The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On the Text of Juvenal I. 115.

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 3 / Issue 01 / January 1909, pp 66 - 68

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800018176, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800018176

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (1909). On the Text of Juvenal I. 115.. The Classical Quarterly, 3, pp 66-68

doi:10.1017/S0009838800018176

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ON THE TEXT OF JUVENAL I. 115.¹

AMONGST the readings of the Parisian codex collated by Mr. Stuart (supra pp. 1-7) which he classes as interpolations is one whose singularity at once arrests attention. In the well-known passage, I. 113 sqq., where all known MSS. including P have

etsi, funesta Pecunia, templo
nondum habitas, nullas nummorum ereximus aras,
ut colitur Pax *atque* Fides Victoria Virtus
quaeque salutato crepitat Concordia nido,

II presents *firma* instead of *atque*.

The reasoning which has induced Mr. Stuart, and no doubt will induce others after him, to regard *firma* as interpolated, may without unfairness be set out as follows. *atque* gives a perfectly satisfactory sense, and is attested by the all but universal consent of our MSS. *firma*, whether it be taken with *Pax* or with *Fides*, is open to grave objection; it is supported by but a single witness, and it cannot have come from *atque*, as an honest error should have come, by the route of mere clerical mistake. Such is the strong argument of the prosecuting counsel; but the advocate of the defendant must be allowed his turn, and he will point out, on the one hand, firstly, that an actually complete unanimity on the part of the MSS. of Juvenal by no means proves (as even the most conservative critics admit) that the lection which they support is genuine, and secondly, that though *we* may find it perfectly satisfactory, it does not follow that Juvenal would have done the same, nor that it is not one amongst two or more alternative expressions between which our knowledge does not allow us to discriminate.² On the other hand, he will require from the prosecution that it should complete its argument by suggesting a reasonable motive for the 'interpolation,' since interpolation without motive is not interpolation at all.

This last plea must be carefully examined. We will take the supposition that *Pax atque Fides* is the genuine tradition of Juvenal, and *firma* an intruder. How did it find its way in? It may be laid down that interpolation never arises unless some scribe or corrector has found the text unsatisfactory. What

¹Read before the *Cambridge Philological Society* on October 22, 1908.

²Compare Housman on vii 139 sq. 'fidimus eloquio' PG, 'ut redeant veteres' Ψ. "We cannot

be sure which Juvenal wrote; we cannot even be sure that he wrote either," *Juvenalis Saturae Pref.* p. xxv.

ground for dissatisfaction is there in 'Pax atque Fides'? Ask any one out of the throng of editors and critics who have edited or commented on this line without misgiving, what medieval scribe or corrector would have found this *atque* unsatisfying? The supporters of a theory of interpolation must now retire on their second line and say that in some MS., from which II is derived, the word *atque* had been omitted or was illegible. This is of course assumption—the postulation of a fact to support a theory. If justified at all, the result must justify it. Can it? Let us see. A scribe or reader observed a trochee missing between two nouns *pax* and *fides*. How, think we, was he likely to have filled the gap? By a *firma*, got we do not know whence, or by a harmless, if not necessary, 'and'—an *atque* which he had had twice already in the last 50 lines (65, 67)?¹

At this point the prosecution would doubtless ask to amend the pleadings in order to suggest the possibility that *firma*, though not an 'interpolation proper, was a corruption, now declared to be unconscious, which was hardly distinguishable from such, and that it was due to the phrase *pax firma*, or the phrase *firma fides*, obsessing the copyist's brain and misguiding his hand. That MS. corruption is sometimes due to such unfortunate reminiscences is undoubted, but a cautious criticism does not assume them unless the evidence is clear.

The advocate of *firma* would now claim to apply to *atque* the same tests that had been applied to *firma*. And he would point out that, if '*firma*' stood before '*fides*' in the archetype of the MSS. of Juvenal, the scribe's eye might slip from the first *fi* to the second *fi*, thus producing a gap for which an *atque* was the natural and obvious supplement. Nor would he now repress the doubt whether this vulgate was, after all, so very Juvenalian, seeing that it runs counter to the Satirist's habit of asyndeton in enumeration and is an employment of *atque* to which no exact parallel can be furnished from any of his writings.² If then, as Mr. Stuart maintains, II is no negligible witness for the tradition of Juvenal, the credit of *atque* in our passage no longer stands where it did.

But though *atque* may be deposed, *firma*, it is clear, cannot reign in its stead. Neither as an epithet of *Pax* nor as an epithet of *Fides* is it tolerable, and its sole claim on our attention is that it points immediately to something which may well have come from Juvenal himself. It is, in fact, an easy corruption of *fama*.

Fama, like Ὅσσα and Φήμη, is a goddess in literature; Verg. *Aen.* 4. 173 sqq. (*dea* 195), Ovid, *Pont.* iv 4 (*dea* v. 20). There is evidence, moreover, that she was worshipped in the Roman, as Φήμη (Aeschin. *F.L.* 145 τῇ Φήμῃ θυόμεν ὥς θεῶ) and Εὐκλεία (Paus. i 14. 5 ναὸς Εὐκλείας) were in the Greek world. We have

¹ How easily an *and* occurs to a copyist who wants a quick relief for a passage in distress may be seen from more than one place in Tibullus i. 5. 28, 'pro segete spicas,' 'et spicas,' codd. (not knowing that Tibullus lengthens a vowel before *sp*); ii. 5. 95, 'operata,' 'operta' (A, the tradition), 'et operta' the Vatican MS. and probably i. 6. 46 'et

amans' codd. for 'amens,' already corrupted to 'amans.'

² Juvenal's practice may be seen from Sat. iii. 73 sq. 'ingenium uelox, audacia perdita, sermo | promptus et Isaeo torrentior,' 76 sq. 'grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes, | augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus, omnia nouit | Graeculus esuriens.'

inscriptions to FAMA (*Orelli* iii 5817) from Cologne and to FAMA AVGVSTA (*C.I.L.* ii 1435) from Spain (Baetica). That she, like *Honor* and the other canonised abstractions with whom Juvenal associates her, had one among the innumerable altars or temples of Rome, I cannot find from direct evidence elsewhere. And it might perhaps be thought that Juvenal's memory had played him false either as to the name of the divinity or as to the place of the worship. But this there is no necessity to assume. A contemporary of Juvenal, the Greek philosopher Plutarch, speaks more than once of a temple *Φήμης καὶ Κληδόνο*s, which has been rightly identified with that of *Aius Locutius* (*Loquentius*), dedicated according to tradition by Camillus (Plutarch *de Fortuna Roman.* 5, *Camillus* 30). This has generally been assumed to be a blunder of Plutarch's; but it seems more reasonable to suppose that he is giving the current interpretation of the nature of an obscure divinity who, according to the tradition, conveyed to Rome the first intelligence of the Gaulish invasion (Livy 5. 32, Cic. *de diu.* i ch. 45, ii ch. 32). If this was the popular view of that divinity's nature in Juvenal's time, is it going too far to say that we might expect Juvenal to adopt it?

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹ For more on these cults see Roscher *Lexicon*, s.u. *Personifikationen* pp. 2135, 2139.