

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](#)



Friedländer's 'Juvenal' *D. Junii Juvenalis saturarum libri v*, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen von Ludwig Friedlaender. (Leipzig: Hirzel). Pp. 612 and 108*, 8vo. 14 M.

F. Haverfield

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 01 / February 1898, pp 50 - 52
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00025415, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00025415

How to cite this article:

F. Haverfield (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 50-52 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00025415

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Hindo-Persians and the European branch of Aryans.

However, without undertaking to determine what the pre-dispersal Aryans did or did not think on this point, let us assume they did believe that a man could be re-born in human form. What can we infer from that fact? Most Aryan peoples dropped the belief so completely that no trace of it is left amongst them. The Celts never, at any rate in pre-Christian times, carried the conception any further, any more than the Algonkins did. The Hindoos added to it the belief that man could be re-born in animal shape; and, above all, they gave the belief an ethical character—the good man got a good birth, the bad man a bad one. Pythagoras taught transmigration not merely as a moral theory but as a religious doctrine, involving the notion of a day of judgment, and taught it in a form so closely resembling Egyptian notions that the balance of opinion still is in favour of the supposition that he borrowed his teaching from Egypt. Mr. Nutt, however, is inclined to ask if the Hindoos could develop a complicated theory of transmigration for themselves, why could not the Greeks? *A priori* reasons can, of course, be supplied—I have attempted some in *An Introduction to the History of Religion*—but the question is, after all, one of evidence. Are the resemblances between the Egyptian and the Pythagorean doctrine so remarkable that borrowing is the most probable explanation of them? And some weight must be allowed to the Greeks' own feeling that Pythagoreanism was an exotic.

Finally, Mr. Nutt returns to the Happy Otherworld, and argues with great force and ability that the views as to the next world which were taught in the Mysteries were purely Greek and Aryan in their origin and development, and were no more

borrowed than were the Hindoo views on the same subject. Now, so many races have independently attained for themselves to a belief in a state of future happiness for the good and of future punishment for the bad, that it would be foolish to suppose that the Greeks were incapable of doing so too. The odd thing is that there are no signs of any such development of ideas amongst the Greeks until just the very time when this belief began to manifest itself with great activity amongst the Northern Semites. Mr. Nutt thinks that if we assume the movement to have spread thence to the Greeks, we ought also to assume that it spread to the Hindoos, and this seems to him rather too much. I am not prepared to say it is not, but I will conclude with a quotation from Huxley (*Evolution and Ethics*, p. 104): 'The Ionian intellectual movement does not stand alone. It is only one of several sporadic indications of the working of some powerful mental ferment over the whole of the area between the Aegean and Northern Hindostan during the eighth, seventh and sixth centuries before our era. In these three hundred years prophetism attained its apogee among the Semites of Palestine; Zoroasterism grew and became the creed of a conquering race, the Iranic Aryans; Buddhism rose and spread with marvellous rapidity among the Aryans of Hindostan, while scientific naturalism took its rise among the Aryans of Ionia. It would be difficult to find another three centuries which have given birth to four events of equal importance. All the principal existing religions of mankind have grown out of the first three: while the fourth is the little spring, now swollen into the great stream of positive science.'

F. B. JEVONS.

FRIEDLÄNDER'S 'JUVENAL.'

D. Junii Juvenalis saturarum libri v, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen von LUDWIG FRIEDLÄNDER. (Leipzig: Hirzel). Pp. 612 and 108*, 8vo. 14 M.

PROF. FRIEDLÄNDER'S 'Juvenal' consists of, first, 120 pages of Introduction dealing with the life and literary merits of the satirist and the history of his text—this contributed in part by Prof. Bücheler—, secondly, the

sixteen satires with critical notes in Latin and explanatory notes in English, and, thirdly, a 'Register' with an apparently complete Index Verborum. In character, arrangement, and even in appearance the whole closely resembles its author's edition of 'Martial,' issued just ten years ago. The merits of that admirable work are known to all Latin scholars, its judgment, its learning, its taste, its terseness. I may

express my opinion, which is also the general opinion, of the present edition, by saying that perhaps it even surpasses its predecessor. It deserves an honourable place in every scholar's library.

The life of Juvenal, the subject with which the book opens, is an old puzzle. Here is Prof. Friedländer's solution, familiar in part to readers of his 'Sittengeschichte.' Juvenal was born about A.D. 60, and in his youth probably served in the army, holding one of the 'Militiae equestres' and as an officer, perhaps, visiting Britain, Egypt and other provinces with which he seems personally familiar. He retired soon, possibly because he failed to get promotion—passages in his writings suggest such disappointment—and about 90 came to reside in Rome. Here he stayed, studying rhetoric and enjoying literary society, especially (till 98) that of Martial; here, later, he wrote his Satires (115–130). If he was exiled (which cannot be decided), it was before 110; if he was *quinquennalis* of Aquinum, he may have left Rome for a year for the purpose. It is an attractive sketch of a career in which (so far as one knows) every detail is possible; its one difficulty, I think, is the date of the Satires. Juvenal, as is well known, refers specifically to three or four events which occurred in Trajan's later years or under Hadrian. Prof. Friedländer combines these references with the presupposition that Juvenal wrote his poems in one definite period. Thus he obtains the limit of fifteen years (in round numbers) between about 115 and 130. But the presupposition seems, at least, needless, and the references in question occur chiefly in the latter part of the Fourth and the Fifth Book. The whole atmosphere of the first three, perhaps of the first four Books—that is, two-thirds or three-quarters of the whole—the personages mentioned in them, the resemblances to Martial, and many other details, reek of Domitian's reign. Juvenal promised, in his first Satire, to deal chiefly with the dead, but he can hardly have lived so wholly in the past as to write or publish in 115 a satire on the men and manners of nearly thirty years before, all the more when those men and manners had been largely swept away by the downfall of Domitian. If he did this, it is certainly a literary problem of considerable magnitude. It is surely more probable that these Satires were published soon after 96, when the memory of the third Flavian was yet fresh. We may venture further. The Flavian colouring (if I may so call it) is

most marked in Satires i–vii, less so in viii–x, while in xi and following it fades wholly out. Again, Satires xi and following show a new and weaker manner; they also contain nearly all the references to events later than 115. It is credible that Juvenal began to write before or about 100, and to publish soon after that date, and that he continued to write at intervals until 130, gradually dropping his Flavian allusions as the Flavian age faded from his and the popular memory, changing his manner with this change in matter and growing weaker in style as he grew old. Whether he wrote his Satires in their present order, whether he revised, remodelled, re-edited, are problems which it is safer at present not to raise.

I may pass by the rest of Prof. Friedländer's Introduction, excellent and complete as it is. The sections of most interest, those dealing with the history of the text, have been already expounded admirably to readers of this review by Mr. S. G. Owen, whose own edition of the poet we are all awaiting. I will only express my regret that the chapter on 'Juvenals Versbau' contributed by another hand, should seem to me below the general level. It contains numerous statistics, but statistics, popular as they are in contemporary scholarship, are very blind guides. They have certainly not enabled their compiler to grip the central fact about Juvenal's 'Versbau,' that his rhythm is Virgilian and not Horatian. In many respects—use of colloquialisms, use of dialogue, indifference to logical sequence of thought—Juvenal followed the tradition of the old Satura. In his rhythms he broke away, and that fact is surely noteworthy. For the rest, the Introduction is complete, interesting and judicious.

The commentary is equally admirable; two of its merits seem to deserve special notice. In the first place it exhibits a rare combination of fulness and brevity. Everything is adequately explained, and yet text and notes, both printed in a fine legible type, together occupy no more than 480 pages. It is a fault of the present age to confound length with learning and the word 'short' with the word superficial. It is therefore a great gain that a scholar with Prof. Friedländer's deserved reputation should set a contrary example. It is a further gain that he should give us a full and brief edition of Juvenal. We have, of course, one admirable edition, Mr. Mayor's monumental work. But Mr. Mayor's monument is Juvenal's tomb, while the smaller English and foreign editions are too

small for advanced students. Prof. Friedländer gives us a commentary of the right length and the right learning. And, in the second place, his notes combine in an unusual degree a command of many subjects: Latin, history, antiquities. The interpretation of Juvenal demands this combination to a rather special degree, though editors (Mr. Mayor apart) have rarely recognized the fact and have in consequence written oddly, for instance, about the Roman army. Prof. Friedländer, with aid from Prof. Hirschfeld, Dr. Klebs (who supplies some valuable 'Nachträge') and others, deals adequately with all problems.

I conclude by noticing a few unimportant points, and first I. 158 *cum fas esse putet curam sperare cohortis*. The command of a cohort commenced the Equestrian career, on which Juvenal himself had embarked with more labour than profit. He is naturally indignant at the spendthrift's easy entrance. Probably the latter was of senatorial birth (*maiorum censu*), had lost or resigned his rank (Tac. Ann. ii. 48, xii. 52, etc.), and, through influence, had been consoled with a salaried post. I may add that I see no reason for saying that either *cura* or *sperare* are here used technically. *Cura* = 'command' is common in Imperial Latin, but I very much doubt whether, even on military inscriptions, it ever denotes special or extraordinary command, as is sometimes affirmed. *Optio ad spem ordinis* and similar phrases (*Ephem.* iv. 471) are certainly technical, but only of certain promotions; they do not apply here.

I. 67. *Signator falsi qui se lautum*, etc. No one, except Mr. Mayor, not even Prof. Friedländer, has quite faced the fact that while the context is about forging, the word *signator* means 'a witness,' and Mr. Mayor's theory of a friend 'called in at the mortal agony' seems open to the objection that five witnesses were required. The Cornelian Forgery Law apparently provided for the case of witnesses who knowingly signed a forged deed by which they were to benefit, and who therefore were accomplices. I

suppose Juvenal's *signator* must have forged in some such manner, perhaps concocting the will as well as sealing it. Witnesses, however, are not often mentioned as tampering with wills, while some doubt arises about *falsi*, for the text in P seems only half certain and *falsum*, though constantly denoting the crime of forgery, does not seem to denote a forged document.

I. 155. *Tigellinum*. There seems some reason to think that the monster's name was Ofonius, not Sofonius or Sophonius, though *nomina* formed from barbaric, or, at least, non-Roman names, do occur in the early Empire.

II., 35. Dr. Klebs is plainly right in referring Juvenal's and Horace's *Scauros* to the Aurelius Scaurus who fell nobly in Gaul in 105 B.C.; the Aemilii Scauri, who were prominent from about B.C. 120—A.D. 20, seem to have been throughout a bad lot. But the reference may be also to Scauri unknown to us. Virgil's *Gracchi genus* (A vi. 842) is possibly the same.

III., 64. *Gentilia tympana*. Dr. Klebs renders 'foreign' a sense which he finds also in Horace's *terrui Urbem, terrui gentes*, Tacitus' *duret gentibus amor nostri* and elsewhere. The sense is common enough in the fourth century, and, as the 'tribe' was an uncivilized thing, neither Roman nor Greek, the Roman was on the verge of this sense whenever he used *gens* to mean a 'tribe.' But the first instance I know of *gentilis* 'foreign' belongs to A.D. 232, and the frequent occurrence of the adjective in Tacitus to mean 'native' shows that we may expect that sense here, where it suits perfectly. Besides, one may object to Dr. Klebs that a Syrian from the Orontes was not a 'foreigner' but a subject of Rome and native of a Roman province. In Horace, I suppose, *terrui gentes* means 'terrified the World,' a suitable antithesis to Rome. Tacitus in the words quoted comes, naturally enough, nearer to the later sense, but he probably means no more by *gentibus* than uncivilized tribes.

F. HAVERFIELD.

PAYNE'S HARVEY AND GALEN.

Harvey and Galen; the Harveian Oration delivered to the Royal College of Physicians, Oct. 9th. 1896. By J. F. Payne, M.D., Oxon., &c. London, 1897. 2s. 6d. net.

If we have delayed the due notice of this excellent little book we may truly say that

its value is not transitory; until the author himself, or some student of like competence widens and enriches the argument in a fuller treatise the present essay has a permanent claim on our attention. Dr. Payne is one of the few physicians who has combined historical scholarship with large