

MANILIANA<sup>1</sup>

1.343-4

tum magni Iouis ales fertur in altum,  
*assueto uolitans gestet ceu fulmina mundi.*

assueto *GL*: adsudet et *M*

Housman reads *assueta euolitans*; the former word is a conjecture of his own, the latter a conjecture of Ellis, which I think he would have ignored if the relevant fascicle of the Thesaurus had been available to show that *euolitare* occurs once in Columella and then (if at all) not before the sixth century. If *assueto* is sound, *mundi* must be changed to *mundo* (an isolated variant) or to another noun. Bentley read *mundo*, and this may well be the right solution: the eagle carries thunderbolts to the sky, ‘cui scilicet per diuturnas operas assueuerat’. Shackleton Bailey (1979, 162) emends to *nisu* (on the theory that this fell out after *-mina* and was replaced by the stopgap *mundo*). If emendation were required, I suggest that *motu* would be palaeographically more satisfactory; the assumed process of corruption is well illustrated by 3.82, *motu* GL<sup>2</sup>: *modum* M: *mundo* LV.

1.354-6

## Cassiepia

in poenas *signata* suas iuxtaque relictam  
Andromedan, uastos metuentem Pristis hiatus.

Although he retains *signata* in his ed. maior, Housman admits that the word is meaningless by itself (i.e. without mention of the ‘mark’ in question), and then proceeds to set out three possible solutions, one of which is to emend *signata* to *clinata*, ‘inclined’. In his additional note on p. 107 he has a different suggestion but one which would give much the same sense, in *poenam sinuans ulnas*; in support of this he adduces 2.339, where *sinuata* has been corrupted in our manuscripts to *signata*. I wonder why he did not propose the simple solution of making the same change in our passage: Cassiepia would then be described as ‘curving’ towards her own punishment, which was the exposure of her daughter Andromeda to a sea-monster (*Pristis*); the *-que* after *iuxta* is in effect epexegetic (‘*poenae suae dicuntur quas pro matre pendit filia, siue ipsa filia matris uicem beluae obiecta*’, Housman). This seems more satisfactory than *resupina*, Housman’s final thought on the passage, which he put into the apparatus of his ed. minor and tried to make palaeographically acceptable in his note on p. x of that edition.

1.412–15

tum nobilis Argo

in caelum subducta mari, quod prima cucurrit,  
emeritum magnis mundum tenet *acta* periclis,  
servando dea facta deos.

\* *Agi periclis* nihil est, says Housman, and proceeds to suggest two solutions: 1. *ante periclis*; in his additional note on p. 109 he says that this is the solution which he prefers, but *ante* is quite otiose; 2. *acta lacertis*, which is grotesque if taken to mean that the Argonauts rowed their ship into the sky (this second alternative is not mentioned in his ed. minor). I suggest *emeriti magnis mundi tenet alta periclis*; the

<sup>1</sup> Except where otherwise stated, all references to Housman are to his second edition in five volumes (Cambridge, 1937); I also refer to his one-volume *editio minor* (Cambridge, 1932). References to G. P. Goold are either to his Loeb edition (1977) or to his Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1985). References to D. R. Shackleton Bailey are either to his article in *CQ* 6 (1956), 81–6, or to his review of Goold's Loeb edition in *CP* 74 (1979), 158–69. I am deeply indebted to Professor Goold for commenting in detail on an earlier version of these notes and on others now suppressed.

corruption of *alta* to *acta* is an easy slip (cf. *careant* for *lateant* at 3.277), and the genitives could then have been changed to accusatives to regularize the grammar. For the expression cf. Seneca, *Oed.* 390 *alta caeli*, *Nat.* 7.17.2 *altiora mundi*; Egnatius frg. 1 *altissima caeli*. While on earth, the Argo *tenebat alta* (i.e. what Manilius at 5.420 calls *alta profundii*); now in the sky it *tenet alta mundi* (i.e. *caeli*), a typically Manilian conceit.

1.797–8                      et Cato fortunae uictor, *matrisque* sub armis  
miles Agrippa suae.

Two of the glorious dead who inhabit the Milky Way.

In his note *ad loc.* Housman apparently agrees with Bentley in suspecting *armis*, but that is supported by *miles*. In his additional note on p. 114 his suspicion is, with much greater probability, directed at *matris*, which he tentatively proposes to replace with *factor*; though this has plenty of Manilian point, it leaves the origin of *matris* unexplained, and perhaps it is not surprising that Housman does not mention it in his ed. minor. Shackleton Bailey (1979, 163) also tackles *matris*; he suggests *meritus*, which has the disadvantage of requiring the further change of *suae* to *suam*. I think that good sense can be obtained by the alteration of *matris* to *patriae*; at Seneca, *Contr.* 1.7.8 *patrem* has been corrupted to *matrem*, and *patrimonium* and *matrimonium* are liable to be confused (cf. *TLL* 8.476.27ff.); other words in which initial *p* and *m* are often interchanged are *pons/mons* and *proximus/maximus* (see my note on 3.96–8 below); I would take *suae* in the sense of ‘dilectae’. The resulting phrase reminds one of Lucan 2.519f., ‘quod castra secutus / sit patriae’.

1.827–30                      quod nisi uicinos agerent occasibus ortus  
et tam parua forent accensis tempora flammis,  
alter nocte dies esset, caelumque rediret  
immensum et somno totum deprenderet orbem.

If comets did not disappear so quickly, there would be a second daytime in the night.

Lines 829–30 have not been satisfactorily interpreted or emended. For *immensum* Scaliger’s emendation *immersum* has been generally accepted. With this reading the sense will be that the daytime sky, sunk below the horizon during the night in which there have been long-lasting comets, would return at dawn to find the whole world asleep. But why should the whole world be asleep at dawn? The poet gives no hint, and leaves it entirely to the reader’s imagination to supply a reason; e.g. because, having been kept awake by the long fire-works display of comets, people make up for the loss of sleep by sleeping in. I regard this whole interpretation as fantastic.

Another difficulty is presented by *somno deprenderet*: can *somno*, unsupported by a participle (like *sepultum* or *immersum*), mean ‘asleep’? Housman denied that it could, and altered *totum* to *positum*, a most improbable change. For the same reason Shackleton Bailey (1979, 163) proposes to replace *somno* with *somni*, ‘in the throes of sleep’, but this genitive with *deprendere* derives no support from the passage which he adduces, ‘omnia noctis erant’, Ovid’s witty curtailment of a line of Varro Atacinus.

I think that the fault lies in two words which have not hitherto been suspected, *rediret* and *deprenderet*. I should read *caelumque ruberet / immensum et somno totum depelleret orbem*. *Rubere* is used of comets at Virgil, *Aen.* 10.273, Seneca, *Nat.* 7.17.3 (cf. *rubicundus* at 7.11.3 and 7.15.1), Silius 8.637, Avienius, *Arat.* 597, Claudian, *Rapt. Pros.* 1.233 and *carm. min.* 29.4; the *b/d* confusion is an easy one (e.g. 1.820 *cordibus > torridus*, 4.184 *mandris > membris*). *Depellere* would be used in *OLD* sense 6, ‘force a person to desist from something’; although *TLL* (5.1.565.55) lists Manilius

among the authors who do not use *depellere*, in fact it occurs just above, at 819, where Housman (cf. his p. 119) rightly prefers *depulsa* (GL) to *dispulsa* (M).

Thus *caelumque... orbem* is merely a development of *alter nocte dies esset*: 'during the night there would be daylight which would wake people from sleep'; there is no allusion to the dawn of the following morning.

2.829–30                    hinc inter Graias horoscopus editur urbes,  
                                 nec capit externum proprio quia nomine gaudet.

The *tertius cardo* bears the Greek name 'horoscopus' because 'from that point are measured the hours of day' (3.539), and there is no Latin equivalent.

Housman draws attention to this surprising use of the verb *edere* in the sense of *appellare*, and seeks (p. 128) to illustrate it by Jerome's use of the noun *editio* in the sense of *interpretatio*; but this hardly provides adequate support for *editur* in the sense of *appellatur*. In the single passage which *TLL* (5.2.95.73ff.) finds to couple with ours for the sense of *appellare*, Tertullian, *adu. Marc.* 2.10.2, 'sapientissimus omnium editur [sc. Lucifer] antequam diabolus [sc. factus est]', *editur* means *dicitur* (*fuisse*) rather than *appellatur*. I suggest that *editur* should be changed to *inditur*, the *mot juste* in 'naming' contexts (cf. *TLL* 7.1.1215.60ff.), and *nomen* supplied from the following line; for such a construction see Housman's notes on 2.337 *quiscumque* (sc. *locis* from 338), 3.114–15 *nudantem* and *soluentem* (where it is quite legitimate to supply *iudicem* from 116), 3.158 *permixta* (sc. *membra* from 159; passages from other authors are listed in his additional note on p. 71).

3.96–8                    Fortunae sors prima data est. hoc illa per artem  
                                 censetur titulo, quia proxima continet in se  
                                 fundamenta domus domuique haerentia cuncta.

'Because it contains in itself the chief essentials of the home and all that attaches to the name of home' (Goold). For *proxima* in the sense of 'maxime necessaria' Housman quotes Propertius 1.21.4, 'pars ego sum uestrae proxima militiae', 'I am your close comrade-in-arms' (Butler-Barber), but I do not see how that passage, where the reference is to the *close* relationship between human beings, can lend any support to its use here, applied to the 'foundations' of home-life. I suggest that this is yet another instance of the common confusion between *proximus* and *maximus*; examples at Lucan 10.408 and Velleius 2.110.4 (cf. Ellis's note on pp. 177f.); in the very line of Propertius adduced by Housman there is a minor variant *maxima*.

3.393–4                    a me sumat iter positum, sibi quisque sequatur  
                                 perque suos tendat gressus, mihi debeat artem.

'Let each one take the path laid down by me, and, following it for himself, trace that path with his own footsteps; let him owe the method to me' (Goold). Before Housman it was usual to punctuate after *iter*, not after *positum*, but Housman points out that the usual Latin idiom then requires not *positum* but *sumptum*. He goes on to query the unusual phrase *iter ponere*, and tentatively suggests returning to the traditional punctuation but reading *iter, post hinc sibi*. One wonders why he preferred *post hinc* to *sumptum*, which he apparently did not consider as a replacement for *positum*, although *pos-* for *sūp-* would be another example of that inversion of three letters which he illustrates so copiously in Vol. i, pp. lviff.

3.525–9                    idcirco tanta est rerum discordia in aevo  
                                 et subtexta malis bona sunt lacrimaeque sequuntur  
                                 uota nec in cunctos seruat fortuna tenorem;  
                                 usque adeo permixta fluit nec permanet usquam,  
                                 amisitque fidem uariando cuncta per omnis.

Housman is suspicious of *in cunctos* because it is inconsistent with 529, where fortune is said to 'change everything in the lives of *all*.' Shackleton Bailey (1979, 166) tentatively suggests that *in cunctos* can be retained if the negative is taken with *seruat* (*non seruat* = 'mutat'); this seems very harsh, and even if it is possible the result seems too much of an anticipation of line 529. Goold reads his own conjecture *inconstans*; this is admirable as an epithet of *fortuna*, but one is reluctant to sacrifice *in* with the accusative plural, a construction of which (in its various senses) Manilius is inordinately fond (see Housman's Index, Vol. v, p. 125). I suggest *in uiuos*, the reference being to the commonplace best known from the story of Solon's reply to Croesus: μηδένα εἶναι τῶν ζώντων ὀλβιον (Herodotus 1.86.3), 'neminem, dum adhuc uiueret, beatum dici debere' (Val. Max. 7.2, ext. 2). As for the corruption, both *uiu-* and *cuct-* consist essentially of five minims; it is also possible that there has been an anticipation of *cuncta* in 529, or even a recollection of 4.97 (of *Fortuna*), 'uaga per cunctos nullo discrimine fertur'.

4.3-4                      aeternisque senes curis, dum *quaerimus*, aeuum  
perdimus.

Housman had a good reason for putting a comma after *quaerimus*, not (as previous editors) after *aeuum*. The context shows that the meaning is not 'forfeit length of days by our very quest for it' (Goold) but 'waste our life in the pursuit of gain'; for *quaerere* without an object in the sense of *lucrum quaerere* (4.402) see *OLD* sense 7b.

4.50-4                      quis te Niliaco perituro litore, Magne,  
post uictas Mithridatis opes pelagusque receptum  
et tris emenso meritos ex orbe triumphos,  
cum te iam posses alium *componere* Magnum,  
crederet?

53 te iam *Shackleton Bailey*: iam etiam *codd.*  
posses *GL<sup>2</sup>*: posset *LM*

His victories might have made Pompey a second Alexander the Great, but he perished on the shore of Egypt.

Goold adopts Shackleton Bailey's excellent emendation *te iam* but not either of his fantastic interpretations of the resulting sentence (1956, 84, and 1979, 166). Goold translates 'when you could now represent yourself as another styled the Great', but the exact sense of *componere* remains doubtful. It is likewise doubtful at Lucan 7.266f. (the words of Caesar), 'ipse ego priuatae cupidus me reddere uitae / plebeiaque toga modicum *componere* ciuem'; here it is usual to take *componere ciuem* as an expression like *agere senatorem* or *promisit oratorem*, but I think that Postgate (*ad loc.*) was right in supplying *me* from the previous line. In both passages the general sense of *componere* is 'make (oneself) into', almost a synonym of *ingere*, as at 5.451, 'uultus componit', and 5.456, 'componet [sc. Cepheus]... qui [i.e. eum qui] nutriat'. On this view *alium* = *alterum*, for which usage ('kaum bei den klassischen Dichtern', according to Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr 207 *ad fin.*) see the passages listed in *TLL* 1.1648.70ff.

4.60-2                      toto spectante senatu,  
indiciu dextra retinens *nomenque*, cruore  
deleuit proprio.

Just before his assassination Julius Caesar had been handed a document informing him of the plot against him.

Can *nomen* mean 'the list of the conspirators' (Goold)? Surely it must be used in the sense of *crimen* (*OLD* sense 25), unless indeed it should be emended to *crimen*.

- 4.180–2                    hos habet hoc studium, postes ornare superbos  
pellibus et captas domibus praefigere praedas  
et pacare metu siluas et uiuere †uictor†.

People born under Leo become hunters.

*Victor* is ungrammatical and yields no suitable sense. The most favoured emendation has been the old conjecture *rpto*; Housman approved of this, but did not put it in his text, possibly because he could not explain the assumed corruption. I suggest that *uictor* is a slight adaptation of *uictu*, an explanatory interlinear gloss on *rpto* which has displaced the original; for other glosses see Housman's notes on 1.386 *Caesar*, 2.38 *mundum*, 2.925 *conubia*, 4.467 *uictum*.

- 4.473–4                    et quinta in Chelis et septima inutilis aestu,  
                                  tertia et undecimae decimaeque est septima iuncta.

With good reason Housman is unhappy both with *aestu* (the mention of fire is unexpected in this context) and with his own tentative conjecture *et, septima, inutilis es tu* (this second person is out of place between *est* understood with *quinta* and *est* expressed in the next line). But *es*, or rather a metrically suitable equivalent thereof in the third person, is all that is required; such an equivalent is *exstat* (Manilius uses this verb at 2.877). I regard this as preferable to Gain's *astri*, adopted by Goold, which is quite otiose.

- 4.686–7                    maxima terra uiris et fecundissima doctis  
                                  urbibus.  
urbibus *GL*: orbibus *M*: artibus *Housman*

The *terra* in question is Europe.

*Doctis urbibus* may remind us of 5.475, *doctior urbe sua* (of Menander), but I nevertheless agree with those who query the text. Shackleton Bailey (1956, 85) shares Housman's distrust of it ('quot doctae urbes in Europa fuerunt?') but rejects Housman's *artibus* as 'an almost equally inappropriate introduction to the list... which follows'; he would therefore retain *urbibus*, which indeed seems to be guaranteed by that list (Athens, Sparta, Thebes, etc.), and change *doctis* to *Achaeis*, which I find far from convincing. I desiderate an adjective which can be taken with both *uiris* and *urbibus*, and suggest *notis*, 'well-known'. The insertion of a superfluous *c* before *t* is found already in the capital manuscripts of Virgil (e.g. *Georg.* 1.81 *effectos*, 1.277 *quinctam*, 3.230 *instructo*), so that the progression in our passage could have been *notis* > *noctis* > *doctis*, a progression which is well illustrated by 4.524 *dote M*: *docte L*: *nocte GV*.

- 5.112–14                    in uulnus numquam uirtus sed saepe libido  
impellit, turpisque emitur uel morte uoluptas;  
et minimum cecidisse malum est, quia crimine uictum.

The character of people born under the Kids.

For *uictum* Housman reads *uincunt* and explains 'quia uictoria eorum stupro constat' ('since their triumph is a triumph of vice', Goold). But Shackleton Bailey (1979, 168) has a point when he says that it is not clear just what sort of combat Housman had in mind; he would substitute *iunctum*: 'if the libertine is cut down in the pursuit of his desires, that is a trifling evil because it is conjoined with another and great evil – guilt.' That is too subtle for me. I suggest *quia crimina uiuunt*, 'because,

living, they are a reproach', 'they are a living reproach'; for *crimina* used of persons see *OLD* sense 2b, *TLL* 4.1195.5ff.; at 4.665 Manilius calls the noxious creatures of Libya 'crimina terrae', but an objective genitive is not essential.

5.206-7                      cum uero in uastos surget Nemeaeus hiatus  
                                  †exoriturque canis† latratque Canicula flammās.

I believe that the right restoration of the corrupt passage is not *exoritur candens* (Schrader) nor *exoritur laeua* (Housman) nor *exoritur latrans* followed by *spiratque* (likewise Housman) but *exserit ora micans*. This conjecture was included in *Twelve Emendations of Manilius*, published privately by E. L. B. Meurig-Davies at Oxford in 1946, which has apparently remained unknown to scholars (I am grateful to Mr G. F. C. Plowden for bringing it to my attention). For *ora exserere* cf. *TLL* 5.2.1855.48ff.; similar expressions referring to the heavenly bodies in Manilius are 2.96, 'reddis ora'; 2.923, 'sua collocat ora'; 4.535, 'produxerit ora'; 5.39, 'extulit ora'.

5.461-4                      †atri luxum memorare sepulchra†  
                                  ructantemque patrem natos solemque reuersum  
                                  et caecum sine nube diem ... iuuabit  
                                  dicere etc.  
     sepulchra *LM*: sepulchri *GL*<sup>2</sup>  
     nube *Ellis*: sole *codd*.

One theme of tragic poetry: the story of Thyestes eating his three sons served up to him by his brother Atreus.

Housman prints his own conjecture *uix una trium memorare sepulchra*: 'scarce one burial accorded three', Goold, who explains that 'the burial (incomplete because the sons were not completely eaten) took place in the father's stomach'. Housman (Vol. v, p. xxxiv) claimed this as one of the three conjectures of his which he judged to be quite certain but which 'I can well believe, will make the hair stand up on many uninstructed heads'. I find it quite incredible, not so much because of the far-fetched conceit of one incomplete burial for three sons but on palaeographical grounds: Housman juggles with letter-transpositions in an attempt to show how *uix una trium* became *atri luxum*, whereas I should have thought it clear that *atri* arose not from any such transpositions but from a gloss which identified the story in question as that of Atreus (for such glosses in Manilius see my note on 4.180-2 above); indeed Housman himself much earlier (in 1901: *Classical Papers* 549) had proposed (*gaudebunt*) *Atrei rixam memorare sepultam*. It is therefore pointless to take the letters *atri* as an indication of what the poet wrote. No certainty is possible, but Bentley's conjecture *uiui bustum memorare sepulchri* is far superior to Housman's in sense as well as in transcriptional probability (although Housman queries the combination *bustum sepulchri*): apart from the doubt about whether *una sepulchra* is possible for 'a single grave', there is much more point in 'bodies buried in a living grave' than in 'three buried in a single grave', which is not very remarkable. The same corruption, of *bustum* to *luxum*, has, I think, occurred at Petronius 121, line 110, *pascere luxum*.

5.574-6                      et, postquam poenae causam cognouit ab ipsa,  
                                  destinat in thalamos per bellum uadere ponti,  
                                  altera si Gorgo ueniat, non territus ira.

Perseus, fresh from slaying Medusa, makes up his mind to rescue Andromeda.

'Ira Gorgonem terribiliorem non reddit, quae uultu uel placidissimo inuita necat atque adeo mortua', says Housman, and therefore changes *ira* to *illa*. As an alternative I suggest *heros*, a word which the epic poets are fond of placing at the end

of a hexameter (usually preceded by an epithet); Virgil does so 18 times, including 5.453, 'neque territus heros'. The word was often spelled *er-*; *TLL* 6.2663.74 records one instance of *ir-*.

5.612–14                      perfundit liquido Perseus in marmore corpus  
                                   *maior* et ex undis ad cautes peruolat altas  
                                   soluitque haerentem uinclis de rupe puellam.

After killing the sea-monster Perseus rescues Andromeda.

What does *maior* mean? 'A greater warrior now' is Goold's translation, but that is a very odd thing to say. I think that it is a simple corruption of *uictor*; for the interchange of initial *u* and *m* cf. 1.766 and 4.162 *uictam/metam*, 2.399 *ualent/manent*, 2.630 *uinclum/mundum*, 1.716 *mirantur/uibrantur*, 2.758 *membra/uerba*. One might then query whether *uictor* goes with what precedes or with what follows; the latter alternative is supported by 5.22, '*uictor et inuisae Perseus cum falce Medusae*', but the former cannot be ruled out.

5.707–9                      ille tigrim rabie soluet pacique domabit,  
                                   quaeque alia infestant *siluis* animalia terras  
                                   iunget amicitia secum.

*Siluis*, which can only be a local ablative, does not combine happily with *infestant terras*; as Housman says, we should rather expect *infestant siluas animalia terris* (but that is still not satisfactory, since *terris* is otiose). Perhaps we should look for an epithet of *terras*, e.g. *saeuas*; then *terras* would be used in *OLD* sense 7b, 'lands', 'regions', and they would be called *saeuas* inasmuch as they harbour wild beasts. The corruption of *seuas* to *siluis* may have been partly due to the natural association of wild beasts with woods (cf. Ovid, *Hal.* 49, 'quae densas habitant animalia siluas'). (Housman's tentative proposal of *furiis* for *siluis* is not mentioned in his ed. minor.)

Aberdeen

W. S. WATT