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](#)

Postgate's Edition of the Seventh Book of Lucan *M. Annaei Lucani Be Bello Civili*, Liber VII. With introduction, notes and critical appendix by J. P. Postgate, Litt.D. Cambridge, University Press, 1896. 2s.

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 03 / April 1897, pp 167 - 169
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00026603, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00026603

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1897). The Classical Review, 11, pp 167-169 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00026603

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

τοῦχον βασιλῆα καὶ ἐν πολέμοισι μαχητὴν|
ἔμμεναι. ἀλλ' ἄγε θάσσον ἐὼν γενεὴν ἀγόρευε
om. Oxf. Rom. Par.² (three families of the
same class). The lines are unnecessary it is
true, but not on that account late; they
belong to the commonest category of epic
variant, the dispensable supplement. ἐὼν =
σὴν is not conclusive; Aeschylus uses ἐαυτοῦ
&c. for the second person, and in the loss
of serious epic literature between the
Hymns and Alexandria it is impossible to
say that Panyasis and Antimachus may not
have used ἐός = σός. 25. τίπτε γένος τοῦμόν
ζητεῖς; the variants on the rest of the line
seem to point to a pair of readings φίλε δῆλον
ἅπασι, and τὸ δὲ δῆλον ἅπασι. Z has τὸ
δ' ἄσσημον ἅπασι, from which I hardly think
L. right in deducing εἰσσημον ἅπασι. The
permutation of α and the ligature εν is
usually confined to late minuscules, and Z
is not far from the uncial limit. 30. γείνατο
δ' ἐν Καλύβηι με καὶ ἔρρυψε νέμεσθαι Z, ἐξεθρέ-
ψατο βρωτοῖς cet. Accepting Z's reading I
prefer L's earlier conj. εἰσέρρυψε (why not
ἐξέρρυψε?) to his later invention ἔκρυψ'
ἐννεμέθεσθαι. 36. ἔχων πολὺν σπασμότυρον.
I agree with L. in printing this; the altern-
ative, the unmetrical πολλὴν σισαμίδα, is the
gloss on it, accepted by the same Byzantines
to whom the following passage is due.
42-52 om. ZII. The view to be taken of
these vv. is of vital consequence to the
Batr. as a whole. The editor while lending
weight to their omission by his best family,
still regards them as ancient, part perhaps
of another poem of Pigres (!), and accord-
ingly rewrites the lines which betray the
worst metrical faults. I cannot but think
this a mistaken policy. (1) There is no
homœoteleuton, homœarchon or other palæo-
graphical condition to explain their omission
in ZII; the presumption is therefore that
they are an addition in the other MSS.
(2) In purport they are not contemptible,
but I presume that it was not beyond the
powers of Byzantines of the IXth century
to compose additions to a fable of this sort;

putting such additions into good hexameters
would have been the difficulty. (3) There
is no reason why these lines should have
undergone more metrical corruption than
the rest. To say they resided on a margin
and therefore (though why?) were damaged,
is to beg the question. Such lines as οὐδέ
ποτε πολέμοιο κακὴν ἀπέφυγον αὐτήν, νήδυμος
οὐκ ἀπέφυγεν ἵππος δάκνοντος ἐμεῖο, ἀνθρώπων
οὐ δέδια καίπερ μέγα σῶμα φοροῦντα, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ
λέκτρον ἰὼν ἄκρον δάκτυλὸν δάκνω are such as
would have been composed by learned men
acquainted with the epic dialect but who
had lost the sense of quantitative metre.
They remind me of the gems of the Perio-
chae to the books of the *Iliad*, Ζῆτα δ' ἱρεῖ
ἐκάβη ἀθῆνās ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκεν, πὶ πάτροκλος
πέφνε σῆρπηδόνα καὶ θάνεν αὐτός, ῥῶ δαναοὶ
τρῶες τε ἄμφι νέκυν πῆριμάχοντο, &c.; and it
seems a mistake to rearrange them into
ἀπέφευγον αὐτήν, νήδυμος οὐκ ἀπέφευγε πόνος,
οὐ δέδι' ἀνθρώπων, ἔδακον κατὰ δάκτυλον ἄκρον.
Similarly at 113 sq., 210 sq., and elsewhere
I am not clear as to the reasons that impel
the editor to reject some alternative lines,
and to keep others equally unmusical, doctor-
ing them into metre. Another point where
I find myself at variance with the learned
editor is the expedient of transposition,
which he employs largely, 65 sq., 184 sq.,
and elsewhere. The question is thorny; I
must content myself with expressing my
belief that MSS. as we know them were not
largely liable to this source of corruption;
nor do I agree with the editor's theory
[p. 102] that lines originally omitted and
added on a margin, got into a wrong place
in the text of the next copy.

The edition it need hardly be said super-
sedes its predecessors, Baumeister, Abel and
Brandt, in which we were accustomed to
read the *Batrachomachia*. At the same
time whatever is of value in them and the
earlier editions is presented here: in few
modern books is so much justice done to
the past.

THOMAS W. ALLEN.

POSTGATE'S EDITION OF THE SEVENTH BOOK OF LUCAN.

M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili, Liber VII. With introduction, notes and critical appendix by J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D. Cambridge, University Press, 1896. 2s.

To those who wish to be introduced to the peculiar style of this poet, at once so

attractive for his brilliancy of epigram, and so disappointing for his shallow soullessness and redundant rhetoric, this book will be of the utmost service. The historical introduction gives a full and vivid account of the battle of Pharsalia, based on a comparison of the ancient authorities. The exact learning and conciseness of the notes leave

little to be desired; perhaps the great difficulty of Lucan, the difficulty of following his connexion and appreciating his bold expressions, might have been met better by introducing rather more translation and curtailing the comments. But the work is the loving work of a scholar who has much to teach. I offer with diffidence some suggestions towards improvements in the next edition.

Line 28 *unde pares somnos populis noctemque beatam?* would be best explained by a translation: 'how couldst thou, Pompey, have slumbers like the multitude and a night of joy?' Cp. Hor. *Sat.* 2, 5, 102 *unde mihi tam fortem tamque fidelem?* In the next line *si te uel sic tua Roma uideret* is passed over. I think *uel sic* refers to *funestas acies* 27 and it means 'O happy, if thy Rome had seen thee even defeated,' whereas, in fact, Pompey never returned to Rome. L. 93 *labor belli* = μάχης πόνος *Il.* 16, 568, and has no reference to "the exceedingly toilsome character of Roman warfare." *Labor* in this sense belongs to the epic vocabulary: Verg. *Aen.* 2, 619 *finemque inpone labori*: 12, 727 *quem damnet labor*. L. 162 *signa uix reuolsa solo* is probably a reminiscence of Liv. 22, 3, § 12 *nuntiatur signum omni ui moliente signifero conuelli nequire*: l. 165 *fugit ab ara taurus* of Liv. 21, 63, § 13 *immolantique ei uitulus iam ictus e manibus sacrificantium sese cum proripisset*. L. 268 "*nilil esse recuso*, i.e. I am prepared to be anything," hardly brings out the point. Rather 'there is nought (hateful) that I refuse to be,' explained by the following words *inuidia regnate mea*. L. 273 *non illa* from the note might be inferred to be a mannerism of Horace and Vergil; but it is of general occurrence, cp. Liv. 22, 5, § 7 *non illa ordinata per principes*. L. 287 *ensem* is the 'sword,' not the "sword stroke," as *lancea* is the lance in the next line. Here again Lucan is probably thinking of Livy 21, 43, § 17. I have often wondered that Lucan's careful study of Livy has received so little attention. L. 320 *dum tela micant* requires explanation: it means 'while darts fly to and fro:' Liv. 6, 12, § 9 *tum micent gladii*: 21, 7, § 8 *non pro moenibus modo atque turri tela micare*. Verg. *Aen.* 10, 396 *semaninesque micant digiti*. L. 325 *ignoti iugulum tamquam scelus inputet hostis*: the note is long and obscure, and leaves me in doubt as to the meaning, which I take to be: 'Mar with the sword faces you should respect, whether it be that a man shall advance with ravening steel against his kinsfolks' breasts, or shall disfigure no dear one with his sword; he

should regard it as a crime to slay a stranger foe-man.' The troops are to kill Italians only, whether related to them or not: non-Italian combatants are to be disregarded. The subject to *inputet* is supplied from *quis*: the meaning of *pignus*, a relation, common in Ovid, might have been illustrated. L. 395 *nocte coacta*, a night 'forced upon him,' is erroneously illustrated from Ov. *Trist.* 4, 10, 35 *clauis mensura coacta est*, which, of course, means 'the size of my stripe was curtailed,' i.e. I wore the *angustus clauus*. L. 414: on *laturos* it is said that "the fut. part. in poets often appears to differ little from a present:" this seems doubtful; at any rate here *laturos* = 'ready to hurl.'

The critical appendix, the materials of which are taken almost entirely from Hosius, invites consideration, as Dr. Postgate has produced an independent text. I assign a very high value to M, the Montepessulanus, which, though not always right, is generally superior to the other MSS., and which is sometimes unwisely deserted by Dr. Postgate. Francken's edition containing the Ashburnham MS. contains only books I.—V.

The following changes are improvements: 130 *mortis uenturaest* (*uentura est M*): 179 *defunctosque ululare patres et sanguinis umbras* for *defunctosque patres et cunctas sanguinis umbras*. 575 *confundere* (for *contundere*) *uoltus* restored from V. 622 *ore quis aduerso demissum faucibus ensem expulerit moriens anima*; for *moriens, animam* restored from U. 658 *uoluitque* (for *uoluitque*) *sui solacia casus*.

It is clear that our MSS. descend from two or more archetypes: therefore omissions such as line 90 by MB, line 257, found only in G mvbe, and 796, omitted by MGU, do not seem to me to throw any doubt on the genuineness of these lines, but prove that the exemplar copied was in those places damaged or illegible: the dislocations at 488-521, where the new order adopted by Dr. Postgate seems very probable, indicate that this kind of fault existed early in the MSS.

In the following passages the text seems to be questionable: 180 *dementibus unum hoc solamen erat*: here *dementibus* is the editor's emendation for *sed mentibus*, which is, I think, sound: 'still this was the only consolation to their hearts,' i.e. though frightened by spectres they take an insane pleasure in horrors.

262 *gladioque exsoluite culpam* (from G) for *gladiosque exsoluite culpa* (M), i.e. 'free yourselves from guilt by the sword' instead

of 'free your swords from guilt,' i.e. by victory, seems doubtful, as the next line *nulla manus belli mutato iudice pura est* seems intended to explain the meaning. Why should Dr. Postgate desert M for G here, when he rejects 257-258 because they are contained in G but not in M? Again in 286 he adopts *quarum* from BCU instead of the quite simple *quorum* of MGV, thus abandoning both the excellent M and his new ally G.

303 *poena paratur* BEUG is rightly read for *poena parata* M. It might have been pointed out that the mistake of M is due to the tendency of MSS. to assimilate terminations, e.g. 309 where M has *fodientia* (for *fodientem*) *uisce* on account of *uisce*: so 1, 435 *canas* (for *cana*) *pendentes rupe Cebennas*: 2, 51 *non adliget Hister, fundet* etc. (for *fundat*): 2, 155 *praecipiti iaculatus pondere duro* (for *dura*) *dissiluit percussus humo* (error due to *pondere*).

334-335 *si totidem Magni soceros totidemque petentes urbis regna suae funesto in Marte locasses*, the conjecture of Grotius *locasses* is adopted for *locasset* MSS., "for Lucan would not have said 'si Caesar in Marte locasset totidem Caesares' (*Magni soceros*), and he has just told us Caesar did not arrange his men." But Hosius is right in keeping *locasset*: the meaning is 'If Caesar had (which he did not do) arranged so many Caesars.' The subjunctive mood shows this. And *locasses*, which must be addressed to the reader, is awkwardly abrupt.

504-505 *nec Fortuna diu rerum tot pondera uertens abstulit ingentis fato torrente ruinas* means 'and Chance who was overthrowing so many weighty interests did not long withhold the dire downfall whirled on by destiny.' The text is quite sound: the very abundance of measures proposed for its reformation in the note makes them improbable.

522 *tenet obliquas post terga cohortes* means Caesar keeps six cohorts behind in reserve. *Tenet* does not require alteration, such as *ciet* proposed.

587 *quid ferrum, Brute, tenebas* so Postgate following Hosius reads from a lost Hamburg MS. *quod ferrum* MSS. 'what sort of a sword were you wielding' is certainly weak.

Perhaps *quoi* (*cui*) should be read: 'against whom,' i.e. Caesar (dat. incommodi).

625 *quis cruor e scissis perruperit aera uenis inque hostis cadat arma sui*. Here *e scissis* is the editor's conjecture for *emissis* MSS. But *emissis* seems to me unquestionably right; though *uenis* does not then mean 'blood,' as Dr. Postgate says, but 'veins': translate 'whose blood has dashed through the air when the veins have been loosened (opened) and falls on the arms of its enemy.' *Quis*, I think, is not nom. but dat. pl.: *emissis uenis* is a bold variation on such a phrase as *sanguine uenis emissio* Plin. H. N. 25, 23, § 56. With similar boldness in 735 *aut Marte subactis* means not 'conquered' but 'exhausted' by war i. q. *confectis*. To read *ac Marte peractis* is to rewrite Lucan.

I take this opportunity of offering the following suggestions.

140 *tunc omnes lancea saxo erigitur* MSS. has no satisfactory meaning. Read *exigitur* 'is tested': Cic. in Verr. 2, 1, § 133 *ad perpendicularum columnas exigere* (Postgate's *corrigitur* is rather violent).

156 *et trabibus mixtis auidos typhonas aquarum detulit* (*pytonas* BM) so Hosius and Postgate: but *typhonas* seems to have to do with fire not water. The conjecture *siphonas* (Grotius) seems to have been a reading known to the scholiast: I think it is right, and means 'water spouts.' See Munro's note on Aetna 327.

462. Here the MSS. vary greatly, the Palatine palimpsest of the fourth century has *VVLTVSQVONO* the rest of the line being lost. M has apparently *tempus quo noscere possent* and so V. Read *uultu quoque noscere tempus, facturi quae monstra forent*. *Possent* seems to be a gloss intended to explain the absence of the verb. (Postgate's *uultusque ac noscere tempus* is harsh in sound.)

I have noticed the following misprints: p. 67 three lines from the bottom *reflexion* for *reflexion*: p. 68, line 1 *pellets* should, I think, be *bullets*, at least the latter word would be happier: p. 76, note on 676 sq., *desired* should be *denied*: p. 94 note on 462-3, 'he does not quote 462' should be '463.'

S. G. OWEN.