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members can always be recognised from the fact that the text ends with the letters singu (for singulari) at ii. 1, § 111. The Paris MS., numbered 7775, which is signed 'Claudii Puteani,' is a thirteenth century codex, with 43 lines to the page; and it is remarkable that no one should have hitherto noticed that its last folio before the lacuna ends with the letters singu. The inference is obvious. It is almost inconceivable that the writer was copying from a codex already ending in that imperfect word, and that by a mere accident he happened to complete his page with it. Unfortunately only four pages now remain of this portion of 7775: the rest gives the tradition of Books IV. and V. already known to us from the Regius 7774, a codex of the ninth century. But enough remains to enable us to classify all extant MSS. of the Divinatio and the earlier part of the Verrines in the order in which they most nearly reproduce what must now be considered the archetype.

W. P.

REMARKS ON JUVENAL.

I.

THE BODLEIAN FRAGMENTS.

There is a pretty general agreement among scholars that the lines of Juvenal in Satire vi. recently discovered by Mr. Winstedt are genuine. Two of them 32, 33, are quoted by the scholiast on vi. 348. The terse vigour of the language, the general stylistic peculiarities, the horrible insistence and ruthless unreserve with which the disgusting subject is handled, are in Juvenal's most perfect manner; indeed it is hard to believe that any save he penned those terrible lines. Proof in detail of their authenticity has been given by Professor Ellis, in his able lecture (The new Fragments of Juvenal, p. 9) and by Mr. H. L. Wilson (American Journal of Philology, xxii. p. 271 ff). If any aesthetic argument were wanted, the words cum quibus Albanum Sur- rentinunique recusat | flaua ruinosi lupa degustare sepulchri, and quern rides | aliis hunc mimur | would be sufficient.

To me the only internal difficulty is the quantity of promittit in line 2 obscenum et tremula promittit omnia dextra.

It recalls uncomfortably similar lengthenings so frequent in the verse of declining Latinity: some examples are given by Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. LIV, p. 486: I may add quo melior | ut est longe subtilior illo, one of the admittedly spurious lines prefixed to Hor. Sat. i. 10; and aethere se mittit audiitque vocatus Apollo (Baehrens, P.L.M. iv. 209), stridula cardinibus auditt antica retortis (Baehrens, P.L.M. iv. 250), stat similes auro citri mirabilis arbor (Baehrens, l.c. 311): all however in arsis. This suggests that the lines may have been composed about the fourth century after Christ, possibly by one of those admirers of whom Ammianus speaks (xxviii. 4. 14): such is the opinion of Bücheler. But it is more natural to consider that there is a corruption in the text; though I am not satisfied with any emendation hitherto proposed. The most ingenious is Mr. Housman's tremula promittit et, but Juvenal nowhere else places et third word in a clause. Dr. Postgate's criminis i. g. supra, though attractive paleographically, is to my ear rather too recondite. Professor Ellis's somnia sounds to me too modern: it cannot bear the meaning, 'dreams of happiness,' which he gives it, comparing 547 qualiacumque woles Judaei somnia vendunt, for there somnia is literal; the Jews dealt in the interpretation of dreams from the time of Joseph downwards. I formerly suggested ibi omnia (C.R. xiii. 267) ; which I now retract, and propose promittit mollia sc. effeminate practices, cp. 23 quanto uox mollior. If bona means good things, and mala bad things, I don't see why mollia should not mean effeminate things, since mollis means effeminate; cp. ii. 165, cunctis ephesib mollior, ix. 38, mollia aurum Petron. 126 ocularum mollis petulantia. The man is mollis similisque cinaedis. The text being now set right, I think there is no argument from internal evidence that can be brought against the lines, the meaning of which has been brilliantly expounded by Mr. Housman.

Assuming the lines to be genuine we are confronted with an external difficulty. How has it come about that they are preserved in the Oxford MS., Canonici Lat. 41, which I call O, alone, a MS. which agrees to a large extent with the MSS. of the inferior
class rather than with the Pithoeanus. P von Winterfeld (Berl. phil. Woch. xix. 793; Gött. Gel. Anz., 1899, p. 895), laying stress on the fact that there are twenty-nine lines on a page of the Pithoeanus, which is the case, and of the Aarau fragmentary MS., has suggested, with the assent of Mr. Housman (C.R. xvi. 265), that the loss of the lines in most of our MSS. was due to the loss of a page in the archetype. But what archetype? The archetype of P or of P, he says. And yet O mainly agrees with 

This does not help us much. Now it is important to notice that though, as Mr. Winstedt’s collation shows, O disagrees considerably with P, it yet frequently agrees with it in a surprising way, more so than Mr. Winstedt’s silence would often lead the reader to suppose. An examination of the MS. has made this clear to me. Here are some instances; i. 68 fecerit PO fecerat P, 86 nostri farrago libelli est PO est farrago libelli o, 114 habitat PO habitas 145 et PO it P o, i. 116 abrumpere PO abscindere, abscindere 140 moriuntur PO morientur o, iii. 210 aerumnas est PO aerumnae o, 259 s PO de o, v. 24, quo PO quod 63, 64 transposed in PO, 63 rogatus PO vocatus o, 88 dabitur PO datur o, vi. 159, nudo PO nemo o, 474 est pretium curae PO est operae pretium o, vii. 100 nullo guippe modo PO namque oblita modi o, viii. 163, dicit PO dicit PO, ix. 26 quoque taces PO quod taceo o, x. 197 om. ille PO, xiv. 38 damndis huius enim PO damnis huiusce stetin PO o. 

Also it presents unique or almost unique readings, e.g. i. 169 anime ante tubas (so Valla), and, what is more noticeable, readings of this sort which are either probably or certainly genuine, such as ii. 45 nam plurum for hi plurum, iii. 218 hic Asiano- rum for hae Asianorum or fesicianorum, iv. 148 ex for et P, the word is omitted by o, v. 561 longa for longa PO or longo o, vii. 130 Tongilti for Tongilli, xv. 75 praestant instantus Orbis for praestantissim orbis instant, 145 pariendique for capiendique. 

It follows from all this that (1) O cannot be derived from the archetype of either P or O, since in the case of all those MSS. the new lines are absent, and (2) that it is an independent witness, as is shown by the strange deviations of its readings. It is an eclectic authority. I am thus drawn to the conclusion that it must represent a recension other than and earlier than the recension from which the archetype of all our existing MSS. is derived; which has been proved to be the recension of Nicaeus (C.R. xi. 402). The newly discovered lines I conclude were excised from the text by Nicaeus for some unknown reason. It follows that the Oxford MS. represents the vulgate text such as it was before the recension of Nicaeus was made. Now the fact that all our MSS. end abruptly at xvi. 60, proves clearly that they all descend from a truncated original in which one or more leaves were lost at the end. This loss, if my hypothesis is true, must have taken place prior to the recension of Nicaeus and that of the Oxford MS.: it probably took place very early during the period of neglect which the poet’s works appear to have experienced for some time after his death (Friedländer, i. p. 80 foll.). This may well have been the case; and just as the recension of Persius by Sabinus is preserved in only two MSS., so the Oxford MS. may be the only specimen of Juvenal’s text unrevised by Nicaeus.

II. 

On VI. 614 foll. 

In this connexion must be considered the lines which occur in some, though not in most MSS., either after vi. 601 or after 614, to which latter place they evidently belong: tamen hac tolerabili si non | semper aquam portes rimosas ad dolia, semper | istud omus subas ipsas manantibus urnis, | quo rabidus nostrum Phalarim de rege dedisti. These lines are omitted by editors, and are unintelligible as they stand. As the two recent attempts to explain them do not convince me (Ellis, New fragments of Juvenal, p. 19; Housman, C.R. xvi. 265), I will venture a third. But first as to their genuineness, it is clear that our established text has lost lines in some cases. Such accidents frequently befal texts: thus the Pithoeanus omits lines of undoubted authenticity, e.g. v. 91, vi. 126. 558—559, x. 67. It may well be then that the lines in question are genuine; whether they vanished through accident or through the energy of a Nicaeus cannot be affirmed. It is clear from Valla’s note that their omission was of early date (hi tres usurciili in multis non sunt codicibus quos in antiquissimo legitum codice et f'robus etiam refert). And they are manifestly ancient: they do not smack of interpolation. They have the crisp vigour of Juvenal; they have his allusiveness to a marked degree. The first two lines refer to the Danaids; the third to Phalaris, a potentate affected by Roman poets, and elsewhere alluded to by Juvenal (viii. 81). But the third line does not cohere well with the other two; and it
seems to me that the two former lines should follow 614, where they were found by Valla, the meaning being that the administration of philtres to her husband by the wife would be endurable if it did not finally produce mania, as for example the hallucination that he is engaged like a Danaid in filling sieves with water. The third line I think should follow 617. It clearly refers to the mad emperor Caligula, who turned from a Roman monarch into a perfect Phalaris, and behaved for three years as such. That the line is corrupt is indicated by the variations in the MSS., quod for quo, rabidum for rabidus, rostro for nostro, Phalarim for Phalaris, ede for de rege. I therefore propose to read quo <m> for quo, and reconstruct the whole passage thus

\[
\text{tamen hoc tolerabile si non semper aquam portes rimosatem dolia, semper istud onus subeas ipsis manantibus urnis, }
\]

\[
\text{et furere incipias ut auunculus ille Nero, }
\]

\[
\text{qui totam tremuli frontem Caesonia pullit infudit. quae non faciet quod principis uxor,}
\]

\[
\text{quom rabidum nostro Phalarim de rege dedisti? i.e. 'who will not do what you the emperor's wife did, when you made a mad despot of our Roman monarch?' On dedisti = fecisti }
\]

I need only refer to Munro on Lucret. iv. 41. I may note that \textit{cum} with perf. indie, is not unusual in Juvenal: see iii. 122. 195. vi. 421, 458, 542. vii. 83, 86.
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