740-1)

The remarkable pattern of repetition in juxtaposition in regalis (739) ... regales (741) ... regalis (741) serves to emphasise the folly of the guests in rejecting what is offered by the King, God the Father. Cuncti operates on the allegorical level to bring out this rejection of the feast (and all that it implies) by the entire Jewish nation; not only of the proceres accepts. This betrayal

---

70. Cf. prayer in the Nuptial Mass: Deus, qui tam excellenti mysterio conjugalem copulam consecrasti, ut Christi et ecclesiae sacramentum praesignores in foedere nuptiarum. This idea is derived from Paul; e.g. Eph. 5, 22 ff, cf. Apoc. 21, 2.



is implicitly contrasted with St. Joseph's faithful and obedient acceptance of his pregnant fiancée as his wife. As he meditates leaving Mary we find the phrase thalamosque recuset (I 136), echoed here by recusant ... thalamos (stressed by the repetition of thalamos from thalamorum, 737). The "Jews" deprive themselves of heavenly bliss and doom themselves to damnation, by a total inversion of Joseph's obedience to the will of God.

The phrase regalis pocula mensae evidently suggests the sacrament of Communion and the Eucharist that is perpetually celebrated in Heaven. The eucharist feast at the parousia will be a perfect and final Mass offered by the Lord.

Mt. 22, 4: Iterum misit alios servos dicens: Dicitte invitatis: Ecce prandium meum paravi; tauri et saginata occisa sunt et omnia parata sunt; venite ad nuptias.

Post alios mittit, sese largissima cuncta  
Magnificasque dapes, convivium laeta parasse. (742-3)

Jerome on vv. 3-4 takes the servants to be the prophets of the Old Testament and the Apostles respectively;<sup>71</sup> other interpretations that have been canvassed are that the two sets of servants represent the former and the latter prophets, or that both refer to the former prophets. The poet, however, by his use of famulus appears to imply the specifically Christian famulus Dei and hence the servants seem to represent

---

71. In Math. III 1662-70.

the apostolic mission of the Church.<sup>72</sup>

God's grace and abundance is expressed in Juvencus' paraphrase of the Gospel text by largissima and magnificas, and the repetition of convivia laeta from l. 738 re-emphasises the allegory. The phrase reminds the reader that the banquet stands for the messianic feast. The details tauri et saginata occisa sunt are artistically inadmissible: firstly, because they refer to Jewish wedding customs; secondly, because these literal details detract from the allegory of the Eucharist. They are omitted in favour of more abstract conceptions.

Mt. 22, 5: Illi autem neglexerunt et abierunt; alii in villam suam, alii vero ad negotiationem suam; (6) reliqui vero tenuerunt servos eius et contumelia adfectos occiderunt.

Illi neglectis opibus diversa petebant.  
745 Hic aedes proprias, hic ruris tecta propinqui,  
Ast alius merces potius ac lucra revisit.  
Multi praeterea missos, qui ad laeta vocarent,  
Insontes famulos rapiunt et corpora ferro  
In mortem cruciant. (744-9)

Juvencus turns in villam suam into a reference to the specifically Roman topos of the town and country dichotomy in the elegant line

Hic aedes proprias, hic ruris tecta propinqui ... (745).  
This is partly stylistic and partly a reflection of later Imperial society in the West, but the idea that the man merces potius ac lucra revisit carries strict moral overtones.

---

72. Cf. Hil. Comm. In Matt., ad loc. (= PL 9, 1045), Servi missi, qui invitatos vocarent, apostoli sunt. Famulus is the liturgical equivalent of servus; cf. prayer at the Offertory ... ego indignus famulus tuus offero ...

The respectable negotiatio is altered to the perjorative lucrum, a word which often has the sense of our cliché "filthy lucre". The merchant is guilty of the sin of avarice.<sup>73</sup> Juvencus has created a sort of rising tricolon with the accent on the sin of the third element. The excuse betrays moral depravity.

The latter effect and the change of reliqui to multi syntactically divorces the inhuman treatment of the servants by the guests from their excuses. The focus shifts dramatically to martyrdom to make allegorical points, and the emphasis on the details of the murder of innocent men creates in the reader's mind the impression that hic ... hic ... alius ..., the men who plead excuses for non-attendance, are not morally guiltless of their deaths. The innocence of the victim is stressed by the insertions insontes and qui ad laeta vocarent. Ad laeta is an additional reference to the eucharistic feast and picks up the repeated phrase convivia laeta (738 and 743); in essence it is a compression of the phrase ad convivia laeta. God's mercy and grace are expressed in a further reminder of his call to all to share the Great Banquet, so that the treatment of His servants appears in starkest contrast. The evil lies not just in the guests' reaction but in its being their response

---

73. Cf. Hil. Comm. In Matt., ad loc. (PL 9, 1045); plures vero ob pecuniae cupiditatem negotiatione detineretur.

to an invitation of such generosity. Furthermore the poet employs extremely dense imagery to express that evil: corpora ferro /In mortem cruciant.<sup>74</sup> The reader is impelled irresistibly to think of martyrdom (of the Apostles and their successors) in general without the unwanted associations of any particular historical event, though the contemporary reader must have had knowledge of many such deaths in the Great Persecution which began in A.D. 303. The imagery is clearly apostolic rather than prophetic in character (crucifixion in this context is specifically Christian), and implies that the famuli represent not the prophets of the Old Testament but the saints of the Church. The savagery of the treatment of the servants by the guests also expresses in allegorical terms the furor of the "Jews" in their treatment of Christ and his followers, as Poinsette (p. 235) has noted.

Mt. 22, 7: Ille rex cum audisset, iratus est et misit exercitum suum et perdidit homicidas illos et civitatem illorum succendit.

750 Tum rex ubi conperit acta,  
Milibus armatis cives cum moenibus ipsis  
Subruit, effusi famulorum sanguinis ultor. (749-51)

Jerome interprets the Matthean verse thus:

Exercitus seu ultores angelos de quibus in psalmis scribitur: Inmissionem per angelos pessimos, seu Romanos intelligamus sub duce Vespasiano et Tito qui occisis Iudaeae populis praeuaricatricem succenderint ciuitatem. (In Math. III 1689-93)

---

74. Cf. IV 78-9, O Solymi, Solymi ferro qui saepe profetas/ Ad vestram missos vitam sine fine necastis.

It seems that Juvencus' version combines elements of both ideas. The rex who is effusi famulorum sanguinis ultor certainly suggests the Deus vindex of the Apocalypse; the God who is asked by the souls of the faithful to avenge them:

vidi animas interfectorum propter verbum Dei, et propter testimonium, quod habebant, et clamabant voce magna dicentes: Usquequo Domine (sanctus, et verus), non iudicas, et non vindicas sanguinem nostrum de iis qui habitant in terra? Et ... dictum est illis ut requiescerent adhuc tempus modicum ... (Apoc. 6, 9-11).

They are told to rest a little longer, but the rest of the visions of the Apocalypse show that their request is granted. Evidently the milibus armatis can be read as the legions of angels avenging those who have died for the Lord, especially as a sequence of eschatological imagery has been observed in this version of the parable. As discussed above (p. 103), rex nearly always stands for Christ, and clearly does here.

Equally cives cum moenibus ipsis/Subruit (from civitatem illorum succendit) appears to refer to the sack of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and the consequent scattering of the Jews. Subruit in emphatic sedes and applied to cives and moenia is surely intended to remind the reader of the Roman response to Jewish insurrection. As discussed above (p. 96), the emperor is at least associated with the term rex, so that we may see in rex 1. 749) a reference to Titus; the milibus armatis would then refer more naturally to the legions of Rome. Both the historical and anagogical :

allegories seem to work at the same time. It may be objected that the poet cannot make rex stand for two different ideas at once on the allegorical plane, but it has been seen already that he does tend to do just that, working on several levels at the same time. Besides it is not clear that he intends that the allegories should be worked out to the letter. The meaning of this double allegory is that God punished the Jews for their disobedience to Him and their persecution of the Christians by destroying them and their city; and on the eschatological level He will order his angels to cast them down into Hell (subruit) at the Last Judgement. The allegory is complex.

Mt. 22, 8: Tunc ait servis suis: Nuptiae quidem paratae sunt, sed qui erant invitati non fuerunt digni.

Tunc servis fatur: 'Nunc festa iugalia cenae,  
Praelargis opibus quaecumque instruximus illi,  
Contempsero meis proceres contingere mensis. (752-4)

The verbal parallels of Tunc servis fatur to Tunc ait servis suis have been noted above, but the lone variation of famuli to servi and the introduction of the only passage of direct speech in the version of the parable are also important. Clearly the poet wants the reader's full attention at this point as he moves into what is spiritually the most significant section: the rejection of the guests and invitation to sinners, that is rejection of the Jews and acceptance of Gentile Christians. The point is also made by the opening words of the king's speech itself: Nunc festa

iugalia cenae.<sup>75</sup> Each word is used only at this place in the parable and yet festā iugalia cenae is the most direct statement of its subject, the wedding feast. Indeed Juvenecus expands the simple words Nuptiae quidem paratae sunt into a full line and a half containing the addition praelargis opibus. Here the repetition of opibus from l. 744 with the intensified adjective in prae- in emphatic sedes brings out well the bountiful grace of the Lord in calling the guests to His feast, preparing the reader for the final rejection of them because they have rejected the Lord.

Contempserē meis proceres contingere mensis.  
The link with the original invitation is achieved by repetition from the opening verses of the narrative; proceres is from l. 738 and mensis repeats mensae (l. 741) in the same metrical sedes.

Mt. 22, 9: Ite ergo ad exitus viarum et quoscumque iueneritis, vocate ad nuptias.

755 Ite igitur propere per publica saepta viarum,  
Et quoscumque illic casus glomeraverit, omnes  
Huc laetis nati thalamis adhibete vocantes.' (755-7)

It is worth pointing out again the unusually close rendering here: Ite ergo ad exitus viarum et quoscumque ... is shadowed by Ite igitur ... per ... saepta viarum/Et quoscumque.

---

75. Cf. the introduction to the Wedding at Cana II 127, Interea thalamis conubia festa parabant ...

This Biblical structure, allied to the remarkable alliteration of propere per publica saepta noticed by Knappitsch (ad loc.), creates a highly memorable line. Effectively it is the call for a mission to the Gentiles which begins after the Resurrection. The poet ensures that the reader remembers that call by means of these technical effects. Notice that all (omnes) are called (vocantes) to the wedding-breakfast of the Son (laetis nati thalamis). Eschatologically it is also a call to All to share in the joy of the Kingdom:

Beati qui ad coenam nuptiarum Agni vocati sunt.  
(Apoc. 19, 9)

This is a hint to the initiated reader.

Mt. 22, 10: Et egressi servi eius in vias congregaverunt omnes quodquod invenerunt, malos et bonos, et impletae sunt nuptiae discumbentium.

Progressi famuli per compita cuncta viarum<sup>76</sup>  
Inventos duxere simul. Iam denique cunctae  
760 Complentur mensae mixtae sine nomine plebis.  
Hic iusti iniustique simul cubuere vocati. (758-61)

Juvencus stresses that all (cunctae) are called to the feast, though they are nobodies (mixtae sine nomine plebis) and have no right to be there. He is referring to the fact that according to God's law delivered to Moses only the Jews have a right to be at the feast (the Old Covenant), but God has rejected them and sent his Son to call sinners

---

76. Arevalo, Harold and Huemer all print cuncta (from the best MSS.), but Knappitsch follows Petschenig with lata (a reading with considerable MS. support), and cites IV 206 per compita lata viarum as a parallel. Hansson (p. 103) suggests that perhaps lata was the poet's first thought and that cuncta was his own alteration.



and Gentiles. God's grace and mercy to us is infinite. In addition it may be that the emphasis on the low social status of those who actually attend the supper is influenced by the contemporary social hierarchy. On the literal level the king's proceres correspond to the remnants of the old senatorial aristocracy on whom Constantine's court depended, and who were generally resistant to Christianity in any more than a nominal form. The spirit of the religion was in opposition to the traditional Roman values as preserved by those near the top of the pyramid, families tracing their names back through many generations. Perhaps the Juvenius who had probably himself seen the Church change in a few years from an unofficial almost underground movement into a massively important political institution with the favour of the emperor is hinting at a possible reversal of the nobles' political status if they do not change their attitude.

The idea in iustiiniustique is important for the continuation of the parable, for it is an "unjust" guest who is cast out of the wedding hall.

Mt. 22, 11: Intravit autem rex, ut videret dicumbentes, et vidit ibi hominem non vestitum vestem nuptialem.

At rex ingressus convivium laeta revisit.  
 His videt indutum pollutae vestis amictu, <sup>77</sup>  
 Laetitia thalami fuerat cui dissona longe. (762-4)

---

77. This is the probable reading in c, r and other codices, and is printed by Knappitsch. Arevalo prints quae for qui and this is Hansson's solution too (p. 164 n. 41). I would point out, however, that cui has the better MS. support. Marold and Huemer have Laetitiis thalami fuerat cui dissona lingua, which does not appear to make sense. See Hansson, p. 92, for the best apparatus and Knappitsch (ad loc.) for discussion.

Juvencus repeats his keywords for the eucharistic banquet convivia laeta from ll. 738 and 743 before turning to the incident of the guest and the garment. Laetitia completes a sequence of repetition that implies the eucharistic joy: convivia laeta (738) ... convivia laeta (744) ... laeta (747) ... laetis (757) ... convivia laeta (762) ... laetitia (764). In itself this would be impressive but when taken with the repetitions of rex, famuli, vocare and thalamus it can be seen how significant the poet found this parable.

The most interesting point here is that the poet has changed the detail of the parable. In Matthew the man has no wedding garment (a detail of Jewish marriage custom that did not interest Juvencus), whereas in Juvencus' version the man has on a dirty garment, which is unsuitable (dissona) for the occasion. Jeremias recounts a parable attributed to Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai (fl. c. A.D. 80) describing a king who issued invitations to a banquet, but without specifying the time of it:

The wise attired themselves, while the foolish went on with their work. Suddenly the summons came, and those who were not dressed in clean clothes were not admitted to the banquet.<sup>78</sup>

It is probable that the wedding garment in Jesus' parable was originally understood as a newly-washed, clean or even new garment, not as a special festive one. The host at a

---

78. Jeremias, p. 118.

formal banquet as a mark of special courtesy did not eat with his guests but only appeared during the meal; evidently this is what happened here. The king appears during the feast and is insulted by the fact that the man is wearing a soiled garment, not a clean one fit for a wedding.<sup>79</sup>

Modern scholarship insists that this parable of the wedding garment was originally separate from the story of the feast and that Matthew ran the two parables together. This accounts for a major problem in the text: how could a guest be blamed for not being correctly dressed for a wedding, when he has been dragged in from the highways and byways?

Juvencus clearly sees that to make sense of the parable as he finds it, he must alter the details. In his view presumably it is not reasonable to expect that a man should be wearing a wedding garment as he goes about his daily business; he can hardly be expected to be in his best clothes when he receives the summons. But to be dressed in dirty clothes is another matter. A man who attends wedding festivities wearing a filthy garment, even when he has been invited under such unusual circumstances, is not guilty of a mere solecism. He reveals in himself grave faults of character that justify his expulsion from the feast. It is suggested, then that Juvencus understood

---

79. Cf. Jeremias, p. 187.

the point of the parable as told by Jesus and the rabbi, and accidentally hit on the details of the rabbi's story, and perhaps Jesus' too in its original form: the message is readiness, that is, repentance. At the parousia (rex ingressus) that is the sole test of the faithful Christian.

Mt. 22, 12: Et ait illi: Amice, quomodo hoc venisti non habens vestem nuptialem? At ille obmutuit.

765 Isque ubi regalis sermonis pondere causas  
Reddere pro vestis maculis et labe iubetur,  
Oppresso tacuit non puri pectoris ore. (765-7)

The emphasis in vestis maculis et labe picks up pollutae vestis amictu and extends it. A clean garment stands for the repentance of sin and the new life of good works in Christ:

Beati, qui levant stolas suas in sanguine Agni.  
(Apoc. 22, 14)

Byssinum enim iustificationes sunt sanctorum.  
(Apoc. 19, 8)

Et exsultabit anima mea in Deo meo,  
Quia induit me vestimentis salutis. (Isa. 61, 10)

Jesus asks only that men should put on clean clothes and repent in order to enter the Kingdom: Paenitentiam agite; adpropinquavit enim regnum caelorum (Mt. 4, 17). This man does not have the clean clothes of the new life; he has not repented. His clothes are spotted with sin, and therefore he is condemned. Indeed he is conscious of his own sin and cannot speak because of it: Oppresso ... non puri pectoris ore. The alliteration noted by Knappitsch

(ad loc.) dramatises his stuttering inability to offer anything in his own defence; he is condemned by his own impure heart. He has no good works to act as intercessors on his behalf, unlike Cornelius to whom the angel said: Orationes tuae et eleemosynae tuae ascenderunt in memoriam in conspectu Dei (Act. 10, 4). He has no acts of charity to plead for him, so he is silent (tacuit), and there is no one to speak for him.

Mt. 22, 13: Tunc dixit rex ministris: Tollite illum pedibus et manibus et mittite in tenebras exteriores; ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium. (14) Multi autem sunt vocati, pauci vero electi.

770 Et tum conversus famulis rex praecipit illum  
 Conexis manibus pedibusque et corpore toto  
 In tenebras raptum mox praecipitare profundas.  
 Illic stridor erit vasti sine fine doloris,  
 Et semper fletus. Multis nam saepe vocatis  
 Paucorum felix hominum selectio fiat. (768-73)

It is noticeable how at the only point in the Biblical text of the parable where Matthew does not use servi, Juvenius does not depart from his pattern of repetition of famuli. He is concerned to bind the parable together at the eschatological climax, and repeats his keywords rex (from ll. 737 749 and 762) and famuli (ll. 739, 748, 751 and 758) for the last time. It is important that the reader should remember that the King of Heaven and His angels are meant.

The punishment of the sinner is severe. Arevalo (ad loc.) first noted that conexis manibus pedibusque is repeated at IV 394. Significantly, however, it occurs in the Raising

of Lazarus and refers to the struggle of Lazarus with the grave-wrappings that bind him to Death and Hell, the bonds that Christ loosed forever at the Resurrection. Here the sinner is bound by the King with those very bonds because he is cast out of the Kingdom. The repetition of corpore from corpora (l. 748) contrasts the bodily sufferings in Hell of the sinner who does not repent. The word is the poet's own addition in both cases, and the phrase corpore toto here surely makes the reader think of the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body. The faithful famuli will rise in their purified bodies on the Last Day, but the body of the man non puri pectoris will be given over to Satan and his devils to be tortured in Hell. In tenebras ... profundas is Juvencus' version of the Matthean formula in tenebras exteriores, which refers to Hell.

The poet evidently regarded this formula as doctrinally important because he renders it on all three occasions when it occurs in Matthew. In the eschatological remarks of Jesus to the centurion there is caecis ... tenebris, I 758 (= Mt 8, 12); at the end of the eschatological parable of the Talents he renders it tenebras ... adimas, IV 257 (= Mt. 25, 30). This is a characteristic of Matthew's Gospel, and Juvencus evidently follows his interest in the theology of the Last Judgement. Praecipitare, for instance, describes the headlong plunge into Hell of the hapless sinner and makes the picture more vivid.

Another rendition of an eschatological Matthean formula follows immediately: ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium.<sup>80</sup>

---

80. The form in the Itala and Afra is always ibi/illis erit fletus et stridor dentium.

Again the poet renders all occurrences of the formula, except for one in a section of the Gospel omitted in its entirety:

I 759-60 (= Mt. 8, 12)

Dentibus horrendum stridens fletumque frequentans  
Perpetuis poenam cruciatibus acta subibit.

III 14 (= Mt. 13, 42)

Dentibus his stridor semper fletusque perennis.

(Mt. 13, 50 is in the section Mt. 13, 43-53 omitted entirely.)

III 770-1 (= Mt. 22, 13)

Illis stridor erit vasti sine fine doloris,  
Et semper fletus.

IV 196 (= Mt. 24, 51)

Illum perpetuus fletus stridorque manebit.

IV 258 (= Mt. 25, 30)

Perpetuum fletus poenae stridore frequentet.

It is clear that this formula has special importance in the poet's perception of the meaning of Matthew's Gospel.

These are the warnings to the reader of eternal punishment in Hell if he does not repent and reform; the expression vasti sine fine doloris is particularly striking and captures brilliantly the eternal suffering of the consciousness of loss of Heaven.<sup>81</sup>

The final logion is of great significance. Multis nam saepe vocatis is a literal rendition of Multi autem

---

81. The phrase sine fine is more common in liturgy than semper; cf. the final words of the Preface before the dramatic Sanctus: ... hymnum gloriae tuae canimus sine fine dicentes: Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus ...

sunt vocati. The message is that many are called into the Kingdom by the preaching of the Gospel, perhaps indeed one could say that all the world has been called. The second part of the logion is significantly altered and elaborated from the source text.

Faucorum felix hominum selectio fiet.

This is an impressively classical line with which to close the third book of the poem. Juvenecus alters pauci vero electi with its emphatic verb to an abstract noun with verb, selectio fiet. The abstract adjective felix, which agrees with the noun selectio in an unusual abstract-describing-abstract formation, picks up the sequence of repetitions of laetus and its important phrase convivia laeta; it is clear that felix refers to the joy of the eucharistic wedding feast and in the context comes to mean almost "those fit for heaven". However the emphatic sedes of Paucorum reaffirms how few are fit for heaven; how few, that is, of those who are called by the gospel: only those who repent and live a new life in Christ will be the felix hominum selectio. A further point of doctrine here is that those who do repent and are saved do so because God has chosen them (selectio), not because of their own merit. Thus the structure of the line with its abstracts surrounding the central word hominum in itself suggests that God alone saves man.



This parable embraces vital doctrinal details but modern theologians are agreed that it is an illogical amalgam of two separate parables told by Jesus. The poet solves this problem by altering details and welds it into a homogenous unity through repetition of key words. The parable may be interpreted in several ways: on the literal level the social structure parallels the rigid Diocletianic hierarchy and seems to conceal a message to Constantine's nobles to submit to Christianity or suffer the inevitable and inelectable consequence of damnation; in terms of history the Jews' rejection of Christ prompted God to hand them over to the Romans and destroy Jerusalem (so it was thought), and this may be another hint to the aristocracy; on the spiritual level the parable represents the call to all men into the Kingdom and the mystic marriage in Heaven; on a moral plane the reader learns the necessity of repentance in his own life if he too is not to be cast out; and finally the parable explores the eucharistic feast of the Lamb and the Eternal Judgement on the Last Day in imagery of eschatology. Elements of all these ideas may be found in this version of the parable, and it is a tribute to the poet's craftsmanship that these different exegetic strands do not interfere with one another. The poet achieves a coherent story in both literal and allegorical terms in the longest and most complex of the three

parables. There is hardly a detail here that does not have some doctrinal significance and, as has been shown, Juvencus' interpretation is in broad agreement with the exegetic tradition represented by St. Jerome and Juvencus' near contemporary, St. Hilary of Poitiers.

e) Conclusion

In all three parables alteration has been discovered, and in each case an attempt at interpretation may be discerned. Anagogical, eschatological and other allegorical meanings have been found which are in broad agreement with the work of later exegetes. This does not mean that Juvencus was attempting systematic exegesis of the Biblical text as if he were writing a commentary; he was simply a poet exploiting the poetic possibilities of the mysteries of Christianity as revealed in the Bible, and putting them in a form that would appeal to his readers. His attempts to interpret these mysteries may be seen as a response to the difficulties of the Bible and the Gospel story. He adheres closely to the text of the Bible and tries to make sense of what he reads there. In III 703 he provides a coherent reading of the original text, which does not appear to make sense, by altering the details. He is also prepared to omit from his source when he considers it necessary; surprisingly, he omits Mt. 21, 42 with its reference to Christ's resurrection, presumably because it interferes

with the narrative of the parable and introduces a point of doctrine that is inapposite to it.

Before considering, in the next chapter, the details of Juvencus' techniques it is worth stating what should by now be clear: that Juvencus' primary reason for versifying the Biblical story is to bring out its poetic meaning as he conceives of it, not to exploit its possibilities for stylistic display. That these three parables emerge as fiercely anti-Semitic in tone is not an accident but the result of a deliberate policy on the part of the author, as Poinsette has shown. Similarly, in the parable of the Wedding Feast, it is no accident that a coherent interpretation is present. Despite the fact that no words of Christ are recorded explaining the parable, Juvencus uses every resource at his command to interpret it in the light of the Gospel call to the chosen to enter the Kingdom through repentance. This adaptation of pagan to Christian cannot fairly be called "dull and pedantic";<sup>82</sup> it is a genuinely successful attempt to express the majestic mysteries of Christianity in the language that was universally admitted to be the greatest achievement of the pagans, that of Virgil. It is a creative synthesis of Virgil's elegance with Christian themes.

---

82. Hudson-Williams, p. 11.

CHAPTER 3: THE MEANS OF ALTERATION

In the previous chapter it was demonstrated through detailed analysis of the passage III 692-773 that the poem is a version of the Gospel with significant alterations from the Biblical text. It was shown that in each of the three parables considered changes have been made. This chapter is devoted to systematic investigation of the paraphrastic procedures and techniques adopted in altering the source text: in terms of the alteration principle, the subject under consideration is "what are the actual means of alteration employed?" As usual the material for this analysis according to paraphrasis is drawn exclusively from the poem's parables, but not, of course, from any single parable or group of parables.

Roberts identifies and studies various forms of paraphrase according to ancient rhetorical theory in his second and third chapters (pp. 6-101). He finds that the literary paraphrase can be of two basic types:<sup>1</sup> the exegetical paraphrase with larger pretensions than those of a mere school exercise, and the literary work that uses paraphrastic technique to create an independent literary composition.<sup>2</sup> Characteristic of the first type is that it attempts

- 
1. Roberts, p. 70, has a useful table of all types of paraphrase with their characteristics.
  2. Roberts, pp. 89-90, notes that there were two other minor types of literary paraphrase, the fable paraphrase and and Greek iambic verse paraphrase.

to make the (usually difficult) content of the original intelligible to the reader through recasting it in a simpler form; that it may be read independently of the texts it paraphrases; that it is stylistically highly developed; and that it has an overtly interpretative purpose.<sup>3</sup> Many of these features may be found in Biblical epic but Roberts is right to locate Juvenecus and his successors in the second category (p. 88).

Clearly Themistius' paraphrases of Aristotle or Eutecnius' paraphrases of Nicander's Alexipharmaca and Theriaca written in LateAntiquity are significantly different from the Evangeliorum libri.<sup>4</sup> They are written in prose and are related in kind to the commentary, which seeks to make the original comprehensible to the reader through recasting it in an instantly intelligible form.<sup>5</sup> The other type of paraphrase makes claims to be regarded as a separate work of literature and is not primarily interpretative or exegetic.<sup>6</sup>

Many of the techniques used in the poem are recommended by paraphrastic theory. The three basic modes of the

---

3. Cf. Roberts, p. 85.

4. See Roberts, pp. 85-6.

5. See Roberts, p. 97, n. 71, for commentaries containing paraphrase.

6. Into this category falls the Biblical epic and a number of poetic versions of hagiographical texts both Christian and pagan (Roberts, p. 89 and p. 99 n. 86). Related to it is the verse paraphrase of a technical prose treatise, as practised by Nicander and Aratus in particular. "There is every reason to believe that the procedure these poets followed when recasting technical treatises in poetic form was not essentially different from the procedure followed by a writer of a literary paraphrase. The poems belong to the genre of didactic poetry, but their technique is that of the paraphrase". (Roberts, p. 90).

paraphrase are abbreviation, amplification and transposition (Quintilian I 9, 2 and X 5, 8; cf. Roberts, p. 115). These three principles provide a clear structure for investigation of the types of alteration employed by Juvencus. In broad terms, Roberts' analysis according to rhetorical theory will be followed, both because he provides useful insights and his is the only exhaustive treatment of the poem's elements of paraphrase; his argument is adopted with certain modifications.

Roberts considers the three basic procedures of the paraphrase, but he also takes account of two additional techniques (p. 115). One is the omission of passages from the original not considered essential to the narrative.

This however is a means of abbreviation recognised by paraphrastic theory (cf. Quintilian X 5, 4 effusa substringere), as Roberts himself says (p. 145, n. 78), and should not be treated separately as if it were a technique in its own right. It will be considered in the section on abbreviation. The other is the employment of very much more literal paraphrases than are the general rule, what Roberts refers to as "quasi-grammatical paraphrases" (p. 115) or "literal paraphrases" (p. 118). His unease with terminology here shows that the technique is no more than the inevitable effect produced by a stylistic reworking of an original: some passages will be very close to the language of the source,

and some will not, according to the whim of the author. The principle of alteration depends on that fact. However, fidelity to the original is not in itself interesting and does not constitute a distinct technique, though it does furnish the critic with a means of assessing the quality of the paraphrase. Roberts' instinct to pay attention to the closeness of the poem to the Gospel is sound; the reader should continually monitor the level of fidelity and ask why the poem diverges from or adheres to this source. Nevertheless what Roberts describes does not constitute a mode of paraphrase and is therefore not considered here. With these points in mind one can look at Juvencus' work according to the principles of ancient paraphrase.

a) Abbreviation

Juvencus' few omissions of a sizeable passage from Matthew are well known and do not affect the parables.<sup>7</sup> The one exception is the omission of the passage Mt. 13, 44-52, which includes the final three of a series of parables of the Kingdom. The section begins with the parable of the Sower and continues with the parables of the Tares, Mustard-seed and Leaven (Mt. 13, 4-35 = II 733-829) and the explanation of the parable of the Tares (= Mt. 13, 36-43 = III 1-16). In the Gospel text Jesus follows his

---

7. Widmann, pp. 24-32, lists all omissions of one or more verses.

explanation of the Tares parable with the parables of the Treasure, the Pearl and the Seine-net, and a conclusion to the whole discourse including a parabolic comparison:

13, 52: Ideo omnis scriba doctus in regno caelorum  
similis est homini patri familias, qui proferet de  
thesauro suo nova et vetera.

Evidently this saying presents problems of meaning both in itself and in its position as a summation of the whole section. H. Benedict Green gives the following schema for this passage (pp. 130-1):

The scene set: vv. 1-3

The model demonstrated: (1) the Sower: vv. 4-9

The model justified: purpose of parabolic teaching: vv. 10-7

The model explained: interpretation of the Sower: vv. 18-23

The model extended: interpretation of the Sower:

(2) the Tares: vv. 24-30

(3) the Mustard-seed: vv. 31-2

(4) the Leaven: vv. 33

Break, with changes of audience: vv. 34-6

The Tares interpreted as a parable of the end: vv. 37-43.

Three parables of the end:

(5) the Treasure: vv. 44-5

(6) the Pearl: v. 46

(7) the Seine-net (with interpretation): vv. 47-50

Conclusion: things new and old: vv. 51-2



It is evident from this that the passage Juvencus omits consists of three eschatological parables and the conclusion to the whole section. Roberts (p. 115) states that this is an example of omission to avoid repetition, but that is by no means clear. Juvencus is not normally shy of repetition and is at pains to stress the theme of eschatology in Matthew, as has been observed in the previous chapter. Finally there is not even much repetition here. The Seine-net parable does not add anything to the ideas put forward in the Tares, though it does repeat in a sketchy fashion the situation of the separation by the angels. The parables of the Treasure and the Pearl do make a similar point, but it is not the same point as is made by the earlier pair, the Mustard-seed and the Leaven. If repetition were Juvencus' criterion, he would omit the Leaven as well as the Pearl and the Seine-net, but not the Treasure.

The separation at the end of the age is a major theme in Juvencus' poem. The first direct statement of it is in Jesus' words explaining the Tares parable at the beginning of Bk. III (1-16) though it is implied in Juvencus' version of the parable itself (II 795-811). The punishment of the damned also completes Bk. III with the parables of the Tenants in the Vineyard (III 712-36) and the Wedding Feast (III 737-73). In Bk. IV it is present even more strongly in the parable of the Ten Virgins, the parable of the Talents, and

the Sheep and the Goats parable of the Last Judgement (IV 197-305). The latter passage is followed immediately by the raising of Lazarus and the Passion. There is a noticeable growth in the importance of and emphasis on this theme from its first appearance in the Tares.

Whether the omission of Mt. 13, 44-52 affects the progress of this theme is difficult to say. It cannot be stated with any confidence what was in the mind of an author who was writing c. A.D. 330. It is at least possible, however, that Juvencus thought that the parable of the Seine-net (Mt. 13, 47-50) was too weak a restatement of the theme and detracted from the total effect. The omission of the conclusion to Christ's teaching (Mt. 13, 51-2) could then be explained in a similar way. The comparison of a scribe who is learned in the Kingdom to a householder who brings from his treasure-chest the new and the old does not make as clear and memorable an ending to Christ's words as

Dentibus his stridor semper fletusque perennis,  
 15 Secretisque piis veniet lux aurea vitae,  
 Sedibus ut caeli vibrantur lumina solis. (III 14-16)

The poet simply omitted the rest of Christ's speech to let these words stand as a conclusion to the passage and a warning to the reader.

The largest omission of a passage of more than one verse containing a parable, apart from these three major parables, is Mt. 11, 16-17 (after II 547). This minor

parable<sup>8</sup> and interpretation is part of the large omitted passage Mt. 11, 16-24.

Mt. 11, 16: Cui autem similem aestimabo generationem istam? Similis est pueris sedentibus in foro et clamantibus ad invicem (17) et dicentes: Cantavimus vobis et non saltastis; lamentavimus vobis et non planxistis. (18) Venit enim Iohannes neque manducans neque bibens et dicunt: Daemonium habet. (19) Venit filius hominis manducans et bibens et dicunt: Ecce homo vorax et potator vini, publicanorum et peccatorum amicus. Et iustificata est sapientia a filiis suis.

This omission (together with 5 others in Bk. II) is explained by de Wit (p. 9) in the following way:

Fortasse noster eos non vertit, ne nimis multis vocabulis diceret Iesum iam in terras venisse neque tamen homines paratos fuisse, ut in Eum crederunt, praesertim cum non Iudaeorum causa haec scripserit, sed ad omnes homines convertendos.

Poinsotte (p. 102) considers the omission as an example of Juvenius' typical elimination of Palestinian scenes and scenery. The minor parable of the Children in the Marketplace can only be elucidated by knowledge of the children's game of "weddings and funerals" (H. Benedict Green, p. 117; Fenton, p. 181). The point of the saying is that the children who shout the remarks in v. 17 to each other are sitting down (sedentibus), not prepared to take part actively but only to demand participation from the others; they blame the others for spoiling the game (by not joining in) that they themselves had never intended to join. Equally, this

---

8. Cf. Widmann, p. 27.

generation never meant to take the kingdom seriously; they will not repent with John, nor rejoice with Jesus, but find fault with both for perversely contrary reasons. The omission is probably partly because of the reference to the Jewish wedding-game and funeral-game, but it is worth noting the effect it generates.

Lex omnis summam Baptistae ad tempora cepit  
 540 Atque profetarum finis concluditur idem.  
 Si vultis volucris penetralia noscere saeculi,  
 Corpus Iohannis felix habitabile sumpsit  
 545 Helias, quondam quem, turbine missa corusco  
 Flammipedum rapuit simulatio quadriugorum.  
 Audiatur haec dictis pandens vitalibus aures.  
 Nunc tibi confiteor, genitor, cui gloria servit  
 Fulgentis caeli et terrarum frugiferentum,  
 550 Celasti nunc quod sapientibus ista superbis  
 Parvulaque infantum vis haec comprehendere corda.  
 (II 541-51)

The first two lines of this passage are a typical Juvenecan rendition of Mt. 11, 13: Omnis enim propheta et lex usque ad Iohannem prophetaverunt. There is nothing startling so far, but the next four verses (543-6) are a remarkable expansion of the Biblical text; Mt. 11, 14: Et si vultis scire: Ipse est Helias, qui venturus est. Arevalo (ad loc.) notes the large addition employing the idea of the metempsychosis of Elijah into John the Baptist's body, an idea often associated with this passage of scripture (cf. Jerome on this passage, In Math. II 116-3).<sup>9</sup> Juvenecus adds three complete verses to his source (de Wit, ad loc.). He then renders the formula in Mt. 11, 15: qui habet aures audiendi, audiat, as :

---

9. On these lines see Roberts, pp. 124-5; Herzog p. 137 n. 310; Widmann pp. 40-1. Roberts, p. 152 n. 136 compares the language of this and the other addition about Elijah, III 265-7.

Audiat haec dictis pandens vitalibus aures.<sup>10</sup>

After the formula however, he omits nine verses of his source and continues with Christ's prayer of thanksgiving to the Father that the things which have been hidden from the wise have been revealed to children; Mt. 11, 25: Confiteor tibi, pater Domine caeli et terrae, qui abscondisti haec a sapientibus et prudentibus et revelasti ea parvulis. As was pointed out above ( pp. 58-60) Juvencus makes ista in l. 550 (the things which have been hidden from the wise) refer not to the miracles wrought in Chorazin, etc., (Mt. 11, 21-24) but the mystery of Elijah entering John's living body (Corpus Iohannis felix habitabile sumpsit / Helias, 544-5). Though the omission of Mt. 11, 16-19 may partly be because Juvencus did not understand the reference to Jewish children's games and Mt. 11, 20-24 is omitted because it refers to Palestinian towns,<sup>11</sup> the effect is to alter the meaning of the passage. Juvencus' version strongly emphasises his own additional lines about Elijah: the omission makes the message simpler to understand.

Another parabolic logion omitted is the Budding Figtree minor parable.

Mt. ~~27~~<sup>4</sup>, 32: A fici autem arbore discite parabolam, cum iam ramus eius tener fuerit et folia nascuntur, scitis, quia prope est aestas. (33) Ita et vos, cum videtis haec omnia fieri, scitote, quia prope est in ianuis.

---

10. Cf. II 754 (= Mt. 13, 9) audiat haec, aures mentis qui gestat apertas but the formula in Mt. 13, 43 (which should be after III 16) is displaced to II 812, cordis si panditis aures.

11. On the omission of toponyms, see Poinssotte, pp. 40-3.

Both these verses are omitted by Juvencus (after IV 158) although the parable is in a section about the signs of the Day of Judgement.<sup>12</sup> It is the first of a sequence of seven parables of warning and expresses the inevitability of the end when the signs that Jesus has just mentioned appear (cf. H. Benedict Green, p. 202). The other parables are all rendered by Juvencus; this omission is uncharacteristic and surprising.

The Lamp and Bushel minor parable consists of just one verse, and comes in a cluster of short images. The disciples are compared with salt and then with light. The Lamp and Bushel comparison is the second of two illustrations of the light image in the Gospel but Juvencus expresses the passage about light thus:

Vos estis mundi clarum (ne abscondite) lumen.  
 Nam quis praecelsis inpostam rupibus urbem  
 Occultare queat? Vestrum sic lumen ad omnes  
 480 Perveniat rerumque decus sub luce serena  
 Ponatur. (I 477-81)

The Lamp (Mt. 5, 15) is omitted after the city on the hill.<sup>13</sup> It has not been remarked, however, that although the minor parable as such is omitted, the point of it is suggested in the parenthesis added to l. 477, ne abscondite, referring to lumen. Juvencus has hit upon an ingenious and

12. Cf. Widmann, p. 31.

13. Cf. Widmann, p. 25: de Wit, ad. loc.

economical way of rendering in two words the whole of Mt. 5, 15: neque accendunt lucernam et ponunt eam sub modio, sed supra candelabrum, ut luceat omnibus, qui in domo sunt.

This avoidance of the figurative language of a parable is unusual. Poinssotte's (p. 105) suggestion that the candlestick is omitted because it brings with it associations of an Eastern civilisation may explain why the poet practises such drastic compression.

The greater number of examples of abbreviation consists in omissions of part or parts of a verse. It has been shown that Juvencus is prepared to omit details of the Gospel text if he thinks it necessary. In the parable of the Wedding Feast, for example, the following passage is found:

Mt, 22, 4: Iterum misit alios servos dicens: Dicitte invitatis: Ecce prandium meum paravi, tauri et saginata occisa sunt et omnia parata sunt, venite ad nuptias.

Post alios mittit, sese largissima cuncta  
Magnificasque dapes, convivium laeta parasse. (III 742-3)

The recasting of the whole into indirect speech allows considerable abbreviation. The details tauri et saginata occisa sunt are completely excised, presumably because they refer to Jewish wedding customs and because the inclusion of these literal details would detract from the allegory of the Eucharist (see above, p. 112). Such details are not vital to the narrative.<sup>14</sup>

---

14. Cf. Nestler, p. 61.

In the Biblical parable of the Leaven the actual amount of yeast is specified:

Mt. 13, 33: Simile est regnum caelorum fermento, quod acceptum mulier abscondit in farinam mensuris tribus, donec fermentatum est totum.

820 Fermento par est munus caeleste salubri,  
 Quod magna condit mulier sub mole farinae,  
 Illa dehinc modico fermenti mixta calore  
 Conducto, unius coalescit corpore massae.  
 (II 820-3)

Juvencus omits the exact amount of flour and substitutes generalised words. The large amount of flour is expressed by magna ... mole ... massae in contrast to modico, the small amount of yeast. The effect of this omission of the "three measures to one" (mensuris tribus) is to exaggerate the amount of flour leavened by the tiny amount of yeast; this stands for the universal transformation that the Kingdom will bring about. Juvencus' version is more allegorical and is also a better expression than the Itala of the Greek text σάτα τριὰς, which is both an exact amount and a very large quantity.

Roberts (p. 116) considers the parable of the Ten Virgins from the standpoint of omission of details (Mt. 25, 1-13 = IV 197-226). He finds three small details which are not explicitly stated by Juvencus. The passages are the following:

Mt. 25, 4: Prudentes vero acceperunt oleum in vasis suis cum lampadilibus suis.

Sed sapiens pars illa ...  
 sortere simul curabat olivum. (202-3).



Roberts comments that the phrase is omitted as an insignificant detail but in truth it is implied by portare ... olivum.

The oil must be carried in a vessel of some sort; the use of in vasis suis or even cum lampadibus suis would distract the reader's attention from the important fact that the wise carry oil (and the stupid are not that prudent).

Mt. 25, 8: Fatuae autem sapientibus dixerunt: Date nobis de oleo vestro, quia lampades nostrae exinguntur.

Num stolidae rogitant olei sibi cedere partem,  
Prudentes secum quod tunc gestare videbant. \*(212-3)

Roberts assumes that the omission of the fact that the foolish virgins' lamps had gone out is because it is of little importance and may be inferred from the context in any case. A close reading of Juvenecus' version, however, shows that he refers to the lights as taedae (ll. 201, 209, 230) "torches", never as "lamps". Moreover the description of the virgins being awakened and feverishly making last-minute preparations for the welcome of the groom implies that the torches were not already lit and set in position. The bridesmaids have to light the torches using the oil:

210 Surgere virginibus properatum, et lumina taedis  
Instruere et flammam pingui componere olivo. (210-1)

It seems that the poet has visualised not lamps burning all night until they run out of fuel but torches lit at the announcement of the imminent arrival of the bridegroom.

Mt. 25, 9: Responderunt prudentes dicentes: ...  
ite potius ad vendentes et emite vobis. (10) Dum eunt emere, venit sponsus ...

Tum pergunt stultae, ut liquidum mercentur olivum. (217)

It is true that the wise virgins' speech does not include the advice to go out and buy some oil, as Roberts points out; nonetheless this idea is implied in l. 217. It is not really that a detail is omitted, rather that the text is abbreviated.

b) Amplification

Juvenius' poem is particularly rich in periphrases and pleonastic expressions. The parables as individual stories within the poem are particularly elaborated to create the impression of copia verborum, which was the style favoured by contemporary taste. The parable of the Mustard-seed is a suitable example to illustrate some of the characteristic techniques employed by Juvenius.

Mt. 13, 31: Simile est regnum caelorum grano sinapis, quod accipiens homo seminavit in agrum suum, (32) quod minimum quidem est omnibus seminibus, cum autem creverit, maius fit omnibus holeribus et fit arbor talis, ita ut volucres caeli veniant et habitent in ramis eius.

Haut aliter simile est, cordis si panditis aures,  
 Praeparvi grano regnum caeleste sinapis,  
 Quod proprio insinuans disponit cultor agello  
 815 Seminibusque illud minus omnibus esse virentum  
 Creditur; at iusti mox incrementa viroris  
 Sumpserit, erecto transcendit vertice cunctas  
 Agrorum fruges, ramis ut plumea turba  
 Conludat possitque umbras habitare virentes.  
 (II 812-9)

Juvenius frequently makes use of synonymous or nearly synonymous expressions. This is a conventional aspect of the rhetorical paraphrase.<sup>15</sup> In the present passage the phrase seminibus ... virentum (815) is constructed of near synonyms.

---

15. Cf. Quintilian X 1, 7.

this "genitive of identity" is a common feature in Juvencus, especially where the genitive depends on an abstract noun (incrementa viroris, 816, is an example). Another characteristic procedure is the doubling of verbs found in l. 814. The simple verb seminavit of the source text is replaced by two verbs insinuans and disponit both referring to the noun phrase proprio ... agello. In this instance Juvencus appears to be imitating the syntax of the original by using a main verb and a dependent present participle.

There are other circumlocutions in this passage, iusti ... incrementa viroris/sumpsit (for crescit), plumea turba (for volucres) and erecto transcendit vertice (for maius fit). Particularly interesting is the end of the parable with its doubling of verbs:

ramis ut plumea turba  
Conludat possitque umbras habitare virentes. (818-9)

Juvencus makes two clauses out of one. It is also worth noting that virentes repeats virentum (815) and so associates the shade with the tiny seed from which it has grown.

There are hints of interpretation in the use of adjectives. Praeparvi grano ... sinapis with its transferred epithet emphasises the smallness of the seed (= beginnings of the kingdom) compared with its magnitude and its fruition. The adjective proprio applied to agello makes the reader consider who the cultor is. The point of the parable, as with the parable of the Tares which has just preceded it (proprio ... ruri), is that this world is God's; He is the great creator who sows the seeds of salvation in His land.

Iustus is at first sight an unusual word to describe viror; indeed the phrase iusti ... incrementa viroris is somewhat strange. This use of iustus, however, is the same as is found a few lines further on in the explanation of the parable of the Tares (III 1-16), where it means good men: Mt. 13, 38: bonum vero semen, hi sunt filii regni, which Juvencus renders thus: atque homines puro pro semine iustos (III 6). It is his most common word expressing goodness (he uses it 58 times in the poem); the phrase Iustus Iohannes is his name for John the Baptist (used at the beginning of a line in II 510; III 39, 263 and 708). It may even be said that iustus virtually means "Christian". Iustus seems at this point to show that for the kingdom to come there must be Christian spiritual growth.

The images of verdure in viroris and virentes, then, are images of burgeoning and wholesomeness. This is picked up by the harvest imagery of cunctas/Agrorum fruges. Goodness will bear fruit eventually. All these details are added by Juvencus to express his interpretation of the parable.

Longer expansions of an interpretative nature are uncommon in Juvencus. The addition of three verses about Elijah at II 544-6 has been noted above, but the only (minor) parable which involves a large addition to the source is that of the Two Ways, which combines interpretative with poetic expansion. Roberts (pp. 125-6) considers the passage in detail and his analysis raises several interesting points.

Mt. 7, 13: Intrate per angustam portam: quam lata et spatiosa est via, quae ducit ad perditionem, et multi sunt, qui intrant per eam; (14) quam angusta porta et arcta est via, quae ducit ad vitam, et pauci sunt, qui inveniunt eam.

Ite per angustam, iusti, super aethera portam.  
 680 Quam lata et spatiosa via est, quae limite laevo  
 Praeruptum convolvit iter caligine mortis,  
 Innumeraeque illam penetrant per prona catervae!  
 Vitalis vastis stipatur semita saxi,  
 Celsaque vix paucos ducit per scrupea virtus.  
 685 At si quos nimium fallax inlexque malorum  
 Planities suasit deformi lubrica lapsu,  
 Adripit hos pronosque trahit velut impetus ænis,  
 Aut alacer sonipes ruptis effrenus habenis.  
 Aut rectoris egens ventosa per aequora puppis.  
 (I 679-89)

The idea of two ways, one leading to life and the other to death, seems to have been a commonplace in Jewish teaching. Ultimately it derives from Deut. 30, 15: Considera quod hodie proposuerim in conspectu tuo, vitam et bonum, et a contrario mortem et malum; similarly Jer. 21, 8: Ecce do coram vobis viam vitae, et viam mortis (Fenton, p. 112). Juvencus follows the textual tradition of the a-type text of the Itala. In v. 13 he takes the text as above rather than the quia lata porta et spatiosa via ... of half the Itala texts and Jerome's Vulgate (with the support of most Greek texts). The result is that he omits any reference to the gate in ll. 683-4, leaving ite per angustam ... portam as the sole reference to it; his interest is focussed on the two ways.

Juvencus begins with a rather close paraphrase of his source, as Roberts (p. 126) has noted. The correspondence of vocabulary in 679-80 is unusual.



The same contrast between the light of life and the dark of death underlies the use of vitalis here, but vitalis also implies eternal rather than mortal life and hence the antithesis between eternal life and eternal death (in Hell).<sup>17</sup>

Pronus often has the association of succumbing to sin (cf. 687 in this passage; Roberts, p. 126). The last five lines of the passage, 685-9, are the largest addition in the poem (Kievits, ad loc.) and present a poetic and interpretative amplification of the parable. The insertion of this passage explicitly contrasts fallax inlexque malorum, the morality of the easy path, with virtus, l. 684, the morality of the rocky path. The allegory is resolved and the moral content of the parable is made clear by the addition. The reader is to choose which path he will take, that to Heaven or that to Hell.<sup>18</sup>

The passage develops the image of 681, Praeruptum convolvit iter. The man who chooses the broad and level path of sin, planities, rather than celsa ... per scrupea virtus, the hard but virtuous path, is starting on the slippery slide to Hell, deformi lubrica lapsu. The idea is made even more vivid by the classical triple simile in the form of a tricolon linked by anaphora (Aut ... Aut ...). Vidmann (pp. 41-42) has shown that language of these similes is highly Virgilian: sonipes, 689 (for equus) occurs in

---

17. Roberts, p. 126; also p. 152 n. 138 for vitalis of eternal life.

18. Cf. Roberts, p. 126.

Aen. XI 600 and ventosa per aequora, 689, occurs in the same sedes in Georg. I 208 and Aen. VI 335 with ruptis ... habenis, 688, we can compare Aen. XI 600 pressis ... habentis. Aut alacer sonipes ruptis effrenus habenis then was probably suggested by Aen. XI 600, insultans sonipes et pressis pugnat habenis. The point of comparison is that the headlong, uncontrolled downward slide to Hell is like a river in flood (impetus), or a runaway horse (the semi-pleonastic alacer ... ruptis effrenus habenis with a quibble on effrenus = alacer and effrenus = ruptis ... habenis), or a storm-tossed ship with no-one at the helm (Menoetes is rectorem nauis, Aen. V 161). In each simile there is a sense of speed and danger as well as of ungovernability; even impetus amnis makes us think of the speed, danger and uncontrollable nature of a river current.

There are other linking features apart from the imagery. The structure of the Gospel text is that of parallelismus, the parallelism of antithesis and contrast. The allegorical sense of the parable is made explicit in the two phrases quae ducit ad perditionem (7, 13) and quae ducit ad vitam (7, 14). Juvencus does not attempt to copy this pattern, but he does use one antithesis to bind his version of the parable together and bring out this allegory. He takes the antithesis angustam: lata et spatiosa from his source; the antitheses celsa: planities and virtus: fallax inlexque malorum are Juvencus' own, making clear the literal and the moral choices respectively.



Alliteration is another device used here to reflect the structure of the original. The most striking example is the golden line, 683:

Vitalis vastis stipatur semita saxis.

The alliteration in juxtaposition counterpoints the grammatical agreements in a most remarkable way, as Roberts has noted (p. 127). Semita is linked grammatically to vitalis, saxis to vastis, with stipatur poised between, but in terms of alliteration vitalis and vastis are linked as are semita and saxis.

The symmetry is left unperfected however by the alliteration of semita and saxis with stipatur. For the Christian this line is the important one in the parable. Allied with this are several alliterative pairings: angustam ... aethera (679), lata ... limite laevo (680), convolvit ... caligine (681), penetrant per prona (680), fallax inlexque (686), lubrica lapsu (687). This is an unusual amount of alliteration in a passage of this length.<sup>19</sup> Antithesis and pairing to a remarkable degree - this is surely Juvencus' response to the rigid parallelismus of the original.

c) Transposition

The technique of substituting one of the modes of the sentence for another is a characteristic of paraphrase (Roberts, pp. 128-9). Juvencus does not practise the

---

19. Hansson, p. 82 n. 84, gives figures showing how close Juvencus is to Virgil.

technique very much, especially in the parables. The most frequent employment of it is in replacing a question in the source with a direct statement, as in the minor parable of the Sheep in a Pit.

Mt. 12, 11: Qui ex vobis habet ovem unam, et ceciderit in foveam sabbatis, non tenebit eam levabit?  
 (12) Quanto magis melior est homo ove. Itaque licet sabbatis benefacere?

Christus ad haec: "Foveam si forte pecuscula vestra  
 590 Inciderint, certe transibitis otia legis  
 Et pecus abrupto tolletis vile profundo.  
 Quanto igitur nobis hominum curatio maior  
 Ad benefacta animos tollens accendere debet!  
 (II 589-94)

The whole passage is more forceful than the original. The rhetorical questions are dropped (totally in the case of the second) for direct statement. Thus there is great exclamatory emphasis on the v. 12 point. The reverse technique, however, is employed - interrogative or exclamatory modes are substituted for statements. Thus Non potest civitas abscondi supra montem posita (Mt. 5, 14) becomes Nam quis praecelsis in postam rupibus urbem/Occultare queat? (I 478-9). There is a strong emotive effect here, as there is in the exclamatory mode; in the minor parable of the Two Ways just considered Mt. 7, 13 ... portam; quam lata et spatiosa via, quae ducit ... may be transposed into this mode with the exclamatory quam:

680 Quam lata et spatiosa via est, quae limite laevo  
 Praeruptum convolvit iter caligine mortis,  
 Innumeraeque illam penetrant per prona catervae!  
 (I 680-2)

It is not clear that the Biblical quam is exclamatory since many texts (including Jerome's Vulgate) have quia;

so it is possible that there is a change of mode. Equally of course it may have been "misinterpreted". The poet has certainly brought out the potential of this passage whether the mode alters or not.

A similar procedure is the change of direct to indirect speech, a large feature of the work.<sup>20</sup> The inverse procedure, the replacement of indirect speech by direct speech, occurs only once in III 288-95 (= Mt. 16, 21) where Jesus first tells the disciples about His Passion and Resurrection; hence a very important passage but not one that falls within the compass of this study. It has already been observed (above, ch. 2) how in the parable of the Wedding Feast (Mt. 22, 2-14 = III 737-73) all the direct speech is removed except for one speech by the king rejecting the guests and calling in those who are willing to come (vv. 8-9 = ll. 752-7), obviously the allegorical crux of the parable. The rest of the direct speech is omitted to abbreviate and "tidy up" the style. The section towards the end where the king encounters the man who is incorrectly dressed will serve to illustrate this.

Mt. 21, 12: Et (rex) ait illi: Amice, quomodo hoc venisti non habens vestem nuptialem? At ille obmutuit. (13) Tunc dixit rex ministris: Tollite illum pedibus et manibus et mittite in tenebras exteriores.

765 Isque ubi regalis sermonis pondere causas  
Reddere pro vestis maculis et labe iubetur,  
Oppresso tacuit non puri pectoris ore

---

20. Widmann, pp. 51-55; Herzog, pp. 128-30; Roberts pp. 129-30.

Et tum conversus famulis rex praecipit illum  
 Conexis manibus pedibusque et corpore toto  
 770 In tenebras raptum mox praecipitare profundas.  
 (III 765-70)

This cannot be called an especially brief version of the encounter - which would probably not be appropriate to a story that involves such important Christian themes. But the verbal abundance of phrases such as Regalis ser-  
 monis pondere, pro vestis maculis et labe, / Oppresso tacuit ... ore and non puri pectoris is made possible only by the tightness inherent in the direct speech structure. The lack of fussiness in getting over both the fact that the king spoke, and the actual words he spoke, draws attention to Juvencus' additions, the things he is really interested in, such as non puri pectoris and the punishment of the man. Juvencus here is abbreviating overall while at the same time he is amplifying details likely to be morally and spiritually instructive to his reader.

Often Juvencus employs a summarising style, which Roberts equates with the rhetorical figure of percursio (p. 130). In the parable of the Workers in the Vineyard, for example, the Biblical text is not at its most economical, especially after the verbal repetition of hiring the labourers at different hours of the day. The end of the parable is expressed in the following language:

Mt. 20, 8: Cum sero autem factum esset, dicit dominus vineae procuratori suo: voca operarios et redde illis mercedem incipiens a novissimis usque ad primos.  
 (9) Cum venissent ergo, qui circa undecimam horam venerant, acceperunt singulos denarios. (10) Venientes

autem et primi arbitrati sunt, quod plus essent  
 accepturi, acceperunt autem et ipsi singulos denarios.  
 (11) Et accipientes murmuraverunt adversus patrem  
 familias (12) dicentes: Hi novissimi una hora fec-  
 erunt et pares illos nobis fecisti, qui portavimus  
 pondus diei et aestus. (13) At ille respondens uni  
 eorum dixit: Amice, non facio tibi iniuriam. Nonne  
 ex denario convenisti mecum? (14) Tolle quod tuum  
 est et vade, volo autem et huic novissimo dare sicut et  
 tibi. (15) Aut non licet mihi facere quod volo? An  
 oculus tuus nequa est, quia ego bonus sum?

Juvencus' version of this is very much simpler. He  
 gives the bare framework of the narrative:

Sed vespere protinus orto

570 Praecipit, ut cuncti caperent mercedis honorem  
 Aequalique omnes portarent praemia nummo.  
 Tunc manus illa virum, prima quae luce laborem  
 Sustulerat factisque diem toleraverat aequum,  
 Indignans secum tali cum murure fatur:

575 'Iniustum est, istis similem nos quaerere nummum,  
 Ultima quos operis sero coniunxerat hora.'  
 Tum dominus ruris sedato pectore fatur:  
 'Inlibata tibi mercedis portio salvae  
 Redditur et pacti servantur iura fidelis.

580 Istis de nostro liceat concedere tantum,  
 Extima quos operis glomeravit portio ruri.  
 (III 569-81)

The detail of the last being first, the fact that all were  
 given one denarius, the procurator, and the lord's claim  
 that he is not injuring the grumblers are all omitted.  
 What Juvencus does is to stress the interpretative and  
 moral aspects of the story: the equality of the amount  
 given to the workers (571, 575), the lateness of the arrival  
 of the last arrivals (576), the inequality of the work  
 done (573, 575), and the fact that the money is given by  
 the grace of the owner (580-1). These details all have  
 allegorical meanings for the Christian. Consequently, it

may be seen that in this passage two tendencies interact:

the tendency to abbreviate the narrative context of the Biblical original and the tendency to amplify what in that bare framework is susceptible to poetic or moralising elaboration.

(Roberts, p. 131)

These two tendencies can be seen in action throughout the poem, with the latter dominating, so that a passage such as this is a little unusual. Among Juvencus' successors narrative abbreviation, which is then expanded, is more characteristic and common.

A major problem for the poet consisted in the numerous short speeches of the Gospels. There was obvious danger of disrupting the epic narrative if he followed the text and rendered literally the short speech. Moreover the continual repetition of verbs of saying was ugly according to classical principles of brevitas. It has been seen that indirect speech afforded a solution by means of incorporating the short speeches and verbs of saying into the narrative. Another possibility was to conflate two or more speeches by a person into a single speech. A further possibility was to include details from one person's speech in the speech of another.<sup>21</sup>

The best example of these techniques being used together is in Juvencus' version of the parable of the Tares.<sup>22</sup> His transpositions create a more economical narrative.

---

21. Yet another solution was to include narrative details in a person's speech, but this technique does not appear to be employed in any of the parables; cf. Roberts, p. 132.

22. Cf. Widmann, pp. 48-8; Nestler, pp. 60-1; Kievits, p. 9; Roberts, pp. 132-3.

Mt. 13, 27: Accesserunt autem servi patris familias et dixerunt ei: Domine, nonne bonum semen seminasti in agro tuo? Unde ergo habet zizania? (28) Et ait illis: Inimicus homo hoc fecit. Dicunt ei servi: Vis, imus et colligimus ea? (29) At ait illis: Non, ne forte colligentes zizania eradicetis simul et triticum. (30) Sed sinite utraque crescere usque ad messem ...

Tum domino famuli mirantes talia fantur:  
 'Nonne bonum terrae semen per terga dedisti?  
 Unde igitur lolio turpi tua rura gravantur?  
 Sed iam, si iubeas, messem purgabimus omnem,  
 805 Triticeusque nitor selecta sorde nitebit'.<sup>23</sup>  
 Tum dominus miti contra sermone profatur:  
 'Hic dolus est, inimice, tuus, sed farra sinamus  
 Crescere cum lolio ...

(II 801-8)

In the original the servants and the master have two speeches each (vv. 28 and 29, 29 and 30 respectively). Juvencus conflates each pair into one, by delaying the lord's first speech until after the material from the second speech by the servants. Lines 802-3 correspond to the servants' first speech and 804-5 to their second; 807 to the masters' first speech and 807ff to his second. Line 805, spoken by the servants, is constructed by Juvencus from material suggested by the master's second speech. The result is that a more economical sequence of speeches is found, and the disjointedness caused by rapid alternation of speaker is avoided. The transpositions rationalise the Biblical narrative.

---

23. Alternatives here are resistet, nitescet; cf. Hansson, p. 101.

One further feature that requires brief comment is the Biblical parallelismus membrorum.<sup>24</sup> It has been observed above how Juvencus responds to it in the minor parable of the Two Ways, not by reproducing it exactly but by creating his own antitheses and contrasts. In the parables he does not seem to follow the symmetry of the Gospel; he prefers instead rather more classical techniques of narrative. This is characteristic of Juvencus' approach to his text at all times. The means of alteration conform with classical rhetorical theory; whatever is foreign to the rules of paraphrase is omitted.

Now that the principle of alteration has been established and the techniques of alteration have been discussed, it is possible to follow the "alteration implies interpretation" principle further. In the next five chapters reasons for changes in the parables are suggested and studied in detail. The poem is evidently not just a simple paraphrase, so that chapters four and five study alteration from the point of view of the Biblical epic: the first investigates epic features exhibited in the parables; and the second attempts to define more closely the poem's stance with regard to the Biblical source texts, as revealed in the language of these narratives. Subsequent chapters consider the different allegorical and anagogical levels of meaning that may be identified in Juvencus' parables.

---

24. Cf. Widmann, pp. 36-38; Herzog, p. 112 n. 232; Roberts, pp. 131-2.



CHAPTER 4: JUVENCUS AND EPIC

The Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard

Alteration has been identified in the parables of the poem, and some tentative conclusions about the frequency and meaning of such changes have been formed in Chapter Two. In Chapter Three the paraphrastic modes and techniques of alteration were considered in detail. In this chapter the composition of the poem according to the dictates of the epic genre is shown to necessitate alteration in the source text parables; in the following one the importance of the Biblical language in the evolution of the new genre is demonstrated.

Even the detractors of the poem admit that it follows the stylistic practice of Virgil to a remarkable extent (for example, Anne Stanislaus, "The Scriptures in Hexameter", CW 32 (1938), p. 99, concluded that the "verses are mere imitations of Virgil"). Indeed, in the praefatio the poem is carefully located in the epic tradition of Homer and Virgil:

Sed tamen innumeros homines sublimia facta  
 Et virtutis honos in tempora longa frequentant,  
 Adcumulant quorum famam laudesque poetae.  
 Hos celsi cantus, Smyrnae de fonte fluentes,  
 10 Illos Minciadae celebrat dulcedo Maronis.  
(pr. 6-10)

The sublimia facta/Et virtutis honos of innumeros homines are clearly those of the heroes and demi-gods of classical

epic; it is their famam laudesque that poets such as Homer and Virgil have increased and made all but immortal. Even as the "lies" of pagan epic are rejected, the glory a Virgil has rightly attained is emphasised:

15 Quod si tam longam meruerunt carmina famam,  
 Quae veterum gestis hominum mendacia nectunt,  
 Nobis certa fides aeternae in saecula laudis  
 Immortale decus tribuet meritumque rependet.  
 (pr, 15-8)

Juvencus' fame will be greater, indeed immortal, only because his epic has the advantage that the poems of the pagans did not have, that of singing the deeds of Christ while He was on this earth:

Nam mihi carmen erit Christi vitalia gesta,  
 20 Divinum populis falsi sine crimine donum.  
 (pr. 19-20)

It is the content of pagan epic that is at fault (mendacia, pr. 16), not the form. By referring to the tradition of pagan epic, the poet is announcing his chosen genre for this new Christian theme. The Evangeliorum Libri IV will attempt to improve upon Virgil by taking as its subject the ultimate truth of Christi vitalia gesta. It hardly needs to be added that Juvencus therefore set out to write not a didactic work in hexameter but a full-blown Christian epic narrative poem (see Herzog, pp. 102-5).

In the epilogue Juvencus further implies that he intended this poem to adorn the Gospel truth with the most perfect style achievable in this sublunary world:

Has mea mens fidei vires sanctique timoris  
 Cepit et in tantum lucet mihi gratia Christi,  
 Versibus ut nostris divinae gloria legis  
 805 Ornamenta libens caperet terrestria linguae.  
 (IV 802-5)

In view of what he says in the praefatio and his general practice in imitating Virgil, it can be stated with confidence that "terrestrial ornaments of language" refers to the high style of classical epic. This was a natural choice of form. Juvencus and his fellow Biblical epicists regarded Virgil with particular veneration: when attempting to express "the glory of the divine law" no other poetic model was conceivable. The antithesis divina gloria legis: ornamenta ... terrestria linguae shows clearly that Juvencus intended to express God's plan for His Creation as revealed in the earthly deeds of His Son (content) in an epic narrative poem subjected to the utmost embellishments of human rhetoric, the epic "Virgilian" style as the early fourth century understood it (form).

The style adopted is the best that this world can boast, because the subject is that greatest of all subjects, the Christi vitalia gesta. No doubt Juvencus put forth all his powers in the writing of the poem and was pleased with the result, but from the standpoint of eternity the style even of a Virgil is human, imperfect, of this fallen earth (terrestria as opposed to divinae, IV 804-5). The important point is that, in the poet's view, his subject is greater

than Virgil's, indeed the only "true" subject. Moreover his inspiration comes from the Holy Spirit not the Muses of antiquity (sanctificus ... carminis auctor/Spiritus, pr. 25-26), so that the superiority of the Evangelia is a result of God's grace. Nevertheless the poet's rejoicing is occasioned not by exceeding Virgil but by achieving personal salvation. On the Last Day the poem will be judged by eternal standards according to its content not its form:

Nec metus, ut mundi rapiant incendia secum  
 Hoc opus; hoc etenim forsan me subtrahet igni  
 Tunc, cum flammivoma discendet nube coruscans  
 Iudex, altithroni genitoris gloria, Christus.  
(pr. 21-4)

It is the fact that Juvenecus has written this Christian epic that may save him from the fires of Hell. On the cosmic scale judgement of his poem in purely literary terms is quite irrelevant.

Despite this pious disclaimer, however, and because the reader is not facing the Judgement seat, the poem may be assessed according to the author's original view of it, as a representative of the new genre, or rather sub-genre, of Christian epic. More precisely it is the first example of Biblical epic.

Composition of a Biblical epic involves a number of problems for the author. The language of the Gospel text was simple and unadorned, contrary to fourth century taste which favoured the copia verborum style. Biblical speeches,

especially in the parables, tended to be short and expressed in direct speech, presumably for greater vividness and memorability among a largely unlettered and uncultured Palestinian audience, whereas classical epic aimed at extremely long, complex speeches, usually employing oratio obliqua for unavoidable short speeches. Equally, secondary epic preferred a more complex and artificial range of imagery and characteristically employed stock epithets for heroes and gods; neither feature is to be found in Matthew as a whole or the parables in particular. Diction, speeches, imagery and epithets: the parable of the Workers in the Vineyard exemplifies many of the difficulties encountered by Juvenius in creating his Biblical epic.

#### Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard

Mt. 20, 1: Simile est regnum caelorum homini patri familias, qui exivit primo mane conducere operarios in vineam suam. (2) Conventione autem facta cum operariis ex denario diurno misit eos in vineam suam. (3) Et egressus circa horam tertiam invenit alios stantes in foro otiosos, (4) et ait illis: Ite et vos in vineam, et quod iustum fuerit, dabo nobis. (5) Illi autem abierunt. Iterum exivit circa sextam et nonam horam et fecit similiter. (6) Circa undecimam autem exivit et invenit alios stantes et dicit illis: Quid hic statis tota die otiosi? (7) Dicunt ei: Quia nemo nos conduxit. Dicit illis: Ite et vos in vineam meam. (8) Cum sero autem factum esset, dicit dominus vineae procuratori suo: Voca operarios et redde illis mercedem incipiens a novissimis usque ad primos. (9) Cum venissent ergo, qui circa undecimam horam venerant, acceperunt singulos denarios. (10) Venientes autem et primi arbitrati sunt, quod plus essent accepturi, acceperunt autem et ipsi singulos denarios. (11) Et accipientes murmuraverunt adversus patrem familias (12) dicentes: Hi novissimi una hora fecerunt et pares illos nobis fecisti, qui portavimus pondus diei et aestus. (13) At

ille respondens uni eorum dixit: Amice, non facio tibi iniuriam. Nonne ex denario convenisti mecum? (14) Tolle quod tuum est et vade, volo autem et huic novissimo dare sicut et tibi. (15) Aut non licet mihi facere quod volo? An oculos tuus nequa est, quia ego bonus sum? (16) Sic erunt novissimi primi et primi novissimi; multi sunt enim vocati, pauci autem electi.

The pater familias has four and the workers two direct speeches of less than one verse, in addition to the lord's longer direct speech in verses 13-6 and the implied hint of speech in verse 2. This preponderance of very short direct speeches in the parable is contrary to normal epic practice. From a strict fourth century literary point of view, the vocabulary must be considered as simple, repetitive, and indeed nothing short of crudely primitive, giving rise to an unacceptable amount of redundant repetition. In the first part of the parable the phrase exivit circa [numeral] horam, together with its cognates, becomes formulaic;<sup>1</sup> this is a typical feature of Hebraic literature, which employs repetition as a primary technique in expressing the meaning and developing narrative content. Indeed in the parable as a whole the number and frequency of temporal expressions is very high, and constitutes perhaps the most striking feature of the narrative. The literary orthodoxy of his day regarded this large amount of repetition as relatively lacking in meaning, but Juvenecus saw advantages in these

---

1. The Afra gives (3) Et exivit circa tertiam horam et . . ., so that the phrase occurs in some form at vv. 1, 3, 5 and 6.

Hebraic temporal expressions and his reaction to this feature of the parable is very interesting for what it reveals of his conception of the Christian epic and its demands.

- 550 "Sedulus ut ruri dominus, cui dulcia fundum  
Pinguibus in campis late vineta coronant;  
Hic ubi progressus primo cum lumine solis,  
Conduxit iuvenum fortissima robora pactus  
Unius in lucis certa mercede laborem,<sup>2</sup>
- 555 Et sua tum iussit cultu vineta polire.  
Ipse sed egrediens, ubi tertia venerat hora,  
Invenit ecce alios operique ad crescere iussit,  
Pro meritis operis promittens praemia digna;  
Illi non aliter laeti praecepta sequuntur.
- 560 Ast ubi sexta dehinc lucis transfluxerat hora,  
Haut secus hinc alios iuvenes conducere pergit.  
Horaque nona dehinc ubi solis cursibus acta est,  
Tunc alios pariter conductos iussit adire.  
Ultima labentis restabat portio lucis:
- 565 Egressus cernit iuvenes causasque requirit,  
Cur pigris manibus torperent otia lenta.  
Aiunt, conductoris quod praecepta fuissent  
Nulla sibi. Dominus mox hos insistere ruri  
Tunc etiam iussit. Sed vespere protinus orto
- 570 Praecipit, ut cuncti caperent mercedis honorem  
Aequalique omnes portarent praemia nummo.  
Tunc manus illa virum, prima quae luce laborem  
Sustulerat factisque diem toleraverat aequum,  
Indignans secum tali cum murmure fatur:
- 575 'Iniustum est, istis similem nos quaerere nummum,  
Ultima quos operis sero coniunxerat hora'.  
Tum dominus ruris sedato pectore fatur:  
'Inlibata tibi mercedis portio salvae  
Redditur et pacti servantur iura fidelis.
- 580 Istis de nostro liceat concedere tantum,  
Extima quos operis glomeravit portio ruri.  
Nam multos homines dignatio sancta vocavit,  
E quis perminimam dignum est secernere partem'."
- (III 550-83)

It is apparent that the temporal expressions in the Biblical parable are also broadly present in the poem. To account for this feature of the Juvenican parable, it may be observed that the temporal expressions of the Gospel text meshed with

---

2. Knappitsch omits in because he cannot find a parallel for pactus in laborem: the position of in seems more unlikely than the construction, but since both versions are metrically possible these do not seem sufficient grounds to go against the entire MS. tradition.

Juvencus' awareness of the obsession of classical epic with time. The treatment of time and frequent use of temporal expressions is a characteristic of the epic genre, as Herzog (pp. 103-4) has pointed out. Clearly these details of the parable are deliberately employed to create epic tone and reflect standard classical practice. It is therefore important to investigate this feature more closely.

a) Temporal Expressions

There are two different types of temporal expression in the Juvencan parable: the first is the Matthean "formula" mentioned above and the poet's reaction to it; the other is the temporal sign-posting characteristic of epic in general. Both are important in creating a full-blown epic treatment of the story. An analysis of the ways in which time is treated in the Juvencan parable will clarify the process.

A) The "Formula"

In the Gospel text the whole passage is structured by the times at which the pater familias went out into the marketplace: primo mane (1) ... circa horam tertiam (3) ... circa sextam et nonam horam (5) ... circa undecimam (6) ... cum sero autem factum esset, (8) ... There are corresponding phrases for each of these: ... ubi ... primo cum lumine solis (552) ... ubi tertia venerat hora (556) ... ubi sexta dehinc lucis transfluxerat hora (560) ... Horaeque nona dehinc ubi solis cursibus acta est (562) ... ultima labentis restabat portio lucis (564) ... vespere protinus orto



(569) ... Each of these phrases is more flowery than the preceding one, with the possible exception of the very last. Even more remarkable is the fact that the poet developed the simple words of the Gospel in v. 5 into two separate occasions:

Mt. 20, 5: Iterum exivit circa sextam et nonam horam et fecit similiter.

560 Ast ubi sexta dehinc lucis transfluxerat hora,  
Haut secus hinc alios iuvenes conducere perguit.  
Horaque nona dehinc ubi solis cursibus acta est,  
Tunc alios pariter conductos iussit adire. (560-3)

Nothing much is added to the story by this separate treatment of the visit to the marketplace at the sixth and ninth hours, though fecit similiter is rejected for the chance of periphrastic descriptions of what the owner did: alios iuvenes conducere perguit, and alios ... conductos iussit adire. This is a clear alteration from the source made to reinforce the copia verborum in the reader's mind. Nevertheless Juvencus could omit the exact time while retaining this effect; the temporal expressions are not vital to the narrative. That he should render the exact times at which the dominus went out to hire men is surprising, for his normal practice with such apparently irrelevant details is to omit them; that he should embellish and amplify them and then supply his own additional ones is without parallel in the poem. Close study of each example is necessary to explain this embellishment.

i) Hic ubi progressus primo cum lumine solis, (552) comes from qui exivit primo mane (v. 1). Juvencus adds the temporal particle ubi to form a new subordinate clause. This is of interest since he picks up ubi later. The periphrase primo cum lumine solis for primo mane is an apparently simple evocation of the rising sun, which dramatises the story for the reader; yet light has an important Christian meaning too, and the light imagery, of which this is the first hint, builds into a significant pattern (see below).

ii) Ipse sed egrediens, ubi tertia venerat hora, (556) expresses much the same thing as the Biblical text, which has a similar structure: Et egressus circa horam tertiam (3). The similarities point up the alteration, however. The insertion of ubi creates a subordinate temporal clause with a finite verb and links it with the ubi in the first of these phrases. It seems that Juvencus is fashioning a "formula" as an analogue to the Biblical temporal pattern.

iii) Ast ubi sexta dehinc lucis transfluxerat hora, (560) It has been observed that this example and the subsequent one come from a simple statement that the man went out at the sixth and ninth hours and did the same (v. 5). This is virtually an addition by the poet, and certainly a large amplification. The paraphrastic variation is highly developed here so that the temporal expressions take up the whole line: ubi is again introduced to link the clause with

the previous instances; and hora also repeats l. 556 where it occurs in the same sedes. The use of lux for "the light of day" is common but when used for "a day" it betrays the high style; here lucis, meaning "of the day", refers back to unius lucis (554) where the workers agree to work for one day, and, of course, to lumine (552) in the first example. Dehinc is an additional word denoting time introduced by the poet to create an impression of verbal abundance. Finally on this line, the image of the sixth hour "flowing through" (transfluxerat) is unusual. Arevalo (ad loc.) has noted that (transfluo) is used of time (diem) by Claudian at Ep. IV 5, meaning "to pass away", "elapse", but the word is rare and only attested elsewhere in Pliny (N.H. XI 38 (91) sanguis; XVI 35 (63) vina). Juvencus has consolidated and developed his temporal "formula".

iv) Horaque nona dehinc ubi solis cursibus acta est, (562) Again this comes from Iterum exivit circa sextam et nonam horam ..., and again Juvencus has created here a full line about time from virtually nothing. Hora is repeated from ll. 556 and 560, not in the end-stop position, as there, but in the other emphatic sedes, at the beginning of the line. Dehinc completes the remarkable pattern in 560-2 of dehinc ... hinc ... dehinc, noticed by Knappitsch (ad loc.). Ubi associated this line with the three other examples by repetition. Further, solis cursibus as well as being a fine periphrase in the epic tradition, picks up solis

in the first instance: primo cum lumine solis (552).

Horaque nona ... acta est is another periphrase for "passed" and so is equivalent to transfluxerat and venerat. Juvencus has created a varied formula in response to the Matthean exivit circa ... pattern.

v) Ultima labentis restabat portio lucis: (564) is a full-time version of the last occasion when the man went out to hire workmen, Circa undecimam autem exivit ... (6). The poet diverges from his practice hitherto of rendering the exact hour, substituting instead a generalized but effective statement to the effect that day was nearly done (literally, "the final share of the light/day that was slipping away remained ..."). This elegant golden line (abcb) with its alliterative agreement, labentis ... lucis, expresses well the idea of the last hour of the day. Lucis here meaning "day", is repeated from ll. 554 and 560, and with the alliterative pair labentis ... lucis can be compared sub extremo labentis lumine solis (III 77), as the day grows late before Jesus feeds the five thousand. The periphrase portio lucis with its characteristic abstract and genitive of identity is used also by Prudentius, Cath. VIII 11-12:

quarta devexo superest in axe  
portio lucis

as Arevalo (ad loc.) has noted. Portio is one of Juvencus' favourite words (used 15 times, always in the clausula sedes

and always in the nominative case), so that this may be a borrowing by Prudentius. This is the last time that the lord went out and it is also the least literal of the renditions.

Juvenius has established and developed a kind of epic temporal formula in the first four examples: all four contain ubi, and three of the four contain hora and an ordinal number (tertia ... hora, 556; sexta ... hora, 560; horaque nona, 562). Clearly this is the poet's response to the circa [ordinal] horam formula in Matthew. Indeed, in the first example, where the Matthean text has primo mane (v. 1) instead of the formula, the poem imitates with primo cum lumine solis. Four examples are formulaic; the fifth is not. It does not contain ubi or hora, and seems not to fit the pattern. The formula is there in the Gospel text (the Afra and most texts of the Itala have Circa undecimam autem horam ... in some order or other), so the omissions of ubi and of a reference to the exact time of day are interesting.

Example (v) is

Ultima labentis restabat portio lucis: (564)

Lucis is the key word here, emphasised by its end-stop position in the metre. Moreover it is a repetition from lucis (554) and lucis (560). Now the immediately previous occurrence of lucis (l. 560) is in the sixth hour instance,

one of the two which Juvencus has expanded almost beyond recognition. It was observed above that lucis (560) in the third (sixth hour) example referred back to lumine (552) in the first (dawn) example. Clearly then there is a link between example (v) and the formula. Confirmation of this view is found in the fact that the other expanded occurrence (ninth hour) contains a reference to the sun (solis, 562), which is also a repetition from the first (dawn) example (solis, 552). Juvencus has self-consciously patterned these "formulaic" temporal expressions. There is one more clause of time in Matthew that is related to the formula and must be considered at this point.

At the reckoning in the Gospel text the following phrase occurs: qui circa undecimam horam venerant (v. 9), a clear instance of the Matthean formula. Yet this occurrence of the formula poses a problem for the poet since, as has been seen, at example (v) he omitted the statement that it was at the eleventh hour and substituted a generalised remark that it was at the last hour of the day. The full exchange, between the lord and the workers he had hired first, provides the necessary context.

Mt. 20, 9: ... dicit dominus vineae procuratori suo: Voca operarios et redde illis mercedem incipiens a qui novissimis usque ad primos. (9) Cum venissent ergo, circa undecimam horam venerant, acceperunt singulos denarios. (10) Venientes autem et primi arbitrati sunt, quod plus essent accepturi, acceperunt autem et ipsi singulos denarios. (11) Et accipientes murmuraverunt adversus patrem familias (12) dicentes: Hi novissimi una hora fecerunt et pares illos nobis fecisti, qui portavimus pondus diei et aestus.

570 Præcipit (sc. dominus), ut cuncti caperent mercedis  
 honorem  
 Aequalique omnes portarent præmia nummo.  
 Tunc manus illa virum, prima quæ luce laborem  
 Sustulerat factisque diem toleraverat æquum.  
 Indignans secum tali cum murmure fatur:  
 575 'Iniustum est, istis similem nos quaerere nummum,  
 Ultima quos operis sero coniunxerat hora'. (570-6)

So much percursorio or summarising has been employed here that the formula has apparently been omitted, at least at the point where Matthew employs it. Effectively, however, its form has been altered and it has been transposed bodily into the complaint of the workers hired first:

Ultima quos operis sero coniunxerat hora. (576)

This is a manifest reminiscence of Juvenecus' reference to the formula in example (v). As noted above, he does not employ the formulaic ubi or [ordinal] hora but refers to his version of the Matthean formula through the image of light, lucis (from lumine in the first example, 552):

Ultima labentis restabat portio lucis: (564)

Ultima in 576 is a linking repetition from this latter line. It is worth noting, however, that hora is from the Juvenecan "formula" (in the same end-stop sedes as at 556 and 560; cf. line-beginning sedes at 562), even though the temporal conjunction ubi is not present. Surely this is intended to be a last appearance of the formula. It may be objected that the link is too tenuous but corroboration is provided in the poem itself. Just after qui circa undecimam horam venerant (9) those who came first and had worked all day are described as Venientes autem et primi

(10)<sup>3</sup>. Juvencus takes the opportunity of referring to his first formulaic temporal clause with prima quae luce laborem/Sustulerat (572-3); prima luce is the phrase which he avoided at 552 by a periphrasis, primo cum lumine solis. The pattern of formulaic links and cross-references is deliberate, and deserves a final summary.

Line	<u>ubi</u>	ordinal	<u>hora</u>	image(s)
552	*	primo	-	lumine solis
556	*	tertia	*	-
560	*	sexta	*	lucis
562	*	nona	*	solis
564	-	(ultima)	-	lucis
572	-	prima	-	luce
576	-	(ultima)	*	-

It may be observed that the fullest renditions of the formula are the two middle ones (sexta and nona), which Juvencus has "invented". After the strong and clear opening statements of the motif (ll. 552 and 556), the presentation of the formula rises to a crescendo and then fades rapidly away; the last three examples above (564, 572 and 576) show only sketchy portrayal of the motif, yet the attentive reader cannot miss the echoes.

---

3. There are clearer versions of what is meant: Afra has Et cum venissent primi; some texts of Itala Venientes autem primi.



It has been observed that this formula is a reaction to the Matthean formulaic patterning of the narrative, but Juvencus exploited this feature of the Biblical text for his own purposes. Highly trained in classical rhetoric and poetry as he must have been, he would have been aware of the passion classical epic had for using temporal "sign-posts" to weld together long narrative passages. It appears that this was a happy conjunction for the poet; he set out to render the formulaic temporal expressions of his Gospel source, but in a manner that was appropriate to the high tone of classical epic. Juvencus saw features in Virgil such as ubi used to express movement of the narrative and introduce atmospheric embellishment:

est iter in silvis, ubi caelum condidit umbra  
Iuppiter, et rebus nox abstulit atra colorem.  
(Aen. VI 271-2)

The poem, with its temporal formula, imitates this epic sign-posting. Hence it can be said that Juvencus structures his parable with such epic formulaic temporal expressions. His treatment of the other aspect of time, the non-formulaic temporal expressions, shows similar concern for the epic voice in this parable.

#### B) Other Temporal Expressions

There are one major and two minor temporal expressions in the Juvencan parable not fully covered in the previous section. In addition there are a number of other temporal sign-posts introduced into the poem without any parallel in the source. These are considered in turn.

i) Cum sero autem factum esset, dicit dominus ...

(v. 8) is rendered at 569: Sed vespere protinus orto ... Juvencus turns a generalised statement of the condition of the day into an exact and vivid image. The reckoning of course takes place at the close of day, so that the end of one and the beginning of another section of the parable is marked by this phrase which answers the dawn image primo cum lumine solis (552), at the point where the hiring begins. The hiring section is framed by dawn and dusk; the narrative then passes on to the money question and the moral. This dawn-dusk schema is an epic commonplace.

It is possible that the actual form of words vespere protinus orto is the Juvencan version of another Matthean formula, vespere autem facto (cf. Mt. 14, 15; 1, 2; 26, 20). However the vespere ... orto figure is an epic conceit rather than a Biblical allusion; Arevalo (ad loc.) first commented upon its use in the high style and compared the following significant instances:

nec tibi Vespero  
surgente decedunt amores, (Hor. Carm. II 9, 10-11)

illic sera rubens accendit lumina Vesper.  
(Virg. Geo. I 251)

The obvious diction would have been vespera, but Juvencus prefers to make a highly classical allusion to Hesperus, the evening star of Venus, sometimes known as vesper hesperus:<sup>4</sup>

---

4. The planet Venus was both the morning star, Lucifer, and the evening star, Hesperus; cf. Cic. N.D. II 20, 53:

Infima est quinque errantium terraeque proxima  
stella Veneris, quae Φωσφόρος Graece Lucifer  
Latine dicitur cum antegreditur solem, cum  
subsequitur autem Έσπερος.

an epic tone is consequently imparted to this section of the parable.

ii) The temporal phrase prima luce has been briefly mentioned at the close of section A, but since it is not a rendition of the Matthean formula and in view of what has just been said, it requires re-examination in this section. The germ from which it comes is doubtless the word primi in Matthew's verse ten:

Venientes autem et primi arbitrati sunt, quod plus  
essent accepturi ...

Juvencus takes the idea and creates a link with his peri-phrase in the opening, primo cum lumine solis (552):

Tunc manus illa virum, prima quae luce laborem  
Sustulerat factisque diem toleraverat aequum ...(572-3)

This is typical epic sign-posting of course, but Juvencus goes further. The phrase vespere ... orto (569) has just been noted and prima ... luce (572) is in close juxtaposition with it; the poet has started the reckoning section of the parable with dawn and dusk artfully inverted, vespere ... prima luce. Furthermore, except for comedy, prima luce is not found in verse before the fourth century (cf. T.L.L. sv. lux, which omits this instance), but then there is an interesting juxtaposition:

(speculator) nos diebus omnibus  
actusque nostros prospicit  
a luce prima in uesperum. (Prud. Cath. II 106-8)

The reference to vesper surely clinches the reference by Prudentius to this passage of Juvencus. Taken in conjunction with the imitation of portio lucis (564; at Cath. VIII 12) discussed above at example A (v), Prudentius' debt to this section of Juvencus' parable may be taken to be proved.<sup>5</sup>

iii) It was stated towards the close of section A that the qui circa undecimam horam venerant formula had effectively been transferred to the complaint of the workers in the form:

Ultima quos operis sero coniunxerat hora. (576)

It should be noted, however, that the motivation for the latter line is provided by a minor temporal expression in Matthew at the same point in the narrative:

Hi novissimi una hora fecerunt et pares illos nobis fecisti ... (12)

While the Juvencan line clearly comes from the formula in verse 9, and is therefore displaced, the reason for the transposition was clearly provided by the feeble, prosaic una hora of the Biblical text. The epic temporal sign-posting at this point and the verbal abundance of 576 are the result.

iv) In addition to the major temporal sign-posting characteristic of epic observed both with regard to formulaic and non-formulaic temporal expressions, Juvencus has added

---

5. Bergman's edition of Prudentius cites only 7 imitations of J. and omits these two.

a plethora of small temporal adverbs and the like. These do not warrant individual consideration and can most conveniently be discussed at this point.

It is characteristic both of classical epic and, even more so, of Juvencus' Biblical epic that there should be a liberal sprinkling of words such as tum and hinc, words that have little significance in themselves but help the narrative to flow along; indeed Kirsch has observed that the Evangelia is bound together by such words as these (p. 138). The parables in particular, as separate stories of a traditional type within the whole narrative, are rich in these epic sign-posts. This is partly a reflection of early fourth century literary taste, and partly a function of the unusual Latin of the Biblical texts. At any rate it was evidently the poet's judgement that his versification of Matthew into an epic poem necessitated frequent use of tum, tunc, dehinc, etc. In this parable alone the list of such words is impressive, and all are without parallel in the source: tum, 555, 577; tunc, 563, 569, 572; and the extraordinary pattern dehinc (560) ... hinc (561) ... dehinc (562) in the large expansion of the source (ll. 560-3).

Juvencus has clearly exploited the temporal expressions in the Biblical parable to create the sign-posting characteristic of epic, and hence impart an epic voice to the parable. This obsession with time, however, is found

throughout the poem. As Herzog (p. 103) has pointed out, the poem adheres so closely to the optimum book length of epic and the necessity for a new day to start a new book that, after Christ's speech including the parables of the Tares, Mustard-Seed and Leaven, Juvencus feels he has to start a new book. Hence before the disciples ask Christ the meaning of the parables of the Tares, a new day begins with an epic conceit of sun-rise, similar to that in Ennius Annales (557 Vahlen), Interea fugit albus iubar Hyperionis cursum:

Fuderat in terras roseum iubar ignicomus sol.  
Discipuli rogitant, lolii quid quaestio vellet ...  
(III 1-2)

The illogicality is caused by Juvencus' adherence to epic convention with respect to temporal expressions. This is an extreme example, but he is certainly conscious throughout of the temporal element in the classical epic poem and imitates it in his own Biblical epic. Similar adherence to epic practice is found in other aspects of the poem.

b) Speech

Among the features characteristic of epic, mentioned in the section introducing this chapter, was the treatment of speech. Speech in an epic poem is usually handled in the following manner: long monologues in direct speech (virtually the whole of Od. IX-XII is Odysseus' account of his wanderings; cf. Aen. II 3 - III 715); or passages of

indirect speech, incorporating short speeches and verbs of saying into the narrative to lessen disruption of the narrative thread and avoid continual repetition of words like dixit, fatus, etc. This is not to say that short speeches in oratio recta are never employed in epic, but that the tendency is to avoid them. Frequent use of the short speech was a fault according to fourth century literary standards. Thus it is evident that the numerous direct speeches of the Gospel text, as appeared in chapter three, were an embarrassment to Juvencus the epicist. The techniques and procedures employed in the poem were specified there but not studied in any detail. It is proposed, therefore, to investigate the treatment of speech, especially in the parables, from the point of view of classical epic and for what it reveals per se. Direct and indirect speech will be considered separately to avoid confusion.

#### A) Direct Speech

The parable of the Workers in the Vineyard is in Bk III of the poem. In Bk. III as a whole there are 56 examples of direct speech, ranging in length from Christ's three words on the five loaves and two fishes, "Hoc", inquit, "satis est" (III 83; cf. Virg. Aen. VII 116 Heus! etiam mensas consumimus) to His speech of sixty-nine and a half lines, which includes the explanation of the Two Sons, and the parables of the

Tenants in the Vineyard and the Wedding Feast (III 704-73).<sup>6</sup> These 56 speeches make up  $473\frac{1}{2}$  lines (61.2%) of the 773 lines of the book, from which Christ is given 39 speeches totalling 428 lines (90.4%).<sup>7</sup> It can be seen, then, that the average speech length is  $8\frac{1}{2}$  lines (8.455), whereas the average in the Aeneid is 11 (11.35 lines).<sup>8</sup> These figures suggest

6. Passages of direct speech in Bk III:- Christ: 11. 4-16 (12 lines), 30-1 (2), 83 ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ), 107-9 ( $2\frac{1}{2}$ ), 138-51 ( $13\frac{1}{2}$ ), 154-8 ( $4\frac{1}{2}$ ), 162-75 (14), 186-7 ( $1\frac{1}{2}$ ), 190-1 ( $1\frac{1}{2}$ ), 205-9 ( $4\frac{1}{2}$ ), 224-35 (12), 239-54 (16), 262-8 (7), 274-95 (22), 300-15 ( $15\frac{1}{2}$ ), 339-42 (4), 347-52 ( $5\frac{1}{2}$ ), 365-6 (2), 373-80 ( $7\frac{1}{2}$ ), 385-6 (2), 388-95 (8), 400-32 (33), 435-58 ( $23\frac{1}{2}$ ), 468-78 (11), 482-91 ( $9\frac{1}{2}$ ), 504-9 (6), 513-8 ( $5\frac{1}{2}$ ), 522-6 (5), 531-3 ( $2\frac{1}{2}$ ), 539-83 (45), 586-9 (4), 596-9 (3), 602-21 (20), 650-2 ( $2\frac{1}{2}$ ), 659-60 (1), 663-73 (11), 677-82 ( $5\frac{1}{2}$ ), 690-702 ( $12\frac{1}{2}$ ), 704-73 ( $69\frac{1}{2}$ ); Peter: 111-3 (3), 121 (1), 271-2 ( $1\frac{1}{2}$ ), 297-9 (3), 325-9 (4), 387 ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ), 535-7 (3); iuvenis (the rich young man): 501-2 (2), 510-2 ( $2\frac{1}{2}$ ); the crowd: (plebes) 25-8 (4), (populi ... omnes) 639-40 ( $1\frac{1}{2}$ ); scribes and Pharisees: 135-7 (3); femina (Canaanite woman): 188-9 (2); the Father: 333-4 (2); vir senior: 356-63 (8); disciples: 479-81 ( $2\frac{1}{2}$ ); prophecy: 634-5 (2).
7. As a comparison Peter has the next highest proportion: 7 speeches making up 16 lines (3.4%), his longest speech 4 lines long.
8. See H.C. Lipscomb, Aspects of the Speech in the later Roman Epic, diss. (Baltimore: J.H. Furst, 1907), p. 15. Lipscomb (pp. 7-15) maintains that there is a decrease in the percentage of speech and the number of speeches as the epic develops. His figures are that the Iliad and Odyssey are 50% speech; of the 9896 verses of the Aeneid, 3757 (38%) are devoted to speech; the 8060 lines of Lucan have 2586 (32%); Silius Italicus offers 3759 verses of speech out of a total of 12202 (31%); and the 8050 lines of Claudian's work contain 2403 (30%). He does not consider Juvencus, however, and he does not appear to regard Aen II 3 - III 715 as a speech. Moreover he points out (pp. 11 and 13) that Aen. VI contains 53.9% speech so that Juvencus' 61.2% speech in Bk. III is not completely without warrant.



a commonsense standard for analysis of length of speech in the poem: long speeches are taken to be those that are at least ten lines long; short speeches are less than ten lines in length. The proportion of the two in Bk III is: 15 long speeches (26.8%), all by Christ; 41 short (73.2%).

i) Long speeches

The longest speech in the poem is the 273 lines of the Sermon on the Mount (I 454-727). At first sight this may not appear to meet the standards of Odyssey IX-XII or Aeneid II-III but it must be borne in mind that 273 lines represents 8.5% of the total poem, a very reasonable proportion for a speech containing little narrative.<sup>9</sup> The Sermon on the Mount of course contains one major and four minor parables or groups of minor parables.

All the parables are contained in long speeches. Even short parables like the Leaven (Mt. 13,33 = J. II 820-3, part of II 795-83) are incorporated into long speeches by omission of irrelevant narrative introductions such as Aliam parabolam locutus est eis (Mt. 13, 33). Indeed sequences of parables like IV 185-305 (from the speech IV 97-305), including the parables of the Servant entrusted

---

9. According to Lipscomb (op. cit., previous n.), pp. 9 and 15, there is an increase in the number of speeches over 40 verses in the later epic. Figures are: Virgil, 13; Lucan, 18; Silius, 18; Claudian, 18; for total verses in each case see previous note.

with Supervision, the Ten Virgins, the Talents and Last Judgement, and III 704-73, mentioned above, constitute a large part of some of the longest speeches in the poem.

However there are no speeches located in the parables themselves that are of sufficient length to be considered as long direct speeches; as the parables themselves are located within the long speeches uttered by Christ, naturally the speeches they enclose are short. Evidently there is no room for a long rhetorical monologue in a short illustrative fable such as a parable.

ii) Short speeches

The quoted figures with respect to Bk. III refer only to the direct speeches by a character or characters in the narrative. They do not include speeches-within-speeches, and to that extent they falsify the position, because in the individual narrative parables there are examples of direct speech. By no means all the parables utilise oratio recta (of the parables studied in chapter two, the Tenants has none, while the Two Sons and the Wedding Feast have one direct speech each: III 693-5 (2½ lines) and III 752-7 (5½ lines)), but it is a technique that the poet is prepared to employ on occasion. Direct speech however is used very sparingly; usually not more than once in a parable and only at a significant point in the narrative. The parable of the Workers is something of an exception but it allows us to make a number of characteristic points.

The Gospel text is punctuated by short direct speeches and verbs of saying:

Mt. 20, 4: et ait illis: Ite et vos in vineam, et quod iustum fuerit, dabo vobis. (6) ... et dicit illis: Quid hic statis tota die otiosi? (7) Dicunt ei: Quia nemo nos conduxit. Dicit illis: Ite et vos in vineam meam. (8) ... dicit dominus vineae procuratori suo: Voca operarios et redde illis mercedem incipiens a novissimis usque ad primos. (12) dicentes: Hi novissimi una hora fecerunt et pares illos nobis fecisti, qui portavimus pondus diei et aestus. (13) At ille respondens uni eorum dixit: Amice, non facio tibi iniuriam. Nonne ex denario convenisti mecum? (14) Tolle quod tuum est et vade, volo autem et huic novissimo dare sicut et tibi. (15) Aut non licet mihi facere quod volo? An oculus tuus nequa est, quia ego bonus sum? (16) Sic erunt novissimi primi ... etc.

Omitting the lord's speech at the end of the parable, which is clearly different in kind (it is four Biblical verses long), there are six direct speeches of less than a verse in nine verses of narrative (vv. 4-12). This is by no means exceptional; parables studied in chapter two offer similarly high proportions of direct speech. The Wedding Feast has four short direct speeches in nine verses of narrative (Mt. 22, 4-13; speeches at vv. 4, 8-9, 12, 13), while the Two Sons has an even higher concentration with short speeches (two of them one word only) in each of the three verses of the parable's narrative (Mt. 21, 28-30). However, the concentration and overall number of speeches present the epicist with problems, for the reasons given above.

In the Workers parable Juvencus' solution is to avoid direct speech entirely in the hiring (first) section of the parable. In fact he effectively avoids it until verse twelve:

(10) Venientes autem et primi arbitrati sunt, quod plus essent accepturi, acceperunt autem et ipsi singulos denarios. (11) Et accipientes murmuraverunt adversus patrem familias (12) dicentes: Hi novissimi una hora fecerunt et pares illos nobis fecisti, qui portavimus pondus diei et aestus.

Tunc manus illa virum, prima quae luce laborem  
Sustulerat factisque diem toleraverat aequum,  
Indignans secum tali cum murmure fatur:  
575 'Iniustum est, istis similem nos quaerere nummum,  
Ultima quos operis sero coniunxerat hora.'  
(572-6)

Two lines is not an uncommon length for an epic speech. There are eight speeches in the Aeneid of one verse or less;<sup>10</sup> Juvencus has a higher proportion of such speeches (4 in Bk. III alone: 83, 121, 387, 659-60), but his is a smaller scale epic. Nevertheless, in view of the alteration of direct speech earlier in the parable and avoidance of oratio recta in other parables, there is a need to account for the two line speech at this precise point in the narrative.

It was noted above that the lord's speech in Matthew is of a different order from the earlier speeches of less than one verse. This is true in terms both of length

---

10. I 437; II 232; V 166, 615-6, 637-8; VI 45-6, 620; VII 116; X 481, 737; XII 296. Details from Lipscomb (op. cit., n. 8), p. 10.

and of doctrinal importance. Juvenecus renders it in a direct continuation of the above passage.

Tum dominus ruris sedato pectore fatur:  
 'Inlibata tibi mercedis portio salvae  
 Redditur et pacti servantur iura fidelis.  
 580 Istis de nostro liceat concedere tantum,  
 Extima quos operis glomeravit portio ruri.  
 Nam multos homines dignatio sancta vocavit,  
 E quis perminimam dignum est secernere partem.'

Even the narrative introduction of this speech places it within the epic tradition and emphasises the significance of the lord's words. Sedato pectore is a Virgilian phrase found in the same sedes, as Huemer (ad loc.) has indicated:

olli subridens sedato pectore Turnus:  
 (Aen. IX 710)

In the epic reminiscence an effective contrast is established between the troublesome and irate questioners, (Indignans, tali cum murmure) who do not understand, and the calm lord (i.e. Christ), who explains the justice and mercy of Heaven.

The actual speech picks up and answers what the disgruntled labourers said: istis ... quos operis ... (575-6) is cunningly echoed here by Istis ... quos operis ... (580-1). Through percursio the sense of the Biblical text emerges. The questions are all recast or omitted, statements are excised, material is compressed and rearranged. The result is that the lord gives the lie to the fractious men who have worked all day. He is merciful to those who come late because of His grace, but those who have followed Him faithfully from the beginning get their promised reward too.

Why then are two direct short speeches, one very short (2 lines) and the other approaching average length (6 lines), used in such exceptionally close juxtaposition when the tendency is to avoid such features? The reason is linked with the allegorical levels of meaning. The end of the parable provides the reader with a short, sharp exchange between (allegorically) Christ and his earliest disciples. The dramatic interchange of view corrects a fallacy in the workmen's thought and brings out the parable's point and message.

Before leaving the subject of the parable's final direct speech and its message, it is worth noting that the final logion is not the one that concludes the parable in the modern Bible. The best Greek Biblical texts give only the saying that "the last shall be first, and the first last" (Ὀὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι). All Latin texts, including Jerome's Vulgate, add to this the saying that "many are called, but few are chosen". The Itala tradition at this point reads

Mt. 20, 16: Sic erunt novissimi primi et primi novissimi; multi sunt enim vocati, pauci autem electi.

Now Fenton (p. 319) comments that, since all the workmen receive the same payment, the parable as in Matthew does not illustrate the former logion. It may be that the "last shall be first" saying is in some way misplaced from Mt. 19, 30 or has been generated by attraction with that

verse, which immediately precedes this parable. Whether, as seems unlikely, Juvencus' Gospel text(s) at this point omitted the less appropriate saying, or he decided that the two logia were incompatible, Juvencus apparently interpreted the narrative according to the eschatological message "many are called, but few are chosen":

Nam multos homines dignatio sancta vocavit,  
E quis perminimam dignum est secernere partem."  
(582-3)

In the poem this is a foreshadowing of the Matthean formula rendered at the end of the Wedding Feast parable that closes Bk. III:

Multis nam saepe vocatis  
Paucorum felix hominum selectio fiet.  
(772-3)

Juvencus' version of the Workers parable, therefore, concerns the certainty of salvation for those who repent and follow Christ, no matter how late in their lives. The grace of God allows into the Kingdom even those who waste their lives in idleness and turn to Christ only at the very end (Ultima ... portio lucis, 564; Ultima ... sero ... hora, 576). Equally, death-bed baptism into Christ was not uncommon among fourth-century Christians, as Constantine's example shows; the idea was that the Christian passed away in a state of baptismal grace unallayed by the sin of everyday life, and hence was received into Paradise (Eus. Vita. IV 62).

The parable of the Workers in the Vineyard in the poem is about those who are called and chosen; the parable of the Wedding Feast, which is to come later, presents the corollary that not all are chosen, and hints at the punishment for those who turn to Christ too late.

B) Indirect Speech

Indirect speech is used in the poem to render two forms in the narrative: either direct speech in the Gospel is transposed to indirect, or indirect speech is enclosed in the same mode. These will again be considered separately.

i) Indirect - indirect speech

In the Biblical parable of the Workers there is no indirect speech; however, two instances of oratio obliqua implied by the narrative detail of the Gospel are employed in the poetic version of the parable.

1) Mt. 20, 2: Conventione autem facta cum operariis ex denario diurno misit eos in vineam suam.

Conduxit (sc. dominus) iuvenum fortissima robora pactus  
Unius in lucis certa mercede laborem,  
555 Et sua tum iussit cultu vineta polire.

(553-5)

Here misit eos in vineam suam clearly suggests indirect speech. Juvencus has introduced the verb of saying, iussit, and the clause of indirect speech (indirect command), sua ... cultu vineta polire. The reason for the change appears to be the insertion of the image of viticulture (for which, see below).



2) Mt. 20, 5: Iterum exivit circa sextam et nonam horam et fecit similiter.

560 Ast ubi sexta dehinc lucis transfluxerat hora,  
Haut secus hinc alios iuvenes conducere perguit.  
Horaque nona dehinc ubi solis cursibus acta est,  
Tunc alios pariter conductos iussit adire.

(560-3)

The oratio obliqua details here are clear additions, suggested by fecit similiter, and consist in each case of a verb of saying (commanding) and an infinitive clause fulfilling the role of indirect command: alios iuvenes conducere perguit (561) ... alios ... conductos iussit adire (563). The parallelism is emphasised by the repetition of alios and conducere (iuvenes conducere = conductos). Iussit is a repetition from 555 and 557.

ii) Direct - indirect speech

There are seven direct speeches in the source version of the parable of which the last two are rendered economically in oratio recta (vv. 12, 13-6; see above pp. 186-8). The other five are transposed into indirect speech.

1) Mt. 20, 3: ... invenit alios stantes in foro otiosos, (4) et ait illis: Ite et vos in vineam, et quod iustum fuerit, dabo vobis.

Invenit ecce alios operique ad crescere iussit,  
Pro meritis operis promittens praemia digna.  
(557-8)

The main verb of saying, iussit (also at 555 and 563), and the indirect command clause attached, operique ad crescere, are both inventions. Juvencus also employs a present

participle, promittens, to introduce the copia verborum of pro meritis operis ... praemia digna. The effect results in expression of the meaning of the Matthean verses in a wholly different style, that of high poetry.

2) Mt. 20, 6: ... exivit et invenit alios stantes et dicit illis: Quid hic statis tota die otiosi?

565 Egressus cernit iuvenes causasque requirit,  
Cur pigris manibus torperent otia lenta. (565-6)

The direct question is transposed into the indirect mode.

The phrase causas requirit cur ... is certainly an epic means of expression (cf. causas requirit followed by indirect question at Virg. Aen. VI 710, as Huemer, ad loc. has noted).

3) Mt. 20, 7: Dicunt ei: Quia nemo nos conduxit.

Aiunt, conductoris quod praecepta fuissent  
Nulla sibi. (567-8)

A direct statement is expected after aiunt but the speech is forced into oratio obliqua. Effectively quod ... fuissent is a suboblique clause, depending on a missing indirect statement implied in the previous indirect question (something like aiunt se torpere ... quod fuissent underlies the structure here).

4) Mt. 20, 7: Dicit illis: Ite et vos in vineam meam.

Dominus mox hos insistere ruri  
Tunc etiam iussit. (568-9)

Another example of iussit with prolative infinitive standing for an indirect command (cf. 555, 557, 563); hos insistere ruri is the indirect clause.

5) Mt. 20, 8: ... dicit dominus vineae procuratori suo: Voca operarios et redde illis mercedem incipiens a novissimis usque ad primos.

570 Praecipit, ut cuncti caperent mercedis honorem  
Aequalique omnes portarent praemia nummo. (570-1)

The character of the procurator is omitted as a final verb of commanding, praecipit, is employed; this time it introduces two full indirect commands with ut plus the subjunctive (caperent, portarent), instead of prolative infinitives.

The substance of the Gospel speech is altered. Instead of the direction to the procurator to call the workmen in and pay them in reverse order of arrival, the orders in the poem are to pay them and pay them all the same. In Juvencus' version of the parable the order of payment has no importance. It is the amount they are paid that troubles the first-comers.

### C) Concluding Comments

Now that the full range of speech in this parable has been studied, it is worth seeing what has been achieved by the use of oratio recta and obliqua. There are no long examples of oratio recta in the poem's parables, though as has been observed some of the "short" speeches are developed and extended into several lines. In the parable under consideration the lord's (effectively, Christ's) concluding speech is moulded into a coherent, formal oratio of six lines. Moreover there is a very short speech in the direct mode introduced for the sake of a quick interchange of

views with the lord, a feature which is sanctioned in epic. The effect is something akin to stychomythia. Juvencus is sparing in his use of short oratio recta in parables.

The usual procedure employed is to transpose the short speeches of the Biblical source from the direct into the indirect mode. This tendency conforms with the classical principles of brevitas, and hence creates a more economical narrative sequence within which the poet can ornament. In the Workers parable Juvencus certainly achieves these aims. Furthermore he exploits the verbs introducing the indirect speech and their dependent clauses for a purpose of his own. Quotation of these features of the parable alone reveals an interesting effect.

... sua ... iussit cultu vineta polire (555) ... alios operique ad crescere iussit (557) ... alios iuvenes conducere pergit (561) ... alios pariter conductos iussit adire (563) ... hos insistere ruri/... iussit (568-9) ... Praecipit, ut cuncti caperent mercedis honorem/Aequalique omnes portarent praemia nummo. (570-1)

Of the eight instances of oratio obliqua in the parable these six contain a verb of commanding and an indirect command. All refer to the dominus, who allegorically represents Christ. It is clear then that the oratio obliqua has been used to characterise and hence dramatise the allegory. Juvencus has created a strong effect of command in the lord's instructions; in terms of the allegory this is wholly appropriate, for they represent Christ's commandments

to his followers and indeed to all men. Christ is seen through the presentation of speech in this parable as Pan-crator.

One other aspect of the oratio obliqua here deserves to be mentioned. Juvencus is of course concerned to conform to epic norms, but he is also trying to preserve the spirit of the Biblical text. It is manifest that he achieves this dual aim to a remarkable extent. Nevertheless there is one passage of this parable that is unsatisfactory precisely because the two aims of the poem pull in opposite directions (a continual problem for the poet but one that he solves more elegantly elsewhere).

Mt. 20, 6: ... exivit et invenit alios stantes et dicit illis: Quid hic statis tota die otiosi? (7)  
Dicunt ei: Quia nemo nos condixit. Dicit illis: Ite et vos in vineam meam.

565 Egressus cernit iuvenes causasque requirit,  
Cur pigris manibus torperent otia lenta.  
Aiunt, conductoris quod praecepta fuissent  
Nulla sibi. Dominus mox hos insistere ruri  
Tunc etiam iussit. (565-9)

The poet has conscientiously attempted to follow the Biblical structure of three short direct speeches but in the form suggested by the literary principles of his time for epic, namely oratio obliqua. The effect of the three sentences of indirect speech in such close juxtaposition is to create confusion. Even though they are cunningly varied in the pattern question-statement-command, the middle sentence with its sub-oblique subjunctive clause after aiunt (which

normally expects a direct statement), and the command in 568-9, sit together very uneasily. The passage is inelegant and confusing because the Biblical short speeches and the epic oratio obliqua form of those speeches do not mesh. The poet has tried too hard to harmonise the irreconcilable. Only rearrangement of the material in some way could have solved the problem here; as it does in the parable of the Tares (see pp. 156-7). Overall the problem of speech is dealt with successfully, however, and it may be said that the epic tone of the speeches in the parables is a major factor in creating the epic ambience of these narratives and the poem as a whole.

c) Diction

The epic diction of the Evangeliorum libri IV has generally been taken for granted. Arevalo, Huemer and Knappitsch in their editions have indicated where Juvenecus imitates a specific line of Virgil, and Hatfield (pp. 40-5) and Widmann (pp. 57-85) have investigated in detail the linguistic debt of the former to his poetic model. Hatfield (p. 40) noted that the direct citations of Virgil include every book of the Georgics and Aeneid, as well as some passages in the Eclogues. It is evident that Virgil was often present before the poet's mind as a model to be followed, frequently in a highly complex and sophisticated manner (see Hatfield, pp. 44-5). Hatfield's

conclusions may be taken as representing the scholarly consensus on this matter:

Juvencus' verses are not crude centos [of Virgil] inartistically joined together without due sense of fitness ..., but the quoted material is artistically introduced, and laboriously transformed and concealed ... The imitation is as often general as literal (p. 40) ... He assumes a ground-plan of imitation and varies this by borrowed material skillfully (sic) inserted (p. 45).

Modern critics such as Herzog, Roberts and Poinsette have added to our knowledge of other aspects of the poem, but sentiments similar to the above underlie their findings.<sup>11</sup> Juvencus' diction is epic because Virgilian.

This is not always the case. Hatfield, in his study of Juvencus' language (pp. 47-52), found a number of words that are clearly not Virgilian; indeed, he listed twenty-four words that do not seem to be used by any other author, Christian or not. How could he say that the poem "does not exhibit the cumbrous and unclassic language of the patristic writers" (p. 47)? An inspection of Hatfield's list reveals six words found in major and minor parables; they are typical of the full list and provide a perspective on the diction of the Evangelia.

---

11. Herzog (pp. 69-97) studies Virg. Aen. III 707-15 and its relationships with Sil. It. Pun. I 140 ff. and J. Ev. III 33-72; see also Roberts, p. 111, and Poinsette, p. 11.

i) *pecusculum*, II 589.

The use of diminutives is characteristic of Silver and Later Latin poetry. Juvenal is particularly fond of diminutives (see for example, John Ferguson, Juvenal: The Satires, London, 1979, p. xxvii). Pecusculum is employed in the minor parable of the Sheep in a Pit:

'Foveam si forte pecuscula vestra  
 590 Inciderint, certe transibitis otia legis  
 Et pecus abrupto tolletis vile profundo.  
 Quanto igitur nobis hominum curatio maior  
 Ad benefacta animos tollens accendere debet!  
 (II 589-93)

The effect of the word is quite natural and suggests that it may not be a neologism.

ii) *praeparvus*, II 813.

In the parable of the Mustard-seed the Kingdom of Heaven is compared to a tiny mustard-seed:

Haut aliter simile est, cordis si panditis aures,  
 Praeparvi grano regnum caeleste sinapi ...  
 (II 812-3).

The intensification of adjectives is one of the characteristics of copia verborum; by the fourth century the prae- prefix had superseded adjectives in per- almost totally. Praeparvus therefore is really a Later Latin form of the much more common perparvus. This is confirmed by the fact that praeparvus is also found at I 154; clearly it is an accident of survival that the word is only attested in Juvenal. The comparative scarcity of Latin poetic texts from the second century onwards may well account



for the appearance of several words on Hatfield's list:

six out of a total of twenty-four are adjectives in prae-, each with a well-attested equivalent in per-.

iii) perminimus, VII 583.

This intensified superlative occurs in the parable of the Workers in the Vineyard, the passage under consideration. Apparently it is a coinage by Juvencus, formed on the analogy of permaximus (cf. perparvus and permagnus), but again the accidents of survival may account for the fact that this is its only appearance in Latin literature. Unusually, the per- form is preferred to prae-

iv) praestupidus, IV 199.

Another intensified adjective in prae-. It occurs in the parable of the Ten Virgins:

... pars est quarum sapientior una,  
Altera praestupido pars est stolidissima corole.  
(IV 198-9)

The verbal abundance here is intended to emphasise the criminal stupidity of the foolish virgins.

v) flammicomans, IV 201.

Two lines on from the previous example this neoteric compound epithet appears:

200 Occurrere illae votis sponsalibus omnes  
Ornatu adcinctae taedarum flammicomantum  
(IV 200-1)

Flammicomans is not attested elsewhere (but cf. flammicomus, Prud. Psych. 775), and the effect here is intentionally

striking; the lighted torches are important both on the literal and the allegorical levels of the parable. However, whether or not it is a neologism, the word is formed in precisely the same way as neoteric epicisms such as flammifer (flammiferam ... vim, Enn. Alc. (Sc. 29 Vahlen). Juvencus is fond of these compound epithets and apparently invents a number of them (flammipes, glaucicomans and ignicolorus), as well as employing those attested elsewhere (auricolor, altithronus, ignicomus, venenifer, etc.).

vi) miseramen, IV 289.

Juvencus introduces this adjective during the parable of the Last Judgement:

Namque sitim passo quondam mihi pocula nulla  
 Nec famis in poena parvi miseramina panis,  
 290 Aut peregrina mihi tecti vestisve parumper  
 Tegmina de magnis gracili pro parte dabantur,  
 Carceris aut saepto claustris morbisve iacenti  
 Umquam visendi solacia vestra fuerunt.

(IV 288-93)

The effect created is of verbal abundance, emphasised by the juxtaposed alliteration of the letter "p" to which the double "m" of miseramina provides a sub-motif:

Nam sitim ... quondam mihi .../Nec famis ... miseramina  
 ... mihi ... parumper/Tegmina ... magnis ... The word itself is probably a late formation and may well be a Juvencan coinage.

It has been seen that Juvencus is very conscious of the epic tradition in these examples of apparent innova-

tions in diction. If, as is by no means certain, the words studied above are new coinages and were never used by other authors, it is nonetheless true that they are not unpoetic in their effect and justify Hatfield's distinction of Juvencus' diction from the "cumbrous and unclassic language of the patristic writers" (p. 47). The language may vary from Virgil's on occasion - one might rightly be sceptical if it did not, considering the gap of three and a half centuries - but it does not falter in presenting the grand tones of high epic.

Characteristic of Juvencus' diction is the last couplet of the Workers parable, where the narrative ends and Christ's logion sums up what the poet sees as the message of the parable:

Mt. 20, 16b: multi sunt enim vocati, pauci autem electi.

Nam multos homines dignatio sancta vocavit.  
E quis perminimam dignum est secernere partem.  
(III 582-3)

Juvencus wants to make his point and remind the reader of the meaning of the fable. However, the simplicity of the Gospel saying, though it contains profundity for the initiate, is not for him; the taste of the time demanded elaborate periphrases and embellishments. Accordingly the linguistic structure of the source is taken and then ornamented. The skeleton of the original is present, as the correspondences demonstrate:

enim	=	Nam
multi	=	multos
sunt vocati	=	vocavit
pauci	=	(perminimam)
electi	=	secernere

In the first part of the saying all the words of the Matthean text are rendered, but with the important change of voice; instead of "many are called" the poem effectively says "God has called many", a much more powerful way of expressing the message. In the second part of the saying the structure diverges a little: Pauci has no direct equivalent, although the idea is clearly present in the use of perminimus; autem is omitted; the parallelism with the first part of the saying is avoided. Nevertheless the details of the Matthean formula are presented, with certain words "quoted" from the original.

On to this Biblical linguistic structure Juvencus has grafted his elaborations. Multos homines is a pleonasm but one that reminds the reader of the call to all mankind. Dignatio sancta is a typical Juvencan locution: dignatio is an example of the abstract nouns ending in -io of which he is so fond (cf. portio at ll. 564, 578, and 581 in this parable), here described by an abstract adjective, sancta; dignatio is primarily used by Christian writers of God's grace (T.L.L. s.v. dignatio IB1) and refers here to the honour due to Christ (cf. Itala Eph. 4, 7, dignationis Christi;

Gk. <sup>τῆ δόξης</sup>; Vulg. donationis); moreover the word is a technical term used in panegyrics to refer to the emperor (cf. T.L.L. s.v. dignatio IB2). Hence the "holy worthiness" is a circumlocution for Christ, the God Who has called men to Him, but with a side-long allusion to Constantine, the emperor who is seen as Christ's representative on earth. After linking the two parts of the logion together with the relative Equis, Juvencus then indulges in word-play with dignum est. The point of the dignatio-dignum word-play is to draw attention to the meaning of the parable; what the poem emphasises is the fact that the few who are chosen are worthy. Whatever time of day they have joined the work, whether at dawn or at the last hour, they are all equally worthy of the ultimate reward, that of eternal life in the Kingdom.

The diction of the second section of Christ's saying contains other subtleties. Dignum est is the crescendo of a theme of images of equality and fairness: pariter (563) ... Aequali (571) ... aequum (573) ... Iniustum est (575). As the parable reaches its climax with the objection of those who come first and the lord's reply, these images increase in frequency and emphasis; indeed, dignum est is effectively the lord's reply to their charge of injustice, iniustum est. In addition, secernere is an improvement on eligi because it expresses more fully the idea of the separation of "sheep from goats" on the

Last Day. It is also worth noting that perminimam ... patem completes a series of images in the parable. The hyperbole of perminimus brings out the smallness of the number of those who are saved, but partem is a reference by word-play and variation to the theme of amounts and sharing in the parable. Portio is used of the day (lucis, 564; but lux has several allegorical senses), of the money (mercedis ... salvae, 578; with an allegory of salvation), and of the work (operis, 581; allegorically referring to the Church's mission on earth); another of these images is mercedis honorem (570). The same share of money is given to all who undertake the work, no matter when they were hired, because of the Lord's grace; but in partem the poet points out the irony that only the very smallest number of those who are called are worthy of salvation. The complexity of these two lines is remarkable, stemming from the author's attention to the highly-wrought diction of epic.

d) Imagery

Another aspect of the poem that gives it its epic tone is the employment of imagery either not present in the original or intensified for poetic effect. Most of Juvenecus' developed themes of imagery in the parables consist of Christian symbols added to assist in the interpretation of them for his readers. However, one example from the poem, of pagan imagery which has associations with

high poetry and the world of the epic generally, is the image of viticulture. In chapter two images of viticulture were identified and investigated in the parables of the Two Sons and the Tenants in the Vineyard. In the parable of the Workers too there are additions of this type.

Mt. 20, 1: ... homini patri familias, qui exivit primo mane conducere operarios in vineam suam.

550 Sedulus ut ruris dominus, cui dulcia fundum  
Pinguibus in campis late vineta coronant;  
Hic ubi progressus ... (550-2)

The description of the farm dwells on the richness of the soil and the sweetness of its vines, for this is the locus amoenus which is Paradise. The addition coronant, with its image of encircling or surrounding (an epic usage; cf. Aen. IX 380, omnemque abitum custode coronant), alerts the reader to vineta, which is to be picked up a few lines below.

Mt. 20, 2: ... misit eos (sc. operarios) in vineam suam.

555 Et sua tum iussit cultu vineta polire. (555)

Here the reference to the vineyard and its vines is already present in the Matthean text, but the repetition of vineta in the same sedes is emphatic; clearly cultu ... polire is an important addition. Polire is a technical term of agriculture generally and refers to weeding or hoeing (cf. Enn. Ann. 319 (Vahl.), rastros dentefebres capsit causa poliendi/Agri), an important aspect of viticulture. Hence the labourers have a specific task to undertake, just

as in the Two Sons the vines are only half-pruned, semiputata (III 694), and require drainage and pruning work:

Nunc scrobibus nunc falce premens vineta retunde.  
(III 695)

One reason for the additional specific images of viticulture is that Juvencus' audience would probably have been familiar with the process of farming vines and how much care it required. More importantly, however, the vineyard in Biblical symbology meant Israel (cf. Isa. 5, 1ff.) and in Christian terms viticulture is a reminder of the Apocalyptic grape harvest which is to come on the Last Day (Apoc. 14, 14ff.). Hence Juvencus introduces details of viticulture both to reflect the interests of his readers and to draw attention to the eschatological elements that underlie the parable. In the Workers very few (perminimam partem) of those many who are called (multos homines ... vocavit) are saved (secernere); what happens to the rest is seen elsewhere.

If these pagan and classical images function both as "epic" commonplaces and signs of Christian eschatology, other images function both as epic temporal sign-posts and Christian symbols. It has been seen in section (a) above that expressions such as primo cum lumine solis (552) mark the passage of the day and function as temporal sign-posts conventional to epic. Additionally, in the new Christian vocabulary light images stand for Christ Himself,



the new life in Christ, eternal life, resurrection and all that is the opposite of darkness (death, hell, etc.). In the last line of the poem, for example, Christ is referred to as dominum lucis (IV 811). The images of light and the sun in the parable of the Workers in the Vineyard must be seen in this context. Light and the condition of the sun refer allegorically to the time left before the Adventus, the Second Coming on the Last Day:

primo cum lumine solis (552) ... Unius lucis (554)  
 ... sexta lucis transfluxerat hora (560) ... Hora-  
 que nona solis cursibus acta est (562) ... Ultima  
 labentis restabat portio lucis (564) ... vespere  
 orto (569) ... prima luce (572) .. sero (576)

This strand of imagery is intended to remind the reader how late it is getting for repentance. The day is slipping away (transfluxerat, labentis) and it is evening (vespere, sero), but those who repent and join the task even at the last hour (ultima portio lucis, 564; ultima hora, 576) receive the reward of eternal life. There is hope for the reader even now though it is late in the day; but few are chosen.

Other images in this parable dramatise especially the allegorical meaning. The imagery of equality and justice and of shares and amounts has been referred to in section (c) above. The parable of course concerns the difference between the celestial and earthly view of justice; fairness in shares of the Kingdom is governed by a supernatural scale of values. The development of this theme in the

parable enables Juvencus to omit totally all reference to the exact sum of money agreed for the day's work (one denarius, Mt. vv. 2 , (4), 9, 10, 13), a detail of Palestinian life irrelevant to his readers. Instead the poet concentrates on the fact that work is necessary in the vineyard: laborem (554) ... operique (557) ... operum (558) ... laborem (572) ... operis (581). Presumably this refers to the life of works which is the sign of the Christian as opposed to the pagan. Certainly the lord criticises the laziness of those who are not undertaking the work he has commanded:

565 Egressus cernit iuvenes causasque requirit,  
 Cur pigris manibus torperent otia lenta.  
 (565-6)

The fine images of sloth and idleness are the opposite of the work theme.

One characteristic feature of the imagery of epic poetry that has not been mentioned so far is the epic simile. Epic similes of course are considered as those that are artificially extended into a long comparison. In the Evangeliorum libri as a whole there is little trace of such effects. One reason for this may be that Christ's sayings are full of figurative language which Juvencus regarded as equivalent to the extended similes of pagan epic; indeed, it is not hard to view the parables, or the minor parables at any rate, as a sort of epic simile.

In fact there are relatively very few similes even of the most abbreviated type in the poem that are not present in the original. There are no similes at all in the Workers parable and the only obvious addition of similes is at the close of the minor parable of the Two Ways.

Mt. 7, 14: quam angusta porta et arta est via, quae ducit ad vitam; et pauci sunt, qui inveniunt eam.

Vitalis vastis stipatur semita saxis,  
 Celsaque vix paucos ducit per scrupea virtus.  
 685 At si quos nimium fallax inlexque malorum  
 Planities suasit deformi lubrica lapsu,  
 Adripit hos pronosque trahit velut impetus amnis,  
 Aut alacer sonipes ruptis effrenus habenis,  
 Aut rectoris egens ventosa per aequora puppis.  
 (I 683-9)

As Roberts (p. 126) has commented, lines 685-9 are an interpretative amplification of the parable, but it should be noted that the final simile section is an addition. Roberts (p. 127) has pointed out the tricolon form, linked by anaphora (Aut ... Aut ...). The language of the three similes and their form is rooted in classical epic. Widmann (pp. 41-2) has shown that ventosa per aequora is a Virgilian reminiscence (Geo. I 206; Aen. VI 335) and that the simile of the galloping horse was perhaps suggested by Aen. XI 599-600:

fremit aequore toto  
 insultans sonipes et pressis pugnat habenis.

The effect of this series of similes is irresistibly evocative of classical pagan epic.

e) Epithets

Recurrent stock epithets applied to important characters are characteristic of pagan epic. Juvencus imitates this feature in his own epic - indeed so copiously that Hatfield (p. 47) remarks that

Juvencus has a prevailing fondness for introducing high-sounding titles for divine personages, and in this he indulges without restraint,

and provides a list of 24 different epithets of Christ and 10 of the Father, several of which are used frequently in the poem (Hatfield, pp. 47-8). Juvencus is especially fond of associating Christ with light and life:-

aeternae gloria vitae, III 530; auctor vitae, III 503; clarus, II 128, III 3, IV 789; dominus lucis, IV 655, 811; hominum lumenque salusque, III 356; lucis vitaeque repertor, IV 479; sator aeternae vitae, III 161; terrarum lumen, II 75, 733; vitae lucisque parens, I 747; vitae repertor, II 405; vitae spes unica, III 521.

God the Father is nearly always referred to as parens or pater: for instance, parens perfectus, I 572; pater aeternus, III 203; pater altithronus, II 62; etc. There are two exceptions. One is the expression caeli terraeque repertor (I 35; cf. of Christ, vitae repertor, II 405; lucis vitaeque repertor, IV 479). The other is the title Tonans, which is used at the beginning of the parable of the Tares.

If stock epithets and titles of God and Christ are common elsewhere in the poem, the situation is very different in the parables. For although one or more of the Persons

of the Trinity may be referred to allegorically, the literal "characters" of the parables are usually personages lacking epic grandeur, for whom stock epic epithets might seem out of place. Nevertheless there is one instance of an epithet used in a parable; the title Tonans is used of the Father in the introduction to the Tares (cf. IV 553, 671, 785).

Mt. 13, 24: ... Simile est regnum caelorum homini,  
qui seminavit bonum semen in agro suo.

795 Agricolaе simile est regnum sublime Tonantis.  
(II 795)

This is not only the sole instance of a stock epithet used in a parable, it is also the only one that is a direct borrowing from pagan epic. Tonans was originally a title of Jupiter, "the Thunderer". It is frequently employed by Ovid in the Metamorphoses (I 170; II 466; etc.), and has been appropriated by Juvencus to designate the Father.

Elsewhere in the parables Juvencus uses key words as a sort of analogue to the stock epithets of classical epic. In the parable of the Workers in the Vineyard, for example, the dominus who is described as sedulus ruris dominus (550) is clearly intended to represent allegorically Christ. Matthew's version of the parable refers to this character initially as a pater familias (v. 1), and only in verse eight does the more overtly Christian dominus vineae appear. Juvencus ensures that his reader perceives the allegory and interprets it "correctly" by rendering

the title of the man as dominus throughout (550, 568 and 577).

It is clear therefore that in this aspect of epic practice also Juvenecus was concerned to adhere to the norms of classical pagan epic as far as possible, while at the same time creating a new genre that would sing of the ultimate Truth, a Christian epic. In the next chapter the other major constituents of the new Biblical epic are examined - those that come from the Gospel texts themselves.

CHAPTER 5: JUVENCUS AND THE BIBLE

The Parables of the Two Houses and the Sower

In the previous chapter Biblical epic was seen as a lineal descendant of classical pagan epic, and the elements of the poem clearly drawn from that source were identified and studied. The present chapter examines ways in which the source, the Biblical texts specifically represented by the parable narratives, contributed to the growth of the new genre and this poem in particular.

There has been no systematic attempt to define the poem's relationship to the Gospel text. Marold; Verhältniss, examined the poem's derivations from the Itala texts with the intention of discovering which text or texts Juvencus utilised. His conclusion (p. 341) was that the nearest are the Ver-cellensis (a), Corbeiensis (ff') and Claromontanus (h). Little detailed study of Juvencus' relationship to his Biblical source has been carried out since Marold's article until the recent works by Roberts and Poinsothe. Roberts is primarily concerned with the paraphrastic techniques employed in the poem, but he does study in detail passages such as the minor parable of the Two Ways (Mt. 7, 13-4 = J.I 679-89) from the point of view of closeness to the Biblical text (Roberts, pp. 125-7). Again Poinsothe investigates in detail the passage I 1-132 from the point of view of closeness to its source (Lk. 1, 5-80), but he is tracing the way Juvencus eliminates Semitisms and

Semitic references in this text (Poinsotte, pp. 58-69). It does not fall within the scope of this study to attempt to repair this lack, but there is clearly room for a short investigation of a couple of parables on the lines Poinsotte has followed. It will then be possible to say something about Juvencus' reaction to the Biblical text in the parables and perhaps in general.

a) The Two Houses

The parable of the Two Houses built on rock and sand exhibits some characteristic and some unique problems for the paraphrast. Repetition in story-telling is a normal Semitic technique, stemming presumably from the oral tradition; in this parable, however, the amount of repetition is excessive and a considerable challenge to the poet, whose fourth century audience would demand rhetorical variation rather than "slavish" repetition.

Mt. 7, 24: Omnis ergo, qui audit verba mea haec et facit ea, similis est viro sapienti, qui aedificavit domum suam supra petram. (25) Descendit pluvia flaverunt venti advenerunt flumina et offenderunt in domum illam et non cecidit; fundata enim erat supra petram. (26) Et omnis, qui audit verba mea haec et non facit ea, similis est viro stolto, qui aedificavit domum suam supra harenam. (27) Descendit pluvia flaverunt venti advenerunt flumina et offenderunt in domum illam et cecidit et facta est ruina eius magna.

An analysis of this passage shows that the difference between the pairs of verses is minimal. The variation in vv. 24 and 26 can be expressed thus:



24 x ergo  
Both omnis , qui audit verba mea haec et

26 Et x

24 non sapienti  
Both facit ea, similis est viro , qui

26 x stulto

24 petram

Both aedificavit domum suam supra  
26 harenam.

The two have as many words as possible in common, apart from the conjunctives autem/Et. There are really only three words which vary, including the inclusion or omission of non before facit ea, Similarly vv. 25a and 27a can be expressed in this way:

25 non  
Both flumina et offenderunt in domum illam et cecidit.  
27 x

Here the similarity is even greater; only one word varies - the omission or inclusion of non before cecidit. Matthew's conclusion to these two verses (25b and 27b) is of course quite different, since that is where the punch of the parable lies. It is clear that the force of the Matthean parable is achieved by parallelismus followed by departure from the parallel structure in ;

fundata enim erat supra petram (25b)

et facta est ruina eius magna (27b)

Even the word order lays stress upon the last word of the verse. Clearly this is as perfect in its own way as is possible; Juvencus could not rival it in its own kind. Moreover the stylistic dictates of the fourth century meant that variation and periphrases were required rather than this heavily elaborate word-for-word repetition. At all events something different was created.

715 Quisque meis monitis auresque et facta dicabit,  
 Hunc aequabo viro solidis fundamina saxi  
 Ponenti, librata super cui moenia surgent.  
 Illa domus pluviis ventisque inlaesa manebit  
 Torrentumque minas firmato robore vincet,  
 720 Haerent inmotae quoniam fundamina petrae.  
 Qui vero auditu tantum mea iussa tenebit  
 Diversisque procul factis per lubrica perget,  
 Hunc similem faciam, volucris qui fulcit harena  
 Fundamenta domus; primo cui flamine venti  
 725 Et pluvia infusis coepit cum incumbere rivis,  
 Omnis subverso procumbit ponder moles  
 Insequiturque gravi tectorum strage ruina.  
 (I 715-27)

Juvencus has carefully varied the phrases. The correspondences are revealing:

Mt.		J.	
1 (=24-5) + 2 (=26-7)		1 (= 715-20)	2 (= 721-7)
omnis, qui	=	quisque	qui
audit	=	aures	auditum
verba mea haec	=	meis monitis	mea iussa
et facit ea	=	et facta dicabit.	mea iussa tenebit
similis est	=	hunc aequabo	hunc similem faciam
viro ..., qui	=	viro	qui

aedificavit domum suam	=	fundamina .../ Ponenti ... /domus	fulcit .../ fundamenta domus
descendit pluvia	=	pluviis	pluvia
flaverunt venti	=	ventis	primo flamine venti
advenerunt flumina	=	torrentumque minas	infusis ... rivis
offenderunt in domum illam	=	illa domus	cui ... incumbere

In each case the two versions by Juvencus are both different from each other and from the source. Even more impressive is the fact that the whole narrative is given a natural and easy flow.

Before looking in more detail at what Juvencus has made of the Gospel text, two points may be noted.

The first is that Juvencus omits the viro sapienti (v. 24) ... viro stulto (26) contrast, although he presents and emphasises that contrast in the parable of the Ten Virgins. Of course it may be said that it is implicit in the Two Houses in any case, for who but a fool would build on sand? On that reading of this parable the man who built his house on rock is an equivalent to the wise virgins. The point of the Ten Virgins, however, at least in Juvencus' presentation of it, is that it demonstrates the necessity to be prepared for the Coming at all times; a rather different matter. Both the man who built his house on sand and the foolish virgins can be accused of

moral failings in terms of the allegory but the difference of degree with regard to the literal level should be noted: the one acts in a manner that is incredibly stupid, so stupid as to be criminally unconcerned for the safety of himself and others; the others show lack of forethought but not morally culpable irresponsibility. Hence the omission of this detail may reflect the moral seriousness of the parable according to the poet's interpretation of it.

The second is that foundations are mentioned: funda-  
mina (716) ... fundamina (720) ... fundamenta (724).

Now Matthew's parable does not refer to foundations, but there is a version of the parable in Luke that does.

Lk. 6, 47: Omnis, qui venit ad me et audit sermones meos et facit eos, ostendam vobis, cui similis est. (48) Similis est homini aedificanti domum, qui fodit in altum et posuit fundamenta supra petram. Inundantia autem facta allisit flumen domui illi, et non potuit eam movere; fundata enim erat supra petram. (49) Nam qui audit et non facit, similis est homini aedificanti domum suam supra terram sine fundamento; allisit flumen domini illi et continuo concidit, et facta est ruina domus illius magna.

It can be seen that the contrast here is between a house built on foundations (posuit fundamentuam, Lk. 6, 48) and one built without any foundations (sine fundamento, Lk. 6, 49). Moreover, Luke's version of the parable also omits the overt antithesis between the wise man and the foolish man, although of course it is implied in the details of the story. The corollary would appear to be

that Juvencus has followed Luke's version of the parable and departed from Matthew.

In fact however Juvencus quite clearly follows Matthew's detail that the house was built supra harenam (v. 25), "on sand", with volucris qui fulcit harena/Fundamenta domus (723-4), rather than Luke's detail that the man built super terram (6, 49), "on the ground". Furthermore the reason for the collapse of the house in the Lucan version is that it was built directly on top of the earth without foundations, whereas in Juvencus as in Matthew the reason is that it was built on sand, a substance which is naturally unstable (volucris).

Foundations or lack of foundations in the Juvencan parable does not affect the stability of the house; the point is that it is built on sand. If the man did dig his foundations down into the sand it would be so much wasted effort, because the sand would not stabilise the house. But Juvencus does not say that the house had foundations dug into the sand; the man volucris ... fulcit harena /Fundamenta domus - that is, founded his house on sand. The reference to fundamenta is an impure allegory referring to the interpretation of the parable. The fool has based his life on something insubstantial and hence has no real foundation to his life. It seems that Juvencus does not depart from Matthew at this point.

There are elements of both Biblical versions of the parable in the Juvenecan Two Houses. Is the conflation of the two accounts deliberate or unconscious? At no other point in the poem is there a harmonisation of two Gospel accounts, so that on balance it seems unlikely that this is a deliberate conflation. Probably the detail of the allegorical foundations suggested itself quite naturally, perhaps with an unconscious reminiscence of the Lucan parable. It is likely that the poet was unaware that he was combining the two different versions of the same parable.

Mt. 7, 24: Omnis ergo, qui audit verba mea haec et facit ea, similis est viro sapienti, qui aedificavit domum suam supra petram.

715 Quisque meis monitis auresque et facta dicabit,  
Hunc aequabo viro solidis fundamina saxis  
Ponenti, librata super cui moenia surgent. (715-7)

Quisque, used here for quisquis, is stressed by position. It is of some importance as a word because it has pastoral implications for the reader; if we hear His words and act on them we too are like this man. Dicabit is also emphasized by position. Dicare is a technical term of religious worship, meaning "to dedicate" or "consecrate", and is so used by Virgil at Aen. I 73:

conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo,  
which is repeated entire at Aen. IV 126. The man who carries out Christ's commandments does indeed dedicate his deeds to Christ, for he is a Christian. Thus

the solidis fundamina saxis (Matthew has supra petram) on which he founds his life are Christ's teaching. Arevalo (ad loc.) comments that fundamen is a poetic word, used by Virgil, Ovid and others; it is nevertheless a rare word and is employed only once by Virgil: prima facis ponunt fundamina Geo. IV 161). Both fundamen and dicare appear in the poem only in this parable.

The verbal abundance of the lines that follow is impressive:

solidis fundamina saxis  
Ponenti, librata super cui moenia surgent. (716-7)

Librata suggests that the walls are powerful and unshakeable, as Arevalo (ad loc.) noted, and an epic reference underpins the clause. All commentators from Arevalo on have noted Virgil at Aen. I 437:

'o fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt!'

The epic tone is certainly assisted by moenia, and the occurrence of the words in the same sedes is indicative of the imitation.

Mt. 7, 25: Descendit pluvia flaverunt venti advenerunt  
flumina et offenderunt in domum illam et non cecidit;  
fundata enim erat supra petram.

Illa domus pluviis ventisque inlaesa manebit  
Torrentumque minas firmato robore vincet,  
720 Haerent inmotae quoniam fundamina petrae. (718-20)

The expansion is almost ecphrastic. Inlaesa indicates a pathetic fallacy in that a domus cannot be hurt by wind and rain and it is developed by the minas of the torrentum

(though minae is often used of inanimate objects in a way that laedere is not). It seems indeed that the passage draws on the oaktree simile of Aeneid IV where Aeneas' refusal to respond to Dido's entreaties is compared to an oak buffeted by storms:

ac uelut annoso ualidam cum robore quercum  
 Alpini Boreae nunc hinc nunc flatibus illinc  
 eruere inter se certant...  
 ipsa haeret scepulis ... (IV 441-3, 445)

The presence here of robore and haerent in the context of stormwinds battering an unmoving object makes it remarkably similar to the Virgil passage. The borrowing is confirmed, however, by inmotae; in the application of the simile to Aeneas' reactions just a few lines further on come the famous words, mens inmotae manebit (IV 449).

The second line is virtually an extended military image within an image:

Torrentumque minas firmato robore vincet, (719)

The house conquers the menaces of the flood with its strength as an army overcomes the threats of an enemy. Firmato robore is of course a pleonasm.

The reason for this strength and resistance is inmotae quoniam fundamina petrae. Inmotae is a transferred epithet that leads into the repetition and variation in juxtaposition of fundamina petrae (cf. fundamina saxis, 716). Petrae is emphasised by its end-stop position and by variation from saxis, possibly to remind us of Christ's words to Simon Peter at Mt. 16, 18:



Et ego dico tibi, tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram  
aedificabo ecclesiam mean.

It is impossible to imagine that Juvencus was unaware that inmotae ... fundamina petrae could be interpreted as a reference to the Church, which Jesus entrusted to Peter the Rock. Those who build upon the Church (super cui moenia surgent, 717) can be sure that their house will prevail (firmato robore vincet, 719) and will not be shaken (inmotae, 720).

Mt. 7, 26: Et omnis, qui audit verba mea haec et non facit ea, similis est viro stulto, qui aedificavit domum suam supra harenam.

Qui vero auditu tantum mea iussa tenebit  
Diversisque procul factis per lubrica perget,<sup>1</sup>  
Hunc similem faciam, volucris qui fulcit harena  
Fundamenta domus, (721-4)

Juvencus avoids with some exceptions the language both of the original and of his own first rendition of these lines. Factis is a direct repetition of facta (715), hunc is repeated exactly from 716 in both form and sedes, and domus repeats 718 where tooit is the second word in the line. Furthermore fundamenta evidently refers to fundamina (716 and 720) and mea iussa is intended to remind the reader of meis monitis (715). Hence there is a remarkable structure of variation and reminiscence through repetition:

---

1. Knappitsch prints fulcit but argues for figit from C in his commentary. However fundamenta figi in harena is impossible. Fulcit must stand as the lectio difficilior.

715 Quisque MEIS monitis auresque et FACTA dicabit,  
 HUNC aequabo ...  
 Qui vero auditu tantum MEA iussa tenebit  
 Diversisque procul FACTIS per lubrica perget,  
 HUNC similem faciam (715-6, 721-3)

All the details of the first are present in the second, but much amplified. Juvencus has rejected the Gospel structure of total repetition, and has created instead an interesting mixture of small scale repetition, slight variation and actual difference. In addition to the repetitions (capitals) mentioned above, there are several slight variations (underlined): for instance, quisque becomes qui, and aequabo becomes similem faciam. Similem is from similem est (vv. 24 and 26), but the construction similem faciam is still a distinct variation of similis est. Juvencus is reacting away from the Biblical text.

He makes a slight change from it in the second line of the section under consideration: diversisque procul (i.e. oppositis, plane contrariis; cf. Knappitsch, ad loc.) factis ... perget is not the same as non facit ea (v. 26). This man does not simply not do what Christ commands, he hears indeed (auditu ... mea iussa tenebit, a pleasant periphrase) but he does the opposite. He goes pigheadedly per lubrica, which as has been observed of lubrica in the minor parable of the Two Ways above (p. 149) refers to Hell. In that parable just a few lines earlier in the Sermon on the Mount, the reference to Hell is even more clear:

685 At si quos nimium fallax inlexque malorum  
Planities suasit deformi lubrica lapsu ... (I 685-6)

But here the one man is on the slippery path to Hell because he rejects Christ's commands (diversisque procul factis), in contrast with the other man who dedicates his life to following them (facta dicabit).

This contrast is also brought out by the images associated with the second man. In an absurdity he is described as

volucris qui fulcit harena  
Fundamenta domus, (723-4)

Volucris indicates the impossibility of supporting anything with sand (fulcit harena), let alone making sand form the foundations of a house (fundamenta domus). Volucris ... fulcit harena is virtually an oxymoron, making an explicit comparison with solidis saxis. Volucris harena is a striking image. The closest parallel seems to be in Horace:

Inclinare meridiem  
sentis ac, veluti stet volucris dies, (Carm. III 28,  
5-6)

The idea is that valuable drinking time is passing by and Lyde is behaving as if swift time were standing still. The opposite is true here. The man expects the sand to stand still and support his house, but in fact it is quickly washed away when the rains and floods come. More directly the image comes from the simile volucris... somno, which

is employed to describe how Aeneas tries vainly to embrace his father:

ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia cirum;  
 ter frustra comprehensa manus effugit imago,  
 par leuibus uentis uolucrique simillima somno.  
 (Virg. Aen. VI 700-2)

The ghost of Achises is as insubstantial as a dream; the house is built on sand, which provides no stability. Volucris is an addition by the poet to assist in interpreting the parable, an impure allegory.<sup>2</sup>

Mt. 7, 27: Descendit pluvia flaverunt venti advenerunt flumina et offenderunt in domum illam et cecidit et facta est ruina eius magna.

725 Et primo cui flamine venti  
 Et pluvia infusis coepit cum incumbere rivis,  
 Omnis subverso procumbit pondere moles  
 Insequiturque gravi tectorum strage ruina. (724-7)

Much the same synthesis of quotation, reminiscence and new material may be found here as in the last section. A comparison of the two passages, however, shows that the same features are present but not to the same extent. Venti/Et pluvia repeats pluviis ventisque, and cui repeats cui in line 717. Apart from these only rivis for torrentum (719) and tectorum for domus (718 and 724) can be listed as links with the first section.

The image of the cumulative attack on the house by the elements is very fine:

---

2. Kievits, ad loc., suggests that it means "instabili" without explanation or giving grounds for this interpretation.

primo cui flamine venti

725 Et pluvia infusis coepit cum incumbere rivis, (724-5)

The awkward syntax and the incipient movement of the house expressed in the sequence flamine ... infusis coepit ...

incumbere contrasts with the house founded on faith:

inlaesa ... robore firmato ... haerent immotae. Juvencus

deftly associates one man with images of permanence:

solidis fundamina saxis ... moenia surgent ... inlaesa

manebit ... haerent immotae ... fundamina petrae; while

the other is similarly associated with images of flux

and mutability: diversis ... per lubrica perget ... volucris

... harena ... infusis coepit ... incumbere, followed

by the great fall:

Omnis subverso procumbit pondere moles

Insequiturque gravi tectorum strage ruina. (726-7)

The pleonastic copia verborum of subverso ... pondere

and procumbit ... moles, where procumbit pondere is linked

by alliteration, gives a marvellous effect of a great

mass laid low. The last line adds nothing to the reader's

information but its inverted word order and consequent

stress on ruina is much more effective than the similar

effect in the original. Gravi ... strage ruina refers

to more than just the house. This is Jesus' promise that

at the last those who have been weighed in the balance

and found wanting will be cast down into Hell. Kievits

(ad loc.) notes that there is a probable echo of Juvencus

in Hilary of Poitiers' commentary on this parable:

stultus ... cum gravi ruinae strage solvendus (Comm. in Matt. VI 6). The eschatological tone of the last couple of lines is very effective, and may easily have influenced St. Hilary's language.

He thinks the parable refers to false prophets and hypocrites and how their teachings do not stand up in practice.

St. Jerome has a similar interpretation:

Fundamentum quod apostolus architectus posuit unus est Dominus noster Iesus Christus. Super hoc fundamentum stabile et firmum et per se robusta mole fundatum aedificatur Christi ecclesia; super harenam uero quae fluida est et coagmentare non potest nec in unam copulam redigi, omnis hereticorum sermo ad hoc aedificatur ut corruat.

(In Math. I 1034-9)

Juvencus' reaction to the Gospel is different.

Juvencus' version of the parable is that the man who follows Christ's words and dedicates his life to carrying them out is safe; but the man who rejects Christ's teaching and acts against it, founding his life on something insubstantial, will be cast into Hell. In putting across this message he abandons the formulaic repetition of the Gospel. He substitutes for it a number of repetitions of and references to key words, creating by this means a contrast between the two halves of the story that disposes entirely of the parallelismus membrorum of the original. To give the parable greater vividness he develops the imagery and even adds fresh images. The one word volucris, for instance, seems to make the whole of the second section

of that parable come alive on both literal and allegorical levels. It is not a word that would normally be appropriate to describe sand, but in this case it is wonderfully suggestive of what will happen to the sand (and hence the house) when it rains.

Juvencus' usual practice with regard to the Biblical text is to render virtually every verse, though he is at the same time prepared to modify the text. This is done chiefly for purposes of interpretation. In the parable of the Two Houses that interpretation is allegorical and coherent, yet the actual language and style totally eschews the most characteristic feature of the Gospel, its quasi-formulaic repetition.

b) The Sower

Another example different in kind is the parable of the Sower. The Matthean version is again repetitive.

Mt. 13, 3: Ecce exiit seminator seminare semen suum. (4) Et cum seminat, quaedam ceciderunt secus viam et venerunt volucres et comederunt ea. (5) Quaedam autem ceciderunt in petrosa loca, ubi non habebant terram multam; et continuo exorta sunt, quia non habebant altitudinem terrae. (6) Sole autem orto aestuaverunt et, quia non habebant radicem, aruerunt. (7) Alia autem ceciderunt in spinis et creverunt spinae et suffocaverunt ea. (8) Alia vero ceciderunt in terram bonam et dabant fructum, quaedam centesimam, aliud sexagesimum, aliud vero tricensimum.

There are several problems here for the "translator".

The phrase seminator seminare semen suum is clumsy and ugly. The repetitive ceciderunt (vv. 4, 5, 7 and 8) and habebant (vv. 5, twice, and 6) are intrusive. Such

formulaic repetition in the Gospel is deliberate and quasi-liturgical in effect if not in origin (cf. litanies, etc.). Yet Juvencus responds to these challenges in the following manner:

"Ecce sator proprio commendat semina ruri;  
 Illa cadunt diversa solo sortemque locorum  
 740 Pro virtute ferunt. Nam sicubi trita viarum  
 Sub pedibus solido densetur limite tellus,  
 Aeriis avibus dant nudam semina praedam.  
 Ast ubi pertenui velantur pulvere saxa,  
 Farra quidem viridem depromunt germinis ortum;  
 745 Sed quia nulla subest suci substantia glebis,  
 Inserto arescunt radicum fila calore,  
 Cunctaque mox apicum labuntur acumina leto,  
 Seminibusque aliis contingunt aspera rura;  
 Sentibus hic spinisque feris velocius exit  
 750 Roboris augmentum frugemque internecat angens.  
 Uberibus vero dantur quam semina glebis,  
 Illa ferunt pulchram segetem, cui laeta frequentat  
 Incrementa sui centeno copia feta.

(II 738-53)

As Roberts has pointed out (p. 119), this passage is particularly rich in synonymous or nearly synonymous expressions creating the impression of copia verborum, in keeping with the literary code of the time. The simple verb (ceciderunt) of the original is replaced by the two nearly synonymous expressions cadunt ... solo (739) and sortemque locorum ... ferunt (739-40), but there is an important difference between them not noticed by Roberts (p. 119). The first is properly the rendition of ceciderunt and the second, influenced by the interpretative pro virtute it encloses, virtually personifying the semina, implies that they make their choice of places onto which they fall according to the suitability of each (but with an



allegory in virtus that refers to the Christian life; see below).

Near synonyms avoid tedious repetition and are a technique Juvencus uses to pull the parable together. In a similar manner the near antonyms radicum fila (746) and apicum ... acumina (747) serve a structural purpose, through mutual emphasis.<sup>3</sup> These "genitives of identity" are common in Juvencus, especially when dependent on an abstract noun (cf. germinis ortum, 744, and suci substantia (75; Roberts, p. 119). He is structuring the language of the parable.

Roberts (p. 120) has noted that there are an extraordinary number of periphrases and circumlocutions in the parable: commendat semina (738), trita viarum ... solido densetur limite tellus (740-1), viridem depromunt germinis ortum (743) and labuntur ... leto (747). These and other circumlocutions will now be examined.

Mt. 13, 3: Ecce exiit seminator seminare semen tuum.

Ecce sator proprio commendat semina ruri;  
Illa cadunt diversa solo sortemque locorum  
740 Pro virtute ferunt. (738-40)

The periphrase commendat semina is for seminat (Roberts, p. 120). There is a hint of the allegory in commendat,

3. Roberts (p. 11) is surely mistaken in saying that they are synonymous: radix and apex are opposites.

"he entrusts", for the Sower (Christ; He is described as sator aeternae ... vitae at III 161) entrusts his word to all alike (meum verbum, 776). Lines 739-40 are an addition by Juvencus based on the narrative and meaning of the whole parable. Roberts (p. 120) comments

The lines alert the reader to the crucial aspect of the parable he is to hear, that the seed experiences a different fate depending on where it falls, and anticipate the allegorical interpretation that the parable is to receive (in the phrase pro virtute especially).

Pro virtute anticipates the interpretation of the parable of the Sower in the narrative ( at II 775-93), by the device of the "impure" allegory (on which, see Roberts pp. 120 and 149, n. 108). The reference to the good Christian is picked up by virtutis (793) in the last line of the explanation of the parable.

Mt. 13, 4: Et cum seminat, quaedam ceciderunt secus viam et venerunt volucres et comederunt ea.

740            Nam sicubi trita viarum  
                Sub pedibus solido densetur limite tellus,  
                Aeriis avibus dant nudam semina praedam.     (740-2)

The extraordinary circumlocution sicubi trita viarum/ Sub pedibus solido densetur limite tellus stands for in via. The expansion makes the reader see this path trodden across the unploughed field by the feet of passers-by, a dramatisation of the literal narrative that has allegorical importance. Moreover the redundancy of aeriis avibus (cf. volucres caeli, Mt. 8, 20) leads into the hypallage nudam semina praedam ← nuda semina; Knappitsch, ad

loc.);<sup>4</sup> the image of plunder becomes directly associated with the image of the exposed seeds. Allegorically of course the man whose faith is barren (for he has none) is easy plunder for the devils, who are represented by the birds, as Christ points out:

Quisque meum verbum summas dimittit in aures,  
 Nec sensus recipit stabili praecepta vigore,  
 Eripit illius totum de pectore daemon.  
 Hic agro est similis duro, qui germina farris  
 780 Exponit rapidis avibus sine fruge rapinam.  
 (II 776-80)

The menace and threat of what happens to those who have no faith is particularly impressive:

Eripit illius totum de pectore daemon. (778)

The idea comes from the rather less effective Mt. 13, 19: .. venit malus et rapit ... The poet dramatises the whole scene so that the reader understands what will happen on the Last Day to those without faith.

Mt. 13, 5: Quaedam autem ceciderunt in petrosa loca, ubi non habebant terram multam; et continuo exorta sunt, quia non habebant altitudinem terrae. (6) Sole autem orto aestuaverunt et, quia non habebant radicem, aruerunt.

Ast ubi pertenui velantur pulvere saxa,  
 Farra quidem viridem depromunt germinis ortum;  
 745 Sed quia nulla subest suci substantia glebis,  
 Inserto arescunt radicum fila calore,  
 Cunctaque mox apicum labuntur acumina leto. (743-7)

The text is brilliantly tidied up so that the seed is not sown on rocky ground, because it cannot grow at all on

---

4. De Wit (ad loc.) compares Prud. Symm. 1033, haec (sc. grana) avibus quia nuda patent.

rock; instead Juvencus interprets the idea for the reader and makes the location of the seed where the soil is shallow, with rock underneath, ubi pertenui velantur pulvere saxa. The verbal abundance of viridem depromunt germinis ortum is a fine periphrase for exorta sunt (Roberts, p. 120). The vivid nature of the language is stressed by the alliteration of the "m" sound in the line (Knappitsch, ad loc.). Suci substantia really only means sucus (Knappitsch, ad loc.); the word is a favourite for use in periphrases (cf. substantia salis, I 474; substantiapanis, I 595, etc.; Knappitsch, ad loc.; Roberts, p. 148, n. 100).

Line 746 is dominated by the alliterative "r" sound (Knappitsch, ad loc.; de Wit, ad loc.), to suggest the parching of the sun. Juvencus in this line and the following one pictures for the reader what happens. The thin roots (radicum fila) are burnt up (arescunt) in the heat and the tiny shoots (apicum acumina) die (labuntur ... leto). This is a circumlocution for death (see Roberts, p. 121, for discussion), completing the idea that the whole plant, from root to the top of its young shoots, is burnt up and dies.

Both ideas dramatise the allegory. The shallow soil is equivalent to shallow faith; there is a brief flowering but when trouble comes (persecution?) the man loses his faith:

Sunt alii, laeto qui pectore nostra receptant,  
 Sed brevis est illis perceptae gratia frugis.  
 Nam si dura premat mentem strictura coercens,  
 Continuo trepidi produnt sibi credita leto.  
 785 His saxosus ager simili levitate virescit. (IV 781-5)

The death (leto, 784; cf. 747) referred to is clearly the death of the soul, i.e. the loss of eternal life.

Mt. 13, 7: Alia autem ceciderunt in spinis et creverunt spinae et suffocaverunt ea.

Seminibusque aliis contingunt aspera rura;  
 Sentibus hic spinisque feris velocius exit  
 750 Roboris augmentum frugemque internecat angens.  
 (IV 748-50)

The verbal abundance of sentibus ... spinisque feris (from spinis) and exit/Roboris augmentum (a periphrase for crescunt) develops the simplistic language of the Gospel text.

The strangling and choking of the plants (internecat angens) stands for that faith that is choked off by worldly matters, and especially money.

At spinosus ager curarum mole gravatis  
 Respondet, pressant quos pondera divitiarum.  
 Semina sic nostri sermonis pressa gravantur,  
 Nec fructus sequitur spinarum horrore necatus.  
 (II 786-9)

The mass of cares (curarum mole) is the concern for worldly matters and it is balanced by the weight of riches (pondera divitiarum), a parallelism that has been observed in ll. 746-7).

Mt. 13, 8: Alia vero ceciderunt in terram bonam et dabant fructum, quaedam centesimam, aliud sexagesimum, aliud vero tricesimum.

Uberibus vero dantur quae semina glebis  
 Illa ferunt pulchram segetem, cui laeta frequentat  
 Incrementa sui centeno copia fetu. (751-3)

Juvencus links in the contrasting section on true Christian faith by repetition of words from earlier in the parable. Semina is repeated from ll. 738 and 742 (cf. seminibus, 748), glebis is repeated, in the same sedes, from 745 and ferunt comes from 740. Wisely Juvencus ignores the sixty-fold and thirty-fold to concentrate on the hundred-fold,<sup>5</sup> perhaps the omission is to "make room" for the verbal abundance of laeta frequentat/Incrementa sui centeno copia fetu.

The interpretation embroiders further on these ideas.

790 Pinguia sic itidem paribus stant viribus arva  
 Illis, qui clarae copiunt praecepta salutis,  
 Quae penetrant animum sensu tractante tenaci  
 Centiplicemque ferunt virtutis robore frugem." (790-3)

The poet emphasises that to follow Christ's words (praecepta) : brings salvation (clarae ... salutis). This is how to avoid death. The last words, with their repetitions, could be taken as a motto for the parable: ferunt virtutis robore frugem.

Juvencus' interpretation of this parable is not of course original, being given in Mt. 13, 18-23. Nevertheless he dramatises and develops that interpretation. His approach to the problems of the language of the Bible is to use reminiscence and repetition, but not in the same way as the

---

5. Fenton, p. 214 and Benedict Green, p. 132, both comment that the numbers purely express a miraculously abundant yield, for ten-fold was reckoned good and seven and a half average. The point is that when the Kingdom comes such yields will be normal.

repetition of the Gospel narrative. The basic Juvenecan method is to vary, to express things ornately, to demonstrate mastery of the copia verborum techniques. Hence the complete difference between the two versions of the Gospel.

c) Conclusions

From detailed study of the two parables in close comparison with the source text it can be observed that the major alteration made is the avoidance of the characteristic Biblical repetition. Especially in these two rather repetitious parables, but also in the four parables investigated in the course of the previous two chapters, exact repetition of words, phrases and ideas is eschewed except for a specific reason. Individual key words and concepts may be emphasised through direct repetition when they express an important Christian symbol or assist in the interpretation of the parable. This emphasis is only effective, however, because it is not over-used. The basic approach is to avoid repetition.

The poem substitutes pleonastic variation for the almost formulaic repetition of the Biblical text. Wherever possible the copia verborum effect is created by the use of circumlocution, a plethora of adjectives and descriptive words, and a complex pattern of cross-referencing and reminiscence in close juxtaposition. Nevertheless this adornment

of the simple Gospel language is not pure stylistic tour de force. The aim at all times is to extract meaning from the difficult moral fables Jesus told.

The diction employed is very different from the primitive prose of the original. Sophisticated classical vocabulary is adopted wherever possible, and direct verbal allusions are made to Virgil. Imagery is developed out of what is suggested by the Biblical parable but is made to conform with epic usage. Often the Juvenecan parable contains elements of impure allegory intended to interpret its meaning for the reader even at the narrative stage.

The result of all these alterations from the Gospel is to create something quite new, something that can be read on its own as a separate work of literature rather than a commentary, something that has a form and content all its own - a Biblical epic. The text of the Gospel is followed so closely that the poem is a verse-by-verse rendition of the Matthean narrative yet the style is so close to classical norms that it is truly a Christian epic. The next three chapters consider reasons for alteration and levels of meaning in this Christian epic.



CHAPTER 6: JUVENCUS AND SOTERIOLOGY

The Parables of Going Before the Judge, the Workers  
in the Vineyard, and the Two Sons

As was observed above (pp. 41-3), the Alexandrian school of Biblical exegesis considered that allegory was the primary tool to be employed in interpreting the Scriptures. Origen, its greatest representative, regarded allegorizing as the technique for revealing the hidden meanings in the apparently simple Gospel text, a task which should occupy the full efforts of Christian scholarship (cf. Comm. in Ioh. I 10). The deep things of the meaning of the Gospel in his view were the spiritual and moral truths implied in the "sensible" Gospel. Hence any particular passage might bear a moral meaning (psuchē) and a spiritual meaning (pneuma) in addition to its literal one (sōma).

In general, antiquity accepted this view as standard (the school of Antioch utterly rejected allegorising, but to little effect): exegesis of the Gospels was necessary to bring out its "true" meanings; allegory was the key to that exegesis. Moreover, the identification of three senses of Scripture was highly influential.<sup>1</sup> This form

---

1. Especially in the Middle Ages when Origen's "spiritual" sense was further divided into the "allegorical" and the "anagogical", making a total of four levels of meaning; see Beryl Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, 2nd edn. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), pp. 12 ff.

of analysis was so dominant in the early fourth century that, at about the same time as Juvencus was writing, Hilary of Poitiers was engaged in making Origen's comments available in the Latin of his own commentaries to those who had no Greek (McClure, p. 308). Later in the same century Rufinus set himself to translate all Origen's works. It therefore seems possible that Juvencus was at least aware of the concept of the three-fold meaning of the Gospel. In several parables he seems to stress a moral level of meaning such as Origen identified. Whether or not he knew Origen's writings or ideas in detail, Juvencus was apparently conscious that Scripture was susceptible of a moral sense as well as a literal one. Since anagogical or "spiritual" allegories of several types have also been observed above in the course of discussion of certain Juvencan parables, it is proposed in the next three chapters to take Origen's method of exegesis as a starting point. This chapter will consider the moral level of meaning.

Simply in rendering and trying to interpret a Biblical parable, however, Juvencus is directing his reader's attention to its teaching. An additional effect of the allegorical treatment of the moral level of narrative meaning is to impart a pastoral concern on the author's part for the moral welfare of his audience. Juvencus was a priest and displays a priest's pastoral devotion to his flock.

The Juvenecan parables may be seen as moral fables instructing the initiate in how to live the Christian life.

A major difference between the Christian religion and pagan mystery cults and philosophies in general was the strict moral code promulgated by the Church. To accept Christianity one had to embrace a new way of living. Hence there was a great concern from earliest days about how to live one's life (St. Paul's first letter to the Corinthians is mostly about how a Christian should behave ). Juvenecus fits into this tradition. He uses the Gospel to give his readers a guide to Christian behaviour. In that sense the parables are paraenetic and soteriological.

Although the Evangeliorum libri is an epic, it is a Christian epic; hence, while not generically didactic it contains didactic elements. Some of these elements are clearly aimed at proselytising or evangelising. The audience of the poem was apparently to be the Roman aristocracy, who were still mostly pagan at this time and highly resistant to adopting Christianity. The dedicatee is Constantine, the first Christian emperor, and the poem may have been written at his behest: it seems likely that he may have directed that Juvenecus write a poem that would appeal to and perhaps convert his nobles. Certainly it is inconceivable that the emperor should not have approved of any such attempt. In my view, the moral level of certain parables may therefore be seen as directed at the reader

with a view to either converting him to Christianity or improving the quality of his spiritual life in Christ. There is a soteriological thrust to the moral level of meaning which springs from a pastoral concern on the part of the poet; paraenesis is employed on several occasions.

The most striking example of these features may be seen in the minor parable *Going Before the Judge*, where Juvencus' evangelising zeal leads him to depart totally from the source text. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus gives the commandment to come to an agreement with one's accuser:

Mt. 5, 25: *Esto consentiens adversario tuo cito, cum es cum illo in via, ne forte tradat te adversarius iudici et iudex tradat te ministro et in carcere mittaris. (26) Amen dico tibi: non exies inde, donec reddas novissimum quadrantem.*

This is an exhortation to reconciliation with one's enemy, and is connected with the prohibition of hate (Mt. 5, 21-2). It is better to be reconciled (as Mt. 5, 23-4 advises), or your worship is a lie; not until you have been reconciled will God accept your offering and your prayer for forgiveness (Jeremias, p.43). If the disagreement has come to trial then you should make an agreement with your opponent as soon as possible. You must be the one to give way; if you do not then the Judge may throw you in jail. In Matthew, then, this is a parable giving a direction for one's behaviour, and there is "no denying that the reason for such a direction sounds perilously near triviality" (Jeremias, p. 43).

The context for the parable in Juvencus is much the same, but the treatment and detail differ from the Gospel text.

Est tibi praeterea semper contraria virtus  
 Corporis; hoc casti celeri curetur amore,  
 Dum rapidae tecum graditur per compita vitae.  
 Accusabit enim polluti corporis usus  
 515 Et te sublimi statuet sub iudice vinctum.  
 Damnatum rapiunt ad vincula saeva ministri  
 Nec prius e tenebris solveris carceris atri,  
 Ultima quam minimi reddatur portio nummi.  
 (I 511-8)

Here the advice is to avoid unchastity because it will condemn you when you are judged by God. Christian sexual morality was of course quite different from pagan practice; indeed it was the main area of conflict between the Church and the ancient world. These lines were apparently included to warn the world that the sexual licence common throughout the empire would be punished severely by God. Juvencus is concerned here for his readers' souls. Moreover, such an extensive reworking of the Gospel cannot arise from a mere misunderstanding of it; this is a deliberate passage of pastoral instruction.

The divergence from the Gospel is well done. The virtus/Corporis (note the periphrase) is always contraria, "opposed", and this threat you must ward off with your love of chastity. The "c" of contraria is picked up and repeated in the alliteration of the letter in the subsequent line (Knappitsch, ad loc.):

Corporis; hoc casti celeri curetur amore, (512).

The conceit of quick love, celeri amore, is picked up by rapidae ... vitae in the long periphrastic expansion

Dum rapidae tecum graditur per compita vitae. (513)

This means simply "as long as you live", and is virtually redundant to the sense of the passage. Per compita vitae is unique in the poem but per compita is used elsewhere (five times; per compita viarum is found at III 758, parable of the Wedding Feast, and IV 206, parable of Ten Virgins). The onomatopoeic quality of the line and this phrase in particular has been noticed by Knappitsch (ad loc.).

The polluti corporis usus that will accuse one before God surely refers to sexual immorality as the ultimate sin; it is similar to the man indutum pollutae vestis amictu (III 763) in the parable of the Wedding Feast. The polluted body and the polluted garment both mean that the owner is totally perverted by sin.

With line 515 Juvencus begins to develop a line of eschatology that is not present in the original:

Et te sublimi statuet sub iudice vinctum.

Sublimi ... iudice is a clear reference to an allegorized spiritual level above the literal narrative; the word refers to the Father (cf. III 463, sublimisque patris) and indicates that the poet refers here to the Judgement. Vinctum implies that the man is in chains.

This is confirmed by the next couplet:

Damnatum rapiunt ad vincula saeva ministri  
Nec prius e tenebris solveris carceris atri, (516-7).

The ministri are clearly God's angels, and the description of the Judgement and punishment contain details familiar from other eschatological parables. The vincula (cf. conexis manibus pedibusque, III 762 parable of Wedding Feast), tenebris (cf. tenebras III 770, ibid.), and carceris occurs in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant, though not in an eschatological context:

Carceris et mersum tenebris poenisque premebat, (III 450)

For the metaphor rapiunt ad (= in) vincula Knappitsch (ad loc.) compares Horace Serm. I 9, 77: rapit in ius.

The last line of the parable, however, brings the passage back to the Matthean source:

Ultima quam minimi reddatur portio nummi. (518)

This comes from Mt. 5, 26: non exies inde, donec reddas novissimum quadrantem. Juvencus also refers to the last farthing, ultima minimi portio nummi, but in a context which does not appear to make sense. The man is being thrown into prison for having a polluted body, not for being in debt, so what is the money that he must repay? The answer apparently is that the repayment of money stands allegorically for the purgatorial cleansing of sin from the body. Nevertheless the last line introduction of an important element of the parabolic narrative is confusing for the reader,

especially since the earlier part of the narrative is de-allegorised so that the crime for which the man is arraigned is not debt but sexual immorality (according to the Christian code). Juvencus is so concerned in the early part of the parable to preach sexual chastity that he destroys the actual parable per se. Too late he tries to introduce the original details of the Matthean story and creates utter confusion. The repayment of the money is quite unconvincing on the literal level, and is disruptive on the eschatological spiritual level too. It does not fit the allegory at all. Juvencus' pastoral concern has betrayed him into violation of the Gospel text (cf. Marold, Verhältnis, p. 336).

Hilary of Poitiers and Jerome both mention "moral" allegorical interpretations that view the parable in terms of the concord between spirit and body:

Quid autem a pluribus in hoc capite sensum sit, non putavi esse tractandum. Hoc enim, quod adversario reconciliari benevolentia iubemur, ad corporis et spiritus adversantium sibi concordiam retulerunt.  
(Hil. Comm. in Matt. IV 19)

... plerique arbitrantur de carne dictum et anima, uel de anima et spiritu quod penitus non stat.  
(Jer. In Math. I 574-5)

They reject the approach favoured by Juvencus, but then he avoids the debt and the financial aspect of the parable. Effectively the parable has been replaced by pastoral instruction.

The poet's soteriological concern is clear in this passage; indeed he alters the Gospel text so much that



what remains is not a parable at all. The narrative element is so contaminated by the "impure" allegory of the spiritual level, it is dominated by the eschatology. Hence the final line with its reference to a debt becomes metaphorical rather than literal.

Nec prius e tenebris solveris carceris atri,  
Ultima quam minimi reddatur portio nummi. (517-8)

The idea of paying off the entire debt is an image expressing the complete purgation of sin from the body of the sinner in the world to come.

This is a unique instance of departure from the Biblical source in a parable, where the moral element is not a function of the allegory. In all other examples of paraenesis in the Juvencan parables alteration is much less drastic and is related to the moral allegory. Moreover the Going Before the Judge passage is only a minor parable even in its original form. It can be said that it is completely atypical. To illustrate Juvencus' characteristic employment of paraenesis it is necessary to reconsider two major parables discussed above, the Workers in the Vineyard and the Two Sons. The advantage of choosing parables already examined from another viewpoint is that the material relevant to Juvencus' pastoral concern only may be extracted from them without leaving an incomplete picture of the parable.

In the parable of the Workers in the Vineyard, as has been remarked above in chapter four (pp. 188-9), the logion "the last shall be first and the first last" is discarded by the poet in favour of "many are called, but few are chosen":

Nam multos homines dignatio sancta vocavit,  
E quis perminimam dignum est secernere partem.  
(III 582-3)

In view of this "message" it is not surprising to find that the Juvencan parable lays great stress on the fact that those who joined the work very late at the last possible moment (Ultima ... portio lucis, 564; Ultima ... sero ... hora, 576), receive the same reward as the rest. Juvencus' moral meaning expressed allegorically is that salvation is certain for those who repent and turn to Christ, no matter how late in the day. God's grace will receive into the Kingdom those who see the truth only at the very end.

This Juvencan interpretation is very decidedly soteriological. The careful structuring of the parable to fit the altered formulaic saying that concludes it indicates clearly that the poet intended his reader to apply the allegory to his own circumstances. It has been noted earlier in this chapter that Constantine's court was pagan for the most part, and therefore there was a need for conversion on the part of many of the poem's readership.

Moreover, Constantine's own life and his deathbed baptism<sup>2</sup> (so that the soul went to the Judgement seat cleansed of sin, in a state of grace, and hence attained Paradise) provides just one instance of how the aristocracy tended to delay finally committing themselves to Christ. If the great Christian emperor was one of those received into baptism at the last hour how about those nobles who were genuinely undecided? The emphasis in the parable then is clearly soteriological, inviting the pagan to consider what a great prize is offered him and how attainable it is. Juvencus' tactful reference to the emperor's apparent refusal at the time the poem was written to receive the sacrament of baptism must be seen as an attempt to gather into the vineyard those of his retinue who were uncertain about this religion. In other contexts, for example the parable of the Wedding Feasts, the message is not so forebearing: elsewhere the emphasis is firmly on the dreadful punishments awaiting those who are not chosen and have turned too late to Christ. The Workers parable is an attempt to evangelize through the allegory of the moral sense.

Another example of a moral level of meaning intended to lead to the salvation of the reader is in the parable of the Two Sons. This parable has been discussed above

---

2. See Eusebius, Vita. IV 62.

in the second chapter (pp.62-76) but requires further comment.

The Matthean parable is applied to John the Baptist. He had found disobedience in the professional servants of God, and obedience in those whose way of life was ungodly. Hence he had been treated in the same way as the householder in the parable (Jeremias, p. 80). This application is not the original one (Jeremias, pp. 80-1; Fenton, p. 339) and is not followed by Juvencus.

The parable exists in three forms, each with some manuscript support. Manson (p. 222) expresses the three in the following manner:

- i) The first son says "No" and repents; the second son says "Yes" and does nothing. Who did the will of his father? The first.
- ii) The first son says "No" and repents; the second son says "Yes" and does nothing. Who did the will of his father? The second.
- iii) The first son says "Yes" and does nothing; the second says "No" and repents. Who did the will of his father? The second.

The first and third say essentially the same thing, but the second is the one which Juvencus chooses.

He reconciles it with the context in Matthew by having the proceres give the wrong answer and Jesus' rejoinder condemn them, where his answer is normally understood in a different sense.

The parable proper was probably used to illustrate the difference between saying and doing (Fenton, p. 339), and this is exactly what Juvencus' version succeeds in doing.

By making Christ correct the proceres, he is making him correct us, the readers, too. Hence the parable works on the literal level, has a spiritual level criticising the Jewish leaders (and the Jewish people) and also achieves a moral level presenting the necessity for deeds not simply words, a soteriological concern. The details make this clear.

The parable opens with dicta (III 693), which consist of elaborate instruction about viticulture:

Vitis mihi portio maior  
Semiputata iacet. Sed perge et robore forti  
Nunc scrobibus nunc falce premens vineta retunde.  
(693-5)

This is clearly about facta. The son is given specific instructions to restore the vineyard where the season's work is behindhand (semiputata). He is to dig and dress the vines (Italian vineyards required a remarkable amount of both; cf. White, pp. 230 and 237-40; O.C.D. s.v. Viticulture). Since the vines are only half-pruned (and should all be fully pruned, presumably) it may be autumn (White, p. 239) when the ablaqueatio was performed. This involved digging around the roots to let the air in, and at the same time surface rootlets were pared off (White, p. 238). If this is the operation referred to by nunc scrobibus nunc falce premens then the tool used is not normally the falx vinatoria but the two-bladed drag-hoe, bidens (White, p. 239). Whatever the actual

tasks to be carried out, the deeds described in these words are rejected by the son as sordida dicta laboris (696). However, he eventually follows the commands of his father, condemns his behaviour and reforms himself.

When the second son is asked, he says "Yes" but afterwards nec dictis facta repensat (701), his deeds do not match his words. Significantly the proceres, however, applaud his response.

Finally Jesus corrects them, by implication saying that they chose wrongly: Nunc vera advertite dicta (704). This completes the pattern of repetition, and hence the section concerning words and deeds. The emphasis on dicta, iussa, responsa (-um) and laboris points to an anagogical level. The reader is to read the parable as a moral lesson that his deeds must match his words; the professed Christian must live a Christian life of charity, or he is not a Christian. As Jesus says on another occasion:

Mt. 7, 21: Non omnis, qui dicit mihi: Domine, Domine, intrabit in regnum caelorum, sed qui facit voluntatem patris mei, qui in caelis est, ipse intrabit in regnum caelorum.

Salvation requires more than acknowledgement of Christ in word, it demands that inner conversion that changes the individual's whole life to one of service.

Two major parables have been examined for pastoral concern and a soteriological concern in the allegorized

moral sense. In both, such features have been located and in each case alteration has been detected, implying that the poet has deliberately exploited this characteristic of the Biblical parables and shaped his versions of them round a specific message intended for the reader. The alterations, as has been demonstrated, take the moral sense latent in the Gospel text, allegorize it and make it into a coherent statement of concern for the reader's moral welfare. This is characteristic of Juvenecus' approach to the parables in general. Of those examined in detail in this study, the Wedding Feast, the Two Houses, the Sower, the Talents, and the Ten Virgins all show some sign of a concern on the part of the poet that the reader should see a moral lesson in the narrative and profit from it in his own life. In the next chapter another major theme of Juvenecan allegory is investigated - that of eschatology expressed in the spiritual level of meaning.

CHAPTER 7: JUVENCUS AND ESCHATOLOGY

The Parable of the Talents

In the previous chapter the moral sense of Juvencus' parables was considered. It was shown that a soteriological concern often underlies the moral allegory and accounts for paraenetic elements in their Juvencan versions. Much more prominent in the poem, however, is Origen's "spiritual" or anagogical level of meaning. As we have seen, this may take many forms, but Juvencus frequently exploits the allegory to bring out eschatological meanings in his parables. This chapter is devoted to a consideration of the spiritual interpretation of the Gospel as revealed in the poem's eschatology.

One of the most striking features in Juvencus' poem is his concern with the Last Things. Matthew is arguably the most eschatological of the synoptic gospels, so that the choice of gospel in itself indicates some interest in eschatology, an interest more than confirmed by Juvencus' treatment of the Gospel. The parable of the Talents is an example.

Mt. 25, 14: Sicut enim homo peregre afuturus vocavit servos suos et tradidit illis bona sua. (15) Et uni dedit quinque talenta, alii autem duo, alii vero unum, unicuique secundum propriam virtutem, et profectus est. (16) Continuo abiit qui quinque talenta acceperat et operatus est in eis alia quinque. (17) Similiter qui duo accepit, lucratus est in eis alia duo. (18) Qui autem unum talentum accepit fodit in terram et abscondit pecuniam domini sui. (19) Post multum vero tempus venit dominus servorum illorum et posuit



rationem cum eis. (20) Et accedens qui quinque talenta acceperat optulit alia quinque talenta dicens: Domine, quinque talenta mihi dedisti, ecce alia quinque superlucratus sum. (21) Ait illi dominus eius: Euge, bone serve et fidelis, quia super pauca fuisti fidelis, super multa te constituam, intra in gaudium domini tui. (22) Accessit autem qui duo talenta acceperat et ait: Domine, duo talenta tradidisti mihi, ecce alia duo lucratus sum. (23) Ait illi dominus eius: Euge, serve bone et fidelis, quia super pauca fuisti fidelis, super multa te constituam, intra in gaudium domini tui. (24) Accedens autem qui unum talentum acceperat ait: Domine, scio, quia homo austeris es, metis, ubi non seminasti, et congregas, ubi non sparsisti. (25) Et timens abii et abscondi talentum tuum in terra; ecce habes, quod tuum est. (26) Respondens autem dominus eius dixit ei: Serve nequa et piger, sciebas, quod meto, ubi non semino, et congrego, ubi non sparsi. (27) Oportuit ergo te committere pecuniam meam nummulariis et veniens ego recepissem quod meum est. (28) Tollite itaque ab eo talentum et date ei, qui habet decem talenta. (29) Omni enim habenti dabitur, et abundabit; ei autem qui non habet, et quod habet, auferetur ab eo. (30) Et nequam servum proicite foras in tenebras exteriores; illic erit fletus et stridor dentium.

Dodd's consideration of the parable (pp. 146-53) has shown that it went through several stages before Matthew incorporated it in his Gospel. He shows that Jesus probably told the parable to denounce the scribes and Pharisees, who had buried the Law under a mass of traditions and regulations (Dodd, p. 151). Next the early Church made use of the parable to illustrate the maxim, "To him that hath shall be given"; the point of the parable was felt to lie in the curious treatment of the worthy and unworthy servants (Dodd, p. 148). Somewhere in the Matthean line of tradition further ethical developments were made. In Matthew, unlike the versions in Luke 19, 12-17 and the non-canonical Gospel

of the Nazarenes fr. 18 (Hennecke), the amounts of money entrusted to the three servants are graded, which is clearly intended to illustrate the varieties of human endowments (Dodd, p. 152).<sup>1</sup> Finally this paraenetic interest is superseded or supplemented by the eschatological motive (Dodd, p. 153).

It is evident that for Matthew the application of the parable is eschatological: the return of the master signifies the second advent of Christ; the servant is not only deprived of the money that was given him (as in Luke and Nazarenes) but cast into outer darkness, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth; the master's reckoning with his servants has become the Last Judgement. The parable is virtually pure eschatological allegory in Matthew.

Juvencus extracts elements of meaning from both traditions: within the moral allegory he provides a coherent paraenesis and at the same time on a spiritual level he develops the eschatology of the parable.

"Sicut enim, longas cui contigit ire profecto  
 In terras, credens servis tractanda talenta  
 Uni quinque dedit, duo cepit et alter habenda,  
 230 Tertius unius curam tractare talenti  
 Suscepit, vires quoniam diversa merentur.  
 Sed maior quis est concredita portio nummi,  
 Certatim duplis auxerunt incrementis.

---

1. It should be noted, however, that the word talent carried none of the associations it has for us of personal attributes or abilities.

Ille sed, unius cui credita cura talenti,  
 235 Telluri infodiens servat sine fructibus aera.  
 Iamque aderat praesens dominus: tum primus et alter  
 Se geminasse illi pariter concredata monstrant.  
 Illos laudat herus potioraque credere tantae  
 Promittit fidei. Sed tertius ille refodit  
 240 Et domino reddit tali cum voce talentum:  
 'Quod scirem domino memet servire severo,  
 Qui meteres segetes alieno semine cretas,  
 Extimui, argentumque tuum concredere terrae  
 Malui, quod salvum semper tibi reddere possem.'  
 245 Tum dominus famulo respondens talibus infit:  
 'Si nescire meos auderes dicere mores,  
 Nequitiae tantae veniam concedere possem.  
 Hoc etiam gnarum potius praestare decebat,  
 Ut fructum nobis tractata pecunia ferret.  
 250 Quapropter segni tollatur portio nostri  
 Prudentique dehinc detur possessio maior,  
 Quem duplis cumulasse lucris mea quinque talenta  
 Inveni. Namque est certum, potiora mereri,  
 Quis res uberius cumulatae sortis abundat.  
 255 At cui parva subest segni substantia corde,  
 Id minimum penitus iuste tolletur ab illo,  
 Ut nequam servus tenebras dimersus ad imas  
 Perpetuos fletus poenae stridore frequentet.'  
 (IV 227-58)

Eschatology is of course present to a high degree in the last few lines, the condemnatory judgement of the third servant by the Lord, but the whole parable is developed by the poet in an interesting fashion. The eschatological motive is present even in the first line of Juvencus' version, whereas it is absent from the original.

Mt. 25, 14: Sicut enim homo peregre afuturus vocavit servos suos et tradidit illis bona sua. (15) Et uni dedit quinque talenta, alii autem duo, alii vero unum, unicuique secundum propriam virtutem, et profectus est.

"Sicut enim, longas cui contigit ire profecto  
 In terras, credens servis tractanda talenta  
 Uni quinque dedit, duo cepit et alter habenda,  
 230 Tertius unius curam tractare talenti  
 Suscepit, vires quoniam diversa merentur.  
 (227-31)

Juvencus develops the departure of the lord. The Latin Bible has only the fact that he was going abroad, peregre afuturus (Vulgate has proficiscens), and the actual departure, profectus est. This is extended and further details are added: longas cui contigit ire profecto/In terras (227-8), where the meaning is "it so happened that he set out and went into distant lands" (longas terras). The pleonastic ire profecto and the framing of the clause between agreeing adjective and noun, longas ... terras, create the effect of verbal abundance required by the age. On the spiritual (eschatological) level, however, this departure refers to the ascension of Jesus into heaven, so that the distance the man travels (longas ... in terras) signifies the length of time before the parousia. It may be that this comes from the words introducing the Second Advent of the man in the parable:

Post multum vero tempus, venit dominus ...  
(Mt. 25, 19)

Nevertheless it is surely significant that Juvencus begins the parable with a clear eschatological reference.

Also of importance is the addition of words of management and trust. Instead of simply handing over the money, the lord credens servis tractanda talenta/Uni quinque dedit (228-9), and the third servant unius curam tractare talenti/Suscepit (230-1). The repetition tractanda talenta ... tractare talenti in the same sedes is more than just a

stylistic trick; tractare is a technical term from the financial world meaning that one has charge of money for the sake of managing or administering it, that one is trusted to use it.<sup>2</sup> As with credens and curam, Juvencus has inserted words showing that the Lord entrusted his servants with the talents to work with them. The reader is to understand that the servants are not to keep the money only, but to make more from it. This is to circumvent the main problem of the parable, which is why the third servant is treated so harshly. On the moral allegorical level the talents stand for God's gifts freely given, so that the servant is guilty of not making the best possible use of them. The penalties for failure then become appropriate not only to the parable itself, but also to the final Judgement (the spiritual meaning). Crede, tractare and cura all show how seriously the lord bestows the talents on his servants. On the moral (and soteriological) level this refers to the necessity for works in addition to faith (being a servant of the Lord).

The apparently small change of virtutem (v. 15) to vires (231) also brings out the command to the Christian to practise good works. Vires quoniam diversa merentur

---

2. Arevalo (ad loc.) compares Cic. Div. in Caec. 10, 32, eras enim tu quaestor, pecuniam publicam tu tractabas. So also Verr. II 5, 24, 60, Verres ... imperavit... ut is ea pecuniam tractaret.



Percursio is employed sensitively here, as Roberts (p. 154, n. 154) has noted. Instead of the form, "The servant who had five made five more; the servant who had two made two more ...", there is a simple statement that the servants who were entrusted with large sums of money increased that money two-fold. The two are associated together as examples of one possible course of action, which will be contrasted with the course that the third servant chooses.

Maior ... portio nummi, an example of the abstract noun with genitive of identity so common in the poem, is a periphrase with an underlying subtlety.<sup>3</sup> Portio reminds the reader that the servants are each given a particular share of the whole, according to merit and ability. Within the eschatology, where the talents stand for all the gifts that God gives us, the specific share is in effect a share in the Kingdom. For God gives us all around us, including our own selves, and if we use those gifts of grace properly then we shall be given a place in it when the Kingdom comes. The share of money (= the share of God's gifts) is a reference to this idea of the coming Kingdom.

Another interpretative detail inserted is the word concredita. As with credere, tractare and cura the implication is of trust. The money is committed by God to his

---

3. Cf. II 693, portio maior, in the parable of the Two Sons.

servants. Their response to this act of faith in his servants by the lord is expressed by the addition certatim and emphasised by its position at the beginning of a line. The servants are faithful and strive earnestly to carry out their lord's commandments. Because they set about their task with a will, their efforts are rewarded by success; this success is celebrated in the verbal abundance of auxerunt incrementis, which closes a four-word hexameter. The poet is pointing up the soteriological moral for the reader: "If you act as they did, your efforts too will be crowned by this wonderful result."

Mt. 25, 18: Qui autem unum talentum accepit fodit  
in terram et abscondit pecuniam domini sui.

Ille sed, unius cui credita cura talenti,  
235 Telluri infodiens servat sine fructibus aera.  
(234-5)

The third servant too is trusted with the responsibility of the money, credita cura talenti. The echo in unius credita cura talenti of unius curam tractare talenti (230) links the third servant with the others, in order that the contrast may be developed. Every word of the clause in l. 234 is a repetition:

Unius from uni (229), unius (230)  
cui from cui (227)  
credita from credens (228), (con-) credita (232)  
cura from curam (230)  
talenti from talenta (228), talenti (230).

The parallel with the other servants is established by this remarkable pattern of repetition. Knappitsch (ad loc.) has noted the alliteration of cui credita cura.



Furthermore telluri at the beginning of the line varies terras (228), as aira at the end varies nummi (232).

Telluri infodiens with its dative of the indirect object is directly taken from Matthew's fodit in terram. The verb is uncommon but used by Virgil: et corpora partim/multa uirum terrae infodiunt (Aen. XI 204-5).

Apart from the trust theme (credita cura), these details are more or less present in the original. Where Juvenecus diverges slightly, however, is in the final phrase of the couplet: servat sine fructibus aera. The employment of servare rather than condere or one of its compounds is apt, in that the servant keeps his lord's money safe by not using it. The addition of the harvest image, sine fructibus, is even more illuminating for the spiritual interpretation.<sup>4</sup> It anticipates the harvest imagery of the third servant's excuse to the lord, which is present in Matthew:

... homo austeris es, metis, ubi non seminasti,  
et congregas, ubi non sparsisti (v. 24).

The lord repeats the servant's very words in an ironic use of the same imagery:

... sciebas, quod meto, ubi non semino, et  
congrego, ubi non sparsi (v. 26)

---

4. Cf. sine fruge a detail added to the explanation of the parable of the Sower (II 780); sine fructibus occurs in the same sedes at IV 23.

Thus there is warrant for it in the parable itself. Moreover, in the parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard fructus is used to express metaphorically what is due to God from man (III 715, 717 and 736). Here too fructus means what a man should make from God's gifts around him and within him. In terms of the spiritual allegory the fact that the servant is sine fructibus justifies the Lord in casting him into Hell. The fruits he expects (fructus) are only those of the true Christian, the life of good works without which faith is useless. The servant does not follow Christ in his life if he is without these fruits.

Mt. 25, 19: Post multum vero tempus venit dominus servorum illorum et posuit rationem cum eis. (20) Et accedens qui quinque talenta acceperat optulit alia quinque talenta dicens: Domine, quinque talenta mihi dedisti, ecce alia quinque superlucratus sum. (21) Ait dominus eius: Euge, bone serve et fidelis, quia super pauca fuisti fidelis, super multa te constituam, intra in gaudium domini tui. (22) Accessit autem qui duo talenta acceperat et ait: Domine, duo talenta tradidisti mihi, ecce alia duo lucratus sum. (23) Ait illi dominus eius: Euge, serve bone et fidelis, quia super pauca fuisti fidelis, super multa te constituam, intra in gaudium domini tui.

Iamque aderat praesens dominus: tum primus et alter  
Se geminasse illi pariter concredita monstrant.  
Illos laudat herus potioraque credere tantae  
Promittit fidei. (236-9)

Roberts (p. 154, n 154) has noted the percursio here, where the source is more heavily summarised than any passage in a parable or indeed elsewhere in the poem.<sup>5</sup> The bare

---

5. See Roberts, p. 154, n. 154, for a full list of summarising passages.

bones of this section are present however. Four speeches in oratio recta are converted into two clauses of oratio obliqua. The lord has two speeches saying

quia super pauca fuisti fidelis, super multa te  
constituam, intra in gaudium domini tui.<sup>6</sup> (vv. 21 and 23).

Juvencus gives a précis of these two speeches: potioraque credere tantae/Promittit fidei. The obedient servants have been tested in faith and won through. The change from fidelis to the stronger fidei emphasises that through doing the works commanded by Christ they have shown their faith. Without works there is no true faith. This is the point of the repetition of credere from ll. 228 and 234. The Lord has entrusted the servants with the talents and they have not betrayed his trust. The servants show that they were aware of the responsibility laid on them by repeating concredita from l. 232, one of Juvencus' "trust" words. No wonder that Illos laudat herus; they have proved themselves worthy to enter the Kingdom.

Herus (= erus; hēros of P and G is metrically impossible) is an unusual word in a religious context. Catullus 68 is the only reference which antedates Juvencus:

nondum cum sanguine sacro,  
hostia caelestis pacificasset eros,  
nil mihi tam ualde placeat, Ramnusia uirgo,  
quod temere inuitis suscipiatur eris. (75-8)

---

6. This may be a mistranslation of the Gk. (copied by Vulgate). Jeremias, p. 60, n. 42, maintains that the Aramaic word rendered by chara means "feast", and hence is an invitation to the eucharistic banquet at the parousia.

Juvencus himself uses it in the eschatological parable of the  
 Servant entrusted with Supervision:

190 Ast ille infelix (sc. servus), qui sordida luxuriatus  
 Tardantem contempnet herum ... (IV 190-1 = Mt. 24, 48)

Clearly the master here is Christ. In Prudentius' Liber  
Apotheosis too erus refers to Christ:

denique post multi sermonis mutua postque  
 conspectum praesentis eri et consortia longa, (39-40).  
 exemplo mutaret eri similesque per artus, (160).<sup>7</sup>

Thus when dominus (237) is varied by herus two lines later,  
 the reader is indirectly told that the man of the parable  
 is Christ.

The religious overtones of the description of the  
 return of the lord are pronounced: Iamque aderat praesens  
dominus. Praesens is what every supplicant prays that  
 the god invoked will be to him, and means "favourable",  
 "propitious". Nisus calls on Diana thus:

"tu, dea, tu praesens nostro succurre labori,"  
 (Virg. Aen. IX 404)

Adesse has much the same sense. When one prayed that a  
 god should be present, implied was that the god would protect  
 and aid. For instance, Aeneas calls upon Mercury thus:

"adsis a placidusque iuues et sidera caelo  
 dextra feras."  
 (Virg. Aen. IV 578-9)

---

7. Bergman, however, considers this line to be an inter-  
 polation.

Prudentius too uses the pagan address at the beginning of a hymn:

Ades, pater supreme,  
(Cath. 6)

The description of the lord's return, then, clearly implies his divinity, aderat praesens dominus. The reader is to understand that this is the Advent, the return of Christ to this world that is to bring the Judgement and the Kingdom. The Apocalypse has arrived.

It should be noted here that Juvencus compares and contrasts the servants through the repetition of ille. The close repetition illi ... Illos separated by three words picks up Ille (234) and looks forward to ille in the next line (239), both of the unfaithful servant.

Mt. 25, 24: Accedens autem qui unum talentum acceperat ait: Domine, scio, quia homo austeris es, metis, ubi non seminasti, et congregas, ubi non sparsisti. (25) Et timens abii et abscondi talentum tuum in terra; ecce habes, quod tuum est.

Sed tertius ille refodit  
240 Et domino reddit tali cum voce talentum:  
'Quod scirem domino memet servire severo,  
Qui meteres segetes alieno semine cretas,  
Extimui, argentumque tuum concredere terrae  
Malui, quod salvum semper tibi reddere possem.'  
(239-44)

The servant's reaction to the Parousia is to dig up the money again, refodit. Refodere is an unusual word but it is explained by the presence of infodere; infodiens ... refodit forms a symmetrical pattern. Several words in the first two lines are repeated keywords:

tertius from Tertius (230)

ille from Ille (234), illi (237), Illos (238)

domino from dominus (236)

Talentum from talenta (228), talenti (230), talenti (234)

These repetitions help to make the parable coherent.

The servant's claim that he knew he served a severe master is undercut by the parechesis servire severo on the verbal level. In terms of its meaning the excuse does not stand up to examination. If the servant knew how strict his lord was, why did he not do what his lord commanded? He is condemned out of his own mouth.

The detail of the claim that the lord takes a harvest from land where he has not sown is developed by the poet into an image of harvest and agriculture:

Qui meteres segetes alieno semine cretas.

Metere and seminare (which may have suggested semine to the poet) are present in the Gospel. What is interesting is the emphasis on the abundance of the harvest in segetes ... cretas. The claim that these crops are sprung from someone else's sowing, alieno semine cretas, is not in itself ridiculous; indeed it is a very serious charge. The servant is justifying himself by implying that his master runs a very corrupt business, and therefore he would not put the money to work. Next he claims that he was frightened of his master (Extimui). First his master is strict, and

he was frightened in case he lost the money on some business deal. Next his master is a nasty capitalist, exploiting others while not dirtying his own hands. Now he is plain terrified of him. The servant says anything that comes into his head because of his guilty conscience.

For these reasons, he says, the money was buried. Argentum here is a further variation on nummi (232) and aera (235), while terrae repeats terras (228) and refers back to Telluri (235). These techniques appear to lend weight to what the servant says. Concredere, however, uncuts his specious words. Concredita (232 and 237) has been used to express the trust theme: those who were entrusted with the large sums of money doubled them (concredita, 232 and 237). Now concredere is being used of entrusting the money to the earth. Apart from the fact that the earth provides little security for the money, the money was entrusted to him not so that it could in turn be "entrusted" to the earth but so that it could be used:

230 Tertius unius curam tractare talenti  
Suscepit, (230)

The servant's language betrays his fault.

Malui in its emphatic line-beginning sedes, isolated from the rest of the line, forces the reader to realize that the servant had no right to choose what to do with the money. His personal desires and promptings

have nothing to do with the matter: he was given the money to increase it. His wilfulness becomes even clearer if the paraenetic moral allegory is regarded. God made us just as he made everything; He entrusts his creation to us to make something of. If we fail to do the works necessary to restore his Creation to its prelapsarian state then the Kingdom will not come. The servant is wilfully preventing the fulfilment of the Kingdom by daring to prefer something else.

Evidently combating the wrongs of this world is neither easy nor safe. Christ did not choose a safe way for himself and his followers. Hence the falsity of the servant's position: quod salvum semper tibi reddere possem. He was not asked to keep the moeny safe (salvum); one is not saved (salvum) by being safe. The way of the Christian is the opposite of the safe one:

Qui invenit animam suam, perdet illam; qui  
perdiderit animam suam propter me, inveniet  
eam. (Mt. 10, 39)

This servant will lose his life by trying to save it.

Mt. 25, 26: Respondens autem dominus eius dixit ei:  
Serve nequa et piger, sciebas, quod meto, ubi non  
semino, et congrego, ubi non sparsi. (27) Oportuit  
ergo te committere pecuniam mean nummulariis  
et veniens ego recepissem quod meum est.

245 Tum dominus famulo respondens talibus inquit:  
'Si nescire meos auderes dicere mores,  
Nequitiae tantae veniam concedere possem.  
Hoc etiam gnarum potius praestare decebat,  
Ut fructum nobis tractata pecunia ferret.(245-9)



The final repetition of dominus (from 236, 240 and 241) and the variation famulo for servis (228) leads into the reply of the lord. Huemer (ad loc.) compares the end of the verse with Virgil, Aen. X 860: adloquitur maerentem et talibus inquit.

Here the lord does not repeat the servant's words saying that he reaps where he does not sow. In Matthew the ironic tone is very noticeable behind these words; the lord sees that it is a very feeble excuse but is prepared to allow it. Juvencus omits all this and substitutes a statement to the effect that if the servant really did not know the normal practice then the lord would be merciful even in the face of such idleness (auderes and possem balance nicely here; possem repeats the last word of the servant's speech at 243). This conditional is immediately denied, however. Hoc etiam gnarum, the servant (as one would expect) did know the normal procedure, and since he knew it he should at least have invested the money.

The fact that the lord would have been merciful to the man if it were a genuine mistake, Nequitiae tantae veniam, is a feature added by the poet. The grace of God is emphasised by this remarkable suggestion of forgiveness, especially in the face of such a sin. Nequitia does not mean simply idleness, it is one of the strongest possible words signifying bad moral qualities. That the lord should

forgive this man even though he is guilty of nequitia shows that the lord is not an earthly one.

There is a strong sense of moral obligation in the verbal abundance of potius praestare decebat. The fact that the man did not respond to that obligation shows that his sin is grave indeed.

The poet further extends the harvest imagery with:

Ut fructum nobis tractata pecunia ferret.

Tractare (ll. 228 and 230) expresses the trust theme while fructum repeats fructibus (235). Ut fructum ... pecunia ferret is a fine periphrase for investing the money; it refers very naturally to the allegory where men's deeds do indeed bear fruit. Pecunia varies nummi, aera, and argentum. It should be noted that Juvencus improves on the rather muddled *Itala*.

Mt. 25, 28: Tollite itaque ab eo talentum et date ei, qui habet decem talenta.

250 Quapropter segni tollatur portio nostri  
Prudentique dehinc detur possessio maior,  
Quem duplis cumulasse lucris mea quinque talenta  
Inveni. (250-3)

The talents are to be taken from the lazy servant and given to the servant who has ten talents. The servant is described as segni (cf. serve nequa et piger, v. 26), in contrast with the Prudenti who made five more talents. The division between them is the same as in the parable of the Ten Virgins: Prudentes (IV 213) of the wise and segnes (IV 220) of the foolish virgins.

The contrast between the two is further developed by the two abstract noun phrases, one to each of them: portio nostri ... possessio maior. Moreover, portio nostri refers back to portio nummi (232) since they are both in the line-ending sedes, but possessio maior is a variation of maior ... portio (232). Portio nostri is understood as referring to "our money" on the literal level, but on the spiritual level of the eschatology it is the share of Christ which is taken away from him, for he is doomed to an eternity without Christ in Hell.

The verbal abundance of l. 252 helpsto bring out the riches of the prudens (spiritual riches, of course):

Quem duplis cumulasse lucris mea quinque talenta  
Inveni.

Duplis cumulasse lucris mea ... talenta is a periphrase where duplis is repeated from l. 232 and lucris is another variation in the sequence nummi, aera, argentum, pecunia and lucris; quinque is repeated from l. 229 and talenta is the last of the five occurrences of the word, all in the end-stop position (ll. 228, 230, 234, 240 and 252). Inveni is stressed by its isolated position; it reminds the reader that all this is what the lord saw when he returned (= the parousia). This is his Judgement.

Mt. 25, 29: Omni enim habenti dabitur, et abundabit; ei autem qui non habet, et quod habet, auferetur ab eo. (30) Et nequam servum proicite foras in tenebras exteriores; illic erit fletus et stridor dentium.

Namque est certum, potiora mereri,  
 Quis res uberius cumulatae sortis abundat.  
 255 At cui parva subest segni substantia corde,  
 Id minimum penitus iuste tolletur ab illo,  
 Ut nequam servus tenebras dimersus ad imas  
 Perpetuos fletus poenae stridore frequentet.  
(253-8)

The contrast is continued in reverse order with the prudens first. The man who already has deserves to have even more:

Quid res uberius cumulatae sortis abundat.  
(254)

The synonyms are heaped together in a remarkable example of how far contemporary demands for copia verborum can go. Sors refers to the money he was given at the first to invest (Arevalo, ad loc.). The poet generalizes from the instance of the prudens, creating a universal statement that applies to the reader too. Cumulatae repeats cumulasse two lines previously, and potiora is repeated from l. 238. Mereri brings back the theme of deserts from l. 231 where the money was allocated according to the capacity of each man to produce: vires quoniam diversa merentur. The parable is a study in what people deserve for fidelity, and also for its absence.

The poet turns now to those who are not faithful, generalizing from the segnis man. Here those of little faith are described as having parva ... substantia and a segni ... corde. Corde by metonymy refers to spirit, as it does frequently in the poem (cf. praestupido ... corde of the

foolish virgins, IV 198), and substantia refers both to the money and to the inner strength of a man. The type he is talking of is like the segnis man who is given little money (one talent) and makes nothing of it, hence has parva ... substantia; but he is also like him in that he is a man of straw, a hollow man, a man with parva ... substantia.<sup>8</sup> Even that little he has (id minimum), says the poet, will be taken from him (tolletur links this period with l. 250 tollatur, where the money is taken from the segnis). Penitus, "within", here tips the statement over to the spiritual allegorical/eschatological level. Even that little that such a man has within him will be taken away from him.

Nothing is left of the man so he is cast into Hell:

<sup>9</sup>Ut nequam servus tenebras dimersus ad imas<sup>10</sup>  
Perpetuos fletus poenae stridore frequentet.  
(257-8)

- 
8. This is an example of what Roberts calls "impure allegory", where some words cut across the literal sense straight to the allegory. See Roberts, p. 120 and p. 149, nn. 108-9.
9. Hansson (pp. 50-1) says that these lines cannot be either a result or consecutive clause depending on ll. 255-6, and suggests et as the best alternative (with MS. support). Evidently, however, this is a result clause, as Knappitsch (ad loc.) suggests; ut is the reading of C (followed by Marold, Huemer and Knappitsch) and seems best in the context.
10. dimersus in R, M, K, L, Mp, G; demersus in the rest of the MSS. Huemer prints the former, as also at III 158. The two readings do not affect the meaning so dimersus should be preferred as lectio difficilior.

Nequam comes from v. 26 of the Gospel, so the poet postpones it for effect, and the Matthean formulae are both rendered. In tenebras exteriores is discussed above (p. 124), as is illic erit fletus et stridor dentium (pp.124-5). Both are found in the parable of the Wedding Feast, another highly eschatological parable.

As Roberts (p. 121 and p. 149, n. 115) has pointed out tenebras ... ad imas carries connotations beyond mere physical death. The Christian light imagery (tenebras) implies that the man undergoes the spiritual death of Hell. The suggestion is that the reader too may be weighed in the balance and found wanting at the last day, if he does not show his faith through living the Christian life of good works.

It has been shown that Juvencus has an eschatological interpretation of this parable. The lord is Christ, who leaves this earth at the Ascension; He entrusts his followers with this world and its problems; when He comes again, bringing the Kingdom with Him, He judges whether men are fit for the Kingdom according as they have been faithful to His commands; He divides them like the sheep and goats, and those who are rejected are cast into Hell. There is nothing particularly startling here, most of this is what Matthew thought Jesus was saying in this parable. It is worth noting nevertheless that the eschatological allegory corresponds to Origen's spiritual sense. Further, however,

there is a paraenetic moral level of meaning to the parable. The reader is continually forced to examine his conscience to decide which way he has chosen. Juvencus is telling the reader what will happen to him at the Last Day. Either the lord will praise him:

Illos laudat herus potioraque credere tantae  
Promittit fidei, (238-9)

or he will order him to be cast into Hell:

Ut nequam servus tenebras dimersus ad imas  
Perpetuos fletus poenae stridore frequentet.  
(257-8)

Juvencus is advising his reader not to act like the segnis man. Hence the two features are made to cohere in an entirely natural way.

Apart from the very short minor parables, such as the Eye as the Light of the Body, there are very few parables as told by Juvencus that have no eschatology in them. Even a parable illustrating the need for reconciliation is turned into a paraenesis warning the reader of the necessity of chastity in the parable of Going Before the Judge. The details of the punishment for debt then become details of what will happen to the reader on the Last Day if he does not forgo fornication.

Mt. 5, 25: Esto consentiens adversario tuo cito, cum es cum illo in via, ne forte tradat te adversarius iudici et index tradat te ministro et in carcere mittaris.  
(26) Amen dico tibi: non exies inde, donec reddas novissimum quadrantem.

Est tibi praeterea semper contraria virtus  
 Corporis; hoc casti celeri curetur amore,  
 Dum rapidae tecum graditur per compita vitae.  
 Accusabit enim polluti corporis usus  
 515 Et te sublimi statuet sub iudice vinctum.  
 Damnatum rapiant ad vincula saeva ministri  
 Nec prius e tenebris solveris carceris atri,  
 Ultima quam minimi reddatur portio nummi.  
 (I 511-8)

The paraenetic elements of this passage have been discussed above (pp. 242-7), as the parable's moral level of meaning, and so do not need detailed analysis. Apart from the last line, however, Juvencus has deviated from the substance of Matthew. The scene visualized in his version of the parable refers to the Last Judgement; the judge becomes the sublimi ... iudice, God himself; the ministri are the angels and they cast the guilty man into the blackness of Hell:

Damnatum rapiant ad vincula saeva ministri  
 Nec ... prius e tenebris solveris carceris atri.  
 (516-7)

The last line of course does not fit this interpretation, nor indeed does it agree with the rest of the passage. For some reason the poet suddenly reverted to Matthew:

Non exies inde, donec reddas novissimum  
 quadrantem (v. 26)  
 Nec prius ... solveris ...  
 Ultima quam minimi reddatur portio nummi.  
 (517-8)

Other parables discussed containing eschatological features include the parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard (pp. 76-92), the parable of the Wedding Feast (pp. 92-128), the parable of the Workers in the Vineyard (pp. 163-212), and



the parable of the Ten Virgins (pp. 281-320). Part of the parable of the Tares is discussed above (pp. 156-7) for the transposition of speech it exhibits, but several eschatological parables rendered by Juvencus receive no attention in this study: the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (III 437-58 = Mt. 18, 23-35) and the parable of the Servant entrusted with Supervision (IV 185-96 = Mt. 24, 45-51), which are both sizeable major parables; the minor parable of One Taken, the Other Not (IV, 170-6 = Mt. 24, 40-1), the minor parable of the Householder and the Thief (IV, 179-84 = Mt. 24, 43-44), and the Last Judgement parable of the Sheep and goats (IV, 265-7 = Mt. 25, 32-3). From the size of this list it can be said that Juvencus was vitally interested in eschatology. This interest in eschatology seems to be a feature of the time. Constantine's surviving letters and speeches and the writings of Lactantius also betray a strong eschatological outlook. To us their code of rewards and punishments in the world to come may seem naive and unsophisticated, but persecution had been the lot of the Christian up to the accession of Constantine. What sustained the martyrs no doubt was the thought of their rewards in Heaven, and their persecutors' torment in Hell; indeed Lactantius wrote De mortibus persecutorum dwelling on precisely that. No doubt the Second Coming seemed nearer than at any time in the previous two centuries, now that the

Golden Age of Constantine was here, and perhaps the Millenium itself. It is in this context that Juvencus' eschatology must be seen; effectively it is an expression of faith in the imminence now at last of Christ's Return.

In the previous chapter Origen's moral level of meaning (psuche) was considered; it was discovered that Juvencus exploits that sense of Gospel parables to develop a soteriological paraenesis aimed at his reader. This chapter has similarly considered the spiritual sense (pneuma), from which, it is concluded, Juvencus develops a theme of eschatology, while at the same time presenting a coherent paraenesis in the moral meaning. It seems, then, that the poem broadly follows Origen's method of exegesis in allegorizing the Gospel text in order to interpret it, yet the actual levels of meaning depart totally from the Alexandrian theory.

CHAPTER 8: JUVENCUS AND CONTEMPORARY CONCERNSThe Parable of the Ten Virgins

In the two previous chapters Origen's moral and spiritual levels of meaning have been discussed as they are represented respectively in Juvencus' soteriology and eschatology. From these analyses it can be suggested that the poem interprets the parables in a rather different way from the exegetic tradition of Biblical commentary expressed in the Alexandrian school and its successors. This chapter investigates another kind of interpretative meaning in the Juvencan parables: that associated with contemporary concerns. While discussing contemporary features in the parable of the Ten Virgins, other levels of meaning are not neglected, so that final conclusions may be drawn about the poem's use of interpretation in general.

a) Introductory

Any writer will be influenced by the opinions of his day, whether consciously or unconsciously, negatively or positively. Juvencus is no exception, and his work displays attitudes characteristic of Constantine's reign. Traits such as anti-Semitism are too deliberately employed to be accidental, whereas Juvencus' obsession with eschatology is probably induced by the society in which he found himself. Three main areas of contemporary concern are to be found in the work: one is the deliberate replacement of textual

details, that might seem unfamiliar to the reader, with characteristically Roman references; another is the insertion of didactic elements to influence his readers (an example is the pronounced anti-Semitism of the work); thirdly, there are contemporary elements whose inclusion appears to be inadvertent or unconscious; as in the parable of the Ten Virgins.

Mt. 25, 1: Tunc simile aestimabitur regnum caelorum decem virginibus, quae acceperunt lampades suas et venerunt obviam sponso et sponsae. (2) Quinque autem ex eis erant fatuae et quinque prudentes. (3) Sed quinque fatuae acceptis lampadibus suis non sumpserunt oleum secum. (4) Prudentes vero acceperunt oleum in vasis suis cum lampadibus suis. (5) Moram autem sponso faciente dormitaverunt omnes et dormierunt. (6) Media autem nocte clamor factus est: Ecce sponsus venit, surgite obviam ei. (7) Tunc surrexerunt omnes illae virgines et acceperunt lampades suas. (8) Fatuae autem sapientibus dixerunt: Date nobis de oleo vestro, quia lampades nostrae extinguuntur. (9) Responderunt prudentes dicentes: Non, ne forte non sufficiat nobis et vobis; ite potius ad vendentes et emite vobis. (10) Dum eunt emere, venit sponsus et quae paratae erant intraverunt cum eo in nuptias, et clusa est ianua. (11) Novissimae veniunt relinquaee virgines dicentes: Domine, domine, aperi nobis. (12) At ille respondens ait: Amen dico vobis, quod nescio vos. (13) Vigilate itaque, quia nescitis diem neque horam.

"Conferri possunt caelestia regna puellis  
 Bis quinis, pars est quarum sapientior una,  
 Altera praestupido pars est stolidissima corde.  
 200 Occurrere illa votis sponsalibus omnes  
 Ornatu adcinctae taedarum flammicomantum.  
 Sed sapiens pars illa, sibi quo lumina flammae  
 Susciperet, portare simul curabat olivum.  
 Stultarum vero non est prudentia talis.  
 205 Cumque moraretur sponsus, tum membra sopore  
 Solvuntur cunctae per compita lata viarum.  
 Iam noctis medio clamor crebrescere magnus  
 Exoritur, laetoque dehinc occurrere voto  
 Adonuit taedisque vias ornare coruscis.  
 210 Surgere virginibus properatum, et lumina taedis  
 Instruere et flammis pingui componere olivo.

- <sup>1</sup>Tum stolidae rogitant olei sibi cedere partem,  
 Prudentes secum quod tum gestare videbant.  
 Sed quoniam sapiens pavitat chorus, omnibus aequae  
 215 Ne desint clarae nutrimina pingua flammae,  
 Ex parvo aequalis si detur portio cunctis,  
 Tum pergunt stultae, ut liquidum mercentur olivum.  
 Dum pergunt, laetae transcurrunt omnia pompae  
 Et sponso tantum comitatur factio prudens.  
 220 Adveniunt brutae sero post tempore segnes  
 Et sponsi pulsare fores et limina clausa  
 Nequiquam ingeminant precibusque ingrata frequentant,  
 Ut liceat miseris penetrare in limina laeta.  
 Illas non comitum sponsi cognoscere quisquam  
 225 Non ipse sponso voluit. Vigilate timentes,  
 Adventus vobis quia non est certior hora.

(IV 197-226)

Several contemporary references may be found in this passage, from the elimination of Hebraisms and a Romanising tendency to the eschatology and the idea of the celestial marriage. Detailed analysis of the passage is necessary before more can be said about these features.

b) Narrative level

Mt. 25, 1: Tunc simile aestimabitur regnum caelorum decem virginibus, quae acceperunt lampades suas et venerunt obviam sponso et sponsae. (2) Quinque autem ex eis erant fatuae et quinque prudentes.

- "Conferri possunt caelestia regna puellis  
 Bis quinque, pars est quarum sapientior una,  
 Altera praestupido pars est stolidissima corde.  
 200 Occurrere illae votis sponsalibus omnes  
 Ornatae adcinctae taedarum flammicomantum.  
 (197-201)

The formula in v. 1 has been discussed above (pp. 96-103). Conferri possunt is his best solution to the problem that the kingdom of heaven is not like ten virgins, or a landowner, or what you will, but like the situation in which they find themselves.

---

1. Tum in C, A, K<sub>1</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>, Mp, P, Bb, H. Marold, Huemer and Knappitsch print tunc only to avoid Tum (212) ... tum. Arevalo has Tunc (reading of R) ... tunc.

The Aramaic phrase of which the formula is a translation means "It is the case with ... as with ..." (Fenton, pp. 181 and 221), so that "The kingdom of heaven can be compared with ..." is his best rendition of the formula. It is perhaps significant that it is also his last; he can afford to reinforce the formula in the reader's mind by a fairly literal paraphrase because there is no longer any danger of repetition becoming tedious.

The poet alters the order of details presented by Matthew. The Gospel has:

- (i) the formula;
- (ii) they took lamps;
- (iii) they went to meet the bridegroom;
- (iv) 5 were stupid, 5 wise.

In the five lines of Juvencus' translation, however, the order is:

- (i) the formula;
- (ii) some were wise, some were stupid;
- (iii) they set out towards the wedding;
- (iv) they took torches.

This schema also highlights three alterations of detail.

- 1) In Juvencus the girls go to meet the bridegroom alone, but in the Latin Bible (both Itala and Vulgate) the reading is obviam sponso et sponsae. Some Greek MSS. add *καὶ τῆς νυμφῆς* but the best tradition has simply *ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπὲρ τῆσιν τοῦ νυμφίου* (cf. Fenton, p. 396; H. Benedict Green, p. 205). It is

possible that the poet is following this preferred tradition yet there are cogent eschatological reasons for the change (see below).

2) In Matthew the virgins venerunt obviam sponso (et sponsae) but in Juvencus

Occurrere illae votis sponsalibus omnes ...

In Matthew the virgins came or went to meet the groom. But Juvencus instead employs occurrere with votis not to mean "they ran" but "they fell in with the groom's wishes", they met or agreed to his request (votis sponsalibus here means more naturally "the sponsal wishes" not the wedding; but cf. Arevalo and Knappitsch, ad loc.). They agree to his wedding plans, and, following his instructions, furnish themselves with accoutrements.

3) A third alteration is the change of lampades to taedae. Lampas usually means "torch" but in this parable both ancient and modern commentators agree that it must mean "lamp" (e.g. Jer. In Math. IV 749-53; Jeremias, p. 175). The terracotta oil-lamp (λυχνος, lucerna) was the commonest form of lighting throughout the Roman empire up to the end of the fourth century (Forbes, SAT 6, pp. 156-63). Since oil is the form of fuel and an essential part of the parable (cf. Matthew vv. 3, 4, 8), it seems likely that oil lamps are referred to by lampades in this parable (for lampas of a lamp cf. Ov. Her. XIV 25, praecinctae lampades auro; Juv.

III 285 aenea lampas). Taedae, however, are certainly not lamps but torches, which is what Juvencus substitutes (ll. 201, 209, 210). Now oil was most commonly the fuel in the Roman torch; the torch case, often of wood, was filled with flax, tow or even rags which were soaked in oil and then lit (Smith, DGRA s.v. fax; PWRE 6, 2, 1948-50).

One reason for the change may be that taeda is both epic diction and Virgilian (cf. Aen IV 505). Moreover torches are the correct accoutrements for a wedding. Indeed, so closely were the two associated, that the word became used by metonymy for marriage itself (cf. Virg. Aen. VII 388; Prud. Sym. I 263; II 1074). Weddings in the ancient world were usually followed by a torchlight procession (Marquardt, pp. 39ff).

pars est quarum sapientir una,  
Altera praestupido pars est stolidissima corde

This is Juvencus' version of the Hebraic parallelismus membrorum; pars est ... pars est helps to point up the contrast of the adjective: sapientir against praestupido and stolidissima. The ablative of description, praestupido ... corde, refers to their inner quality (cf. segni ... corde, IV 255, discussed above, pp. 274-5) and extends the effect of the superlative stolidissima. The poet wants us to see that they are stupid to the point of obstinacy.

The four word hexameter that closes this section of the parable is also of interest:



Ornatu adcinctae taedarum flammicomantum

This is a splendid example of the verbal abundance admired by the period. Ornatu adcinctae taedarum is a periphrase with Juvenus' favourite genitive of identity attached to an abstract noun. Moreover, flammicomans is only attested apart from this usage by one M S. of Prudentius' Apoth. at 495 where the accepted reading is flauicomantum (cf. flammicomus at Prud. Psych. 775).

Mt. 25, 3: Sed quinque fatuae acceptis lampadibus suis non sumpserunt oleum secum. (4) Prudentes vero acceperunt oleum in vasis suis cum lampadibus suis.

Sed sapiens pars illa sibi, quo lumina flammae  
Susciperet, portare simul curabat olivum.  
Stultarum vero non est prudentia talis.

(202-4)

Roberts (p. 116) has commented upon the rearrangement of the whole passage, and in particular has referred to the transposition of material in 200-4 as an example of transposition to rationalise the order of the Biblical narrative (pp. 133 and 155, n. 168). He has also suggested (p. 116) that the omission of in vasis suis from this version is because it is an insignificant detail. As mentioned above, however, the use of some receptacle is implied by portare ... olivum. Furthermore the poet wants the reader to focus upon the oil, and the fact that the wise bring some whereas the stupid do not.

The explanatory clause of indirect thought quo lumina flammae / Susciperet is introduced to emphasise further the oil and its purpose. Lumina flammae is another periphrase

with stress on flammae. Flame and light are important in the parable.

Mt. 25, 5: Moram autem sponso faciente dormitaverunt omnes et dormierunt.

205 Cumque moraretur sponsus, tum membra sopore  
Solvuntur cunctae per compita lata viarum.  
(205-6)

The expression used instead of the clumsy dormitaverunt omnes et dormierunt (an over-literal translation of ἐρύσκαζον τῶν καὶ ἐκαθευδον) is very elegant: tum membra sopore/Solvuntur cunctae. Membra here is an accusative in imitation of the Greek cognate accusative, as Knappitsch (ad loc.) has remarked. Moreover the idea of the body relaxing in sleep is an epic conceit (cf. Virg. Aen. IX 236 somno uinoque soluti; XII 867 membra ... soluit ... torpor; Ov. Met. X 368-9 corpora somnus/solverat).<sup>2</sup>

The phrase per compita lata viarum is an addition by Juvencus. He pictures for the reader the girls waiting at the crossroads, probably outside the town on the highways.

Mt. 25, 6: Media autem nocte clamor factus est:  
Ecce sponsus venit, surgite obviam ei.

Iam noctis medio clamor crebrescere magnus  
Exoritur, laetoque dehinc occurrere voto  
Admonuit taedisque vias ornare coruscis.  
(207-9)

---

2. Roberts, p. 120, points out that activities such as sleep, death, birth etc., tend to generate these periphrases; he gives a list of all examples of these and others on p. 149, n. 111.

The last line is an indirect command added to express what the sound meant to the virgins. The clamor (taken from v. 6) heralds the arrival of the groom. This signal, although it is midnight (noctis medio), warns them to fall in with his wishes and light the road with the torches: taedisque vias ornare coruscis (a Juvenecan addition). Taedis and ornare repeat Ornatu and taedarum both from l. 201, and vias comes from viarum, 206. Coruscis refers to the torchlight.

Mt. 25, 7: Tunc surrexerunt omnes illae virgines  
et acceperunt lampades suas.

210 Surgere virginibus properatum, et lumina taedis  
Instruere et flammis pingui componere olivo.  
(210-1)

The girls hastily obey the summons, Surgere virginibus properatum. Virginibus here varies puellis (197) from the first line of the passage.

The interesting feature in this couplet is the light and fire imagery. Lumina taedis/Instruere is a circumlocution for "light the torches", and flammis pingui componere olivo means "feed the flames with oil". These expressions pick up ll. 202-3 lumina flammae and olivum. The importance of the words is in the allegorical Christian meaning attached to these concepts by the poet.

Mt. 25, 8: Fatuae autem sapientibus dixerunt: Date nobis de oleo vestro, quia lampades nostrae extinguuntur.

Tum stolidae rogitant olei sibi cedere partem,  
Prudentes secum quod tum gestare videbant.  
(212-3)

Direct speech is transposed into indirect speech, as it is throughout this parable. The stupid virgins ask the wise ones to give them some oil. The reason for this is that the torches will not light without a combustible material impregnated into the indifferent material within the torch case.

As mentioned above (p. 143), the torches have not gone out because they were not lit in the first place. The torches are lit only at the arrival of the groom. Roberts' remark (p. 116) that quia lampades nostrae extinguuntur is a detail omitted by the poet is misleading.

The variation olei for olivum 203, and olivo, 211 is suggested by the Gospel text (vv. 4 and 8). Sibi is repeated from l. 202 and tum (twice) from l. 205. Both stolidae and Prudentes are words associated with the two contrasting groups: stolidissima, 199; prudentia, 204 (cf. prudentes in Mt. vv. 4 and 9).

Mt. 25, 9: Responderunt prudentes dicentes: Non, ne forte non sufficiat nobis et vobis; ite potius ad vendentes et emite vobis.

215 Sed quoniam sapiens pavitat chorus, omnibus aequae  
Ne desint clarae nutrimina pingua flammae.  
Ex parvo aequalis si detur portio cunctis,  
Tum pergunt stultae, ut liquidum mercentur olivum.  
(214-7)

Again the direct speech is transposed. The image of nourishment and feeding clarae nutrimina pingua flammae, associated with gestare (213), brings out the reason why the wise will not give to the foolish (cf. flammas pingui componere

olivo, 211). The oil feeds and nourishes the flame of the torch; without oil, there is no flame. Hence the foolish virgins leave to buy the nutriment for their torches (217).

Sapiens ... chorus refers back to pars ... sapientor (198) and sapiens pars (202), but there are numerous other repetitions and echoes here. As observed above (pp. 143-4) Roberts' contention (p. 116) that the advice given by the wise virgins to go out and buy some oil is omitted as an insignificant detail is overstated. The words ite pius ad vendentes et emite vobis are not directly rendered here, but the idea is implied in the clause, ut liquidum mercentur olivum. The advice is there in skeletal form.

Mt. 25, 10: Dum eunt emere, venit sponsus et quae paratae erant intraverunt cum eo in nuptias ...

Dum pergunt, laetae transcurrunt omnia pompae  
Et sponso tantum comitatur factio prudens.  
(218-9)

The wise alone (tantum) accompany the groom into the feast. The joy of the procession is brought out in the words laetae ... pompae. Only the wise virgins attend the groom on his procession through the streets (l. 218. transcurrunt omnia must mean "passed through everything", i.e. all the streets, etc.) and accompany him into his house (comitatur sponso, 219).

Mt. 25, 10: .. et clusa est ianua. (11) Novissimae veniunt reliquae virgines dicentes: Domine, Domine, aperi nobis.

200 Adveniunt brutae sero post tempore segnes  
Et sponsi pulsare fores et limina clusa  
Nequiquam ingeminant precibusque ingrata frequentant,  
Ut liceat miseris penetrare in limina laeta. (220-3)

The foolish virgins have arrived too late, sero post tempore, through their own stupidity and laziness (brutae, segnes). Their reaction to the locked doors is to use violence:

Et sponsi pulsare fores et limina clausa,  
and when this has no result they vainly redouble their efforts, Nequiquam ingeminant. The wedding feast is held in the house of the groom, sponsi fores, and they cannot get in. In their unhappiness, miseris, they assail the inanimate door with prayers precibusque frequentant.

The repetition of limina in the same sedes, limina clausa ... limina laeta, and the alliteration serve to emphasise the word laeta. The doubling of nouns, fores et limina, has been noted by Roberts (p. 148, n. 104). He suggests that it is for poetic effect. Now the Biblical text does refer to the door (clusa est ianua) but not to the fact that they knocked on the door, pulsare fores. What needs to be explained is the reason for the additional detail, and why it is expanded into a full clause.

This means that there are two more problems here.

4) Why does Juvencus emphasise so strongly that the foolish virgins knock at the door: pulsare fores et limina clausa/ ... ingeminant)?

5) What does ingrata mean, and to what does it refer?

Knappitsch follows Arevalo (ad loc.) in saying that ingrata is used adverbially, interpreting ingrata precibus frequentare

as meaning iterum et saepius moleste petere (Knappitsch, ad loc.). However, ingrata may be read more naturally as the object of frequentant, qualifying the objects of ingeminant, the fores et limina clausa. An explanation is to be sought that would clarify ingrata in these terms.

Mt. 25, 12: At ille respondens ait: Amen dico vobis, quod nescio vos.

Illas non comitum sponsi cognoscere quisquam  
225 Non ipse sponsus voluit. (224-5)

The repetition of sponsus has been correctly seen by Roberts (p. 148, n. 104) as an interpretative expansion. The figure non comitum sponsi ... Non ipse sponsus heavily emphasises the command of the Church's Bridegroom. Indeed, sponsus is employed four times in the seven lines at this point (ll. 219, 221, 224 and 225) to ensure that the reader makes the allegorical connection.

The expression quod nescio vos is a translation of an Aramaic formula used by a rabbi to forbid his disciple to approach him for seven days, meaning "I will have nothing to do with you" (Jeremias, p. 175; Fenton, p. 397; H. Benedict Green, p. 205). Juvencus copies the formula with Illas ... cognoscere, but cognoscere captures better the meaning of the original saying for it has a sense of acknowledging someone already known to the spectator (cf. Callisto as a she-bear meeting her son, Ov. Fast. II 185-6 illa quidem, tamquam cognosceret, adstitit amens, et gemuit).





Oil is a primary christian symbol of repentance and a sign of forgiveness by the minister (Fenton, p. 397); the association is clear in the following passage:

... et orent super eum, ungentes eum oleo in nomine Domini: et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum, et alleviabit eum Dominus: et si in peccatis sit, remittentur ei. (Jac. 5, 14-5).

The practice also has apostolic support, as is clear from Mark 6, 13:

... et ungebant oleo multos aegros et sanabant.

It was widely used in the early Church and survives in Catholic and Orthodox practice. As a priest Juvencus would have known the administration of oil in the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, extreme unction and ordination, where it was used, among other things, as an outward sign of inward penitence. Since this association was so marked it is hardly surprising that he interpreted the oil in this parable as standing for repentance.

Repentance is the single demand made on the Christian; indeed it is the only necessary condition of being a Christian. John the Baptist and Jesus both insist that men should repent to enter the Kingdom:

John           Mt. 3, 2: Paenitentia agite: adpropinquavit enim regnum caelorum.

Jesus          Mt. 4, 17: Paenitentiam agite: adpropinquavit enim regnum caelorum.

This is all the Christian need do. All his faith and works, his new life in Christ, spring from his rejection of his

former life of sin, which in turn is a manifestation of Divine Grace. In the terms of the parable, therefore, the foolish virgins, who have no oil, are stupid to the point of neglecting the one absolutely necessary thing - that they repent.

Juvencus also develops a theme of flame and light imagery in the parable. All instances are Juvencan additions: flammicomantum (201); lumina flammae (202); coruscis (209); lumina (210); flammas (211); clarae ... flammae (215). These light and flame images are associated throughout the parable with the oil, especially by the feeding images at lines 211, 213 and 215 (flammas pingui componere olivo; gestare refers to olei ... partem; clarae nutrimina pinguia flammae is a periphrase for oil). The light/fire is intimately linked with the oil. However, there is also an association between the light and flame images and the torches taedarum flammicomantum (201); taedis ... coruscis (209); lumina taedis/Instruere (210-1). Additionally the association is a necessary one of narrative meaning. Hence the oil of repentance is linked both with the light/fire of the torch and the torches themselves. Further allegory is evidently intended.

Jerome in his commentary on Matthew verses 3-4 says that the wise virgins have both faith and works, but the foolish virgins have faith but no works:

Oleum habent uirgines quae iuxta fidem et operibus  
 adornatur, non habent oleum quae uidentur simili  
 quidem fide Dominum confiteri sed uirtutum opera  
 neglegunt. (In Math. IV 715-8)

These are the two major elements of the Christian life.  
 Faith in Christ and acts of charity distinguish the Christian  
 from the pagan. Juvencus does refer to faith and works  
 but not in the terms that Jerome uses to interpret the  
 parable. In his reading of the parable the two important  
 features are the light/flame and the torches; it is these  
 two details which correspond to faith and works.

The foolish virgins, like the wise ones (omnes, 200,  
 emphasises the point), have torches (201), but without  
 oil they cannot sustain the light of a flame (213, 215).  
 The reason for carrying the oil and the dividing line between  
 the two groups of girls is brought out early in the parable:

Sed sapiens pars illa, sibi quo lumina flammae  
 Susciperet, portare simul curabat olivum.  
 Stultarum vero non est prudentia talis. (202-4).

Lumina flammae, then, is what the foolish virgins lack.  
 The allegorical meaning is given by inference. Light and  
 fire in Christian symbology have many meanings but in a  
 sense most of them refer back to an early piece of theology  
 in John's gospel. At the beginning of John Christ is described  
 as lux, the Light (1,7-9) and frequently He is referred  
 to or describes Himself as lux mundi and lumen or lux vitae  
 (cf. Jn. 2, 19-21; 5,35; 8, 12; 9,5; etc.). As  
 the light/fire imagery stands for either faith or works in

this parable it seems reasonable to say that if Christ is the Light, the light/fire must stand for faith. This is confirmed by the identification of the allegorical meaning of the other element in the equation.

The meaning of the torches is easier to solve. As noted above, Juvencus emphasises by the addition omnes in l. 200 that all the virgins make ready torches (201) and thus fall in with the groom's wishes (200). And he parallels this with cunctae (206) to stress that all the virgins go to sleep at the crossroads. Allegorically, then, the foolish virgins evidently live their lives in accordance with the wishes of Christ in every respect, except that of the oil. Unlike the wise virgins they are not prepared and do not take oil with them. This must mean, despite Jerome's interpretation, that they live the life of Christian works. The torch stands for works, while the flame means faith. This makes sense of the parable. The foolish virgins are cast out because, although they live good lives, they have no faith. Indeed they are not Christians at all because they have not repented of their misdeeds, and hence are still living a life of sin. All their good works mean nothing without repentance which nourishes faith in Christ.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGORYSYMBOLS

- A) Oil references: olivum (203); olivo (211); olei (212); olivum (217); plus (via feeding image) at ll. 213 and 215.
- B) Flame and light references: flammicomantum (201); lumina flammae (202); coruscis (209); lumina (210); flammis (211); clarae ... flammae (215).
- C) Torch references: taedarum (201); taedis (209); taedis (210).

ASSOCIATION OF SYMBOLS

- A with B: sibi quo lumina flammae susciperet ... olivum (202-3); flammis pingui componere olivo (211); plus (via feeding image) olei ... partem ... quod gestare videbant (212-3); clarae nutrimina pingua flammae (215).
- B with C: taedarum flammicomantum(201); taedis ... coruscis (209); lumina taedis (210).

MEANING: Wise virgins have A hence both B and C.

Foolish virgins have C but not A hence not B.

A, Oil, stands for Repentance.

B and C must be the associated concepts of Faith and works.

B, Flame/light = Faith, and

C, Torch, stands for Works (despite Jerome).

Christ is the Light of the World. He may be followed in appearance by carrying a torch (works) but the torch is useless unless aflame (i.e. lit by faith and fed by repentance). All the virgins carry torches (i.e. they fulfil Christ's commands in appearance = do Christian works). But the foolish virgins have no repentance (oil) and thus no light (faith).

SUMMARY OF ESCHATOLOGY

- a) Sponsus (200, 205, 219, 221, 224, 225) = Christ.
- b) Bride = Church.
- c) Votum (200, 208) = Christ's commands.
- d) Delay (moraretur, 205) = Christ's absence from world between Ascension and Adventus.
- e) Clamor ... magnus (207) = shout of joy at Second Coming.
- f) Stultae cast into Hell (miseris, 223) because of their sin (segnes, 220).
- g) Prudentes welcomed into Paradise (limina laeta, 223) because they have repented their sin and become Christians.
- h) Prudentes = 144,000 Brides of Christ?
- i) Comites sponsi (224) = Angels.

d) Spiritual (Eschatological) level

There is obviously such a level in Juvencus' parable. The bridegroom is clearly Christ, a frequent idea in Christian mysticism. In the Apocalypse John sees the holy City, the new Jerusalem, as a bride adorned for her husband:

Et ego Ioannes vidi sanctam civitatem Ierusalem novam descendentem de caelo a Deo, paratam, sicut sponsam ornatam viro suo. (21, 2)

The bride of Christ is the Church, as in St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians:

Mulieres viris suis subditae sint, sicut Domino: quoniam vir caput est Ecclesiae: ipse, salvator corporis eius. Sed sicut Ecclesia subiecta est Christo, ita et mulieres viris suis in omnibus. (5 22-4)

This explains the omission of the bride from Juvencus' parable (the first problem). On the eschatological level he envisages that the Church unites with its head, Christ the Bridegroom, on the Last Day. The medio noctis arrival of the groom is the Messianic parousia (Jeremias, p. 53) and agrees with the tradition of the primitive Church mentioned by Jerome:

Traditio Iudaeorum est Christum media nocte venturum in similitudinem Aegypti temporis, quando pascha celebratum est et exterminator venit et Dominus super tabernacula transiit et sanguine agni postes nostrarum frontium consecrati sunt. Vnde reor et traditionem apostolicam permansisse ut die uigiliarum paschae ante noctis dimidium populos dimittere non liceat expectantes aduentum Christi et postquam illud tempus transierit, securitate praesumpta, festum cunctis agentibus diem. (In Math. IV 738-46)

The faithful did not depart on the dies vigiliarum paschae, presumably Holy Saturday, until midnight, when, with no Adventus, it became clear that they must wait for another year.

Another eschatological feature is the final rejection by Christ at the Last Judgement of those who have not done His will and His acceptance into the Kingdom of those who have (votum; 200, 208). The foolish virgins are described as praestupido and stolidissima (199), stultarum and non prudentia (204), stolidae (212), stultae (217), brutae and even segnes (220). Juvencus is at pains to stress that their stupidity is rather more than mere foolishness or lack of forethought; that last epithet, segnes, certainly implies that they are sinful. They have not repented their sins and so they are not truly Christian. They have the torches (works) but not the flames (faith in Christ). The reader understands that they are justly cast out into the desolation of Hell (miseris, 223).<sup>3</sup>

Equally the wise virgins are welcomed into Paradise on the Day of Judgement. They are laetae pompae (218) because they are received through the limina laeta (223), the gates of heaven; they are summoned at the Second Coming into the eucharistic wedding and feast within the Bridegroom's

---

3. For the necessity of faith, see Hebrews, passim.

house (sponsi ... fores, 221 = the Kingdom of God).

Furthermore laetae pompae may indicate that Juvencus imagines the wise virgins as the 144,000 of the faithful, the chosen of Christ, from the Apocalypse:

Et audiui numerum signatorum, centum quadraginta  
quatuor millia signati, ex omni tribu filiorum Israel.  
(7, 4)

In the fourteenth-century poem "Pearl" the Gawain-poet interprets the 144,000 in the light of this parable and represents them as faultless maidens who are all individually Brides of Christ. Though ancient commentators do not mention this idea, Juvencus' omission of the figure of the bride (Mt. v. 1) may imply that he saw the wise virgins as individual Brides of Christ, as well as representing the Church, the Bride of Christ.

The delay of the bridegroom referred to in line 205 is Christ's long absence from this world between the Ascension and the Adventus (moraretur, 205). In the apostolic age the parousia was awaited as an imminent event, as the gospels themselves show; even at that time, however, there were those who chafed at the delay and began to doubt that Christ would come soon. They asked the question

Ubi est promissio, aut adventus eius? (2 Peter 3, 4)

This doubt spread as time passed, until in the third century it is doubtful whether Christians expected His imminent return. But since Juvencus was writing soon after the Edict of Milan and the Council of Nicea, the victory of the



true Church, and hence the Coming of Christ, must have seemed closer than for two and a half centuries.<sup>4</sup> At any rate the clamor ... magnus (207) is the shout of joy at the Adventus (cf. Paul at 1 Thess. 4, 5 and 1 Cor. 15,52). This was the standard interpretation of Mt. v. 6 (cf. the Commentaries of Jerome and Hilary of Poitiers, probably derived from Origen).

Juvencus employs extensive Apocalyptic imagery at the climax of the parable. The figure of the Bridegroom is dominant in the closing lines as the word sponsus is used four times in seven lines (ll. 219, 221, 224 and 275). In addition he adds the detail of the comites sponsi (224). The Bridegroom turns to his companions and orders them not to admit the foolish virgins - a clear reference to the angels in the Apocalypse who stand around the throne of the Lamb and execute His Judgement (Apoc. 7, 11; 14, 14 ff, etc.).

e) Moral (Soteriological) Level

The whole parable is of course a lesson originally delivered by Christ to the assembled multitude, and now narrated by the poet to his readers. To that extent Juvencus' parable is didactic and, as it was composed by a priest, may be thought of as fulfilling the same purpose as the gospel

---

4. Certainly Constantine was convinced that the Church had overcome its enemies (that is, he had overcome its enemies!) at the Council of Nicea, even as late as c. 340; see Eusebius' Vita, IV 47.

reading and homily of the liturgy. The parable, indeed the whole poem, provides evidence of a pastor's concern for his flock.

The clearest indication of this moral or pastoral concern is in the final logion, the saying of Jesus that emphasises the message of the parable. He addresses it to those who fear God (timentes, 225) and he adds the word adventus to indicate clearly that the reader must be ready for the Second Coming.<sup>5</sup> Yet Juvencus cannot conceal the problem caused by the injunction vigilate. How should the reader understand the command "stay awake for you do not know the time of the Second Coming" when all the virgins fall asleep, even the wise ones, and are asleep when the Bridegroom comes? If the wise virgins are received into Paradise even though they were asleep, why should we "stay awake"?

Juvencus meets the problem head on, through the addition cunctae(206): he stresses that all the virgins went to sleep. He then focusses on the light/fire, torches and oil, as noted above. He emphasises that the wise virgins are spiritually awake at the adventus - they have the repentance that feeds true faith in God - whereas the foolish virgins are not. Vigilate is to be understood allegorically, as is so much of this parable. It applies only in a moral

---

5. Adventus is a technical term of exegetics referring to the parousia; it is used by Jerome in his commentary on this parable no less than 3 times.

sense. We are to be spiritually prepared for the sudden return of Christ, like the wise virgins, not caught with the stains of sin on us like the foolish virgins.<sup>6</sup>

f) The Parable and the Komos

The komos, a genre whose origins go back at least to early Greek lyric poetry, and which is copiously exemplified in all subsequent periods of Greek and Latin poetry, has been the object of a number of recent scholarly studies.<sup>7</sup> The typical komos scene has been described by Copley (p. 1) thus:

The lover has been at a symposium ...; now, warmed with wine, he goes to seek out [his beloved] ... A garland on his head, he takes up a torch, and either alone or in the company of a friend or two goes through the streets to the girl's house. He knocks on the door, begs for admission, ... pleads and threatens, but to no effect. Then he sings his song, in which he may combine a plea that the girl will yet relent, a warning of the lonely days to come, when she will be too old for love; a protestation against her cruelty, and a picture of his own sufferings ... In the end he may hang his garland on the door, or throw it at the threshold ... Then he lies down in the doorway ... until morning.

- 
6. There may be a topical thrust here. Constantine seems to have steadfastly refused baptism - the sign of repentance - until he was on his deathbed; cf. Eus. Vita. IV 62.
7. F.O. Copley, Exclusus Amator. A Study in Latin Love Poetry (American Philological Association Monographs 17, 1956); W.S. Anderson, "Hercules exclusus: Propertius IV 9", AJPh 85 (1964), 1-12; F. Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry (Edinburgh: University Press, 1972), esp. pp. 6, 85-9, 146, 201ff, 209ff; Further Adventures of a Locked-Out Lover: Propertius 2, 17 (Liverpool: University of Liverpool Inaugural Lectures, 1975); "Two Unidentified Komoi of Propertius", Emerita 44 (1977), 325-53; Paola Pinotti, "Propert. IV 9: Alessandrino e arte allusiva", Giornale Italiano di Filologia n.s.8 (1977), 50-71 (with a formula for the genre); R.F. Thomas, "New Comedy, Callimachus, and Roman Poetry", HSCP 83 (1979), 179-212.

Hence, as Cairns (GCGRP, p. 76) has stated, in essence the genre portrays

the words and actions of lovers who, within the ancient traditions of post-symposiastic visits to the beloved, are attempting, usually in vain, to reach the object of their love.

At least in Latin versions of the komos the motif of the shut door is common. Indeed Copley (p. 33) has commented that

clausa tibi promissa ianua nocte is the only theme of [Roman] versions of the [komos].

He has amplified this further by noting the following:

fores, ianua, limen: these are the keywords: to the Romans, the [komos] from beginning to end is the door song. (Copley, p. 36; cf. Anderson, p. 6).

The studies of the komos cited above have made it absolutely clear that terms like fores et limina clausa are not only characteristic but also diagnostic of the genre. Thus Juvenecus and his readers would see the whole situation described here in terms of the komos; and indeed his extension of the situation in Matthew through the komos is logical enough given that the fundamental elements of the genre (viz. excluded lover, beloved, door, and attempt to win entry) could easily have appeared to him to be present in the Matthean version.

The parable can therefore be interpreted, and several problems solved, by a systematic analysis of it in generic terms. Here the "formula" of the genre set down by Paola

Pinotti can be used to abbreviate discussion. The primary (or logically necessary) elements of the komos are the following:

A1: lover.

A2: beloved.

A3: attempts of the first to join the second (generally expressed by laments in a monologue).

A4: appropriate setting (e.g. a city street, the door of the beloved's house closed, and the procession of komasts who arrive at the door from a symposium).<sup>8</sup>

The four primary elements are all present here, though with an interesting variation in the first two. The normally male exclusus amator (A1) becomes here female and plural, i.e. the foolish virgins who are locked out of the wedding breakfast.<sup>9</sup> Similarly the normally female beloved (A2) becomes the male sponsus<sup>10</sup> (205, 219, 221, 224, 225), who stands for the Celestial Bridegroom, Christ. In one set of terms the plurality of locked-out female lovers in Juvencus may stand as equivalent to the lover and the komastic companions who frequently accompany him in procession to the door of his beloved. But it is interesting to note that the uniquely plural excluded female lovers, although formally

---

8. Pinotti, p. 61; cf. Cairns, GCGRP, p. 6.

9. The same variation of woman lover and man beloved is found in the Frag. Grenf.

10. Male beloveds are found (homosexual boys; a man in Frag. Grenf.) but clearly the variation is intended.

plural in number, are also thought of collectively as representing criminal stupidity or worse throughout the parable (cf. Altera praestupido pars est stolidissima corde, 199) rather than as individuals.

The third primary element, the lover's attempts to come in to his beloved (A3), is expressed in ll. 220-3. The description of the knocking at the door, pulsare fores et limina clausa, is a Juvencan addition, and expands the pleas of the foolish virgin (see also below). An interesting feature is that the "monologue" of the lovers is limited to one line (223) of indirect speech, much shorter than is usual.

It is with the appropriate setting (A4) that Juvencus can be seen reinforcing the first three elements - all of which are already present in the Matthean narrative. Copley's description of the conventional komos scene cited above contains all the details of the setting normally found in examples of the genre: the city street; the beloved's house with the shut door; and the procession of komasts, carrying torches, who have left a symposium.

Reference to each of these details is made by Juvencus. The city street scene of the typical komos is alluded to at l. 206, but with a variation, for the ten virgins lie down to sleep per compita lata viarum<sup>11</sup> out on the highways

---

11. For crossroads as a feature of the komos, see Cairns, Further Adventures, pp. 16-7.

at the crossroads outside the town. It is an added detail; Matthew says only that they slumbered and slept, dormitaverunt omnes et dormierunt (v. 5) without referring to the location. The standard topos is that the lover falls asleep on the doorstep of his beloved's house (cf. Prop. I 16, 2ff). The shut door (limina clausa, 221) is a feature from Matthew, but it is expressly identified by Juvencus as the door of the beloved's house, sponsi ... fores (221).

The virgins represent the procession of revellers to the door of the beloved. It is noticeable that the wise virgins who arrive there at the right time are described as chorus (213) and laetae pompae (218); if, by implication, the foolish virgins are also to be thought of as pompae (although of a different sort) it may fairly be observed that, since pompa is a term used elsewhere of komasts,<sup>12</sup> it too is, already at 218, preparing the way for the scene which will follow. Both sets of virgins are said to be carrying the taedae, "torches", characteristic of the komastic procession: omnes/Ornatu adcinctae taedarum flammicomantum (200-1; cf. 209, 210).<sup>13</sup>

The perception that both sets of virgins have komastic accoutrements and behave like komasts allows a further conclusion about Juvencus' interests in the whole scene.

---

12. Plaut. Curc. 2; Hor. Od. III 26, 7; Sat. I 4, 52; Tib. I 2, 36; Prop. I 16, 8.

13. For torches cf. AP. XII 117, 1 (Mel.); XII 252, 1 (Straton); Arist. Eccl. 692; Plut. 1041.

Although the komos usually is that of an excluded lover, there is a further category of komos - that of the admissus amator;<sup>14</sup> what Juvencus intends is to contrast the wise virgins who are the admitted lovers accepted by the beloved, in this case because they have oil and hence burning torches (allegory for repentance and faith), with the foolish virgins who are excluded lovers. These leave the komastic procession and are then shut out, partly because a rival<sup>15</sup> has been accepted (they are too late: sero post tempore, 220), and partly because they do not have blazing torches (faith fed by true repentance).<sup>16</sup>

Two final variations on the standard setting of the komos are present here in Juvencus. The komasts, both admitted and excluded, are not leaving a symposium to go to the house of the beloved but are actually on their way to a symposium, the great symposium which is to be the great eucharistic Wedding Feast at the Second Coming (cf. Apoc. 19, 9). This is not so very unusual since bands of komasts go to and fro between symposia (e.g. Alcibiades in Plato's Sym., who arrives drunk after supping at another

---

14. Demonstrated by Cairns, Unidentified Komoi, pp. 325-30.

15. See topos B10 below.

16. Perhaps the torches/faith by repentance is a hint at the topos of the munus required by the beloved/doorkeeper /door to gain entry to the beloved (B6b); cf. J.C. Yardley, "Menelaus Amans: Vergil Aen. VI 525-6", Emerita 49 (1981), 65-6.



symposium). However, Juvencus has chosen the less common form of the *topos*. Finally, the term comites, usually applied to the companions of the *komast*, is used of the attendants of the bridegroom who exclude the foolish virgins at his instructions (the *topos* of the role of the custos/ianitor in excluding lovers). Hence there is a deliberate contamination of the two *topoi*.

The primary elements and their variations in the parable may be summarised in the following manner:

- A1: lover - stultae (variation: plural female for singular male)
- A2: beloved - sponsus (variation: male for female)
- A3: attempts of the first to join the second - 11.220-3 (variation: 1 line of indirect speech for long monologue of complaints)
- A4: appropriate setting - city street scene - per compita lata viarum, 206 (variation: crossroads, but outside town); door of beloved's house closed - sponsi ... fores et limina clausa, 221; procession of *komasts* - chorus, 213, laetae ... pompae, 218 (variation: comites = custos/ianitor, not *komastic* companions); *komasts* coming from symposium (variation: going to symposium).

Now that the primary elements of the genre as they appear have been considered, the secondary elements or *topoi* associated with the genre may be considered. They are as follows:

- B1: prayer to open the door.
- B2: accusations of cruelty (hard-heartedness, deafness, sleeping with successful rivals) on the part of the beloved, the door, or the doorkeeper.

- B3: laments of the locked-out lover.
- 3a: tears.
  - 3b: pain, shame, despair.
- B4: unfavourable weather conditions.
- 4a: night.
  - 4b: rain.
  - 4c: wind.
  - 4d: cold.
- B5: long vigil of the locked-out lover.
- 5a: wakefulness.
  - 5b: sleeping on the doorstep.
  - 5c: walking about before the beloved's house.
- B6: attempts at captatio benevolentiae (of the beloved/door/doorkeeper).
- 6a: songs, poems.
  - 6b: valuable gifts.
  - 6c: acts of propitiation (to the door): presentation of wine, ointments, kisses, garlands.
- B7: momentary hope (that the door will be opened, or that the beloved will be moved to compassion).
- B8: self-portrayal.
- 8a: boasts about his own virtues, riches etc.
  - 8b: fears of appearing ugly.
- B9: invocation of a deity (Venus, but also other gods).
- B10: mention of rivals (often with insults).

B11: threats.

11a: to assault the door.

11b: to leave.

11c: of a future change of roles by which the beloved will find herself locked out in her turn.

11d: of the rapid decline of beauty/youth.

11e: of divine wrath towards one who does not love.

11f: of suicide.

B12: violence.

12a: assault on the door.

12b: brawling in the street with other lovers.

B13: arrival of the dawn (heralded by the cock or other birds).<sup>17</sup>

The prayers to open the door (131) are briefly expressed in precibus .../Ut liceat ... penetrare in limina (222-3); the substance of this comes from the words of the foolish virgins in Matthew: Domine, domine, aperi nobis (v. 11). But the addition of preces<sup>18</sup> and the substitution of the polite request (ut with the subjunctive expresses a wish, which is further modulated by the use of the impersonal and permissive licere as the subjunctive verb)<sup>19</sup> for the

- 
17. Based on Pinotti's formula (pp. 64-5) but with some re-classification. The suicide topos (her B3c) has been moved to its more natural position under the threats topos at B11f. The vigil topos (B5) has been expanded in the light of Thomas' article: his wakefulness motif (Thomas, pp. 195-212) becomes B5a; Pinotti's sleeping on the doorstep (Pinotti, p. 64) becomes B5b; and Thomas' walking about (Thomas, pp. 180-95) becomes B5c. There is also some minor reorganization of material.
18. For preces in komoi, cf. Ov. Am. I 6; III 61; Prop. I 16, 30; IV 9, 33; Hor. Od. III 10, 13.
19. For ut(i) liceat in prayer formula cf. Virg. Aen. X, 46-7.

peremptory imperative of the Latin Bible, strongly indicate a formal prayer.<sup>20</sup> The virgins humbly beg for entry since the door remains closed.

The next topos to occur - the accusations of cruelty (B2) - solves the problem of ingrata. Interpreting it as referring naturally to the limina clausa object, the poet for a moment sees the door through the eyes of the locked out virgins: they are (he feels) accusing the limina of hard-hearted cruelty. To them the door is ingrata (222) "disagreeable", although hypocritically they speak of it as laeta (223).

The laments of the locked-out lover (B3) are limited to the one word miseris (223), which the foolish virgins use to describe themselves; words of sorrow are conventional within the genre (B3b) and miser is common in Latin elegy, especially in komoi, as an epithet for lovers. The inclement weather conditions (B4) are not mentioned by the virgins, but the fact that it is night, and therefore both a bad time to be shut out of doors and the correct time for a komos (B4a),<sup>21</sup> is established by the poet early in the parable (noctis medio), 207). Sero post tempore (220 is

20. For Gebetsparodie in the komos, see J.C. Yardley, "The Elegiac Paraclausithyron", Eranos 76 (1978), 24-7 and 31-4.

21. As Cairns, Unidentified Komoi, p. 330, n. 3, has noted, the very unusual nature of a daylight komos, (e.g. Theoc. Id. III) is "intended to strike the reader as extraordinary and in need of explanation".

primarily an expression of the tardiness of the foolish virgins (cf. Novissimae, v. 11) but it also reminds the reader that the time of day was put earlier as noctis medio. The virgins then return to find the door shut some time in the small hours.

The long vigil of the lover (B5) is referred to in three different ways. As referred to above, the virgins go to sleep at a crossroads, per compita lata viarum (206), a variation on the topos of sleeping on the doorstep of the beloved's house (B5b). The topos is displaced, however, because all the virgins go to sleep before the groom's arrival, membra sopore/Solvuntur cunctae (205-6) and it is only after his arrival that the foolish virgins are locked out. The sleeping applies to both sets of komasts and is located before the komos proper. A second reference to the vigil of the exclusus amator is found in neququam ... frequentant (222). This is the topos of walking about before the beloved's house (B5c). Frequentare ingrata (sc. limina) means that the foolish virgins swarm round the door, pacing back and forth in their agitation. Finally the long wait at the door is implied in that the whole parable is an allegory of the Christian waiting for his Lord to come again. The foolish virgins wait in vain for they were not ready when He came, and it is too late now on the Dies Irae.

What follows is an attempt by them at captatio benevolentiae (B6). Ut liceat appears to indicate a flattering (and mendacious) adoption of a mock-humble pose. The extraordinary sing-song alliteration liceat ... limina laeta, noticed by Knappitsch (ad loc.), undercuts the humility of Ut liceat. There is a sycophantic and caressing quality here in the jingle (B6a). Furthermore, in a last attempt to insinuate themselves inside, with a sly side-glance at the door, they describe it as limina laeta. Now they really see the door as ingrata (222), so this must be a false and flattering reference to it to win entry - a sort of verbal tribute or act of propitiation (B6c). Admittedly it is not as developed as the offerings of wine, etc., to the door found in some komoi, but there is a clear attempt to win the door round, to make it open of its own accord. The wordplay of ingrata (222) ... miseris (223) ... laeta (223) (= door - locked-out virgins/lovers - door) emphasises that they are lying in every word they say.

Their pose of humility and actual lack of repentance is dramatised by their simultaneous assault on the door (B12a). When the foolish virgins' knocking is unanswered they frenziedly redouble their efforts: pulsare fores et limina clausa/ ... ingeminant (221-2). The strained syntax of ingeminare pulsare, noted by Knappitsch (ad loc.), shows that this is no gentle tapping on the door, and moreover

it is an addition. The foolish virgins are ironically compared with the exclusus amator who attempts to get in by knocking vigorously at or even trying to break down the door. Their stupidity, and perhaps even their demonic character, is shown in this ludicrous attempt to gain entry to the eucharistic wedding and feast by violence. The reader is supposed to laugh at their criminal stupidity but then draw the moral for his own life.<sup>22</sup>

Lastly, the foolish virgins do not mention rivals (B10), but the wise virgins are certainly seen as the successful rivals, admitted lovers, in the parable. This fact is brought out just before the komos:

laetae transcurrunt omnia pompae  
Et sponso tantum comitatur factio prudens. (218-9)

Only the wise virgins accompany the Bridegroom into Paradise.

These topoi and variations employed by Juvencus can also be expressed in terms of the formula:

B1: prayers to open the door - precibus (222), Ut liceat (223).

B2: accusations of cruelty - (here to the door) ingrata (222).

B3: laments of the lover.

B3b: sorrow, pain, despair, etc. - miseris (223).

22. Similarly in medieval mystery plays the spectator was often intended to laugh at the ludicrous antics of the evil characters, particularly devils, but he was also expected to derive for himself a lesson from their vain sublunary outlook, and apply it in his own life.

- B4: inclement weather conditions.
- B4a: night - noctis medio (207).
- B5: vigil of the lover.
- B5b: sleeping on doorstep - (variation, here at cross-roads outside town, and displaced before komos) membra sopore/Solvuntur ... per compita lata viarum (205-6).
- B5c: walking about before the beloved's house - nequiquam ... frequentant (222).
- B6: attempts at captatio benevolentiae.
- B6a: songs, poems - (here to the beloved) Ut liceat ... limina laeta (223)
- B6c: acts of propitiation to the door - (variation, here a verbal tribute rather than a gift) limina laeta (223).
- B10: mention of rivals - (variation; not mentioned by foolish virgins) laetae transcurrunt omnia pompae/ Et sponso tantum comitatur factio prudens (218-9).
- B12: violence.
- B12a: actual assault on the door - pulsare fores et limina clausa/ ... ingeminant (221-2).

This is an impressive list of topoi in what is, after all, a very brief komos. Juvencus seems to use this reference to the komos genre to dramatise his interpretation of the Gospel - that the foolish virgins are utterly cast out. Possibly he felt that his use of komastic topoi was sanctioned by the Song of Songs:

Cant 5, 1: Ecclesia de christo dicit. Descendat frater meus in hortum suum, et manducet fructum pomorum eius. (Christus dicit). Intraui in hortum meum, soror mea sponsa. Uindemiaui murrum meam cum aromatibus meis. Manducaui panem meum cum melle meo. Bibi uinum meum cum lacte meo. Christus ad apostolos dicit. Manducate, proximi mei, et bibite, et inebriamini, fratres mei. (2) Ego dormio et cor meum vigilat. (Ecclesia dicit).



Uox fratris mei. Pulsat ad ianuam: aperi mihi, soror mea sponsa, proxima mea, perfecta mea. Quoniam caput meum impletum est rore, et crines mei guttarum noctis. (3) Exui me tunicam meam; quomodo induar illam? Laui pedes meos; quomodo inquinabo eos? (4) Uox ecclesiae ad christum. Frater meus misit manum suam per clostrum, et anima mea turbata est ad illum. (5) Surrexi et ego aperire fratri meo. Manus meae stillauerunt murram, digiti mei pleni sunt murra; super manus clusurae (6) aperui ego fratri meo. Frater meus transiuit, anima mea exiuit in uerbo eius.<sup>23</sup>

Several features of this passage are similar to komastic commonplaces, and of course the Canticle's Bride and Groom were seen as Christ and His Church, from Origen onwards.

g) Conclusions

An example that demonstrates Juvencus' adoption of contemporary concerns is his substitution of the torch for the Matthean oil-lamp. On the level of the narrative the torch works just as well as the lamp. However, taeda is a word redolent of epic, and so is stylistically more appropriate. In social or historical terms there is again little to choose between them from the point of view of familiarity to the reader; but Juvencus does imply details that would seem realistic to his audience, such as the business of lighting the torches only when they awaken rather than letting the lamps burn out while they sleep - surely the wise virgins at least would extinguish them before falling asleep.

---

23. Itala text from D. de Bruyne, "Les anciennes versions latines du Cantique des Cantiques", RBen 38 (1926), 97-122.

Moreover the taeda was so closely associated with Roman wedding custom that the word was metonymically used for marriage; hence Juvencus' audience would have had no difficulty in identifying with his version of the parable. The word also has social and literary associations with the komos, which Juvencus exploits to the full, to establish an allegorical meaning. The torch, or the torch flame at any rate, points to the faith in God of the true Christian as opposed to those who have only the torch case, the shell of a Christian life, and hence on an eschatological level explores the justice of Christ and the reasons why He will accept or reject those who come before Him on the Last Day. Finally, the reader must see in the torch Juvencus'; and hence Christ's message for him; on the moral or pastoral level he must be spiritually awake and ready for the uncertain hour of the Adventus.

The torch, then, illustrates all three types of contemporary concern. It is an alteration to conform with contemporary methods of illumination and wedding custom; hence it is intended to make sense of the parable for the Roman reader (type 1). There is no sign of anti-Semitism in this parable (though it has been noted, for instance, in all three parables in chapter 2: the parables of the Two Sons, the Workers in the Vineyard, and the Wedding Feast), but the torch is a paraenetic feature and hence is didactic (type 3). On the moral level at which Juvencus is addressing the reader,

the message is that without repentance (oil) all the good works (torch) are useless; the reader must repent his life of sin now for Christ is coming again and it will be too late on the Dies Irae. The unconscious contemporary interests and features include the remarkable eschatological viewpoint of the period. A reading of Constantine's surviving writings, of Eusebius' Vita and Historia, and of the works of Lactantius impresses the modern reader with the apparently simpler scale of values of the early to mid fourth century. Rewards and punishments in this world and the next were in a strictly reciprocal relationship, according to the standard view of the time. Perhaps because the memory and indeed the fact of persecution was so recent (Diocletian's Great Persecution was 303-6), the view of Heaven and Hell was less complex than ours. Moreover the reign of Constantine must have seemed to be the millenium to those who had suffered a few years before; the Second Coming was a real and imminent possibility. No wonder fourth century Christians were interested in eschatology. As has been seen, this concern informs much of Juvencus' interpretation of the parables, and the gospel as a whole. The parable of the Ten Virgins is dominated by his eschatological interpretation, an interpretation that is automatic, almost unconscious, because it is so much a feature of his age. The torch, or rather the flame of the torch, is a symbol of the division of

the sheep and the goats on the Last Day; the Christian will be received into Paradise, the pagan or heretic will be damned to eternal torment in Hell.

It is interesting that Juvencus also makes reference to the literary genre, the komos, in an attempt to dramatize the interpretation. The komos is specifically classical rather than Palestinian in its antecedents, and perhaps represents an actual state of affairs in the ancient world. It is not certain but possible that gangs of young men got drunk at symposia and then sought admission at their ladies' houses throughout the Hellenistic period and before. Whether this tradition survived into the fourth century as more than a literary one is unknown, but it is possible that Juvencus is alluding to a social custom still alive in his time. Either way it is clearly a specifically Roman (rather than Jewish) concern that is at least a literary reality in the fourth century; hence it is one more sort of contemporary concern. Juvencus is very much a writer of his time, as well as a Christian poet.

Conclusions may now be drawn about the interpretative levels of meaning in Juvencus' parable. Clearly there are several such levels in the Ten Virgins: a simple spiritual allegory, an allegorized eschatological level of meaning, and a paraenesis in the moral allegorical sense, may all be identified here in addition to the literal narrative

and the komos references, which are not allegorized but constitute separate levels of meaning. This complex of sense levels goes far beyond Origen's tripartite analysis in the purely numerical sense; and yet it is not like Augustine's exegesis, or the rigid system of exegetic classification typical of the Middle Ages (anagogical, analogical, allegorical, etc.). The crucial difference between Juvenecus' interpretations of the parables and those of the exegetic tradition is that the poet is not attempting a commentary on the hidden spiritual meanings of the Gospel. The Evangeliorum libri IV is a personal poetic treatment of the Gospel narrative to be read as a separate work of literature not a theological work of scholarship. Hence, though Origen's allegorical levels of interpretation (borrowed from Philo) have proved useful in approaching the allegorized sense levels in this poem, they are of less assistance in analysing this parable because of its complexity. Furthermore the fact that the standard patristic exegetical technique cannot be applied in this instance suggests that the poet may have employed the fruits of Biblical scholarship for his own purposes and only when it suited him. Origen and the other exegetes are an understandably unreliable guide to the interpretation of his poem.

CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSION

It is clear from the foregoing that Juvencus' treatment of the Biblical narrative is interpretative. The analysis of the poem's parables suggests that Juvencus did not adopt Origen's three levels of meaning but approached the Gospel text in a different way from the exegetes; accordingly patristic Biblical commentary must be regarded as a development parallel to but separate from Biblical epic, not as congruent with it.

The parables in the poem nonetheless stand out as clear evidence that the Gospel narrative is being interpreted by the allegorical method. They may be understood as lessons, with many but distinct senses, which seem obviously to be directed at the reader for his spiritual good. This statement, however unfashionably, implies a view of the poet's intention in writing the poem;<sup>1</sup> and raises the question, who is the reader?

Herzog (pp. 60-9) is primarily interested in how and why the early writers of Biblical epic came to choose poetry as a suitable medium for Biblical narrative. His explanation

---

1. While remarks about a writer's intention have no critical finality, they may still be useful; to know, for example, that Alexander Pope, wrote The Rape of the Lock in a light-hearted and amusing vein to effect a reconciliation between the real protagonists (Lord Petre and Arabella Fermor) celebrated in his poem, enables one to appreciate what a work of genius its final draft is, considering its trivial occasion.

of the Biblical epic relies on the practice of the Christian fathers of quoting passages from the pagan poets (above all, Virgil) for apologetic purposes; Virgilian quotation in the poetry of a Juvencus is an equivalent to and indeed a natural development from this feature of patristic literature.

Roberts (pp. 109-12) considers poetry as the chosen medium of expression largely from the viewpoint of paraphrastic theory, where the choice between poetry and prose is a matter of artistic preference rather than of rhetorical prescription.<sup>2</sup> To him the fact that Juvencus wrote in verse is of less importance than the reason why the poem was written at all. Juvencus' poem was written for the educated pagan or semi-pagan audience as a reaction to the primitive language of Latin translations of the Bible. In Roberts' view the poem is intended to improve the Gospel text stylistically and make it appeal to these cultured pagans.

---

2. Nonetheless he is surely guilty of over-emphasis when he says (pp. 110-1), "Lactantius equates poetry and prose ... Juvencus would have shared Lactantius' belief in the equivalence of prose and poetry," and quotes Div. Inst. V 1, 10. When Lactantius says here that both prose (philosophi et oratores) and poetry are dangerous to the Christian because of the charm of their diction, he is simply emphasising that prose too has charm (for the charm of poetry topos, which is derived from Homer, see Roberts, p. 141, n. 46), rather than saying that prose and poetry are equivalent. Juvencus would certainly not have understood that statement: as the Stoics originally noted, poetry was the medium of the sublime, capable of expressing the ultimate truths; prose to the Christian of his day meant apologetics or exegetics, neither of which attracted Juvencus or any other Biblical poet (except Paulinus; see McClure, pp. 310-1, for discussion).

Kievits (p. 3) and Donnini (p. 232) go further and suggest that the poem was written with apologetic purpose to popularise the Christian message. It is a kind of alternative to the Scriptures, it is suggested, intended to lead pagans into understanding the importance of the Gospel message (the content), so that they could then appreciate Holy Writ itself (the form).

So on the one hand the Biblical epic is a natural development from the patristic practice of quoting Virgil, while on the other it is an attempt to make Scripture acceptable and indeed pleasing to the well-educated pagans, or even to popularise the Christian message. Judith McClure's article on "The Biblical Epic and its Audience in Late Antiquity" has considered the standard approaches and rejected them (McClure, pp. 307-9). She maintains that a likely means of resolving this problem lies in detailed study of the debt of these paraphrases to Biblical exegesis (McClure, pp. 309-10):

What is needed is the investigation of a given work in relation to the entire contemporary tradition of Latin biblical exegesis of the text in question.

While the present study cannot claim to be the complete analysis visualised by Dr. McClure, it does involve a realistic attempt to relate the poem to the exegetic literature on Matthew's parables. A major problem, however, has been the fragmentary and confused nature of the exegetic tradition itself in this area, and more difficult yet has proved investigation of that tradition to the poem. It is perhaps not



surprising that the ancient exegetes have proved unhelpful in suggesting approaches to the Evangeliorum libri, or indeed in accounting for the development of Biblical epic, since as a body, they neglect and ignore works of this type (McClure, pp. 312-3, 315). Juvencus' poem and its successors were very much peripheral to Biblical study (McClure, p. 315), but equally, from the opposite view, the Biblical exegetes had little influence on Biblical epic: the traditions of Biblical epic and of exegesis were parallel but separate.

The problem remains. There is much to be said for all these interpretations relating to the purposes of Biblical epic in general and this poem in particular. As Dr. McClure (p. 307) has noted

the distaste felt by educated Christians when they first read the Vetus Latina versions of the Scriptures is amply documented in the third and fourth centuries.

The Evangeliorum libri may well have been written at Constantine's command, as Gregory of Tours maintains (cited above, p. 2, n.4), and certainly would have met with the "thirteenth Apostle's" approval if its intention was to win converts from his aristocracy. Yet that Juvencus should have imagined he was improving on the Scriptural text is unthinkable; it was generally accepted among Christians of his time that the language of God, no matter how apparently primitive, contained subtleties and depths of meaning beyond the attainment of human rhetoric (cf. Lactantius, Div. Inst. V 1, 15-6; McClure, pp. 308-10).

Indeed the very order of words in Holy Writ had its own meaning (cf. Jer. Ep. LVII, 5 ... Scripturis sanctis, ubi et uerborum ordo mysterium est). Furthermore the Biblical paraphrase would have been a poor medium for apologetics, since the editing of the Scriptures necessarily involved would tend to confuse disputed issues in the text (McClure, p. 309). The matter is a complex one; any account of the purpose of the Evangeliorum libri IV, therefore, is of its nature no more than a moderately informed guess.

My own view is that the poem was written to celebrate the dedicatio of Constantinople in 330, a new synthesis of Christian and pagan designed to rout the devil out of the epic, just as the reborn city was now purged of all idolatry (Eus. Vita. III 48). The poem is the Gospel in the sense that, by allegorically interpreting the meaning of and yet remaining close to the word of Scripture, it arrives at the essential truth, the deep senses of Holy Writ. In the parables, at least, there is a level of pastoral concern and soteriology which implies proselytizing or evangelizing zeal. Juvenius in his parables and the poem at large has succeeded to a remarkable degree in rendering in epic verse Christi vitalia gesta.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baker, G.P., Constantine the Great and the Christian Revolution. London: Eveleigh Nash and Grayson, 1931.
- Bardenhewer, Otto, Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur. 2nd edn. 5 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 1913-32.
- Bardy, Gustave, "L'église et l'enseignement au IVe siècle." RScR 14 (1934), pp. 525-49 and 15 (1935), pp. 1-27.
- "L'église et l'enseignement pendant les trois premiers siècles." RScR 12 (1932), pp. 1-28.
- Warren Bonfante, Larissa, "Emperor, God and Man in the IVth Century." PP 19 (1964), pp. 401-27.
- Brandes, Wilhelm, Über das frühchristliche Gedicht „Laudes domini." Prog. Braunschweig: Meyer, 1887.
- Brown, P.R.L., "Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy." JRS 51 (1961), pp. 1-11.
- The World of Late Antiquity from Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad. London: Thames and Hudson, 1971.
- Burckhardt, Jacob, The Age of Constantine the Great (1852). Trans. by Moses Hadas. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949.
- Clarke, Amy K., "Claudian and the Augustinian Circle of Milan." In Strenas Augustinianas V. Capanaga oblas, Vol. 2, ed. Oroz Reta, José (Madrid, 1968), pp. 125-33.
- Jimenez Delgado, José, "Juvenco en el Código Matritense 10.029." Helmantica 19 (1968), pp. 277-332.
- Donnini, Mauro, "Un aspetto della espressività di Giovenco: l'aggettivazione." Vichiana 2 (1973), pp. 54-67.
- "L'allitterazione e l'omeotelento in Giovenco." AFLPer 12 (1974-5), pp. 127-59.
- Firth, John B., Constantine the Great. London: Putnam, 1905.
- Flury, Peter, "Das sechste Gedicht des Paulinus von Nola." VChr 27 (1973), pp. 129-45.

- Fo, Alessandro, "La visita di Venere a Maria nell'epithalamium de nuptiis honorii augusti di Claudiano." Orpheus 2 (1981), pp. 157-69.
- Gebser, Augustus Rudolphus, De Caii Aquilini Iuveni presbyteri hispani vita et scriptis. Diss. Jena: Schmidium bibliopolam, 1827.
- Haupt, G., "Coniectanea (CXCI)." Hermes 8 (1874), p. 251.
- Jones, A.H.M., The Later Roman Empire. 3 vols. Oxford: OUP, 1964.
- The Decline of the Ancient World. London: Longmans, 1966.
- Constantine and the Conversion of Europe. rev. edn. Harmondsworth: Pelican, 1972.
- Kidd, Beresford James, A History of the Church to A.D. 461. 3 vols. Oxford: OUP, 1922.
- Korn, Otto, Beiträge zur Kritik der historia evangelica des Iuencus. I. Die Handschriften der historia evangelica des Iuencus in Danzig, Rom und Wolfenbüttel. Danzig: Groening, 1870.
- Kuhnmuensch, Otto J., Early Christian Latin Poets from the Fourth to the Sixth Century. Chicago: Loyola Univ. Press, 1929.
- Langlois, Pierre, "Les poèmes chrétiens et le christianisme d'Ausone." RPh 95 (1969), pp. 39-58.
- Lipscomb, Herbert Cannon, Aspects of the Speech in the Later Roman Epic. Diss. Baltimore: Furst, 1909.
- Herrero Llorente, V.J., "Lucano en la literatura hispano latina." Emerita 27 (1959), pp. 19-52.
- Longpré, André, "Aspects de metrique et de prosodie chez Juvencus." Phoenix 29 (1975), pp. 128-38.
- Manitius, Max, Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1891.
- "Zu spätlateinischen Dichtern I." ZOEG 37 (1886), 81-101.

- Harold, Carl, „Althochdeutsche Glossen aus Juvenius - Handschriften." Germania 32 (1887), pp. 351-5.
- „Otfrids Beziehungen zu den biblischen Dichtungen des Juvenius, Sedulius, Arator." Germania 32 (1887), pp. 385-411.
- „Anzeige von Huemers Ausgabe." BPhW 12 (1892), pp. 843-7.
- Martin, Josef, „Christliche lateinische Dichter (1900-1927)." JAW 221 (1929), pp. 112-3.
- Mercati, G., „Il palinsesto bobbiense di Iuvenio." Studi e Testi 79 (1937), pp. 506-12. Reprint from EIS (Athens, 1935), pp. 77-82.
- Moricca, Umberto, Storia della letteratura latina cristiana. 3 vols. in 5. Torino: Società editrice internazionale, 1923-34.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo (ed.), The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century. Oxford: OUP, 1963.
- van der Nat, Pieter Gijsbertus, Divinus Vere Poeta: Enige Beschouwingen over Onstaan en Karakter der Christelijke Latijnse Poëzie. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Opelt, Ilona, „Die Szenerie bei Iuvenius: ein Kapitel historisches Geographie." VChr 29 (1975), pp. 191-207.
- Pall, Roberto, „Aeterna in saecula in Giovenio, Praefatio 17." SCO 26 (1977), pp. 277-82.
- Petschenig, M., „Zur Latinität des Iuvenius." ALIG 6 (1889), pp. 267-8.
- „Anzeige von Huemers Ausgabe." BPhW 11 (1891), pp. 137-44.
- Poinsotte, Jean-Michel, „Le Juif dans la pensée chrétienne à l'époque constantinienne: l'obsession de la différenciation." Annales du C.E.S.E.R.E. (1981).
- Raby, F.J.E., A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages. Oxford: OUP, 1927.

- Rand, E.K., "Note on the Vossianus Q86 and the Reginenses 333 and 1616." AJPh 44 (1923), pp. 171-2.
- Sanday, William, "Recent Publications dealing with the Latin Fathers." CR 6 (1892), pp. 48-50.
- Stanislaus, Anne, "The Scriptures in Hexameter." CW 32 (1938), pp. 99-100.
- Strzelecki, Ladislaus, "II. De synaloephae apud Iuvenum usu." In Studia prosodiaca et metrica, Polska Akademia Umiejetnosci Rozprawy Wydzialu Filologicznego, 68 no. 3 (Krakow, 1949).
- Thoma, Herbert, "The Oldest Manuscript of Juvenus." CR 44 (1950), pp. 95-6.
- Angel Custodio Vega, P., "Capitulos de un libro: Juvenco y Prudencio." Ciudad de Dios 157 (1945), pp. 209-47.
- Vivona, Franciscus, De Iuveni poetae amplificationibus. Palermo, 1902.
- Wehrli, Max, "Sacra Poesis: Biblepik als europäische Tradition." In Formen Mittelalterlicher Erzählung (Zurich: Altantis, 1969), pp. 51-71.
- Weyman, Carl, Beiträge zur Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie. Munich: Hueber, 1926.
- de Wit, Jan, "De textu Iuveni poetae observationes criticae." VChr 8 (1954), pp. 145-8.
- Zannoni, Giuglielmo, "Quid poetica popularis ratio, quid optimorum scriptorum imitatio aetate SS. Patrum ad latinam christianorum poesim contulerint." Latinitas 6 (1958), pp. 93-106.

SELECT LIST OF TEXT EDITIONS USED  
BIBLE

GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

Novum Testamentum graece, ed. Alexander Souter. 2nd edn. Oxford: OUP, 1947.

Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, ed. E. Nestle and G.D. Kilpatrick. 3rd edn. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958.

VETUS LATINA

Itala: das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung, ed. Adolf Jülicher. 4 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963-72.

VULGATE

Novum Testamentum Latine secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi, ed. John Wordsworth and Henry Julian White. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1889-1913.

Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam, ed. Alberto Colunga and Laurentio Turrado. 5th edn. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1977.

JUVENCUS

EVANGELIORUM LIBRI

Evangeliorum Libri Quattuor, ed. Johann Huemer, CSEL 24. Vienna: Tempsky, 1891.