The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Francken's *Lucan M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*. Cum commentario critico edidit C. M. Francken. Vol. I continens libros I—V. Lugduni Batavorum, apud A. W. Sijthoff. [1896]

W. E. Heitland

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 01 / February 1897, pp 35 - 43
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0002607X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0002607X

How to cite this article:

W. E. Heitland (1897). The Classical Review, 11, pp 35-43 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0002607X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

accept them as conclusive without further evidence. Mr. Granger now adduces the *Lemuria* in May as confirming Servius, and quotes Ovid's description of the ejection of ghosts from the house by the aid of beans. But a little consideration will show that even this evidence is doubtful. It is by no means easy to determine what kind of a ghost was understood by the word *lemur*: but we have at any rate one clear definition by Porphyryon (on Horace Ep. ii. 209) viz. 'umbras vagantes hominum ante diem mortuorum atque ideo metuendas.' Cp. Nonius p. 125, who quotes Varro. On the whole the *lemures* would seem to be exceptional, unfortunate, and hostile ghosts, the spirits of men who had died a violent death, or were unburied: not the spirits of ancestors who had been buried in the proper way, and who were duly honoured at their graves during the Parentalia in February. I doubt in fact whether any amount of evidence for the practice of getting rid of ghosts from a house can be taken to prove that men were

once buried there. All ghosts of course have a natural tendency to return to the house where they once lived in the flesh, and primitive man was much exercised to prevent their return. I cannot but agree with Marquardt (*Staatsverwaltung* iii. 309 note 1) that the statements of Servius and Isidorus are probably guesses suggested by the domestic worship of the Lares.

But this is a difficult matter, into which I cannot go further now. In conclusion, one word about 'suggrundarium.' What I objected to was Mr. Granger's statement, made without reservation, that down to late times children who died before the fortieth day were buried in niches under the eaves. What did he mean by late times? The time of Fulgentius? The matter is so obscure and so ill-attested that I should not like to hazard even a conjecture about it; and I think that both Professor Voigt and Mr. Granger would have done well to have left it alone.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

FRANCKEN'S *LUCAN*.

M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia. Cum commentario critico edidit C. M. FRANCKEN. Vol. I continens libros I—V. Lugduni Batavorum, apud A. W. Sijthoff. [1896]

THE Introduction extends over xxxix pages, and contains a quantity of interesting matter. First comes an account of the work of the scholars who in the first half of last century, after the death of Nicolas Heinsius and Grotius, turned their attention to Lucan. These were Bentley, Burman, Oudendorp, Kortte (pp. i–iv). In the present century C. F. Weber (pp. iv, v) is the chief name till we come to the work of the new school, Steinhart, Usener, Genthe, and finally the recent edition of Hosius (pp. vii–x). Prof. Francken then gives his reasons for thinking that more yet remains to be done, and that the time has come when a critical commentary will be of use. Now that certain MSS are recognized as of preeminent merit among the crowd (about 150 are known in all), and now that we know something about the traditional text, criticism aided by interpretation is in its proper place and need be no longer delayed. The text of Hosius in fact cannot be regarded as final: an opinion which every student of Lucan's poem will probably share.

From this part of the Introduction, a most judicious piece of writing, the Editor passes to the MSS employed by him in the present work.

1. Of these the first is *Ashburnhamensis* [A], a ninth century MS now at Paris. The editor had previously treated of it in *Mnemosyne* (1891). It is now for the first time brought into line for critical purposes, and it is evident that the estimate of its importance given in a passing remark of Hosius (praef. p. xvi) would hardly satisfy Dr Francken.

2. *Bernensis* [B] of the tenth century, used by Hosius. The editor points out its very close agreement with A and gives instances shewing how it agrees with A as against M. He adds *haec omnia tam ad amussim conveniunt, ut alterum ex altero libro descriptum esse appareat*, and goes on to show that A is the earlier of the two. Prof. Francken therefore takes B for a copy of A, which is quite a new light on the subject.

3. *Montepessulanus* [M] of the tenth century. The editor agrees with Steinhart and Hosius in putting a very high value on this MS, and no more need be said here.

4. *Erlangensis* [E] of the tenth century, described and collated by A. Genthe (*C.R.* viii 371), now first used directly for the

critical treatment of the text. The editor admits the close agreement of this MS with AB and M. He does not however admit that it is a sister-copy of B, derived from the same original. Rather it must be classified as derived from the common archetype of ABM.

5. The *commentum Bernense* [C] edited by Usener. Of this and its value an admirable account is given.

6. *Vossianus secundus* [U] of the tenth century, long used by editors. The account of it here differs little from that of Hosius, and perhaps it may now be taken for granted that it is of a 'mixed' character, standing between the two chief classes of MSS represented by M and V.

7. *Vossianus primus* [V] of the tenth century, a celebrated MS, very finely executed. It is the chief representative of one of the classes of MSS. The description given of it is full and most interesting.

8. *Daventriensis* [D] of the fifteenth century, belonging to the V class. Not hitherto used, at least by modern editors.

9. *Bruxellensis olim Gemblacensis* [G] of the twelfth century (tenth according to Hosius), used by Hosius, who reckons it in the 'mixed' class. This our editor plainly denies. He says that G never sides with M against VU, it often agrees with V and sometimes with U. It agrees with AB more often than with M: hence he infers that AB are less pure representatives of their common archetype than M. Moreover G does not always agree with V: in fact it is not a copy of V, but comes from a common source. It is an inferior V.

10-13. *Taurinensis* [T], *Regius* [R], *Heinsianus*, and *Lipsiensis* [L], have been used to some extent, but not in complete collations.

After this (p. xxvi) Prof. Francken passes on to discuss the two Palimpsest fragments of MSS edited years ago by Detlefsen, the *Romanus* [P^a] and the *Vindobono-Neapolitanus* [P^v and Pⁿ]. Of these P^a belongs to the same recension as V and supplies the inference, confirmed by a passage in Priscian, that this recension is as old as the fifth century or earlier. P^v cannot be assigned to either class, but partake of both.

Next comes a brief treatment of the doubtful verses, strictly kept to the point, which is that the M class omit far more than do the V class. This is well known; but the editor is working up to a change of nomenclature, wishing to make it correspond with his view of facts. He rejects the names 'Pauline' and 'Non-Pauline,' urging that we really know nothing of the Paulus

after whom these names are formed, that he was probably not a scholar or real editor but a mere collating scribe, and that we ought not to create a legend without authority. He classifies thus (i) *codices mutili*, the best of which are MABEU, and the class generally may be called μ . (ii) *codices vulgares*, the chief of which is V, and the general name ϕ . This, he argues, is a sounder nomenclature in the state of our knowledge: and it is not easy to dispute his conclusion.

On page xxxvii comes his *stemma codicum*, which naturally differs somewhat from that of Hosius.

It will be seen that this Introduction contains in its thirty eight pages much that is either new or regarded at least from new points of view. But it is when we turn to the text in detail that we find ourselves in the presence of the main body of novelties. These may be thus summarized.

(1) The record of the MSS readings is often very different from that given by Hosius of the same MSS. For instance the readings of M are differently described over and over again. This sometimes means that there is disagreement as to what M gives: at other times we have the same facts put from different points of view. Thus in iii 19 Hosius prints *rumpentis stamina*, noting 'rumpenti stamine M.' That is, he prints the actual reading of M, and gives in a note the original reading of M [M'], as it was before correction. The method of notation is rather obscure. Francken prints *rumpentes stamina*, noting 'rumpentes stamina M.' That is, he also prints the text of M, but indicates that something different was written at first,—what, he does not say. This plan also has its drawbacks. We must observe that while Francken himself examined M [? in 1890], Hosius used the collation of Steinhart [? made in 1863]: Francken [p. viii.] says that Steinhart sometimes confused the readings of the earlier and later hands in M, but admits [p. xii] that the MS was in better condition at the time when the earlier collation was made. It will therefore not be easy to decide where the two accounts disagree.

(2) A great number of passages are subjected to emendation, and the conjectures adopted are largely those of Heinsius Bentley and the editor himself. Others of course come in for their share.

(3) The reasons given for preferring one MS reading to another, or an emendation to them all, are often in my opinion most unsatisfactory. Such phrases as *durum*,

minus aptum, non convenit, melius convenit, etc. are so frequent as to indicate a too subjective treatment of matters often delicate and difficult. Even when the great treasury of the Latin tongue has been produced by the united forces of Germany (which will take some time) we shall seldom be in a position to say positively that an author could not have written this or that, and therefore did not. Meanwhile here is a specimen of the kind of criticism that I utterly mistrust. In ii 128-9 *parvum sed fessa senectus sanguinis effudit iugulo* (So Hosius and MSS) the editor gives *parvum*, with this note: '*Parvum—sanguinis*' *pro inusitato 'parvum—sanguinis'* Heinsius et sic malo credere Lucanum dixisse quam quod eius aetate inauditum fuit; nemo exemplum sufficiens attulit, cf. Heitland CIII. Now the genitive after *parvum* may have been used colloquially long before we know of it; or it may be an innovation of Lucan's, for there must be a beginning to every change. Anyhow we cannot reject it without assuming that *parvum* was Lucan's word and that it was altered very early: for the corruption assumed extends to both families of MSS. And if this assumption be correct, what is the value of our excellent MSS authority after all? We may surely proceed to rewrite Lucan at our own sweet will. And this, I grieve to say, is just what Prof. Francken does.

I have said before, and say it again now, that, when a critic sits down to revise an author's text in the spirit of the school-master looking over a pupil's exercise, he puts himself in a false position. He wants to improve what is before him; and, while teaching the reader what his author probably wrote, he is apt to teach his author what he ought to have written.

It is to be noted that of the three great conjectural correctors of Lucan—Heinsius, Bentley, Withof—not one produced an edition. For the Bentelean fragment is posthumous. I suspect that the pressure of editorial responsibility would have made a great difference to them, bringing them more into line with Oudendorp and Hosius.

To turn to details, we first notice that the MSS title *de bello civili*, restored by Hosius, is rejected and the conventional *Pharsalia* preferred. I search the critical note in vain for any justification of this. That ix 985, vi 313 will serve the purpose is in my view a mere delusion.

I now give a few instances to illustrate the notable difference in the accounts of MSS readings furnished by the two recent

editors. Francken's version comes first, then that of Hosius in brackets.

I. 120 *permissum est. est om VAMG*, addit U [*est add. FL*]. BE are commonly included under A by Francken, so the difference here is simply in the report of U. For Hosius, in noting that two of his occasional MSS give *est*, clearly means that his regular MSS all omit it.

405 *nomine*, GM[M¹G]. Francken says that M has *nomine*, Hosius that it had *nomine* corrected afterwards to *numine*.

429 *sanguine* [*foedere*]. Here I cannot understand Francken's note, but I gather that on his shewing M¹ gives *sannine*, M *sanhine*, while *sanguine* and *foedere* are marginal readings [m]. Hosius says *foedere* MU et fortasse G¹. *sanguine* VB g and var lect. m [*add E*].

448 *dimittitis* VU [*demittitis* VB¹]. Here the reading of V is directly in dispute.

463 *crinigeros* AG [*cirrigeros* as an emendation only]. From Francken I infer that MVU have not *crinigeros*; from Hosius that they have. It can hardly be that Francken is only recording what is new [A's reading], for G is one of Hosius' regular MSS.

580 *et medio. e medio* A [*et medio FL*]. Here Francken seems to record A only.

604 *et tollens* VA (man 2 in marg. *attollens*) G [*attollensque* U]. From Hosius I gather that M has *et tollens*, from Francken nothing.

633 *viscera* [pectora]. According to Francken MG have *viscera*, V *pectora*, UA *pectore*. Hosius says that G has *viscera*, MB *pectore* [VU *pectora*].

642 *ulla sine lege* [*nulla cum*]. According to Francken VUEA have *nulla sine*, M *nulla cum* (but *cum* in ras.) Hosius says that MV have *nulla cum*, UBG *nulla sine*.

A curious instance is i. 254 where both editors read *ruentem*; but Francken cites it from G only, Hosius from VG. Francken distinctly says that V has *furentem*.

It is to be wished that editors who give readings of MSS would make it quite clear which collations were made by themselves and which not. I infer that Francken has used V and U himself, but I cannot find this directly stated. And on I 103 *mare* he cites VU for the variant *male* on the authority of Steinhart. This does not appear in Hosius. But on line 101 he cites the same MSS for the same variant on the same authority. This does appear in Hosius, who indeed accepts *male*. Can it be possible that there is some error

here? I fear there are slips. Thus on 453 we find 'datur UMP.' But the editor has no codex P, for the palimpsest fragments P^v Pⁿ P^a include no part of the first book.

The following are a number of passages which it is not possible or desirable to discuss here at length, in which it appears to me that Hosius' text is to be preferred. I give the new editor's reading first, then that of Hosius in brackets, indicating briefly the MS authority for each.

I. 26 nulloque domus custode tenentur ABEG^c, [tenetur MVUG]. 54 mergitur T and Grotius¹, [vergitur MABEVUG and Priscian]. 305 valido UGmb, [validae MVABE]. 315 sociabunt G¹, [satiabunt MABEVUG]. 341 non me duce VU, [cum MABEGTL]. 405 nomine M¹G, [numine MABEVU]. 475 adserat V (asserat), [adferat MABE, afferat UG]. 507 conciperet D and a Berlin MS (Hosius' D), [conciperent all best MSS]. 534 e partibus ABEVUG, [de M]. 614 vulnere laxo VU m GC, [largo MABE]. 615 diffusum est U, [est om MABEVG]. 667 confundet ius omne manus EC, [manu MABVUG]. 688 et super is var. lect. in g, [desuper all best MSS]. 695 defecta AKg, [deserta MBEVUG].

In a poem left unfinished it is but natural that there should be weak places. In particular, weak lines and defects of *iunctura* need not surprise us. Therefore I cannot approve the bracketing of such lines as

I. 188

turrigero canos effundens vertice crinis
[MSS and Servius ad Aen.]

282

par labor atque metus pretio maiore petuntur.

620

plurimus adspero variabat sanguine livor.

There is no reason whatever for suspecting these. Nor ought 424-5 *optimus excusso* . . . *Sequana frenis* to be doubted to the point of bracketing, though they come in a passage specially liable to interpolation. On the other hand the wretched lines 436-40 *Pictones* . . . *alis* have long been known to be spurious, and Francken after W. E. Weber rightly ejects them. They have no more business in the text than 423a *et Lemovix audax nimium levitate movetur* and 426a *quamvis non parva retinens sui pectoris arma*, which C. F. Weber rightly rejected. The wonder is that they were ever printed in any text.

Emendations are sometimes necessary;

now and then they are even successfully achieved. But they commonly break down in one (or both) of two ways: either the necessity of some change is not proved, or the proposed change is at least no improvement. When an editor ventures to introduce a change into his text, he challenges free criticism: and I shall be surprised if scholars in general accept many of the changes made by Prof. Francken. I give his text first, then that of the MSS.

I. 16 quaque dies medius flagrantibus aestuat auris [horis]. Bentley's *auris* is adopted, but not for Bentley's reason. Yet 'pleonasmus non ferendus' is surely no reason for the change in Lucan; and that *aura* and *hora* may be confused is of interest only when a change is needed. For *horis* see Horace *carm.* iii. 13, 2 *flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae*. Render 'where the land of the noonday sun swelters in its seasons of broiling heat'. In 414 below it appears that A gives *oris*. But the error is well known.

102 nec patitur conferre gradum [fretum]. Either editors one after another have lost their heads over this passage, or I am dreaming. To me 'fretum ferri non potest' is a sorry piece of dogmatism. As *conferre gradum* or *manum* could be said of two men, so *conferre fretum* of two isthmus-bursting seas. But, it is said, then it should be *freta*. Perhaps it might be. But it may be noted that we have above *geminum mare*, not *duo maria*, also that *fretum* is a noun of multitude = *aquas, undas* &c. *Conferre gradum* is said of two men meeting face to face with their swords: *conferre fretum* is a figurative application, used of two seas meeting face to face with their waters. It is a fancy; the fact we have in the case of the Strait of Messina in ii. 437 *postquam gemino tellus elisa profundo est*. There too both seas have acted, each from its own side. Yet in 435-6 above this common action is thus described, *donec confinia pontus solveret incumbens*, where *pontus* = *undae, fretum*.

115-6 tu sola *furentis* inde virum poteras atque hinc retinere parentem [furentem]. This easy change, proposed by Heins Bentley and Kortte, must have suggested itself to many other readers. The nearness of *furentem*, and our old friend the scribe's eye, seem to settle the matter. Yet the corruption, if such it be, is very old, and the more I look at it the more I doubt whether the singular does not give a rather better shade of meaning. Julia's likeness to the Sabine women is in the result that would have followed her mediation. She would not rush between a father and a husband in

arms, but hold them back one by one, work on their feelings separately. Thus *furētem* would be better. That Lucan does not object to the assonance of endings every reader knows.

119 morte tua *discissa* fides [*discussa*]. An atrocious change, missing the point of the metaphor, as Bentley did at times. The metaphor inverts that of the arch, for *discussa* is just *collapsa* turned the other way. As the withdrawal of a keystone sends the fabric down in a heap, so the withdrawal of a tie lets it fall helplessly in all directions. Why then not *dilapsa*? Surely because this word is commonly used of gentle or gradual dispersion or decay, and what he wants to convey is a notion of instant ruin. The moment Julia died, the *fides* fell to pieces. That *dilabi* is a rarer word in Lucan we may let pass.

138-9 nec iam validis radicibus haerens, pondere fixa suo, nudosque . . . etc [*suo est*, and no comma at *haerens*]. This is the editor's own. And yet, by making the clause with *fixa* a mere participial echo of the preceding, the whole result is summed up in *trunco non frondibus efficit umbram* below. But the words *nudosque per aera ramos effundens* lead us up to this: and so does the weakness of the root-hold lead us to the statement that the tree is held up solely or mainly by its own weight. This part of the picture is brought out more clearly by the preceding detail; for the votive offerings hung upon the tree enhance its dignity and will share its fall.

186 *lugens* visa duci patriae trepidantis imago [*ingens*]. Why the conjecture of Heins is preferred, I cannot see. It thrusts upon Lucan a wretched tautology, for we have *maestissima* in 187 and the further context to boot; '*ingens* fere de rebus turpibus, nimis magnis' says the editor. How about ii. 730 *ingens exul* (Pompey), Hor. epist. ii. 1, 6 *ingentia facta*, and *ingens gloria, fama, Aeneas*, in Vergil? The truth rather is that *ingens* takes colour from its context, and it is not strange that the colour is often an ugly one. Here it merely means that the figure was of superhuman size, and hence the more impressive.

260 *mersusque* iacet sine murmure Pontus [*medius*]. No doubt *medius* is difficult, and the two words are confused in the MSS at iv. 745. But here there is no disagreement, and in iv. 745 the editor prefers *medios* to *mersos*. Even Damsté's *mutus* does not satisfy me here. And does *medius pontus* mean any more than 'the open expanse of sea'? True, the transition from *rura*

silent preceding is abrupt, but in the writing of a youth this is not strange. And *medius* is very common in this sense in Lucan. See ii. 665 *medias* . . . in *undas*, iii. 2 *medium* . . . *profundum*, and many more where the expanse is of land.

262-3 ecce faces bello, *dubiasque* in proelia *mentis* *urguentis* addunt stimulos . . . fata [*belli dubiaeque* . . . *menti*]. Here *bello* is from Bentley, and is clever, though hardly necessary. The other correction is adopted because the singular *menti* and *urguentis* used absolutely will not do. For the former see iv. 704 *variam semper dant otia mentem*, referring to *miles* preceding = the soldier, the soldiery, not a particular individual, vii. 183 *mentisque tumultu* of the same men to whom *mentibus* is applied in 180 above. For the rest, hear Oudendorp's Scholiast 'ordo est, ecce fata addunt dubiae menti faces belli, et addunt stimulos urgentes in proelia.' Surely better than emendation.

291-5

sic postquam fatus, et ipsi

in bellum prono, tantum tamen addidit irae accenditque *duci*, quantum clamore iuvatur Eleus sonipes, quamvis iam carcere *clausus* imineat foribus, pronusque repagula laxet.

[*ducem* and *clauso*]. Bentley proposed *facem* and other changes to suit. To me *ducem* seems better than *duci*, for we have a pleonasm in any case, and the two verbs with *tantum irae* are in my opinion the more awkward expression. The comma at *prono* is quite needless. And *clauso* I also prefer to *clausus*. For it is a mere ablative of place, and there is no need to cut off *carcere clauso* by commas, as if it were an ablative absolute. I am glad to see that the editor rejects Hosius' *pedibus* for *pronus* in the last line.

316 ille roget currus nondum patientibus annis? [*reget*. some MSS having *regit*]. The complaint against *reget* is that it is in bad taste, 'questus est pusionis invidi vulgaris.' Even if this be a fair statement—which I doubt—I reply that much of Lucan's rhetoric is in bad taste, for instance, most of this very speech, which is not in character with Caesar at all. Perhaps viii. 85 is in itself worse, though it may possibly be more in character with the speaker, his darling Pompey.

333 quem tandem inveniet tam longa potentia finem? [*tamen*]. This is one of Bentley's hasty changes. But we may observe that 327-31 are a simile, 331-2 a gnomic application of this. Looking then to 325-6, we find a reference to Sulla as

Pompey's master in the evil trade of civil war and so forth. Now Sulla *invenit finem* by his retirement. The force of *tamen* is then 'But after all' [Sulla retired, and why will not you?] Hence in 334-5 we return to this point, *ex hoc iam te, inprobe, regno ille tuus saltem doceat descendere Sulla*.

340 *paruerit* [*paruerim*]. To catch at a marginal note of a corrector of A (a), in order to avoid the change to the first person, is 'improvement' with a vengeance. I have always thought the change of person vigorous and good, and think so still. I cannot believe it to be the work of the early scribes.

342 miles sub quo iubet iste triumphet [*quolibet*]. This emendation is resorted to because Caesar, addressing his men face to face, could not venture to speak of them with contempt, and therefore *iste* cannot agree with *miles* in the common sense, of *miles meus*. I reply that the use of *iste* = *hic* or *meus* in Lucan often leaves contempt very far to seek. Haskins cites v. 351-2 *sunt ista profecto curae castra deis*; even better is iii. 125-6 *certe violata potestas invenit ista deos*, where the tribune has no mind to disparage his official character.

372 *iussa sequi tam posse iuvat quam velle necesse est* [*mihi*]. Here the suggestion of Withof is followed. Most editors find a difficulty in applying *necesses* to *posse*, and it is true that *mihi* may have crept in from a note. Very early, however; for both families of MSS are involved. To prove, as Withof does, that *iuvat* is a good and common antithesis to *necesse est* is nothing: who doubts it? Perhaps Lucan may not have wanted it here. The centurion is under constraint; he cannot say *non possum*, in the face of his previous exploits: he cannot say *non volo*, for he has gone too far to turn back. Thus in vii. 260-3 Caesar urges on his men by pointing out that treason will be swallowed up in victory. And in that very speech he is clearly looking back both to his own speech i. 299-351 and this of the centurion. Surely the case for emendation here is not yet made out.

407-8 *solus sua littora turbat Circius, et tuta prohibet statione Monoecum* [*Monoeci*]. The editor explains his text thus, 'facit ut deus tutam stationem non habeat aut nautis offerat.' The god then wants the roadstead not for himself but for seafarers, and this W.N.W. wind *prohibet quominus stationem habeat aut praebat nautis*. It may be that this comes fairly out of the new text, but I doubt it. It seems to me that *prohibet* more

naturally refers to those debarred from an advantage, *prohibet nautas quominus utantur*. The only similar passage I know in Lucan is vi. 503 (of the moon) *si fraterna prohiberet imagine tellus*, 'if the earth were debarring her from reflecting the sun's light,' *quominus solis lumine uteretur*. In fact A prevents B from enjoying C, not C from helping B. Therefore I would rather abide by the old interpretation, understanding an object *nautas*, than alter the old text. But this is harsh, I grant. If we must emend, what a glorious case of a note that has crept into the text is here! *Monoeci* is not wanted to localise the phenomena, for we have *sub Herculeo sacratus nomine* [*numine*] *portus* just above. Then it is a scholion on *statione*, and has taken the place of the object-accusative, say *carinas*, *petentis*, or the like. So much for a conjecture. I should remark that the details of the winds in this passage present great difficulty.

426 *et docilis rector constrati Belga covinni* [*monstrati*]. *constrati* is from Hein-sius, and Curtius ix. 10 § 25 is cited in support; but there the chariots seem to be *constrati* for a special purpose only. Whether Lucan wrote *monstrati* meaning 'a vehicle adopted from abroad' may fairly be doubted: that he wrote *constrati* there is no reason whatever for believing.

432 *quos Sulga pererrat gurgite* [*qua Cinga*]. This is Bentley's correction. As to the name of the river I will say nothing, for I can offer no solution of the difficulties. But *quos* rests on the assumption that '*pererrare* absolute dici non potest.' Is this so certain? Let us look at some neuter verbs, compounds of *per*. In viii. 664 *permansisse* the noble expression of Pompey's face 'lasted through' the death-struggle and remained in death. Very similar are the uses of *perstat* *perstant* &c. iii. 620, iv. 30, v. 210, vii. 690. For *permanere*, *perdurare*, *perequicare*, see the dictionaries. Add Horace epist. i. 17, 38 *qui pervenit, fecitne viriliter*? See too Silius v. 391 *pervasit*, viii. 430 *perstrepit*, xi. 288 *personat*, xv. 143 *perlabi* [connected loosely with a *qua* preceding], and note *oberrare* used in *Persius* vi. 32. Above all Fronto (p. 196 Naber) *ut rectam ingressis viam certus itin-eris est finis ac modus, errantibus autem peragraré facilius est quam pervenire*, illustrated by p. 204 (of nomads) *non ad locum sed ad vesperum contenditur*. I venture therefore to keep *qua* and render 'there is relief too [see 422] in the lands where Cinga (or Sulga) goes his wandering way, where Rhone.' . . . &c.

453-4 *nemora alta, remotos incolitis lucos* [remotis . . . lucis and no comma]. Here Bentley is followed because *nemora non sunt pars lucorum*. So that when the correction is made we are still left with a wretched tautology, for *remotos* is not really different from *altos*; 'the depths of the groves' will do for the whole. If we say that *lucus* is more particularly a sacred grove, we remove the tautology but make the ablative of place tolerable. 'Ye dwell in the depth of woodlands among the retired sacred groves,' that is, in the retirement of the sacred groves. If the ablatives are corrupt, the corruption is very old. 'Corruptio in fine versus et simili exitu in proximo vocabulo facile intelligitur' says the editor. Does this mean that the neighbourhood of *incolitis* has affected the other two words? If so, it is not easy to believe.

461 *animaeque rapaces mortis* [*capaces*]. The text is due to Heins. Against Haskins' rendering 'great enough for death' it is said 'sed qui mortem timet etiam notionem mortis animo continet.' I take this to imply that *capaces* means 'containing a notion of death.' Surely it means 'able to contain or receive death.' = ready for death. Compare 511-3 *urbem . . . generis . . . capacem . . . humani*, x. 182-3 *quis dignior umquam hoc fuit auditu mundique capacior hospes?* It is also I believe true that Lucan does not elsewhere use *rapax* with a genitive. The MSS reading should be kept.

463 *cirrigeros* [*crinigeros*]. Text after Lipsius, because, says that great scholar, all men *crinem gerunt*. Surely this is not enough to condemn the word. If you say that a man *crinem gerit*, you call attention to a particular circumstance, thus laying stress on it. Hence such forms as *crinitus*.

486-8 *nec solum volgus inani percussus terrore pavet, sed curia et ipsa; sedibus exiliere patres* [*ipsi* sedibus, with no stop]. No justification is given for this wanton change, and I see none.

491 *urguent*, [*urguet*]. This is hardly worth discussing, and I suspect the comma is a misprint.

536 *discurrere* [*decurrere*]. Why this change? In 643 *incerto discurrunt sidera motu* is a hypothesis at once rejected. Here we want a word meaning 'run their normal course,' and *decurrere* is the right word. Compare Manilius i 503 [505], where Orion is said *toto semper decurrere mundo*, and Pompon Mela i. 1 *unde sol oritur oriens nuncupatur aut ortus, quo demergitur oc-*

cidens vel occasus, qua decurrit meridies, ab adversa parte septentrio.

544 *noctem inducere* Mycenae [*duxere*]. The meaning of *duxere* is that Mycenae 'took on itself' the darkness of night, that is, was suddenly veiled in gloom. To Haskins' note on vi. 828 *caelo lucis ducente colorem* add Stat. Ach. ii. 21 (307) *ducere nubes*. The MSS reading is far the better.

555 *summumque inpellit Atlanta* [*implevit*]. This is a fragment of one of Bentley's wildest reconstructions. Why the editor adopts it is not explained in the note, and I cannot tell. Surely *implevit* = 'rose to the top of,' like *fossas implere* = 'fill the ditches to the brim.'

600 *et lotam parvo renovant Almone* Cybeben [*revocant*]. This is Burman's conjecture. I had guessed the same, but gave it up on finding that the word *revocare* undoubtedly occurs in the sense of 'refresh' 'renew' in Silius iv. 15 *revocantque nova fornace bipennis*. It is proposed to emend that passage also, but Bauer rightly keeps the word. There are plenty of passages in good writers where the sense comes very near 'renew' 'restore.' See Verg. Aen. i. 235 *revocato a sanguine Teucri*, Georg. iv. 282. With these compare Aen. i. 214 *victu revocant vires*. For the matter see Silius viii. 363 *tepidoque fovent Almone Cybelen*.

607 *et terra maesto cum murmure condit* [*terrae*]. This is due to Kortte. I see no reason for leaving the MSS, and the instances given in Haskins' note seem to me enough to establish the dative construction.

630 *haec ubi concepit magnorum fata malorum* [*his . . . fata*]. This is from Bentley. No instance of *fetus* with genitive is given by him. Dictionaries supply one from Claudian (bell Goth. 25-6) which seems doubtful to me. I take *fata malorum* = the destiny that brings or imposes great calamities. Not unlike is ii. 65 *gravis vivacia fata senectae*, the doom of long life that brings a burdensome old age. That *his* is both pointed and correct I have no doubt.

637-8 *flexis* sic omina Tuscus involvens multaque tegens ambage canebat [*flexa*]. That *flexa* carried on with *involvens* to *ambage* is ugly, I freely admit. That *flexis* became *flexa* by assimilation to *omina* is a pretty and possible assumption. But both families of MSS are involved. I had rather not meddle with the passage without a stronger reason than I can find at present.

656 *toto furerent incendia mundo* [*fluere*]. The MSS text is here rejected because *fluere* is not in keeping with *incendia*. Now *fluere* and related words

supply a great number of various metaphors, while *ignis* etc. create a great demand for them. Fire *serpit, pascitur, scandit, vorat, lambit, currit*, and so forth. Thus I do not wonder to find in Silius xvii. 98 *ex omni manant incendia tecto*, 101 *fluit undique victor Mulciber*, 103 *exundat pestis*, xiv. 311 *exundante vapore*, or of the bull in Val. F. vii. 572 *atro volvens incendia fluctu*, though this last is bracketed by Schenkl. To suppose that *furerent* became *furent* or *fuerent* and was corrected into *fluerent* is ingenious, but unwarranted and quite unnecessary.

I may seem to be blindly devoted to the traditional MSS text and to ignore the necessity for emendation that now and then undoubtedly exists. Let me point out what the state of affairs really is with regard to Lucan. We have a great number of MSS, some of which are confessedly good, that is, afford a better authority for the text than do the MSS of most writers. Two families of MSS are recognized, (1) the V family, the non-Pauline or *vulgares codices*, (2) the M family, the Pauline or *mutuli codices*. It is agreed that the V recension dates back to before the fifth century. That the M recension is very old is not disputed, though details are: in any case a good and ancient ancestor is assumed, however far back. That copies of Lucan varying greatly in care and correctness were current shortly after his death is attested by the Suetonian life. What then is the case against a reading in which both families of MSS agree? It seems to me that the arguments from within must be perfectly overwhelming to justify emendation on the score of necessity. As for arguments from outside, accounting for the assumed blunder, we must be very careful how we let ourselves be carried away even by the most ingenious and learned palaeographers. We are not dealing with the errors of the slumberous but diligent monk, but with those of the trained copyist of a much earlier time; errors transmitted to us by two separate lines of tradition. Once we are convinced that there is an error of this kind before us, we have to explain its existence by hypotheses built up on hypotheses, with the chance that at any given moment we may have lost the clue, if indeed we ever had it. Is not it clear that we are in a position where the forces of obstruction must and should prevail: where readiness to emend betrays a misapprehension of editorial duty?

I maintain, therefore, that in the present state of our knowledge we are not entitled to set aside the concurrent tradition of both

families of MSS, provided that a fairly intelligible meaning can be got out of the text. However much we may seem to improve it by a change, however certain it may be that the proposed change is palaeographically possible, we have no business with change in cases of this kind. However much we may respect the veteran scholar who edits Lucan, we must never forget that the poem before us is the work of an immature genius, and was confessedly transmitted to later times in an unfinished state. What editing may have gone on soon after the author's death, we do not know. We do know that it is risky to correct tradition by guesswork. If the agreement of the MSS is not to be trusted, what is? Every word of the poem may be called in question: and, when the MSS differ, why should we prefer one to another? If conjecture is our habitual remedy against their agreement, much more may we trust in it against their disagreement. On pp. xxvii-xxviii of Hosius' preface are some admirable remarks: it is only to be regretted that in practice he now and then abandoned his own sound principles. Prof. Francken is not inconsistent with himself [pref. pp. viii, ix], so far as I understand his somewhat obscure words. One function of his edition was to be this, 'ut ex inventis Grotii, Heinsii, Bentleii, aliorum caute optima quaeque reciperentur, et ex eorum ingeniis aliquod lucrum in verba poetae redundaret.' And my opinion of the result is that in applying this process to Lucan the 'poet's words' seldom gain, while there is nothing to show that the poet does not lose. As Lucan said of Sulla ii. 140-3,

Ille quod exiguum restabat sanguinis urbi
hausit: dumque nimis iam putria membra
recidit,
excessit medicina modum, nimiumque secuta
est,
qua morbi duxere, manus.

But, alas, I find this emended also. Aug. civ. dei iii. 27 has *manum*, quoting the lines. After the instances I have given above, the reader will not wonder that *manum* is adopted, against the MSS of Lucan.

Transposition of lines is a favourite form of emendation with some editors. That lines may have got out of place is not to be denied. But it is true also that different minds will often prefer different sequences of notions, and very great caution is needed in transpositions carried out in defiance of MSS tradition. If any reader of Lucan

will look at i. 324-6, I shall be surprised if he approves Francken's putting 326 before 325. The reason given seems to me absurdly inadequate. And the further change of order in 326 (putting *scelerum* before *Syllam* in order to make it go with *docilis*) is an equally wanton disturbance.

On the other hand the editor keeps *motus* and *monitus* in i. 587-8, where I believe that Graevius Heins Burman and Schrader rightly transpose the words, and where a slip of eye and pen was so very easy. However, he may be right. His note on the clever conjecture *fulminis edoctus mentem* &c. is amusing, for we are told that Bentley was 'ut saepius, ornare potius quam emendare studens.' Which recalls to mind two famous lines of Burns.

There are many lines in Lucan where the order of words is differently given in different MSS. But i. 160, 589, are not instances of this, and Hosius rightly keeps the traditional order. But in 583 Francken is very likely right in reading *fracto Marium* with VG, for the other order is surely worse.

There are of course a number of passages where the MSS readings differ, where either reading makes sense, and where a final decision satisfactory to all scholars is perhaps not to be looked for. Here are a few passages where Hosius and Francken disagree, and where it is hard indeed to decide between them. Francken's reading is given first, and the MSS authority is appended to each.

I. 37 *ipsa* VUB¹G¹(AE), *ista* M. 103 *frangat* VAm C(BE), *franget* MUGT. 209 *iubam et vasto grave murmur* AGm (B¹E), *iubas et vasto murmur* MVU. 453 *datur* MU, *datum* Gm [*datum est* VABEgT]. 531 *denso* Gm (and V acc to Hosius), *tenso* UCA(BE)v g (and M, but *in rasura* acc to Francken). 646 *an tollet* VUG, *attollet* A (B and *in ras* E) M (*in ras* acc to Francken).

In some passages where the two editors agree I still have doubts: here are some. Their text is given first.

I. 320 *micantes* A(BE)mu, *minantes* M VUGb, 588 *errantis* VUGmb, *volitantis* MA (BE) u g. 687 *Enyo* Vc, *Erinyes* (in various spellings) MABEUGv.

Questions of orthography are the plague of editors of Latin texts. Prof. Francken's rule is [Intr. pp. xxxvi. foll.] to note the instances where MSS preserve archaic spelling, whether this be accepted in the text or not. He himself uses a varying spelling, but gives no clear account of the method by which it is arrived at. Hosius [praef. pp. xxiv. xxv.] on the contrary leaves no doubt as to his procedure. Our editor however points out that the palimpsest fragments confirm his spelling in various points, though they are too meagre to furnish a standard. For instance *harena*. Why *arena* should nevertheless occur in the text [cf. i. 368, 685] is a natural question. The wording of this part of the introduction is certainly obscure. I will only note in the text *cespes*, *cohercere*, *limphatus*, *circuire*, *Tibris*, *exiliere* (488), and *maenia*. The last seems to be the cause of the misprint *manibus* (571). I should add that misprints are rare in this book.

Punctuation is a matter on which there are and will be wide differences of opinion. As instances of innovations in which I cannot agree it will be enough to refer to i. 126, 311, 520, 648.

I have not dealt with the details of books ii.-v., for my main object is to exhibit the freedom with which the editor has treated the MSS tradition whenever he finds cause of offence in the traditional text. With the utmost respect for him as a scholar, I must submit that his procedure is wholly inadmissible. To multiply details would serve no good purpose. If my principles are shown to be wrong I shall gladly welcome the exposure: meanwhile I have said enough to raise a serious and definite issue.

The photographic specimens of the codices A M V are interesting. I only hope that the second volume will contain a specimen of U. Of the printing &c. it need only be said that the book is produced in a style worthy of the traditions of the Dutch press.

W. E. HEITLAND.

LAFAYE'S NOTES ON *STATIUS SILV. I.* AND KLOTZ; *CURAE STATIANAE*.

Quelques notes sur les Silvae de Stace, premier livre, par G. LAFAYE. Paris, Klincksieck. 1896. Fr. 2.50. *Curae Statianae. Dissertatio inauguralis*. Scripsit A. KLOTZ. Leipzig. 1896. 1 Mk. 20.

THESE two pamphlets are the latest contribution I have seen in book-form to the literature, every year increasing, of the *Silvae* of Statius. The list of works on this subject which Lafaye marshals on the two