The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Madrid Ms of Manilius and its Kindred

A. E. Housman

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 1 / Issue 04 / October 1907, pp 290 - 298

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800005310, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800005310

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1907). The Madrid Ms of Manilius and its Kindred. The Classical Quarterly, 1, pp 290-298 doi:10.1017/S0009838800005310

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE MADRID MS OF MANILIUS AND ITS KINDRED.

THAT family of Manilius' MSS which is now usually called the second, and is designated by the letter β , made its first decisive entrance into criticism in the year 1739. The early vulgate had shaped itself out of hybrid copies in which the tradition of the two families α and β was indistinguishably blended; one good and ancient representative of α , the Gemblacensis, was brought into employment by Scaliger in 1600: but the testimony of β was never disengaged and isolated until Bentley's edition made public the readings of the Leyden codex Vossianus 390. The next member of the family to emerge was Matritensis M 31, discovered in 1879 by Gustav Loewe and brought to general notice in the middle of 1893 by the simultaneous publication of two papers,—one by Mr Breiter in the *Neue Jahrbuecher* vol. 147 pp. 417–423, one by Prof. Ellis in *Hermathena* no. xix pp. 261–286. Two other MSS closely akin to this, Vrbinates 667 and 668 in the Vatican library, containing the first 82 verses of the poem, which the Matritensis has lost, are employed in an edition of Book i which I published in 1903.

Mr Breiter on p. 421 of his paper, where he made the important observation that the Vossianus, from i 1 to ii 683 (673 of Jacob's text) or thereabouts, has no kinship with the Matritensis and is practically worthless, pronounced also his opinion that even in its latter portion, from ii 684 to v 745, the Vossianus possesses no independent value: 'dasz in dem zweiten teile sämtliche gute lesarten des V sich in M bereits vorfinden, und dasz demnach dem V ein eigner wert überhaupt nicht zukommt'. The question whether this opinion is right or wrong, and whether V is or is not derived from M, has nothing to do with the question whether M is or is not the actual copy made for Poggio about the year 1417, by a scribe who was 'ignorantissimus omnium uiuentium', from the ancient MS which Poggio had discovered in Switzerland or Germany during the Council of Constance. Granting that M is this copy, it does not follow that no other copy of the original was made. Of the Asconius which Poggio discovered about the same time there were made no fewer than three copies,—one by Poggio himself, one by Zomini, and one by Bartolomeo da Montepulciano; and we have no right to presume that the Manilius, on the contrary, was copied only once. If a second copy was made, and if V is derived from that second copy, it is of course an authority independent of M. The only way to ascertain the relations subsisting between M and V is to examine their contents. I proceeded therefore to test Mr Breiter's opinion by comparing

the readings of V with the excerpts from M which were printed by Mr Ellis in the *Classical Review* of 1893 and 1894 ; and I found it contradicted by this formidable array of exceptions.

ii 735 <i>destituent eius tum</i>] <i>destituēte iustū</i> V,
<i>destituēterustū</i> M.	609 <i>Hadriaco mutatum</i>] <i>adriam ēmutatus</i> ,
V, <i>hadriam comitatus</i> M.
iii 350 <i>attritis</i> V, <i>atricis</i> M.	776 <i>condidit</i> V, <i>possidet</i> M.
408 <i>perducta</i> V, <i>deducta</i> M.	919 <i>cogatque</i> V, <i>doceatque</i> M.
618 (title) <i>tropica</i>] <i>triplica</i> V, <i>triplicia</i> M.	935 <i>et</i> V, om. M.
626 <i>paruo</i>] <i>parito</i> V, <i>pariter</i> M.	v 36 <i>Argo</i>] <i>arco</i> V, <i>arto</i> M.
iv 397 <i>suis opibus super</i>] <i>suis opibus usu per</i>
V, <i>suis usu per</i> M.	231 <i>sub</i> V, <i>in</i> M.
576 <i>bilingui</i>] <i>biligui</i> V, <i>biligro</i> M.	646 <i>et</i> V, <i>uel</i> M.

This is a select list of passages where V has a true reading not found in M, or a reading which is nearer to the truth than M's ; and, taken together, they are enough to prove that V is independent of M. They are not all of the same weight, and some of them would have no weight if they stood alone. For example : *r* and *i* are often so much alike in M that V's *destituente iustum* at ii 735, though nearer to the truth than M's *destituenterustum*, might nevertheless have arisen out of it ; for a copyist when he blunders will sometimes undo an earlier blunder. V itself provides elsewhere a good and clear instance of such accidental correction : at iv 257, where Manilius wrote *priste*, all other MSS have *pisce*, but V has *piste* ; and again at i 356, where Manilius wrote *pristis*, all other MSS have *piscis*, but v (that is the first part of this same Vossianus) has *pistis* : you would think that the *t* had been preserved from the original. But alas, at iv 573 and 582, where Manilius wrote *pisces* and *piscibus*, V again has *pistes* and *pistibus* : it is nothing but a false spelling of the scribe's. Again : V's *attritis* at iii 350 'attritis consumitur horis' may be a deliberate emendation of M's *atricis*, for V indisputably contains a certain number of conjectures, some of which are right, though they are seldom right unless they are very easy. If however it should be suggested that both *attritis* and several more of the above examples, such as iii 408 *perducta*, 776 *condidit*, v 231 *sub*, 646 *et*, are borrowed from some MS of the family *a*, that suggestion must be pronounced incredible. In the whole of V, from ii 684 to the end, there is no example of such borrowing unless these are examples. Had the scribe of V or of V's exemplar enjoyed access to the other family, he must have used it oftener and used it where its help was more urgently needed. But when he leaves whole lines of meaningless barbarism uncorrected, and does not employ the first family even to fill gaps or to finish the imperfect verses iii 615 and 616, it is absurd to suppose that he would alter such unexceptionable readings as *deducta* at iii 408 or *in* at v 231 and borrow from another source alternatives which possess no obvious superiority.

This list of variants, I say, forbids the belief that V is derived from M. But now I have to enquire whether these variants themselves are facts or phantoms. I testify to the readings of V, but for the readings of M I depend on others. This MS is a bad sailor, and has not forgotten the Armada : it will travel to Germany

and Italy, but to England it will not travel ; it is also modest, and dislikes to be photographed ; and I am not disposed to learn a fresh language with a poor literature, and undertake a long journey to an uninviting capital, merely in order to settle a question of so little practical importance as the question whether V is or is not a copy of M. There is perhaps only one passage, iv 919 above, where an editor, in framing his text, need seriously trouble himself about the exact relationship of the one MS to the other. *doceatque* is quoted not only from M but from all the MSS of the family *a* : it must be false, but *cogatque*, if V is not independent of M, can only be a conjecture, and the true reading will remain uncertain. In the other passages which I have cited, though the relationship of the MSS may be a puzzle, a critic can have no hesitation as to what reading he should adopt.

M was collated in 1879 by its discoverer Loewe in the margin of a copy of Jacob's edition which is now preserved in the University library of Goettingen as cod. MS philol. 139 ; but this collation has never been published. Mr Ellis in *Hermathena* no. xix p. 261 relates that in the Easter vacation of 1892 he 'visited Madrid with the object of seeing and collating this codex'. He saw it, but he did not collate it ; he addressed himself instead to the much more laborious and much less profitable task of making excerpts, which he printed, as a 'collation with the text of Jacob', in volumes vii and viii of the *Classical Review*. That they were no collation with the text of Jacob was clear from the outset : one of the first entries, i 90 'ex aliis alia pros.', is Jacob's text itself, which a collator would have passed over in silence ; and a little study soon gave rise to the suspicion that they were defective as well as redundant. Not even Mr Bechert could easily believe that the misprints of Jacob's edition already existed in a MS of the 15th century, nor that it exhibited Jacob's foolish conjectures *promisca et* for *permiscet* at iv 101 and *ductantem* for *fluitantem* at 787, as, if Mr Ellis's silence could be relied upon, it did. Mr Bechert however believed as much as he could : he believed for example that at iv 574 the MS agreed with Jacob's text in the true lection *uenenum* for *mouentum*, because Mr Ellis said nothing to the contrary. I was more sceptical, and when I was editing Book i I procured from Rome information as to the readings of Vrb. 667 (probably a copy of M) in several places where I distrusted Mr Ellis's silence.¹ But it will soon appear that I was not sceptical enough.

By the kindness of my colleague Prof. R. Priebsch, of Prof. W. Meyer of Goettingen, and of Prof. Pietschmann, librarian of that University, Loewe's collation of M was sent over to London, without shipwreck or seasickness, in March 1907. I have examined it, and I will now enumerate, not all the discrepancies between Loewe's testimony and Mr Ellis's (for the MS is so ill written that no two scholars could be expected to agree, at any rate without

¹ In one place the information supplied to me was wrong : Vrb. 667, I have now ascertained, gives i 314-316 in the same order as Jacob, and there is no

reason to doubt that M agrees with it and that Mr Ellis's silence therefore is not misleading.

tedious scrutiny and comparison, whether certain characters meant *ui* or *m*, *cl* or *d*, *e* or *c*, *c* or *t*, but all the noteworthy discrepancies. Where the testimony of either is borne out by the agreement of any of the three cognate MSS, V and U (Vrb. 667) and R (Vrb. 668), I shall note the fact. First I give a list of the places where the silence of Mr Ellis is contradicted by the express statement of Loewe.

- i 141 *nec* Ellis sil. : *ne* Loewe (UR).
 172 *prohibentur* : *prohibent* (UR).
 175 *et* : om. (UR).
 275 *caelo* : *caelum* (UR).¹
 365 *tunc* (R, but the *t* seems later) : *hunc* (unc U).²
 540 *quantis* : *et quantis* (UR).
 544 *a* : om. (UR).
 558 *fatum* : *fetum* (UR).
 585 *nobis* : *uobis* (UR).
 631 *sedem* : *sede* (UR).
 675 *ducitur* : *dicitur* (UR).
 730 *curribus* : *cursibus* (UR).
 736 *curru* : *cursu* (UR).
 746 *lumina* (UR) : *limina*.
 762 *uenerantur* (R) : *ueneramur* (U).
 837 *ignis* : *ignes* (UR).
 917 *Roma* : *pompa* (UR).
 ii 99 *si* : *sic* (UR).
 150 *est* : *τ* (*sunt* U, *cuius* R).³
 169 *quod* : *que* (*quae* UR).
 177 *utrimque* : *utrūque* (U, *utrunque* R).
 272 *sorte* : *forte* (UR).
 381 *sex* : *sed* (UR).
 426 *fructibus* : *fluctibus* (UR).
 549 *auersi* : *aduersi* (UR).
 583 *erat* : *erit* (UR).
 630 *uinclum* : *mundum* (UR).
 832 *ducetque* (R) : *ducet* (UV).
 940 *recursus* : *recursu* (URV).
 iii 166 *retinent* . . . *mutant* : *retinet* . . . *mutat* (URV).
 275 *tempore* : *tempora* (URV).
 294 *in* : *nue* (V, *tue* U, *me* R).
 324 *temet praeuerteris* : *tenet praeuecteris* (URV).
 329 *degrediere* : *digrediere* (URV).
 333 *ducentur* : *ducuntur* (URV).
 408 *deducta* : *perducta* (URV).
 425 *steterit* : *steteris* (UV, *steris* R).
 508 *obitus* : *ortus* (URV).
 578 *producet* : *producit* (URV).
 596 *solus* : *solis* (URV).
 607 *per* : *ter* (URV).
 613 *iuuentam* : *iuuenta* (URV).
 626 *pariter* (R) : *parito* (UV).
 637 *brumam* : *brumae* (URV).
 665 *dum* : *cum* (URV).
 674 *capricorni* : *capricornie* (*capricornie* UV, *capricorni* e R).
 679 *aduersum* (RV) : *auersum* (U).
 iv 6 *bonis* : *bonus* (URV).
 17 *hinc* : *tunc* (URV).
 63 *urbes* (R) : *orbes* (UV).
 101 *promisca* et : *permiscet* (URV).
 123 *studia* et : *studii* (URV).
 142 *summittit in astris* : *summit ceteris* omissis (UV, *ipse sumit* R).
 157 *iuuentam* : *iuuenta* (URV).
 212 *limine* : *lumine* (URV).
 245 *munera* (R) : *numera* (UV).
 341 *lucibus* : *lucidus* (R, *luculus* UV).
 455 *par* : *pars* (URV).
 495 *iuncta* (R) : *iunta* (UV).
 574 *uenenum* : *mouentum* (UV, *momentum* R).
 600 *uadosas* : *uadosis* (URV).
 730 *calore* : *colore* (URV).
 787 *ductantem* : *fluitantem* (V, *fluit autem* UR).
 841 *in* : om. (URV).
 879 *nutricia* (RV, *nutritia* U) : *uictricia*.
 v 8 *circum* : *circa* (URV).
 41 *puppis* : *puppi* (URV).
 132 *magni mater* : *mater magni* (URV).
 137 *tamen* : *etiam* (URV).

¹ *caelum* was conjectured by Scaliger and again by Bentley, and was adopted by the few rational editors : by Jacob and Bechert it was not only rejected but totally ignored. It is now seen to be the reading of the family β.

² This reading, '*hunc* subeunt Haedi', may be

right : compare v 357 '*hunc* subit Arquitenens'. So may the next, i 540 '*quantum* . . . *spatium*, *et* *quantis* . . . *finibus*'; and the next after that, 544 '*quantum* *terris* atque *aequore* *signa* *recedunt*'.

³ *uariast* appears to be indicated.

And now, if the reader, after perusing these three lists, will turn back to the first list of all, the list in which I enumerated the obstacles to Mr Breiter's opinion that V has no value independent of M, he will find that those obstacles have vanished away. Nothing remains of them but *attritis* in iii 350; and this, as I said, may be a conjectural emendation, though it is somewhat above V's usual level of conjecture. All the rest repose upon Mr Ellis's account¹ of M, and that account is never once borne out by Loewe's. I accede therefore to Mr Breiter's opinion: V is not an independent authority; it presents no reading which cannot be explained on the hypothesis that V is either immediately or ultimately derived from M.

Indeed U's claim to be reckoned an independent authority is quite as good as V's. Here is a list of passages where U has a true reading which is not in M, or a reading nearer to the truth than M's. Where R, of which I shall speak presently, agrees with U, I record the fact.

i	139 <i>prohibent</i> U, <i>prohibet</i> M.	iv	28 <i>fulmina</i> U, <i>flumina</i> M.
	455 <i>figit</i> U ex corr. (so Scaliger), <i>pingit</i> M.		314 <i>ducitur</i> U, <i>dicitur</i> M.
	829 <i>rediret</i> UR, <i>reditz</i> M.		399 <i>precio</i> U (<i>pretio</i> R), <i>preuo</i> M.
ii	55 <i>gustarint</i> U, <i>gustarunt</i> M.		516 <i>sorore</i> U (<i>sorori</i> R), <i>sori</i> M.
	180 <i>conexo</i> U, <i>cōnexo</i> M.		722 <i>et Syriam</i>] <i>cisyriam</i> U, <i>cisyram</i> M.
	260 <i>unum</i> UR, <i>urium</i> M.		750 <i>et Syriae</i>] <i>e sirie</i> (corr. in <i>et s.</i>) U, <i>e sire</i> M.
	399 <i>ualent</i> UR, <i>manent</i> M.		776 <i>Caesar melius</i>] <i>cesar meus</i> U, <i>caesarque meus</i> M.
	692 <i>possis</i> UR, <i>poscis</i> M.		783 <i>centauro</i> U, <i>centaure</i> M.
fin.	<i>Manili</i> U, <i>Manlii</i> M (?) ²		784 <i>minois</i> U, <i>minuis</i> M.
iii	26 <i>uela</i> UR, <i>uella</i> M.		792 <i>helicen</i> U, <i>helicem</i> M.
	144 <i>miscere</i> U, <i>miserere</i> M.	v	13 <i>heroum</i> UR, <i>heorum</i> M.
	188 <i>ad lunam</i> U, <i>alunam</i> M.		15 <i>cetus</i>] <i>cetum</i> U, <i>cecum</i> M.
	310 <i>foedere</i> , UR, <i>foere</i> M.		46 <i>ortus</i>] <i>portus</i> UR, <i>portur</i> M.
	316 <i>litoreumne</i> U, <i>litoreumue</i> M.		106 <i>corda</i> U (so Carrio), <i>coda</i> M.
	402 <i>tribuatur</i> U, <i>tribuantur</i> M.		426 <i>diducet</i> U, <i>dicucet</i> M.
fin.	<i>Manili</i> U (<i>Manilii</i> R), <i>Milnili</i> M.		

Most of these can be explained as emendations, and many of them are easy emendations: for instance *Manili* at the end of ii and iii could be restored by anyone who referred to the end of i. Some, like ii 180 *conexo*, may be nothing but accidents. iv 776 *Caesar meus*, as I have argued on p. xxx of my edition of Book i, was probably the reading of the Manilian archetype; but its apparition in U seems due merely to the scribe's bad habit of omitting *que*, a negligence which recurs ten lines below at iv 786. One only of these lections is an obstacle to the

¹ Even the strangest-seeming of Mr Ellis's errors, if errors they are, are not inexplicable. *hac geritur* is the reading of M at i 552, and Mr Ellis may have transferred to i 532 his note on that verse. *possidet orbem* ends an hexameter at Luc. i 110 and Claud. in Rufin. ii 451 and I daresay elsewhere, and some trick of memory may have caused Mr Ellis to write down this phrase instead of *condidit orbem* at iv 776. *doceatque* stands in the text at iv 918, and Mr Ellis, like the scribe of *a*, may have repeated it in iv 919

when he meant to write *cogalque*.

Mr Ellis's recently published edition of the appendix Vergiliana supplies a parallel. In u. 534 of the ciris the codex Arundelianus 133 has *sidere* according to the silence of Baehrens but *munere* according to the express statement of Mr Ellis. I have looked at the MS and I find that it has *sidere*: Mr Ellis's eye has wandered to the line above, where *munere* occurs.

² So Ellis: Loewe has imitated the ductus litterarum, and they look something like MANLLI.

belief that U is derived from M: the *ualent* of ii 399. A scribe of the 15th century would have found no more fault with *manent* than Jacob did; and even if by any chance he had tried to emend it he would never have hit upon the true reading preserved in G and L². Nor can it well be supposed that U and R drew *ualent* from G or L² or any other member of the family *a*; for they nowhere show any clear trace of access to that family, unless it be here.¹ But our assurance that *manent* is the reading of M rests upon no statement either of Loewe's or of Mr Ellis's: it rests upon their silence; and until I have definite evidence to the contrary I shall suspect that they have both committed an oversight, and that the reading of M, as of UR, is really *ualent*. To make the double oversight credible let me quote what seems to be another: at v 239 Jacob's misprint *fronte* is passed over in silence by both witnesses, and should therefore be the reading of M; but when all other MSS have *fronde* this is by no means likely.

In R conjectural alterations are bolder and more numerous, and the corrections of modern critics are not uncommonly forestalled. Thus i 194 *natura tibi* (Lachmann) for *tibi natura*, ii 839 *coniugia atque* (Bentley) for *coniugiatque atque*, 877 *exstiterunt* (Scaliger) for *exstiterint*, iv 650 *perinde* (Rossberg) for *perunde*, v 497 *contemnere* (Ellis) for *contenere*, are all in R. At v 479 the true reading *externis* (found also in the Cusanus, a MS of the family *a*) may be an accident rather than an emendation of *hesternis*, for these two words are perpetually interchanged; while at iv 412 it seems to be an accident pure and simple that the *quae sexussurat* of R comes nearer in one particular to the true reading *quas exusserit* than does the *quae sexus erat* of M.

Positive proof that one MS has been copied from another is often unattainable; and the chief strength of the position that U and R and V are derived from M is the fact that among their hundreds and thousands of variants there is virtually nothing against it. Anyhow the superiority of M is so great that the three other MSS are negligible in comparison. To take one point only: each of them omits verses which M contains, and none of them contains a verse which M omits.² In the case of U however there is one phenomenon which amounts very nearly to proof positive. The verse i 744 'quid querimur flammas totum saeuisse per orbem' stands thus in M:

quid querimur flammas totum sciuisse per orbem.

The *eui*, written above by a later hand, is meant to correct *sciuisse* into *seuisse*. In U the verse is

quid querimur flammas totum eui per orbem.

eui has been mistaken for a correction of the whole word.

¹ One delusive example I will remove. At i 697 (*Cassiopeia petens super ipsum Persea transit*) the reading of M is given by Mr Ellis as *Casi^o que pia^e super ipsum persea tangit*, U has *Casiopeia petens ipsum persea transit* and R *Casiopeia petens supra ipsum persea transit*: whence did these two MSS

get their *petens* and their *transit* if not from *a*? Well, Loewe, as I have recorded already, knows nothing of any *tangit* for *transit* in M; and as to *petens* he states that *Cassiopeia petens* is given by M man. 2.

² Except of course that M's first page has now been torn away.

As to the relation between these three apographs of M, they are mutually independent. That R is not derived from U nor U from R is rendered plain enough by the lections from the first 200 lines of the poem given on p. xi of my prolegomena to Book i; but the shortest and simplest way of proving that all three are separately descended from their source is the following. U omits the verses ii 184, 416-419, iii 31, 302, iv 227, 228, 298-301, 456-459, 718, 719, 777, 849, v 403-406, 442, 533, 738, which are not omitted by R or V (except that V does not begin till ii 684 or thereabouts). R omits the verses ii 166-168, 264, iv 638, 639, 894, which are not omitted by U or V. V omits the verses v 52, 488-503, 515 (= 510 Bechert), 550, which are not omitted by U or R.

Of the three copies, U is the most faithful on the whole and R the least. The special frailty of the scribe of U is that he soon takes fright at anything which is not, or does not seem to be, a Latin word, and often, instead of copying letter by letter the barbarous or meaningless forms which he has before him, leaves empty gaps. V is quite undismayed by barbarisms, and is also freer than U from attempts at emendation, except that it frequently substitutes the current spelling of the 15th century for the genuine orthography of M; but these advantages are more than outweighed by its errors of ignorance and negligence. In the last two books however, whether the scribe of U grew more careless or the scribe of V became more expert, the two MSS are much on an equality. The scribe of R was more competent and less scrupulous than either. He deciphered the original with more ease, read it with more intelligence, and emended it with more success; but he also allowed himself wider licence and in consequence has inflicted deeper wounds.

In conclusion I will quote from Loewe's collation a number of orthographical details hitherto unrecorded. They are cases in which it would be inferred from Mr Ellis's silence that the spelling of Jacob's text is also the spelling of M, but Loewe expressly states the contrary. Any confirmation of Loewe's testimony which U or R or V may furnish I will add; but where on the other hand they agree with Jacob's text, as they often do, in exhibiting the late or the customary spelling, I shall not trouble to note the fact, which is without significance.

i 95 *sollercia* (*sollertia* R). 149 ^e*atherias* (*aetherias* UR). 273 *adsuetas* (U). 282 *aetherios* (R, *accherios* U). 392 *ad* (UR). 498 *noces* (UR). 540 *optineat* man. 1. 649 *facilis* (UR). 802 *aetherii* (U). 910 *harena* (U).

ii 31 *cignum* (R, *signum* U). 100 (also 201, 876, iii 48, 241, 244, 297, iv 766) *cum* (UR). 177 *autumnus* (UR). 187 *arquitenens* (UR). 237 *complentes*. 294 *partis* (UR). 441 *Iuppiter*. 504 *arquitenens* (R, *equitenens* U). 582 *umquam*. 639 *conmutant*. 878 *compulsi*.

iii 68 *quicumque* (V). 107 *compositum*. 146 *omnes* (URV). 367 *numquam*.

iv 69 *quod* (URV). 71 *sepulchris* (URV). 89 *breuioris* (URV). 92 *sepulchrum* (UV). 200 *impedit*. 208 *inposuit*. 297 *partes* (URV). 305 *conpendia*. 342 *conponit*. 375 *quod* (R). 540 *umquam* (UV). 550 *inponet*. 594 *expirant* (UR). 774 *inperium* (V). 805 *conplectenda*. 905 *inposuit*. 907 *aspectat* (URV). 915 *adque* (V).

v 47 *substuleris* (URV). 48 *adpulsam* (UV). 112 *numquam*. 231 *artes* (URV). 356 *expectare* (URV). 383 *innurmurat*. 459 *coturno* (URV). 496 *cumque*. 527 *harenas*

(URV). 552 *adstrinxere* (RV). 634 *ecus* (UR, *etus* V). 648 *adtollit*. 659 *caedes* (U). 666 *expectant* (URV). 676 *communem*. 694 *ad* (URV). 721 *sūmota* (URV). 730 *harenae* (RV).

One of these readings has, in its small way, a special interest. F. A. Wolf litt. anal. i p. 61, discussing Bentley's observation on the genitive case of substantives ending in *-ius* and *-ium*, relates that he has employed 'an accurate young man' to read Manilius through and examine his usage. He gives the results of this investigation (which show that the young man was not so accurate as Wolf supposed, for he has overlooked the frequent occurrence of *Aquari* and *Sagittari*); he adds comments of his own (which show that Wolf was not very well equipped for metrical researches, inasmuch as he mentions the absence of *spati* and *consili* as a relevant fact); and his last sentence is this: 'das allersonderbarste ist, dass auch kein *dubii*, *medii* und dergleichen adjective Casus vorkommen'. Now it might already have been seen that this observation, though accurate, was fallacious. It is true that the editions and MSS of Manilius presented i 802 as follows,

altius aetherei quam candet circulus orbis ;

but in the Augustan age the adjective was *aetherius*, and Manilius must have written *aetherii*. We now find this form preserved in U and R and recorded by Loewe as the reading of M. Indeed there are now only two places, i 561 and v 10, where the joint silence of Loewe and Mr Ellis leaves us to infer that M agrees with Jacob in giving *aethereos*. And even their joint silence I distrust, for in both places R, like G at any rate among the MSS of the family *a*, has *aetherios*.

Last of all, out of those places in which M is evidently hard to decipher, and Loewe sees one letter while Mr Ellis sees another, I will mention i 423, where M, instead of the *dubitanit* of *a*, gives *esurcione* according to Mr Ellis but according to Loewe *esurtione*, which is one letter nearer to my conjecture (Class. Rev. 1903 p. 343) *eguit loue*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.