The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On Some Passages in Juvenal *Satires* I., and III

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 08 / November 1897, pp 399 - 403

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042050, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042050

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1897). On Some Passages in Juvenal *Satires* I., and III. The Classical Review, 11, pp 399-403 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042050

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ON SOME PASSAGES IN JUVENAL SATIRES I., AND III.

I. 64-58.

cum iam sexta ceruice feratur
hinc atque inde patens ac nuda paene
cathedra
et multum referens de Maecenate supino
signator falsi, qui se lautum atque beatum
exiguus tabulis et gemma fecerit uda.

67 falsi P (apparently) falso p ω.

Here *signator falsi* means 'the signatory to a forgery.' Dig. xlviii. 10, 1, § 4 *qui in rationibus tabulis cerisue uel alia qua re sine consignatione falsum fecerint* ('have committed forgery') etc. Id. 12 *falsi reus*. 13 *falsi nominis uel cognominis adseueratio poena falsi coercetur. ordine decurionum decem annis aduocatum motum, qui falsum instrumentum cognoscente praetore recitauit, post finem temporis dignitatem respondi recipere, quoniam in Corneliam falso recitato, non facto non incidit.* Suet. Aug. 33 *cum de falso testamento ageretur, omnesque signatores lege Cornelia tenerentur*. Roman wills were signed by five witnesses in the presence of a *libripens* (Dict. A. ii. 803): they were usually kept in temples: the forger in question probably abstracted the genuine will, and forged a new one in his own favour, together with the seals of the witnesses. *Signator* accordingly means 'the maker of signa.' Such a forgery was performed by Oppianicus Cic. Cluent. § 41 *eadem hac Dinea testamentum faciente, cum tabulasprehendisset Oppianicus, qui gener eius fuisset, digito legata deleuit et cum id multis locis fecisset, post mortem eius ne lituris coargui posset, testamentum in alias tabulas transcriptum signis adulterinis obsignauit*. The will which was signed by the five witnesses, was written on tablets tied with strings, and sealed on the outside with the seals of the witnesses (*gemma uda*). *Signator* is regular for a witness to a will: x. 336 *ueniet cum signatoribus auspex*.

The reading *signator falso* must be rejected. It cannot be explained as 'the signatory to a forgery' ('*signator falso* intellige *testamento*, qui obsignauit suppositicum testamentum, signator in falsis tabulis'—Gronovius Obseru. ii. 24); Latinity would require the genitive, as in the text, not dative: nor can it be equivalent to *signator falso* (*signo*) (Heinrich), as the ellipsis of *signo* is hard to parallel. Therefore, if it were retained, it would be necessary to punctuate *signator, falso qui* etc. (Ruperti,

Mayor), 'the signatory, who by forgery, those tiny tablets and the moistened signet, has made himself prosperous and wealthy:' then *exiguus tabulis* and *gemma uda* would be a further explanation of *falso*. But the ambiguity inherent in the interpretation of this reading condemns it, apart from any external reason. The conjectures *signato falso* (Madvig) *signator falsus* (Ruperti) hardly deserve notice; though Sall. Cat. 16 § 2 *ex illis testis signatoresque falsos commo-dare* shows the latter to be possible.

I. 105.

sed quinque tabernae
quadringenta parant.

Here *quinque tabernae* seems to mean 'five shops' which are managed for the affluent *libertinus* by *institores*, and bring him in an income of H.S. 400,000 (£3,400), the assessment of an *eques* (v. 132). Trade at Rome was chiefly in the hands of freedmen. As the profit on these five shops has seemed to some persons large, it has been supposed that the *quinque tabernae* are the five banks in the Forum mentioned by Livy xxvi. 27, 2 *eodem tempore* (B.C. 210) *septem tabernae, quae postea quinque, et argentariae, quae nunc nouae appellantur, arsere*. The meaning would then be 'my dealings on 'Change produce me a knight's fee.' But these *tabernae* in Juvenal's time had ceased to exist, and their site was occupied by the Basilica Iulia (Middleton, Ancient Rome, i. 233): hence this hypothesis must be dismissed. As we have no means of knowing how much business this freedman's five shops did, it is idle to criticise the amount of the profits. It is even possible that the *tabernae* in question were private banks, in which case the profits might have been very great. Further, though this freedman is no doubt boasting, there is nothing irreconcilable or absurd in his naming the sum *quadringenta*, and proceeding to add *ego possideo plus Pallante et Licinis* (108): for though Pallas was worth about two-and-a-half million sterling (Tac. A. xii. 53, 5), that was not his annual income. This freedman may well have had other sources of income besides the *quinque tabernae*; as indeed is indicated by the word *possideo*, which means 'I am holder (*possessor*) of more real property.' Cp. iii. 141 *quot possidet agri*

umenta? x. 225 *quot villas possideat nunc.* xii. 129 *possideat quantum rapuit Nero.* xiv. 159 *si tantum culti solus possederis agri.*

Friedländer may be right in understanding *quinque* as a round number 'five shops or so': see his note on xi. 206 *facere hoc non possis quinque diebus.*

I. 142-146.

poena tamen praesens, cum tu deponis amictus turgidus, et crudus pauonem in balnea portas.

hinc subitae mortes atque intestata senectus

et noua nec tristis per cunctas fabula cenas: ducitur iratis plaudendum funus amicis.

143 *crudus* P and Paris. 9345 saec. xi., published by Hosius. *crudum* p w.

The reading *crudus* is unwisely rejected by all editors in favour of *crudum*, which, besides appearing in the inferior MSS., is found also in Phocas G.L.K. 24 *dicuntur et haec balnea . . . Iuuenalis 'et crudum pauonem in balnea portas.'* Schol. Pers. iii. 98 Jahn. *turgidum dicit crudum, indigestum, ut Iuuenalis 'turgidus et crudum pauonem in balnea portas.'* Cornutus Schol. (Höhler, p. 392) *crudum. indigestum incoctum.* gloss. Pith. (Lommatzsch, p. 396) *crudum: nondum coctum indigestum.*

As regards external evidence, the testimony of P outweighs all inferior authorities; whether interpolated MSS., or grammarians, whose quotations are notoriously inaccurate, or scholia and glosses, which are generally valueless: moreover I believe that the words *turgidus et crudus* are a reminiscence of Hor. epp. i. 6, 61 *crudi tumidique lauemur.* As regards internal evidence, Latin usage requires *crudus*, which means 'suffering from indigestion' as in vi. 203 *mustacea crudis donanda.* Cato R. R. 125 *cruda aluus.* Hor. sat. i. 5, 49 *namque pila lippis inimicum et ludere crudis.* Cic. Clu. § 168 *cum ad illud prandium crudior uenisset.* de or. i. § 124 *crudior fuit.* de fin. ii. 8, 23 *qui de conuiuio auferantur crudique postridie se rursus ingurgitent.* Mart. xii. 76, 2 *ebrius et crudus nil habet agricola.* Sen. epp. 89, 22 *quantulum ex ista fera periculose capta dominus crudus ac nauisians gustat?* Luxorius, Baehrens P.L.M. iv. 425 *inmensi soricis cattus cum membra uorasset, | deliciis periit crudior ille suis.* The accusative *crudum*, as far as I know, can only be supported in the sense of 'undigested,' as it is usually explained, by the solitary passage of Celsus i. 2 *qui*

crudum sine praecordiorum dolore ructat: but there the meaning is uncertain: *crudum* might even be adverbial: and *crudus* in the sense of 'undigested' I take to be solecistic and late Latin. Consequently the reading *crudum* could only mean 'raw': xv. 83 *contenta cadauere crudo.* Ov. F. vi. 158 *extaque de porca cruda bimestre tenet.* Mart. xi. 57, 4 *exta cruda.* Suet. Ner. 37 *crudam carnem.* But it is absurd to suppose that the rich epicure's peacock was underdone; such an imputation on his cook is incongruous here, and could not be supported by Mart. iii. 13. *dum non uis pisces, dum non uis carpere pullos, | et plus quam putri, Naevia, parcis apro, | accusas rumpisque cocum, tamquam omnia cruda* ('You abuse the cook for sending up all the victuals raw') | *attulerit. numquam sic ego crudus* ('dyspeptic') *ero.* Juvenal's expression for 'undigested food' is *cibus imperfectus* (iii. 233). I suspect *crudum* to be a grammarian's alteration, the product of Cornutus or Heiric of Auxerre. The errors introduced by grammarians into Latin texts are discussed in the prolegomena to my edition of Ovid's *Tristia*, p. lxxvii. foll.

I proceed to consider *intestata*, about which Madvig (Adu. iii. 249) found a difficulty, because though indigestion may cause death, it need not have prevented the man from making his will. He therefore proposes to read *infestata*, understanding *infestata senectus* as 'old age estranged,' old age that declines to visit men ('senectus subitis his et praematuris moribus infestatur, paucique aut nulli eam consequuntur'). But rich old men would naturally often put off making their wills till death was imminent; partly from fear of being poisoned by their prospective legatees (cp. xiii. 25, xiv. 173, 251: see Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*, i. 338 foll.), and partly to keep on the alert the expectations of the legacy-hunters, by whom they were courted and whose special prey they were (cp. iv. 19, x. 202, xii. 121 ff.; Sen. epp. 95, 43, *amico aliquis aegro adsidet: probamus. at hoc hereditatis causa facit: uultur est, cadaver expectat*). Further *intestata* is required to explain *iratis amicis*: the friends are angry because the rich man has died without making a will, their attentions to him are all wasted labour (iii. 124 *perierunt tempora longi seruitii*), and so they exult over his demise (*plaudendum funus*).

I. 155-157.

pone Tigellinum: taeda lucebis in illa qua stantes ardent qui fixo pectore fumant, et latum media sulcum deducit harena.

deducit P and HVBM published by Hosius, and Cod. Trin. Coll. Cantab. O. 4, 10 saec. X., of which Mr. G. R. Scott has kindly lent me his collation. deducis, p. s.

Translate: 'If you portray Tigellinus you will blaze amid the bonfire in which the wretches stand and burn who smoke pierced through the chest, and which bonfire draws out (flashes out) a broad streak of light in the middle of the sand' of the amphitheatre. I cannot agree with Bücheler and Friedländer in rejecting *deducit* in favour of *deducis*. The syntax is *et (quas taeda) sulcum deducit*. The relative is occasionally thus supplied: xiv. 105 *sed pater in causa, cui septima quaeque fuit lux ignava et (qui) partem vitae non attigit ullam*. xv. 170 *sed (qui) pectora brachia uolturn | crediderint genus esse cibi*. See Madvig, Opusc. ii. 176 = 541. Munro, Lucr. vi. 52. The meaning of *sulcum deducit* has been much disputed: that adopted was suggested by Maguire (Hermathena, ix. 422): *sulcus* = *sulcus luminis*: ep. Verg. Aen. ii. 697 (of the trail of a comet) *tum longo limite sulcus | dat lucem*. v. 527 *caelo ceu saepe reflexa | transcurrunt crinemque uolantia sidera ducunt*. Lucan v. 562 *dispersos traxere cadentia sulcos | sidera*. This seems simpler than to understand *sulcum deducit* of the track of pitch and burning stuff which dripped off the stakes fastened in the ground: as this would not be broad (*latum*). So Nipperdey on Tac. A. xv. 44 and Weidner.

If *deducis* be accepted it means 'and there you are drawing a broad furrow on the midst of the sand.' The picture then is of the track left by the dead body dragged away by the uncus (x. 66): Lycophron 268 *λευρὰς βοώτης γατομῶν δι' αἶλακος* (= *sulcus* of Hector dragged by Achilles): Sen. de ira iii. 3, 6 *eculei et fidiculae et ergastula et cruces et circumdati defossis corporibus ignes, et cadauera quoque trahens uncus*. Plin. paneg. 33, 3 *nemo e spectatore spectaculum factus, miseras uoluptates unco et ignibus expiauit*. But though the present indicative is often used of actions about to be commenced (e.g. iii. 296), the abrupt change from the future to the present is here impossible, and is not paralleled by the far easier changes quoted by Friedländer, such as iii. 239 *si uocat... uehetur...curet*, v. 87 *qui adfertur—olebit*. Further, as Mr. Marindin observes to me, the meaning obtained is absurd: for though the body of a criminal executed in an ordinary fashion and then removed could no doubt 'describe a furrow' in the sand, the victim burnt at the stake would leave little or no body to drag, and it seems impossible

to suppose that Juvenal would so describe the removal of his remains. No probable conjecture has been proposed, though *sulcum uncus ducet* (Mayor) and *sulcum dant lucis* (Dobree) deserve mention for their ingenuity.

III. 216–218.

hic nuda et candida signa,
hic aliquid praeclarum Euphranoris et
Polycliti,
haec Asianorum uetera ornamenta deorum.

Haecasianorum PS, Fecasianorum p ALVB, ectosianorum (o prior post. mut. in a) H, Fetasianorum ex Fecasianorum cod. Trin. Coll. Cantab.

The notes of the scholia are:

haec Asianorum superstitiosae gentem nominauit. schol. Pith.

Phaecasianorum. Phaecasiani populi sunt in cultu idolorum superstitiosi plurimos deos colentes. ipsi sunt etiam Phaeaces. Cornutus schol. (Höhler, p. 418).

Haec Asianorum, the reading of P, is retained by Ruperti, Lewis, Bücheler, Weidner, and Friedländer. Friedländer, following Lewis, understands *haec* to mean 'another, a woman': he considers that the introduction of a lady among the sympathetic male friends who effusively vie with one another in offering material consolation to their burnt out wealthy neighbour is in Juvenal's manner, and makes the scene more realistic: he might have quoted *horrida mater, pullati proceres* (213). This may be so: but the sudden introduction of one female among so many males, without any very obvious reason, to say nothing of that of one *haec* among so many *hic*'s, has always seemed to me strange.

Weidner, feeling this difficulty, proposes to take *haec* as accusative plural with *Polycliti*; 'another brings some masterpiece of Euphranor and these glories of temples in Asia wrought by Polyclitus in days gone by, now by Rome possessed' (*haec* these near us). But the position of *Polycliti* seems to show that it cannot be separated from *Euphranoris*; and had such been the meaning I think that *haec* would in order have preceded *Polycliti*.

Therefore, if *haec* be retained, the comma must be kept after *Polycliti*, and *haec uetera ornamenta* must be acc. pl. in apposition both to *nuda et candida signa* and *aliquid praeclarum*; 'these glories in days gone by of eastern temples.' But even then the use of *haec* in juxtaposition to four *hic*'s, in a different case from them, is awkward; and

I fancy a Roman would have written *ista* or *illa*.

It cannot then be said that the reading *haec* is satisfactory. Thus Heinrich remarks: '*haec Asianorum* ist ohne allen Zweifel corrupt,' and proposes to retain *phaecasianorum* (so Burmann on Anth. Lat. p. 608). Though admitting that *phaecasiatus* is the ordinary form of the adjective, he contends that *phaecasianus* may have been also in use, quoting Cic. ad fam. ix. 16, 8 *miniani Iouis*, which form, altered by most editors to *miniati* after Lambinus, is retained by Mendelssohn, who says that it may well have been a vulgar form of the word, like *Lenana*, *Praenestana*, *Tutannus*, *Vorannus*.

Roth, following a suggestion of Ruperti, proposed *phaecasiatorum*, which alteration is adopted by Mayor.

Whether *phaecasianorum* or *phaecasiatorum* be read, the reference would be to the white leather shoe worn by the Greeks: Appian, B. C. v. 11 (speaking of the luxury of Antonius in Athens) καὶ στολὴν εἶχε τετραγώνον Ἑλληνικὴν ἀντὶ τῆς πατρίου, καὶ ὑπόδημα ἦν αὐτοῦ λευκὸν Ἀττικόν, ὃ καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἔχουσι ἱερεῖς καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων, καὶ καλοῦσι φαυκάσιον. Sen. epp. 113, 1 *puto quaedam esse quae deceant phaecasiatum palliatumque*. The word would then be contemptuous, almost equivalent to foreign, as the rogue says in Petron. 82 '*age ergo*' inquit ille '*in exercitu uestro phaecasiati milites ambulant?*' 'Tell me, pray, are there any fellows with foreign shoes marching in your regiment?' Juvenal's use of *stlattarius* (vii. 134) might be quoted in support of this.

Now in all textual matters the question is not whether a reading may be explained by dint of grammatical or learned ingenuity, but whether the source from which it proceeds is pure. Either we must hold that there is no best MS. of Juvenal, a position which many scholars seem to have adopted either explicitly or implicitly with regard to other authors, in which case textual criticism may be dismissed as a vain thing which it would be wise for sane persons to eschew. Or we may hold, as I do, that we have in P a pure source, a faithful guide, which though not necessarily always right, at any rate offers readings from which the truth can be extracted. It is further necessary to appreciate the relation to P of the numerous other MSS. (*pω*), such as those collated by Hosius the Bodleian and Trinity College, Cambridge MSS., and the Cornutus-scholia published by Höhler.

The MSS. of the *ω* class used to be regarded as representing the recension of

Nicaeus, that of P being distinct. But Bücheler (Friedl. i. 113) has now proved that all our MSS. are drawn from the recension of Nicaeus. This follows from the fact that *ω* do not consistently deviate from P, but sometimes one MS. departs from it, sometimes another, while frequently many of them agree with it. The absence of the subscription *Legi ego Niceus Romae apud Seruivum magistrum et emendavi* at the end of Sat. V is accounted for by the fact that there are no comments and adscripts in P at the end of Sat. V and beginning of Sat. VI, showing that something was there lost or obliterated in the original from which P was copied.

The following appears to be the history of the text. In the fourth century Nicaeus revised the text, and he or some other grammarian composed the original ancient commentary, the source of our scholia. Some time later, perhaps in the fifth century, a further recension was made by Epicarpus and Exuperantius, who repeated the commentary.

From this recension came Valla's Probus, which ends at viii. 198, and preserves the early commentary more fully than P.

Also from this recension was copied a MS., from which spring all our known MSS., of which the last sheet was lost. This accounts for all our MSS. ending abruptly at xvi. 60.

From this original were drawn P, with the abbreviated scholia Pithoeana, and the fragmentary MSS. which agree with P, the Aarau fragments and florilegium Sangallense.

Again, from this original came the further revised text of 'Cornutus,' on which was based the recension of Heiric of Auxerre, whence sprang P and *ω*. Whether the so called Cornutus scholia were the work of Cornutus, whoever he may have been, or of Heiric, or, as I am inclined to believe, of both, cannot be fully determined. The interlinear glosses in P, published by Lommatzsch, have nothing to do with the scholia Pithoeana, but are excerpts from the Cornutus scholia.

This theory accounts for the numerous passages in which *pω* agree; and the labours of Cornutus and Heiric, and the variations which grew up in the course of transmission, account for the numerous variants in *pω*.

I think it will now be clear that the reading *phaecasianorum* (*phaecasiatorum*) cannot be accepted: it was produced in the laboratory of Cornutus and Heiric; the foolish explanation of the Cornutus scholia was doubtless

the work of the latter. Also I believe that I have made it appear improbable that *haec Asianorum* can be right. What then are we to read? In answering this question let us consider whether that most fertile source of error in Latin MSS., the mistaken solution of a contraction, may have caused the trouble (see Lindsay, *Latin Textual Criticism*, p. 90 foll.). This I believe to be the case: the contraction *H'*, as may be seen by a glance at Chassant's *Dictionnaire des Abréviations*, stands in Latin MSS. for *hic*, *haec*, or *hoc*. I propose then to restore *hic* to the text of Juvenal, as Jahn has already done in his edition of 1851, following a suggestion of Ruperti. The copyists, I imagine, introduced *haec* for *hic*, from supposing that the word agreed with *uetera ornamenta*. The tendency of MSS. to assimilate endings is well known: I have given some instances in the *Classical Review*, Vol. XI., p. 169, on Lucan vii. 303: see also Lindsay, p. 23 and 27.

III. 226-227.

hortulus hic puteusque brevis nec reste
mouendus
in tenuis plantas facili defunditur haustu.

defunditur P. diffunditur *pw*.

Bücheler and Friedländer wrongly reject *defunditur* in favour of *diffunditur*: either word would apply to watering a garden; but if Juvenal can say *patulas defundere pelues* (277), why should he not say *puteus defunditur*? Further, Latin writers, particularly the poets (Postgate, *Selections from Propertius* p. xev.) are so fond of the pregnant use of substantives, by which here the well stands for the water of the well, as *pelues* stands for the contents of the *pelues*, that it is unnecessary with Bücheler to put a comma at *mouendus*, and construct *diffunditur* (as he reads) impersonally 'you water your slips': this involves an asyndeton harsh for Juvenal.

S. G. OWEN.

NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES OF THE *AGAMEMNON* OF AESCHYLUS.

12.

εὐτ' ἂν δὲ νυκτίπλαγκτον ἔνδροσόν τ' ἔχω
εὐνήν δνείροις οὐκ ἐπισκοπουμένην
ἐμήν

Apart from the objections hitherto urged against ἐμήν, it is evident that to be visited by dreams is by no means desirable unless the dreams be kindly. A suggestion not yet made is

εὐτ' ἂν δὲ νυκτίπλαγκτον ἔδροσόν τ' ἔχω
εὐνοίς δνείροις οὐκ ἐπισκοπουμένην
εὐνήν

In the circumstances it would be easy for εὐνήν to take the place of εὐνοίς, and then (for that or other obvious reasons) become corrupted into ἐμήν in its own verse.

525.

ἦπου πάλοι φαυδροῖσι τοῖσιδ' (sic) ὄμμασι
δέξασθε κόσμῳ βασιλέα πολλῶ χρόνῳ.

So *f*, but with *v* over *a* of πάλοι. *h* has τοῖσιν and δέξασθε. The εἴ που of editors comes from Auratus, not from MSS. The evidence therefore points to error somewhere in πάλοι or τοῖσιδ' or δέξασθε or all of them. If ἦπου (or ἦ που) is right, the only tense to

which δέξασθε and δέξαισθε can point is the future δέξεσθε (*αι = ε*).

Read therefore

ἦπου, πύλαι, φαυδροῖσι τοῖς διόίγμασι
δέξεσθε κόσμῳ βασιλέα πολλῶ χρόνῳ.

'I ween, ye gates, with joy in your wide openings will ye welcome...'

560 sqq.

μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσαντίας,
σπαρνὰς παρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους, τί δ' οὐ
†στένοντες, οὐ λαχόντες, ἡματος μέρος;

Perhaps nearer than previous conjectures is

τί δ' οὐ
στένοντας, οὐ λάχοις τις, ἡματος μέρος;

'and during what portion of the day in which a man's lot fell did we not groan?'. The men took their 'watches', and all the operations of any 'watch' were disagreeable. ἡματος = 'the day's work'. After the participle στένοντας the next words οὐλαχοιτις might easily pass into οὐ λαχόντες.

The construction is, of course, εἰ λέγοιμι (τοὺς ἀνδρας) στένοντας πᾶν (= τί οὐ) ἡματος μέρος, οὐ τις λάχοι.