

On Housman's *Juvenal*

R. G. M. NISBET

The assessment of famous editions is more difficult than is sometimes supposed. Snap judgements can be made about other works of scholarship in a library or a bookshop, but to criticise a textual critic it is desirable to have wrestled with the problems oneself, as well as to know the state of opinion before he came on the scene. That is a tall order with Housman's Manilius, so that with a few distinguished exceptions eulogies derive from Housman himself, but *Juvenal* at least is relatively familiar and intelligible. The present sketch is the sequel to my article in the *Skutsch Festschrift*, *BICS* Supplement 51 (1988) 86 ff., where a number of proposals are made on the text of *Juvenal*. Apart from Housman himself, I have used particularly the texts of Jahn, Knoche, Clausen, and now J. R. C. Martyn (Amsterdam 1987), as well as the commentary by Courtney (note also his text of 1984).

Housman's first text of *Juvenal* appeared in 1905 in the second volume of Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*; it had a greatly abbreviated apparatus but was otherwise virtually identical with the separate edition. This was published in the same year "editorum in usum" by Housman's friend Grant Richards; the second edition (Cambridge 1931) has some twenty additional pages of introduction but only minimal changes elsewhere. For Housman's articles and reviews on *Juvenal*, I refer to the index of his *Classical Papers* (edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear, Cambridge 1972). One may note especially his expositions of the Oxford fragment (pp. 481 ff., 539 ff., 621 f.), which presumably led to the invitation from Postgate, and his mauling of S. G. Owen (pp. 602 ff., 617 f., 964 ff.), whose rival Oxford text of 1903 he ignores in his own editions.

Housman's first service to *Juvenal* was his clear-headed and clearly expressed account of the manuscript position. On the one hand there was *P*, the ninth-century Pithoeanus, with a few congeners, on the other hand the vulgate tradition, from which with uncanny flair he singled out seven witnesses (his Ψ , roughly equivalent to Clausen's Φ). Jahn and Buecheler, against whom he was reacting, had followed *P* except where it offered manifest nonsense, and sometimes even then. In a typically forceful passage (p. xi) Housman points out that if Ψ were derived from *P* it should never be used, but seeing that it is independent, its readings must be

considered on their merits; and he listed 26 places where *P* had been wrongly preferred (p. xviii). Some of his expressions might seem to undervalue manuscript authority, as when he recommends an open mind about the relative merits of *P* and Ψ (p. xiv); after all, when an editor is about to issue his edition, he has gone beyond that preliminary agnosticism. But in practice he recognised the superiority of *P*, and was ready to prefer it when there was little to choose (p. xv).

When Housman mocked *Ueberlieferungsgeschichte* (p. xxviii) as "a longer and nobler name than fudge" (Lucan, p. xiii), he was thinking of attempts to conjure up ancient editors ("Nicaeus and his merry men") from the bald assertions of *subscriptions*; and here at least his scepticism was justified.¹ But though he could analyse acutely the relationships of manuscripts from given data, he was not much interested in looking at them within their historical context: hence some of the deficiencies of his stemma of Propertius, where it is now realised that he was wrong against Postgate.² On the other hand the tradition of Juvenal suited him well: he understood the essential set-up, which was quite straightforward, and what was needed was not stemmatological refinement but the discrimination of the critic. Yet even with Juvenal a little more might have been said about the history of the tradition.³ W. M. Lindsay in his cool review asserts that only one ancient MS survived the dark ages (*CR* 19 [1905] 463); when Housman talks of two ancient editions, he was surely right against the manuscript expert, but he does not really argue the matter. Something more is needed about the character and date of the interpolations, which are already imitated in poets like Dracontius. And when the reader is invited to consider corruption, it is never made clear enough what letter-forms and abbreviations are envisaged.

"No amount . . . of palaeography will teach a man one scrap of textual criticism"⁴; and a textual critic need not be and seldom is an expert palaeographer. Housman used palaeographic arguments, sometimes to excess, to support solutions that he had reached by reason, but he never believed in altering a letter or two to see what happens.⁵ Like Porson, he seems to have derived little enjoyment from collating; his gastronomic tours of France did not lead him to the Pithocanus at Montpellier, and he did not

¹ J. E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (Salem, N. H. 1981) 211 ff.

² J. L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, *Phoenix* Suppl. Vol. 17 (Toronto 1984) 6 ff.; G. P. Goold, *BICS* Suppl. 51 (1988) 28 ff. (who cites Housman's offensive criticisms of Postgate).

³ See now E. Courtney, *BICS* 13 (1966) 38 ff., R. J. Tarrant in *Texts and Transmission*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford 1983) 200 ff.

⁴ A. E. Housman, "The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism," *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 18 (1922) 68 = *Selected Prose*, ed. J. Carter (Cambridge 1961) 131 = *Collected Poems and Selected Prose*, ed. C. Ricks (London 1988) 325.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 142 (Carter) = p. 333 (Ricks). See also Manilius V, pp. xxiv f., E. J. Kenney, *The Classical Text* (Berkeley 1974) 122 f.

himself exhaust even the famous Oxoniensis, in which E. O. Winstedt as an undergraduate had discovered 36 unique lines. He relied for his reports of readings on printed sources or inspection by acquaintances; he acknowledges particular indebtedness to the collations of Mr. Hosius, though he is ready enough to insult him elsewhere. When his Ψ group speaks with divided voices, one is left without a clear view of the preponderance of the tradition, but too much information may be more misleading than too little. As Housman retorted to an early work by Knoche: "He complains that Leo and I use too few MSS and despise most of those which Mr. Hosius collated and which Jahn professed to collate. We despise them because we find them despicable" (*Classical Papers*, 1106).

However superficial Housman's recension may seem, later industry has made remarkably little difference. In 1909 C. E. Stuart called attention to Parisinus 8072 (*R* in later editions), a further congener of *P*, and Housman in his second preface records interesting readings in three places (1. 70, 2. 34, 2. 45); the most striking of these is the first, where he had printed *quae molle Calenum / porrectura viro miscet sitiiente rubetam*. Here Plathner's *rubeta*, which he had not recorded, is now supported not only by *R* but by the first hand of *P* itself; it is certainly right (Housman in his second edition simply says "perhaps"), for *viro* must be dative after *porrectura*. In the same year A. Ratti, the future Pope Pius XI, discovered in the Ambrosian Library a palimpsest containing scraps of the fourteenth satire⁶; Housman in his second preface mentions a few notable readings (p. lv), none of which was both new and true. In 1935 C. H. Roberts published a papyrus from Antinoopolis, which showed errors going back to antiquity (*JEA* 21 [1935] 199 ff.). Its most interesting novelty was a mark indicating doubt at 7. 192 *adpositam nigrae lunam subtexit alutae*, which had been deleted by Prinz and Jahn (1868) without a word from Housman; in fact the best solution is that of M. D. Reeve, *felix et [sapiens et nobilis et generosus / adpositam] nigrae lunam subtexit alutae* (*CR N. S.* 21 [1971] 328).

The scrutiny of minor manuscripts since Housman has produced still less of consequence, and even the better new readings are so thinly supported that they are likely to be conjectures or accidents (for details see Knoche and Martyn). 2. 38 *ad quem subridens* (against *atque ita subridens*) may simply be derived from Virg. *Aen.* 10. 742. 5. 105 *pinguis torpente cloaca* (of a fish in the sewers) had been proposed by Rutgers, and is worth considering against *torrente*; yet the Elder Pliny talks of torrents in the *cloacae* (36. 105). At 8. 38 *sic* had been proposed by Junius and endorsed by Housman;

⁶ *Classical Papers*, p. 815 "It was a fine August morning which placed in Monsignore Ratti's hand the envelope containing this fragment, and he gives us leave to imagine the trepidation with which he opened it and the joy with which he discovered that the parchment was in two pieces instead of one. When a scholar is so literary as all this, it would be strange if he were quite accurate . . ."

at 8. 229 *seu personam* is questionable (see Courtney). A more interesting case is 8. 240 ff., a passage that has been plagued by bad conjectures:

tantum igitur muros intra toga contulit illi
nominis ac tituli quantum †in Leucade, quantum
Thessaliae campis Octavius abstulit udo
caedibus adsiduis gladio.

Here a stray manuscript plausibly reads *sub Leucade*, a phrase that already appears in the scholiast's note; see also Walter of Châtillon, *Alexandreis* 5. 493 f. *cum fuso sub Leucade Caesar / Antonio* (cited by P. G. McC. Brown, *Hermes* 114 [1986] 498 ff.).

In his apparatus criticus Housman helpfully signalled his own conjectures with an asterisk; there are some 30 such asterisks. We may begin with 6. 157 f. (on a precious ring):

hunc dedit olim
barbarus incestae, dedit hunc Agrippa sorori.

For the inanely repeated *dedit hunc*, which disassociates *incestae* from *sorori*, Housman printed *gestare* (lost after *-cestae*), citing Virg. *Aen.* 12. 211 *patribusque dedit gestare Latinis*. This was the kind of proposal that makes "the hair stand up on many uninstructed heads" (Manilius V, p. xxxiv), but it was characteristic of its author (posit the loss of an easily lost word followed by interpolation to restore the metre); Housman rightly insists that the plausibility of a conjecture does not depend on the number of letters changed. I have described *gestare* as the best emendation that has ever been made in Juvenal (*JRS* 52 [1962] 233), and this view has been endorsed by Professor Courtney in his commentary.

Others of Housman's conjectures are almost as brilliant; like Bentley, he was at his best when things were difficult. See 3. 216 ff. on the presents given to a rich man who has lost his possessions in a fire:

hic nuda et candida signa
hic aliquid praeclarum Euphranoris et Polycliti,
haec Asianorum vetera ornamenta deorum,
hic libros dabit et forulos mediamque Minervam,
hic modium argenti.

Here *haec* disrupts the series of *hic . . . hic*, and the demonstratives seem one too many for the flow of the passage. Theoretically one might consider a long word in place of *haec Asianorum*, such as *phaecasiatorum* (derived by C. Valesius from the widely attested *phaecasianorum*); but "slipped gods" has no obvious meaning, and plural *ornamenta* is unattractive in opposition to *aliquid praeclarum*. Housman proposed *hic aliquid praedarum*,

*Euphranoris et Polycliti / aera, Asianorum vetera ornamenta deorum.*⁷ The enjambment produced by *aera* is persuasive, and *ornamenta* now fits well. If this is accepted, *praedarum* must follow (since cited by Knoche from a minor manuscript without authority); Courtney reads *hic aliquid praeclarum Euphranoris et Polycliti / aera*; but that compromise impairs the balance.

Juvenal tells us that the young, unlike the old, do not all look the same (10. 196 f.):

plurima sunt iuvenum discrimina, pulchrior ille
hoc atque ille alio, multum hic robustior illo.

The second *ille* is omitted by *P* and a few other MSS; it clearly gets in the way. Housman proposed *ore alio*, "with another face" (see his second edition, p. liii = *Classical Papers*, pp. 878 f.); but he comments in his apparatus "*alia conici possunt velut voltuque alio; minus bonum videtur aliusque alio.*" The decisive argument is provided by the scholiast's comment *quidam pulcher est, alter eloquens* (cited not by Housman but by Courtney); this looks like a misguided explanation of *ore alio*, and is hard to explain any other way. Martyn's *eloquio*, "stronger in eloquence than him," produces an impossible confusion of ablatives.

At 10. 311 ff. we are told of the fate that awaits a good-looking young man:

fiet adulter
publicus et poenas metuet quascumque mariti
exigere irati debent, nec erit felicior astro
Martis . . .

Line 313 appears thus in Ψ (with a variant *exire*), which is a foot too long; *P* reads the metrical but meaningless *mariti / irati debet*. Housman proposed *lex irae debet*, pointing to 314 ff. *exigit autem / interdum ille dolor plus quam lex ulla dolori / concessit*. Nothing else that has been suggested fits in so well with the following context.

Other of Housman's conjectures are plausible even if less striking. At 4. 128 *erectas in terga sudas*, the turbot's fins are described as an omen of war; Housman comments "*in terga erigi non possunt, cum sint in tergo,*" and proposes *per terga*. E. W. Bower, followed by Courtney, interprets "spines running up the back," comparing *erigere aciem in collem* (*CR N. S.* 8 [1958] 9); but when *erectas* is applied to stakes, it ought to have a more literal meaning. At 9. 60 *meliusne hic* Housman's difficulty about *hic* has not been met, nor his *melius nunc* clearly bettered (though note Castiglioni's *dic*). At 15. 89 ff. Juvenal describes how everybody in an Egyptian village took part in a cannibal feast:

nam, scelere in tanto ne quaeras et dubites an

⁷ Housman's proposal is commended by J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism*, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 61 (Urbana, Il. 1972) 66.

prima voluptatem gula senserit, ultimus autem
 qui stetit, absumpto iam toto corpore ductis
 per terram digitis aliquid de sanguine gustat.

In 90 Housman's *ante* may seem dull, but it is difficult to refute; the word was later recorded by Knoche from a London MS without authority.

It is not the purpose of this paper to analyse the Oxford fragment of the sixth satire, where Housman hoisted his asterisk five times. At 2 *obscenum, et tremula promittit omnia dextra* he restored the metre by transposing *et* to precede *omnia*; but von Winterfeld's *promittens* gives a more natural word-order. At 8 f. *longe migrare iubetur / psillus ab eupholio* he ingeniously conjectured *psellus* and *euphono*. At 11 *munimenta umeri pulsatamque arma tridentem* he proposed in the apparatus *pulsata hastamque tridentem*, but one might prefer a long word agreeing with *tridentem*. At 12 f. *pars ultima ludi / accipit as animas aliosque in carcere nervos*, his *has* and *aliosque* are obviously right. He sorted out the punctuation of 27 *quem rides? alii hunc mimum! sponsio fiat*. Beyond this he elucidated indecencies that were unintelligible to everybody else.

Housman had no hesitations about the authenticity of the passage: he notes at the end with the braggadocio of an earlier age "Buechelero . . . et Friedlaendero . . . Iuvenalis editoribus huius aetatis celeberrimis eisdemque interpolationum patientissimis, hi XXXIV versus, quia ipsi eos non expediebant, subditivi visi sunt; quod ne ex hominum memoria excidat, quantum potero, perficiam." One may agree that once allowance is made for the obscurity of the subject and the uncertainty of the transmission, some of the passage sounds splendidly Juvenalian: note especially 15 f. *cum quibus Albanum Surrentinumque recuset / flava ruinosi lupa degustare sepulchri*, 21 f. *oculos fuligine pascit / distinctus croceis et reticulatus adulter* (a passage imitated by Tertullian, *Cult. Fem.* 2. 5. 2 *oculos fuligine porrigunt*, like other lines that are certainly by Juvenal). But Housman has not satisfied everybody that the situation described makes sense and is relevant to the context. In particular Axelson⁸ has pointed to the difficulty of the closing lines: *novi / consilia et veteres quaecumque monetis amici* (O. 29 f.) is clumsy compared with the alternative *audio quid veteres olim moneatis amici* (346).

Housman improved the text of Manilius and Lucan by many repunctuations, and it is well known how by moving a comma he made sense of Catullus 64. 324 *Emathiae tutamen opis, carissime nato*. Similarly at Juv. 2. 37 everybody accepts his *ubi nunc, lex Iulia, dormis?*, where previous editors had swallowed *ubi nunc lex Iulia? dormis?* At 5. 32 he joins *cardiaco numquam cyathum missurus amico* to the following sentence (*cras bibet Albanis aliquid de montibus*), thus sustaining the

⁸ B. Axelson, ΔΡΑΓΜΑ *Martino P. Nilsson . . . Dedicatum* (Lund 1939) 41 ff. = *Kleine Schriften* (Stockholm 1987) 173 ff.

contrast between the menu of the host and the guests. At 6. 454 ff. he points to the absurdity of *ignotosque mihi tenet antiquaria versus, / nec curanda viris opicae castigat amicae / verba: soloecismum liceat fecisse marito*; here he punctuates after *viris* and reads *castiget* with a stray manuscript, but admits merit in the minor variant *haec curanda viris*? In the fourteenth satire he rightly placed 23–4 between 14 and 15 (I say nothing of his rearrangement of 6. 116–21, where no proposal seems entirely satisfactory).

Some of Housman's repunctuations were less plausible: the involuted hyperbata that he delighted to detect in other Roman poets do not suit Juvenal. At 4. 11 f. he punctuates *caecus adulator dirusque, a ponte, satelles, / dignus Aricinos qui mendicaret ad axes* (that is to say, he takes a *ponte* with *mendicaret*); but he puts forward this fantastic notion with unaccustomed diffidence. Perhaps Juvenal means that Catullus has come from a beggar's mat by the Tiber, and is sinister enough to ply his trade even at Aricia (where the virtuoso performers may have congregated). At 8. 142 f. Housman punctuates *quo mihi te, solitum falsas signare tabellas, / in templis quae fecit avus*, but his comma after *tabellas* is undesirable (see Courtney); legal documents could be signed in temples, and this provides a better parallel to what follows (*quo si nocturnus adulter / tempora Santonico velas adopena cucullo?*). At 13. 150 ff. Housman reads:

haec ibi si non sunt, minor exstat sacrilegus qui
radat inaurati femur Herculis et faciem ipsam
Neptuni, qui bratteolam de Castore ducat;
an dubitet, solitus, totum conflare Tonantem?

But he rightly doubts his own commas round *solitus*, and considers deleting the line as an interpolation (without noticing that J. D. Lewis had said that the line would be better away); other proposals are *solitum est* (Munro), *solus* (*codd. dett.*, Leo), and *solidum* (D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *CR N. S.* 9 [1959] 201). There is a further difficulty at 15. 131 ff.:

mollissima corda
humano generi dare se natura fatetur,
quae lacrimas dedit; haec nostri pars optima sensus.
plorare ergo iubet causam dicentis amici
squaloremque rei.

Housman pointed out the unnaturalness of taking *squalorem* with *amici* as well as with *rei*; he therefore joined *sensus* to the following sentence as the first object of *plorare* (interpreting "emotions"). A strong pause occurs in this place elsewhere in the satire (72, 147, 159), and *ergo* can come third word in the sentence (Housman cites 15. 171); but this may be less natural when it is second word in the line. As an alternative, Housman suggested genitive *census* ("endowment"); for other proposals see Courtney.

Housman made some suggestions for lacunae that he did not signal with his asterisk. At 1. 155 ff. his insertion must be on the right lines:

pone Tigellinum, taeda lucebis in illa
 qua stantes ardent qui fixo gutture fumant,
 <quorum informe unco trahitur post fata cadaver>
 et latum media sulcum deducit arena.

Here it is often said that the subject of *deducit* is *taeda*, derived as Latin allows from the ablative of 155; but the burning of a single individual would not produce a trail of light, and a furrow in the sand must be more literal. Housman is less convincing when he proposes a lacuna after 1. 131. From 95 to 126 Juvenal has dealt with the *sportula*; then from 127 to 131 he gives a meagre and irrelevant summary of the client's day; then at 132 we are told *vestibulis abeunt veteres lassique clientes*. Rather than assume a lacuna, it seems best to delete the five irrelevant lines with Jahn (as reported by Knoche); as they are lively in themselves, they presumably originate from a genuine satiric source. Housman's suggestion of a lost line after 2. 169 is much more plausible. A less convincing case is 8. 159 ff.:

obvius adsiduo Syrophoenix udus amomo
 currit, Idymaeae Syrophoenix incola portae
 hospitis adfectu dominum regemque salutat.

Housman admits that after the subject has been repeated by epanalepsis, the verb *salutat* is not wanted; he suggests that a line may have fallen out after 160. Leo's *salutans* had independently occurred to him (second edition, p. li), but this plausible idea is not recorded in the apparatus.

Something has fallen out at 3. 109, where *P* reads *praeterea sanctum nihil ab inguine tutum*, and various stop-gaps have been tried by manuscripts and editors. Housman himself printed *nihil aut tibi ab inguine*, but Juvenal does not elide at the trochaic caesura of the fourth foot. He made a more interesting supplement at 3. 203 ff. (describing the poor man's modest furniture):

lectus erat Codro Procula minor, urceoli sex
 ornamentum abaci, nec non et parvulus infra
 cantharus et recubans sub eodem marmore Chiron.

Here the scholiast refers to marble statuettes; on the other hand marble is too grand for the sideboard, and in any case now irrelevant. C. Valesius proposed *sub eo de marmore* (which gives a weak demonstrative), Housman much more convincingly *sub eodem e marmore*. As an alternative I have toyed with *rupto de marmore*, to underline the tawdry appearance of the man's ornaments.

Housman's text brackets 17 lines as interpolations, but he was responsible for none of these deletions himself: see 3. 113, 3. 281, 5. 66, 6. 188, 8. 124, 8. 258, 9. 119, 11. 99, 11. 161, 11. 165-66, 12. 50-51,

13. 90, 13. 166, 14. 208–09 (as well as 6. 126, which is poorly attested, and 6. 346–48, which have to go if the Oxford fragment is accepted). At 7. 50 ff. he considers:

nam si discedas, [laqueo tenet ambitiosi
consuetudo mali], tenet insanabile multos
scribendi cacoethes et aegro in corde senescit;

but to say no more, after the general *discedas* there is an anticlimax at *multos* (at *BICS* Suppl. 51 [1988] 99 f. I argue that something has been displaced by line 51). He rightly suspects 8. 134 *de quocumque voles proavum tibi sumito libro*, but does not notice that Ribbeck had questioned the line. He plausibly casts doubt on 8. 223 (“*facietiarum lepori officere mihi videtur*”), 13. 153 (see above), and 14. 119 (which had already been questioned by Duff).

Housman often makes conjectures where it would be better to posit an interpolation. There is a striking instance at 6. 63 ff. (on the reactions of women to the dancer Bathyllus):

chironomon Ledam molli saltante Bathyllo
Tuccia vesicae non imperat, Apula gannit,
sicut in amplexu, subito et miserabile longum;
attendit Thymele: Thymele tunc rustica discit.

Here Housman transposed *gannit* and *longum*, awarding himself two asterisks, but Guyet's deletion of 65 seems certain; the conjecture was not known to me when I made it independently in *JRS* 52 (1962) 235. The impossible *miserabile longum* is removed more economically than by Housman; the proper names are put in a pointed relationship (add this to the instances collected at *BICS* Suppl. 51 [1988] 45); and *sicut in amplexu* gives the plodding explanation of *gannit* that is characteristic of a gloss.

Juvenal says that famous ancestors are of no avail if you behave disgracefully in front of their statues (8. 1 ff.):

stemmata quid faciunt, quid prodest, Pontice, longo
sanguine censi, pictos ostendere vultus
maiorum et stantis in curribus Aemilianos
et Curios iam dimidios umerosque minorem
Corvinum et Galbam auriculis nasoque carentem,
quis fructus generis tabula iactare capaci
Corvinum, posthac multa contingere virga
fumosos equitum cum dictatore magistros
si coram Lepidis male vivitur?

7

In 7 Housman proposed *pontifices* for *Corvinum* (ineptly repeated from 5) and accepted Withof's *posse ac* for the meaningless *posthac*; but it is simpler to omit 7 with Ψ, and better still to delete 6–8 with Guyet and Jachmann (for the arguments see Courtney). It may seem inconsequential to say “what avails it to boast of the Curii when you live badly in front of the Aemilii?”

(cf. Courtney, p. 384); but for such a distribution of examples see Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1. 7. 10.

At 8. 108 ff. Juvenal describes how extortionate governors loot even the most trifling possessions:

nunc sociis iuga pauca boum, grex parvus equarum,
 et pater armenti capto eripietur agello,
 ipsi deinde Lares, si quod spectabile signum,
 si quis in aedicula deus unicus; haec etenim sunt
 pro summis, nam sunt haec maxima. despicias tu
 forsitan imbellis Rhodios unctamque Corinthon:
 despicias merito.

Housman rightly objected to the *inanis strepitus verborum* at *haec etenim sunt / pro summis, nam sunt haec maxima*; he proposed *quis sunt haec maxima, despicias tu / forsitan. imbellis Rhodios unctamque Corinthon / despicias merito*. That disrupts the natural sequence *despicias . . . Corinthon: despicias merito* (as does Manso's deletion of 111 *si quis . . .* 112 *despicias tu*). It seems best to delete *haec etenim . . . haec maxima* and to restore the metre by something like *deus unus* (thus Heinecke and Heinrich).

At 8. 199 ff. the degenerate nobleman becomes a *retiarius*, who is worse than other kinds of gladiator:

et illic

dedecus urbis habes, nec murmillonis in armis
 nec clipeo Gracchum pugnantem aut falce supina;
 damnat enim tales habitus, sed damnat et odit,
 nec galea faciem abscondit: movet ecce tridentem.

Line 202 is absurdly repetitive (while *sed* is meaningless); if it is deleted (thus Ruperti), the pieces of equipment are set against each other in Juvenal's usual manner. But Housman incredibly transposes *sed damnat et odit* and *movet ecce tridentem*, thereby destroying the climax.

At 11. 167 f. Housman proposed *nervi* in the apparatus for *Veneris*, and *ramitis* in the text for *divitis* (p. xxx "the conjecture of which I expect to hear most evil"); but it may be enough to delete with Jachmann the irrelevant 168 f. *maior tamen ista voluptas / alterius sexus* (NGG [1943] 216 ff.). At 15. 97 f. *huius enim quod nunc agitur miserabile debet / exemplum esse cibi sicut modo dicta mihi gens* Housman proposed *si cui* for *sicut* (accepting the poorly attested *tibi* for *cibi*); but the lines are nonsense (see Courtney), and should be deleted with Guyet. Consider again 16. 17 f. (on the alleged advantages of military justice) *iustissima centurionum / cognitio est igitur de milite, nec mihi derit / ultio, si iustae defertur causa querellae*. Here Housman proposed *inquit* for the meaningless *igitur*; I believe that the simplest solution is to delete 118, assigning the thought to a centurion (*BICS* Suppl. 51 [1988] 109).

Sometimes where a difficulty had been solved by deletion, Housman turns a blind eye to the problem. There is an interesting case at 1. 81 ff. where Juvenal is saying that wickedness is now worse than ever before:

ex quo Deucalion nimbis tollentibus aequor
 navigio montem ascendit sortesque poposcit
 paulatimque anima caluerunt mollia saxa
 et maribus nudas ostendit Pyrrha puellas,
 quidquid agunt homines, votum timor ira voluptas
 gaudia discursus nostri farrago libelli est.
 et quando uberior vitiorum copia? 85

Lines 85–86 are untrue, disruptive, and produce a top-heavy sentence; they were rightly deleted by the neglected Scholte (with the familiar change to *ecquando* at 87). E. Harrison independently made the same proposal at the Cambridge Philological Society in 1920, but though his colleague Housman was present he did not express dissent either then or later (*CR* 51 [1937] 55).

Housman disregarded many other proposals for deletion, or mentioned them in the apparatus when he might have marked them in the text. I select some notable cases in a list that in no way aims at completeness⁹: 1. 14 (Dobree), 1. 137–38 (Ribbeck), 3. 104 (Jahn), 3. 242 (Pinzger), 4. 17 (Ribbeck), 4. 78 (Heinrich), 5. 63 (Ribbeck), 6. 138, 359, 395 (Scholte), 6. 530 (Paldamus), 7. 15 (Pinzger), 7. 93 (Markland), 7. 135 (cod. U), 9. 5 (Guyet), 10. 146 (Pinzger), 10. 323 (Heinrich), 10. 365–66 (Guyet), 13. 236 (Jahn), 15. 107 *nec enim . . .* 108 *putant* (Francke). Since Housman's edition deletions have been made by G. Jachmann (*NGG* [1943] 187 ff.), U. Knoche (who usually expelled the wrong lines), and M. D. Reeve (note especially *CR* N. S. 20 [1970] 135 f. for the excision of 10. 356 *orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano*). I have made some further suggestions at *JRS* 52 (1962) 233 ff.; here I revive two points about Hannibal that have not attracted much attention. 10. 148 ff. *hic est quem non capit Africa Mauro / percussa Oceano Niloque admota tepenti, / rursus ad Aethiopum populos aliosque elephantos*. Line 150 gives an unconvincing asyndeton (not solved by Astbury's *rursum et ad*), a false suggestion that Hannibal's empire extended far south, and a cryptic reference to "other elephants"; a concurrence of oddities should always arouse suspicion. 10. 159 ff. *vincitur idem / nempe et in exilium praeceps fugit atque ibi magnus / mirandusque cliens sedet ad praetoria regis, / donec Bithyno libeat vigilare tyranno*. Line 160 prosaically fills up a gap in the story, *nempe* is used elsewhere by the interpolator (3. 95, 13. 166), and *magnus* shows a misunderstanding of

⁹ See also E. Courtney's interesting study, *BICS* 22 (1975) 147 ff. He considers 40 lines "pretty certainly spurious" (p. 160), but does not include a fair number of interpolations that I should regard as likely or at least possible.

mirandus: Hannibal was an object of astonishment not because he was a great man but because he was a client.

Housman argues forcibly in his introduction for the recognition of interpolations (pp. xxxi ff.), and he may have thought himself radical compared with Buecheler, who deleted one line, and Friedlaender, who deleted none at all (whereas Jahn had expelled 70). In practice he was untypically conservative, largely because of the prevailing state of opinion; and perhaps he preferred to show his ingenuity by verbal conjecture. In fact in an author like Juvenal, where there is a significant number of interpolations, nothing should be taken for granted; unsatisfactory lines can be deleted with much more confidence than in a text that has not been tampered with. Many of the interpolations tend to follow recurring patterns¹⁰; usually they are metrical explanations rather than glosses turned into verse. There are a fair number of marginal cases that may legitimately be questioned even where proof is impossible; it is absurd to think that doubts cannot be raised unless guilt can be proved. Textual critics are not simply concerned with grammatical absurdities, and in the great classical authors they look for something more felicitous than what satisfied a fourth-century schoolmaster. "Improving the author" it is called by a curious *petitio principii*, but Housman at least should have been free from that misconception.

Housman did well to use the scholia as a guide to the ancient text (p. xxviii "our purest source of knowledge"), but sometimes he may attach too much significance to imprecise or ambiguous comments.¹¹ At 4. 5 ff. Juvenal says that Crispinus's riches do not matter:

quid refert igitur quantis iumenta fatiget
porticibus, quanta nemorum vectetur in umbra
iugera quot vicina foro, quas emerit aedes?
nemo malus felix, minime corruptor et idem
incestus, cum quo nuper vittata iacebat
sanguine adhuc vivo terram subitura sacerdos.

8

For 8 *minime* Housman read *quam sit* on the basis of the scholia (joining the two sentences together); but there is no need to pursue his reasoning, as he virtually recanted in the second edition (p. xv). The simplest solution is to delete 8 with Jahn; the point is not the unhappiness of the wicked but the general contempt in which they are held. The interpolator failed to appreciate that *incestus* was the postponed subject of *fatiget*, *vectetur*, *emerit*, and so introduced a new line; for similar misunderstandings on his part see *BICS* Suppl. 51 (1988) 97.

¹⁰ I give some instances at *JRS* 52 (1962) 233 f.; see also E. Courtney, *BICS* 22 (1975) 161. For a more general treatment of the typology of interpolations see R. J. Tarrant, *TAPA* 117 (1987) 281 ff.

¹¹ E. Courtney, *BICS* 13 (1966) 41 ff.

At 9. 133 f., after mentioning the homosexuals who flock to Rome, Juvenal proceeds:

altera maior
 spes superest: tu tantum erucis inprime dentem.
 gratus eris, tu tantum erucis inprime dentem.

Thus the Pithoeanus, but the repetition is intolerable; the vulgate tradition omitted the last line. In 1889 (*Classical Papers*, 107 f.) Housman confidently proposed *derit amator* for *altera maior* (omitting the last line and making metrical adjustments before *derit*); he supplied one of his unconvincing palaeographical justifications (*derit* turns into *diter*, and "the difference between *diteramator* and *alteramaior* is not worth considering"). In his edition he takes seriously the scholiast's comment *multos inberbes habes tibi crescentes* (which previously he had waved aside); he now supplies *spes superest: turbae properat quae crescere molli / gratus eris*. But great obscurities will remain (see Courtney), notably the need to provide a transition to 135 *haec exempla para felicibus*.

Juvenal's slave, unlike the rich man's, will be home-born, so that you can order your drink in Latin (11. 147 f.):

non Phryx aut Lycius, non a mangone petitus
 quisquam erit et magno; cum posces, posce Latine.

For *et magno* (Ψ) *P* reads *in magno* (which would have to mean "when you ask for a pint"); neither reading is convincing. Housman proposed and printed *qui steterit magno*, a conjecture that goes back at least to 1891 (cf. Manilius I, p. xxxvii); he cites the scholium *quales vendunt care manciparii*, but that may simply be an attempt to interpret the vulgate reading ("sought at a great price"). In fact the emphasis should not be on the price of the rich man's slaves but on their alien origin. G. Giangrande proposed *Inachio* (*Eranos* 63 [1965] 3 ff.); that does not seem a natural word for "Greek" in so prosaic a context (E. Courtney, *BICS* 13 [1966] 41), but there are attractions in some epithet that balances *Phryx, Lycius, Latine*.

Violent revenge on the trickster will bring you odium (13. 178 f.):

sed corpore trunco
 invidiosa dabit minimus solacia sanguis.

Naturally Housman saw that *minimus* is meaningless (cf. Manilius I, p. lxvi); he proposed and printed *solum*, positing the loss of the word before *solacia*. He cited the scholiast *nihil inde lucri habebis nisi invidiosam defensionem*; but this may simply be a loose paraphrase. His alternative proposals *nimum* (with *invidiosa*) or *damni* seem more forceful, but one really expects an adjective or participle to balance *trunco*. Wakefield proposed *missus*, Martyn *nimius* (with a cod. det.), but I might have expected something livelier on the lines of *saliens*, "spurting." It is a case for the obelus.

At 14. 267 ff. Juvenal addresses the merchant who suffers at sea while conveying saffron from Cilicia:

Corycia semper qui puppe moraris
atque habitas, coro semper tollendus et austro,
perditus †ac vilis† sacci mercator olentis.

Housman saw that *P's ac vilis* does not go well with *perditus* (while *Ψ's a siculis* is obvious nonsense). He conjectured and printed *ac similis*, i. e. the merchant turns as yellow as his cargo; he cited the scholiast's *tu foetide*, but that may simply be a muddled gloss on *sacchi olentis*. In fact sea-sickness seems too temporary an affliction to characterise the man (especially in view of the repeated *semper*); Housman says that he is called *perditus* because he cries *perii* in a storm (Manilius I, p. xxxvi), but again one looks for a more permanent attribute. At *JRS* 52 (1962) 237 I proposed *perditus articulis* (he is arthritic from living in a damp ancient ship); cf. Persius 1. 23 *articulis quibus et dicas cute perditus "ohe"* (where *articulis* is Madvig's necessary conjecture for *auriculis*).

Some other asterisked proposals fail to convince, though they usually contribute to the argument. 6. 50 f. *paucae adeo Cereris vittas contingere dignae / quarum non timeat pater oscula*. Here Housman's *teretis vittas* is too mild to balance the following clause, and Giangrande's *Cereris victus* seems to give the required point (*Eranos* 13 [1965] 26 ff.); Housman himself had suggested something like *Cereris contingere munera dignae* (second edition, p. xlvi). 6. 194 ff. *quotiens lascivum intervenit illud / ζῶν καὶ ψυχῆ, modo sub lodice relictis / uteris in turba*: Housman saw that the endearments of octogenarian women cannot be described as "recently left under the blanket." He regarded as certain (p. xxx) his own *ferendis*, "only to be endured," and it is undoubtedly on the right lines (see Courtney); but I prefer my own *loquendis*, which may combine better with *uteris* (*BICS* Suppl. 51 [1988] 96 f.). At 9. 118 Housman rejects *cum . . . tunc* as a solecism, only to produce the questionable elision *tum est his*. 12. 12 ff. (*taurus*) *nec finitima nutritus in herba, / laeta sed ostendens Clitumni pascua sanguis / iret et a grandi cervix ferienda ministro (iret et grandi P)*. Housman pointed to the ambiguity of *sanguis iret* of the walking bull, and proposed *et grandi cervix iret ferienda ministro*; but the origin of the bull was shown by his colour rather than his blood. Castiglioni proposed *grandis* for *sanguis*, and I have considered *tergus*; that leaves Housman's problem about *a* with the gerundive (not elsewhere in Juvenal), especially as the scholiast glosses by dative *sacerdoti*. 13. 47 ff. (on the small number of gods in Saturn's day) *contentaque sidera paucis / numinibus miserum urgebant Atlanta minori / pondere; nondum †aliquis sortitus triste profundi / imperium Sicula torvus cum coniuge Pluton*. Here the meaningless *aliquis* is omitted by *P* and is presumably an interpolation. Housman supplied *imi*, but a proper name would be more forceful; I have suggested *Erebi* (*BICS* Suppl. 51 [1988] 108). I refrain from discussing 14. 71, where

Housman ingeniously proposed *si facis ut civis sit idoneus*; I once doubted this (*JRS* 52 [1962] 237), as Courtney does for different reasons, but am now unable to make up my mind.

I turn now to those of Housman's conjectures that are confined to the apparatus. He points to the faulty tense at 2. 167 f. *nam si mora longior urbem / †indulsit pueris, non umquam derit amator* (the problem is not solved by Clausen's *indulget*, as the verb has jumped from 165 *indulsisse*); he suggests *praebuerit*, and I have tried *induerit* (*BICS* Suppl. 51 [1988] 91). 8. 47 ff. *tamen ima plebe Quiritem / facundum invenies, solet hic defendere causas / nobilis indocti; veniet de plebe togata / qui iuris nodos et legum aenigmata solvat*; here Housman suggests *pube togata* (to avoid a pointless contrast with *ima plebe*), but he does not mention *togatus* (Scriverius), which elegantly balances *Quiritem*.¹² At 10. 184 *huic quisquam vellet servire deorum?* he reasonably suggested *nollet* to sustain the irony. A more intractable place is 10. 326 f. *†erubuit nempe haec ceu fastidita repulso (repulsa Ψ) / nec Stheneboea minus quam Cressa excanduit*; here Housman proposed *coepto* for *nempe haec*, but a line has probably fallen out (Markland, Courtney). At 12. 78 f. *non sic †igitur mirabere portus / quos natura dedit* (on the harbour at Ostia), Housman saw unlike some editors that *igitur* is meaningless in the context; his *similes* is too restrictive and his *illos* too dull, and I have tentatively considered *veteres*.

Housman does not cite nearly enough conjectures by others; here I record a few cases of particular interest. Jahn placed 3. 12–16 (on Egeria's grove) to follow 3. 20; this is a necessary transposition, but either something has been lost after 11 (Ribbeck), or 11 should be marked as a parenthesis (my own solution, *BICS* Suppl. 51 [1988] 92 f.). At 3. 260 f. *obtritum volgi perit omne cadaver / more animae Eremita* proposed the adverb *vulgo*, "indiscriminately"; *vulgus* would refer to the common people in general, not like *turba* to a particular crowd. 6. 44 *quem totiens textit perituri cista Latini*. In this bedroom farce Latinus, who owns the chest, should be the injured husband rather than the concealed lover; Palmer's *redituri* (cited by Owen) is worth reviving (cf. Hor. *Serm.* 1. 2. 127 *vir rure recurrat*, etc.). 8. 219 ff. (the matricide Orestes is favourably contrasted with Nero) *nullis aconita propinquis / miscuit, in scaena numquam cantavit Orestes, / Troica non scripsit*. Weidner's witty *Oresten* was ignored by Housman, and the conjecture had to be made again by C. P. Jones, *CR* N. S. 22 (1972) 313. At 10. 90 f. *visne salutari sicut Seianus, habere / tantundem* Lachmann proposed *avere* (cited by Jahn), which balances *salutari* much better. The verb is normally confined to the imperative, but for the infinitive cf. Mart. 9. 6. 4 *non vis, Afer, havere: vale*. 11. 96 f. *sed nudo latere et parvis frons aerea lectis / vile coronati caput ostendebat aselli*. Henninius proposed *vite*, a certain emendation that

¹² In the same passage P. G. McC. Brown plausibly deletes *solet hic defendere causas / nobilis indocti* (*CQ* N. S. 22 [1972] 374).

has been ignored; he cited the paraphrase at Hyginus, *Fab.* 274 *antiqui autem nostri in lectis tricliniaribus in fulcris capita asellorum vite alligata habuerunt*. 13. 43 ff. (the simple life of the gods in Saturn's time) *nec puer Iliacus formosa nec Herculis uxor / ad cyathos, et iam siccato nectare tergens / brachia Vulcanus Liparaea nigra taberna*. Housman records and ought to have accepted Schurtzfleisch's *siccato* (the nectar's sediment is strained as with wine); he mentions the scholiast's note *exsiccato faeculentio aut liquefacto*, where the second word gives the clue.¹³ I have recorded some other neglected conjectures, and put forward some new ones, at *JRS* 52 (1962) 233 ff. and *BICS* Suppl. 51 (1988) 86 ff.

Where it is a question of weighing one reading against another, Housman's decisions are usually difficult to refute. But at 1. 2 he reads *rauci Theseide Cordi* (thus *P*), where Ψ offers *Codri*; *Codrus* is not only a type-name for a bad poet (from Virg. *Ecl.* 7. 22), but combines pointedly with *Theseide* to suggest the kings of early Athens. At 1. 125 f. a client receives the *sportula* on behalf of his wife, who is alleged to be resting in a closed litter: "*Galla mea est*", inquit, "*citius dimitte. moraris? / profer, Galla, caput. noli vexare, quiescet.*" The scholiast assigns *profer, Galla, caput* to the cashier (cf. p. xlv), and this leads better to *noli vexare*; it also seems best to accept Ψ 's *quiescit* rather than to derive an idiomatic future from *P*'s *quiescaet* ("don't disturb her because she is resting now" is more to the point than "if you disturb her, you'll find that she is resting"). At 7. 114 Housman follows *P* in calling the charioteer *russati . . . Lacernae*, but the cloak used in country drives (1. 62) was perhaps too cumbersome for a race; Ψ 's *Lacertae* ("Lizard"), is an excellent name for a quick mover (Courtney cites *ILS* 5293), and as lizards are usually green there is a pointed combination with *russati*. At 8. 4 f. (on a nobleman's battered statues) Housman reads *et Curios iam dimidios umeroque minorem / Corvinum*. Here "impaired as to the shoulders" (*umeros P*) is better than "diminished by a shoulder" (*umero* cod. det.): a statue does not lose a shoulder without losing an arm as well.

Even when he does not debate the text, Housman sometimes gives explanations that are open to challenge. I do not believe that 1. 28 *aestivum . . . aurum* refers to light-weight rings for summer wear (for the use of the adjective cf. 4. 108, also on Crispinus); or that 1. 144 *intestata senectus* means that old age among patrons is unattested (I delete 144 *subitae . . . 145 et*); or that 3. 4 f. *gratum litus amoeni / secessus* illustrates a genitive of quality¹⁴ (I propose *limen*): for all these points I refer to the discussion at *BICS* Suppl. 51 (1988) 86 ff. At 1. 47 *omne in praecipiti*

¹³ Martyn attributes *exsiccato* to Schurtzfleisch and *siccato* to myself, an honour I never claimed; the proposal was already known to J. Jessen, *Philologus* 47. 1 (1888) 320, to whom it is assigned in Housman's edition of 1905.

¹⁴ Housman cannot have found the passage straightforward: in 1900 he had actually considered taking *amoeni secessus* as a nominative plural (*Classical Papers*, 518)

vitium stetit Housman interprets "vice has come to its extreme limit" (*Classical Papers*, 613 f.); that does not convey the precarious position of vice, a thought that leads to the following *utere velis*, "use all your energies to attack it."¹⁵ 7. 61 f. *aeris inops, quo nocte dieque / corpus eget*. Housman comments that the body needs food night and day rather than money, and mentions sympathetically Ribbeck's *quom*; but this spoils the paradox that we are using up resources even while we sleep.

No critique of Housman's *Juvenal* can ignore his extraordinary style of debate. His admirers sometimes imply that his opponents deserved all they got, but his gibes are scattered too widely for that defence to be tenable. He could be generous to the schoolmaster S. T. Collins, who at 16. 25 *quis tam procul absit ab urbe?* (of a defending pleader), irrefutably proposed *adsit* (p. lvii "we ought all to be ashamed that the correction was not made before"). He was indulgent to J. D. Duff's "unpretending school-edition" (p. xxix) and to the commentary of H. L. Wilson, who quoted his own work respectfully and made no claims of his own (*Classical Papers*, 611 ff.). But to professional rivals he was persistently offensive, and not just to Owen but to Buecheler and Leo (even Jahn among the dead); and the effect on rising scholars was inhibiting. He rebukes non-critics who at Propertius 3. 15. 14 read *molliaque immittens* (v. l. *immites*) *fixit in ora manus* (p. xii); that must be a reprisal against Phillimore, who in his 1901 edition had criticised Housman's boldness in conjecture. He denounces the author of the *Thesaurus* article who by relying on Buecheler's text had failed to pick up *aeluros* at Juv. 15. 7 (pp. lv f., repeating his Cambridge inaugural of twenty years before); his solemn rodomontade was absurdly disproportionate to its object¹⁶ ("this is the felicity of the house of bondage" etc.), and caused lasting offence. This reversion to the manners of previous centuries was due not just to a love of truth, "the faintest of the passions," as he called it, though error grated on him more than on most; the explanation must surely lie in an underlying unhappiness¹⁷ that found a more creditable outlet in his poetry. All this makes one sceptical of the claim that Housman was uniquely objective; less original scholars may find it easier "to suppress self-will," to use his own phrase (Manilius V, p. xxxv).

None of this dislodges Housman from his position: he continues to impress alike by his subtle and original poetry, now more justly valued,¹⁸ the energy of his prose style (especially by academic standards), and his formidable intellectual and rhetorical powers. The *Juvenal* remains the most stimulating introduction to textual criticism that there is, and a classic

¹⁵ F. O. Copley, *AJP* 62 (1941) 219 ff., D. A. Kidd, *CQ* 14 (1964) 103 ff.

¹⁶ See especially Edmund Wilson, *The Triple Thinkers* (London 1938) 83 ff. = C. Ricks (ed.), *A. E. Housman: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs 1968) 14 ff.

¹⁷ For a realistic view see R. P. Graves, *A. E. Housman, The Scholar-Poet* (Oxford 1981).

¹⁸ See C. Ricks (above, note 16) 1 ff. (with other contributions to this collection), and (above, note 4) 7 ff.

demonstration of a particularly English mode of scholarship, impatient of theory, sparing of words, displaying no more learning than necessary, going for the vital spot, empirical, commonsensical, concrete, sardonic. Housman himself said that "a textual critic engaged upon his business is not at all like Newton investigating the motion of the planets: he is much more like a dog hunting for fleas";¹⁹ but the irony should not mislead. Though he himself had felicity of instinct (as every good editor must), he probably showed it less persistently than some other great critics.²⁰ It is his lucidity of mind and argumentative power that place him next to Bentley, and one can never disagree without being conscious that something may have been missed.

Housman's dominance is so great²¹ that it is difficult to avoid the cult of personality, but eulogies concentrate on the most brilliant feats without looking at an edition as a whole. In textual criticism there are horses for courses, and Housman found Juvenal well-suited to his talents: the style was vigorous and incisive, but it did not strain normal Latin usage. Even so, his solutions were often unconvincing, and not just because the edition was undertaken in haste, "for the relief of a people sitting in darkness" (p. xxxvi); he had twenty-five years to change his mind before the second edition, though his manner of argument may not have made retraction easy. It is not that he was too acute for his author, the criticism that used to be orthodox; as he emphasised himself in his London "Introductory Lecture,"²² the great classical writers had a standard of finish that is lacking in more recent literature. The truth of the matter is that in textual criticism, as in other scholarly activities, you win some and you lose some: new evidence is noticed, fresh arguments are devised, and no edition is sacrosanct. We should not surrender to Housman's authority, and assume that nothing remains to be done: there is no greater incentive for finding corruptions in a text than the fact that corruptions have already been found.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

¹⁹ Carter (above, note 4) 132 = Ricks (above, note 4) 326.

²⁰ This point is made by G. P. Goold, *BICS* Suppl. 51 (1988) 28.

²¹ For two notable recent assessments of Housman as a scholar see C. O. Brink, *English Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge 1986) 168 ff., H. D. Jocelyn, *Philology and Education, Liverpool Classical Papers* 1 (Liverpool 1988) 22 ff.

²² Carter (above, note 4) 9 ff. = Ricks (above, note 4) 265 f.