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](#)

Hosius' *Lucan M. Annaei Lucani de Bello Civili* Libri decem. G. Steinharti aliorumque copiis usus iterum edidit Carolus Hosius. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1905. 8vo. Pp. lx + 374. Price M. 4.50.

W. B. Anderson

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 07 / October 2006, pp 354 - 360

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00994927, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00994927

How to cite this article:

W. B. Anderson (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 354-360 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00994927

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

on 7. 4. 2 by an Oxyrhynchus papyrus. Much more serious than any of these small details is his choice of certain words to express Aristotelian terms. No one can ever really understand the *Ethics* who is taught to think of εὐδαιμονία as 'happiness,' or even who has 'habit' given him as an equivalent of ἔξῃς. 'Intuition' is very questionable for νοῦς; 'voluntary' and 'involuntary' do not fairly represent ἐκούσιον and ἀκούσιον, unless we considerably alter their ordinary English

meaning. Whether in 10. 9 οἱ σοφισταὶ is well rendered by 'Professors,' I will not venture to say. The use of inverted commas is sometimes misleading and may give the idea of a much closer translation than the author really attempts. There is a useful index. I hope to see a second edition, revised in places and much cheaper.

H. RICHARDS.

HOSIUS' *LUCAN*.

M. Annaei Lucani de Bello Civili Libri decem. G. Steinhartii aliorumque copiosis iterum edidit CAROLUS HOSIUS. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1905. 8vo. Pp. lx + 374. Price M. 4.50.

IN the year 1892 appeared Dr. Hosius' first edition of *Lucan*, and all scholars interested in the poet rejoiced that a really scientific text was at last available. The great merits of Hosius' work were duly recognized in this *Review* (viii, pp. 34 ff.) as marking 'an important epoch in the critical study of *Lucan*.' After the lapse of thirteen years we have now the opportunity of welcoming a second edition. In the interval much study has been devoted to the *De Bello civili*, and if it is true that the new light shed on one of the most complicated of textual problems has often served merely to make the complication more evident, it is no less true that the elucidation of many obscure points by various scholars has materially advanced our prospects of a final solution of the great enigma.

In 1894 Lejay published at Paris a scholarly edition of Book I, with a long introduction containing, among other things, an account of the MSS and a discussion of their relationships. The chief importance of this book lies in the fact that it drew attention to several Paris codices of which Hosius had taken practically no account.¹ But Lejay's edition has been strangely overlooked by most scholars. Beck, in a work which will shortly be mentioned, says that it is hardly to be found in a single

state or university library in Germany. The year 1894 saw also the publication of Genthe's dissertation on the codex *Erlangensis* (E).

Even before Hosius' first edition was published, C. M. Francken had shown his interest in *Lucan* by several articles in *Mnemosyne*, and in 1896 and 1897 appeared the two volumes of his edition. Francken's opinions about the MSS do not, on the whole, differ very much from those which had been expressed by Hosius, but he uses a few codices which had, for the most part, been neglected by former editors. Of these, the ninth-century *Ashburnhamensis* (A), which Lejay had used for Book I, is in some respects the most notable. Full use was made of this MS by Mr. Heitland in editing *Lucan* for the new *Corpus Poetarum* (1900). The same scholar has also made in this journal several valuable contributions to the study of *Lucan*'s text.

In the same year in which Mr. Heitland's text appeared there was published at Munich a doctoral dissertation entitled *Untersuchungen zu den Handschriften Lucans*, by Friedrich Beck. This is probably the most important treatise that has ever been published on the subject. Beck availed himself of previous labours in the same field, and he had also examined some MSS previously ignored. He aimed at comprehensiveness, and therein lies his chief fault. The problem of *Lucan*'s text is a tangle of broken threads which are not likely to be unravelled and sorted out for many a long day to come. Beck's 'scharfe Scheidung und Ableitung'² was rash in itself; it was doubly rash, because he had a very defective

¹ Lejay's discussion of the relationships of the MSS shows much industry and acumen, but it is vitiated by some very serious oversights, which will be mentioned later.

² The words are those of Hosius in his review of Beck's work, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* Feb. 23, 1901.

knowledge of some of the chief MSS; but his treatise is a model of industry and exceedingly useful to all students of the subject. With his revolutionary judgment concerning A, which will soon be mentioned, all must agree.

The foregoing is a very brief summary of the research which made a revision of Hosius' edition necessary. 'Ne mea quidem omnia,' he says, 'quae antehac praedicavi,

recto etiam talo stare concedo, neque me piget aliqua ex parte palinodiam cantare atque delere, quae falsa esse aut alii evicerunt aut ipse repetitis curis perspexi' (*Praef.* p. xxx). After this frank statement one is prepared to find considerable alterations in the second edition. How great these alterations are may be judged by a comparison of the following small extracts from the *apparatus criticus* of both editions (p. 115, Bk. IV. 620-639).

ED. I.

620 Mirantur (antur *in ras.*) M Miraturque B₁U vg | neque G₁ || 623 gelide C fesso gel. V || 624 Tum Um | tum MUG || 625 Vrgere (M₁ ?) B₁ || 630 vena M₁ || 632 lax. robore V | nudos B₁ || 634 undis *in ras.* M arvis (C)mvb || 636 Confixere M₁ | partes B₁ || 637 separare B₁ | noverca M₁ || 639 exsuccam Bothe | conferre B₁.

These examples are enough to show that the *apparatus* has been largely re-written. B has practically disappeared, and two new symbols, Z and P, are prominent. The alterations are of such interest and importance to the student of Lucan, that it may not be out of place to explain them here at some length, and I am indebted to the kindness of the editor for permission to do so.

Briefly stated, the view taken in Hosius' first edition as to the relationships of the MSS and their respective value is as follows. There are three classes. The first consists of codices which go back to the recension of 'Paulus Constantinopolitanus,' the mysterious individual mentioned at the end of some of the books in a few extant codices (*Paulus Constantinopolitanus emendavi manu mea solus*). The MSS belonging to this first class are M (*Montepessulanus* H 113) and two Berne codices, B and C, which, though they have not the *subscriptio Paulina*, show kinship with M. The second class is represented by V (*Vossianus I*), which seems to be the only pure representative of its family. U (*Vossianus II*) and some other MSS come midway between the first two classes, being a mixture of both. The third class consists of three fragments of palimpsests, perhaps of the fourth century, which contain parts of Books V, VI, and VII. One of these fragments preserved at Naples seems to be part of the same codex to which a palimpsest at Vienna belongs, and both portions are denoted by the symbol N in Hosius' edition. The other palimpsest is the 'Palatine' or 'Roman' fragment (II). According to Hosius Class I and U are

ED. II.

620 (Mir)antur(que) *in ras.* M Miraturque ZUvg | neque G₁ || 623 gelide C fesso gel. V || 624 Tum Ump | tum MPZ,UG || 625 Vrguere Z₁ (M₁ ?) || 627 & ad Z(M₁ ?) | complet ilibus ss. Z || 628 descendit P || 630 vena M₁Z₁ || 632 lax. robore V || 634 duris P | undis *in ras.* M arvis Z₁ (C)mv || 636 Confixere M₁ | noverca M₁Z₁ || 639 exsuccam Bothe.

most valuable, but the other codices must not be neglected.

The most important addition which subsequent criticism has made to our knowledge of the subject is derived from the MS denoted by the symbol Z, a ninth-century codex, Bibl. nat. lat. 10,314. It hails from the abbey of Epternach, as M. Omont believes. It is written by various scribes, and is much 'corrected,' though I venture to doubt if the 'correctors' are as numerous as Lejay supposes. The 'vulgar' errors in the codex are very numerous. Lejay mentions the following: i 129 *cogliere*, 166 *fuitur* (for *fugitur*), 195 and 225 *agit* (for *ait*) and several others. Even a cursory examination is sufficient to show that the readings of Z and of M present a very marked similarity, and M, instead of being *paene gemellus* of B, as Hosius formerly thought, stands in some such relation to Z. It is satisfactory to note that in his second edition Hosius is careful to point out that the resemblance just mentioned subsists between the first hands of the two MSS. Both Z and M have been very plentifully 'corrected,' and writers on the present subject have not always distinguished between the original text and subsequent insertions, though the distinction is of prime importance. As M is generally rated high by scholars, an earlier MS which is closely allied to it must possess great interest. The resemblance between the two codices will be evident if we compare their readings in any passage chosen at random. Let us take a few examples from the latter half of Book IV.

412	campus Z ₁ M ₁	campum O
417	fuga Z ₁ M ₁	fugae
477	consulit Z ₁ M ₁	consulite
483	reddere Z reddere M ₁	prodere s. perdere
491	obrupta Z ₁ M ₁	obruta
509	quod Z M ₁	quid
523	pauerunt Z M ₁	pauerent
525	mergere Z ₁ M ₁	uergere
531	temptare Z ₁ M ₁	temptauere (tent.)
578	O ferrum Z ₁ M ₁	ob f.
590	quas Z ₁ *M	quae
604	Adsuerant Z ₁ M ₁	adsuerunt
630	uena Z ₁ M ₁	uenaë
637	nouerca Z ₁ M ₁	nouercae
645	tandemque Z ₁ M ₁	tandem
658	potiti Z† M ₁	potito
695	caesaries Z ₁ M ₁	caesareis
710	odore Z ₁ M ₁	odere
761	illi Z ₁ M ₁	ulli
786	uidit Z ₁ † M ₁	uidet
788	inuisos Z ₁ M ₁	inuisas

From this list it will be seen that Z and M frequently agree in readings which are obviously false; and it is an elementary principle of textual criticism that concurrence in errors is one of the strongest proofs of kinship between two MSS. At this point, a question naturally suggests itself,—

can Z throw any light on the original reading of M in the many cases in which, owing to erasure or other cause, that reading is very doubtful. We shall find our answer in the part of Book IV with which we have just been concerned.

411	proserit s in rasura duo litt. M (Francken)	prosterit Z ₁
438	odoratae (d in ras.) M‡	ororatae Z ₁ §
459	tectum (tec in ras. 6 litt.) M (Francken)	effectum Z ₁
465	sensit (sit in ras.) M	sentis Z ₁
563	incurrunt (u in ras.) M	incurrant Z ₁
571	conspicitur (sp. in ras.) M	conficitur Z ₁
612	cleonei (cle in ras.) M	cifonaei Z ₁
	proiecit (iecit in ras.) M	prolegit Z ₁
645	tactae (t in ras.) M	factae Z ₁
688	concitus (tu in ras.) M	concilus Z ₁
739	ciuile suum (e suum in ras.) M	ciuilis suum Z§
782	pressis stipataque (sis stipataque in ras.) M	pressistipataque Z §
805	urbi (bi in ras.) M (Francken)	urbes Z ₁
821	fecerit (it in ras.) M	feceret Z ₁

In some cases (e.g. iii 350, 718; iv 741; v 322, 779; vi 405) M can be used to restore the original reading of Z. Again, if we apply to the two MSS the criterion of omitted lines, we shall find one more bond of union between them, for several lines were originally omitted in these codices but in no other. Such are ii 463–4; iii 146, 608; v 810; vii 607, 725.

But in spite of these striking resemblances, neither of the two MSS is copied from the

other. The evidence on this head is quite convincing, but cannot be set down within the limits of this review. They must, then, be derived from a common original, which Hosius denotes by the symbol ϕ . They cannot, however, both be direct copies of ϕ , as Hosius considers possible. It seems certain that Z, at least, comes from ϕ through an intermediate codex.¹

¹ The proofs of this are, briefly stated, as follows:—

(1) Many differences of reading throughout. (2) Especial divergence in Bks. IX and X. (3) A few striking readings in Z which are not found in any other MSS, or, at any rate, not in any of those usually cited: e.g. ii 27 *nec tam* (*sed iam* O).

* Z, according to Hosius.

† Or Z, according to my collation.

‡ According to Hosius' first ed.

§ Not mentioned in Hosius' *apparatus*.

|| Francken's 6 should therefore be 5.

Thus we may with confidence construct the following alternative stemmata.¹

The striking similarity between M and Z forbids us to separate them farther than is done in the second stemma.

An interesting but extremely difficult question, which is not discussed by Hosius, is whether Z or M is the better representative of ϕ's readings. The problem can hardly be discussed here. My own investigations have led me to give the place of honour to Z.

We have, then, in Z a MS which is closely allied to M, which often supplies the original reading of M where that reading is illegible, and which perhaps represents better than M the text of the common original of the two codices. This was a discovery worth making, but there is a greater to follow. Z is the source of Ashburnhamensis (A), Bernensis (B), and Erlangensis (E).² The credit of this discovery is due to Lejay and Beck. Hosius sets forth the evidence in his preface (pp. xxxvi, xxxvii). Lejay had noticed that iii 211 was originally omitted in Z, but subsequently added in a ninth-century hand at the top of the page, i.e. before v. 194. In B line 211 is found in the text immediately after 193. From this fact, as well as a like occurrence in the same book (v. 244), Lejay came to the natural conclusion that B is copied from Z.³ He did not notice that A, which he declared to be *plus vieux d'un bon demi-siècle que*

tous les autres, exhibits similar signs of being derived from Z. It was reserved for Beck to supplement Lejay, and to show that a great mistake had been made in assigning A to so early a date, and that not only B, but A and E must be referred to the same original Z.⁴ They are not direct copies: each has been 'contaminated' from other sources; but that they are copies there can be no doubt. To the evidence already mentioned Hosius adds some other proofs.⁵

It must be carefully noted that A, B, and E were derived from Z in its corrected form (*quod cum fugisset Beckium, magnas sibi peperit turbas*, Hos. p. xxxvii.).

Some years ago Mr. Heitland remarked that M is probably our best MS, but that the original of B must have been a codex of no mean value. It is now clear that the original, though not the direct original, of B has been found.

Thus A, B, and E must disappear almost wholly from the *apparatus criticus*. As Hosius says,

Iam sequitur ABE, ubi cum Z aut z concrepant, abiciendos esse; nam ubi ex fonte haurire possumus, non rivulis longe derivatis utemur; paucis locis ubi discrepant, si cum ceteris codicibus concinunt, sua auctoritate carentes nihil proficiunt, si singularia praebent, suspicionem aut corruptelae aut interpolationis plerumque movent (p. xlii).

Besides Z there is another Paris MS which is of considerable importance for the textual criticism of Lucan, viz. P, no. 7502 in the Bibliothèque Nationale. This MS seems to be of the tenth century. It contains the prose arguments and, at the end of every book except the ninth, the *subscriptio Paulina*. An excellent facsimile of a page of P in Chatelain's collection is enough to show that the MS was written by a very ignorant scribe. Like Z it alters its complexion very much in the last two books. There it has a marked resemblance to M; in the others it presents a wonderful mixture,

¹ Hosius gives

in his stemma (p. xlix), but he does not mean to affirm positively that Z and M are derived immediately from the same codex (see p. xxxv of his ed.).

² Also of a ninth-century Montpellier codex (F, according to Beck's notation).

³ In spite of this Lejay, by a curious oversight, assigns Z and B to different families!

⁴ Students of Latin palaeography know only too well 'the difficulty of accurately assigning MSS of the period of the ninth and tenth century to their true positions' (Sir E. Maunde Thompson's *Manual*, p. 262). In the present case the evidence afforded by the handwriting is actually misleading, and it is to be regretted that Beck made an attempt to support his conclusion—the only possible one—on palaeographical grounds.

⁵ One small piece of evidence, which Hosius does not mention, is rather interesting. In iv 352, for *aperimus* B reads *asprimus*. This reading is easily accounted for by Z, which reads *asprimus* (= *as-perrimus*).

but very often agrees with Vossianus I (V).¹ The V-tradition is found to a considerable extent in M, but still more in P. As to the origin of P it is impossible to speak with any confidence. Hosius' theory—which does not seem to be adequately represented by his *stemma*—does not carry conviction; indeed it is tolerably clear that Hosius himself does not put very much trust in it, so it need not be fully explained here. There are, alas! in the MSS of Lucan too many problems whose investigation merely leads on from one difficulty to another and ends in no more tangible result than a violent headache. One forms a theory which seems to account fairly well for the facts; then another fact is observed which, if it does not upset the whole theory, necessitates the addition of a corollary to it, and so there is gradually built on a foundation of sand a tottering structure which the lightest breath of a critic may perchance upset. But whatever may be its origin, P is certainly a MS to be reckoned with.

Hosius mentions other MSS, but the only ones which he adds in his new *stemma* are P, Z, and Q (a fragmentary Paris MS akin to M); the outcome of Beck's too courageous effort has deterred him from attempting to frame an elaborate scheme amid so much uncertainty. He divides the codices into two groups, (1) the 'Pauline' group, going back to the *recensio Paulina*, though with more or less 'contagion' from the V-class, (2) the recension represented by V. (1) includes M, Z, P, U, A, B, E, Q, C, and many others, while V is the truest representative of the second group. Paulus, he thinks, in spite of his somewhat boastful language—*emendavi manu mea solus*—concerns himself more with punctuation and annotation than with emendation. On the other hand V represents an edition by a man of taste and knowledge, who for that very reason was 'elegantiae sermonis et perspicuitatis magis studiosus quam veritatis et sinceritatis.' Whether it is right to talk of a 'Pauline group' is open to grave doubt; the question cannot, however, be discussed here. Most scholars who have investigated the merits of the case will probably agree with Hosius that the text represented by M and Z is nearer to what Lucan wrote than is the V-tradition.

Thus Hosius' view of the comparative value of the MSS has not changed very materially. M, to which Z must now be

added, is, he still thinks, the best authority. P and U approach these codices in value. V is distinctly less important, 'non tamen abiciendus.' The other codices, he says, either confirm the readings of those just mentioned or exhibit evident traces of corruption. He is confident that we now know, from the original text or the correctors of the codices already examined, all the readings current in the Carolingian age, and he does not see any necessity for the examination of other codices.² With the last remark I find it hard to agree. Surely another discovery like that of Z would not be useless.

But in his second edition Hosius has not merely used MSS not employed in his first; he has tried to obtain accurate information about the readings of MSS which have long been known to fame. The student of Lucan's text cannot but be struck with the variations in the reports of readings as given by different collators. In iv 563, according to Hosius,¹ V and U read *incurrant*; according to Francken they read *incurrunt*. In v. 662 of the same book these editors are again at variance, thus:—

Hosius³: regat UG gerat MVB(C)

Francken: regat EMU gerat ABVG.

Examples might be multiplied¹; indeed Mr. Heitland in editing the *Corpus* text was compelled to invent symbols (Ms and Mf) for Steinhart's and Francken's records of the readings of the great Montpellier codex. By personal inspection and the assistance of others (notably of M. Bonnet) Hosius has very considerably improved our knowledge of the readings of M, V, U, and other MSS. We must be particularly grateful for the trouble taken to ascertain the text of M, both because of the intrinsic importance of the codex, and because it seems to have deteriorated even within the last forty years,⁴ and the sooner a minute collation was made, the better.

Having said enough to indicate that Hosius' *apparatus criticus* is in advance of all others, I venture to make a few criticisms. On this side of the North Sea we cannot help being grateful for the appreciation of

² Praef. p. liv; also *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 23rd Feb. 1901.

³ Since writing the above I have noticed that Mr. Heitland gives in vol. ix of this *Review*, p. 37, a few examples of such differences.

⁴ 'Qui [i.e. Steinhartus] quod saepius quam mihi contigit deletam lectionem invenit, explicandum esse puto e meliore condicione libri, quo tempore Steinhartus multis ante me annis eum contulit.' Francken's ed., vol. i, *Praef.* p. xii.

¹ Often also with Voss. II (U); e.g. P and U agree in reversing the order of viii 25 and 26.

Bentley's work which almost every page of the edition shows; but in spite of our national pride we must admit that in his treatment of Lucan's text Bentley allowed his magnificent scholarship to run riot, and only a small proportion of his conjectures deserved mention in an *apparatus* so condensed as that of an edition in the Teubner *Bibliotheca* necessarily is. Indeed, despite the statement on p. lvi of the preface, Hosius displays misleading capriciousness and inconsistency in the recording and omitting of variants. In ii 125, and 157, as my collation informs me, Z reads *robura*. Hosius gives the variant in the second instance, but not in the first. In the same book impossible readings, which may or may not show the character of the MS, are cited in v. 58 (*decedat* for *decidat*) and v. 224 (*igitur* for *ibitur*), but *sequemur* for *sequimur* (320), *set* for *et* (642), and others of a similar kind are not mentioned. In 299 *iuuet*, for *iubet*, is recorded, but nothing is said of the opposite error, *iubat* for *iuuat*, in 282. The following are a few other points open to objection in the *app. crit.* to Book II:—

27 *nec tam* Z₁ not mentioned; 31 '*om* Z₁', but '*lumine* Z₁'! 90 *Iugurtae* Z not mentioned, though in 92 *Kartago* is recorded; 93 '*dies* Z' should be '*diis* Z'? ib. *lybica sibi* for Z read Z₁; 164 Z₁ has *libiae*; 276 for Z read Z₁; 352 *unaque* Z not mentioned; 392 for Z read Z₁; 444 for Z₁ read *z*; 672 by an oversight the readings *xersem* and *sersen* are both attributed to Z, which, if my collation is correct, reads *xersen* (*s* in rasura).

The points just mentioned are perhaps of no great importance, but they certainly impair the value of the *apparatus*. In v 62 the real fact about the reading of the Vienna palimpsest seems, oddly enough, to have escaped all the editors. According to both Hosius and Francken N reads DONATA or DONATE *ex corr.*, where formerly was a word 'dessen Züge Aehnlichkeit hatten mit PYIRACC' (Detlefsen *ap.* Francken; so Hosius, 'DONATA *ex* PYIRACC (?)' N). But the half-deciphered letters represent PVERACC, i.e. the scribe of N had begun to write *puer accipit* (or *accipis*), which occurs in the previous line, then, noticing his mistake, he corrected it as shown in the *apparatus*.

On iii 128 a reference should have been given to *Praef.* p. xlviii.

The new text does not differ very widely from that of the first edition. There are, however, several changes. Sometimes the editor returns to a MS reading where a conjecture had formerly been adopted. In i 74

mixtim (Usener) gives place to *mixtis*; 101 for *male* (Kortte) *mare* is now read; 295 Hosius' conj. *pedibus* is no longer read in the text, though it is mentioned in the *app. crit.* All these changes are for the better; the same may reasonably be said of ii 26, *minaces*, with the MSS (*micantes*, ed. I). *Micantes* is retained, perhaps rightly, in i 320, where it now has the support of P and Z. In v. 107 (*totas* for *notas*), vi 25 (*colli* for Vossius' *collo*), and ix 288 (*increpat* for *increpet*) we have further instances of a recantation which was amply justified. *Mentimur dominos* in v 386 now appears to be a conjecture by Burmann (it was formerly thought to have the authority of V), and Hosius takes the safest course in reverting to the reading of the MSS, *m. dominis*.

There are very many cases where the MSS vary between two words, each of which gives a suitable meaning. The diversity of reading may be due in nearly all cases to a gloss, but in some it may be derived from Lucan himself, who left his work in an unfinished state. In deciding between two such alternatives it is dangerous to follow one group of MSS exclusively, for glosses may be as numerous in the best class as in the worst. *Praestat lectio difficilior* is often the safest rule. Hosius wisely refuses to allow his preference for the 'Paulines' to determine his choice in every case.

A few typical examples may be given.

- i 381 { *signa* Z
 castra O } Hosius prefers *castra*, but *signa*, as the more difficult reading, ought perhaps to be adopted (as it is by Lejay) in spite of the preponderance of MS authority for *castra*. In v 349, where the same variation occurs, *signa* is rightly preferred. The reading in ix 379 (*signa* Hos.) is not quite so certain.
- ii 293 { *signa*
 bella } *signa* Hos.¹ *bella* Hos.², rightly, in all probability.
- i 588 *errantis* VPUGC Hos. *uolitantis* MZ. A very difficult case, but it seems, on the whole, more probable that *uol.* is a gloss on *err.* than *vice versa*.
- iv 147 {
viii 364 } *mortis* > < *Martis*. *Mortis* has the MSS on its side in each case and gives a forcible meaning. Hosius is doubtless right in preferring it.
- viii 575 *sociosque* G, Hos. *classemque* O. *Sociosque* is *prima facie* more probable, but the authority of G against all other reputable MSS is so slight that Hosius

is decidedly bold in accepting its reading.

Hosius is not so prone as some are to suspect the genuineness of lines. He is probably right in bracketing ix 83. In the same book v. 86 was bracketed by him in his first edition (as later by Francken); in ed. II he removes the brackets to the following line. It is true that v. 87 is absent from most of the MSS, but the similar endings (*cura, hora*) of 86 and 87 are sufficient to account for the omission,¹ and 87 (*pace* Francken) seems otherwise unexceptionable.

v 53 *Massiliaeque suae donatur libera Phocis*, ought perhaps to be bracketed. It is omitted not only by P but by the very ancient Vienna palimpsest. It comes at the end of a list of allied states on which rewards and distinctions were conferred by the senate, meeting in Epirus. The meaning is, 'and the freedom of Phocis is granted as a favour to her (colony) Massilia.' [The confusion of Phocis and Phocaea occurs also in iii 340.] The line may well have been inserted by some native of Massilia who wished to have some mention of his birth-place in the list of honoured states. We may compare the well-known 'Athenian interpolation' in the *Iliad*.

Considerations of time and space allow only a few more notes on a text which may justly be said to be not only founded on a rational view of the manuscript evidence, but constructed with skill and sound sense.

ii 425 *sq. radensque Salerni | Cultra Siler.*

Cultra B Hosius *Tecta* O *Tesqua* Heinsius.

¹ Omission of lines through this cause is not uncommon in the MSS of Lucan. Cf. ii 466, vi 562.

Hosius boldly flies in the teeth of all the MSS that count. I venture to support his seeming rashness by suggesting that the origin of the impossible *Tecta* is a gloss on a false reading *occulta* for *culta*.

v 191 (of the prophetess) *anhelo clara meatu | Murmura.*

Clara murmura seems a very unnatural combination. As it is read in N, the corruption, if there is one, must belong to the age of capitals. Many conjectures (*crebra, clausa, caeca*, etc.) have been made. Perhaps ANHELOLARGA would be more easily corrupted to ANHELOCLARA than any of the other emendations proposed. *Largus* occurs several times in Lucan, and is appropriate enough to the volumes of sound issuing from the cavern.

vii 462 One of the most desperate *cruces* in Lucan, as a reference to Hosius' or any other reputable *app. crit.* will show. Without going into details or attempting a solution of the problem it may be suggested that the variants *vultus* and *tempus* could be explained by supposing a gloss (*h*)*ora*. Or did the original text contain the word *ora* (e.g. . . . *spectant atque ora agnoscere quaerunt*)?

ix 805 *om. MP.* Perhaps the line should be bracketed. It reminds us of x 419 as given by MU, which, as Lejay says, 'paraît être la versification d'un titre.'

In reviewing a work of such excellence it may seem trivial to take exception to small points of orthography, but it is owing to that very excellence that such spellings as *littus* offend one's sense of the fitness of things.

W. B. ANDERSON.

Manchester University.

BILLSON'S *AENEID*.

The Aeneid of Virgil with a Translation.

By CHARLES J. BILLSON, M.A., Corpus Christi College, Oxford. 10½" x 7½". Pp. v + 309, iii + 335. London: Edward Arnold. 1906. 30s. net.

It is the age of the translation. In verse and in prose alike we have supply and demand. So Mr. Justice Ridley's *Pharsalia*, noticed in this *Review* 1897, pp. 270 sqq., has found its way into a second edition; and a bare decade of years sees the completion of three English *Aeneids* in verse and the inception

of another. The first and the fourth of these it will be most natural here to compare.

The first half of Mr. Rhoades' version was favourably judged by Mr. T. E. Page in the *Classical Review* of 1893, pp. 415 sqq.: it was completed in 1896: Mr. Billson's appeared in 1905. Both translators spare us the disquisition upon the canons of translation so apt only to set in a clearer light the incongruous aim or the inadequate performance. Three pages sufficed Mr. Rhoades for his prefatory apology. Mr. Billson is more parsimonious still. No word