

a descriptive epithet as a noun (I. 1. 6 *laniger* 'the lamb', I. 11. 6 *auritululus* 'the ass', IV. 4. 3 *sonipes* 'the horse', IV. 9. 10 *barbatus* 'the goat'). Again, it is unlikely that Phaedrus, after using *canis* twice, should substitute the specific name *Lacon*: indeed neither *Lacon* nor *Molossus* occurs in Phaedrus at all. In I. 1 the sequence is *agnus—agnus—laniger*: in I. 11 *asellus—auritululus—asinus*: in IV. 4 *equus—sonipes*: in IV. 9 *hircus—barbatus—hircus*. The evidence of style is thus strongly in favour of *latrans*. Cunningham's emendation is improbable because *latrans*, placed at the beginning of the sentence, would naturally mean 'barking' and not 'barker.' The existing MS. P does not give the least hint of suspicion: *latrans* is fully and clearly written, and Prof. Housman's conjecture that *Lacon* was corrupted by the following *non* is quite arbitrary, for, though Phaedrus is written as prose in P, there is no evidence

that he was so written in P's archetype. Against style and tradition, therefore, stands only a rule of prosody which is not so clear. Avienus, who must have known Vergil's (*Aen.* VIII. 698) *omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis*, nevertheless wrote *cura latrantis Anubis*. The *a* may have been really short, usage in the poets notwithstanding, or it may have tended to become short in the *sermo quotidianus* or when *latrans* was used as a noun. I believe that the *i* of *migro* is short only in Ter. *Hec.* 589 and Manil. III. 79: similarly the *a* of *flagrum* is short only in one or two passages of Plautus. Lastly, Phaedrus was a foreigner and may have made a mistake, as foreigners will. There happen to be so many chances of evading the rule of prosody that I think I was not bound to treat it as paramount and to obelize *latrans* as corrupt.

J. Gow.

#### PROF HOUSMAN, BENTLEY, LUCAN.

'FINDING faults,' says Prof Housman, if they are real and not imaginary, is the most useful sort of criticism.' So I have thought as long as I can remember, and I am truly glad to learn that I have been right.

In settling the text of an ancient author there are two main lines of fault-finding: there are the faults of the MSS tradition, and the faults of the author himself. When MSS evidence is conflicting, and when it tells, as it sometimes does, on the side of that reading which is in itself clearly inferior, it is of the first importance to take full and fair account of the character and circumstances of the author so far as they are known to us. It may well be that what commends itself to the judgment of a modern scholar as the better reading is not (even though that scholar be infallible) what the author wrote. The cases of the several authors vary, and a slip that would be improbable in Statius' *Thebaid* *bis senos multum vigilata per annos* may more safely be allowed to stand in an unfinished poem by a young and fluent writer.

To take the case of Lucan. Prof Housman finds fault with me for 'refusing corrections by Bentley and others.' Now I admire the cleverness and learning shewn

in Bentley's 'corrections' as much as any one. But when I ask myself in each case 'is this a correction, or an improvement, or both, or neither?' I find myself generally constrained to answer 'an improvement, at least from Bentley's point of view.' And it seems to me that the mature and ratiocinative Bentley was out of touch with the crude and uneven rhetoric of Lucan, and that his actual results are in this case of little value. As for 'correcting,' he could not help it: but his attempts to correct Milton betrayed the false direction of much of his work.

But it may be said that some corrections are so obvious, the improvement in the sense so manifest, that we must perforce accept them. Thus in I 481 *inter Rhenum populos Albimque iacentes* does indeed seem preferable to *Alpem*, let alone *Alpes*. But two objections soon occur (a) with *Albim* the reference is clearly to Germans, and it is not certain (see 308-9) that Lucan is thinking of Germans rather than Gauls, (b) the words 'inter Rhenum Alpemque' seem strained when judged by a modern map, but Lucan had not a modern map. And when I read the queer geographical notions of Polybius (III 47), when I recall the endless controversies to which the Roman landings in

Britain have given rise, I am loth to 'correct' the MSS for the sake of bringing the text into harmony with modern knowledge. If the maps of Lucan's time were at all like the *tabula Peutingeriana*, then the Rhine made an acute angle with the Alps, and there is no reason to suspect the text.

So much for a correction which so far as I know is not Bentley's. The conjecture *Belgis* for *bellis* in I 463 is due to him. But it should be added that he proposed to rewrite lines 460-72 in an astounding manner, in fact as a master correcting a pupil's exercise. If the MSS are worth no more than this, then it is a case of 'every man his own Lucan.' No doubt the just and unaggressive character attributed to the Chauci by Tacitus (Germ. 35, not 33) makes it seem strange that Caesar should have kept military posts 'to restrain them either from war or by means of war.' But if we read *Belgis* and paraphrase 'to restrain them from attacking the north-east of Gaul,' the position is still stranger: if this is not to call the Chauci wilfully aggressive, what is? It is hard for me, who am 'too little concerned with the sense of what Lucan is supposed to be saying,' to offer an opinion: but may not *bellis* mean 'by wars,' that is, by campaigns carried on, when necessary, beyond the Rhine? Did not Caesar twice cross the Rhine to impress the Germans? Are not the Chauci a rather ill-chosen *pars pro toto*?

Among the changes proposed by Bentley in this part of Lucan is in lines 464-5 Rhenique *ferocis* deseritis ripas et apertum gentibus *annem*. The MSS tradition is *feroces* and *orbem*. Bentley asks 'quid vero illud *orbem*? an totus orbis undique apertus, quia ripa Rheni deserebatur?' He takes *orbis* to mean the whole world. So in III 276 'nunc huc nunc illuc, qua flectitur, ampliatur *orbem*' Prof Housman renders 'the globe,' and regards the result with not unjustified dismay. But need we accept this? Even *totus orbis* is used with exaggeration where only the Roman world (VIII 211-2 *orbis* qua Romanus erat) is meant. Thus I 110 *quae mare quae terras quae totum possidet orbem*, while in 166-7 *totoque accersitur orbe*, quo gens quaeque perit the non-Roman East is more particularly referred to. Of the uses of *orbis* with adjectives, such as *extremus medius arcuous eous Lativus Thessalicus* and many more, there is no need to speak. But V 686 et *tantus* caput hoc sibi fecerit *orbis*, '[the people of] so large a part of the (Roman)

world' is worth noting. And in VIII 603-4 *ne quo non fiat in orbe* heu facinus civile tibi we see the transition to the use of *orbis* by itself as 'a part of the world.' In I 369 *ut victum post terga relinqueret orbem* it is the whole world, meaning in truth but a part. In IX 416-7 *maior in unam orbis* abit *Asiam* it is 'a greater part of the world.' In IX 436-7 *natura deside torpet orbis* 'the world' is no more than 'the surface of the country.' In IX 466 *orbem* que a sede moveret, 481 *sic orbem* torquente noto, the idea seems very confused, as happens in Lucan at times. In X 476 *gelido circumfluis orbis* Hiberno it is 'the country,' as IV 407 *Adriaco tellus circumflua* ponto.

To return to I 465 *apertum gentibus orbem*, I hold that it means 'the [Roman] world laid open to [barbarous] nations,' that is, nations not owing allegiance to Rome, *gentibus externis*. See Haskins' notes on I 31, 82. In III 276 *nunc huc nunc illuc, qua flectitur, ampliatur orbem* I render 'according to its various bends enlarges a continent to East or West.' That is, this or that continent. In this passage *orbis* is comparatively easy to understand, being helped by *diversi mundi* which precedes. Whether the reading *hunc...illum* is on other grounds preferable or not, is a different matter. That the sense compels us to adopt it I feel unable to concede. A good deal here and elsewhere depends on the value to be assigned to the codex Vossianus primus (V). If Prof Housman would finally settle this question, readers of Lucan would owe him many thanks. We might perhaps be able to read (for instance) *recepimus* in VIII 831.

It is unnecessary to discuss points where I agree with the Professor, such as the questionable use of the name 'Pauline' to describe a certain class of MSS. Nor need I deal with such matters as the readings of I 588 and 687, on which I have already said what I had to say in previous numbers of the *Classical Review*. It will be enough for my purpose if I have succeeded in shewing that Prof Housman does not always manage to state the case fairly against a reading when he is in a hurry to dismiss it with contempt. Who it is that neglects 'the sense of what Lucan is supposed to be saying' is a question upon which opinions may differ—or rather might have differed; for I have now learnt that in readings—never mind reasons—there is one final Court of Appeal.

The passage I 531 calls for special notice. I have accepted the reading 'et varias ignis *tenso* dedit aere formas.' Prof Housman would read *denso* with VG. He refers to the regular quotation of editors, Seneca N Q VII 21 § 1, where it is said that the Stoic view is that comets and certain other fiery phenomena *denso aere creari*. But Lucan has already done with the comet and the *faces*, and it is not clear to me that what he is now describing is included in the things mentioned by Seneca. And to say that Lucan is 'copying his uncle' is only true if 'copying' does not mean 'following.' For in his next chapter Seneca adds 'ego nostris non adsentior,' and gives his reasons.

At this stage let me insert a passage from a letter written to me by Prof J. S. Reid before I even knew that I had the honour of being noticed by Prof Housman. He says "It may interest you to know that I have for a long time thought *tenso* right, because it chimes in so well with Stoic terminology. The term *ρόνος* (commonly rendered by *intentio*) encounters one at many points in the Stoic system. Things approximate to the pure *πνεῦμα* in proportion to the degree of *ρόνος* which they possess. The expression occurs most commonly in connexion with mental phenomena, but, as the mind is regarded as purely material, that does not matter. The cold air, acquiring more *ρόνος*, naturally passes into fire, and with the reading *tenso* the line of Lucan is genuinely Stoic. That air may be said to be 'put on the stretch' is shewn by the following passages.

Epictet II 23 § 4 τὸν μεταξύ ἀέρα οὕτως ἐνεργὸν ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐντρονον ὥστε δι' αὐτοῦ τεινομένου πως δικνεῖσθαι τὴν ὄρασιν ;

Gellius V 16 § 2 Stoici causas esse videndi dicunt radiorum ex oculis in ea quae videri queunt emissionem aerisque simul intentionem.

Seneca N Q II 6 § 3 intentionem aeris ostendent tibi inflata nec ad ictum cedentia ...quid enim est vox nisi intentio aeris, ut audiatur, linguae formata percussu ? [there is more in this chapter and in cc 9, 57].

It is true that elsewhere Seneca talks of

the emission of light accompanying the compression or thickening of the air. Whether the Stoics did so or not is far from certain. In his *Nat Quaest* Seneca inserts matter from all quarters, even from *Lucretius*."

When therefore Prof Housman says 'Air is notoriously incapable of tension,' I may accept his authority in a department where he has done nothing to create mistrust of his judgments. But the question is not one of modern Physics: it is the point of view of Lucan and his Stoic teachers with which we are concerned. As for Dr Hosius, who restored *tenso* from what he believed to be the better MSS authority, his defence will be found in the *Neue Jahrbücher* for 1893 page 340.

I should not have made any reply to the remarks of Prof Housman were it not that the credit of the new *Corpus* is concerned. In such a work it is hardly possible to be too cautious in avoiding needless emendation: and this is particularly the case in dealing with an author the MSS of whom 'may almost be called good.' A conservative spirit must predominate, if the work is to be of any use. Again, in a cooperative work there will be delays. The completion of each instalment depends on the slowest contributor. The single-handed worker has in point of speed a great advantage over the driver of a team.

But if I were simply editing a text on my own account I should still be under a conviction of the difficulty of attaining results that could fairly be called certain. One moves in a region of probabilities varying from more or less ingenious guesswork to moral certainty: and the latter is rare. If this conviction has made me culpably timid, I can at least assure Prof Housman that I try to imitate Prof Francken in 'disinterestedness' and 'unwillingness to be duped.' But I am far from having reached those *edita doctrina sapientum templa serena* around which the *intentio aeris*, or rather *aetheris*, is in all probability extreme.

W E HEITLAND.