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](#)

Some Passages of Juvenal

H. W. Garrod

The Classical Review / Volume 25 / Issue 08 / December 1911, pp 240 - 243

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00047442, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00047442

How to cite this article:

H. W. Garrod (1911). Some Passages of Juvenal. The Classical Review, 25, pp 240-243
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00047442

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SOME PASSAGES OF JUVENAL.

I. 150-151.

dicas hic forsitan 'unde ingenium par materiae? unde illa priorum scribendi quodcunque animo flagrante liberet simplicitas? cuius non audeo dicere nomen? quid refert dictis ignoscat Mucius an non?'

Editors interpret 153-4 as = simplicitas Lucili dicentis 'cuius . . . etc.' But it is in vain that they throw about their inverted commas. Lucilius never ventured on *audēō*.

Is not the real remedy a gentler one? Remove the note of interrogation after *nomen* in 153, and write:

cuius non audeo dicere nomen,
quid refert dictis ignoscat Mucius an non?

'What does it matter whether Mucius is implacable in his resentment when the Lucilius *de nos jours* dare not name him? *Cuius* is, in fact, the relative, and the antecedent is *Mucius*.

III. 76.

grammaticus rhetor geometres pictor aliptes.

Geometres is commonly taken as a trisyllable (*geometres*): cf. L. and S. s.v. But Juvenal eschews synizesis. Friedlaender takes the word as *gēōmetres*, defending it by Ausonius *Epp.* 18. 17 *gēōmetrica*. Yet Juvenal is ill defended by the example of an author who elsewhere gives *trigōnum* for *τριγωνον*.

Aurelius Victor (cited by Mayor), echoing our passage, has 'Graeculus appellatus est . . . potitus . . . canendi psallendi medendique scientia, musicus, *geometra*, *pictor*' (*Épitome* xiv. 2). Is it not possible that Juvenal wrote here:

grammaticus rhetor <que>, *geōmetra*, pictor, aliptes?

-*que* (*q.*) might easily drop out before the initial letter of *geometra*: and it couples naturally the allied professions of *grammaticus* and *rhetor*.

III. 112-113.

horum si nihil est auiam resupinat amici.
[scire uolunt secreta domus atque inde timeri.]

113 is rightly deleted by Pinzger. But those who follow Pinzger omit to

remark the strongest of all the arguments against the line. In 112 the majority of MSS. other than *P* have *aulam* for *auiam*. Now 113 is nothing else than a gloss upon *aulam resupinat*. The interpolator understood *aulam resupinat* very much in the sense of Propertius' *totas resupinat Cynthia ualuas* (iv. 8. 58). He took it to mean 'breaks into the house' 'scire uolens secreta domus.' But if 113 is thus an explanation of *aulam resupinat* it is an explanation of something which Juvenal did not write, and therefore it does not proceed from Juvenal.

III. 128-130.

cum praetor lictorem impellat et ire praecipitem iubeat dudum uigilantibus orbis, ne prior Albinam et Modiam collega salutet.

If Albina and Modia have been 'awake for ages' (*dudum uigilantibus*), neither the *pauper cliens* nor the praetorian *captatores* will get much credit for their *salutatio*. They will alike be late. Friedlaender supposes that *dudum uigilantibus* is inserted to show us that Albina and Modia are *old*—'alte Leute die wenig schlafen.' And it is no doubt true that old people wake earlier than young—that indeed is why our parents inculcate in us the virtue of early rising. But the race for the *salutatio* begins *nocte* (127): and we can hardly suppose our *orbae* so incredibly old as to rise before most people have gone to bed. And in any case the praetors will still be late.

The fact is that Albina and Modia have *not* been 'awake for ages.' They have been 'awake for ages' only in the fevered imagination of the praetor hurrying his lictors along. In other words *dudum uigilantibus orbis* is part of an oblique narration.

V. 104-105.

aut glacie aspersus maculis Tiberinus et ipse uernula riparum pinguis torrente cloaca.

Mr. Housman notes that he, Schrader and Hadrianus Valesius, alone of men, have been perplexed by *glacie* in 104. Do fish become spotted from cold and ice? and is a sewer the most likely

place for cold and ice? The second difficulty might be got rid of by reading, with Rutgers, *torpente* for *torrente* (at 4. 43 *torrentis* . . . *Ponti* there is a well-supported variant *torpentis*, of the *Palus Maeotis*: but for *torrentis* cf. Lucan 3. 277 *fretum torrens Maeotidos egerit undas*). But *torrente* seems to be supported by Columella R.R. 8. 16. 4 who, speaking, like Juvenal of the *lupus*, says that Marcius Philippus would have the trained palate to despise *fluuialem lupum nisi quem Tiberis aduerso torrente defatigauisset* (cf. Mayor *ad loc.*). That fish become spotted owing to the action of ice or severe cold seems neither to be true in itself nor to be asserted by any ancient writer. Pliny, in Bk. ix. of the *Nat. Hist.*, has some occasional remarks upon the colour of fishes; but nothing to this effect. In fact of the *phycis* (the lamprey?) he says exactly the opposite: it becomes mottled (*uaria*) in the *spring* weather (ix. 26. 42). Now the scholiast's note on 104 is 'proprium nomen piscis.' This perhaps refers to *Tiberinus* which is certainly used as a *proprium nomen* in the passage of Galen cited here by Friedlaender. Yet *Tiberinus* as a proper noun is unsupported from any *Latin* writer, and it is possible that under *glacie* is concealed the name of a fish, and that it is to this that the scholiast's note refers. Perhaps *glanis*—a kind of shad. See C.G.L. vii. p. 486 **γλανιος silurus* (read *γλάνις*, ó, *silurus*). The gender is, I fancy, always masculine: *glanis* qui *uocatur*, Pliny, *N.H.* ix. 43, 145: Aristotle, *H.A.* viii. 20. 12 οἱ *γλάνεις*: though L. and S. give *γλάνις* as common. The corruption *glacie* may have been assisted by iv. 42-4 *glacies Maeotica* . . . *longo frigore pingues* (of turbot).

VII. 104.

quis dabit historico quantum daret acta legenti?

'The slave would of course not be paid for reading this' (the *Acta*), says Mr. Duff. So too Friedlaender. Why, then, in all conscience, should Juvenal speak as though the slave *would* be paid?

But is Juvenal speaking of a slave at all? He is no doubt thinking of the *actuarii*. But does he mean more than

that the historian would have more generous patrons if at his public recitations he read not his own compositions but—the Gazette? This would be clearer if for *historico* we wrote *historias*, and this may, I think, be the true reading: cf. Schol. 'qui scribitis historias.'

The scholiast glosses *quantum daret acta legenti* by *quantum datur exceptori*. It is open to anyone to say that this is not a gloss but a variant. To anyone who does not take this bold line, it is worth while to point out that not only is this gloss metrical, but if we prefix to it the last words of the scholion immediately preceding we get a perfect hexameter:

scribitis historias. quantum datur exceptori.

I call attention to this for the reason that scholars who regard this or that line in Juvenal as an interpolation due to a *scholion* are so often asked, Why should a *scholion* scan? Let them tell me, then, Why does *this scholion* scan? If it stood in *P* as part of the text of Juvenal between 103 and 104, they would defend it with the same zeal as they defend III. 113.

VII. 112-114.

ueram deprendere messem
si libet, hinc centum patrimonia causicorum,
parte alia solum russati pone Lacernae.

What then? No doubt, so weighed in the scales, the *patrimonia causicorum* would fly up and kick the beam. But why does Juvenal forget to say so? Why does he not go on somewhat to this effect:

inuenies centum patrimonia causicorum
nutare, unius depressa lance Lacernae?

How easily two such lines might have been lost from our copies is obvious. That Juvenal has in his mind the image of a balance with its two scales *hinc* . . . *parte alia* is clear from a comparison of VI. 436-7:

inde Maronem
atque alia parte in trutina suspendit Homerum.

VIII. 105-7.

inde Dolabella atque hinc Antonius, inde
sacrilegus Verres referebant nauibus altis
occulta spolia.

Is it possible that in 105 Juvenal wrote *Dolabellas*, nom. sing.? *Agrippas*

is found in a *Latin* inscription in Egypt (C. I. L. iii. 14. 19): and in almost any of the provinces the Greek forms of Latin names must have been familiar to Roman ears. Inversely Juvenal has, at IX. 2, *Marsya* for *Marsyas* (taken from Horace, S. I. 6. 120), and this licence is, of course, fairly common. It is found even with non-Greek names: e.g. Ovid, *Fasti* iii. 552 *Iarba*.

X. 256-7.

haec eadem Peleus, raptum cum luget Achillem;
haec eadem, cui fas Ithacum lugere natantem.

257. haec eadem *scripsi*: atque alius *codd.*

The only defence of *atque alius* is I. 10, *unde alius furtivae deuehat aurum pelliculae*. Is not the true reading there *alvus* (used for the Argo with a touch of contempt)?

X. 311-316.

fiet adulter
publicus et poenas metuet quascunque mariti.
lex in rete dabit, nec erit felicius astro
Martis. Vt in laqueos nunquam incidat, exigit
autem
interdum ille dolor plus quam lex ulla dolori
concessit.

313 *lex in rete* (=irete) *dabit scripsi*: exire irati debet *Monacensis* 408: irati debet *P*: exigere irati debet *codd. plerique*.

The law will give him into the net: and even if he escape the toils of the law, yet there are *raphani mugilesque*.

For *in rete dabit* cf. XIII. 244 *dabit in laqueum*: and for the whole passage II. 30-31 *leges reuocabat amaras omnibus atque ipsis Veneri Martique timendas*.

XI. 100-107.

tunc rudis et Graias mirari nescius artes
urbibus euersis praedarum in parte reperta
magnorum artificum frangebat pocula miles,
ut phaleris gauderet equus caelataque cassis
Romuleae simulacra ferae mansuescere iussae
imperii fato, geminos sub rupe Quirinos
ac nudam effigiem clipeo uenientis et hasta
pendentisque dei perituro ostenderet hosti.

With the grammatical difficulty in the last two lines of this passage I am not here concerned. But what in 102 is the meaning of *frangebat*? 'The soldier,' says Mr. Duff, 'broke up a cup chased by Mentor, to adorn the trappings of his horse or his helmet with a detached piece of ornament.' But what

were Romulus and Remus, Mars and Rhea Silvia doing upon cups chased by *Mentor*? The *magni artifices* of Greece did not habitually employ Roman themes.

The fact is that *frangebat* in 102 bears a technical meaning which seems to have escaped commentators. *Frangere*, used of works of art, etc., in metal, means to destroy the shape or fashion of an object and to work it into a new shape or fashion. This may be seen at once from a single passage of Pliny, N.H. 33. 54. 153: *Fabricius, qui bellicos imperatores plus quam pateram et salinum habere ex argento uetabat, videret hinc dona fortium fieri aut in haec frangi*. The *rudis miles*, therefore, takes a 'cup chased by Mentor' and has the metal worked into a tasteless representation of a Roman theme (Mars is represented as going to the nuptials of Rhea Silvia *nudus*, indeed, but equipped with shield and spear—much as Lord Fauntleroy expected his grandfather to dine in his coronet).

Similarly, at XI. 18 *lancibus oppositis uel matris imagine fracta*, the bankrupt gourmet allows the bust of his mother to be fashioned into something else: he sells it as so much solid metal. In the Bodleian Fragment, again, l. 5, *uasa frangenda* are cups so polluted that washing can do them no good. The metal must be used for something else.

XII. 30-34.

cum plenus fluctu medius foret alueus, et iam
alternum puppis latus euertentibus undis,
arboris incertae—nullam prudentia cani
reitoris cum ferret opem—decidere iactu
coepit cum uentis.

As I have punctuated this passage, I would take *arboris incertae iactu* together, though *iactu = iactura* may be defended from Seneca, *Troad.* 1052 sqq. *Arboris* will then bear its natural sense of mast. *Et* in 30 will merely intensify *iam*. 37-53 are a parenthetical description of the circumstances which led to the *iactus* of the mast. The sacrifice of the mast is mentioned at the very beginning as being the climax of Catullus' peril. Then follows a description of the minor features of the disaster. And then, 53 sqq., Juvenal returns to the mast episode. For the intensitive *et* with *iam*

see *L.* and *S.* s.v. *iam*. *Alueolus iam* would be possible, perhaps, 'the crazy hold': though the diminutive is not elsewhere found in the sense of 'hold.'

XII. 80-81.

interiora petit Baianae peruia cumbae
tuti stagna sinus.

Variants in 81 are *tuti stacta*, *tunci stagna*, *tunc stagnante*. Perhaps these variants point to *Tusci* for *tuti*. Juvenal perhaps recalled Horace, *S.* ii. 2. 32-3 *amnis ostia sub Tusci*.

XII. 128-9.

uiuat Pacuius quaeso uel Nestora {tantum}
possideat quantum rapuit Nero. {totum}

For *uiuat Nestora totum* editors are content to compare Horace's *Cyclopa mouetur* (*Epp.* II. 2. 125), *saltaret Cyclopa* (*S.* i. 5. 63). But are these any more a parallel than *cantare Catullum* or *agere Thyesten* would be? Perhaps

uiuat Pacuius *questo* uel Nestore, tantum etc.

XIV. 23-24.

quid suadet iuueni laetus stridore catenae
quem mire efficiunt inscripta ergastula carcer.

For *inscripta* in 24 *P* has *scripta*. This may be a mere blunder: for at VIII. 168 *P* has *scriptaque* for the *inscriptaque* of the other MSS. Yet it seems possible that it may point to *cryptae*. The hiatus would account for the change to *inscripta*. I would understand *cryptae* of underground dungeons. *Crypta* is used in V. 106 of a drain. But it seems suitable to any underground construction. Suetonius uses it of a 'vaulted passage' (*Calig.* 58), and in the C.G.L. it is glossed by βαίτης = βέρης, the cellarage of a temple (cf. Hesychius s.v. βέρης).

XIV. 269.

perditus {ac uilis}
 {a Siculis} sacci mercator olentis.

Prof. Housman writes *perditus ac similis*. But (1) often as Juvenal uses the word *similis* he never uses it with the genitive, but either absolutely or followed by a dative. (2) *Similis* could not mean, as Mr. Housman supposes, *pallens* but only *olens*: and lest his critics should not know this Mr. Housman cites two passages of Martial which 'prove it'. In '*quaeque gerit similem belua nigra Libyn*,' and in '*quaeque gerit similes candida turris aues*,' and in '*similis sacci . . . olentis*' the point of 'likeness' is in respect of the quality denoted by the dominating epithet (*nigra, candida, olens*).

For *perditus* the scholiast seems to have read *foetidus* or *foetide* (unless this be a gloss upon *perlitus*). Possibly

foetide fasciculis sacci mercator olentis.

XIV. 290-291.

cum sit causa mali tanti et discriminis huius
concisum argentum in titulos faciesque minutas.

Men undergo all these dangers 'just for a handful of silver' coined into money with a tiny image and superscription on it?

But nowhere else in the world is *concidere* used of coining silver. It would be a suitable word for the *clipping* and *paring* of coins. And it could mean this here well enough if we made the simple correction

concisum argentum in titulo faciesque minuta—
i.e. coins pared round the edges (*in titulo*) and with the very image of the Caesar mutilated. For this conjunction of *concidere* and *minuere* (used in metaphor) cf. Cicero, *Orat.* 231 *minutos numeros sequens . . . concidit sententias*. Juvenal means, 'just for money—and bad money at that: for the cheat is everywhere.'

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.