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](#)

Note on Juvenal Sat. X. 82 foll

W. W. Merry

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 01 / February 1897, pp 26 - 27

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00026019, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00026019

How to cite this article:

W. W. Merry (1897). Note on Juvenal Sat. X. 82 foll. The Classical Review, 11, pp 26-27
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00026019

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

is due to the preceding *falsa*,—*e falso falsum*. (Unless, indeed, *adfecta* be regarded as the archaic form of *adfixa*: see Munro on *Lucr.* 3, 4: in either case, however, the contrast with *detracta* makes it reasonably certain

that we have to do with a participle of *adfigere* not of *adfigere*).

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Bryn Mawr College.

NOTE ON CURTIUS VI. 4, 7.

THE Ziobetis, a rapid mountain-stream, suddenly plunges into an abyss and, after a subterranean course of some forty miles, again emerges to the surface.

Being told by the natives, that all that is thrown into the chasm, where the water disappears, is given back by the stream at its reappearance,

Alexander duos, qua subeunt aquae terram, praecipitari iubet, quorum corpora, ubi rursus erumpit, expulsa videre, qui missi erant, ut exciperent.

This is the unanimous reading of the elder MSS.: only in the Florent. G, an interpolated one, someone has inserted *tauros* after *duos*, which ancient editors have adopted. Hedicke and Vogel however justly rejected it as lacking positive authority. Of late Kinch declared the interpolation justified.

Now let us put the question; what most likely was taken by Alexander as an object for his experiment? If living men, firstly Curtius would have added to *duos*, which is not definite enough in itself, such a word as *viros* or *incolas*: secondly, such a useless cruelty does not agree with Alexander's nature. Indeed for this reason ancient editors adopted the reading *tauros*. If not men, which were his victims? Animals of course,

as by the following *corpora* lifeless matters are at once excluded. What animals would he have sacrificed most probably? If bulls, some reference would have been given whence he got them. Little animals would not do, for they might have passed by unseen or have been caught by a rock. Now we are informed in § 3, that he came there *cum phalange et equitatu*. So the assumption is near at hand, that he took horses: should therefore *equos* be inserted after *duos*? No. Firstly, that manner of correcting is very arbitrary and far too often applied to Curtius by modern critics, and secondly, Alexander did not take two horses from elsewhere, but two of *his* horses; so *duos equorum* is the expression required.

Now let us read the passage again. Does not *quorum* strike us then as a pedantic addition, quite different from Curtius' rather easy and poetical style? It is clear that the men, who were sent to look for the reappearance of the bodies, saw the bodies of the horses—not of other animals emerge from the whirlpool. So I suggest:

Alexander duos, qua subeunt aquae terram, praecipitari iubet equorum: corpora, ubi rursus erumpit, expulsa videre, qui missi erant, ut exciperent.

P. H. DAMSTÉ.

LEIDEN, 1 December 1896.

NOTE ON JUVENAL SAT. X. 82 foll.

pallidulus mi
Bruttidius meus ad Martis fuit obviu aram.
quam timeo victus ne poenas exigat Aiax
ut male defensu!

No satisfactory explanation seems to have been found for this passage. After the death of Sejanus, every one (in mortal terror of informers) is doing his best by

word and deed to show his hatred of the fallen favourite, and so to conciliate Tiberius. And every one is afraid that something he has done, or has left undone, may be distorted into an appearance of disloyalty. What is the cause of the anxiety of Bruttidius the orator; and how does the wrath of Ajax come into the question?

Mayor, ad loc., says that "Sejanus is the

Ajax ill-defended, who avenges himself on his luke-warm advocate, gloating over his terrors from the other world." This seems to be very unintelligible. Weidner is right in identifying Ajax with Tiberius; but he needlessly alters *victus* to *victis*, in construction with *timeo*, adding the comment: "Er wüthete gegen die Anhänger Sejans und den Senat (*victis*); es fühlte sich niemand mehr sicher, und es war zu fürchten dass er das ganze Volk in seiner Raserei anfallen würde...*ut male defensus*, vom Senat (*victis*) der dem Sejan sich allzu sehr ergeben gezeigt hatte." This does not seem to account satisfactorily for the introduction of Ajax.

I do not pretend to offer a convincing interpretation, but a passage in Suetonius, Tib. cap. 61, seems to suggest a simpler explanation. The attitude of Tiberius is there described in these words: *omne crimen pro capitali receptum, etiam paucorum simpliciumque verborum. Obiectum est poetae quod in tragoedia Agamemnona probris lacessisset, etc.* This must mean that Tiberius, in his crazy egotism, identified himself with the principal Greek heroes, and resented any attack upon them, or any neglect of their interests, as a personal affront. Here comes in the bitter irony of Juvenal. Not only was there danger that Tiberius might consider himself attacked in the person of Agamemnon, but it was not even safe for an orator to declaim

the *Armorum Iudicium*; for the Emperor might be whimsical enough to make a *volte face*, and to put himself in the place of Ajax, considering that the orator had not loyally championed his cause, and so had contributed to his defeat in the trial (*victus*). This is the very word used in the famous tragedy of Accius—"si autem vincar, vinci a tali nullum mihi est probrum." The genuine fear of Bruttidius as to the possible misinterpretation of his '*simplicia verba*' is very significant. The annotation of Torrentius, in the Variorum notes on Suetonius, l.c., refers to Dion. 1. 58 as follows: "*Simile est quod de Scauro [narrat], is enim ob tragoediam quamdam suam, cui Atreus nomen fecerat, quia Euripidis verbis quidam in ea alterum monuerat ut stultitiam imperantis ferret, a Tiberio mortem sibi consciscere coactus est.*"

It was by no means unusual in the Roman theatre to make pointed reference to the politics of the day, by throwing special emphasis on some particular lines in a popular play. So, when the *Simulans* of Afranius was acted in B.C. 57, in the presence of Cicero's friend, the consul Lentulus Spinther, the words "*haec, taeterrime, sunt postprincipia atque exitus malae vitiosae vitae*" were uttered so markedly at Clodius, that he was glad to escape the storm of hisses and to quit the theatre. (Cic. pro Sest. 55.)

W. W. MERRY.

NOTE ON LUCRETII V. 436 SEQQ.

*Sed nova tempestas quaedam molesque coorta
Omne genus de principis discordia quorum
Intervalla vias conexus pondera plagas
Concursus motus turbabat proelia miscens
Propter dissimilis formas variasque figuras
Quod non omnia sic poterant coniuncta
manere.*

MUNRO translates the last two lines of this passage thus: 'because by reason of their unlike forms and varied shapes they could not all remain thus joined together.' What does '*thus* joined' mean?

Dr. Duff in the Pitt Press edition says: '*sic* "straight off, at once," οὐτως.' Can this interpretation be justified?

Lewis and Short s. v. *sic* p. 1691a say: 'a local demonstrative accompanied with a corresponding gesture.' If so, what is the exact meaning here?

I suggest that a simpler and better explanation is to take *sic* in the ordinary sense of 'thus' or 'such,' equivalent to *dissimilia formis figurisque*, and standing to *omnia* (of which the direct predicate is *poterant coniuncta manere*) in the relation of secondary predicate denoting the character in which or circumstances under which a person or thing acts or is acted upon (Roby, *Lat. Gram.* § 1017 c). For this use of *sic* cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 210 *segg. voltum contemplamini: en, satin' sic est*, where *sic* must mean 'being, or when, like this;' i.e. 'will my face do like this?' Verg. *Aen.* v. 619 *segg. fit Beroe...ac sic Dardanidum mediam se matribus infert*, where *sic* = *Beroae similis*,¹ *Beroen simulans*. Juv. iv. 90 *segg. nec civis erat qui libera posset | verba animi proferre et vitam impendere vero | sic multas*

¹ Cf. *Aen.* i. 588 *restitit Aeneas...deo similis*.