

**ASTRONOMICON
; LIBER QVINTVS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649127832

Astronomicon; liber qvintvs by M. Manilii & A. E. Housman

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

M. MANILII & A. E. HOUSMAN

**ASTRONOMICON
; LIBER QVINTVS**

M. MANILII
ASTRONOMICON

LIBER QUINTVS

RECENSUIT ET ENARRAVIT

A. E. HOVSMAN

ACCEDVNT ADDENDA LIBRIS I II III IV

LONDINII
APVD SOCIETATEM *THE RICHARDS PRESS*
MDCCCXXX

The first volume of the edition of Manilius now completed was published in 1903, the second in 1912, the third in 1916, and the fourth in 1920. All were produced at my own expense and offered to the public at much less than cost price; but this unscrupulous artifice did not overcome the natural disrelish of mankind for the combination of a tedious author with an odious editor. Of each volume there were printed 400 copies: only the first is yet sold out, and that took 23 years; and the reason why it took no longer is that it found purchasers among the unlearned, who had heard that it contained a scurrilous preface and hoped to extract from it a low enjoyment.

A preface to this Fifth book shall follow, but first I will take a retrospective survey of the period; and I begin with the question of the MSS.

Of β , the second of the two families, now shrunk to a single representative **M**, I need here say little beyond what will be found on pp. 101 sq. and 104. I have satisfied myself by comparison that **U** and **R** throughout, and **V** so far as it concerns us, are scions of **M**, and I have no doubt that **H**, though I have not read it through, is another. They all proffer its Italian corrections as well as its original text. But, although **M** is thus left alone in the witness-box, the sign β may usefully be kept to denote its lost exemplar, the MS discovered by Poggio; for a vast number of the corruptions in **M** have sprouted from the pen of its ignorant and unpractised scribe and are no part of an ancient tradition.

Of the other family, α , there are three representatives, **L** and **G** and Gronovius' imperfect collation of the lost cod. Venetus. The cod. Cusanus is none. This MS was brought into use by Jacob in 1846 and retained in the apparatus criticus by Bechert in 1900: in 1903 I set it aside, but Breiter, unwilling to learn from one so much younger than himself, brought it back in 1907. It is now gone for ever. As I explain on pp. 102 sq., it is a copy of **L**, and is itself the parent of Voss. 1 and of the first portion of **V**, which therefore follow it into exile.

Of the three surviving witnesses **L** is much the most faithful, and there is no reason to doubt that it was copied straight from α . whereas **G** and Ven. must be copies of copies. The superiority of **L**

as a representative of α is acknowledged by **G** and Ven. themselves, for they much oftener side with **L** against one another than they side with one another against **L**; but it is sometimes further confirmed by the adherence, entire or partial, of **M**, representing α 's brother β . For example: II 958 *consummat LM, consumat G Ven.*, III 635 *status M, satus L, situs G, satis Ven.*, IV 23 *an] ad LM, aut G, id Ven.*, 453 *tu L, tri M, tum G, tunc Ven.*, 489 *septima fertur M, sexta fertur L, sexta feretur G, sexta refertur Ven.*, 524 *dote M, docte L, nocte G Ven.*, 525 *cum profert unda M, profert cum unda L, profert cum uincla G, profert quando unda Ven.*, 580 *babiloniacas sum mersa profugit M, babilonia casum mersa profugit L, babilonias casus profugit G, babilonia casum mutauit Ven.*, 677 *orbes LM, urbes G, orbem Ven.*, V 57 *decuma lateris] deus malateris L, deus mala terris M, summa lateris G, om. Ven.*, 137 *ingenita est] ingeniest M, ingeniem L, ingenium G, ingentem Ven.*, 487 *rorantis] rotantis LM, portantis G, potantis Ven.* Beside these places, where the reading of α , preserved by **L**, was true or close to the truth, there are others where it was false or inferior, but where it is equally possible to see, or reasonable to suspect, that **L** has preserved it, and that any true or superior reading presented by **G** or Ven. is derived either from conjecture or from some source other than α . Such are II 259 *pede G, per de LM, pes Ven.*, 449 *per Ven.*, *fer L, fers M, fert G*, IV 223 *peragrant Ven.*, *perarant LM, pererrant G*, V 41 *rector G, pector M, pectus L, uectus Ven.*, 392 *senibus GM, sensibus L, sensus Ven.*, 403 *merces est parua GM, parua merces est L, parua mercede Ven.*, 407 *mutat GM, mittat L, mittit Ven.*, 525 *imperat GM, imperit L, imperio Ven.*

Before I proceed to **G** I must interpose a narrative.

In 1903 **G** was the sovereign ms. Bentley had called it so; and although he did not treat it as such, but made more use of **V** in restoring the text, his words outweighed his actions, as words generally do, and as they did again when he preached one thing and practised another in his dealings with the Blandinianus uetustissimus of Horace. Jacob in 1846 pronounced it interpolated, degraded it to the third place, and exalted **V** to the first; but he gave no reasoned and ordered proof of his assertion, and succeeding critics * one after another, from Breiter in 1854 to Bechert in 1900, condemned his judgment and upheld the primacy of **G**. Bechert's devotion exceeded all precedent, and **M** stood low in his esteem: 'codicibus ita usus sum, ut a **G** libro in textu constituendo proficiscendum ratus huius codicis memoriam in textum reciperem, reliquorum codicum testimonia non nisi speciosiora proferens. ubi autem **G** lectio

* Ellis in 1891, though placing **G** first, allowed much weight to **V**; and in 1893 both he and Breiter recognised, though not sufficiently, the value of **M**.

deprauata esse mihi uidebatur, **LC** libros arcessiui ; sed ne his quidem sufficientibus adii **VM** libros in extremo potissimum carmine haud spernendos'. But even this idolatry was not abject enough for Vollmer, who in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1900 pp. 1292-4 might be seen defending interpolations and corruptions abandoned by Bechert himself.

In 1903, on pp. xxvi-xxviii of my first volume, I demonstrated the truth which Jacob had in vain asserted, and showed that **G** is a much interpolated ms, inferior in sincerity to **L** and still more to **M**. This is now denied by nobody and only ignored by the ignorant. The revolution was immediate and complete, and the revulsion excessive. In 1904, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* p. 104, Vollmer rose from his knees, renounced his faith, and stamped upon the altar ; nam cupide conculcatur nimis ante metutum. The slaves of words, for whom interpolation is a name of superstitious terror, set to and disparaged **G** as hard as they could ; and incompetent critics, conscious of their own inability to extract truth from interpolated mss, began to insist that it should be used as little as possible. **M** and **L** were now to be the sole authorities ; where they agreed, that gave the tradition ; where **G** in contradiction gave the truth, that was conjectural emendation ; and ' hätte Housman eine Ahnung von Überlieferungsgeschichte ' he would have come to the same conclusion.

If so, my sad deficiency is a blessing in disguise. Unable to soar in the void, I creep upon the earth ; and there I make the acquaintance of stony facts. They teach me, and in this preface I will teach the teachable, that **G** is not merely an independent witness to the text of **a** but much more than that. For the moment however I am considering it in this aspect only, as one of **a**'s three representatives.

The revolution of which I was the guilty author attained its culmination in a boastful article* ' de librorum Manilianorum

* Mr Thielscher made the impression which he desired and had no cause to be dissatisfied with his reception. ' Es war das Verdienst Paul Thielschers, in das Chaos der M.-Überlieferung Licht gebracht zu haben ' said Mr M. Schuster in *Burs. Jahresb.* vol. 212 p. 89. Mr Schuster could not be expected to know the facts, but an editor of Manilius showed equal ignorance : van Wageningen p. iii ' ex iis quae Paulus Thielscher de librorum Manilianorum recensione disputauit, satis apparet omnes illos libros . . . ex uno eodemque exemplari fluxisse ' etc. The obvious truth that the mss of Manilius, as of most authors, are descended from an archetype was demonstrated by Jacob in 1846 and at greater length by Bechert in 1878. That they form two families was demonstrated by Bechert at the same time. The chief novelties in Mr Thielscher's article were the errors which I am about to refute.

recensione' published by Mr Paul Thielscher in *Philol.* LXVI (1907) pp. 106–125, where he undertook to support by theory what Vollmer had recommended in practice. He contended that **G** was a copy of **L** as corrected by **L**². On p. xxv of my first volume I had tacitly and incidentally refuted this theory before ever it was propounded; but it was nevertheless embraced in 1915 by van Wageningen in the preface to his recension: in the preface only, for in his recension itself he treated **G** throughout as an independent authority and sometimes allowed it too much weight. To prove his contention Mr Thielscher on pp. 123–5 selected 75 examples. They are simply examples compatible—though one at least, iv 414, is not compatible—with his hypothesis; and he might easily have cited 750 or 7500. Every one of them is equally consonant with the true hypothesis, that **G** and **L** are derived from a common source; and most of them, being cases of simple agreement, are equally consonant with a third hypothesis, that **L** is derived from **G**. If **L**, as Mr Thielscher supposes, is older than **G**, and this hypothesis therefore impossible, that only makes the futility of such argument more obvious. That **L**'s corrections are not all of them older than **G** he himself admits*; some of them are in fact much later; and one of these he has had the ill luck to include among his proofs of **G**'s derivation from **L**. It is at i 684, where **L** has *positos* with *a* added above, and **G** *positas*: the superscript *a* is in the hand of which I speak on p. 100, a hand of the 13th century or later; so that if, as Mr Thielscher will have it, one is derived from the other, **G** must be the source. This mischance may perhaps bring home to him the truth, which should have been self-evident, that simple agreement between two MSS is no proof that either is derived from the other; and most of his examples are of this kind,—places where **G** and **L**² have the same reading, as III 2 *saltos* **LM**, *saltus* **GL**², or where **G** and **L** have the same reading, as i 520 *puncto* **L**²**M**, *ponto* **GL**. Another such, iv 422 *ponti* **L**²**M**, *christi* **GL**, is paraded by van Wageningen † p. vi, who calls it, heaven knows why, 'ex omnibus grauissimum'; and Mr M. Schuster in Bursian's *Jahresbericht* vol. 212 p. 90 unreservedly agrees with him and says 'dieses eine Beispiel mag genügen'. The argument is that

* About *albanas* iv 639 he is of two minds: on p. 110 it 'transiit in Gemblacensem', on p. 116 it is 'Gemblacensi posterior'.

† Van Wageningen on the same page makes the false and calumnious statement, repeated by Mr Bickel *Rhein. Mus.* 1926 p. 333, that Traube, like Mr Thielscher, held **G** to be an apograph of **L**. Traube was guilty of no such impertinence: he knew that this was a question not for him but for scholars conversant with Manilius. What he said, *Philol.* 1907 p. 122, was what a palaeographer could say without immodesty: that **L** seemed to him, so far as he could judge from photographs, rather older than **G**.

because **G** was not copied from **L** after *christi* had been corrected to *ponti*, therefore it was copied before : that is how we prove that **G** was copied from **L**.

The case would be altered if there were truth in the assumption made by Mr Thielscher pp. 112-5 and swallowed whole by van Wageningen, that the ms discovered by Poggio was the Manilian archetype and that **L** as well as **M** was directly copied from it. But there is none : it is a second hypothesis in aid of the first, and a false one. The number and magnitude of the differences between **L** and **M** make it incredible that they are sons of one sire, and it is easy to show that they are not. Some of their divergencies are manifestly progressive, and have a history behind them. In v 389 Manilius wrote *anguitenens* and the archetype had the corruption *arquitenens* ; but neither the *arctenens* of **L** nor the *et qui tenens* of **M** came immediately from this : *arctenens* came through *arctitenens* and *et qui tenens* probably through *at qui tenens*. In 1 163 the original *saccata* passed straight into the *siccata* of **L**, but into the *fetata* of **M** it passed through such stages as *saccata* and *faetata*. At v 443, where **M** has the true reading *molliter* and **L** the corruption *tollitur*, we could guess, even if Ven. did not preserve *mollitur*, that this had been an earlier step on the downward way. The verse III 7 is given by **M** in its true place and with its true reading, ' non coniuratos reges Troiaque cadente ' ; in **L** it stands between 37 and 38 with *curatos* and *cadentes*. The writer of **L** did not make all these changes : the transposition was an accident, the alteration *cadentes* was subsequent, consequential, and deliberate, the misinterpretation of *ciuratos* was heedless and stupid. How, at 1 517, could the one scribe copy as *zutas uariam* what the other copied as *iunariam exutam* ? Who will believe that when the scribe of **L** twice, in II 172 and 190, had mistaken the abbreviation of *hominis* for *oris*, the scribe of **M**, ' ignorantissimus omnium uiuentium ', twice expanded it correctly ? or that he in the 15th century could decipher *minor ibi toutit* at IV 414, where **L** in the 11th could get no nearer than *minoribus* ? or that the verses IV 10-313, which **L** in the 11th century found standing between III 399 and 400, had returned to their proper place by the 15th century, or were restored to it by the illiterate copyist of **M** ?

That **G** was not copied from **L** I shall prove by evidence of very different validity from Mr Thielscher's ; but before producing the whole of it I may as well decide the question at one stroke. II 153 :

L cernis ut aduersus redeundo surgat in arcum	
G cernis ut aduersus	surgat in arcum.

G has a blank space just sufficient to hold *redeundo*. In **L** *redeundo* is as clearly written as any word in the verse ; it is as plain as print. It is also perfectly intelligible ; though that has no bearing on the question, since **G** is not one of those mss, like Ven. and Vrb. 667, which omit words because of their unintelligibility. The case is clear : **G** was copied from a ms in which *redeundo* was illegible. And there's an end on't : **G** is not a copy of **L**.

L and **G** are not father and son but uncle and nephew. **G** was copied from a ms, I will call it γ , much resembling **L**, which had been

corrected by a hand somewhat resembling **L**². But it had many corrections which **L**² has not, it lacked many which **L**² exhibits, and its corrections were often different from those of **L**²; and the primitive substance of its text was derived not from **L** but from α . For example in iv 318 'extremam *Erigonae* tribuit' **L** has *erigonem*, **G** *trigone*. Neither is derived from the other; they are equidistant from the truth, and point to *erigone* or *erigonē* in the common source.

To determine in such cases the reading of α we can sometimes employ the joint witness of **M** to the reading of the archetype. iv 414 :

M quaque minor ibi touit namque omnia mixtis
G quaque minor namque omnia mixtis
L quaque minoribus namque omnia mixtis.

α had *ibi touit* or something of the same length; γ could not read it and left the proper space; **L** read it wrong and reproduced it in exactly.*

III 432 *munere*] *munero* **M**, *numero* **L**, *munera* **G**. α , like **M**, had *munero*, which in **L** and **G** is corrupted separately and differently.

IV 519 *feminei incedunt nec*] *feminea iuceat nec* **M**, *feminea iace* (space of 3 letters) *nec* **G**, *feminea iacet nec* **L**. α had *iuceat* (as **L**² corrects) or *iaceant*.

IV 894 *mundus in ipsis* **L**, *mundus ipsis* **GM** and almost certainly α ; for it is evidently much more probable that the unmetrical reading was in the archetype and that **L** made the obvious correction, than that *in* was twice omitted. 'Liesse sich etwa zeigen, dass **M** und **G** in Korruptelen übereinstimmen, die in **L** von erster Hand durch Konjektur behoben sind, so wäre ich ins Unrecht gesetzt' said Mr Thielscher *Philol.* LXXXII p. 173.

The many cases—far more than are registered in my apparatus criticus or need to be registered in any—where **GM** agree in truth and **L** is in error are not certain proof of **G**'s separate derivation from α : for it will appear hereafter that **G** has derived true readings from β or some source other than α , and some of its true readings are such as may be due to conjecture. But a valid argument may be drawn from sundry agreements in orthography.

G's orthography in general, compared with **L**'s, is modernised and vulgarised. It tends to assimilate the preposition in compounds where **L** does not, and to give *-es* in accusatives plural where **L** gives *-is*. It is natural to infer that in such places the spelling of α was that of **L** and not of **G**; and the inference becomes more than natural, it becomes virtually certain, in the many places where **M** agrees

* **L**² wrote *ouit* overhead, of which more anon.