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](#)

A Note on Sallust's *Jugurtha*

Walter C. Summers

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 01 / February 1903, pp 32 - 34

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00207233, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00207233

How to cite this article:

Walter C. Summers (1903). A Note on Sallust's *Jugurtha*. The Classical Review, 17, pp 32-34 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00207233

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

bility. Suppose we interchange the two similar verse-endings *tenenda* and *canenda*, and putting a longer pause at the end of 83 take the *tenenda*, now in v. 84, in closer connexion with *ne trepidēs*. The reason, Lucretius will then say, why you must grasp the things that make storms and lightnings and the various causes that set them in motion, is that you may no longer lose your wits with fear when they do occur. This seems fairly coherent.

To V. 1009 *sq.* (see *C.R. l.c.*) I should not again refer but for Prof. Brieger's serious misconception of the force of my proposal. I had argued that the lines should be thus written

illi imprudentes ipsi sibi saepe uenenum
uergebant, medicis nunc dant sollertius
ipsis

nunc dant being the accepted correction for the *nudant* of OQ, *ipsis* that of Bergk and others for *ipsi* and *medicis* my own supplement. On this Prof. Brieger comments 'als ob die Aerzte in jener Zeit für eine Giftmischerzunft gegolten hätten!' *suum! sibi habeat*. The printed Latin means 'In early days men often poured draughts of poison down their own throats but nowadays they administer it more expertly than physicians themselves.' Where in all this is there anything about a 'poisoners' guild'? The words do not even necessarily mean that physicians did poison in Lucretius' time: 'do administer' and 'can administer' are both legitimate expansions of the thought. The point is not here at all. It is that the increase of knowledge has done harm and that a non-professional can poison as expertly as one whose business it is to be acquainted with the properties of drugs. That *dant* has here a technical reference,

Palmer (who mistakenly conjectured *medici —usi*) saw; and Duff following Palmer points out the same in his note. It forms a suitable contrast to that rather strange word *uergebant* which implies a certain recklessness of action, as when the contents of a patera are upset on a victim or a tomb: compare Servius *ad Aen.* 6. 244, Heinsius on Ovid *ex Pont.* 1. 9. 52. *sollertius* is also most suitable as *sollers* (*sollus* and *ars* 'all skill') is frequently applied to those who are masters in any craft or profession.

The words may very well after all carry a sidelong imputation. The faculty which wields the pharmacopoeia has in all ages been liable to the suspicion of abusing its powers. To prove this for Roman times one quotation from the celebrated invective of Pliny is enough: *N.H.* 29. 20 'non deseram Catonem tam ambitiosae artis inuidiae a me obiectum aut senatum illum qui ita censebat idque non criminibus artis adreptis ut aliquis exspectauerit. quid enim *uenenorum fertilis* aut unde plures testamentorum insidiae?' May be the expression was suggested to the poet by some scandal of the day—some ancient Palmer or Lamson case. At all events it is quite in that saturnine vein of his to which I have recently adverted in this *Review* (*C.R.* xvi. 113b, 114b). To those who would accept my supplement if they could attribute the omission of the word to haplography, I would point out that, as *e* and *i* are confused perpetually in the MSS. of Lucretius, *med* and *nud* are convertible groups of letters, and thus in '*medicis nudant*' a scribe might easily write '*nudant*' when he should have been writing '*medicis*.' But, as I have said before, words are omitted in our tradition without any such contributory cause.

J. P. POSTGATE.

A NOTE ON SALLUST'S *JUGURTHA*.

In ch. 3 of the *Jugurtha* Sallust says he thinks the pursuit of a political career at the present time undesirable:

quoniam neque uirtuti honos datur neque illi, quibus per fraudem fuit, tuti aut eo magis honesti sunt. *nam ui quidem regere patriam aut parentis, quamquam et possis et delicta corrigas, tamen inopportunitatem est...*, frustra autem niti neque aliud se fatigando nisi odium quaerere extremae dementiae est.

nisi forte quem inhonesta et perniciose libido tenet potentiae paucorum decus atque libertatem suam gratificari.

Jacobs explained the first seven lines of this passage as follows: '*nam ui quidem* &c. explains the preceding thought. In carrying out the duties of office one has only two courses between which to choose: either one must use force or one can do nothing. The former course, at the best is

dangerous and objectionable; the latter could only suit a fool.'

This explanation appears to me undoubtedly correct. But in the later editions (at all events in the last, 1894, revised by Wirz), a different one is given, which is in the main the same as that given by Fabri and, I think, almost certainly wrong.

Fabri says '*uis* is opposed to *uirtus* and *fraus*, and denotes a third way of obtaining influence in public life. For the elliptic *nam* cp. Cat. 58. 20.' So far, Fabri and Jacobs-Wirz agree exactly: the latter adds Cat. 13. 1 as a parallel for the use of *nam*. They vary however as regards the explanation of the words *frustra...dementiae est*. Fabri says they mean 'when one can do nothing [even] with the aid of force,' Jacobs-Wirz take them to refer to the case of a man who, after usurpation (*uis*), makes no attempt to use his power. But both agree in making the clause the alternative to the clause *quamquam...corrigas*.

That Sallust uses the elliptic *nam* is undeniable. As certain exx. I would take the two cited above from the Catiline, and Jug. 19. 2. In all these cases *nam* has no direct reference to the preceding clause, and the words 'I say nothing of.....' have to be supplied before we can translate it by the English 'for.'

The conjunction of *nam* and *quidem* is also not uncommon in the Jugurtha—it does not seem to appear in the Catiline. In none of the cases, I think, is the *nam* elliptic. I will take them in order.

24. 9 quid est reliquum, nisi uis uestra, quo moueri possit? *nam* ego quidem uellem... haec uana forent potius quam miseria mea fidem uerbis faceret. sed quoniam eo natus sum ut Iugurthae scelerum ostentui essem, non iam mortem neque aerumnas, tantummodo inimici imperium et cruciatus corporis deprecor.

The first clause is a rhetorical question, equivalent to 'no one is left but you,' and the *nam* clause explains why this is so: 'for I can do nothing.' The editions of Jacobs (including Jacobs-Wirz) give practically the same explanation.

31. 2 multa me dehortantur a uobis, Quirites,... : opes factionis, uestra patientia, ius nullum, ac maxime quod innocentiae plus periculi quam honoris est. *nam* illa quidem piget dicere his annis xv quam ludibrio fueritis superbiae paucorum, quam foede quamque inulti perierint uostri defensores...sed quamquam haec talia sunt, tamen obuam ire animus subigit.

The *nam* clause simply explains the

words that precede, especially those that follow *ac maxime*. It is certainly not elliptic here, and none of the three editions suggests that it is.

31. 20 (the times when the oligarchy had everything) uos autem...satis habebatis animam retinere. *nam* seruitutem quidem quis uestrum recusare audebat?

Here Fabri says *nam* is elliptic, and adds 'so below, § 23.' Jacobs-Wirz agrees, referring to the note on 3. 2. But there is no ellipse at all: *nam* simply introduces the justification for the strong words *satis*—*retinere*.

31. 23 uobis aeterna sollicitudo remanebit, cum intellegitis aut seruandum esse aut per manus libertatem retinendam. *nam* fidei quidem aut concordiae quae spes est?

I do not deny that *nam* may be elliptic here (as Fabri and J-W say), and that the words 'these are the only courses open to you' may be supplied before it. But it is certainly open to us to take the *nam* clause as explaining why they will suffer *aeterna sollicitudo* or why they will understand they have got to choose between two courses.

85. 27 (I know my adversaries can beat me at speechmaking, but the office I hold is a gift from you, they keep abusing not only me, but also you, and so I did not see fit to hold my tongue lest people should think I admitted my unworthiness). *nam* me quidem nulla oratio laedere potest...; sed, quoniam uestra consilia accusantur..., etiam atque etiam reputate.

Here *nam* explains the theme of the previous clause: 'this abuse affects you, not me.' No ed. explains it, either as elliptic or otherwise.

Thus in all five cases *nam* followed by *quidem* can (in four of them *must*) be taken in its usual sense: it introduces a clause justifying a definite and emphatic statement just made. So far, then, as usage goes, we are more likely to be right in taking it so in chap. 3. The definite and emphatic statement here is that those who get office are not *tuti aut eo magis honesti*.

And, usage apart, this seems to suit the context better. The aforesaid statement needs explanation. Cæsar might serve as an example of those who, getting office, used *uis* and yet he was not *tutus*. And his colleague Bibulus, avoiding *uis*, might be said *frustra niti neque aliud se fatigando nisi odium quaerere*, and so to incur the charge of *extrema dementia*. This last corresponds to the (*non*) *eo magis honesti* above. For the confusion of the idea of *folly* and

dishonour cp. Sallust himself, Jug. 107. 1 *nec quemquam decere...in maximo metu nudum et caecum corpus ad hostis uortere*, a direct translation from Xenophon, who however writes $\mu\omega\rho\omicron\nu\ldots\tau\delta\ldots\tau\alpha\ \tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \ldots\ \epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\alpha\ \tau\alpha\tau\tau\epsilon\upsilon\nu\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$

That *S.* is, in this sentence *nam—dementiae est*, bearing in mind the words *tuti aut... honesti* is, I think, made certain by the words which follow—*nisi forte* etc. Here he *does* suggest a third course open to the office-holder, only to stigmatise it as open to each of the objections against the other two: *inhonesta et perniciosu lubido*.

With the other explanation of *nam*, the clause *frustra—est* is awkward. As shown above, the advocates of that explanation

differ in their interpretation of these words. My difficulty with regard to both explanations is this. If we grant that *S.* *did* mean to reckon *uis* as a *third* method of getting office, did he not sufficiently stamp it as undesirable (and that is his point here) by saying that, even at its best, it was *importunum*? Why further refine, and carefully subdivide according to the use made of his office by the office-holder? Jacobs-Wirz's view of the clause seems to me in addition to attach an unlikely meaning to *frustra niti* (which must mean then 'take much trouble and yet, when one gets the desired object, not use it).

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

VIRGIL'S AENEAS.

What! did the hand then of the Potter shake?—OMAR.

CHARLES JAMES FOX, writing to his friend Trotter, speaks of the Aeneid thus:— 'Though the detached parts of the Aeneid appear to me to be equal to anything, the story and characters appear more faulty every time I read it. My chief objection (I mean that to the character of Aeneas) is of course not so much felt in the three first books; but afterwards he is always either insipid or odious; sometimes excites interest against him, and never for him.' The student of Virgil may turn to Dr. Henry's powerful vindication of the phrase *Sum pius Aeneas* (i, 381), to which Fox takes especial exception, and if Dr. Henry does not satisfy him, he can read Marlowe's *Dido Queen of Carthage*, and from Marlowe's Aeneas, with his bows and compliments to the queen, let him go back to Virgil's hero and consider whether after all he is not at once more natural, more manly, and more attractive.¹

But Fox's criticism is one to which it is probable that a large number of Virgil's readers will subscribe, and we are forced to ask ourselves whether it is just; whether it is possible that Virgil's highest conception of manhood is after all so worthless? Or even, if we suppose Fox to use the words 'insipid' and 'odious' with something of the exaggeration of Jane Austen's beaux, must we confess that Aeneas is still funda-

mentally a failure? By lightly accepting such a judgment we should probably lose something which the poet felt intensely to be vital to himself and to everybody. Virgil has a right to require of us some effort to discover this.

Probably no one has ever read Homer and Virgil without remarking the broad gulf between their two heroes. Everyone recognises at once the intense and true humanity of Achilles. There is no doubt that he is a real man, but about Aeneas we are not so sure. Achilles is 'the natural man,' and, as is usual with the creations of a great poet, we like our kind better because Homer has shewn us Achilles, we are reconciled to life and death and have something of Ben Ezra's feeling—'Thanks that I was a man.' Aeneas is not the natural man. He represents a stage at once beyond and behind that of Achilles. He has seen a great deal more of life, he has felt the lifting of a great purpose, he is part of a larger world, but he does not 'see the whole design.' Hence there is a want of poetic satisfaction about him. Aeneas—that is, the ideal Aeneas of Virgil, uncomplicated by outside considerations, is at once an older man than Achilles and the child of a later age of mankind. In the interval between the fall of Troy and his arrival in Italy he has seen many more cities than Odysseus saw and learnt the minds of many more men, and these many minds have confused him. He is a dreamer, and thinks of many things where Achilles looked straight before

¹ Henry, *Aeneidea* i. 647 ff.