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](#)

Remarks on Juvenal

Harry Langford Wilson

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 08 / November 1900, pp 412 - 413

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083384, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083384

How to cite this article:

Harry Langford Wilson (1900). Remarks on Juvenal. The Classical Review, 14, pp 412-413
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083384

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

REMARKS ON JUVENAL.

I. 62.

cum fas esse putet curam sperare
cohortis
qui bona donavit praesepibus et caret
omni
60 maiorum censu, dum pervolat axe citato
Flaminiam puer Automedon? nam lora
tenebat
ipse, lacernatae cum se iactaret amicae.

In the April number of this Review, Professor Gudeman, discussing this passage at some length, can see no reason for calling the woman *lacernatae*, and attempts to justify his course in emending to read *lacernatus*. Plausible as his arguments appear at first glance, they do not stand the test of careful examination and certainly are not sufficient to warrant any change in the text.

In his interpretation of the passage there is a slight inaccuracy which has a decided bearing on the question at issue. 'A patrician youth who has squandered his ancestral wealth, so far forgets what Roman dignitas in a man of his social rank demanded, that he actually *drives in person* through one of the most frequented streets in Rome, for the purpose of showing off to his mistress.' But with anything like exact interpretation *cum se iactaret amicae* can hardly mean 'for the purpose of showing off to his mistress'; it clearly indicates merely an attendant circumstance.¹ The force of this will be clearer as we proceed.

In considering 'the *locality*, where the poet must have supposed this *amica* to have been,' Professor Gudeman says that there are 'only two possibilities and both are incompatible with *lacernatae*. She was either *in a house* on the Flaminian Way or else on the *crowded street* itself.' But surely there is still a third possibility, viz., that she was in the vehicle with the young Automedon, a view to which the number of *pervolat* cannot be urged as an objection, because the *amica* has at that point not yet been introduced. When we remember the immense amount of traffic on the via Flaminia and the restrictions on driving in the city which

were imposed by the Lex Iulia Municipalis and emphasized from time to time afterwards, it is wildly improbable that anyone would have been able to drive at breakneck speed (*pervolat axe citato*) inside the porta Flaminia. Clearly the scene of the incident here recorded must be laid on the via Flaminia outside the city and then the only reasonable place for the *amica* is beside the dashing young driver. The fact that the editors make no comment on this point is, I take it, to be explained only on the supposition that no other view than the one just stated ever occurred to them.

Professor Gudeman calls attention also to the fact 'that *ipse lacernatus cum se iactaret amicae* is a far more natural rhythm than the sudden stop in the middle of the first foot.' Doubtless; but observe the same rhythm in 3, 24f.

proponimus illuc
ire, fatigatas ubi Daedalus exiit alas,

where no one would object to *fatigatas* on metrical grounds. As far as the meaning of *lacernatae* is concerned I heartily agree with Professor Gudeman's interpretation based on Petron. 69: *lacernatus cum flagello mulionum fata egit*.

But it is upon the other pair of shoulders that the coachman cloak lies. Juvenal's thought in my opinion was this: the young spendthrift is speeding his horses on the via Flaminia to the north of the city and, forgetting his rank and dignity, actually holds the reins himself, showing off meanwhile to the *amica* who sits by his side with a driver's cloak thrown over her shoulders. She enters fully into the spirit of the occasion and throws propriety to the winds as much as the young man himself. Herein lies the point of *lacernatae*.

I. 74

I take this opportunity to call attention to the fact that Diderot, who is not usually named among the moderns strongly influenced by Juvenal, knew the satires well. Even a cursory reading brings to light many passages in which the reminiscence of Juvenal is evident. In *Le Neveu de Rameau* (p. 70, Monval) we read: On loue la vertu; mais on la hait; mais on la fuit; mais elle gèle de froid; et dans ce monde il faut avoir les pieds chauds. With this

¹ Professor Hale so interprets the passage, citing it, along with Cic. Phil. 13, 9, 19, Hor. S. 1, 9, 10, Iuv. 10, 52, and other places, under the head of the Sequent Clause of Situation (Added Picture), in his *Cum-Constructions*, p. 191 (p. 233 of the German Translation).

compare Juvenal I. 75: *probitas laudatur et alget*.

IV. 132.

A great fish has been presented to Domitian, who summons the imperial council to discuss what shall be done with it.

Montanus ait 'testa alta paretur, quae tenui muro spatiosum colligat orbem.'

The expression *spatiosum orbem* has never to my knowledge been interpreted as refer-

ring to anything but the fish. But the whole opinion of Montanus, contained in the above and three following verses, directly concerns only the making of a dish; and as *orbis* is so commonly used of round surfaces such as shields, mirrors, tables, etc., why is it not better to understand by these words the inside area of the dish, which is thus enclosed by the rim (*tenui muro*)?

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

*Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.*

CORRECTIONS.

I am sorry to find that on p. 367b I have incidentally misrepresented Mr Heinze as neglecting to say who first invented the explanation of Lucr. iii 420 which he adopts. Mr Heinze, on the contrary, says explicitly 'mit Wakefield.'

This is a good opportunity to retract another slander which I have long had on my conscience. In vol. iv of this Review, p. 107a, I accused Mr Tucker of having invented a fable about Opis and Orion. This was sheer ignorance on my part: the story is duly told by Apollodorus bibl. i 4 5.

And further I will withdraw two conjectures in Ovid's metamorphoses which I published in 1890 in the Transactions of the

Cambridge Philological Society, vol. iii pp. 142 and 145, and which have led others into error. At met. i 632 I adopted Mr Riese's objection to '*amara pascitur herba*' and proposed '*amaro...eruo*' (*erui* is corrupted to *herbe* in med. fac. 55). This is wrong: Ovid is imitating the verse of Caluus quoted by Servius at Verg. buc. vi 47, '*herbis pascereis amaris*.' At met. vi 63 I objected to '*ab imbre...percussis solibus*' on the ground that it ought to be '*a solibus percusso imbre*.' But though Juvenal i 54 has '*mare percussum puero*' Lucan ii 155 sq. can still write '*hic, se praecipiti iaculatus pondere, dura | dissiluit percussus humo*.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

NOTES.

ARISTOTLE, 'Αθ. Πολ. xiii. 2.—εἴτ' ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ στασιάζειν ἄρχοντας ἐλίσθαι δέκα, πέντε μὲν εἰπατριδῶν, τρεῖς δὲ ἀγροίκων, δύο δὲ δημιουργῶν, καὶ οἱ τοὶ τὸν μετὰ Δαμασίου ἤρξαν ἐνιαυτῶν.

Professor Bury, in his recent *History of Greece* (p. 188) adduces the Berlin fragment of the 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία as reading [τέτταρ]ας (the preceding word is lost) in place of πέντε, making the total number of archons for the year following the expulsion of Damasias nine instead of ten. In this he follows the authority of Blass, whose note ('Αθ. Πολ. ed. 3, p. 24) runs: 'δέκα, πέντε] sed τέτταρ]ας (Bl., Landwehr, Diels) ut vid. Berol., quod recte, puto, tnetur E. Meyer.' I had an opportunity recently of examining the Berlin fragment, and am strongly of opinion that its reading is the same as that of the London MS. The letter before μὲν seems to me to be certainly Ε, not C, and the preceding letter may well be T. The rest of the word has wholly disappeared.

If the reading were even doubtful, the *a priori* probability would of course be that it is the same in both MSS.; but personally I feel no doubt that the Berlin fragment has [πέν]τε, and if the London MS. had happened to be the first discovered I do not believe that anyone would have read it differently. The point may appear a small one, but, in view of the use made of it by such historians as Meyer and Bury, it is of some importance.

F. G. KENYON.

* * *

TWO OXFORD MSS. OF DIONYSIUS HALICARNAS-
EUS.—(1) In an article in the *Journal of Philology* (1899), I discussed the composition and authorship of a MS. of Dionysius' treatise *De Compositione Verborum*. I have since received from Prof. R. Förster of Breslau a suggestion which is most attractive; that the writer of the marginal notes was Andreas Dudith. Dr. Förster has compared the writing with