

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER FROM A. E. HOUSMAN ON TIBULLUS, JUVENAL AND HORACE*

— MAXWELL HARDY —

ABSTRACT

This note gives the text of a letter drafted by A. E. Housman in reply to an unnamed correspondent, perhaps J. P. Postgate, concerning the textual criticism of four passages in classical Latin poetry: Tibullus 1.1.39–40, 2.1.47–62; Juvenal 12.92; and Horace, Odes 1.35.22.

KEYWORDS

A. E. Housman, J. P. Postgate, Tibullus, Juvenal, Horace

1. Introduction

Folded between the pages of a copy of E. Baehrens' *Albii Tibulli Elegiarum Libri Duo* (Leipzig 1878), currently housed in the Laudian Library of St John's College, Oxford, lies the draft of a letter composed by A. E. Housman in reply to an unnamed correspondent.¹ The text, which fills one page of a lined sheet of writing paper,² is not identifiable with any of the c. 2,200 letters printed in Archie Burnett's edition of Housman's epistolary correspondence.³ The letter is a reply to five queries on the text of certain passages in Tibullus (1.1.39–40, 2.1.47–62), Juvenal (12.92) and Horace (*Carm.* 1.35.22). It is of interest partly for Housman's views on the text of these authors, partly also for

* I am grateful to the librarians of St John's College, Oxford, for enabling me to inspect Housman's copies of Tibullus, and to the College for permission to publish the text and image of the letter given below. I should also like to thank David Butterfield and Stephen Heyworth for their assistance with the transcription of the letter, and for sharing their thoughts on the identity of Housman's addressee. Thanks too are owed to the anonymous referees and the editors of *HCS* for their helpful suggestions. I alone must answer for any errors which remain.

¹ The Baehrens book is filed under 'CLA / 660 / TIB (LLCpbd.Classics1936)'. It is filled with a variety of underlinings and marginal annotations, and appears to have been the main site of Housman's textual activity on Tibullus. A list of the conjectures therein made is forthcoming in *Euphrosyne*.

² The paper (197×299mm) has been folded twice, a tear having been made at the top.

³ Burnett (2007).

comments therein made on the quality of Tibullus' poetry, being not elsewhere paralleled in Housman's few published writings on this poet.

I offer below a transcription of the draft, followed by some speculative remarks as to the letter's intended recipient, with commentary on Housman's textual arguments. Cancellations are placed between angle brackets < >, while later additions are put between slanted brackets \ /. Words which Housman underlined are rendered in italics. Despite the abrupt beginning, we may reasonably infer that the letter is not a continuation of a longer draft.⁴ Its efficient and business-like style is one which Housman often employed when addressing professional acquaintances on matters of textual criticism.

2. Text

I don't see that the presents of 47–50 between the perfects of 46 and 52\sqq./ incur any objection <from> which the presents of 62–66 between the perfects of 60 and 67 sqq. escape, nor indeed any objection at all: the perfects and the presents are the proper tenses to <express his meaning> \say what he wants to say/: 'it was the rural gods who invented <this or> so and so; it is the country which bears this or that; it was the farmer who first did such and such a thing.' Then if you put 47 sq. before 39 you forestall the point of 43 'tum melius abiere feri' and the following series of agricultural improvements. 49 sq. do seem to be out of place and should perhaps be put before 47 so that you get the series orchards, gardens, the vine, honey, cereals<, and chief of all> \the best kept till last)/, and thence pass easily to the agricola and his aratrum. I should not like to separate *puer* 59 from *puellis* 61 nor to set *rure leuis uerno* 49 beside *rure puer uerno* 59. The distich I 39 sq. is <incoherent with a highly Tibullian incoherency: I 7 23 and 29, II 5 31 sq.>

a silly but quite Tibullian expression: II 5 31 sq. are parallel and I 7 23 and 29 are much worse. In II 1 53 *meditatus* would of course be good sense but *modulatus* will do very well: the *modulatio* \of a song/ may precede its recitation to the gods: see Verg. buc. v <14> 13–15 *carmina, quae modulans notauit, experiar*.

At Juv. XII 92 it might perhaps be made an objection to *operitur* that <it> \the passive/ does not go well with *erexit*. <I don't think *operatur ianua* is so strange as, for instance, XIII 99 *esuriens ramus*.>

⁴ Compare, e.g., his letter to J. W. Mackail on 22 February 1925, in Burnett (2007) 2.585, which straightway begins: 'With *optandum* you require something like *quicquam*, which Estação obtained by writing *dicere quid*' (the line in question being Catul. 107.8).

In Hor. *carm.* I 35 22 your conjecture, if I understand it, will make him say that the only occasion when Fides refuses the company of Fortuna is when Fortuna leaves the fortunate and they become unfortunate \but Fides stays with them still/. But how about those whom Fortuna has never come near? will not Fides \also/ refuse the company of Fortuna in order to dwell with them? But I don't think it is really easier than '*sed - abnegat*'.

I don't see that the presents of 47-50 between the perfects of 46 and 52 ~~imply~~ ^{imply} any objection ~~from~~ ^{from} which the presents of 62-66 between the perfects of 60 and 67 sq. escape, nor indeed any objection at all: the perfects and the presents are the proper tenses to ~~express his meaning~~ ^{express his meaning}; 'it was the rural gods who invented this or that; it was the country which bears this or that; it was the fathers who first did such and such a thing.' Then if you put 47 sq. before 39 you prestate the point of 43 'tunc uelut abire ferri' and the following series of agricultural improvements, 49 sq. do seem to be out of place and should perhaps be put before 47 so that you get the series orchards, gardens, the vine, honey, cereals ^(the best kind of all) and thence pass easily to the *opifera* and his *aratum*. I should not like to separate ~~per~~ 59 from *puellis* 61 nor to set *uere leuis ueno* 49 beside *uere puer ueno* 59. The distich I 39 sq. is ~~inherent~~ ^{inherent} with a highly Tibullian ~~inherent~~ ^{inherent}: I 7 23 and 29, II 5 31 sq. ~~is~~ ^{is} silly but quite Tibullian digression: II 5 31 sq. are parallel and I 7 23 and 29 are much worse. In II 1 53 *meditatus* would of course be good sense but *modulatus* will do very well; the modulation ^{a sort} may precede its recitation to the gods; see *Virg. buc.* v 13-15 *caninia, quae modulans notauit, experias*. At *Juv.* XII 92 it might perhaps be made an objection to *operatus* that it does not go well with *erexit*. I don't think *operatus* ~~is so strange as, for instance, XIII 99~~ ^{is so strange as, for instance, XIII 99} ~~erexit~~ ^{erexit}. In Hor. *carm.* I 35 22 your conjecture, if I understand it, will make him say that the only occasion when Fides refuses the company of Fortuna is when Fortuna leaves the fortunate and they become ~~unfortunate~~ ^{unfortunate} ~~and they become~~ ^{and they become} ~~unfortunate~~ ^{unfortunate}. But how about those whom Fortuna has never come near? will not Fides refuse the company of Fortuna in order to dwell with them? but I don't think it is really easier than '*sed - abnegat*'.

3. Comment

The identity of Housman's querist cannot easily be ascertained from the contents of the draft itself, no name or address being written upon it. One possible recipient, however, is J. P. Postgate (1853–1926).⁵ Housman's remarks on Tibullus 1.1 seem to answer a comment in Postgate's *Selections from Tibullus and Others* (1903; rev. 1910) on 1.1.39–40 (see below); Postgate also discusses Juv. 12.92 in his 1899 paper on 'operatus and operari', though he does not there advocate for *operitur*.⁶ As it seems unlikely (though not impossible) that Postgate would ask for Housman's opinion on problems which the former had already discussed in print, the letter could perhaps be assigned to a time before 1899 (or 1903), if the identification with Postgate holds good.⁷

i. Tib. 2.1.47–50

Housman's correspondent presumably urged the incongruous appearance of the presents *ferunt* (47) and *ingerit* (49) between the perfects *mixta ... est* (46) and *cantauit* (52) as a reason to transpose 47–8 after 38 and 49–50 after 60, like so:

rura cano rurisque deos. his uita magistris	
desueuit querna pellere glande famem;	38
rura ferunt messes, calidi cum sideris aestu	47
deponit flauas annua terra comas.	48
...	

⁵ On Housman and Postgate, see Naiditch (1988) 74–91; Hopkinson (2009).

⁶ Postgate (1899a) 320. Housman is only thrice mentioned in the *Selections* (pp. 213, 216, 217), in connection with readings that he had defended in print or had already proposed in the apparatus criticus of the *Corpus* text. Housman's proposal to swap Tib. 2.1.37–8 with 49–50 is recorded neither in the *Selections* (1903, rev. 1910) nor in Postgate's OCTs (1905b, rev. 1915).

⁷ On Housman's correspondence with Postgate during this period, see Naiditch (1988) 75–80, 85–6. It should, however, be emphasized that Housman corresponded on text-critical topics with a variety of persons other than Postgate, and indeed the original letter could have been from anyone. Note e.g. Burnett (2007) 1.134 (W. M. Lindsay), 1.368–9 (A. S. F. Gow), 1.405 (J. S. Phillimore), 1.433–4 (John Sparrow), 1.538 (Ernest Harrison), 2.168, 295, 394 (J. W. Mackail), 2.359, 361 (J. D. Duff). The only other person to whom Housman appears to have communicated his views on the text of Tibullus is one Robert Cary Gilson (1863–1939): cf. Haber (1956) 387 ('*quodcumque*] *quomcumque*, to match *cum* in the next verse: I think I spoke of this word in writing to you about Tibullus.'—The reference is to [Tib.] 3.7.24, not, as Fletcher (1959) 171 suggests, Tib. 2.6.54), 389.

rure puer uerno primum de flore coronam	
fecit et antiquis inposuit Laribus.	60
rure leuis uerno flores apsis ingerit alueo,	49
compleat ut dulci sedula melle fauos.	50
rure etiam teneris curam exhibitura puellis	61
molle gerit tergo lucida uellus ouis.	

(Tib. 2.1.37–62)

This is a novel idea, not paralleled, so far as I can see, in Tibullian scholarship. But whether it is true is another thing, for Housman seems right in saying that, as vv. 47–50 express a general truth (‘the country bears produce; in the country bees make honey’), their presence between statements of past action does nothing to interrupt the progress of the poet’s thought; rather they serve simply ‘to say what he [Tibullus] wants to say’. It is also worth noting that to put vv. 47–8 between 38 and 39 entails having a present (47 *ferunt*) between two perfects (38 *desuevit*; 39 *docuere*); and hence the new arrangement could be said to lie open to the same objection as the old. Housman’s own proposal, to place 49–50 before 47, may have been grounded on the idea that after mention of ‘summer’ in *calidi ... sideris aestu* (47), mention suddenly of spring in *uerno ... alueo* (49) seems a trifle odd, spring being antecedent to summer.⁸ Housman has noted down his transposition in the margin of his copy of Baehrens (p. 38). It does not appear in the apparatus of Postgate’s OCTs (1905b, rev. 1915).

ii. Tib. 1.1.39–40

Housman refers to the couplet as ‘I 39sq.’, but since he employs Roman numerals to indicate book, not poem number, this refers not to 2.1.39–40 but rather to 1.1.39–40, conventionally printed in older editions with a comma after *pocula*:

adsitis, diui, neu uos e paupere mensa
dona nec e puris spernite fictilibus.
fictilia antiquus primum sibi fecit agrestis
pocula, de facili composuitque luto.
non ego diuitias patrum fructusque requiro
quos tulit antiquo condita messis auo.

(Tib. 1.1.37–42)

⁸ There is, however, a similar difficulty in Virg. *G.* 2.519–21 *uenit hiems ... | ... | et uarios ponit fetus autumnus*, as well as Hor. *Epod.* 2.23–8: cf. Dehon (1991).

Be with me, Gods: nor scorn gifts from a humble board and on clean earthenware. Earthen were the drinking-cups which the ancient yokel first made himself, modelling them from pliant clay. I ask not for the riches of my sires or the gains which garnered harvests brought to my ancestors of yore.⁹

As mentioned above, the only commentator who appears to have been dissatisfied with vv. 37–42 is Postgate, whose note in both editions of the *Selections* is as follows:

39, 40. This couplet comes in rather awkwardly. The connexion of thought should be the same as in 6. 17 sq. (which see) viz. ‘the use of this humble material for your service dates from the good old days of yore’; but the words hardly express this.¹⁰

Whether Housman’s correspondent actually proposed to delete the lines (an expansion of *fictilibus* in v. 38?) is not clear, but it seems a plausible inference given the other conjectural emendations addressed in this letter. One may add that deleting vv. 39–40 would also remove an unusually limp repetition of the epithet *antiquus* in contiguous couplets (39 *antiquus* ... *agrestis* ~ 42 *antiquo* ... *auo*). But Housman makes a fair point when he says that the repetition of *fictilibus* as *fictilia* is consistent with Tibullian style: roughly comparable is the iteration of *fistula* in 2.5.30–1 (*garrula siluestri fistula sacra deo | fistula, cui semper decrescit arundinis ordo*) and of *uincula* in 2.2.18–19 (*flauaque coniugio uincula portet Amor, | uincula, quae maneant semper*), though again it must be admitted that in these examples the repeated word stands in apposition to its earlier self and is qualified by a relative pronoun, whereas in 1.1.39–40 the repeated word begins a new sentence.¹¹

⁹ This is the translation of Postgate (1988) 195, revised by Goold.

¹⁰ Postgate (1903, rev. 1910) 70; by ‘6. 17 sq.’ he means 1.10.17–18, i.e. the sixth poem of his selection. His remarks are not paralleled in Broukhusius (1708) 16 n.; Vulpius (1749) 14 n.; Voss (1811) 144; Heyne (1817) 1.9–10, 2.18; Huschke (1819) 1.25–6 n.; Bach (1819) 8–9 n.; Golbéry (1826) 10 n.; Dissen (1835) 1.20; Martinon (1895) 183–4; or Ramsay (1900) 116–17.

¹¹ On the device of repeating a word at the beginning of the next line, see Wills (1996) 125–73, 394–7. Note also 22 *agna* ~ 23 *agna*.

iii. Tib. 2.1.53

agricola adsiduo primum satiatus aratro
 cantauit certo rustica uerba pede;
 et satur arenti primum est modulatus auena
 carmen, ut ornatos diceret ante deos.

(Tib. 2.1.51–4)

Then first the countryman, sated with ploughing without cease, sang rustic words in time and tune; and, full of meat, first composed a song on the dry oatpipes to chaunt before the gods that his hands had dressed.¹²

To read *meditatus* in v. 53, where all the MSS give *modulatus*, was apparently first proposed by Vulpius in his edition and commentary of 1710.¹³ He compared Catul. 61.12–13 (*aspicite, innuptae secum ut meditata requirunt; | non frustra meditantur: habent memorabile quod sit*). We cannot know whether Housman's correspondent is defending this suggestion or making it anew; but as Vulpius is not mentioned in Housman's reply, probably the idea was independently conceived.¹⁴

iv. Juv. Sat. 12.93

hic nostrum placabo Iouem Laribusque paternis
 tura dabo atque omnis uiolae iactabo colores.
 cuncta nitent, longos erexit ianua ramos
 et matutinis operatur festa lucernis.

(Juv. Sat. 12.90–3)

Here I shall propitiate my own Jupiter, offering incense to my paternal house gods and scattering the multi-coloured pansies. Everything is gleaming. The door has put up its long branches and joins in the festive celebration with its morning lamps.¹⁵

¹² Postgate (1988) 257.

¹³ Vulpius (1710) 243 n.: 'Debuit enim agricola secum ipse meditari, quae postea in frequentia sacrorum ante aras numinum canere oportebat.'

¹⁴ Although no mention of this conjecture is made by Baehrens (1878) 38 n. or by Postgate (1894) 276 n., it does appear in Heyne (1817) 2.213.

¹⁵ I give the translation of Braund (2004) 427.

In the earliest poets and prose writers of classical Latin, *operatus* ‘engaged (in)’ has no finite verbal form. Postgate, in a brief note on the word, contended that *operatus* was therefore originally an adjectival formation derived from *opera* (or perhaps rather from *opus*, *operis*), according to the same rule that derives *moratus* ‘mannered’ from *mos* (*moris*) and *dotatus* ‘endowed’ from *dos* (*dotis*).¹⁶ This passage of Juvenal is the earliest in which *operor* appears as a fully-fledged deponent verb; a curious and interesting circumstance, as Juvenal was not precluded by metre from writing the more classical *operata est* had he wished.¹⁷ Whether it was this fact, or the further oddity of the door’s being likened to a person ‘engaged in worship’, that worried Housman’s correspondent the more, *operitur festa*, ‘in festive guise is decked (with morning lamps)’,¹⁸ is not now generally considered as a more attractive reading than *operatur*. Both in Housman’s *Corpus* text and in his *editio maior*, *operitur* is given last in the *apparatus criticus*:¹⁹

(*Corpus*) **92** *operatur* ω Seru. Aen. III 136, *operantur* P_s,
operitur s

(G. Richards) **92** *operatur* Ψ Seru. Aen. iii 136, **operator** F,
operantur PA, **operitur** cod. R. Stephani

v. Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.22

te Spes et albo rara Fides colit
uelata panno nec comitem abnegat,
 utcumque mutata potentis
 ueste domos inimica linquis.

at uulgus infidum et meretrix retro
periura cedit; diffugiunt cadis
 cum faece siccatis amici
 ferre iugum pariter dolosi.

(Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.21–8)

You [sc. *Fortuna*] are attended by Hope and Loyalty (rarely to be seen on earth) with her hand wrapped in a white cloth; nor do they withdraw

¹⁶ Postgate (1899a) 320.

¹⁷ See Courtney (1980) 528.

¹⁸ Evans (1852) 176.

¹⁹ Housman (1905a) 557 n.; Housman (1905b) 113 n.

their companionship when you change your dress and, no longer in a kindly mood, abandon the houses of the powerful.

But the fickle mob and the treacherous courtesan turn away; those friends who are too cunning to bear their share of the yoke drain the jars to the dregs, and then disappear.²⁰

These stanzas form a very vexatious pair. In the first it is claimed that when Fortune abandons the fortunate, so do Hope and Loyalty; in the second, that, ‘on the other hand’ (25 *at*), friends abandon friends when the latter fall into misfortune. These two thoughts, though phrased as incompatible, are perfectly consistent; and to bring about a true antithesis between them has been the aim of textual critics for many decades, indeed centuries.²¹

The phrasing of Housman’s comment on v. 22 puts one in the awkward position of having to conjecture his addressee’s own conjecture. The task is to find a reading that will make Horace say ‘the only occasion when Fides refuses the company of Fortuna is when Fortuna leaves the fortunate and they become unfortunate, but Fides stays with them still’. This sense is practically conveyed by Peerlkamp’s *sed* for *nec* (‘but they do retract their companionship when you leave the fortunate’); yet as ‘*sed—abnegat*’ is offered by Housman as a seemingly easier solution to his correspondent’s proposal, it cannot have been this. Perhaps it was *nunc*: ‘now they refuse their companionship [sc. to you, Fortuna]’, where *nunc*’s corresponding to *utcumque* might have prompted Housman’s correlative translation ‘only ... when’. Of course this conjecture is fully exposed to the objections which Housman raises against *sed*.

Interestingly, this letter is not the only place where Housman expressed an opinion on the text of these lines. In his own note on this problematic passage, Alan Ker (1904–67) reported Housman as holding the view, expressed at ‘Man. 3.112’, that *at* need not be contrastive, for the proper particle to yield ‘a real antithesis’ is *sed*.²² Ker further claimed that Housman’s view on the matter had changed by the time he came to lecture on Horace at Cambridge in 1930:

²⁰ This is substantially the text and translation of Rudd (2004) 89, but in v. 25 I have restored the MSS’ *et* where he and other editors print *ut* and have altered the English accordingly.

²¹ See e.g. Bentley (1713) 85; Ker (1964) 43–4; Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 396–7; Shackleton Bailey (1982) 91–2; Mayer (2012) 212–13; Kovacs (2013) 341–5; Courtney (2016) 43.

²² Ker (1964) 43–4 and n. 1.

Now *at* is not in fact the correct particle to express a real antithesis. Indeed Housman at Man. 3, 112, who evidently took 11.21–4 in the same way as Wickham, etc., remarks that we must read *sed* here in order to convey what is ‘a real antithesis’.

[...]

Housman, however, evidently altered his view later. Since writing the above, my attention has been drawn to the MS. lecture notes in Cambridge University Library, from which it is clear that by 1930 he had come to accept Bentley's suggestion, as I have done above, and with it the retention of *at vulgus*.

Ker's remarks are puzzling, for neither at Manil. 3.112 nor at 3.312 is any reference made to the problem of *nec* at Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.22; nor, as Courtney observes, were the notes of Housman's *Manilius* written in English, whence it follows that he could not there have used, what Ker reports him as using, the words ‘a real antithesis’.²³ Housman indeed lectured on *Odes* 1–3 in the Michaelmas term of 1930,²⁴ and happily his notes survive in the archives of the Cambridge University Library (‘Notes on the Text of Horace *Odes* I–III’, MS Add. 6884; 60 foll.).²⁵ My suspicion that Ker's quoted phrase may have appeared among the notes on *Carm.* 1.35, that in the same place Housman may have included a reference to his comments on Manil. 3.312, and that Ker, later working from his own notes, accidentally muddled the facts, was partially confirmed by ocular inspection of Housman's MS. Here is what Housman says on the problem, f. 23v:

22 *nec*] *sed* Peerlkamp. The confusion is rather frequent: examples in my note on Man. 3.312, <e.g.> The difficulty well explained by Bentley. Hope is an attendant on Fortune, and, following her, deserts the unfortunate, from whom nothing is to be expected. Loyalty does not: Ou. Ex Pont. 1.9.15–6 ‘ad fuit ille (Celsus) mihi, cum me pars magna reliquit, | Maxime, *Fortunae nec fuit ille comes*’; so Horace's *nec comitem abnegat* is false. The only way out of the difficulty is to suppose that Horace is sarcastic, and means by *Fides* such loyalty as is generally found in the world: Ou. Ex Pont. 2.3.10 ‘*cum Fortuna* statque caditque *Fides*’. And this is suggested also by saying that *Fides*, like *Spes*, ‘colit’ *Fortunam*: one would not say of true loyalty that under any

²³ Courtney (2016) 42 n. 1: ‘I have not found any such comment anywhere in Housman's writings, and I cannot imagine what has happened here.’

²⁴ Butterfield (2009) 133.

²⁵ For the class-mark of these and of Housman's other lecture notes, see Butterfield (2009) 146–7.

circumstances it did this. But Bentley thought that this interpretation was forbidden by *at* 25, which he supposed to introduce a *contrast*: false friends and dependents vanishing away. *at* however is not by nature a particle signifying contrast, but rather calling attention to another side of the picture, a new feature: here the concrete <equivalent> \<or> result/ of what has just been said figuratively: it may <often> \here/ be translated ‘thereupon’: Verg. *A.* 3.675 (Polyphemus gives a shout) ‘*at* genus e siluis Cyclopum ... excitum ruit’. It is indeed a little awkward that *infidum* should be used, when the *uolgu*s is doing just what so-called *Fides* does.

mutata ueste, as position suggests, with *potentes domos*, ‘when they go into mourning’, *Fortuna* has *inimica*

He gives a different and shorter analysis on the opposite page, f. 24r, in revision of his previous note:

Peerlkamp’s *sed* will not do. *abnegat*, like *colit*, must refer to *Spes* as well as *Fides*, and it is not true that Hope, like Loyalty, sticks fast to the side of the unfortunate: anth. Pal. 10.70.1 *τύχης ... ἐταῖραι | Ἐλπιδες*.

[8 lines empty space]

He [sc. Bentley] says *at* should be *tum*: that is very nearly what it is.

This clears up some matters and confuses others. If Ker took ‘Manil. 3.112’ (properly ‘3.312’) from Housman’s notes, why should he say ‘*Since writing the above*, my attention has been drawn to the MS. lecture notes in Cambridge University Library?’ I conjecture that Ker accidentally attributed to the note on Manil. 3.112 the favourable view of *sed* which Housman gave on f. 23v, and attributed to the lecture notes as a whole the unfavourable view which he gave on f. 24r, when in fact these were just different views expressed on different pages.

As for what Horace actually wrote, a plausible answer has recently been offered by David Kovacs: if *ut* be read for *at* in v. 25, the two stanzas can be understood in the relation of general truth to illustrative example: ‘Hope and Loyalty are ever in Fortune’s train; they do not abandon her when she abandons the powerful.’ ~ ‘Like a fickle crowd or prostitute, so false friends decline to bear the yoke of their companion’s misfortune.’ Curiously, Kovacs’s *ut* is already printed in the text of *Carm.* 1.35 on p. 126 of E. R. Garnsey’s *A Student’s Edition of the Odes of Horace: Books I to III: The Monumentum Aere Perennius* (London 1910), where a comma is added after *linquis* and a colon after *cedit*; the commentary (p. 130),

however, gives the lemma of v. 25 as ‘*At uulguſ infidum et meretrix*’, suggesting that *ut* in the main body is just a happy typographical error.

4. Conclusion

Close study of this letter-draft, which can now join a number of other freshly discovered Housmannian epistles,²⁶ has yielded some new and interesting information. The charge that Tibullus is characteristically ‘incoherent’ or ‘silly’ is not paralleled in Housman’s extant writings, and shows that his thinking on this point was in line with that of most contemporary and present-day critics.²⁷ More importantly, the draft provides confirmatory evidence that Housman favoured ‘Tibullian’ as the adjectival form of ‘Tibullus’ (from the Latin **Tibullianus*; cf. ‘Catullian’ < *Catullianus*, at e.g. Mart. 11.6.14), as opposed to ‘Tibullan’ or ‘Tibulline’.²⁸ The scholarly Ker-fuffle arising from Housman’s misreported lecture notes, as well as being a salutary reminder of the dangers attendant upon working without sight of relevant material, illustrates the high esteem in which these documents were held long after Housman had ceased to

²⁶ e.g. Stray (2020); Stray (2021); Shumilin (2022).

²⁷ Simcox (1883) 321: ‘[Propertius] is not incoherent in the same way as Tibullus’; Miller (2013) 52: ‘Tibullus possesses the rare honor of being considered the foremost representative of his genre in antiquity and so incoherent by modern scholars that one famously attributed a brain abnormality to him.’

²⁸ Housman never employs the adjective ‘Tibullian’ (nor ‘Tibullan’) in his *Classical Papers*, but he does use ‘Catullian’ twice in his review of Ellis’ edition of Catullus (Housman [1905c] 121, 123) and once in his paper on ‘uester = tuus’ (Housman [1909] 246). Among Housman’s contemporaries I am aware only of Postgate ever using ‘Tibulline’ in print: cf. Postgate (1899b) 359–60; Postgate (1895) 74, 77; Postgate (1885) xxxii; Postgate (1880) 281. In later years Postgate seems to have favoured ‘Tibullian’, perhaps under Housman’s influence: cf. Postgate (1908) 223–5; Postgate (1909). As 1899 appears to be the last year in which Postgate used ‘Tibulline’ in print (switching thereafter to ‘Tibullian’), Lorenzo Calvelli, to whom I am grateful for the suggestion, enquires whether it may furnish a *terminus post quem* for Housman’s letter. Further investigation, however, reveals that Postgate did use ‘Tibullian’ on an earlier occasion, namely in his article on ‘Tibullus’ for the landmark ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, where it appears twice in the phrase ‘Tibullian authorship’ (Postgate (1888) 350–1). For citations Housman will sometimes use ‘Tibull.’, oftener just ‘Tib.’.

teach from them. Hopefully future editors of Tibullus, Juvenal and Horace will find his remarks in this letter to be of similar interest and utility.

Maxwell Hardy
Trinity College, Oxford
maxwell.hardy@trinity.ox.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- E. C. C. Bach (ed.), *Albii Tibulli carmina* (Leipzig, 1819).
- E. Baehrens (ed.), *Albii Tibulli Elegiarum Libri Duo* (Leipzig, 1878).
- R. Bentley (ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus*, 2nd edn (Amsterdam, 1713).
- S. M. Braund (ed./trans.), *Juvenal and Persius* (Cambridge, MA, 2004).
- J. Broukhusius (ed.), *Albii Tibulli equitis Rom. quae exstant* (Amsterdam, 1708).
- A. Burnett (ed.), *The Letters of A. E. Housman*, 2 vols (Oxford, 2007).
- D. J. Butterfield, 'Housman's Cambridge lectures', *Housman Society Journal* 35 (2009) 122–48.
- E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, repr. (London, 1980).
- E. Courtney, 'Three Passages in Horace's Odes', *Museum Helveticum* 73 (2016) 42–6.
- P.-J. Dehon, 'Horace, *Epodes* 2,23–28', *Arctos* 25 (1991) 41–4.
- L. Dissen, *Albii Tibulli carmina ex recensione Car. Lachmanni* (Göttingen, 1835).
- L. Evans, *The Satires of Juvenal, Persius, Sulpicia and Persius*, literally translated into English prose (London, 1852).
- G. B. A. Fletcher, 'On Housman Lucretiana', *Classical Journal* 54 (1959) 171.
- E. R. Garnsey, *A Student's Edition of the Odes of Horace: Books I to III: The Monumentum Aere Perennius* (London, 1910).
- P. A. de Golbéry, *Albii Tibulli quae supersunt omnia* (Paris, 1826).
- T. B. Haber, 'New Housman Lucretiana', *Classical Journal* 51 (1956) 386–90.
- C. G. Heyne, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carmina. Libri tres cum libro quarto Sulpiciae et aliorum*, 4th edn, 2 parts, rev. E. K. F. Wunderlich (Leipzig, 1817).
- N. Hopkinson, 'Housman and J.P. Postgate', in D. J. Butterfield, C. Stray (eds), *A. E. Housman: Classical Scholar* (London, 2009), 175–91.
- A. E. Housman, *M. Manilii Astronomicon. Liber Primus* (London, 1903).
- A. E. Housman, 'D. Iunii Iuuenalis saturae', in J. P. Postgate (ed.), *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, vol. 2 (London, 1905a), pp. 532–64.
- A. E. Housman, *D. Iunii Iuuenalis saturae* (London, 1905b; rev. 1931).
- A. E. Housman, 'R. Ellis, *Catulli carmina. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit R. E.* (Oxford, [no date, no pagination; published 29 July 1904])', *Classical Review* 19 (1905c) 121–3.
- A. E. Housman, 'uester=tuus', *Classical Quarterly* 3 (1909) 244–8.
- I. G. Huschke (ed.), *Albii Tibulli carmina*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1819).
- A. Ker, 'Some passages of Virgil and Horace', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 10 (1964) 42–7.
- D. Kovacs, 'Two conjectures in Horace: *Odes* 1.16.8 and 1.35.25', *Classical Quarterly* 63 (2013) 339–45.
- P. Martinon, *Les Élégies de Tibulle, Lygdamus et Sulpicia* (Paris, 1895).
- R. Mayer, *Horace: Odes I* (Cambridge, 2012).

- P. A. Miller, 'Tibullus' in B. K. Gold (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy* (Cambridge, 2013) 53–69.
- P. Naiditch, *A.E. Housman at University College London: The Election of 1892* (Leiden, 1988).
- R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I* (Oxford, 1970).
- J. P. Postgate, 'On the Genuineness of Tibullus IV.13', *Journal of Philology* 9 (1880) 280–5.
- J. P. Postgate, *Select Elegies of Propertius*, 2nd edn (London, 1885).
- J. P. Postgate, 'Tibullus', *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th edn, vol. 23 (Edinburgh, 1888), 348–51.
- J. P. Postgate (ed.), 'Albii Tibulli liber secundus', in J. P. Postgate (ed.), *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum a se aliisque denuo recognitorum et brevi lectionum varietate instructorum*, vol. 1 (London, 1894).
- J. P. Postgate, 'Belling on Tibullus. H. Belling, *Prolegomena zu Tibull* (Berlin, 1893); *Quaestiones Tibullianae* (Berlin, 1894)', *Classical Review* 9 (1895) 74–8.
- J. P. Postgate, 'operatus and operari', *Journal of Philology* 26 (1899a) 314–20.
- J. P. Postgate, 'Belling's Tibullus', *Classical Review* 13 (1899b) 359–61.
- J. P. Postgate, *Selections from Tibullus and Others* (London, 1903; rev. 1910).
- J. P. Postgate (ed.), *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum a se aliisque denuo recognitorum et brevi lectionum varietate instructorum*, vol. 2, fasc. 5 (London, 1905a).
- J. P. Postgate (ed.), *Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres* (Oxford, 1905b; rev. 1915).
- J. P. Postgate, 'Cartault's A Century on Tibullus', *Classical Review* 2 (1908) 223–30.
- J. P. Postgate, 'On some Tibullian problems', *Classical Quarterly* 3 (1909) 127–31.
- J. P. Postgate (ed./trans.), 'Tibullus', in F. W. Cornish, J. P. Postgate, J. W. Mackail (eds/trans), *Catullus. Tibullus. Pervigilium Veneris*, rev. by G. P. Goold (Cambridge, MA, 1988).
- G. G. Ramsay, *Selections from Tibullus and Propertius*, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1900).
- N. Rudd (ed./trans.), *Horace: Odes and Epodes* (Cambridge, MA, 2004).
- D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Profile of Horace* (London, 1982).
- M. Shumilin, 'An unpublished letter by A. E. Housman related to the textual criticism of Statius' *Silvae*', *Philologus* 166 (2022) 272–81.
- G. A. Simcox, *A History of Latin Literature from Ennius to Boethius*, vol. 1 (London, 1883).
- C. Stray, 'A. E. Housman and W. H. Semple: a newly-discovered correspondence', *Housman Society Journal* 46 (2020) 8–21.
- C. Stray, 'Housman and Annette Meakin: an epistolary relationship', *Housman Society Journal* 47 (2021) 30–48.
- J. H. Voss (ed.), *Albius Tibullus und Lygdamus nach Handschriften berichtigt* (Heidelberg, 1811).

J. A. Vulpius, *C. Valerius Catullus, Albius Tibullus E.R., Sex. Aurelius Propertius* (Padua, 1710).

J. A. Vulpius, *Albius Tibullus eques Romanus* (Padua, 1749).

J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996).