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, Vol. II *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*.
Cum commentario critico edidit C.M. Francken. Vol II.
continens libros VI–X. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W.
Sijthoff [1897]. Mark 9. 60.**

Walter C. Summers

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 04 / May 1898, pp 228 - 231
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030675, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030675

How to cite this article:

Walter C. Summers (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 228-231 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030675

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

as *Νοήματα* of the Supreme Reason, or if we may apply to it the Aristotelian dictum, *ὁ νοῦς τόπος εἰδῶν*, *Νοῦς* will be identified with the totality of Ideas, which thus enter, in the second instance, the class of which Reason is the principal occupant, viz. the class of Cause. To show that the four classes are not mutually exclusive it may be observed that, although pleasures as *πεπερασμένοι* belong to the class *Κοινόν*, yet, as elements of the *μικτὸς βίος*, both they and sciences must be classed as *Ἀπείρα*.

Again, according to Aristotle, Plato made τὰ *Μαθηματικά* a group of entities mediating between the Ideas and the sensible world. Which of the four *γένη*, commentators inquire, do they occupy? If they are to be identified with anything mentioned in the *Philebus*, it must clearly be with τὰ *πέρατα* or *περατοειδή*: i.e. with the quantitative laws which, being immanent in sensible objects, make them more or less faithful copies or analogues of their respective *παρδείγματα* or eternal archetypes. Mr. Bury has collected a number of opinions of various value on these matters in an appendix, from which it appears that the last of the above solutions are advocated by Schneider and Tocco.

(19) Among statements which involve misconceptions the following may be selected: 'To the Final cause belongs the attribute of Eternity,' Introduction, p. 45. Why Eternity, of all others, is the attribute which cannot belong to the Final cause, an object which by its very nature can only be found in the sphere of *γένεσις εἰς οὐσίαν*—the sphere of transient being.

(20) Further on, p. 49, we are informed

that the *αἰσθητὸς κόσμος* is the *αὐτοζῶον* of the *Timaeus*—a proposition which, after all the eloquence expended by the Master on the contrast of *αἰσθητὰ* and *νοητά*, would assuredly not have been received with acclamations of assent in the groves of Academe.

(21) Subsequently the editor says: 'So far then we have assigned both Reason and Pleasure each to its appropriate *Genus* (viz. *ἡ αἰτία* and *τὸ ἄπειρον*). This is, so to say, to have determined the *formal cause* of these two objects,' p. 55. Neither of these technical terms can be properly employed on this occasion. When Socrates speaks of *τὸ ἄπειρον* and *τὸ αἴτιον* as *γένη* and says that Pleasure and Reason fall under these *γένη*, he only means that they are subjects of which these general terms can be predicated. He does not mean that *τὸ ἄπειρον* and *τὸ αἴτιον* are Genera of Pleasure and Reason in the logical or scientific sense—*ἐν τῷ τί ἐστι κατηγορούμενα*. Assuming that Socrates has established his thesis, Unlimited and Cause are, logically speaking, only Accidents (*συμβεβηκότα*) of Pleasure and Reason: and neither Socrates nor any one else would dream of introducing them as Genera into the definition of those objects.

But, secondly, even if we know the true genus of any thing, we may have made very little progress in the discovery of its formal cause. To know this we must know every factor or character that enters into its complete definition. There may be twenty of them, and the genus the least important of the twenty.

E. POSTE.

FRANCKEN'S LUCAN, VOL. II.

M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia. Cum commentario critico edidit C.M. FRANCKEN. Vol II. continens libros VI–X. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Siijthoff [1897]. Mark 9. 60.

IN scope and principle the second volume of this book closely resembles the first, reviewed by Mr. Heitland in the *Classical Review* for February, 1897. But in spite of the discussion of Dr. Francken's methods to be found there, there are several points on which I feel it necessary to touch.

First as regards the *apparatus criticus*.

Is this intended to be complete? I imagine so: but in that case it requires revision. See e.g. vi. 76 vii. 295 viii. 48 ix. 605 where no mention is made of important MSS. (V, U, or G) which give readings either different to that placed in Dr. F's text or otherwise interesting (as e.g. viii. l.c. where G is omitted though it coincides with M, a rare occurrence). Again, the apparatus is bulky, and clearness essential. F^m and Hosius' F might be given a place in the Notae Codicum opposite p. 1. What MS. is referred to as F in viii. 192, 355? In x 230 F appears (from the note) to be a

misprint for T: is this so in viii. ll. cc? And what is S, quoted on vi. 7, vii. 462, 519, viii. 177¹ etc? Above all, what is the reading of the important MS. G in viii. 231? One statement stands in the apparatus, another in the corrigenda (in which a misprint occurs) and a third will be found in Hosius' edition! In vii. 331 Dr. F. gives us two accounts of the reading of his own MS. A: similar is the note on viii. 134 *ira UV arma VRg*. Some of these defects may be due to printers' errors, which are rather numerous. The corrigenda for this volume start with the correction of a misprint on p. 20. But, to confine myself to really misleading or confusing errors, before that page we have these:—vi. 58 PR—standing for P^R or P^RR 217 *defuisse* etc, words which belong to l. 207² 295 *erigit V egerit V 312 exciri VRg* (apparatus) VRb (note) 316 V mentioned *along* with O (which, ordinarily, includes that MS).

These slips make one distrustful—especially as, in many passages, we have to decide between our editor's account of a MS. reading and that given by other scholars. These cases seem to me rather frequent—whether more so than is to be expected, is not now the question.³ I have before me seven passages, in all of which a choice has to be made between two possible readings and where, in consequence, it is most important to know what our good MSS. read. The passages are vii. 303, 801, viii. 693, 727, ix. 40, 880 X 136. Dr. Francken's notes shew that in all these passages there is doubt as to the real reading given by M. Compare the note on vii. 395: '*quo M (Stht.) G (Us.) in uiroque (sic) ego quod.*' Nor is Dr. Francken himself always confident of the accuracy of his own statements: see vii. 303 '*recepti ex V et fortasse M*' ix. 605 '*de M dubito*' 749 '*M si recte tradit Stht.*' (where the question is, does it read *agris* or *causis*?). Was it not worth while to have these points definitely settled? ix. 40 is the only case I have noted where the editor is confident concerning his own collation. Moreover, there are cases where Dr. Francken does not mention that his account of a Ms. reading differs from that of other scholars. See (for M) vi. 330, ix. 541, x. 245, (for V)

vii. 159, viii. 95, 382.⁴ In x. 316 *tantas* is an emendation, not a reading of M.

Passing to the text, we find numerous emendations of Bentley, Heinsius and others definitely adopted. The editor's own corrections are generally reserved for the notes. A tendency to favour U is noticeable: cp. vi. 734, viii. 390, 529 etc. I think we get improvements upon Hosius' text in the following places: vi. 200, 293,⁵ 313, 650, vii. 12, 462 (a well-known *crux*), 504, 575, 598, 616 (a rare case of return to O), viii. 27, 563, 861 (and perhaps punctuation in 366, 417), ix. 38, 250, 329, 406, 430, 454, 482, 569, 719, 758, 766, 840, 937, 1105, x. 48, 117, 290. I am not quite certain as regards vii. 607, viii. 51, 757, 779.⁶

I pass now to the consideration of some passages where the editor fails to convince me. Even here the care bestowed on the work, the obvious desire to find out what Lucan really wrote which pervades it, and the intimate knowledge of his author, make Dr. Francken's notes and discussions in most cases interesting and, above all, stimulating. The commentary is more exegetical than the average of critical editions leads one to expect. When the same has been done for Valerius, Statius, and even Silius, we shall be on firmer ground with regard to 'silver' poetry. How uncertain the footing is at present can be known only to those who work at these authors, the ordinary histories of literature treating them with confident and conventional inaccuracy. Even Dr. Francken seems at times to fail through not making sufficient allowance for the taste and mannerisms of 'silver' literature. I shall give a few examples below. The reading cited in brackets is that of Hosius' edition.

vi. 88 *digerit artus*] *derigat* ('stiffens') is a bold emendation, more discreetly reserved for the note in ix. 676. 428 *quis prodat aues*] Dr. F. notes that the question is not '*quis sit augur*' but '*quid augurium prodat.*' Hence he reads *quid prodat auis*. But he cannot alter '*quis fulgura servet*' just afterwards, to which he appends the remark '*variandi causa,*' and why not allow variation to begin earlier? 596 *mens dubiis percussa pavet rursusque parat ast Certos*

¹ In vii. 462, 519 it seems to be a misprint for C, in vii. 633 it stands for Servius! In other places one must await Dr. Francken's explanation.

² Similar displacements vii. 383, 868; ix. 651.

³ Dr. Francken's views may be gathered from his words in *Class. Rev.* 1897, p. 181: '*Stht. de V. fallitur, ut cuius potest accidere: in quo facile est tragœdias excitare, præsertim si ipse codices non conferas.*'

⁴ In all these passages there is much doubt as to which reading should be adopted.

⁵ I never believed *Aetnaeis* could be right, for *Aetna* comes soon after and the Roman poets loved variety in proper names. *Notum* need not be taken strictly, and it now appears that A has *Hennaeis*.

⁶ In vi. 360 if emendation is necessary, read *abducta* with Sen. N. Q. vi. 25 (both passages refer to the draining of Thessaly).

ferre metus] Dr. F. complains that 'pauere' and 'metuere' present no contrast, and reads *labat*. But surely the contrast lies between facing a certainty (*metus* = *causa metuendi*, almost death itself) and being in suspense. *Pauor* in this latter sense is common enough. 604 Here the order of words is changed, against the bulk of MSS. and without explanation. Exactly similar cases are vii. 548,¹ 559: compare also vi. 810, vii. 623,² 828, viii. 618, 870 (? a misprint), ix. 29, 150, x. 268 where the readings in text have either no or only inferior authority. 652-3. Dr. Francken here reads *quod traxerit* and *quod descenderat* and in his note explains the difference of tense. But no explanation is given for the change of mood. Other passages where the changes seem objectionable are 192, 286, 484 and 700. Hosius' text in 550 and 565 is retained.

vii. 32 *fructum raperetis*] Here Dr. F. with most MSS. reads *caperetis*, though in 331 he reads *rapiunt* against all MSS., noting 'celeritas erat significanda.' But this is much more the case here, and UG support *raperetis*. Compare V 794 *perit fructus amoris*, where *perit* = *non rapitur*, just as in x. 505-8 *perdo* and *rapio* are contrasted. 768 *nocentem*] Dr. F. complains 'cur terra nocens dicatur nemo dixit' and emends. But 869 is a parallel and Dr. F. has actually provided another by emending to *nocentem Emathiam* in 798. The changes in 2 and 764 do not commend themselves to me.

viii. 229 Here is a serious error, Dr. F. reading in the text *ab igne iam propior qua Persis eram*—'where I was nearer the sun than are the Persians.' To avoid all possibility of mistake he notes *Persis* = *quam Persae*. Metrical points are strangely handled elsewhere: vi. 616 *contentu's* and viii. 431 *transiris Araxen* would surely have surprised so correct a versifier as Lucan. The note on viii. 187 is strange: 'contra usum in additum est ne ultima verbi respondit producat.' In the notes on ix. 990 and 262 Ovid and Seneca are misquoted as writing respectively 'hic locus est Vestae Palladem qui servat et ignes' and 'immane regnum est posse sine rege pati.' 702 *perculit*] *perculit* Dr. F. who notes 'perculit—Weis. explicat suppleto 'ad exitum.' Eodem (i.e. nullo) iure possis supplere 'ad culmen.' Dr. F. wars, and often with justice, against commentators who explain by supplying

omitted words, but surely Aen. ii. 555 and Eclogues v. 34 justify the reading here. I cannot accept the changes in 41,³ 390, 511 and 529. Hosius' reading in 567 is retained.

ix. 9 Is not *animas* meant to stand in text? 43 *momenta* is a misprint. 153 *Pellaeis arcis* is ingenious, but in viii. 736 *arca* has a contemptuous force, out of place here. Nor does the vulgate seem objectionable to me. 211 *scire mori sors prima uiris*] *uiri* Dr. F. who notes 'uiri in plur. opponitur vulgo mulieribus; uirilis praestantiae significatio solet singulari indicari.' This is very new to me, and Lucan seems to ignore the rule in 406. Arbitrary distinctions of this kind abound in the notes (see further below): sometimes they are allowed to affect the text as here and viii. 529 where we are told 'iacere sub aliquo figurate dicitur, sub ruina non item.' 413 *pars erit Europae*] *par* Dr. F. But Silius says of Libya 'aut ingens Asiae latus, aut pars tertia terris' (i. 195). Another passage illustrated by Silius is 425, where Dr. F. keeps Hosius' text *nullo glaebarum crimine pura*. Mr. Heitland has shown that the reading *diues* is supported by Ovid, but I think Silius gives even more certain evidence. In iii. 650 *sqq.* he closely imitates Lucan: how closely, may be seen by the following table:—

Sil. III.		Luc. IX.
653	=	448
655	=	449-50
660	=	453
665	=	495
677	=	622
688	=	452

In the midst then of this passage Sil. writes (l. 673) 'loca plena deo (= Luc. l.c. 564) *dites sine uomere glaebas*.' *Mox* is retained in 776.

x. 47 *prope plus* is surely very unnecessary: *propius timuere sarisas* is surely no harder than *iam propius metuens* and *propius sperans* in Sil. i. 32, xvii. 535. In 122 *fulcit gemma toros* is read, with V, but surely it can hardly stand.

A number of lines are bracketed, or marked as being duplicates. Of the former I can only remark on vii. 759, where the process seems very unnecessary: *sibi* may be repeated with *promiserit*. As for passages which look like duplicates, the silver writers give plenty of scope for such conjectures, but it is very dangerous ground. Take for example vi. 554-5. The sentiment is at once repeated in 556-7 and Dr. F. marks

¹ *non illic* is read by all good MSS.: see the corrigenda in Francken.

² *quis transmittat* only AC (see the corrigenda in Francken).

³ Surely *stares* in l. 43 does refer to Cornelia?

these lines accordingly. But do not lines 560-1 deserve the same fate? In vii. 560 *sqq.* the treatment is too ingenious: that a marginal note would get dovetailed into the text in this way seems to me improbable.¹ In vii. 257-8 Dr. F's. note seems itself to provide material for defence of the lines in their present position.²

I close with a word or two on the notes. They contain a good deal of exegetical matter, and to some of the explanations I must take exception. vii. 357 *sacra antiquus imagine miles* cannot mean 'qui antiquitatis speciem prae se fert': from *Curios, Camillos* in the following line it is clear Lucan has not finished with the *clari viri*. viii. 121 *templorum cultus* is explained to mean 'divine honours,' as though this would induce Pompey to stop in Lesbos. 541 Why is Haskins' explanation of *monstrum* ignored? Cp. *nefas* 550. ix. 866 *ingressis* is certainly not passive. 985

¹ The note on 567 is strange: *premit* surely = 'close'—a friendly act, without any idea of 'manus nocturna.'

² 571-3 are bracketed, but surely these lines do form the apodosis to the preceding ones and quicumque = quibus is rare at beginning of clauses (V. Fl. viii. 4 is quite exceptional).

uenturi me teque legent]. Can *te* = 'your history of the civil war,' as Dr. F. explains? As for the suggested alterations of the text to be found, one cannot but note once more the arbitrary grounds on which some are based. For instance can we assume that in vii. 295 the choice lies between *in tela ruentis* or *in bella furentis*, and that *in tela furentis* is out of the question? In viii. 66 we are told 'relativa sententia qua annectitur illud quod gravius est progressis h.l. non est apta.' Why less so than in vi. 250, vii. 764, ix. 911? I conclude with a very typical example, viii. 303 where Lucan writes *Spicula nec solo spargunt fidentia ferro*. Dr. F. suggests *sidentia*—an unlikely word in any case. But wherein lies the peculiarity which he describes as *admodum insolens*? For the personification cp. e.g. Sen. Epp. xciv. § 57 *nunquam pacem agens ferrum*; V. Fl. vi. 124 *inceptus iam lancea temnit erilis*, and many other similar expressions. Anyhow the text is rendered quite certain once more by Silius who writes (i. 219) *nec fidens (tellus) nudo sine fraudibus ensi* and (13. 198) *nudo non credere ferro*.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

NEUE ON THE LATIN VERB.

Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache, von FRIEDRICH NEUE. Dritter Band. *Das Verbum*. Dritte, sehr vermehrte Auflage von C. WAGENER (Berlin 1894-7, pp. 664). 21 Mark.

NEUE's *Formenlehre* is too well known to need any fresh recommendation. It is enough to say of the third edition by Prof. Wagener that it maintains the high standard reached by the former editions and is absolutely indispensable to advanced students of Latin. In this volume on the Verb, for example, we have carefully compiled statistics on the Passive use of Neuter Verbs, e.g. *regnata rura* (pp. 1 *sqq.*), on the interchange of Deponent and Active Forms, e.g. *assentio* and *assentior* (pp. 17 *sqq.*), on the use of the Tenses (pp. 129 *sqq.*), on the Person endings, e.g. *-runt* and *-re* 3 Pl. Perf., *-ris* and *-re* 2 Sg. Pass. (pp. 111 *sqq.*), on departures from the usual Conjugation-type, e.g. *cupiret* besides *cuperet*, *evenat* beside *eveniat*, *-ibo* and *-iam* Fut. (pp. 241 *sqq.*), on the Gerund in *-undum* and *-endum* (pp. 331 *sqq.*), on Perfect formations

(pp. 340 *sqq.*), on Verb-forms in *-so*, *-sim* (pp. 507 *sqq.*) on Perfect Participles Passive (pp. 521 *sqq.*), on Unthematic and Defective Verbs (pp. 594 *sqq.*), to mention only a selection of the topics discussed. The difficulty of compiling such statistics may easily be imagined. To draw up lists without a flaw would require an accurate knowledge of the textual criticism of every Latin author, a knowledge which is clearly beyond the power of any one. It will always be advisable to verify the Neue-Wagener examples by consulting the best critical edition of each author cited, before pronouncing that this or that form is or is not found in a particular author. On p. 82, where *proficisco* is quoted from Plaut. *Mil.* 4. 8. 19, the remark 'im Leipz, proficiscor' is surprising. The Leipzig MS. (F) of Plautus is well known to be a copy of the Codex Ursinianus (D) in the last twelve plays, so that its departure from the reading of BCD is a fact quite unworthy of mention. Unless one verified this reference in Leo's or the Ritschl edition, one might be misled into supposing