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](#)

Wilson's *Juvenal D. Iuni Iuuenalis saturarum libri V.*
Edited with Introduction Commentary on Thirteen
Satires and Index by Haery Langford Wilson, Associate
Professor in the Johns Hopkins University. University
Publishing Company, New York, Boston, New Orleans,
1903. Pp. lxxviii, 115, 178. 8vo.

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 09 / December 1903, pp 465 - 468

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00208962, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00208962

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1903). The Classical Review, 17, pp 465-468 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00208962

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

But this is properly a grammatical question. To return to our subject; the selection of extracts is judicious and the

compendium can be heartily commended, its brevity being a conspicuous merit.

R. D. HICKS.

WILSON'S *JUVENAL*.

D. Iuni Iuuenalis saturarum libri V. Edited with Introduction Commentary on Thirteen Satires and Index by HARRY LANGFORD WILSON, Associate Professor in the Johns Hopkins University. University Publishing Company, New York, Boston, New Orleans, 1903. Pp. lxxviii, 115, 178. 8vo.

IF one compares Mr Wilson's edition, as one naturally does compare it, with Mr Duff's, there are two points in which it has the advantage. In the first place the introduction furnishes a useful bibliography¹ of recent work on Juvenal, and the footnotes contain a large number of references to current philological literature. Secondly, questions of syntax and of metre are treated in the notes and introduction with unusual closeness and diligence: at xiv 207 for instance the scansion *nemō* is remarked as indicating that the verse is not Juvenal's own but taken from an earlier poet; and at xiii 203, where *illi* is used for *sibi* and Messrs Mayor and Friedlaender make no sign, while Mr Duff observes the irregularity but says that he knows no other instance, Mr Wilson cites a pair of parallels. But in that point where Mr Duff's edition excels all commentaries on Juvenal and stands almost alone among school-books,—in the clear perception and candid recognition of difficulties, Mr Wilson's is much inferior. When an intelligent lad finds *Coruinum* in viii 5, and *Coruinum* again in viii 7, he wonders what is the matter, and turns to the notes for aid; but he gets none from Mr Wilson. At xiv 269 he would like to know the meaning and bearing of 'perditus ac *uilis* sacci mercator olentis': Mr Wilson receives him with '*uilis*: Tac. ann. i 40 2 *uilis ipsi salus*,' which is terse and tranquil, but not instructive. He halts at viii 87 sq. 'expectata diu tandem prouincia cum te | rectorem accipiat, pone irae frenā modumque': 'accipiat: sub-

junctive after *cum* causal,' says Mr Wilson. But that is the very obstacle at which the intelligent lad is halting: *cum* causal does not make sense.² The *tamen* of viii 272 is rightly understood, though not clearly explained, by Prof. Mayor; Mr Duff explains it wrongly, but he sees that it wants explaining; Mr Wilson says nothing about it. He is silent again at a passage which I will cite in order to elucidate it, xiv 47–9.

maxima debetur puero reuerentia, si quid turpe paras, nec tu pueri contempseris annos, sed peccaturo obstet tibi filius infans.

'Eine der auffallendsten Tautologien,' says Mr Friedlaender, 'da dasselbe dreimal gesagt wird'; and so also Mr Duff, 'the amount of repetition in these lines is surprising, even for Juvenal.' Mr Wilson shares the error of these scholars (else he would correct it as in duty bound), but he does not share their outspokenness, and leaves the student to infer that *τοῖς ταυτὸν εἰπεῖν* is too common in Latin to be noteworthy. The verses are misunderstood because it is not observed that *annos* and *infans* are emphatic words: the sense is 'respect your son, and never think that son

² Mr Wilson adds indeed in a footnote '*accipiet* is an easier reading'; but knowledge is not to be thrown in loose fragments at the learner's head: it is for an editor to balance alternatives, to prefer the more probable, and to tell the learner why he prefers it. At vii 112 the note runs '*conspuiturque sinus*: a charm to avert the wrath of Nemesis, who punished boastfulness; cf. Petron. 74. Some editors interpret *is spluttered over* (Lewis), gaining support in the prefix (*con-*): the student is left to choose for himself, and to frame for himself the question 'does one, when lying and boasting, splutter more than at other times?' The same failure to think matters out and reach assured conclusions causes other inconveniences of a different sort: at vii 42 Mr Wilson gives the usual and correct explanation of '*solicitas imitatur ianua portas*,' and the student, quite satisfied, is about to pass on, when his eye alights on this footnote: 'J. Jessen, l. l. p. 505, suggests that *portas* is a scribal error for *porcas*.' Surely, thinks he, the editor would never have mentioned this unless there were either some defect in the explanation given or some superiority in the conjecture: which can it be? and what can it be? And then he wastes his time in the attempt to guess.

¹ I notice one error: Buecheler's edition of 1893 is said to be the third edition of Jahn's Juvenal of 1851: it is the third edition of Jahn's Persius and Juvenal of 1868.

too young to be worth respecting: let even the babe in the cradle be a restraint upon your actions.' It is hyperbole, not tautology.

A commentary on Juvenal, written at this date, must needs be for the most part a compilation, and originality is not to be expected nor even perhaps to be desired. Whenever Mr Duff propounds a new interpretation he discards the heed and judgment which he displays elsewhere; and it is nothing to Mr Wilson's disadvantage that his exegesis appears to contain no novelty at all.¹ For the rest, the notes are compact and business-like, and the writing is easy and unpretentious and not overlaid with the favourite American ornaments of metaphor and slang. In short we have now two good school-editions of Juvenal instead of one.

So I will proceed to note some errors. i 6 '*necdum*: for *nondum*', and again on p. xlv '*necdum* occurs in the sense of simple *nondum*: i 6 *scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus Orestes*'. This means that Mr Wilson mistakes the construction, which is correctly explained by Mr Duff. i 52 '*Heracleas*: sc. *fabulas*'. Certainly not: *Heraclea* is a substantive like *Odyssea*, Ἡράκλεια, not Ἡρακλεία. i 161 accusator erit, qui uerbum dixerit 'hic est': '*qui*: the antecedent is *ei* understood', and then in a footnote 'this seems more to the point as well as in closer harmony with Latin idiom than to take the subject of *erit* as the antecedent of *qui*'. What Mr Wilson means by this reference to Latin idiom I do not know, but he cannot mean what he says. I suspect that 'closer harmony with Latin idiom' really signifies 'sharper discord with English idiom'. iii 23 sq. res hodie minor est here quam fuit, atque eadem cras | deteret exiguis aliquid: '*deteret*: strictly a transitive verb, used here as a reflexive (= *se deteret*)'. What imaginable sense or construction has '*eadem se deteret exiguis aliquid*'? *deteret*, by a common Latin idiom, means *deteri patietur*: so, to take the first instance that occurs to me, Prop. iv 3 27 '*diceris et macie uultum tenuisse*'; and so in Juvenal viii 247 '*frangebat uertice uitem*'. Mr Wilson seems to have been led astray by a confused note of Mr Buecheler's in Friedlaender's edition. viii 180 in Lucanos aut Tusca ergastula mittas: '*Lucanos*: sc. *agros*', 'your Lucanian farm'; the masculine plural without a substantive is common in

this sense'. It is non-existent in this sense: *Lucanos* means the Lucanian folk and thence the Lucanian countryside. Haupt opusc. iii p. 578 (who does not however supply *agros* in these phrases) is corrected by Lucian Mueller Hor. carm. ii 18 14.

The following are mistakes of detail or merely negligent writing. i 1 '*numquamne*: the addition of *-ne* to negative words suggests the affirmative'. No; the negative itself does that part of the business: '*haec ego non agitem?*' suggests the affirmative without the help of *-ne*. iii 302 '*nec... metuas*: on the use of *nec* for *ne*, see § 77', where we read 'in prohibitions *ne* is rarely used, its place being often taken by *nec*'. *nec* is never used for *ne*: when employed in prohibitions it does not cease to be a conjunction. iv 33 *uendere municipes... siluros*: '*municipes* forbids the thought of Crispinus' former life in Egypt'. On the contrary, it suggests that thought: I know what Mr Wilson means, but he has failed to say it. viii 148 'P reads *multo sufflamine consul*, emended by Buecheler'. It was not emended by Buecheler, nor by any one else. But this false statement has been made so often that I am not surprised to see Mr Wilson repeating it again on p. xxviii. xiii 95 '*dimidium crus*: the loss of a leg.' Not unless *crus* means a pair of legs. xv 17 '*abicit*: in compounds of *iacio* Ovid... was the first to treat the initial *i* as a vowel'. Everyone treated it as a vowel, or they would have broken their jaws: not even the conquerors of the world could pronounce *abicit* as a disyllable. Here again I know Mr Wilson's meaning, but his words do not contain it. p. xxix 'the archetype of the Bodleianus': so Mr Owen in his preface speaks of 'archetypus Pithoeani', and indeed it seems as if Anglo-Saxons could hardly write upon textual criticism without using this meaningless form of words. What would be thought of a mathematician who talked about the least common multiple of 5?

If I here turn aside from the ἴδιον to the κοινόν, and comment on certain mistakes in which Mr Wilson has the company of his contemporaries, it is because these errors seem to be spreading apace. i 147-9 nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat | posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores, | omne in praecipiti uitium stetit. utere uelis, | totos pande sinus. *in praecipiti* used to be translated 'at its zenith', 'auf dem Gipfel'; to which it is justly objected that *in praecipiti* does not

¹ His explanation of x 189 is almost the same as Mr Mayor's, and surely wrong.

possess this meaning. Therefore the words are now rendered 'vice always stands on a steep incline', gnomic aorist (Richards, Duff, Wilson). But firstly, vice does not *stand* on the incline, it slips; 'uitiorum natura proclivis' says Seneca. And this is actually what our commentators take *stare* to imply, for they add 'and hence soon reaches the bottom', which is just what it can never do so long as it *stat*. Secondly, granting for the sake of argument that in *praecipiti stetit* means much the same as *praeceps ruit*, and granting further, what is quite false, that the progress of vice is usually headlong and not gradual,—*ποῖον τοῦτο πάγκοινον λέγεις*; What has this gnome to do with the context? 'Hence' say the commentators 'our posterity can go no further'. Our posterity? If 'vice always stands on a steep incline', it stood on a steep incline in our grandfathers' day; 'hence it soon reached the bottom', and 'hence their posterity could go no further'. There is no connexion or relation between this sapient saw and the culmination of vice at the moment when Juvenal was writing. The old interpretation did at least make sense, and it was not far wrong. 'omne in praecipiti uitium stetit' means 'every vice has come to a dead halt at the cliff's edge'; has reached, as we might say, the end of its tether; has gone as far as nature suffers it to go.

i 26-30 cum uerna Canopi | Crispinus Tyrias umero reuocante lacernas | uentilet aestium digitis sudantibus aurum | nec sufferre queat maioris pondera gemmae, | difficile est saturam non scribere. 'per luxuriam' says the scholiast 'anulos aestiuos et hiemales inuenerat': Crispinus airs a light summer ring on his sweating fingers, unable to sustain the weight of a heavier one. What could be more obvious, more apt, more like Crispinus, 'aegrae solaque libidine fortes deliciae'? And Dracontius saw the meaning (how could he miss it?) and reproduced it thus: 'qui solet aestium membris sudantibus ostrum | poscere deposito contractus murice denso, | cuius et in digitis non sedit crassius aurum, | et, licet exiguae, non ferret pondera gemmae', laud. dei iii 56-9. Instead of which Messrs Gercke and Duff and Wilson, following Haeckermann, declare that *aestium* does not imply a special ring, but is adverbial and only signifies 'in summer'; and from the next verse they extort the meaning that Crispinus wears a very heavy ring, so heavy that he could not bear a heavier. And why

this stern endeavour to dodge the plain sense of the words? Because there is no evidence that the Romans wore lighter rings in summer than in winter! Of course the Romans did not: it was a single Egyptian who did. The foppery was insufferable precisely because it was unparalleled. An early device of Mr Disraeli's for attracting notice was to have two canes in use, one for the morning, one for the afternoon. Suppose someone contested the truth of this story 'because there is no evidence that the English used different canes for afternoon and morning': what would be said of him? That he argued like a classical scholar.

iii 4 sq. gratum litus amoeni | secessus. 'secessus': genitive of specification or definition': so also Mayor ('epexegetic gen.') and Duff. The genitive of specification or definition is incapable, by its very nature, of having an ornamental¹ adjective attached to it. *abietis arbor* is Latin: *procerae abietis arbor* is no tongue at all; the Latin would be *procera*. Mr Duff says on the other hand that *amoeni secessus* is not a genitive of quality, because 'a noun, to which the latter is attached, does not take an adjective' (*gratum litus*). Usually it does not, but sometimes it does, as in Hor. serm. i 1 33 'paruola . . . magni formica laboris' and Sil. xiv 443 sq. 'mollia crura superbi . . . gressus' and Iuu. xv 76 'uicina . . . umbrosae Tentyra palmae'.

v 87 pallidus . . . caulis: 'boiling in a solution of saltpetre made it green; Mart. xiii 17 *ne tibi pallentes moueant fastidita caules, nitrata viridis brassica fiat aqua*': so also Friedlaender and Duff. But saltpetre will not turn cabbages green, and *nitrum* is not saltpetre.

x 84 sq. quam timeo, uictus ne poenas exigat Aiax | ut male defensus. 'Aiax: i.e. Tiberius'. Aiax, *uictus* and *male defensus*, means Tiberius, *uictor* and *optime defensus*! Could any explanation be less plausible than this? not to mention that Aiax, in the *armorum iudicium*, was neither *male defensus* nor *bene defensus* nor *defensus* at all, but conducted his own case. Yet this interpretation is adopted by Friedlaender and Duff and now by Mr. Wilson, who makes the following unfortunate attempt to palliate it: 'this parallel, though it seems absurd to us, was less absurd to them, because the *armorum iudicium* was a regular theme for debate'. Because? Then if I compare Napoleon at St. Helena to David dancing before the

¹ I use this term to exclude examples like *causa terroris repentini*, where the adjective adds precision.

Ark, this parallel, though absurd to foreigners, will be less absurd, I suppose, to Englishmen, because Englishmen read their bibles. I should have thought that the more a man knew about the *armorum iudicium* and II Sam. vi 14-23 the more absurd would these comparisons appear to him.

xi 3-8 omnis | conuictus thermae stationes, omne theatrum | de Rutilo. nam dum ualida ac iuuenalia membra | sufficiunt galeae, dumque ardet sanguine, fertur | non cogente quidem sed nec prohibente tribuno | scripturus leges et regia uerba lanistae. *fertur scripturus* used to be interpreted 'they say he is about to subscribe'; but now Messrs Friedlaender and Duff and Wilson insist that it means 'he rushes on a career which will some day end in his subscribing'. Yet bankrupts do not necessarily turn gladiators (some of them 'fas esse putant curam sperare cohortis'); nor is it possible to divine beforehand what action the tribune will take; nor is mere prodigality enough to make Rutilus the universal theme of conversation.

xi 206 '*sextam*: sc. *horam*'; this was about noon in April, growing later as summer advanced, since the solar day was divided into twelve equal parts'. I do not know

which is more overwhelming, the statement, or the reason alleged in support of it. Mr Duff's note, which seems to be the source of Mr Wilson's, is little less strange.

p. xxxviii '*nisi* is used for *quam* after a comparative in vi 580 f. *capiendo nulla uidetur | aptior hora cibo nisi quam dederit Petosiris*': so C. F. W. Mueller, Friedlaender, Duff. But surely it falls far short of the required sense to say that no hour of the day is thought *fitter* for taking a meal *than* that which astrology has assigned. That argues no profound belief in astrology. The words mean that no hour of the day is thought the right hour (fitter than others, Verg. georg. i 286 *nona fugae melior*) for taking a meal, except the hour which astrology has assigned.

Lastly a detail of punctuation. Messrs Buecheler, Friedlaender, Duff, and Wilson all print i 140 sq. thus: '*quanta est gula quae sibi totos | ponit apros, animal propter conuiuia natum?*'—as if Juvenal were asking for information about the magnitude of the gluttony. The old editors rightly marked an exclamation, and Mr Friedlaender himself at Mart. v 70 5 prints '*o quanta est gula, centies comesse!*'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

BURY'S LIBRARY AND ABRIDGED HISTORIES OF GREECE.

A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By J. B. BURY. Macmillan, 1902. Two vols. Pp. 502, 534. 25s. net.

THIS is a 'Library Edition' of Prof. Bury's history, the form being less excellent than that of the edition of 1900 for the learner at school or at the university, but better adapted to the use of the more advanced student. The pictures are gone—maps and plans remaining—and we have in their stead larger print and thicker paper and, as the chief gain, a more abundant provision of references and other notes. In the body of the book there is a certain amount of new matter. The discoveries in Crete have given the opportunity for very interesting additions concerning Cnossus and its palace, the *labrys*, the Dictaeon cave, and Minos,—the human king, or god, or both (I. pp. 10, 18 ff. 34 f.). The account of the years 421 to 418 B.C. has been expanded and in part re-written (II. pp. 2-6). There is a new

paragraph on Herodotus (I. p. 282 f.), and more is said by way of comparison between him and Thucydides in I. p. 433, where remarks are added on the method of Thucydides, and particularly on the value and the treatment of the speeches. Another paragraph (I. p. 380 f.) deals with the system of 'liturgies' in connexion with the lack of a permanent treasury of state, while on p. 446 the less fully organized administration, as compared with that of a modern state, is pointed out to shew how largely continuity of policy depended upon the 'demagogue' at Athens. Other additions will be found in I. pp. 259, 261, besides the mention of the Athenian cavalry at Tanagra (I. p. 386) of which Professor Bury speaks in his prefatory note. Small alterations have been made throughout the book: marginal notes have been added or modified, and here and there a statement has been put in a more cautious form or changed in view of new knowledge. The paragraphs