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 of Juvenal

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 07 / October 1895, pp 346 - 349

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202333, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202333

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1895). On Some Passages of Juvenal. The Classical Review, 9, pp 346-349
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202333

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

beyond the scope of the present inquiry. It will however not be amiss to point out how some of the more prominent idioms connected with the present and aorist indicative flow from the fundamental idea of action going on and concluded.

First, as regards the present forms :

1. Action 'evolving itself' naturally covers habitual action, the latter implying a something that is still going on, *not ended*. Thus we get the present and imperfect of habitual action.

2. Whatever is vividly pictured as enacting itself before our eyes comes under 'action evolving itself'—hence the historic present.

3. Vividness likewise accounts for the prophetic present so common in Aristophanes. In this, as in the previous case, the grammatical present is the more suitable as having no distinctive mark of time.

4. Such expressions as *ἔπεμψαν ἀγγέλλοντας* (instead of *ἀγγελοῦντας*) may be justified on similar grounds. Literally 'they sent persons announcing'; the time, which is colourless in the participle, being left to be gathered from the context. Again *πάρων ἐρῶ* 'being present (in past time) I shall tell.' The time of *πάρων* is *per se* present, past, or future, and has to be inferred from the context.

5. What grammarians term *conative* action is usually nothing more than a disposition to *activity*. Now the nearest approach to this idea lies in the stem which marks action in process of development. Hence the *Praesens de Conatu* and *Imperf. de Conatu*, e.g. Io. xiii. 7 *σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς*

πόδας and *ἔδιδον* of Demosth. 'he was for giving.'¹

6. If we take the verb *νικῶ* it strictly represents no more than 'I a-conquering,' which truth may endure after actual victory, so that *νικῶ* may stand for 'I am conqueror.'

Secondly, as regards the aorist :

1. It is obvious that 'concluded action' is well predicated of a stem which with its augment and personal endings serves to express :—

(a) Absolute past isolated events, (b) in narrative successive events, (c) relative priority of one occurrence with respect to another.

2. The inceptive aorist marks entrance into a state or entrance into action: in either case we have *something concluded* i.e. *the end of the beginning*.

3. The dramatic or conversational aorist (*Aoristus Tragicus*) seems to spring from Greek impatience and haste to mark something as done, e.g. approval given *ἐπήνεσα*, loathing felt *ἀπέπτυσσα*. There being no affix or suffix wherewith to graft an aorist stem (concluded action) on present time, the only resource left is to employ the aorist stem in its only available shape, i.e. with augment.

J. DONOVAN.

¹ I think it is safe to say there exists no *Aoristus de Conatu* in Greek. Such examples as *Ion* 1291 *ἔκτεινά σ' ὄντα πολέμιον*...1286 *κἄτ' ἔκτανες σὺ φαρμάκοις* do not refer to attempted murder but rather by a sort of figurative diction to murder accomplished as far as intention and means taken could effect it.

(To be continued.)

ON SOME PASSAGES OF JUVENAL.

VII. 175—177.

tempta

Chrysogonus quanti doceat uel Polio quanti
lautorum pueros, artem *scindens* Theodori.

So all MSS., but *scindens* was altered by Jahn to *scindes*, and he is followed by Mayor, Weidner, Bücheler. The sentence then runs easily 'Ascertain the sums made by a successful music-master, and you will tear up your Art of Rhetoric.' But I think the participle *scindens* should be restored, as capable both of translation and parallel. It means 'Tearing up your Art of Rhetoric,

go and ascertain the sums a successful music-master makes.' It can be supported by Propertius 3, 17, 37 *ante fores templi crater antistitis auro | libatum fundens* in tua sacra merum; and 3, 19, 21 *teque, o Minoa uenundata, Scylla, figura, | tondens purpurea regna paterna coma*.

VIII. 27.

salve Gaetulice, seu tu
Silanus, *quocumque* alio de sanguine, rarus
ciuis et egregius patriae contingis ouanti.

The asyndeton is harsh; uel *quocumque*

might have been expected. As *quocumque* occurs infra line 60, the scribe's eye may have wandered thither, and the word have been introduced from that line. Read *quorum* alio de sanguine.

VIII. 108—110.

nunc sociis iuga pauca boum, grex paruus
equarum,
et pater armenti capto *eripietur* agello,
ipsi deinde Lares.

For *eripietur* (*pw*) P has *eripiu*, with the rest of the word erased. It seems obvious that *eripiuntur* should be restored.

VIII. 237—244.

hic nouus Arpinas, ignobilis et modo Romae
municipalis eques, galeatum ponit ubique
praesidium attonitis et in omni monte
laborat.

tantum igitur muros intra toga contulit illi
nominis ac tituli, quantum † *in* Leucade,
quantum

Thessaliae campis Octavius abstulit udo
caedibus adsiduis gladio, sed Roma parentem
Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit.

Here there are two points to notice, first the reading *monte*, second the obelized reading *in*. The reading *monte* is apparently due to the first hand of P, and a Paris MS. 1585, cited by Rupert: it is recognized in the scholium. On the other hand *gente* appears in *pw*. Here is a startling difference in sense: was Cicero busy on all the seven hills of Rome with his precautions against Catiline, or in every tribe of Italy, where he stationed forces to crush the rebellion? Or rather may a third view be suggested, that Juvenal is writing with characteristic rhetorical exaggeration of the well-planned arrest upon the Mulvian bridge, upon which he seizes as the central fact in the downfall of the conspiracy? I think so, and propose to restore an ancient reading *in omni ponte*. Two considerations favour the change. (1) The adjacent (l. 245) *Volscorum in monte* solebat may well be the cause of *monte*, another example of the error noticed on viii. 27. I suppose no one would seriously defend *in omni gente*, evidently an attempt to emend *monte*, which was not understood. If emendation is required Weidner's *inermi mente* is neater. (2) The note of the scholiast shows *ponte* to be an ancient reading: *et in omni monte l. quia in montibus condita est Roma. legitur et ponte l. propter Muluium ubi Catilinae coniurati et Allobroges deprehensi sunt.*

I proceed to consider the unmetrical *quantum in Leucade*, which Bücheler rightly calls corrupt. Various remedies have been devised (1) *quantum non Leucade pw* (2) *quantum uix Leucade* Hermann, followed by Mayor (3) *quantum unda Leucade* Weidner. The reading *non* appears to be wrong because, as Kiaer shows, the negative cannot be understood from the first into the second clause, and the words must be translated 'Cicero the man of peace won as much glory as Augustus did not win at Actium but did win at Philippi'; which is absurd. If the negative could be understood in the second clause, it is still inappropriate; for the meaning is that Cicero the man of peace won as much glory as Augustus the man of war won, not as Augustus did not win; indeed an imperial writer could hardly have spoken so slightly of Augustus. The same objection, though to a less extent, applies to the reading *uix*; it disparages Augustus: for Weidner's *unda Leucade*, lumbering in rhythm and lame in syntax, there is little to be said.

I propose to read *ui* for *in*: this slight change makes all simple. 'Cicero won as much glory, the man of peace (*toga*) in Rome (*muros intra*), as Augustus won in war (*ui*) at Actium (*Leucade*), and by constant slaughter with the sword (*udo caedibus adsiduis gladio*) in Thessaly' (*Thessaliae campis*). The double antithesis is very skilful: *intra muros* is opposed to (a) *Leucade* (b) *Thessaliae campis*; *toga* to (a) *ui* (b) *udo caedibus adsiduis gladio*. For *ui* used of warlike violence cp. Verg. *Aen.* 9. 399 *qua ui iuuenem, quibus audeat armis eripere?* 12. 260 *me me duce ferrum | corripite, o miseri, quos improbus aduena bello | territat, inualidas ut aues, et litora uestra ui populat.*

X. 90—94.

uisne salutari sicut Seianus, *habere*
tantundem, atque illi summas donare
curules,
illum exercitibus praeponere, tutor haberi
principis augusta Caprearum in rupe se-
dentis
cum grege Chaldaeo?

Here *habere* at the end of the line so near to *haberi* is suspicious: again I fancy the scribe's eye has wandered, as in viii. 27. Read *amari tantundem*: cp. Hor. *Sat.* 1. 3. 71 *amari si uolet*. The great popularity of Sejanus before his fall is remarked upon by Velleius ii. 127 and 128. The reading

angusta, 'royal,' is adopted by Bücheler from P; but who that has sat on 'Capri's narrow cliff' can doubt that *angusta po* is right?

XI. 117—119.

illa domi natas nostraque ex arbore mensas
tempora uiderunt; hoc lignum stabat ad
usum,
annosam si forte nucem deiecerat Eurus.

Bücheler, in his third edition, has introduced *hoc* from P for *hos* ω: then *hoc lignum* I suppose means 'the logs of this sort of tree.' But this leaves *usus* indefinite, so that the old reading *hos* seems necessary: 'its logs were stored for this use,' viz. to make tables.

XII. 48—51.

sed quis nunc alius, qua mundi parte quis
audet
argento praeferre caput rebusque salutem?
non propter uitam faciunt patrimonia quidam
sed uitio caeci propter patrimonia uiuunt.

Bentley on Horace *A.P.* 337 proposed to expunge the last two lines here printed, lines 50—51. As those lines seem to be genuine, I think it worth while to answer his strictures in detail.

(1) He objects to the employment of the word *quidam* 'some,' as in 47—48 Juvenal says 'All prefer money to life,' while in 50—51 'Some prefer money to life.' What is the sense of saying 'some' after he has said 'all'? If we were criticizing a logical writer, this might be a difficulty. But poets are not logicians, least of all Juvenal, whose thought often tends to be disconnected. After having made a general assertion, the poet proceeds to support it by certain (*quidam*) special cases within his own knowledge. The meaning of *quidam* seems to be 'I know certain persons who do not make fortunes to live, but blind through infatuation live only to make fortunes.'

(2) He criticizes the expression *facere patrimonia* as a 'scabies locutionis.' But in silver writers *patrimonium* often means property generally, not necessarily inherited property, e.g. vii. 113 centum *patrimonia* causicorum, where *patrimonia* is equivalent to *res*. If Horace (*Epp.* 1. 1. 65) can say *suadet qui rem facias*, why should not Juvenal say *patrimonia facere*?

(3) He characterizes *uitio caeci* as 'alienum et pannosum.' Few will feel any

difficulty about the proposition that men are blinded by the love of money. The use of *uitium* is illustrated by xiv. 175 where *humanae mentis uitium* is defined as *saeua cupido immodici census*, i.e. avarice.

(4) He complains that the lines interrupt the context. But illogical amplification is characteristic of Juvenal, who like all moralists loves to enforce his moral truths by repetition in and out of season. There is a similar irrelevant amplification in xiv. 241—243, where he says that the modern love of riches is as keen as was the love of ancient heroes for their fatherland. The mention of Menoeceus, who killed himself to save his city Thebes, *si Graecia uera*, leads to a description of the Σπάρτοί, born from serpents' teeth. These have nothing to do with the point, and I wonder that no critic for that reason has proposed to omit lines 241—243.

XIII. 208.

has patitur poenas peccandi sola uoluntas.

'Such punishments attend on the mere wish to sin.' The reading *sola* (ω) is accepted by Bücheler and most editors. P has *saeua*. I am inclined to think that *saeua* should be retained, taking *peccandi saeua uoluntas* as 'the relentless will to sin'; as in xiv. 175 *saeua cupido immodici census* means 'the relentless craving for unbounded wealth.' Or, if we are to alter *saeua*, I should prefer something nearer to it than *sola*. Weidner's *laeua* is ingenious: cp. xiv. 228 *laeua* monitu pueros producit auaros. Possibly however *saeua* is the poet's word.

XIV. 140—145.

ergo paratur

altera uilla tibi; cum rus non sufficit unum,
et proferre libet fines maiorque uidetur
et melior uicina seges, mercaris et hanc et
arbusta et densa montem qui canet oliua.

So the lines should be punctuated, not with a comma at *tibi* (141), as Mayor and Bücheler, nor a colon at *seges* (143), as Mayor. The awkwardness of the ordinary stopping has led editors to misunderstand, and Weidner to alter, the text gratuitously. Translate: 'This is why you buy another country-house; when one estate does not content you, and you would gladly extend your boundaries, thinking a neighbour's acres broader and better, you buy them as well and the shrubberies and hill gray with clustering olives.'

XIV. 152.

sed qui sermones, quam *foedae* bucina famae.

So the editors, but P has *foede*. The ordinary text means 'But what gossip there will be, blazoning of a report how shameful!' It seems quite possible to retain *foede*, supplying a verb: cp. i. 89 *alea quando hos animos? sc. habuit*; iv. 25 *hoc pretio squamae? sc. emptae sunt*; v. 107 *ipsi pauca uelim, sc. dicere*; xi. 3 *omnis conuictus thermae stationes, omne theatrum de Rutilo sc. locuntur*. The meaning then is 'How foully the trumpet of report will blow!' Or is *foede* for *foedae* = *foeda* ē? In that case we might read *foeda est*.

XIV. 227—232.

nam quisquis magni census praecepit amorem,
et laeum monitu pueros producit auaros,
et qui per fraudes patrimonia *conduplicari*,
dat libertatem et totas effundit habenas
curriculo, quem si reuoces, subsistere nescit
et te contempto rapitur metisque relictis.

The text, so printed by Bücheler after P^ω, is hard, as there is no construction for the infinitive *conduplicari*; nor is *conduplicare*, the reading of a few MSS adopted by Mayor, any improvement. In either case the sentence is harsh, as some verb of teaching must be supplied to govern the infinitive; thus Bücheler *Rhein. Mus.* 43 p. 295 understands *instituit* from *producit*. Weidner ingeniously reads *conduplicandi* dat libertatem, totas effundit habenas, beginning the apodosis at *totas* 'he who allows them free scope in doubling by fraud their inherited property, gives the reins wildly to the chariot.' A simpler remedy would be to transpose 229, 228; then *conduplicari* would depend on *praecepit*.

nam quisquis magni census praecepit amorem,
et qui per fraudes patrimonia *conduplicari*,
et laeum monitu pueros producit auaros, etc.

S. G. OWEN.

ἐκ OR ἀπό DENOTING POSITION.

DR. JEBB in his note on *Antig.* 411 *καθήμεθ' ἄκρων ἐκ πάγων* explains the use of ἐκ or ἀπό with a verb denoting position as follows. After quoting *Il.* 14, 153 Ἥρη δ' εἰσείδε χρυσόθρονος ὀφθαλμοῖσιν στήσ' ἐξ Οὐλύμποιο ἀπὸ ρίου, and three other instances (*Eur. Ph.* 1009, 1224, *Tro.* 522), he says, 'In all these passages, a picture is presented, and we have to glance from a remoter to a nearer object. The mental eye is required to measure the space between Hera on the peak of Olympus, and Poseidon on the plain of Troy; between Megareus on the walls of Thebes, and the cavern into which his corpse is to fall. And, in each case, ἐκ or ἀπό denotes the *quarter* in which the remoter object is to be looked for. This, which might be called the "surveying" use, is distinct from that in which the prep. has a pregnant force, as being directly suggestive of motion (οἱ ἐκ Σικελίας ἤξουσιν); but it springs from the same mental tendency,—viz. to take a rapid glance over the dividing interval. Cp. ἵστασθαι πρὸς τινας ("on his side"). So here: in the foreground of the picture is the corpse, which they have just laid bare. Now look to the hillocks behind

it: in that quarter you will see the guards at their post.'

Similarly on *Philoc.* 1076–7 εἰς ὅσον τά τ' ἐκ νεὼς στείλωσι ναῦται he says, 'The only difference between τὰ ἐκ νεὼς here and τὰ ἐν νηὶ is that the former suggests the notion of the quarter—at some distance from the speaker—where the preparations are to be made. Cp. *Plat. Lach.* 184 A ἦν δὲ γέλως καὶ κρότος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκ τῆς ὀλκάδος:—"the people off there in the merchant-ship." *Thuc.* 6, 32, συνεπηύχοντο δὲ καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ὄμιλος ὁ ἐκ τῆς γῆς (where ἐκ carries the mental eye from the scene on board the ships to the scene ashore).'

May it not be objected that this theory, instead of explaining the prepositions in connection with the words they belong to, attaches them to a verbal notion not expressed in the sentence? Whatever ἐκ means in the words *καθήμεθ' ἐκ πάγων*, it ought to mean something or other that develops and enriches the idea of 'sitting down on the hill' *internally* to that idea: but the theory makes ἐκ *external* to that idea, diverting its force to aid an imaginary verbal notion of 'surveying.' So in ὁ