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](#)

Les Sources De Lucain *Les Sources de Lucain*. Par René Pichon, Docteur ès Lettres, Professeur de Première Supérieure au Lycée Henri IV. Royal 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. iv + 279. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1912.

J. Wight Duff

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 01 / February 1913, pp 25 - 28

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00004376, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00004376

How to cite this article:

J. Wight Duff (1913). The Classical Review, 27, pp 25-28 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00004376

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

'ITALUS' AND 'ROMANUS.'¹

I SEE that Mr. John MacInnes in his paper on this subject writes '(Plautus) scoffs at Praenestine idiom in *Trin.* 609, though in *Trin.* 545 he praises the "Campanum genus" for endurance.' But is not this praise itself a scoff?

¹ *Classical Review*, February, p. 5.

Wagner in his note says, 'The taunt implied in the present passage is very bitter and unfeeling.' The Campanians had been working so long as slaves, a punishment inflicted on them for their anti-Roman policy, that even the Syrians could not be reckoned so long suffering.

ALFRED CHURCH.

REVIEWS

LES SOURCES DE LUCAIN.

Les Sources de Lucain. Par RENÉ PICHON, Docteur ès Lettres, Professeur de Première Supérieure au Lycée Henri IV. Royal 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. iv + 279. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1912.

IT is appropriate that this work, by far the most complete examination of the literary antecedents of Lucan, should emanate from a country where the poet has had a succession of admirers at once enthusiastic and discriminating; but it is even more peculiarly appropriate that the author should be M. René Pichon. For not only does he command the respect of scholars owing to the breadth of his knowledge and taste throughout the whole range of Latin literature, but he also confesses to a personal affection for Lucan which the attentive reader might in any case divine to be the constant inspiration of this able and exhaustive book. 'Je voudrais que mon travail,' says M. Pichon, 'aidât à mieux comprendre un poète que j'ai toujours aimé, et que j'aime encore mieux depuis que je l'ai plus patiemment étudié.' The author's wish must be assured; for his work will be indispensable for any just appreciation of the poet. It may be remarked at once that this regard for Lucan in a critic has its dangers as well as its advantages; and there are portions of M. Pichon's book in which, if I may so put it, he is too kind to Lucan—almost too ingenious in finding excuses for his misstatements, too tolerant of his wearisome digressions, too appreciative of the originality of his borrowings, too

laudatory of the poetic qualities in his powerful rhetoric. With some reservations, however, and a disinclination to go so far on certain questions, the present writer feels himself frequently in substantial accord with the author.

The inquiry is largely historical, as must be inevitable from the nature of the subject-matter; and it is reasonable therefore that the consideration of the historical sources should occupy approximately three-fifths of the book, and the philosophical and literary sources about one-fifth each. The historical sources are examined under the heads of 'accessory facts,' 'account of the civil war,' and 'alterations of history.' For the mass of accessory or episodic material, much of it merely allusive or decorative, a sufficient source was the standard academic learning, amplified by Lucan's own observation and experience—he had been a quaestor, an augural priest, and had travelled, it will be remembered. Many incidents from national history would be as familiar to him as 'le quatorze juillet ou le neuf thermidor' to a Frenchman. Some geographical treatise or treatises he must have consulted; his serpent-lore and catalogue of snake-bites could easily be derived from the Latin of Macer without recourse to Nicander; his information regarding Egypt was likely enough found in Seneca's work on Egypt, and not in the *Quaestiones Naturales*; while a good deal more came from the writer to whom he owed his main theme—Livy. Thus it is a commendable suggestion that Lucan's

excursus upon Gaul, and the account of Druidism, were taken from lost portions of Livy, who, according to M. Pichon's *obiter dictum*, had made a 'contaminatio' of Posidonius and Caesar. So far, all is comparatively plain sailing; for the accessory facts do not involve many stormy disputes.

But problems the most serious beset the account of the civil war, where intricate argument is needed to dispose of some theories and to establish others. M. Pichon's position is in the main a reaffirmation of Baier's theory—now over a generation old, and the outcome of a hint given by Reifferscheid to Baier, his pupil—that Livy was practically the one source of Lucan's historical material. With convincing skill M. Pichon addresses himself to the emancipation of Baier's hypothesis from the exaggerations of Ziehen and Vitelli, and to its championship against the objections of Westerburg and Ussani. Case after case is examined with a view to gauging the amount of agreement, or the reason for variation, between Lucan and authors who drew material from Livy, such as Velleius, Florus, Appian, Dio, and Plutarch. The author is also concerned to maintain the genuine historical worth of Lucan. Hence, while he recognises many of the poet's inaccuracies, omissions, and distortions, he greatly minimises the indictment of error, makes light of several mistakes and absurdities recorded by Heitland, and wards off all really damaging attacks on his historical exactitude.

To follow the arguments in detail is impossible here. One must be content with a selection. A becoming fulness is shown in things Gallic—e.g. (pp. 26 *sqq.*), in the discussion of Lucan's frequently criticised characterisation of the tribes of Gaul by epithets and the alleged disorder in their mention. M. Pichon ranges himself beside M. Salomon Reinach and M. Jullian, as against M. Lejay, in justification of Lucan's accuracy, and claims that, granted a transposition of Arverni and Treviri, the list of tribes would follow a methodical arrangement. The epithets, he maintains, are not applied at haphazard, but may be supported, some on historical, some on philological, some on

archaeological grounds. In this latter connexion, the defence of the *picta arma* of the Lingones as containing 'une allusion aux boucliers ornés d'émail que l'on fabriquait à Bibracte' must interest everyone who has seen the Aeduan antiquities from Mont Beuvray at Autun. Again, take the divergence of authorities on the nationality of the slave who was ordered to kill Marius. The *Periocha* of Livy, the *Commentum Bernense* and Appian would have him a Gaul; Velleius, Valerius Maximus and Lucan make him a Cimbrian; while Plutarch gives both traditions without adhesion to either. What conclusion is to be drawn? Ussani concludes that there were two independent accounts, the one Livy's, followed by the *Epitome*, by the scholiast on Lucan and by Appian; the other that of some different historian (perhaps Valerius Antias), followed by Velleius, Valerius Maximus and Lucan. But M. Pichon has a more likely solution—Livy probably reported two accounts, as he often does, and decided for the Gallic origin; then, of those who consulted Livy, some accepted his conclusion, while others of a rhetorical tendency preferred the dramatic contrast of bringing the conqueror of the Cimbri face to face with one of the tribe.

Apropos of another question of accuracy, that raised by II. 665-666 where Lucan is supposed to imagine ignorantly that Mount Eryx in Sicily could fall into the Aegean Sea, M. Pichon prefers emendation to the explanation that Lucan is thinking in general terms of 'an Eryx' falling into 'an Aegean.' In a line beclouded with conjectures ('nubes est coniecturarum,' as Francken remarks), he ventures on what is at least a fair geographical correction, *Aegati* = *Aegatii*, for the common reading of the MSS., *Aegaei*.

Noteworthy acumen marks the series of arguments (pp. 69-79) which defeat Westerburg's attempt to derive Florus from Lucan instead of from Livy. The weakness of his position is convincingly shown by his reliance on trivial verbal similarities and by his actually founding on an error of Florus which he surmises is due to a misunderstanding of

Lucan, as if Florus might not have been equally capable of misunderstanding Livy! M. Pichon's pithy comment is 'Son contre-sens ne porte pas en soi de certificat d'origine.' Ussani's contentions are in turn subjected to searching analysis, and their frailty exhibited.

Regarding the arrangement of the Pompeians at Pharsalia it is well known that the accounts of Caesar, Lucan, Appian and Plutarch do not coincide except for the centre, which they all assign to Scipio. An incisive analysis makes it extremely probable that Lucan's account is, through the intermediary of Livy, ultimately in agreement with Caesar's; while the Greek writers Appian and Plutarch have reproduced their Latin original inaccurately.

M. Pichon is ready to admit that Lucan not only invents much, but makes daring departures from fact, as in his notorious introduction of Cicero among the counsellors of Pompey on the eve of the decisive battle. His omissions and transpositions are sometimes those of the artist, sometimes those of the partisan. Similarly there are distortions of history due to bias; only, it does not follow that in every case the prejudice began with Lucan. A very considerable share of animus may have been bequeathed by the historian who was twitted with having proved himself a good 'Pompeian.'

When it comes to questions of veracity between Caesar and Lucan, and when allowance is made for the 'personal equation' of two biased authorities, the gulf cannot be fixed so widely as many have thought. Such divergences as that concerning the attitude of senators in Rome towards Caesar after Pompey's flight or that concerning the situation of Ilerda may be appreciably lessened on subjective grounds; since in the one case a 'passive resistance' which Caesar might consider rank rebellion would be in the eyes of 'Pompeians' like Livy and Lucan scandalous weakness; and in the other case, if Caesar's 'mountain' with 'precipitous places' becomes a 'gently sloping hill' in Lucan (*B. C. I.* xlv; *Phars.* IV. 11), it is plausible to hold that the one wishes to overstate and

the other to understate the difficulty. *In medio ueritas.*

And so throughout the historical division the case is maintained by means of able reasoning and attractive conjecture—but, be it remembered, conjecture after all, which in many problems nothing short of the reappearance of the lost books of Livy could raise into certainty. A recollection of this makes statements about that which 'devait être' or 'ne devait pas être' in Livy sound arbitrary, even though deduced from strong probabilities or recognised Livian usages.

On the sources of Lucan's philosophy there is less ground for dispute. Between critics like Heitland who over-emphasise the systematic nature of Lucan's Stoicism and those like Souriau who overemphasise its contradictions, M. Pichon steers a sane middle course. To search for absolute consistency in his thought is logically to end in the negative conclusion of M. Lejay, that Lucan had no philosophy. But his family traditions, if nothing else, made him a Stoic, and Stoic he remained despite human lapses into pessimism and literary excursions into the ancient mythology. Judicious stress is laid on the value of Seneca's eloquent *Consolatio ad Liuiam* as bringing Lucan's views into clear daylight.

The last chapter is devoted to literary sources. The attitude adopted towards the Virgilian influence operative on Lucan is thoroughly sound. Although M. Pichon recognises that Lucan is not to be called a disciple of Virgil, he fully acknowledges his debt—a debt inevitable owing to the education of the times, and indeed so manifest that Merivale's denial of it remains a standing marvel. At the same time, the debt is stated more temperately than in Heitland's elaborate list, which seems to me not infrequently to discover parallels where no parallels are. Yet even so, among M. Pichon's instances, there are some which I personally should think doubtful: e.g. (p. 226) why must the vanishing of Julia's ghost be modelled on that of Creusa's? And why must the agony of a father over his dying son be modelled on Anna's anguish over Dido? In these cases there are not

even verbal resemblances to support the vague analogy of incident.

The evidence adduced by Hosius (*Rh. Mus.* XLVIII.) to trace the influence upon Lucan's style of Manilius, *Aetna*, the earlier books of Livy, and Quintus Curtius, is subjected to minute investigation. This problem has much interest in its bearing on works so dubious in date as the *Astronomica*, *Aetna* and *Historiae Alexandri*; but Hosius' evidence unfortunately amounts to little, and M. Pichon is for the most part laudably cautious in admitting as proof phrases that are too ordinary, although even he inclines to allow overmuch weight to such a phrase as *conscendere currus* (p. 237). The similarities between Curtius and Lucan are not very impressive; and the rejection of Hosius' arguments will generally commend itself. Some of the likeness in words depends upon analogy of facts—deserts, for example, are much alike everywhere and will be usually described in similar terms; other resemblances are arguably due to community of source; and others still are no miracles at all, but part of the common stock of Latin literature.

An Appendix on the 'Composition of the *Pharsalia*' deals first with the chronological limits intended for the poem. That it would have come down, if finished, to Thapsus and the suicide of Cato is M. Pichon's view. This seems likely, though one may doubt the validity of his argument for twelve books on the ground that, as the necromancy of *Pharsalia* VI. suggests the descent to the Lower World in *Aeneid* VI.,

therefore Lucan would have composed twelve books to correspond to Virgil's twelve. The arguments for a contemplated prolongation to the death of Caesar are not entered into, and in reality they do not seem very cogent. Finally, there is the question as to which were the *tres libri* mentioned in Vacca's life of Lucan as having been composed before the others. Ussani thinks I., VII., IX.; M. Pichon thinks II., VII., VIII. Personally I should think I., II., VII. a more likely group than either of these; but in all the suggestions there are difficulties touching Lucan's attitude to Caesar and Nero; and one is driven back to the traditional view as one which presents at least as few difficulties, namely, that I., II., III. constituted the *tres libros quales uidemus*. After all, it is the most natural interpretation of Vacca's words.

In passing, I ought to say that Pichon's suggestion of the identity of the *Orpheus* and the *Catachthonion* among the lost works seems to me, for reasons which there is not space to discuss, absolutely impossible.

There are a few *errata*. Besides occasional omission of punctuation marks, especially full stops, there are misprints such as *ausi* for *aussi* (p. 12, l. 19), *ereurs* for *erreurs* (p. 110, l. 2), *nbique* for *ubique* (p. 236, l. 23); *trouble* (p. 172, l. 9) wants an accent, and *greco romain* (p. 176, l. 26) a hyphen. It is probably more important to point out that on p. 40, l. 19, the argument requires that *la seconde* should be corrected to *la première*.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

REFORM IN GRAMMATICAL NOMENCLATURE.

- (i.) *Reform in Grammatical Nomenclature.*, *A Symposium (University Bulletin)* issued by the University of Michigan. New series. Vol. xiii. No. 6 reprinted from the *School Review*, 1911-12. 8vo. Pp. 64.
- (ii.) *Vorschläge des Wiener Ausschusses für einfache und einheitliche Fachausdrücke im Sprachunterricht.* Gebilligt vom Wiener Neuphilologischen Verein: Sokoll. Wien, January, 1912.
- (iii.) *Grammar and Thinking: a Study of the Working Conceptions of Syntax.* By A. D. SHEFFIELD. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

THESE volumes afford welcome evidence that the movement in favour of a reform in grammatical terminology is spreading and indeed assuming an international character. The matter is also to be discussed at the next meeting of the