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](#)

Owen's *Persius* and *Juvenal*.—A Rejoinder

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 02 / March 1904, pp 125 - 131

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209475, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209475

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 125-131 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209475

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

a prefatory note, the preparation of the map must have been a work of great labour and expense, and much of the matter contained in it is altogether new. In the case of new maps of well explored countries adverse criticism of the precise method of presentation would be damaging, for it could only be on the grounds of excellence of that kind that the maker of the map

could justify its existence. In this case Mr. Anderson has laid scholars under such a debt of gratitude by the new ground he has broken, that we can afford to wait for perfection till he gives it us in the second edition.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

CARDIFF.

OWEN'S *PERSIUS AND JUVENAL*.—A REJOINDER.

PRESSURE of various business has prevented me from noticing earlier Mr. Housman's strictures on my text of Persius and Juvenal, the injustice and flippancy of which seem to call for some remark, if for no other reason, at any rate by way of protest against the style of writing (now fortunately obsolete) which Mr. Housman has thought fit to adopt. It is possible to speak with fairness and courtesy in literary questions of those with whose conclusions one does not agree. But Mr. Housman seems to be of Dr. Johnson's opinion that 'treating your adversary with respect is giving him an advantage to which he is not entitled'; and he has condescended to employ abusive jargon, adorned by rhetorical embellishments such as 'lazy' and 'limpet,' which recall the period when the Battle of the Books was waged, or when Gilbert Wakefield railed against Lambinus. I will say no more on this head except that Mr. Housman, whose bludgeon has recently gone forth against all lands, cannot be surprised if I deprecate language which insults without convincing.

Mr. Housman's review is so lengthy that to reply in detail to all that he alleges would require more space than I can claim or care to give. In some matters, such as the insertion or omission of conjectures, his judgement differs from mine. It is easy to differ with regard to such minutiae. My guiding principle was to insert only such conjectures as seemed to be either inherently possible, or, if not true themselves, to raise critical doubts, which might bear important fruit. The latter consideration caused me to mention several recent conjectures. Few will agree with Mr. Housman that I should have done right to suppress Heinrich's *uetulum* (Pers. iii. 29); as is proved by the coincidence of its rediscovery by no less than four scholars, none of whom knew that

Heinrich had already hit upon it (*C.R.* ii. 85, xvi. 283). I am taken to task for ignoring 'the only certain emendation ever made in the text of Persius, Madvig's *articulis* for *auriculis* at i. 23.' This conjecture of Madvig (*Adu.* ii. 128), based on a false reading printed in the text of Priscian (iii. p. 107 Keil) by Putsche (1605), but unknown to Keil, is not a certain conjecture, and has consequently not been generally admitted, though the curious may find it in Némethy's recent edition. I consider the conjecture wrong firstly because the traditional text yields a satisfactory meaning, as explained by Nettlehip in his edition of Conington, from Sen. *Ep.* 122. 4; and secondly because the repetition of *auriculis* (*tun, uetule, auriculis alienis colligis escas, auriculis quibus etc.*), is a repetition characteristic of Persius, a consideration which ought to weigh with an editor. As this has not, I think, been noticed, I adduce instances: i. 45, 46, *si forte quid aptius exit*, | *si quid tamen aptius exit*; i. 53 *calidum scis ponere sumen*, | *scis comitem etc.*; ii. 22, 23 *Iuppiter...Iuppiter...Iuppiter*; ii. 49 *iam crescit ager, iam crescit ouile*, | *iam dabitur, iam, iam*; ii. 68 *peccat...peccat*; iii. 12, 14 *querimur...querimur*; iii. 15 *miser...miser*; iii. 41, 42 *imus...imus*; iii. 85 *hoc est...hoc est*; iii. 88, 89 *inspice...inspice*; iv. 23 *nemo...nemo*; v. 8 *si quibus...si quibus*; v. 79–81 *Marcus...Marco...Marco...Marcus...Marce*; v. 143 *quo...quo*; v. 172, 174 *nec nunc...nec nunc*; *hic hic...hic*; vi. 12, 13 *securus...securus*; vi. 22 *utar...utar*; vi. 58, 59 *unum...unum*; vi. 68 *reliquum...reliquum*.

As regards the change in the punctuation which I have introduced in Pers. i. 92 ff. Mr. Housman approves of my assigning 92–97 to Persius' antagonist; but he does not agree with me in giving 99–102 to the same disputant. Let me

explain, and perhaps he will agree. Lines 92-97 belong to Persius' interlocutor. 'Is not (he says) our old friend the Aeneid frothy and puffy stuff compared with the newer poetry?' (*hoc* refers to *arma uirum*). Then Persius replies (98 *quidnam igitur* etc.). 'Then give me a specimen of this newer poetry.' The interlocutor obliges with the precious rubbish 99-102; of which Persius gives his opinion at 103 ff. This seems to me more forcible than, with Mr. Housman, to take 98-106 as Persius' derisive retort.

Mr. Housman's well-known eclectic idiosyncrasy as to editing, and his avowed disinclination to allow preponderating authority to one MS. or group of MSS. receive their usual prominence. Thus he talks about the 'strange notion that adherence to one MS. or family of MSS. is scientific,' and 'the lazy habit of preferring P to other MSS.,' and, as to Persius, 'in some places where the choice is doubtful it matters next to nothing how we choose, because both alternatives are good or even equally good.' Perhaps. But if it does not matter, what does matter? What finality is there in textual criticism? None, save the judgement of editor or critic. But surely the choice of editor or critic does not matter one tittle, and is of no importance to anyone except themselves, unless their choice be based upon scientific reason, unless in other words they can show the authority of a MS. or group of MSS. which is preferable as being less contaminated. For some MSS. are better than others, that is to say they have been less subjected to corruption. And, I hold, it is the duty of a sane editor to discover and follow such. Mr. Housman on the other hand seems to think that a critic can declare by intuitive insight that this or that reading is right, taking now from a pure and now from a vitiated source. So that the ultimate court of appeal is not the MSS. but the critic, not the MSS. but Mr. Housman. In this connexion it is relevant to notice that whereas Mr. Housman (*Journal of Philology*, xxi. 101 ff., xxii. 84 ff.) depreciated the Neapolitanus of Propertius and appreciated four late MSS. of the fifteenth century or thereabouts, and denied the supremacy of the Neapolitanus, which he wished to assign to the fifteenth century, this house of cards has been lately overthrown, since Mr. Montagu James has proved (*C.R.* xvii. 462) that the Neapolitanus was written in the twelfth century, as Keil long ago 'main-

tained, and is consequently by far our earliest manuscript of Propertius. I now make bold to ask which of the rival principles is really 'lazy,' and which is really 'scientific.' Granted Mr. Housman's principle, what will happen if another Mr. Housman arrives? What perplexities will follow on his advent? If the new gospel be accepted, we go back to the old happy-go-lucky system of selection of readings, which one would have thought had been permanently dethroned by Lachmann.

Working on the lines of Bieger I claim to have produced a text of Persius which is superior to previous texts because it is based on the admirable Montpellier manuscript P. The more I have studied that manuscript, and I have studied it patiently side by side with the other Montpellier manuscript A, the more have I become convinced of its paramount importance. Thus in v. 83 I have printed from P an *quisquam est alius liber, nisi ducere uitam | cui licet ut uoluit?* *licet ut uolo uiuere: non sum | liberior Bruto?* Here Mr. Housman takes me to task, remarking 'Mr. Owen easily perceives that *uoluit* is the reading of P; and he adopts it, though the next words are "*licet ut uolo uiuere*" not "*ut uolui*"': as if there were never a change of tense in Latin, as if the change in question had not a definite meaning, the perfect being used because the will precedes the action, as Conington long ago explained, and as if I did not know that the reading *libuit* (A B) is to be explained by the etymology of *libertas* from *libet* (Justin. *Institt.* i. 3. 1), an etymology possibly suggested by the jurists. Persius wrote as a Stoic, and therefore wrote *uoluit*, alluding to the Stoic definition of freedom *ελευθερός ἐστιν ὁ ζῶν ὡς βούλεται* (Epictet. iv. 1. 1), which Cicero renders '*libertas est potestas uiuendi, ut uelis*' (*Parad.* v. 1. 34). Again in iii. 15 ff. following P I print: '*o miser inque dies ultra miser, hucine rerum | uenimus? aut cur non potius teneroque columbo | et similis regum pueris pappare minutum | poscis et iratus mammae lallare recusas?*' Here AB have a *cur* adopted by Bücheler and others. Mr. Housman announces that *aut* has no meaning. It has a very definite meaning. The poet begins his reproof in language of serious remonstrance (*o miser—uenimus*). Then he changes his vein, and adopts by preference a tone of ironical banter. 'Or rather (*aut potius* i.e. in a less serious style) like some pet pigeon or little royal highness why don't you ask to have your food chewed for you?' Again iii. 44-46 following P I

print saepe oculos, memini, tangebam parvus oliuo, | grandia si nollem morituro uerba Catoni | dicere non sano multum laudanda magistro, | quae pater adductis sudans audiret amicis. Here AB, followed by most editors, have *morituri-Catonis discere*, approved by Mr. Housman. Either reading is possible, but that of P seems preferable. The boy wants to play truant from the school of rhetoric. He therefore oils his eyes, to create the impression that he is using a remedy against eye-inflammation, and therefore is suffering from that disorder. So he will be excused from school, and consequently will not be compelled before a parental audience which assembles on a regular day to declaim a *suasoria* counselling suicide to Cato about to die, as Juvenal counselled Sulla (i. 16). It is the recitation before the parent which the boy seeks to avoid: therefore *dicere* is a more appropriate word than *discere*. Whether, it is true that, as Mr. Housman says, 'what boys hate is not so much saying their lessons as learning them,' I am not certain. With persons of assurance that may be the case; not being a person of assurance, I distinctly remember that what I chiefly dreaded was the act of repetition before the master: and I am still haunted by the despairing words of a candidate uttered recently to the examiner at a *viva voce* examination at which I was assisting though not performing the sacrifice 'Sir, I can't think of any words in this awful room.'

The attested spelling *Progne* (v. 8) is not, as Mr. Housman imagines, disproved by the fact that in certain passages for metrical reasons (see Hilberg, *Serta Harteliana*, 1896, p. 172) *Procne* is written. Nothing is more certain than that Latin spelling was not uniform: I appeal to Dr. Georges, an undoubted authority, *Lexicon der lateinischen Wortformen*, p. 558 'die Schreibungen *Procne* u. *Progne* sind gleich gut beglaubigt.' Also at v. 134 *rogās*! en saperdas my note '*correpto rogas more Plautino*' is not 'an attack upon the MSS.' as Mr. Housman perversely states. My brief note was intended to suggest that the law of Breves Breviantes, which obtains occasionally in the dactylic poets, is a survival of the earlier scansion, a scansion which continued, it is true, in colloquial pronunciation and so is found in these poets, but which had not its origin in the later colloquial pronunciation, but dates from a far earlier period (See Lindsay's *Captivi*, p. 32).

I pass to Juvenal, whose text being more

difficult than Persius', affords greater opportunities for criticism, which my reviewer has not neglected, enlivening his remarks with characteristic amenities, and among them he actually makes me responsible for the motto of the University of Oxford, of which he is himself a distinguished ornament, a motto which stands at the head of all its publications, in order that he may secure a cheap gibe. Dominus illuminatio mea! It would rather seem that he himself requires some such legend to justify his own self-confidence.

The Venice MSS., mentioned viii. 5 and 7, are mentioned not 'for no apparent reason' but for an obvious one. As I long ago pointed out, it is necessary to expel the false reading *Coruinum* from the text in line 7, and to substitute *Fabricium* for it. The Venice MSS. quoted confirm this contention.

I turn to the alterations which I have made in the text, and Mr. Housman's comments. In vi. 73 I have restored the reading of P soluitur his magno comoedis fibula, not 'because the scribe has failed in his attempt to scratch out the s,' as Mr. Housman erroneously supposes, but because the s has been scratched out by the corrector (such scratching is frequent in P),—a very different thing, for here, as in countless places, P is ranged against the corrector of P in agreement with ω. Moreover *comoedis* not only makes sense, 'the fibula of such players (Accius and Urbicus etc.) is loosed at large outlay,' but is confirmed by Martial xiv. 215 'dic mihi simpliciter, *comoedis et citharoedis* | *fibula quid praestas?* carius ut futuant.' In vi. 120, Mr. Housman objects to my restoration of *sed* from P in place of *et*, his reason being that *sed* 'makes nonsense.' This is false. Mr. Housman has forgotten Beer's brilliant pamphlet *Spicilegium Iuvenalianum*. There p. 68, Beer proposed to restore *sed*: 'iam iam mulier (he says) augusta ad domum famosam appropinquat, extremo fortasse tempore sese recipiet, respuet locum foedissimum—*sed intravit* (sic hat ihren Fuss gesetzt) meretrix lupanar.' The meaning I take to be 'But not content with leaving the palace she has actually entered a brothel.'

In ix. 14, I regard Bruttia praestabat calidi lita fascia uisci, as a certain restoration educed from *brustia* praestabat calidi circum fascia uisci P and praestabat calidi circum lita fascia uisci P²ω. *Circum* was assuredly a gloss which stood over *lita*. P incorporated it into the text, omitting *lita*: the other MSS., incorporating both words, reduced the line to metre by omitting *brustia*

Mr. Housman who at x. 254 wishes to introduce the reading of ω , here inconsistently rejects *lita*, the reading of those MSS.

In xiv. 229 *qui per fraudes patrimoniam conduplicavit* (my emendation for *conduplicari*) is necessary for the construction, which otherwise is non-existent, as Mr. Housman admits. But when he goes on to object that 'Juvenal's point is that avarice is taught not merely by example but by precept' he begs the question. Juvenal knew well enough that evil example is as potent a teacher as evil precept: being a poet we must allow him the right of all poets to vary his forms of expression, and not insist that he should write with that rigid attention to logic which is demanded by paedagogic critics.

In x. 54 *ergo superuacua aut <prope> perniciosae petuntur* the supplement *prope* was suggested to me by the similarity of the letter *p* to the contraction of *prope* ($\varphi\acute{\rho}$), which by haplography would render probable the absorption of *prope* into the succeeding *p*. *Ergo*, as Friedländer has shown, is resumptive, introducing a conclusion based on what preceded, and therefore is inappropriately used here to introduce a question, as in Bücheler's reading approved by Mr. Housman: and Sejanus Crassus etc., who have not yet been mentioned, whom Mr. Housman arrays against me, are not in point for this reason. And when Mr. Housman denies that 'it is our *lot* to pray to the gods for anything whatsoever,' he has forgotten that Juvenal in the Tenth Satire is writing from the Stoic standpoint; the Stoics were fatalists. My translation may have been awkward, but the meaning is obvious: therefore since the things for which we pray in accordance with the law of destiny are superfluous or very likely to prove our ruin, for what things should we pray? Ancient ideas of fate were curious: it was possible to some extent to alter fate by an act of will. The Freedom of the Will and Necessity are still a provoking problem.

As to vii. 222 *mediae quod noctis ad horam* sedisti, Mr. Housman's ill-timed pleasantries should be read side by side with my remarks *C.R.* vii. 401, in defence of the reading *ad horam*. I still decline to believe that Roman schoolmasters started lessons at midnight. They rather continued to work till late at night. They worked no doubt early in the morning and late at night, at which time the boys were not necessarily 'fast asleep in bed' as Mr. Housman assumes, begging the question. In the land

of midday siesta night is turned into day and day into night. Mr. Housman writes as a teacher of English youth. Moreover if midnight may stand as an exaggeration for early morning with the traditional reading, why on earth should it not stand as an exaggeration for late at night? In viii. 241 objecting to my emendation *ui* (for *in*), which has met with considerable favour, Mr. Housman remarks ungenerously that 'if *ui* gave any tolerable sense, it would have been conjectured long ago,' seeking to rob me of credit. If Mr. Housman will refer to *C.R.* ix. 347 he will discover that it not only gives a tolerable sense, but it gives the exact sense required, and it is the only conjecture hitherto proposed which does so without violating the rhythm. *Vis* is used of warlike violence, which is much the same as war, as I showed there: add Attius *Astyanax* I qui nostra per *uim* patria populavit bona. Val. Flacc. v. 359 'non tibi ab hoste minae nec *uis*' ait 'ulla propinquat nec metus.' viii. 370 nunc quid agat, qua *ui* portus et prima capessat | ostia, qua possit Minyas inuadere? Liv. xxi. 2 plura consilio quam *ui* gerens. In vi. 473 my conjecture accipit, haec facies madida est, dicetur an ulcus?, extracted from P accipite (i.e. accipit haec) facies madidae (i.e. madida ē), does not 'ruin' the sense, but, in my opinion, improves it: the position of the adjective *madidae* at the end of the clause in the vulgate is feeble, and as far as I know, without parallel in Juvenal. The only cases at all like it are iv. 105, xv. 70 (with *atque*), vi. 197 (nominatives), and viii. 122 where the adjectives are substantival. The meaning is 'but a face that is coated and bathed with so many cosmetics and which receives poultices of boiled flour, is it a poulticed face, or shall it be called a poulticed sore?' Of course *madida* is to be taken ἀπό κομποῦ with *facies* and *ulcus*. *Madida* has a medicinal connotation (Apulei *Met.* viii. 18 p. 704 Hildebrand, ille spongiis madidatis tumores comprimere) it means wet with poultices, as the word is often used of hair wet with unguents (Ov. *H.* xiv. 13, Mart. iv. 3. 6 etc.).

In vi. 197 the punctuation which I have introduced gives, I believe, an improved sense. 'Your soft lascivious tones have power to allure, but with the result that all ardour subsides, however wanton your accents: your face betrays your age.'

Mr. Housman will, I imagine, find few to agree with him in his censure of me for following Bücheler in removing the brackets which, for various silly reasons, have from

time to time been placed around certain lines, and for excluding from my brief apparatus the names of scholars, mainly defunct, who have been victims of this mania for obelizing. The weighty words of Bücheler (*praef.* p. xiv), in which he justifies the banishing of the brackets, are well known: I may here quote the words in which the ablest exponent of Juvenal expresses his approval of Bücheler's action. 'I may be pardoned for citing (though my name occurs in it) an important protest against the modern rage for obelising works or portions of works, bearing every external and internal mark of authenticity. Remember that the speeches of Cicero condemned so confidently by Tunstall and Markland and F. A. Wolf and proscribed for a century, are now universally accepted; the balance of present opinion is also decidedly in favour of the letters to and from Brutus... My text was printed last year; if I have occasion to print it again, I shall follow Bücheler's example and remove all the brackets. By an improved punctuation he has given a new force to more than one of the condemned passages' (Mayor, *Juvenal*, i.⁴ p. xlvii). Since there is no reason to suppose that there are reasonable grounds for any of these 'suspicions of connoisseurs,' why should I encumber an apparatus, in which brevity is of primary importance, with futilities that have been already amply chronicled and exploded? I will give a single instance of the character of these 'suspicions': viii. 122 tollas licet omne quod usquam est | auri atque argenti, scutum gladiumque relinques[et iaculum et galeam; spoliatis arma supersunt]. The brackets are due to Lachmann, offended by the redundancy which did not however offend Juvenal: ii. 169 mittentur braciae cultelli frena flagellum. vii. 14 faciant equites Asiani | quamquam et Cappadoces faciant equitesque Bithyni. xv. 124 qua nec terribiles Cimbri nec Brittones umquam | Sauromataeque truces aut inmanes Agathyrsi. And how effective is the redundancy! You may rob the provincials of their effects, you cannot rob them of their arms; arms of every sort they will discover. The thought is that of Tacitus *A.* iv. 46 sin ut uictis seruitium indiceretur, esse sibi ferrum et iuventutem et promptum libertati aut ad mortem animum. And all is clinched in the noble epigram, which few but Juvenal could have penned, *spoliatis arma supersunt*. Conceive any one with an ounce of literary feeling consenting to part with that. This is a specimen of the

NO. CLVII. VOL. XVIII.

reasons which are answerable for those precious brackets. And so I have expelled them; and I don't care one jot for the big names of their authors. And in place of the gibes of Mr. Housman, I set up in all modesty a counter-assessment: *εἰ οὖν δέῃ με κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον τῆς ἀξίας τιμᾶσθαι, τοῦτον τιμῶμαι, ἐν πρωταεῖῳ σιτήσεως*.

Finally I will deal with the problem of the preservation by the Oxford manuscript of the newly discovered lines which follow vi. 365: and I must join issue with Mr. Housman when he asserts that this question is not important. It does not require much insight to perceive that if the preservation of the lines in the Oxford MS. and their absence in the others can be satisfactorily accounted for, a great deal has been done towards demonstrating their genuineness: since otherwise, as they are found in one MS. only, they are liable to the suspicion of being a forgery, which in Bücheler's view they are. In my own opinion the lines are from Juvenal's pen, but were expunged by Nicaeus; and the Oxford manuscript preserves them, because it is a manuscript at any rate to a great extent representing the state of the text anterior to Nicaeus. This is common sense, and on this Mr. Housman concentrates his main attack with peculiar acidity. I was gradually led to form this theory by observing the singular way in which, though agreeing largely with the ω MSS., the Oxford manuscript agrees also frequently with P against that group: and the remarkable circumstance that in several instances (*C.R.* xvi. 407) it preserves unique and certainly genuine readings, indicates that it belongs neither to the ω nor the P group. When Mr. Housman says, for the purpose of prejudicing my contention, that 'O, except in those verses which it alone contains, is nothing but a MS of the ω family,' he has forgotten its unique readings, to which elsewhere in his article he calls attention; he is inconsistent in his statements, and says what is contrary to fact. By the 'trivialis textus' current before the labours of Nicaeus, I mean such a text as many recently discovered papyri present of ancient writers, a text frequently for some reason or other (reasons may be found in Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, ed. 2, p. 268, and my *Prolegomena* to Ovid's *Tristia*, p. lxxix ff.) not as good as texts preserved in our MSS., but which at the same time may and often does preserve a genuine reading. I consider that this 'trivialis textus,' represented by the Oxford manuscript, was a text which,

being in ordinary circulation, had become in many ways corrupted. Nicaeus set himself to work to amend this corrupted vulgar text by the use of sources lost to us. The text of P represents best the recension of Nicaeus. The text of ω represents also that recension; but it has been contaminated by the admixture of readings drawn amongst other sources from the original vulgar text. Thus the fact that O agrees largely with ω and not with P is what might be expected; for the ω manuscripts are clearly a family inferior to P, and more akin to the vulgar text. But as Nicaeus, like all human beings, was not infallible, it is natural to suppose that he altered some things for the worse; and in these cases, I mean the unique readings of O and its preservation of the otherwise lost lines, O comes to our assistance. This is my answer to Mr. Housman's taunt levelled at me for not making O the basis of my text. I could not make the basis of my text a manuscript which is on the whole inferior to P: neither could I neglect a manuscript which at times is superior to P. The circumstance that the lines 346-348, an abridged form of lines 30-34 in the Bodleian fragment, besides being preserved in the fuller form in the fragment, occur in the Oxford MS. also after 345, as they do in the other manuscripts, I suppose to be due to the fact that the scribe of O, or of some manuscript from which it was copied, had access to an ordinary manuscript of the ω group, whence the lines were incorporated here. In other words the basis of the Oxford manuscript is a pre-Nicaean recension, whence its unique readings: but the manuscript is conflate.

I now turn to Winterfeld's theory as to the loss of the Bodleian lines from the other manuscripts, of which Mr. Housman says falsely that I 'deny that it has ever been propounded.' I do not deny this: I refer at the end of my preface to a paper, *C.R.* xvi., 406 ff., in which I touched on this theory, giving the references to Winterfeld's two papers (*Berl. phil. Woch.*, xix. 793; *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1899, p. 895). What I did say is that it had not been explained satisfactorily how it is that the addition is preserved in O alone. I held and still hold that this theory does not explain the crux. It was not my business in the short preface to the Oxford text to examine and argue at length against any theory that might have been started. Anyone interested in such things can pursue them in periodicals. I therefore endeavoured to compress in my

preface what appeared to me to be material: brevity above all things was necessary. A statement of a theory which I judged unsound was not, in my opinion, a necessary addition to my preface.

Winterfeld's theory attempts to account for the disappearance of the 34 lines of the Oxford manuscript from the other manuscripts thus. Having remarked that P and the Aarau fragments have 29 lines on a page, Winterfeld conjectured the loss of a page of 29 lines from the archetype of our MSS. other than O, that is to say '34 minus 5,' says Mr. Housman, 'uu. 30-34 being the remnant out of which 346-348 were fabricated.' Now in order to square with the hypothetical loss of a page of 29 lines this theory involves the following assumptions:

(1) The assumption that 30-34 must be subtracted, in order to yield the desired page of 29 lines.

(2) The further assumption that 30-34 were cut down so as to produce 346-348 of the vulgate text, which Mr. Housman explains 'by supposing that the scribe glanced from 'custo-des' in 32 to 'pru-dens' in 34, thus omitting 'qui nunc...prudens' and leaving the defective verse custodes et ab illis incipit uxor, which was then completed by inserting "cauta est"' (*C.R.* xv. 265).

(3) The further assumption that these five lines succeeding the lost page having been preserved and reduced by the roving eye of the scribe to the required three, were then not suffered to remain where they presumably ought to have followed after 365, but were conveniently whisked off by the obsequious scribe of the wandering eye and dumped down after line 345 in order to oblige Messrs. Winterfeld and Housman, and to enable the latter to confront me with this remarkable theory.

Last, but by no means least, this theory fails to explain how the two lines found in the Oxford manuscript after vi. 373 (373a b in my text, mangonum—relict) vanished from the other manuscripts; the explanation is obvious if my view be accepted. I allow that it is supposed that the lines were inserted in the margin of the lost original of the Oxford manuscript; and were copied by the scribe of O into the text. But this is mere supposition.

The nature and quantity of the assumptions and difficulties involved in Winterfeld's theory seem to me sufficient to refute it.

The question I insist upon is this, if Winterfeld's theory be accepted. By what

extraordinary process, if O is a mere manuscript of the ω class, comes it about that it preserves several unique and valuable readings, and that it alone preserves the unique additions? Why should those unique additions have passed out of all the other ω manuscripts? Why in the hundreds of such manuscripts that have been examined is there no trace of them?

It is rather because O comes from a source different from that of ω , than that it alone has been augmented accidentally by these inserted additions. If O were a mere manuscript of the ω class, as Mr. Housman contends, it would agree with ω throughout, which it does not.

S. G. OWEN.

REPORT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—MICHAELMAS TERM, 1903.

Papers were read this Term as follows :—

October 30th : On recent literary discoveries at Oxyrhynchus, with especial reference to a new epitome of Livy xlvii-iv, by Dr. GRENFELL.

November 6th : (a) On Aristotle's notion of $\tau\delta$ *διαφανές*, by Mr. JOSEPH. It is tolerably plain that in defining colour as the limit of the diaphanous, Aristotle did not mean that it bounded the transparent medium between the eye and the coloured body, but that the coloured body itself was in some sense diaphanous, and became coloured through its own definite limitation. For (i) it could not be a *definition* of colour, to say that it terminated a transparent medium : (ii) his words are $\tau\delta$ *τοῦ διαφανοῦς ἐν σώματι ὁρισμένῳ πέρασ* (*de Sens.* 439 b 11) : (iii) light is contrasted with colour as being *ἐν ἀορίστῳ τῷ διαφανεί* (*ib.* 439 a 27). (So far as such indeterminate bodies—air and water are the obvious instances—are coloured, it seems to be due to their limitation by that in which they are contained ; and the fact that their contour changes to suit the receptacle accounts for the shifting nature of the colours seen in them. Alexander however gives a somewhat different explanation ; holding that the colours of bodies are diffused through these transparent media, in the same way as they pass through the transparent humour in the eye to the *πρῶτον αἰσθητικόν* behind it : in this case however the eye ought to receive or apprehend not the colour of the object but the diffused colour produced in the *κόρη*. On the other hand, Aristotle's explanation fails if applied to glass, or the crystalline heavens.

It is tempting to think that the diaphanous was to Aristotle not the body, but something filling the same space with the body, like the luminiferous ether. It was taken so by Stobaeus (*Ecl. Phys.* i. 17, p. 366), yet the view is untenable. For in speaking of light (*de An.* II. vii. 418 b 14), Aristotle tells us that it can be neither body nor an efflux of any body, on the express ground that two bodies cannot be in the same place. It is true that the body with which illuminated space is already occupied is there $\tau\delta$ *διαφανές* : for light is called *πυρρὸς ἢ τοιοῦτου τινὸς παρουσία ἐν τῷ διαφανεί* ; but $\tau\delta$ *διαφανές* cannot mean a body which is diaphanous *οὐκ ἄλλο τι ὄν*, or there could be no *διαφανές ἐν σώματι ὁρισμένῳ* ; since the hypothesis that the diaphanous is distributed through the interstices of another body like water in earth, is excluded by the statement (*de Sens.* 439 b 8, cf. 438 b 24) that all bodies are diaphanous more or less. We might suppose then that $\tau\delta$ *δια-*

φανές is that which is diaphanous *ἄλλο τι ὄν*—not as glass is glass, but as glass is transparent. This however will not suit with the definition of colour above quoted, nor with the passage *de Sens.* 439 a 21 b 12, where colour is explained to be not *πέρασ* but *ἐν πέρατι*, and *ἐν πέρατι* not of bodies but of a *κοινὴ φύσις καὶ δύναμις*, ἢ *χωριστὴ μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν, ἐν τούτοις δ' ἔστι*, καὶ *τοῖς ἄλλοις σώμασιν ἐνυπάρχει*, *τοῖς μὲν μᾶλλον τοῖς δ' ἥττον* ; although in 439 b 12 (*καὶ αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν διαφανῶν, ὅλον ὕδατος καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο τοιοῦτον*) $\tau\delta$ *διαφανῆ* are clearly diaphanous *ἄλλο τι ὄντα*. It remains then to take $\tau\delta$ *διαφανές* (where it does not mean the diaphanous body) as meaning the attribute of diaphaneity ; and Alexander accordingly uses *διαφάνεια* sometimes as its equivalent (*e.g.* vol. ii. p. 147, 27 of the Berlin ed.). But this involves us in another difficulty ; for no quality can be extended ; square can be only a *συμβεβηκός* of blue ; and colour (or rather the coloured) should be the limit or surface not of the diaphanous in a body, but of the body itself. Much then as we may be disposed to commend Aristotle for holding that it was the same nature which is illuminated in air or other transparent media, and coloured in earth or flower, we cannot credit him with a consistent view of his own statement.

Aristotle's account of the genesis of different colours is also involved in grave difficulties. As the indeterminate diaphanous is actually light through the presence of fire, so the determinate diaphanous is actually coloured through the presence of the same element ; and white is in the latter what light is in the former ; while black in the latter corresponds to darkness in the former (439 b 16). Now darkness is the privation of light in the diaphanous ; and black the privation of whiteness in the same (442 a 25) : but this privation arises through the absence of an illuminant ; so that the difference of black and white takes place through the absence or presence of fire in a body of constant diaphaneity. On the other hand in *de Gen. An.* 780 a 33, black is said to be that which is not naturally diaphanous ; and the difference of black and white would depend on the degree of diaphanous matter in a body ; in which case what becomes of the statement that all bodies are more or less diaphanous ? (cf. *de Sens.* 439 b 8).

Since the remaining colours arise through the various admixture of black and white, the solution of the last problem is crucial for them also. There are three ways in which such admixture may be conceived to occur : (i) by juxtaposition of minima that are severally white and black ; but though this