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 Caveat (See Pp. 125–131 and Vol. XVII Pp. 389–394.)

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 04 / May 1904, pp 227 - 228
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209931, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209931

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 227-228 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209931

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

leaders of that older school of critics.—Not of course all agreed, since Hermann recognized it as allowable within narrower limits than the others. I may refer to Spitzner *de Ver. Her.* §3, Hoffmann *Quaest. Homer.* cap. iv. 25, c, where the question is dealt with at some length. I believe that if the conditions which these two allowed were accepted, *plus* that admitted as above by Mr. Tyrrell, all my offences against the presumed canon would be covered, although I may have exceeded due Homeric proportion in their frequency,—riding my hobby a little too hard. Typical examples are

- ε. 272, Πλημάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι καὶ ὀψὲ δύνοντα
Βοώτην
I. 394, Πηλεὺς θῆν' μοι ἔπειτα γυναῖκα γαμέσ-
σεται αὐτός.

Spitzner on this remarks that the imitative fragment of Menander, *ἐγμην ἦν ἐβουλόμην ἐγώ*, shews the antiquity of the reading *γαμέσσεται*; cf. also Eurip. *Med.* 262 *ἦν τ' ἐγμματο*, as preserving the middle voice. To this Hoffmann adds (*ub. sup.* d) 'neminem movit lectio Aristarchi,' which was *γυναῖκά γε μάσσεται αὐτός*, as recorded by Schol. Ven. *ad loc.* It seems to me that Aristarchus must have altered the verse designedly, and did so (*pace viri tanti*) clumsily. I can conceive no other motive than a prejudice against this caesura in the fourth foot. It follows that he may have succeeded by neater alterations in effacing other traces of it. But where the trochaic caesura is followed by a short monosyl. completing the dactyl, e.g. *γυναῖκος ἄρ' ἀντὶ τέτυξο* ©. 163, *θεοῖσι δὲ θῦσαι ἀνώγειν* I. 219, *νεκροῖσι δὲ δέξαι ἄποινα* Ω. 137, the examples are fairly frequent; and here I must leave the question.

2. As regards the galliambic metre, I adhere to the view countenanced by Mr. Robinson Ellis, in his note on Catull. *Attis*, 60 ed. 1889, that it is a development of the ionic à minori in catalectic form,

effected by transpositions or resolutions of the long syllables nearly *ad lib.*, except that the one closing the first half of the line is fixed. Also the doctrine used to be that amidst the vast number of variations on the native form thus admissible, that form was only kept for the first half in v. 54, *ἐτ ἔαρ(um) ὀμνί(a) ἄδирēm*, which I perceive Mr. Tyrrell wants to emend and obliterate; and for the last half in this v. 60, *στάδι(o) ἐτ γυμνάσιis*.

A learned friend informs me that for this last word *guminasiiis* is the form now generally accepted by recent scholars, with a ref. to Varro *de R.R.* i. 55, 4, where it is read with *varr. l.* of *y* or *i* in the first syllable. On this Mr. Ellis remarks, 'it seems doubtful whether *guminasiiis* would have been admitted by Catullus, though L. Müller defends it by Varro' (as above). I certainly share Mr. Ellis' doubt; and when I wrote in my v. 4 *lěvăt ill(e) hōrrisōnōs*, had in my eye this v. 60 of the *Attis*, as guaranteed by, I believe, all the MSS of Catullus. One may also cite for two long syllables concurrent in the last half of the verse, although not in the same places as in v. 60, *cărvicē quătē iūbăm* 83, and *iăm iăm-buē pōnītēt* 73; add *virgultă pēdē văgō* 86.

Mr. Tyrrell censures also my v. 7 *fera dum vocat odia*, paralleled by *Attis* 15 *duce me mihi comites*, and by 50 *patria o mea genitrix*; also my v. 16 *domicilia Persica*; cf. *Attis* 91 *dea domina Dindymi*; as well as others of mine which, I think, after this, I need not mention.

My own belief is that Catullus' ear was really guided in his transpositions of the long syllables or their resolutions, by the cadence of the tambourine with bells—I believe an early form of the instrument. We seem to hear in the long syllables the thump on the skin, and in the short ones the jingle of the bells.

HENRY HAYMAN.

OWEN'S PERSIUS AND JUVENAL.—A CAVEAT.

(SEE PP. 125-131 AND VOL. XVII PP. 389-394.)

I WILL not take an unfavourable specimen of Mr. Owen's reasoning, like the contents of p. 130 b: I will take an average specimen; and in order to avoid any suspicion of picking and choosing I will take the

last sentence of all, which is conveniently brief. 'If O were a mere MS of the ω class, as Mr. Housman contends, it would agree with ω throughout, which it does not.' Now not one known MS of Juvenal agrees with ω

throughout (some MSS, as Monacensis 408, agree with ω even less than O does, and with P even more than O does). Therefore, on Mr Owen's showing, not one known MS is a mere MS of the ω class. Therefore every known MS is similar in this respect to O. And Mr Owen here believes himself to be arguing that O is a unique MS.

Here I should stop, but for one circumstance, of which I think it right that readers should be warned. Mr Owen has an unfortunate habit of saying things which he believes to be true. He says on p. 126 a—

Whereas Mr Housman (Journal of Philology xxi 101 ff., xxii 84 ff.) depreciated the Neapolitanus of Propertius and appreciated four late MSS of the 15th century or thereabouts, and denied the supremacy of the Neapolitanus, which he wished to assign to the 15th 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 12th century, as Keil long ago maintained, and is consequently by far our earliest MS of Propertius.

The reader needs to be told that when Mr Owen says I depreciated the Neapolitanus he is attempting to state the fact that I made the most elaborate defence of the Neapolitanus which is anywhere extant; that when he says I appreciated four late MSS he is attempting to state the fact that I pulled down those four MSS from the elevation on which they had been placed by Baehrens; and that when he says I wished to assign the Neapolitanus to the fifteenth century he is attempting to state the fact that I declared myself totally indifferent to the question whether the Neapolitanus belonged to the fifteenth century or the twelfth. I think I am right in supposing that an incautious student might be misled by Mr Owen's phraseology. Or let me take,—again to avoid any suspicion of picking and choosing,—the very first passage

which he selects for discussion, Persius i 23, where Madvig adu. ii 128 proposed *articulis* for *auriculis*. Mr Owen here makes two statements, which I contradict. He affirms that this conjecture of Madvig was based on a false reading printed in the text of Priscian by Putsche. I affirm on the contrary that it was based on an examination of all the possible meanings of the MS reading, on an exposure of the absurdity of all of them, and on an explanation of the requirements of the sense; and that Madvig expressly stated that he had made the conjecture before he knew of any external support for it, false or true: 'ueram scripturam iam tum coniectura repertam, cum nondum Iahnii apparatu utebar.' Mr Owen affirms that the traditional text of Pers. i 23 was explained by Nettleship in his edition of Conington. I affirm on the contrary that Nettleship did not even attempt to explain the traditional text, and that what he did was to support a particular interpretation of the two words *cute perditus*, words which Madvig did not propose to alter. The issues are simple, the two books are accessible, and our respective assertions can easily be verified or falsified. If Mr Owen's statements are found true, then you are welcome to believe anything he says about me; even when he attributes to me (p. 126 a) an 'avowed disinclination to allow preponderating authority to one MS or group of MSS,' which I conjecture to be his closest possible paraphrase of my remark (vol. xvii p. 390 b) that P is far superior to the whole pack of the other MSS of Juvenal. But if his statements are found false, then I request as a matter of right that when he makes assertions tending to my discredit he may be disbelieved.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

March 14, 1904.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

THE PAULY-WISSOWA ENCYCLO- PAEDIA.

Demogenes—Donatianus.

Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft . . . herausg. von G. WISSOWA. Neunter Halbband: Demogenes—Donatianus. Stuttgart (Metzler), 1903. 1532 columns. 8vo. 15 mk.

IN something like twenty years from now, with a total of thirty volumes, we may

perhaps hope to see the completion of this great work. It is true that in the first volume the estimate was ten volumes and as many years; but as that volume was completed in 1894, and we are now half-way through volume 5, the other estimate seems more probable, especially if we allow for the supplements which are in prospect. None the less, the student who uses the book, the publisher, and above all the editor are to be congratulated on the steady progress, and