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](#)

Tacitus *Agricola* XXIV

F. Haverfield

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 09 / December 1897, pp 447 - 447

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00051933, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00051933

How to cite this article:

F. Haverfield (1897). Tacitus *Agricola* XXIV. The Classical Review, 11, pp 447-447
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00051933

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

E 425 πρὸς χρυσέῃ περόνῃ καταμύξατο χεῖρα
ἀραιήν.

Again in Theocr. vi. 13 κατὰ δὲ χροῖα καλὸν
ἀμύξῃ.

It is observable that the solitary aorist of ἀμύσσω that is to be found in the Homeric poems is καταμύξατο with ξ instead of σ, and this fact must be regarded as to some extent adverse to the correction suggested. The objection however need not be considered very serious; for apart from the fact that an original καταμύσσαστο (duplicate σ) may have been doricised or even accidentally assimilated to other Homeric aorists such as ἐνάριξα, πολέμιξα, ἀλάπαξα, we have a precisely similar phenomenon as regards the interchange of ξ and σ in ἥρπαξα and ἥρπασα, both Homeric, if not in ἐπαιξα and ἐπαισα.

In conclusion I may mention a further reason for the loss of ἥμυσα from our passages over and above the natural tendency of the less known to fail before that which is even a little more familiar—and we have seen that ἀφύσσω occurs far more frequently than ἀμύσσω. The reason is this. ἥμυσε is unfortunately liable to be confused with the similarly spelled aorist of ἥμύω (© 308 ὡς δ' ἐτέρωσ' ἥμυσε κάρη). No doubt the two are distinguishable by the quantity, and in the case of words in common use this would be a sufficient safeguard, but hardly so, when, as in this instance, the later Greeks had to deal with the semi-obsolete, the preservation of which must always have been precarious and uncertain.

T. L. AGAR.

TACITUS AGRICOLA XXIV.

In the October number of this review (p. 328), Mr. A. Gudeman declares his belief in the theory of Pfitzner that Agricola invaded Ireland. I should like briefly to indicate why this theory seems to me wholly mistaken. Two arguments in chief have been adduced to prove it:—

(1) Pfitzner asserts that a certain legion was sent to Britain for the years 81, 82, and that an expedition to Ireland is the only conceivable reason for its being thus specially sent. The first of these statements is admitted by all competent authorities to be wrong: the second is obviously an arbitrary assumption which is not worth discussion.

(2) Mr. Gudeman says that 'the whole chapter [Agr. xxiv.] is unintelligible except on the presumption of an expedition to Ireland.' Now this chapter says a good deal about Ireland; it tells us that Agricola thought about invading the island; it tells us what troops he considered necessary for the enterprise. But it does not tell us that he ever did invade Ireland. It seems to me that the chapter is unintelligible save on the presumption of no expedition.

With respect to the particular passage discussed by Mr. Gudeman, *nave prima*

transgressus, I think Mr. Gudeman has underestimated one objection to his otherwise ingenious view. He considers *nave prima* as noun and adjective in agreement and admits that it ought to be *prima nave*. That certainly is the Tacitean order where there is no special emphasis; and it is not merely the Tacitean order. If it were a mere rule made by Tacitus for himself, we might allow him to break it—and, I may say in passing, that from this point of view I demur to emendations like those suggested by Mr. Gudeman on Agr. xvii or xxxviii; they assume (contrary to the manuscripts) that Tacitus could never vary from his own rule. But this rule about the noun and adjective is common to nearly all Latin, and no writer would break it without an intelligible reason. With a reason, the rule is broken often enough, both by Tacitus and others, but here there is no reason of rhythm or rhetoric or anything else. I still venture to think that my own explanation of the passage, which neither breaks this rule nor disturbs the text, is satisfactory. However, Mr. Gudeman does not think my explanation even worthy of rejection.

F. HAVERFIELD.