A Reader's Notes & Marginalia

A.E. Housman: Classical Scholar, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 2009, pp. x, 288. ISBN 9780715638088 (Eds.) David Butterfield and Christopher Stray

Darrell Sutton

Published online: 6 June 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2012

Abstract This paper treats the articles as represented in A.E. Housman: Classical Scholar. Since Housman wrote on a wide variety of ancient authors, the numerous areas of expertise in which he engaged are noted and examined by a cadre of scholars who are marked by eminence. Each of these papers is summarily critiqued in the following review-essay. Moreover notation of two distinct pathways toward original studies of Housman's rigorous scholarship are then supplied.

Keywords Textual Criticism · Propertius · Manilius · Juvenal · Lucan · Ovid · Prosody · Classical Scholarship

A review essay of A.E. HOUSMAN: CLASSICAL SCHOLAR, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 2009, Pp. x, 288. ISBN 9780715638088 (Eds.) David Butterfield and Christopher Stray

In the Spring of 2010 I contacted Charles McNelis, book editor for the *Classical Journal*, about the possibility of writing up some brief remarks on the new Butterfield & Stray volume and was promptly but politely notified that the book already had been claimed.¹ Rather than dispense with the notes which were scribbled in the margins during a slow and patient reading, I decided to put them in another

¹It was my desire to make use of the expected published review for this essay, but in an email in May 2011 I was informed by the current book review editor, John Marincola, that he had "no record that the book was ever sent out for review." Moreover, he stated that the book "may have been mislaid or lost" and the volume was not received when the *Classical Journal* offices moved. However, in June 2011 I received notification from him that a colleague had indeed completed a review of the Housman volume and that it would be published soon, even though they still possessed no record of receiving the book.

D. Sutton (✉)
Semitica Language Academy, Red Cloud, NE, USA
e-mail: dssemitica@hotmail.com

form suitable for later inspection. The notes sat for almost one year until I returned to them, having found few reports that covered the salient points more important to me.² Now at a distance of more than two years things are clearer still.

Textual criticism is a continually evolving discipline where competing theories strive for the mastery. This volume aspires to resuscitate the memory of Housman's scholarly achievements, illustrates diverse opinions in scholars' views on him and on occasion offers a new direction for future scholars. In the following remarks no attempt has been made to discuss at length the more than 730 classical texts cited in this volume, a few of which are not found in the *Index Locorum* at the back the book³; my approach is more literary. Nor have I attempted to elucidate the involved micro-narratives associated with each reading. But on occasion I have found space to include some thoughts that I deem relevant to some of the critical discussion.

Recent investigations into the classical work of A. E. Housman have generated a number of innovative lines of inquiry toward an understanding of his intellectual life and thought.⁴ Difficulties abound in studies on Housman. His personality was complex. He wrote on many different ancient authors. To be able to unlock the doors to his understanding of ancient poetry requires a number of interpretive keys, but primarily an astute familiarity with the writings of numerous Greco-Roman figures.

And this is to say nothing of the modern language poets Housman enjoyed and often interspersed throughout his Classical Papers. As for the fantastic myths he believed pervaded the assorted cultures of the ancient Mediterranean regions, he describes them often. With regard to recent evaluations of interactions between the West and East in antiquity,⁵ or of the Levantine civilizations, and varying strands of Mesopotamia and Egypt,⁶ and their influences upon Greece and Rome, he understood little. Notwithstanding, Housman deserves to be read in a new light.

The 2009 volume by D. J. Butterfield and C. Stray (hereafter B&S) no doubt will be a standard reference work for years to come. It preserves traditional types of analysis and examines Housman in the usual way. The picture of him which emerges

² I list the reviews known to me: I. Raphael, *Housman Society Journal*, 35 (2009), pp. 155–160; S. J. Harrison, *BMC R* 2010.03.58; F. Sapsford, *Rosetta: Papers of the Institute of Archaeology and Antiquity* online, 8 (2010); V. Izzet and R. Shorrock, *Greece and Rome*, second series, 57.1 (2010), pp. 157–158; A. Wenzel, *The Classical Bulletin*, 85.1–2 (2010), pp. 87–89; E. Kraggerud, *Classical Forum*, 2 (2010), pp. 107–110, and W.M. Calder III, *The Classical Review*, new series, 61.1 (2011), pp. 321–322; J. Jacobs, *Scholias Reviews*, 20 (2011), p. 14. Ward Briggs, *The Classical Journal Online* (2011), pp.124–128.

³ I.e., 3.13.61–2 (p. 17) and 3.4.21–2 (p. 24) are not listed in the index under Propertius, nor are the Lucan texts: 1.233–5 or 1.223–7 on p. 77. For more examples, see errata near the end of the essay.

⁴ Recent explorations into Housman's thought led to the organization of a 2008 conference at Columbia University entitled, *Forgotten Stars: Rediscovering Manilius' Astronomica*. Papers given at this time were published by Oxford University Press in 2011 under the same title as a volume of essays (co-edited by Steven Green). One of the co-organizers of the event, Katharina Volk, followed up the colloquium with the volume *Manilius and his Intellectual Background* (Oxford, 2009), an academic investigation of the poet. This volume was subsequently reviewed by Alexander Macgregor in *American Journal of Philology*, 131.1 (Spring 2010), pp. 162–167.

⁵ For definitive studies of these influences, see M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford, 1999) or Walter Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern influence on Greek culture in the Archaic Age* (Cambridge MA, 1998).

⁶ At times Housman displayed a remote acquaintance with the work of archaeologists and Egyptologists: i.e., H. Schliemann (1822–1890) on p. 105 *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, vol. I (hereafter cited as *HCP I, II, III*), W. M. Flinders Petrie (1853–1942) and J. Duemichen (1833–1894), noted in a review of P. de Labriolle, *Les Satires de Juvenal*, in *HCP III*, p. 1195.

in these pages, in my opinion, is soulless, though thankfully without a nimbus. There is much original material that is not esoteric or academically dull, but there are only fragments of original scholarship that present a synthetic image of him as a modern Poet-Classicist at work on the texts of ancient Greek and Roman poets; or of a Classicist-Poet who filled his own poetic verse with allusions to the myths of Greece and Rome. He is observed closely as one who studies manuscripts, thereupon proceeding to demonstrate how the mistakes of one manuscript are to be corrected by the better readings of other manuscripts or by conjecture.

One initial question, upon which I will not dwell, is: where does B&S fit within current discussion on A. E. Housman?⁷ I presume that an educated reader making his first acquaintance with Housman, who may be unfamiliar with his classical work, might put down B&S in the belief that, in his critical work, Housman wrote on not more than seven or eight ancient poets and that somehow he thrived among academics within a hostile scholarly environment that was always evolving. The latter point is true but the former assertion is dubious; nevertheless this general impression is substantiated by the internal design of the book's contents.

Physically it is an attractive volume and well put together. It is firmly bound and stitched, pages are bright-white, complemented by a nice sized font, and it is handy, not burdensome to hold as one reads it. The picture on the cover of cap and pen atop a desk overlaid with volumes of books amid a somewhat cluttered scholar's office gives an indication of the necessity of study and of the decency and congestion of the scholarly life. Below is the table of contents and the list of the distinguished contributors and their chapters. I have numbered my remarks following the 'contents' section; also, amid my comments on selected statements, I normally include (in parenthesis) the B&S page numbers to which I refer.

Contents:

Introduction: C.A. Stray

Part I. Housman the Scholar

1. Housman and Propertius S. J. Heyworth
2. Housman's Manilius E. Courtney
3. Housman's Juvenal R. G. M. Nisbet
4. Housman, Lucan, and Fraenkel S. P. Oakley
5. Housman and Ovid's *Ibis* G. D. Williams
6. Housman on Metre and Prosody D. J. Butterfield
7. Dust and Fudge: manuscripts in Housman's generation M. D. Reeve

Part II. Housman's Scholarly Environment

8. Housman and R. C. Jebb: intellectual styles and the politics of metre C. A. Stray
9. Housman and J. P. Postgate N. Hopkinson
10. Housman and W. M. Lindsay D. J. Butterfield
11. Housman and A. S. Hunt L. Lehnus
12. Classical Scholarship in Housman Correspondence J. H. C. Leach

⁷ The literature on Housman is immense. Older methods that treated his emotional poetry and less than irenic papers in too sterile a way are now criticized, displaced by speculative post-modern attempts to reevaluate his motives and passions.

Part III. Housman's Legacy

13. Lessons learned from a Master G. Luck
14. 'For we are also his offspring' E. J. Kenney
15. Housman's Cap and Pen J. Diggle

C.A. Stray begins with a succinct six-page introduction to the volume.⁸ It is informative and sets the historical stage by bringing the reader closer to Housman's era, wherein the reader will encounter a variety of esteemed scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Stray cites Housman's inaugural lecture (p. 2) for its distinctive descriptions of the contrasting scholarly styles found within Cambridge and Oxford: here we soon discover that Housman's perception of "literary appreciation" as an "erroneous tendency" is labeled an accurate depiction.⁹ Whether or not Stray concurs with Housman is unstated.¹⁰

I have no doubt that there are a number of learned men and women yet who concur with Housman's disapproving remarks. There are also not a few persons who perceive the existing dichotomy between critical analysis and critical appreciation to be irrelevant to, and unworthy of, scientific fields where focused literary studies are in demand.

Literary critics, like Harold Bloom, who has written appreciably on what are considered by some the "great books" of the Western Canon, might find it strange today that "erroneous" is attached to this branch of critical analysis. Even the late classicist Bernard M. W. Knox (1914–2010) would have found the "erroneous" assertion debatable. The former director of Harvard's Center for Hellenic Studies saw the need for deep penetrating analysis, critical thinking and even some general publicizing of the history of classics in order to maintain a healthy interest among cultivated and educated citizens¹¹: a class of people, Housman, with his firm convictions, tended to ignore—except when he was cultivating his gardens of poetry.¹²

⁸ There is a three paragraph preface of material (pp. vii–viii) which expresses the editors' concern over the "confused state" that exists surrounding the present study of Latin literature. Moreover the editors highlight the need for "a more accessible introduction ... for those justifiably curious." Included in the second paragraph of the preface is a summary outline of the three sections that form the content of the book, along with acknowledgments and a dedication in the third paragraph.

⁹ If one were to read a statement like this prior to a leisurely read-through of Sir Richard Jebb's (1841–1905) volume, *The Growth and Influence of Classical Poetry* (Boston, 1893), it would leave a reader wondering how aesthetic examinations of texts ever found a publisher more than a century ago. On the other hand, if a reader were to pore over Jebb's volume first, and afterwards took up Stray's wording and contemplated it more fully, one would wonder how it is that classical scholars—in their dispassionate interests—have fallen so far and away from engaging in masterful techniques of scholarship alongside an elucidation of the beauty and grace of classical texts.

¹⁰ Stray's own published works within various hallowed fields of classical scholarship are pacesetting, furthering historical inquiries into earlier periods with a just appreciation for the past's ever unfolding histories.

¹¹ For his distinguished achievements, Bernard Knox was selected to be the Sather Professor in the years 1962–63 and lectured on *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* and was also selected to be the Jefferson Lecturer for the National Endowment for the Humanities (1992) for which he spoke on "The Oldest Dead White European Males"; see his *The Oldest Dead White European Males and Other Reflections on the Classics* (New York and London, 1993).

¹² Fortunately Housman's ideal of what a classicist ought to be or how he or she should work provides no overarching influence in modern times. In textual matters, Housman, indeed, was a generalist. But to study his work from perspectives which lay outside his traditional arenas of research, his edicts seem confining and narrow. He hardly developed a critical eye for edifying masses of learned folk.

This debate swings back and forth in print.¹³ It does seem that the art of dispassionate writing has won out, especially since classical chairs wholly dedicated to an aesthetic exegesis of the original languages of Greco-Roman classics may scarcely be found in any country¹⁴; but this is appropriately rounded out by the millions who are presently reading Greco-Roman classics-in-translation. Stray's introduction also offers a brief assessment of what the reader will encounter in the forthcoming pages.

Part I

- 1.) In the first paper, S. J. Heyworth provides a well-written account of Housman's studies in Propertius. From the library of Housman, Heyworth supplies an overview of 10 of his privately annotated editions (p. 13). This kind of detailed data formally alerts a student to how Housman criticized and/or affirmed (p. 12) the efforts of other editors, and I found these treatments to be most helpful. Published for the first time, also, are many new conjectures of Housman otherwise unknown to modern critics. Heyworth wishes that some of these conjectures had been known to him at the time he published his Oxford Classical Text (p. 20). On the same page he contends that the "complexity of the structure" of the stemma for which Housman argued was "implausible as well as wrong." Right and wrong ascriptions are generally out of place in the current critical climate for textualists. The difficulty of proving a reading's correctness is overcome solely by personal opinion. Though stated, no data is offered to prove Housman's error nor does Heyworth refer to other locations where this thesis is confirmed. Disputes over the superiority of one manuscript over another are permanently encircled by subjectivity. I am not convinced that Housman displayed "a lack of attention to historical data" (p. 20).¹⁵ The "complexity" of his procedure, as I read him, stems from his cursory treatment of the stemmatic schemes of Baehrens, Solbisky, Plessis and Weber.

The evaluations of textual matter in this chapter, and in the others to follow, excite interest in but two ways. (1) Cases made for the addition or subtraction of various conjectures is often based upon the eloquent line of defense of one's thesis and the forceful attack upon another's; consensus develops and this leads to the settling of various linguistic problems. Given the critical nature of scientific study, one century from now Propertius' text will be what it is today, unstable.¹⁶ Succeeding generations rarely trust the outmoded genius of their forebears. (2) Jotting down Housman's many conjectures, and comparing and contrasting those to modern conjectures certainly has an historical value all of its own.

¹³ It is a debate in which combatants in this genre are as feisty and as heady as those persons who stand for or stand opposed to the old ideal of requiring young students to enjoy or endure Greek and Latin composition courses.

¹⁴ A possible redress of this unfair situation may be the recently inaugurated A.G. Leventis Chair of Greek Culture, currently held by Paul Cartledge of Clare College, Cambridge.

¹⁵ The historical survey and study of variant readings he performed in his three articles 'The Manuscripts of Propertius {I},' in *HCP I*, presents sufficiently acquainted with the problems of transmission of these manuscripts.

¹⁶ As Heyworth says in his "Preface" to *Sexti Properti Elegos* (Oxford, 2007), p. vii: "any edition must therefore be seen as provisional, a contribution to a continuing debate."

On p. 22 Heyworth oddly labels Housman an “amateur” in the early years of his scholarly work. This too was clearly the attitude of D. R. Shackleton Bailey,¹⁷ and Heyworth places his feet squarely in the same footprints.¹⁸ On p. 25 he states further: “If Housman’s Propertius had been published, it would probably have made no difference to his reputation as a classical scholar, and little to the editing of Propertius...” Heyworth’s supposition was that the conjectures Housman made and his arguments “appeared anyway.”

After decades of work on the manuscripts of Propertius, Heyworth’s judgments are routinely sound but I found this assessment to be peculiar and, from his writing, could detect no compelling proofs for his suspicion. If this line of reasoning is true, then why, more than a century later, does Heyworth now find it necessary to concern the reader with a report of Housman’s unskilled adventures in Propertius? If it had made it through to press, undoubtedly Housman’s edition of Propertius would have been hailed as new and revolutionary for its time. He saw the need for the text’s thorough revision, and my conjecture is this: despite the excellent Greek papers he published as a young man, I maintain the belief that it was his 1887 paper, “*Emendationes Propertiane*,”¹⁹ on the text of Propertius which opened the door to his translation to the University of London in 1892.²⁰

What now seems to be a mainstream view posited of Housman is questionable in light of how his textual criticism was viewed by the late 1880 s. Although profundity attends a number of Heyworth’s arguments, his final section on the poetry of Housman and Propertius is a nice conclusion. For he shows familiarity with Housman’s poems,²¹ and of Housman and Propertius, he

¹⁷ Writing of Housman’s early work on the text of Propertius, for *Grand Street*, 4 (1984), D. R. Shackleton Bailey noted: “It was surely a brilliant though immature performance”; reprinted in his *Selected Classical Papers* (Ann Arbor, 1997), p. 337.

¹⁸ On p. 12 Heyworth quotes F. H. Sandbach as remarking that “he was not convinced that *any* of the early conjectures were necessary.” All this should be treated with extreme caution since comments issued by credible scholars on the youthfulness of another have a tendency to become the “canon” by which a scholar’s work is measured. Whereupon the quality of a critic’s textual criticism is downplayed, not because it is elementary in quality but because the critic is junior in age. Whether or not this was the case here is doubtful but I think there may be a loose connection in some remote way to A. S. F. Gow’s comments in his *A. E. Housman: A sketch together with a list of his writings and indexes to his classical papers* (Cambridge, 1936), p. 11: “The reader who turns from Housman’s later work to this will think it immature.” Gow was referring to Housman’s earliest 1882 paper on Horace. But I believe this thought has overspread all his earlier submissions. Few would see it so simply, and although I am sure to be opposed on this point, this seems to me to be the crux of the matter here, and other places in print when I have encountered summations on Housman’s early conjectures.

¹⁹ Originally published in *The Journal of Philology* (16) 1887, but now republished in HCP I, pp. 29–54—on the exact date of the publication of this paper, see Heyworth’s comments at n. 1. Early on Housman exhibited a unique ability to perform exegesis in the wide-ranging spheres of higher criticism. Since so few of his accomplished peers could operate, critically, in the dimensions in which he functioned, in his young adult years he was rightly recognized for his talent and eminence. This is evidenced by the testimonials that accompanied his application to the University of London for a professorship in either Greek or Latin.

²⁰ His 1888 article “The Agamemnon of Aeschylus” was, too, a celebrated piece.

²¹ The present popularity of Housman’s poetry owes some of its fame, not to the uniqueness of its literary value (in form and metre) only, but also to reductionist critics who esteem his verse for those purported gay allusions which are often eisegetically read into his poetry; and at times, depending on who is reading and interpreting, may be extrapolated from some contexts in his lines of verse. Since the sum and substance of these allegations are always derived from unverifiable beliefs, to see Housman’s scholarly achievements routinely and unequally yoked to the accumulating hearsay is distracting and seemingly less than professional by academic standards.

notes their “willingness to make poetry of the physical effects of death” to be “the most important shared characteristic” (p. 23): especially intriguing since most studies on Housman the classical scholar stand aloof from his poetic contributions.²²

- 2.) In E. Courtney’s paper, “Housman and Manilius,” we are treated to an historical overview of Housman’s connection with a poet somewhat marginalized in ancient and modern times.²³ This chapter proposes a conflict in Housman’s use of “lies” (p. 32) and his use of “truth” (p. 40) and fosters in the reader a desire to hunt up the facts for one’s self.²⁴ Courtney’s reticence to enter academic debates in which he confesses to an “untutored eye” and “lack of expertise” (p. 37),²⁵ could never impair his judicious comments, which soon follow. The criticisms throughout the paper are strong, suitably grounded by his fastidiousness for correcting Housman’s pronouncements. In my opinion, this is the most persuasive paper in *Part One: Housman the Scholar*.

But permit me to address one cavil and to issue one caveat. On p. 34 Courtney and Butterfield offer an enlightening reconstruction at V.461. And if I understand them correctly, *triplex sepulchrum* is submitted by Butterfield and *alui* is suggested by Courtney. But in light of Manilius’ subject matter, I am not

²² Greco-Roman citation and allusion are often manifest in Housman’s poetry (e.g. *Shropshire Lad* LI; *Last Poems* XXV; *More Poems* V).

²³ “Not a single contemporary or later Roman writer mentions Manilius,” so Katharina Volk on the first page of her 2009 study: *Manilius and His Intellectual Background*. Fast-forward to the 21st century, and a random selection of undergraduate and graduate and PhD reading lists from numerous classics departments will contain the so-called heavyweights of ancient Greco-Roman literature; but if you are looking for selections from the *Astronomica*, Manilius will be conspicuously absent; even though the first 75 to 100 words of his introductions to each book are worth their weight in gold on any critical scale (e.g. *Man.* 4.1–121). The prefatory remarks overflow with notation on the genre of poetry and the giants of Greek and Roman myth. Further on, one quickly discovers that the technical pronouncements of this starry-eyed poet are full of stylistic examples of celestial influences on the lives of humans. Manilius’ poetry merits the attention of all students possessed with inquisitive minds who want to grapple with the artistic merits of predestinarian theologies, or with the sundry ways that men and women of old received and enhanced their beliefs; indeed, of other texts displaying ancient theologies, the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, which consists of spells cast by man in order to influence his activities in the afterlife, should be a book that commands a student’s attention, but it is altogether a book of another order. Manilius wrote for those still breathing, whereas, the *Book of the Dead* is a compilation of materials whose meanings are useful only for those who have expired.

²⁴ Courtney laments the moral overtones of Housman’s criticisms and finds them out of bounds. I agree, but would quickly add that Housman deemed J. F. Jacob to be a “liar” only in the sense that in his 1846 edition Jacob misunderstood readings often and then, inadvertently and, at times, purposefully (as Housman interpreted the action) disclosed his delusions to readers. The “morality” question is of little concern now; for what one person today might regard as an immoral, literary convention, another will laud as ethical according to another set of modern, literary ideals.

²⁵ Courtney actually says (p. 37): “The astrological portion of this (and of the introductions) will unfortunately have to be passed over here because of the lack of expertise of the present writer.” But permit me to state the position of another expert. W. Hübner, in his article, “Tropes and Figures: Manilian style as a reflection of astrological tradition,” in *Forgotten Stars: Rediscovering Manilius’ Astronomica*, pp. 141–164 at p. 143, asserts: “It is indeed a fundamentally incomplete approach to deal with Manilius, as so often happens, without paying attention to his investment in the astrological lore.” Moreover, in an email note, Hübner informed me that the aforementioned quote is a redaction (made without his approval) of an earlier thesis which he put forward—which called in question the whole volume as it stood—a statement whose force has been lessened by the changes. His original wording stated: “It is dangerous to deal with Manilius, as it often happens, avoiding his astrological lore” (cited from p.1 of his lecture notes on “tropes and figures...”, given at Columbia University in 2008). Painting with much broader strokes, Quintilian assumed that without some knowledge of astronomy (i.e., the rising and setting of the stars), one would read ancient poets without any understanding: *Inst.* 1.4.4.

particularly attracted to this solution. Their suggestions do raise some subjective questions, which most likely will produce answers inductively derived from how a reader interprets the style of writing under review. He or she might ask: "will the change add any significant meaning, and/or does it plausibly stitch together the original thoughts of the ancient author?"²⁶

I still feel inclined towards the decision of G. P. Goold on this matter.²⁷ "Paleographical sleight of hand" was mentioned (p. 34) as a considered cause but where are the evidences of any alleged trickery? On p. 35 the first paragraph proceeds without the clarity needed for such an intense discussion, equivocates here and there so that the Latin citations, parentheses and the like, all run together and is at times harder to follow than it could be.²⁸ Manilius' language here, *vivi bustum memorare sepulcri*,²⁹ retains distinctive contrasts: life/death

²⁶ Naturally, "significance" is a personal matter for an editor of texts. In one way, both editor and translator are in pursuit of one common goal: deciding what words to put forward. For the editor of a text, it is the on-going process of evaluating and determining which words to print in his or her edition. For the translator, it is the attempt to choose the precise words (for transferring meaning) he or she wishes to manifest before a reading public. Each entails many private moments of indecision that eventually give way to one's own peculiar judgment and decisiveness. In Housman's papers, he typically rehearsed for the reader all the delinquent ways of ancient scribes. In this way, a construct was erected which made it all but a necessity that a newly constructed critical edition of an author would be needed. I am unconvinced that this technique will fall upon hard times anytime soon. Times have changed very little, and now, in some ways, I believe this method to be detrimental to the talents of this generation of scholars. We might ask: is there still a need to denigrate a former edition in order to justify the appearance of a new work? Since, in many instances, scholars continue to privately reach for their old standby when they are in a pinch, but generally cite the newest published edition in scholarly publications. Or, is it possible for a new edition to stand on its own in the public arena on the basis of the critical acumen of the scholar who has been selected to revise it? Too many of the older volumes deservedly received demerits from scholars around the world, but in the last four decades mildly critical texts have been established and translations issued and scholarly introductions created; and the "significant" and the "insignificant" margins of doubt in damaged texts have yielded much ground to new and innovatively critical analyses.

²⁷ In his notes on *Man.* 5.461, Housman marshals a substantial amount of evidence for his claims. But, in the field of textual criticism in general, the extant readings of most manuscripts are too often disproportionately weighed against one another or denigrated in order to be ignored. Some details will require further analysis. Textual conjectures, as a rule, are provisional at best, and all too often are exploited to a point of diminishing returns. So one definitive statement can never be written. As with all critical texts, variant readings and conjectures will remain unresolved until a consensus forms: in which case, the proposal is only worth the value of the critic's opinion who advances it—in some ways the value of it is noted too by the number of people who oppose it. More often than not, classical texts require a good deal of grammatical and lexical patchwork and intuitive faith, but regarding suggestions for the revised and remodeled V.461 (mentioned above) I remain unconvinced. Thyestes, too, I believe, would find them indigestible.

²⁸ Further back on p. 34, Goold is noted for his translation "to tell of scarce one burial accorded three." However, I was unable to find a reference for this citation in the text or the footnotes.

²⁹ Translated by G. P. Goold as: "To tell of a burial in a living grave," *Astronomica*, p. 339, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA, 2006). Manilius expresses himself less cavalierly when reciting tales of mythic origin; in other words, his astronomical material is described so thoroughly that one would assume that the average reader of his day could possess only the slightest inking about his luminary interpretations. Manilius does display significant exactitude with Greek and Latin materials. And on this concern, of the devouring of one's progeny, I am of the measured opinion that Goold's revision, although not an intertextual allusion, is a suitable illustration of a "living/grave" image recorded in numerous ancient texts, e.g. *Lucr.* 5:993: "*viva videns vivo sepeliri viscera busto*;" on the other hand, it should not be presumed that "*bustum*" {or "*sepulchri*" } is an obstacle to, nor out of place in, the original language of Manilius' description of Thyestes' consumption of his offspring: e.g. *Ov. Met.* 6.665, "... *seque vocat bustum miserabile nati*." This is a *locus conclamatus* as noted at 5.461 in W. Hübner's commentary: *Manilius "Astronomica" Buch, V* (Berlin, 2010), vol. II, p. 278; a full listing of suggestions is presented, with various names of scholars who were "for" or "against" specific readings. Housman's conjecture: "*vix una trium*" is only one of many attempts to improve this text.

and light/dark concepts. Both of which, I reason, are needed to buttress the essential meaning of *caecum sine nube diem*³⁰ for the narration that follows.

The caveat of mine is unrelated to the arguments of the article, but is an unintentional oversight of what I perceive to be one of the main weaknesses of Housman's *Manilius*' volumes: his lack of acquaintance with and usage of the elements of Assyriology or cuneiform astronomical texts. Courtney forthrightly states (p. 41) that Housman "falls behind that {the supposed flawlessness of Madvig's *De Finibus*} in dispassionate analysis of problems..."—perhaps. However, his sufficient but limited knowledge is on full display in his commentaries.³¹ And it is preferable to be able to recognize when an unnecessary irruption is pounding on the door, seeking entrance into a sensible line of thought.

- 3.) R. G. M. Nisbet's article is republished essentially as it was in its earlier form: "On Housman's Juvenal" in *Illinois Classical Studies* 14 (1989), pp. 285–302, except that the opening remarks in the paper prepared for this new volume indicate his most recent interactions with Housman's work on the text of Juvenal and bring his efforts up to date. There are a few eye-opening notes in the beginning pages.³² In this regard, his critical eye is not jaundiced as he scans the text. He sees the weaknesses in Housman's conjectures and poses some witty solutions. He even makes many of them secure.

³⁰ Translated by Goold as: "The darkness of a cloudless day." The force of the four Latin words of line 463 are lessened, it seems to me, if the preceding contrast dissipates.

³¹ In my view, a handful of Housman's conclusions never would have escaped the realm of imagination, and found their way into print, had he been familiar with some of the Babylonian or Egyptian astronomical texts. And a number of his comments in his Latin commentary were inaccurate at the time he published them (I hope to illustrate this in a future paper on Housman's labors on the text of *Manilius*). However, these places of error remain invisible to Greco-Roman scholars who do not read outside their area(s) of specialization. In the past, Orientalists had been acquainted quite well with Greek and Latin languages and texts; this is not the case today. And unfortunately, this disinterest towards acquiring control of Near Eastern material remains mostly true to fact for contemporary classicists. But B. R. Foster, Laffan Professor of Assyriology and Babylonian Literature at Yale, affirmed in print: "The Languages of Mesopotamia and Egypt could be read with some confidence by 1860," in *Imagining the End: Visions of Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle East to Modern America*, ed. A. Amanat and M. T. Bernhardtsson (London, 2002), p. 23. Courtney writes on p. 41 of the "wide-ranging richness" of the content of Housman's analyses. This is true as far as it relates to Greek and Roman writings; but for *Manilius*, the background texts of Near Eastern studies that need to be known to interpret the *Astronomica* were disregarded entirely by Housman. I can only wish that Housman could have inclined his ear to the words of Benno Landsberger (1890–1968), the eminent Sumerologist of days gone by, who stated decades ago that "every educated person knows Akkadian just as he does Greek or Latin," quoted on p. 6 of *An Adventure of Great Dimension: The Launching of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* (2002) by Erica Reiner, published by the American Philosophical Society.

³² On p. 48, at *Juv.* 6.157 Nisbet mentions Housman's conjecture, *gestare*. Just prior to pronouncing it the best emendation ever made in Juvenal's text (top of p. 49), he notes Housman's theory of conjecture: "that the plausibility of a conjecture does not depend on the number of letters changed" (p. 48). Housman wrongly insisted on this and it was one of his numerous shortcomings. His denigration of the science of paleography (e.g. as W. Lindsay performed it) cost him much in the way of restraint. And as is obvious from his classical papers, Housman's willingness to emend texts knew no bounds. But even more dangerous for scholarly spheres today is a setting where Housman's "theory" is embedded in the thoughts and minds of textual students of lesser genius who might take a seemingly deficient reading and defile it even more when and where it is not needed. The number of letters in individual words does create problematic schemes. If it is a misspelled word, correcting it involves a number of delicate procedures, particularly knowing how to spell the right word correctly.

He mentions a cult of Housman,³³ “so pervasive” years ago (p. 45). But from what went before and from what follows, it might have been more forthright to declare either that, when Nisbet was a younger scholar, he was unable to see Housman’s shortcomings or that he took note of Housman’s many shortcomings, but a desire to stray far from his brand of polemics in print prohibited him from engaging in Housman’s type of vitriol. Neither of the two positions detracts from the quality of Nisbet’s scholarly work on Horace’s texts.

He closes by stating that it is difficult to avoid the cult of Housman’s personality (p. 61), that is to say, nothing of Housman’s is sacrosanct, and eulogies should uncover his weaknesses, as well as affirm his strengths. Nisbet’s article is sound. His views stimulated discussions, connected difficult passages, and his conjectures made it possible to enjoy and make better sense of Juvenal’s satire.

- 4.) S. P. Oakley’s extended essay on “Housman and Lucan and Fraenkel” is arguably the best written and constructed essay in the book. There are nine sections and an appendix. In section III he lists the relevant lectures Housman gave on Lucan between the years 1912–1921. By giving cursory details of Housman’s declamations, he filled in a significant gap in my knowledge.³⁴ What is more, greater elucidation of the facts of Eduard Fraenkel’s biography in section V would not have elicited a complaint from me either.³⁵ The publishing of Housman’s letter, dated 27 December 1926, to the Sir F. Macmillan (p. 67) shows Housman’s bravado in full swing.

The bulk of the essay is taken up with various divisions in section VI (pp. 68–82). Fraenkel and Housman are compared and contrasted in sub-sections on manuscripts, explanation of the text, re-punctuation, and choice of reading and choice of conjecture, Housman’s own conjectures, deletions and abuse. Oakley states on p. 69 that Housman saw clearly that truth could “lurk” in any “primary witnesses.” But *any available witness* might be a more accurate designation of his critical use of manuscripts. Hating “best and worse” ascriptions, he built his own theories upon the collated efforts of editors whose work he generally despised.

³³ This is a notion that ran aground some years ago, at least in my mind. It was formerly carried forward by an informal group of Housman admirers who were led by their noses to and fro by the academic winds of discussion which spiraled about in print and in the academy. But what really is meant by the phrase “cult of Housman”? Are we to believe that this is a formal subscription to a meaning in a Latin sense: does it relate to the caretakers of a personage who exists only in myth—preserved by a small group who seek to appease the memory of one that is not physically present? Few critics would knowingly enroll their names for submission to such a group. Although only a few decades old, The Housman Society is certainly dedicated to preserving Housman’s memory (along with the memories of his family members), albeit in a critical sense, hopefully. On the other hand, there are numerous professional societies given to preserving someone’s contributions to society at large. Nonetheless, it is doubtful that Nisbet is defining “cult” in the pejorative sense of the word, in which case one’s disciples continue to promulgate the heresies of their founder. After all, Housman’s critical work is not popular on account of its heresy; its lasting value is on account of its perceived orthodoxy, which resulted from his freethinking. I am willing to speculate that as long as there is a field of textual criticism for Greek and Latin studies there will remain a “cult of Housman,” because both young and old enjoy critically engaging with his work on knotty textual problems.

³⁴ It would be helpful to read Oakley’s essay alongside D. J. Butterfield’s “Housman’s Cambridge Lectures,” *Housman Society Journal*, 35 (2009), pp. 122–148, in order to construct a fuller image of Housman the lecturer.

³⁵ For more on this, see “Eduard Fraenkel” by Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones in *Blood for the Ghosts* (Baltimore, 1982), pp. 251–260.

In section VII, it would have been helpful if Housman's reply to Fraenkel could have been translated and placed in a footnote. Then, from section IX (n. 89) given Fraenkel's genius and Reeve's sense of recall, we must ask: is it fashionable now to believe Mommsen was the "greatest classical scholar since Scaliger"? It is a nice historical note but this verdict seems somewhat inflated, like P. Shorey's thoughts on Jebb (see below "Housman and R. C. Jebb"). Undoubtedly Fraenkel would have had his own reasons for praising Mommsen. Maybe the reasons, (if known) should have been placed in a note too.

- 5.) In "Housman and Ovid's *Ibis*," G. D. Williams summarizes his undertaking with an astute set of introductory remarks. For section one, Williams wants to "sample the prevailing climate of scholarship" which "provoked Housman's contributions..." In section two, a "closer appraisal of Housman's three articles" on the *Ibis* is provided; and in section three, he assesses the "consequences of that transformation for later scholarship."

Williams has an eye for detail and responsibly interprets the matter assigned to him. Although Robinson Ellis' (1834–1913) 1881 edition³⁶ is mentioned on p. 95, Williams curiously does not make use of his Latin introduction or the *prolegomena* (pp. xix–lxiii). It contains material which is suitable for an attempt toward rebutting Housman's numerous criticisms of Ellis' intellect.

The comments of Gilbert Murray (1866–1957), cited in his obituary remarks on Ellis (pp. 95–96), possess a remarkable irony. Murray says of Ellis: "He was not characteristically a scientific scholar." The foregoing remark, and many others made by Murray of him, would later prove self-inflicting and would be leveled against him by none other than Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, in his Jane Harrison memorial lecture at Newnham College, Cambridge, on February 8, 1980.³⁷ Williams notes Ellis' hand in the Oxford University Press' refusal to publish Housman's *Propertius* (p. 100). It should not be surprising to anyone that Housman would have been offended by this. He was an easily offended human, and his writings and marginalia run over with scathing remarks directed toward those scholars whose views rubbed him the wrong way.³⁸

In n. 12 on p. 112, Benjamin Jowett's (1817–1893) letter to Miss Nightingale, opens the window on Ellis' insane mental state, and, I believe that the circumstances around Ellis' attempted suicide add weight to Housman's putative judgment of him. Williams views S. G. Owen's (1858–1940) words closely and even-handedly shows how Housman's dismissal of Ellis' "literalist approach" places the *Ibis* in the category of fiction (p. 109).

Housman's final verdict on the *Ibis* is, for the most part, the standard dogma presently. However, today there may be grounds for a new reading which permits the likelihood of fluctuating degrees of truthfulness. Most socio-cultural readings today are psychological to a fault; and exegesis from the vantage point of the reader might allow a myth to be defined as "a man's

³⁶ The 1881 *Ovid: Ibis* by Robinson Ellis has now been reprinted as a Classic Edition by the Bristol Phoenix Press (2008) with a new introduction and bibliography by G. D. Williams.

³⁷ See the essay Gilbert Murray in *Blood for the Ghosts: Classical Influences in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, by Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, The John Hopkins Press, (1982) pp. 195–214.

³⁸ For instance, he attacked literary poets too. See A. E. Housman's "Comments on Morris, Masfield, Wilde, Douglas and Saintsbury," *Colby Library Quarterly*, 4.11 (1957), pp. 194–201.

imaginative understanding of reality.” In this case the obviously false becomes virtually true.

- 6.) In *Metre and Prosody*, D. J. Butterfield offers the reader an original study that aids the mind to some new aspects of Housman's analysis of ancient metre. Multiple poetic pieces are cited for further analyses. Butterfield goes so far as to highlight the auto-didactic nature of Housman's learning in this specific area (p. 117). And he never takes the reader beyond what the evidence will permit. This is a highly refined essay, elaborated with great care, and, as such, the coverage is full and highly technical throughout; certainly beyond the bounds of the “accessible introduction” genre mentioned in the preface. I do think that a curious person who is steeped in metric learning will find here innumerable shafts of light.³⁹

As I read the whole of the essay, I found myself distracted by Butterfield's stated objective on the opening page: “I shall address the primary areas in which Housman contributed to the study...” On account of this I was looking forward to a reconstruction of Housman's methodology or a technical analysis of how he had influenced specific “areas” in the field of ancient poetry. My misreading (of the above stated goal) has led me to believe that “primary texts” would have sufficed in the place of “primary areas.” Included are plenty of illustrations of Housman's divergences from other critics.⁴⁰

Housman's contribution to the study of ancient metre and prosody is a mixed bag. Butterfield notes at p. 122 a “partial uncertainty” displayed on occasion by Housman; but as a comparison, I believe that Housman's uniqueness in its effect on modern metric and prosodic studies at the turn of the twentieth century is still dissimilar to the influence of Noam Chomsky's on the entire field of linguistic grammar study at the turn of the twenty-first century, although not less accurate.

Housman was selective concerning what modern editors he attacked,⁴¹ and mildly eccentric in one area of choice: the types of poetic stanzas over which he would wage war. I am much inclined to Butterfield's thoughts found in n. 12. My own suspicion—from working through Housman's prosodic work—is that Housman preferred to labor on what he perceived to be vocal sets of verse: that is to say, auditory performance texts (and specifically, how they would be received

³⁹ In reading through the entire essay I have the impression from its design that Butterfield, like M. L. West in his *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), adjudges metrical study to be a fruitful branch of literary history.

⁴⁰ Two of Housman's papers should be noted at this point: “Prosody and Method {I},” in *HCP III*, pp. 1114–1126, and “Prosody and Method {II},” *ibid.*, pp. 1136–1146. The former paper is more or less a rebuke of Theodor Birt's (1852–1933) critical enterprises and the latter paper highlights the misinformation which Housman believed was carried forward by Erklart von Gustav Friedrich. Strengths and weaknesses are to be noted in these papers. (1) Housman was a wide ranging reader; (2) he attempted to verify an author's references, and (3) his keenly critical eye spotted variations in literary styles of ancient writers. However, he seldom put forward his own notions on their own merit (especially in prosodic and metric matters) apart from publishing extensive criticisms of other views—i.e., Housman's private remonstrance's against Friedrich are noted by Butterfield in n. 53. And he tended to do no more than declare his disagreement with another's views. He generally denounced as “wrong” all competing conjectures and emendations.

⁴¹ See Stray's article below for an assessment of Housman and Jebb's printed disputes over metrical issues.

acoustically⁴²) and generally sought to restore the ancients rhythmic sequences so that each syllable or sound would be consistent for the oral reader and listening audience.

A guided survey of Housman's criticisms in his younger years along these lines reveals three noteworthy things: (1) he loved to treat longer poetic texts of the ancient world that possessed a varied tradition and history, with problems traceable to medieval scribes, (2) he enjoyed readings that were a part of a larger and grander scheme of narrative events, and (3) he spent ample time emending texts which were ensconced in tapestries of myth; this is in contrast to the many diverse measures he used when reading ancient prose.

- 7.) M. D. Reeve illustrates his accrued knowledge and his expertise in "Dust and Fudge: Manuscripts in Housman's Generation." Presumably the title is inspired by two quotations: one by Housman concerning *Ueberlieferungsgeschichte*⁴³ (p. 141) and the other by Wilamowitz⁴⁴ (p. 145). This is a praiseworthy piece: a formal treatise, densely worded, suffuse with keen editorial perceptions and comparative philological schemes. Housman has long been admired by few and deprecated by most for his personal views on, and lack of attention to, manuscript collation. Reeve explains why (pp. 144–146), and displays a remarkable range of learning throughout as he analyzes texts of both Renaissance and modern editors.

On p. 139 Reeve raises several objections to an overlooked proposal by Housman at Cat. 64.237. At issue is the reading *aetas prospera*. Reeve gives a few alternative proposals in the body of the text such as *Avancius—sors prospera*; *Lambinus—fors prospera*⁴⁵ and *Baehrens—lux prospera*.⁴⁶ But one wonders why there is a need to obliterate *aetas* as a distinct point of time

⁴² Housman stated, "no type of lyric metre is better known to metrists than the dactylo-epitrite: its nature is simple and its relics are abundant: they form more than half of Bacchylides and Pindar," in *HCP II*, p. 466. Housman did limited work in this arena of study, as Butterfield's article attests; but Housman's accurate statement reflects what he observed and mentally noted while reading through poetic texts.

⁴³ This is cited from Housman's *Lucan*, p. xiii, in which he declares that "*Ueberlieferungsgeschichte* ... is a longer and nobler name than fudge."

⁴⁴ Deploing the desire of some to hunt for long forgotten manuscripts, Reeve portrays a Wilamowitz who "had no relish for a diet of library dust": n. 53.

⁴⁵ Peter Green's volume *The Poems of Catullus: A Bilingual Edition* (Berkeley, 2005) has *fors prospera*.

⁴⁶ Reeve cites Housman (n. 3) accusing E. Baehrens (1848–1888) of having "imported ten times as many corruptions as he removed." This was a prevalent view among some that appeared to take wing and fly immediately in the wake of Baehrens's death. In his review of *A Commentary on Catullus* by Robinson Ellis, but writing of Baehrens, H. Nettleship (1839–1893) stated that his "recent death is a loss to Latin philology..., much of his work was hastily done, ... many of his proposed emendations were unfortunate, his paleographical judgments have sometimes proved erroneous; but his views on the MSS of Catullus seemed to have been virtually accepted by every scholar of note...": *The Academy: A Weekly Review of Literature, Science and Art*, XXXVI (July–December 1889), p. 240. Baehrens displayed less confidence in his own conjecture (*lux prospera*) when, in my opinion, it possessed a stronger merit of originality than the other plausibly submitted renderings. From a historical perspective, the varying degrees of tension evident between British classicists and their German colleagues at that time makes it difficult to disentangle individual motives. And varying historical accounts of differences in national perspectives concerning right and wrong definitions of what true critical scholarship consists in make it harder still to comprehend. All these things taken together demand the above dogmatic assessments of Baehrens should be suspended until all his innovative comments have been considered and compared to a host of other critics of his day.

(*tempus*) in the present context.⁴⁷ In this same discussion Reeve makes use of a Latin commentary by Bede—on Acts 28:11—for his explanations of historical corruptions. In his arguments, he inserts historical vignettes, using eight of his longer and shorter non-English citations—which are not translated—and he inspires the reader to assess manuscript witnesses for one's self.

As an act of tribute, in the final sentence of the essay he advances the status of the distinguished Latinist A. C. Clark (1859–1937), encouraging future editors to esteem the “Clark model” as a worthy exemplar in critical work. A contemporary critic alongside Housman, Clark was a capable editor and—like Lindsay (mentioned below)—immersed himself in the study of manuscripts.⁴⁸

Reeve's submission is designed along quite different lines from the other papers in Part I, and the essay is in need of some reorganization: a few division markers or section headings would have been helpful to the reader traveling these corridors with him. There is material of significant interest in this paper. But because of its present form and the uneven arrangement of its contents, the wide variety of texts discussed is less interesting than it should be.

Part II

- 8.) Sir Richard Jebb's (1841–1905) reputation has declined little since P. Shorey's (1857–1934) 1919 conference lecture, in which he declared Jebb to be easily first of all European scholars since the Renaissance.⁴⁹ In the light of the recognizable merits of numerous classicist figures of Jebb's time, few would consider that pronouncement to be a safe bet or would have a willingness to place their wager with Shorey today, least of all, C. Stray. His essay on “Housman and R.C. Jebb: Intellectual Styles and the Politics of Metre” is an assessment of a scholarly duel between two scholars of radically different temperaments and abilities: Jebb, the more genteel in his deportment and Housman, the fearsome warrior—with pen.

The problems are these: (1) Jebb's semi-defensive tone makes him appear weak, even when his work proves otherwise; and (2) the much more complicated matter that a well-read critic today would not judge Jebb's published work to be as scientific in its criticism as Housman's papers. Housman thought of Jebb as a popularizer, as is stated on p. 167. Stray says Jebb “exemplified the high

⁴⁷ At Cat. 64.232; 64.322, and 68.43 the senses are similar. Thus the need for *aetas... mandata* in lines 237–8 is useful as a compliment for the interpretive contexts of the wanderer in the *mandata...aetas* construct of line 232.

⁴⁸ To observe general differences in the scholarship of A. C. Clark and A. E. Housman, one could do little better than to contrast Clark's 1921 lecture, “The Reappearance of the Texts of the Classics,” read before the Bibliographical Society on 21 February 21, with Housman's August 4, 1921 lecture, “The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism,” read before the Classical Society in Cambridge England.

⁴⁹ The whole quotation says “in what may be called the virtuosity of scholarship Jebb is easily first, not only in this group but of all European scholars since the Renaissance,” in *Classical Studies in America*, 1 (1919), pp. 33–61.

cultural ground occupied by late-Victorian Hellenism” (p. 163).⁵⁰ Although the statement is true, again, its appearance reflects a trendy but contradictory affirmation of what is commonly known as “popular” and/or “academic” discourse.

Housman had a tendency to accuse others of a lack of correct judgment⁵¹ and independent insight, when, quite often, he too—with a bit more imagination—appropriated the wisdom of others and applied it in his debates. This was a deft and unavoidable trick that is rarely noted or proven by examiners of Housman’s papers. But Stray is able to see Housman’s links to J. H. H. Schmidt. Therefore, kudos to Stray for following the clues and stating the facts in this timely article.

- 9.) “Housman and J. P. Postgate” is the first of two papers (Butterfield’s “Housman and W. M. Lindsay” is the second) that outline two oft overlooked figures in Latin studies. Academic squabbles can seem trivial in hindsight. So little, by way of “how to behave in print,” is ever learned; if nothing else, all the quibbles are entertaining. Both men were in possession of lives comparably formed for their later duties. Hopkinson rightly infers that the one labored in the shadow of the other—citing J. P. Postgate’s (1853–1926) later bitterness (p. 183) at Housman’s Cambridge election.

The high esteem in which Housman is still held by critics makes it all but impossible for other scholars of his day to be viewed according to their own merit—and not assessed according to Housman’s published criticisms. The good that Postgate accomplished could have been portrayed on a greater canvass and with much more material. Today his published volumes and articles could be depreciated only by individuals whose remarks are firmly based on reading him with Housman’s scandalous words echoing in the room.

One substantive point of note should not go unnoticed: after establishing the timeframe, Hopkinson alleges there is the possibility of some influence derived from the Housman/Postgate controversies of the mid 1890 s—on the composition *A Shropshire Lad* (p. 179). All literary critics and theorists of Housman’s poetry should smile on this point. Hopkinson’s thorough research opens a new avenue for approaching the origins of these important poems. One can only hope that the designated money Postgate left for the publication of his papers finally will be spent. They deserve much better than the obscurity in which they presently reside.

⁵⁰ The collected writings of Sir Richard Jebb have been reissued in several volumes. One wishes still that modern critics could display the wide-ranging depth and perception he often packs into a single page of material. Jebb’s critical eye brightens the corners of Ancient Greek literature and lifts the dramatic actors to an ideal place; and the old notion of using the ancient Greeks as modern exemplars does not seem to me as uncritical in its application as some presently believe to be the case. Modern behavior theories could benefit greatly from the study of ancient cultures.

⁵¹ Prestige and honor offered no protection from Housman’s judgments, and his interactions in print with D. S. Margoliouth (1858–1940) are proof of that. He was a Classical scholar and Orientalist, whose work Housman proceeded to dismantle in his 1888 paper “The Agamemnon of Aeschylus” (p. 56), reprinted in *HCP I*, pp. 55–90. Unlike Jebb, Margoliouth was recognized worldwide for his linguistic skills and textual work, elected a Fellow of New College in 1881; from 1889 and onwards he distinguished himself for the next 48 years as the Laudian Professor of Arabic at the University of Oxford.

- 10.) In “Housman and W. M. Lindsay,” by D. S. Butterfield, we have a detailed and studied paper which draws up similarities between the two scholars. The paper is extensively annotated with 116 footnotes. He paints a vivid portrait of the two characters, Housman and Lindsay (1858–1937), who were both in possession of attractive personalities. But as events are unfolded in Butterfield’s paper, one can see that each of the two men’s magnetic appeal too often repelled the one from the other.⁵²

Lindsay needed this article since so few are aware of his mighty contributions to critical scholarship in the study of manuscripts and paleography.⁵³ Now though, having read through this paper *in toto* several times, it is still doubtful, in my mind, if any remaining disciples of Lindsay will join hands in harmony with the students of Housman over the issues of conjectural (or what Lindsay believed to be a sort of “imaginative style of emendation”⁵⁴) criticism.

Instructive are the notes on p. 202 which forthrightly affirm the necessity of conjectures (this is not a reference to “emendations” in the strictest sense of the word) in an edition if it is to be considered “a critical edition.” One would be hard-pressed today to find noted scholars who would venture to take up a newly issued edition of a classical text, observe the critical apparatus with all its variant notes, wade through a judicious but long-winded history of the its transmission, and then deem it suitable for critical study, if it lacked text-critical conjectures.

⁵² The differences between Housman and Lindsay seem to me to be far more exaggerated than they are laid out here. I believe the moat which separated the two to have been deeper and wider than most now tend to believe. In one way, Lindsay was a better classically trained scholar, for he possessed in his scholarly toolbox all the essentials needed to be an effective Celtic and Sanskrit scholar. He deprecated conjecture because he was of the belief that a textual critic’s vocation was to discover original, authorial readings among consentient manuscripts at hand, and where concord was lacking among them, to return to them again and compare manuscripts with even more scrutiny. Add to this a keen mind for unraveling medieval manuscript traditions and an unparalleled thirst for those watery sub-streams flowing out of the fountains of archaeology and you have all the ingredients necessary for a perpetual conflict with an eminent classicist of Housman’s mold. Housman had little respect for “how” one had been trained. He often depreciated the scholarly abilities of the professors in the university in which he studied as a youth; he attacked his peers who were the contemporary scholars of his own day; and he did all this while amassing a set of “critical tools” so refined that his arguments are to this day hard to overturn: so Nisbet, p. 60, on his Juvenal: “... Housman’s decisions are difficult to refute”. Differences between Lindsay and Housman were great. Housman knew nothing of Sanskrit and/or cared little for parading in print any other language developing in the spheres of philology during his day—he had no academic use for most published opinions of men as he was attempting to repair Greek and Roman readings of manuscripts! His mind catalogued readings from manuscripts like a machine; he remembered many stylistic difficulties he observed in print, and when the manuscripts contradicted one another, he sought to solve the difficulty rationally through conjecture. Even so, “hunches” of this type rarely require the ancillary disciplines of paleography or epigraphy. Thus, Housman and Lindsay were at odds in too many specific ways to note here in print. Their perspectives made reconciliation on vital points difficult on account of their scholarly training and mature presumptions.

⁵³ “W. M. Lindsay left a huge footprint on every area of Latin research,” so says John Henderson (p. 212) in a brief but valuable statement on Lindsay and the scholarship of Isidore, which is an appendix in *The Medieval World of Isidore of Seville: Truth from words* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 212–213. Moreover H. D. Jocelyn has written up an extensive report on Lindsay in “Aspects of Nineteenth-Century British Classical Scholarship,” *Liverpool Classical Papers*, 5 (1996), pp. 99–135.

⁵⁴ These are the descriptive terms he used of Lucian Mueller (1836–1898) in the article, The emendation of the text of Nonius, on p. 47, in *The Classical Review*, Volume 16, Number 1, (February 1902), pp. 46–52. This brief paper is only one of many papers that illustrate Lindsay’s method’s when emending texts.

For good or for ill this is the present state of affairs. However if it was composed in the vein of Housman's *Lucan*, presented with a sort of diplomatic text with all the trimmings of extensive commentary, it might fare better when reviewed by other experts in the field. Nowadays, any distrust of the science of 'conjecture'⁵⁵ is an evident proof that one is unable to think critically or approach an ancient text in an objective way. On this point, Lindsay stood firmly against some of the foaming tides of textual divination which were caused by Housman's many tremors.

On p. 205, Butterfield cites Lindsay's note "Housman has at last made good" and believes the statement ("if the report is accurate") to be an indictment against Lindsay's ability to judge the importance of scholarly work which lay outside his own field. I must issue a mild protest at this point. Having built up Lindsay's academic credentials in the first section of the article, then having carefully made a case for the angst which existed between these two, it would seem that more than these two words "at last" are needed to impugn Lindsay's powers of discernment and to find him guilty of longstanding academic malfeasance.

In truth, I believe, he grudgingly extended some deserved praise for a *Lucan* edition that was extremely well done. Lindsay's judgments as they pertain to the capabilities of his peers are available online and in many other forums.

- 11.) When one arrives at the chapter entitled, "Housman and A. S. Hunt," the reader naturally expects more of what has already been encountered in chapters 8–10. Luigi Lehnus, however, surprises us with eleven short notes by Housman which were previously unknown. They treat matters of grammar, punctuation, syntax, translation, poetics and even myth. Returning to the editor's objective of a "more accessible introduction," I think that some brief historical comments on each note would have lessened the heavy loads of contextual curiosity some readers (this reader included) might have borne as they read through the memoranda.

Most striking to me in all the assembled notes are the congenial tone and the extensive assistance Housman provides to A. S. Hunt (1871–1934); and this behavior stands in stark contrast to the reputation for scorn of others which usually attends the mentioning of Housman's name. This notoriety was gained

⁵⁵ From Lindsay's writings it may be deduced that he never would have judged conjecturing to be anything other than guesswork. His lamentations against the new science of "how to substitute hunches or strong intuitive feelings for truth" have their roots in his discontent at having to work through the manuscripts of editors who very often adjusted ancient texts as they saw fit—or to suit their own needs. His volume, *An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation: based on the text of Plautus* (London, 1896), is quite unique. And it comprehensively covers Lindsay's methods of correcting corrupted readings. I am unsure that Housman could have written the detailed critical introduction to the book. Well known was Housman's dislike for the clerkish work of "collation," which alone provides extensive materials for annotations that are unavailable apart from comparative studies (see Heyworth, p. 22). Like Housman, Lindsay, too, was familiar with all the major contemporary critics of their day, but Lindsay's knowledge of manuscript histories and their transmission was wider and broader, I believe, than Housman's. Differences in scholarly technique and reserve are balanced only by their erudition and the weight of their arguments. Since Lindsay's academic language was much less vitriolic than Housman's, he was not considered to be the fearsome or loathsome character that Housman became known to be, and thus was challenged in ways that differed markedly from how Housman was engaged with in print.

by rigorous method and exhaustive accuracy; and all this is still somewhat overshadowed by his many deplorable critiques of competing authors.

As to the question of Housman's knowledge of Greek, with which we are faced on p. 224, I find it disheartening and I believe it to be kindling for a fire that was wrongly lit. For a small group of people this topic now seems to be a new burning bush with divine appearance aflame, and while some are intrigued by the warmth of these discussions, a few may wonder what other criticism will be heard in the voices of truth emanating from this shrub.

For some reason or other, more and more people are being led by some muse to mount an attack here.⁵⁶ Questions surrounding Housman's skills were answered more than a century ago. His articles on Greek authors in his *Classical Papers* are not mere juvenilia. They display a lucid and facile, if not totally dependable, mind at work in the understanding and exegesis of the subtleties of Greek terms. The idea that he was better equipped to handle Latin texts rather than Greek texts is a longstanding belief.⁵⁷ Possibly the new notes presented here by Lehnus will help to confirm its irrationality.

- 12.) "Classical Scholarship in Housman's Correspondence" by J. H. C. Leach brought an interesting close to part two—"Housman's Scholarly Environment." Letters and other forms of contact invariably contain a few worthwhile nuggets here and there. Leach contends "Housman's correspondence yields rather little about the scholar that is new" (p. 241). This may be true but the flashes of insight manifested here and there are still worth at least one look. There are notes to H.E. Butler (p.230); to J. W. Mackail (pp. 231–233); to G. Murray (p.233); and to J. D. Duff (p. 235), among others.

Regarding Bacchylides' Ode—the all-famous dithyramb: *Od.* 17.88 (p. 236)—the frustration is based on how one adjudges the relationship between Minos and Fate on textual grounds.⁵⁸ Are they in conflict with one another or are they working in tandem? Housman's positive statements are not only decorous, they can be precisely measured. The universal rejection of Housman's *katouron* mentioned on p. 237 only highlights the difficulties which attend the settling of parlous disputes in interpretations.

Housman, in his indifference to Kenyon's 1897 *editio princeps*,⁵⁹ is relying on his own reading of the text of the papyrus.⁶⁰ Whether Jebb is right and Housman is wrong—or vice-versa—does not depend on a universal

⁵⁶ This notion, too, must somehow be rooted in comments written up by A. S. F. Gow. When Housman was asked why he "his early work had been so impartially distributed between the two languages, he had ceased to write about Greek," he is said to have stated because "I found that I could not attain to excellence in both": see Gow, *A. E. Housman*, p. 15.

⁵⁷ One standout example of Housman's expertise in Greek language is his article "On the Paean of Pindar," in *HCP II*, pp. 763–769.

⁵⁸ For more detailed data and expansive background on this, lines of thought to which neither Leach nor I may pursue in this context, see Jacob Stern's dated but richly worded paper "The Structure of Bacchylides Ode 17," *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 45.1 (1967), pp. 40–47. Also, for an up-to-date discussion, see D. Fearn, *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic tradition* (Oxford, 2007).

⁵⁹ See *The Poems of Bacchylides* (Oxford, 1897). Housman interacts with Kenyon's conclusions in his metrical study of Bacchylides: see n. 34.

⁶⁰ See Housman's paper "[Bacchylides] Ode XVII," in *HCP II*, p. 462

recognition of the merits of one or the recognized demerits of the other. Each critic eventually must choose a side on which to stand on a textual matter.⁶¹ Housman insisted on the necessity of coherence and sense in this particular context of the journey, although it still has not attained the approval he desired.

It would have been nice to have the long 1934 Latin letter to Otto Skutsch (1906–1990) available in this volume (p. 237). And it was nice to know of his inquiries to A. C. Pearson (1861–1935) “on a point of Greek” on p. 240. The private correspondence published here disavows any pretence to omniscience he had built up through his published classical articles. Housman was also adept at being disarmingly cordial in some of his correspondence,⁶² arousing surprise and provoking anger at his published remonstrations on the work of some of his correspondents. Those who were the butt of his attacks must have felt betrayed at times.

Having come to the end of all the critical papers in Parts One and Two, one might conclude there was an unstated rule not to translate any foreign terms or phrases for the reader.⁶³ In a volume of this type, with its focus group being the “justifiably curious” (see p. vii), this procedure raised not a few questions and left them unanswered. The importance of translating is underscored by the fact that translations enable the author to check his impressions of what he believes a text declares.⁶⁴

Part III

“Housman’s Legacy” is a collection of reminiscences offered by three eminent critics. The first is “Lessons learned from a Master” by Georg Luck. The second is by E. J. Kenney entitled, “We are all his offspring,” and the third by J. Diggle commenting on “Housman’s Cap and Pen.” In Stephen Harrison’s BMCR (2010.03.58) report on this volume he thought that this part of the book was “perhaps redolent of the old cult of Housman.” That is an overstatement of the worth of the “cult” and surely undervalues what has been contributed in this section of the book.

One wishes that more personal statements of this type could make their way into print. There is much to learn from the men and women who have molded and shaped the methods of our present scholars. Luck’s captivating, albeit brief, discussions on how Shackleton Bailey introduced him to the scholarship of Housman is important if for no other reason than to get to know the formative stimuli in Luck’s own life. And

⁶¹ If possible, it would be best to display all the variants in a multi-text format.

⁶² To compare differences in specific writings, contrast the content of Housman’s private letters with those of his public criticisms; then note the shock in the public replies of his many respondents. The letters are found in A. Burnett’s *The Letters of A. E. Housman* (Oxford, 2007). One must collate a number of his letters and classical papers to see this clearly.

⁶³ Thankfully, one exception to this is G. Williams’ paper, “Housman and Ovid’s *Ibis*.”

⁶⁴ As stated by G. A. Deissman (1866–1937) in *Light from the Ancient East* (London, 1927; reprinted Peabody MA, 1995), p. xvii.

as the lessons Luck seems to have learned find their way into much of his critical work, few would doubt the perspicacity of it.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ Luck's work on the text of Ovid published in *Exemplaria Classica* in the last few years deserves especial notice. I speak particularly of one article and one review of note, both of which are published in *Exemplaria Classica*, 9 (2005): "Naugerius' Notes on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," pp. 155–224, and a review of R. J. Tarrant's 2004 Oxford Text edition, pp. 249–271; see also "Notes on the text of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," *Exemplaria Classica*, 12 (2008), pp. 49–67. As an excursus for biblical students, he published of late "Conjectural Emendation in the Greek New Testament," in *Veræ Lectiones. Estudios de crítica textual y edición de textos griegos*, ed. M. Sanz Morales and M. Librán Moreno (Cáceres 2009), pp. 169–202, in which he offers numerous conjectures that, in my opinion, are not clearly required. It is a first-rate article though, but not one without disputable theses. (1) He asserts that Erasmus completed his work with "breakneck speed" (p. 169); however, this notion was refuted years ago by H. J. de Jonge's article "The Date and the Purpose of Erasmus' Castigatio Novi Testamenti: A Note on the Origins of the *Novum Instrumentum*," in *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*, ed. A. C. Dionisotti, A. Grafton and J. Kraye (London, 1988), pp. 97–110. (2) He endorses the view which ascribes Erasmus' edition of the Greek New Testament to some second- or third-rate manuscripts; but to my knowledge no one in recent times has critically reexamined these few manuscripts (*minuscules*: 1, 2, 817, 2814–17) in detail. For in biblical criticism it is not the age of the tissue of the vellum or papyri that matters, but the antiquity of the manuscripts' readings. Jan Krans in his valuable work *Beyond What is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament* (Leiden, 2006) affirms Erasmus's use of no less than 12 manuscripts for his Greek and Latin editions (see Appendix 1, pp. 346–347). And by the time the critical editions of the works of Erasmus are complete Krans believes that much more will be available to support the antiquity of various readings used by him. Moreover the (1881) critical text of Westcott and Hort was based upon no more than two or three witnesses: Vaticanus and Aleph. Neither of the two manuscripts had a line of historical usage in the previous millennium; they had been set aside by the Church-at-large and effectively discarded: "MS Aleph" was rescued years prior by C. Tischendorf (1815–1874) from a waste receptacle in a remote Egyptian monastery. (3) Luck also assumes that classical scholars were/are the true initiators of the criticism of New Testament texts without noting that early New Testament critics were churchmen and believers too in the God of the Christ of the texts on whom they respectfully worked—which is of huge import for understanding their methods. (4) Furthermore, he strongly affirms the need of biblical scholars to follow the lead of classical critics, believing biblical critics to be deficient in their textual work because they do not follow the pervasive text-critical theories of modern classicists. But both classical and biblical textual critics should be equally keen to determine what was in fact originally written. Nonetheless, it needs to be stated that I am hesitant to embrace Luck's ideals: the aims and objectives of a critical edition of Scripture differ vastly from those of a critical edition of secular texts. A secular text will not be utilized for worship purposes. So naturally a religious environment will foster a didactically scientific approach, which may seem reprehensible to some but is still no less dignified in its scholarly and critical achievement. The issues here are far broader than Luck's oversimplification. My suppositions are straight-forward: that biblical texts, unlike classical texts, are: (a) used for ritual and liturgical purposes and therefore must be treated differently on account of the many humans whose hearts and consciences which could be disturbed and influenced by scholarly persons who sometimes are purposefully pagan (but confessionally "objective") in their outlook, and bent on undermining faith-based systems of belief; (b) manuscripts that were preserved by conservative literary traditions that were and remain sacred to specific communities of faith—this is evidenced within all Jewish, Hindu, Islamic and other faith-based groups dependent on a body of inscribed literature; (c) texts that should not be rearranged in a cavalier fashion, according to each generation of scholars' critical whims and reading strategies, especially when there are people who live and die by what is stated in their religious texts. Martin Hengel, in his biographical notes on the New Testament text-critical work of universal scholar, Gunther Zuntz, writes these words: "His starting point is the recognition that the three-step process of *recensio*, *examinatio*, *emendatio*, established by Lachmann and confirmed by P. Maas is not applicable to the New Testament because of the large amount of textual evidence, since, owing to the hopelessly contaminated transmission, it is not possible to reconstruct stemmata but only groups of texts at best": quoted from *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 87 (1994), pp. 493–522 at p. 504. Luck concludes his paper by asking: "what is required to make emendation in the Greek New Testament?" (p. 202) He answers: "a solid knowledge of Greek..., some experience in editing texts" and an awareness "of all the possibilities of textual corruption." Yet one must also add these to his criteria for each text on which a conjecture is offered: one needs, a knowledge of the whole gamut of Second Temple Judaism and its varieties, a subtle knowledge of the dialects of Aramaic and the Semitic *Vorlage* which may underlie the Greek texts, familiarity with Rabbinic materials in order to patch together the Gospel contexts one attempts to fix, and an acquaintance with the hundreds of thousands of quotations among the Patristic Fathers (i.e., Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Coptic, Ethiopic, Syriac, Arabic etc.) from late antiquity to the Middle Ages, and also the ancient lectionary readings within these Christian communities.

Kenney's attachment to the postcard of Housman on his desk reflects a personal preference and nothing more. Other professors have carried Housman in their minds, too, including Gilbert Highet during his Columbia days.⁶⁶ So Housman's ghostly presence in Francis Dodd's picture lingers in the backdrop of Kenney's own scholarly image. Now that this fact is in the public domain it manifests humble gratitude. All who study Housman receive something from the labor of wrestling with his writings. Thus, Kenney's career in textual criticism on Latin authors is without pretence or showmanship and consists of an immeasurable fraction of Housman's skill⁶⁷; although Diggle still is the one in possession of both, cap and pen.

Memorabilia have a significance all its own. The cautious, but excited, seriousness with which the distinguished scholar of Euripides has issued critical texts has been before the public for some time. In this brief historical note, Diggle's heart is laid bare and some affection for a predecessor is revealed as he tells the tale of a head-covering formerly in Housman's custody but now in his care. Not in the least way trivial but historical, this information was most welcome.

At the risk of losing the reader's interest, I insert here comments on the editorial work. Errors I have found are few, and are mostly stylistic: "Housman and Propertius," on p. 13, Dilthey is cited for *Prop.* 2.34.43, but the index entry reads: *Prop.* 2.34.42:13; p. 21, 2nd paragraph, 9th line, should read "(that is to say...)" in the place of "(that it to say)"; bottom paragraph of p. 17 cites 1.17.3 and 3.19.19, but the index listing under Propertius places them on p. 18; "Housman and Manilius," top of p. 41, *Hor. Epist.* 1.7.29 is absent from the index; "Housman and Juvenal," on p. 54, 8.199 is not listed in the index; "Housman, Lucan and Fraenkel," in the index, the text "*Luc.* 7.19–24:65" should read "7.19–24:75." I observed an inconsistency in spelling: Virgil on p. 76, but Vergil on p. 77. "Housman and W. M. Lindsay," p. 207, 3rd paragraph, 8th line, should read "...against the benchmark of his scholarship" in the place of "against his the..."

Final Thoughts

Studies on Housman the classicist are still few and far between. Hopefully this is the initial blast of a long awaited charge toward an appropriate intellectual history of the man. As the editors state in the preface (p. vii): "Closer analysis of Housman's scholarship should depict his overall contributions in clearer colours." I agree. Housman deserves better investigative schemes through which his writings may be studied. Often his critical work is lauded, while his austere character is depicted in rough terms. The former is derived partly from the belief that Housman's wholly "disinterested" scholarship left little to be desired in the way of appreciative remarks on ancient

⁶⁶ A picture of Housman hung in G. Highet's office, so W. M. Calder III, in "Gilbert Highet, Anthon Professor of Latin, Emeritus," *The Classical World*, 66 (1973), pp. 385–87 at p. 387.

⁶⁷ E. J. Kenney's volume *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley, 1975) yet remains a model of distinguished scholarship.

authors.⁶⁸ This notion has helped craft an unfounded depiction of him many know and value today.

It seems to me that Housman's image is still too alien through this caricature: he seems to have no heart, and to be a man without any sort of feeling for the literature he criticizes. In his *Classical Papers* there are numerous instances of how he *adjectivally* described the texts of classical writers he treated, many in whom he delighted.⁶⁹

This is only one of a number of areas within Housman studies suffering from scholarly neglect. Another is his many, witty translation specimens,⁷⁰ recoverable in his classical papers. In Housman's text-critical world, the criticism of texts consisted primarily of the interpretation of passages. His elucidation of texts fostered this unique sub-division of acuity, and it is a vital link in the nexus of Housman related inquiries. Translation studies, as a province of expertise and as performed by many today, are diminished by scholars who prefer strict treatments of syntax. But as a varied form of analysis in the science of language conversion, translation study ought to be commended on its own terms in the field of textual criticism. Housman surely had no designs for leaving a monument of translation, but this need not deter scholars from pioneering new pathways as they read his papers.⁷¹

Housman studies tend to oscillate between two points of interest: moving back and forth, from papers on his conjectures to critical readings of his poetry. Until a new pendulum manifests itself and newer studies of Housman's scholarship critically confront his writings, he is doomed to be accessible to learners through his poetry only, while critics continue to hedge their bets on which of the right and wrong conjectures of Housman's continue to deserve display or displacement. Here I should end my ruminations; the length of this essay already is an expression of gratitude to B&S for an extraordinary publishing achievement.

I acknowledge my indebtedness to George Huxley, Greek Philologist and Honorary Professor of Trinity College, Dublin, and John T. Ramsey, Emeritus Professor of Classics, University of Illinois at Chicago, who both read the

⁶⁸ For many today "disinterested" is synonymous with "dispassionate." This is a false comparison. As a Victorian description, disinterest in scholarship denoted a virtuous type of research in which an author rose above his or her self-interest in a work of composition: a work not strictly confined to poetry or verse but to any scientific treatise subjected to peer review. It is a most unwelcome sight to see "disinterest" used as a defining motif for an unemotional style of writing that never displays (dis)affection for and/or appreciation for a subject being treated in a scientific paper. Worse still is the modern fusion of "dis-interested" with "un-interested."

⁶⁹ Here are a two of his positive remarks. In Housman's 1888 paper: "*Emendationes Propertianae*," we find him at work on a long discussion of magic, music and miracles. He then calls to the readers' attention some ideas concerning agriculture. At this point he inserts a "private judgment": he speaks of Virgil's "graceful picture of the process...": *HCP I*, p. 49. In the same volume on p. 129, Housman lauds the *Hippolytus*: "by far the most faultless tragedy of Euripides, if not indeed the most faultless of all tragedies except the *Antigone* alone." There are no less than 30 statements throughout the three volumes which adjectivally describe in bits and pieces—and in appreciative terms—his views of various classical texts. Some views of his tend toward negative assessments of ancient textual problems of poets; serious students will also know of his love of Horace Ode 4.7 from "*Diffugere Nives*" {V} in *More Poems* (London, 1936).

⁷⁰ There are a number of his parodies in need of evaluation.

⁷¹ The volume, *Odes from The Greek Dramatists* by A. W. Pollard (London, 1890), contains excellent translations by Housman.

whole of this review-essay, and through numerous suggestions and criticisms sharpened my arguments here and there. I would also like to express thanks to Wolfgang Hübner, Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Munster, for his lucid remarks regarding my observations on chapter two. It goes without saying that none of the persons above is to be held responsible for the flaws in this essay.