

Mr. Kupersmith might be charged with giving readers the misleading impression that I write like Samuel Johnson—or at least those readers who don't know that the words he quotes are Johnson's, not my "deceptively mangled paraphrase." But no matter what Mr. Kupersmith's syntax seems to say, probably most people can tell the difference between me and Johnson.

As for my "paraphrase," which Mr. Kupersmith nowhere quotes, it went like this: "Samuel Johnson said that Juvenal's translators had concentrated on and accurately caught his 'points' at the sacrifice of his 'declamatory grandeur.'" In what does the mangling consist? Mr. Kupersmith tells us: "The 'pointed sentences,' then, are not jokes, as Professor Carnochan thinks, but gnomic utterances, sharp little maxims like 'orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano' (x.356), and 'quis cutsodiet [sic] ipsos custodes?' (vi.347–48)" (p. 509). Why does Mr. Kupersmith suppose that I think "points" are jokes? And to go a little further, in what does the "paraphrase" consist, if it is "points" we're talking about? After the sentence that Mr. Kupersmith quotes, Johnson says of Juvenal and his translators: "His points have not been neglected; but his grandeur none of the band seemed to consider as necessary to be imitated, except Creech, who undertook the thirteenth *Satire*."¹ It must be Mr. Kupersmith who thinks "points" are jokes. I think "points" are pointed sentences, and so obviously does Johnson. One of the definitions of "point" in the *Dictionary* is: "A sting of an epigram; a sentence terminated with some remarkable turn of words or thought." Who is it who has deceptively (or at least unfortunately) mangled what?

Then there is the other matter, whether readers may be misled into thinking that nobody before the later eighteenth century ever thought well of Juvenal. Well, I suppose it's possible, but I shouldn't have thought likely. In *Lemuel Gulliver's Mirror for Man* I had referred to Scaliger's opinion of Juvenal (and Lipsius' also), not to mention Bishop Burnet's and Dennis' and Dryden's—all of this, material that Mr. Kupersmith produces here as evidence. In the article, which was intended as something of a sequel to the book, I call it the "old" quarrel about the satirists. I talk about the "revival" or "rehabilitation" of Juvenal. My point was not that Juvenal had never done Christian service before. It was not that no one had ever called him sublime before. It was not that he hadn't had his turn as "Satyrorum . . . princeps." It was that just as the idea of sublimity changes, just as religious feeling changes, just as the whole culture changes, so do attitudes toward the satirists; and that these attitudes are conditioned partly by what readers want to see, partly by old expectations. When Mr. Kupersmith warns us, "we should remember that the main tradition of

Christian humanism was yet alive in the late eighteenth century" (p. 510), he may not be altogether wrong, but he befogs the issue. Does he really believe that the eighteenth century "*simply* [my italics] held what was the standard opinion of Juvenal from the time of the early church fathers till the nineteenth century" (p. 508)? I don't believe he does. Since the rules of debate in *PMLA* have become obscure to me, however, I wonder (as I write) whether I'll ever find out.

W. B. CARNOCHAN
Stanford University

Note

¹ "Life of Dryden," *Lives of the English Poets*, ed. George Birkbeck Hill (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905), I, 447.

Stoicism and Prose Styles to 1700

To the Editor:

Some new evidence has come to light concerning my article and the two important rejoinders to it ("Patterns of Stoicism . . .," 85, Oct. 1970, 1023–34; Professors Williams and Freehafer, *Forum*, 86, Oct. 1971, 1028–30).

A. N. L. Munby, general editor of a new series, *Sale Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons*, has himself edited the first volume, *Poets and Men of Letters* (London: Mansell, 1971), which includes the sale catalogue of the library of one seventeenth-century poet and his family, Edmund Waller (1606–87). Munby prints the catalogue prepared for the sale in 1832. The books in the collection evidently entered the family library over a long period. Those with very early sixteenth-century imprints must surely be purchases made either by the poet's ancestors or possibly by him in purchase of some smaller library en bloc; similarly, books with imprints after 1687 could only have been purchased by the poet's descendants. All this makes little difference to immediate purposes. We can still take a period from 1530 (so excluding two relevant earlier titles: Horace, 1509; Livy and Florus, 1521) to 1700 (so adding a few titles purchased after Waller's death) and get what may be termed a Waller library acquired by a family in the course of the Renaissance and seventeenth century. I must add that the catalogue includes some mention of "others," books apparently beneath the dignity of naming, mostly shelved with "Octavo et infra." It seems unlikely that the "others" would include classics or theological works, unless perhaps in bad physical condition, but one cannot be sure.

In what follows I have chosen the classical authors referred to in my article. Since there are but nineteen titles, I can put them in a single list. I shall star those by authors usually thought Stoic, especially by English professors.

- 1555 Livy, Venice
 1555 Livy, *Decades*, Paris
 1566 Cicero, *Opera*, Paris
 1568 *Chronologia in Livii Historia*, Frankfurt, 1568
 1576 Cicero, *Opera*, Lyon, 1576
 1577 Cicero, *Ad Familiares*
- 1580 Horace, *Opera*, Basil
 1588 Livy, Frankfurt
 *1596 *Epictetus et Cebes*, Cologne
 1618 Cicero, *Opera*, Hamburg
 *1633 Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, Lyon
- 1642 Horace and Juvenal, Paris
 *1659 Epictetus, n. p.
 1671 Cicero, *Epistolae Omnes et de Officiis*, Amsterdam
- 1687 Cicero, *Orationes*, Paris
 *1689 Seneca, *Tragoediae*, Lyon
 1691 Cicero, *De Officiis*, Amsterdam
 1691 Horace, *Oeuvres*, Paris
 1699 Cicero, *Opera*, Amsterdam

I shall offer a few observations. The number of titles is small, although the number of volumes (especially in "opera," and especially of the prolific Cicero) increase the number of titles many times over. Every title was printed abroad, and thus the evidence supplements that in the short title catalogues, a matter that should particularly interest Professor Williams. Tacitus is missing altogether, as is Marcus Aurelius. Epictetus appears twice (1596, 1659). The amiable Boethius appears once (1633), and that much-touted Stoic, Seneca, but once and late (1689). On the other hand, Livy appears in four editions before 1596 and none thereafter. Horace appears three times well spread over the period (1580, 1642, 1691). Cicero appears eight times, as early as 1566 and as late as 1699, and in that much-talked-of "Stoic" period between 1580 and 1640, when Seneca is absent. There are also three entries with neither place nor date given: Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*; Cicero, three orations (in French); and Horace, ed. Heinsius.

The "Waller library" formally validates the proposition made in my article with books purchased from the continent. In addition, I have been collecting a great deal of other information not yet ready for publication based on certain college libraries at Oxford and Cambridge and with a wider representation of classical authors. I do not think that Professor Freehafer would feel that the new evidence I have given settles everything, and I agree. But he must assent to what I have termed the "formal" validation of my earlier contentions and statistics. And there some will find a rub, because statistics are soulless, contrary to the spirit of the humanities, we are told. In all candor I think that objection rather silly. We can use all the

help we can get in understanding the past. And if we are concerned with classical writers and their impact on England, I do not think that we should imagine ourselves superior to classicists. Epigraphy, numismatics, paleography, computers for archaeological finds—these are basic tools of classicists. Speaking of whom, I shall add that it was a classicist, not I, who said Seneca's style was Asian rather than Attic, and for some reason the rejoinders ignored such facts in my article. And none of them has yet dared question that Cicero's Stoic writings were vastly more popular than Seneca's. Certainly I feel no hostility to the idea of Stoicism or to Seneca, as my *Cavalier Mode from Jonson to Cotton* should show. And I do hope that scholars of such distinction as Professors Williams and Freehafer will provide us with their original work on this general topic, as I hope to return to it myself at a later time. But *hic satis*.

EARL MINER
Princeton University

A Theme with Variations

To the Editor:

In his recent article in *PMLA* (86, Oct. 1971, 924–39), Oskar Seidlin convincingly argues that Mynheer Peepkorn in Thomas Mann's *Der Zauberberg* represents a synthesis between the noumenal and the phenomenal, the divine and the earthly, *caritas* and *eros*, and that he is not simply a blasphemous old fool. Although I would agree with Seidlin on his view of Peepkorn, the fact that Thomas Mann, great Ironist though he may have been, chose to symbolize the union between the noumenal and the phenomenal in such a highly controversial figure allows us at least to question whether this synthesis is, in fact, the author's final word on the matter.

And indeed, the attempt to bridge the gap between the natural and the supernatural represented by Peepkorn is followed immediately by yet another, even more questionable attempt called "Fragwürdigstes" (p. 907)¹: the occultist experiments engendered by Dr. Krokowski's lectures in which "auf einmal solche Rätsel dem Auge der Zuhörer erschimmerten wie das des Verhältnisses der Materie zum Psychischen . . ." (p. 908).

It turns out that the synthesis incorporated by Peepkorn is only one in a long series of probes into possible relations between the physical and the spiritual, beginning in highly conventional terms in the very first pages of the novel, continuing to include not only the figure of Peepkorn and the dubious occultist experiments, but also most other scenes and figures in the novel, and ending with the very last paragraph of the work.