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 Juvenal, I. 132–146

Reynold A. Nicholson

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 01 / February 1900, pp 53 - 53

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00080252, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00080252

How to cite this article:

Reynold A. Nicholson (1900). On Juvenal, I. 132–146. The Classical Review, 14, pp 53-53
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00080252

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the Romans then for the first time became acquainted.

To conclude, it has been shown that the first paragraph of ch. 24 cannot pertain to the Caledonians. But if so, the statement, *crebris...domuit*, being part of it, must refer to an *actual* encounter in Ireland, the remaining items in the chapter being on the one hand, perfectly in harmony with this interpretation, while, on the other, quite incompatible with the traditional view of a *contemplated* invasion of the island.

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

Philadelphia.

I fear that Prof. Gudeman has largely misread my arguments. To take A 1. and 2. only, I never said that *transgredi* meant 'to coast'—far from it—or that *nave prima* denoted 'transporting troops in vessels for the first time,' and Prof. Gudeman's paragraphs are all beside the point. As to *que*

in A 3, Prof. Gudeman has altered his ground. He first spoke of invariably intimate connexion: at least, he meant to do so, but the printer intervened. Confronted with Agr. 22. 4., he talks about 'correlation.' That is an excellent word which exactly suits the ordinary view of *eamque*. Let me add that I can find nothing in Gerber and Graef to show that *que* must mean intimate connexion. But a controversy about misunderstandings, &c. is a waste of time. I will merely emphasize the crucial point, which I fear that Prof. Gudeman still evades. Tacitus states that Agricola most successfully subdued *ignotas gentes* and would have liked to, and prepared to, invade Ireland, which he thought an easy job. Prof. Gudeman says this means that Agricola did invade Ireland and the invasion was a fiasco. I leave plain men to decide if this seems right.

F. HAVERFIELD.

ON JUVENAL, I. 132-146.

ALTHOUGH Prof. Housman has, I think, successfully demolished the current explanations of 144,

hinc subitae mortes atque intestata senectus, has he not overlooked a natural and—I would add, if I could find that it had occurred to anyone—an obvious interpretation? 'Madvig' (says Prof. Housman) 'impugns as absurd the statement that intestate old age is caused by the habit of bathing after a heavy meal.' Absurd, certainly, if 'intestate old age' means 'the delay of old men to make their wills.' But suppose *hinc intestata senectus* = *hinc, testamento non facto, senes fiunt*: hence they (the luxurious) grow old, before they have made their wills, i.e. age prematurely. This seems to me both good Latin and good sense. It may be asked 'why Juvenal should have written *intestata* (an epithet appropriate to *mors*) *senectus*, when he could

so well have written *praematura*, a word he uses elsewhere.' If Juvenal did not write *praematura*, it was because he deliberately chose the more striking word; *intestata senectus* is bold, but not too bold for such a master of pregnant and allusive style. Against Prof. Housman's interpretation of *intestata* it may be urged that the context—old age and sudden death—inevitably suggests a reference to *testamentum*. To employ the extraordinary meaning of an ambiguous word in a place where the ordinary meaning forces itself upon the reader's mind is surely bad art. *Intestata virtus*, unexampled virtue, may well stand in a suitable context: *intestata senectus*, unattested old age, preceded by *subitae mortes* and followed, at a respectful interval, by *plaudendum funus*, cannot stand in Juvenal.

REYNOLD A. NICHOLSON.