

## NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES OF LUCAN\*

The text of each passage commented on is that of Housman except where otherwise stated. The following editions of Lucan or other works concerned with him are indicated by the scholar's name only: (i) *Text*: A. E. Housman (Oxford, 1926). (ii) *Text with commentary*: F. Oudendorp (Leiden, 1728); P. Burman (Leiden, 1740); C. H. Weise (Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1835); C. E. Haskins (London, 1887); R. J. Getty, Book 1 (Cambridge, 1940). (iii) *Text with translation*: A. Bourguery and M. Ponchont (Budé, 1926–29); J. D. Duff (Loeb, 1928); W. Ehlers (Munich, 1973). (iv) *Other works*: G. Cortius (Kortte), a commentary published posthumously by C. F. Weber (Leipzig, 1828–29); E. Fraenkel, *Gnomon* 2 (1926), 497–532; R. Helm, *Lustrum* 1 (1956), 163–228.

## 1. 374 per signa decem felicia castris [iuro]

*castris* is usually interpreted either as 'campaigns' (Haskins, Duff) or as 'legions' (Lejay, Willeumier–Le Bonniec,<sup>1</sup> Getty). Getty objects that no good parallel is cited for *castra* = 'a year's campaign', and suggests that '*castra* may be used as a metonymy for *legiones*'.<sup>2</sup> His appeal to metonymy seems far-fetched and the precise number of Caesar's legions irrelevant. I would explain rather that the reader, having twice been reminded of the details (283 'bellantem geminis tenuit te Gallia lustris', 300 'decimo iam uincitis anno'), is expected to recognize in *decem castris*, not the use of a word in an abnormal or unexampled sense, but a brachylogy for *castris decem annorum*, the expression used (of Troy) by Prop. 3. 12. 25, where, as in Lucan, *castra* is used to typify warfare in general; aptly Ehlers 'in zehn Kriegsjahren'. Cf. cases like 3. 282 f. 'soluens ieunia belli|Massagetes, quo fugit, equo' (*equi sanguine*; cf. Hor. *Od.* 3. 4. 34, Sil. 3. 361), 5. 218 'leuant suspiria uatem' (*tollunt s. uatis pectus*, discussed below), 7. 54 'orbis indulgens regno' (*regni cupidini*). A notable example of compressed diction is 1. 229 f. '[Caesar] it<sup>3</sup> torto Balearis uerbere fundae<sup>4</sup>|ocior et...sagitta' (*glante Balearis uerbere fundae torta*),<sup>5</sup> or 7. 438 'Romulus infami conpleuit moenia luco' (*maleficis quos adducebat ad lucum urbem conpleuit*). The poet gives the key words, the reader supplies the rest.

1. 427 f. Aruernique ausi Latio se fingere fratres  
sanguine ab Iliaco populi.

I omit (like Duff) Housman's unnatural comma after *Aruernique*, presumably intended to make *populi* appositional to *Aruerni* (noun).<sup>6</sup> Housman, quoting Sidonius,

\* I am grateful to the editors and the referee for their criticisms and comments in the preparation of this article.

<sup>1</sup> Editions, with commentary, of Book 1 by: P. Lejay (Paris, 1894), P. Willeumier and H. Le Bonniec (Paris, 1962).

<sup>2</sup> Caesar is mentioned as having ten legions in Plut. *Pomp.* 58.

<sup>3</sup> I read *it* with most edd. for *et* preferred by Housman; note *exit* in Ov. *M.* 7. 778 (see n. 5), as well as Sil. 10. 10–12, to which H. refers.

<sup>4</sup> A variation of Virg. *G.* 1. 309 'stuppea torquentem Balearis uerba fundae'.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. 3. 710 f., Ov. *M.* 4. 709 'Balearica torto funda...plumbo', 7. 776–8 'non orior illo|hasta nec excussae contorto uerbere glandes|nec...calamus...exit', Sil. 1. 314, Stat. *Th.* 7. 338.

<sup>6</sup> It is welcomed, however, by R. Samse (*Rh.M.* 88 [1939], 172) as indicating that *ausi...populi* denotes the Aedui and their kin (with whom many have assumed Lucan to be confusing the Arverni; see Getty p. xlii, and, more recently, D. C. Braund, *CQ* 30 [1980], 420–5, who is sceptical); so strained an interpretation seems improbable.

*Epist.* 7. 7. 2, suggests that the latter read *populos* (conjectured by Bentley), but of this we cannot be sure. Getty (p. xlvi) insists with some vigour that *sanguine ab Iliaco populi* is an obvious but hitherto misunderstood case of hypallage (*populi* genitive singular). Taken as genitive, however, *populi* becomes a useless appendage to *sanguine ab I.*, which is complete in itself, and the neat and characteristic framing of the words *ausi*. . . *Iliaco* by the adjective *Aruerni*<sup>7</sup> and its noun *populi* is thereby destroyed. A close parallel for this order is 10. 47 f. '*Eoi propius timuere sarisas | quam nunc pila timent populi*'; other instances of the separation of adjective from noun by up to ten words are: 2. 386 f., 4. 289 f., 5. 483 f., 6. 299 f., 7. 553 f., 8. 861 f., 9. 798 f., 10. 22 f., 162 f. *Aruerni populi* is probably a loose designation for the Arverni and associated tribes.<sup>8</sup>

1. 542–4                    inuoluitque orbem tenebris gentesque coegit  
desperare diem; qualem fugiente per ortus  
sole Thyestae noctem duxere Mycenae.

542 sc. *Titan*. 543 f. *fugiente per ortus sole*, 'reculant à son lever' Bourgery–Ponchont, 'fled back to where he rose' Duff, and this is indeed the meaning which the context appears to demand: cf. *Ov. P.* 4. 6. 48 '*solis ad Eoas currus agetur aquas*', *Sen. H.F.* 941 f. '*quis diem retro fugat | agiturque in ortus?*', *Med.* 31 '*non redit [Sol] in ortus?*', *Thy.* 1035 f. '*hoc egit diem . . . in ortus*', *Claud.* 1. 172 '*dies . . . uertetur in ortus*'.<sup>9</sup> For such a remarkable use of *per*, however, no commentator, it seems, has been able to account. Like Cortius, Getty (p. lxxv and *ad loc.*) holds that *per* = *in*, a usage, he claims, determined by 'exigencies of metre';<sup>10</sup> he cites no parallel.<sup>11</sup> It may be for consideration whether we have here a forerunner of the loose use of *per* = *in* or *ad* which developed in late Latin (*Hofm.–Szant.* 240): cf. (with Petschenig)<sup>12</sup> *Juvenus* (c. A.D. 330) 1. 127 '*populum [Domini] duces per lumen apertum*', 4. 708 '*animae per membra reuersae*'.<sup>13</sup> It seems wiser to assign to *per* its normal sense and interpret 'through the regions of the east'<sup>14</sup> (cf. 'so wie die Sonne . . . am Morgenhimmel floh' Ehlers). In the context we should certainly expect *ortus* to denote the region of the sun's rising (as in Seneca and Claudian), but *ortus* (like *oriens*) is several times used by Lucan, as by others, = the east, and the language, unnatural as it is, may represent a deliberate variation; cf. 4. 65 *primus sol*, not the rising, but the eastern sun (see below on 1. 683 f.).

1. 599 f.                    tum, qui fata deum secretaque carmina seruant  
et lotam paruo reuocant Almone Cybeben.

<sup>7</sup> *TLL* ii. 728. 9 ff. cites Sidonius as the first to use *Aruernus* as adjective: note *Epist.* 3. 2. 1 *populus Aruernus* (so 7. 1. 2). In *Luc.* 1. 421, vice versa, we find the adjective *Tarbellicus* used for the noun.

<sup>8</sup> But *populi* in Lucan has a range of meaning: cf. 10. 280 '*Cambyzes longi populos peruenit ad aeu*', sc. *Macrobios*.

<sup>9</sup> *TLL* s. *ortus* 1066. 40 ff.

<sup>10</sup> 'Conversely' he adds, '*588 in aere = per aera*'; but in these two expressions the preposition preserves its normal sense; they are not equivalents. *per* = *in* with accus. is a different matter.

<sup>11</sup> None of the passages adduced by Cortius exemplifies the alleged use of *per*: e.g. in *Sen. N.Q.* 2. 40. 1 '*cui per angustissimum fuga est*', *Clem.* 1. 12. 5 '*temptabunt fugam per ipsa, quae fugerant*', *per* has its normal sense.

<sup>12</sup> *Arch. Lat. Lex.* 6 (1889), 267 f.

<sup>13</sup> For colloquial or late usage in Lucan, cf. 9. 766 f. '*parua modo serpens, sed qua non ulla cruentae | tantum mortis habet*', where *qua* represents an ablative of comparison dependent on *tantum* used in place of a comparative (e.g. *plus*; cf. 9. 703): see Housman *ad loc.*, *Hofm.–Szant.* 110 b. An apparent instance of *et* in apodosis occurs in 5. 430 f. '*ut primum . . . tument, et . . . cecidere*' (various conjectures); see *Hofm.–Szant.* 482. Dubious is the reading 1. 642 *nulla sine lege* (somewhat favoured by Löfstedt, *Synt.* ii. 211 n. 1), where *sine* may well be a gloss on the other reading *nulla cum l.* (cf. *non cum* 1. 341, 7. 96).

<sup>14</sup> '*per loci est, refugit sol per orientem*' C. M. Francken (ed.), *Lucan* (Leiden, 1896–97).

The pontiffs engage in a solemn procession round the city walls and are followed by lesser religious figures, whose functions are severally specified. *tum*, sc. *sequuntur quindecimviri*, priests who had charge of the Sibylline books and of foreign cults. Roman readers would at once recognize in 599 an allusion to the Sibylline books and in 600 to the annual bathing of Cybele's image in the Almo. I have seen no convincing explanation of *reuocant*. Some interpret 'bring back' ('ramènent' Bourgerie-Ponchont, Willeumier-Le Bonniec, 'recall C. from her bath' Duff, 'heimgeleiten' Ehlers); but no one explains the concentration on Cybele's return – certainly, the priests knew better than to leave the goddess in the Almo. Others, e.g. Heitland,<sup>15</sup> assign to the word the sense of 'refresh', 'renew', and Getty thinks that C. 'is "restored" to her original purity through being cleansed by the waters'; but this is mere guesswork.<sup>16</sup> I interpret rather: 'recall, renew, repeat, the bathing of C. in the tiny A.'; *lotam Cybeben* = *lauationem Cybebes*,<sup>17</sup> and *paruo Almone* local ablative with *lotam* (cf. Ovid, loc. cit. below). The rite looks back to an event said to have occurred when C.'s image was brought from Asia Minor to Italy. The ship got stuck in the Tiber mud but was released after Claudia's prayers to the goddess. Subsequently, at the junction of the Almo with the Tiber, the image was washed by a priest: Ov. *F.* 4. 339 f. 'illic purpureo canus cum ueste sacerdos | *Almonis* dominam sacraque *lauit aquis*'. This washing became an established custom and its 'renewal' each year was the charge of the *quindecimviri* (cf. the allusion in Mart. 3. 47. 2 'Phrygium... Matris Almo qua lauat ferrum').<sup>18</sup> For *reuoco* = renew, repeat a custom, etc., see *OLD* s.v. 12, e.g. Liv. 39. 41. 4 *priscos mores*, Juv. 2. 30 *leges amaras*, Sen. *H.F.* 841 'quinta cum sacrum [ludos Olympicos] reuocauit aestas'; cf. the use of *refero* in 5. 74 'Delphica Thebanæ referunt trieterica Bacchæ', and of *repeto* in 1. 450 f. 'barbaricos ritus moremque sinistrum | sacrorum, Dryadae, ... repetistis'.

1. 683 f.                    quo diuersa feror? primos me ducis in ortus,  
                                  qua mare Lagei mutatur gurgite Nili.

A prophetic vision of Pompey's end. The expression *primos in ortus*<sup>19</sup> has given trouble: 'to the distant east' (H. T. Riley),<sup>20</sup> 'à l'extrême orient' (Bourgerie-Ponchont), 'to the far east' (Duff), 'ins Land der ersten Morgensonne' (Ehlers). The furthest point in the east to which the lady's imagination takes her is the mouth of the Nile: deranged as she was, it is improbable that she would so designate this region. Sulpitius<sup>21</sup> correctly interpreted the words as *in orientem*, Getty (though uncertain about *primos*) 'the east'. *primus*, while first applicable to the nascent sun, came to mean 'eastern',<sup>22</sup> and *primos in ortus* (*in* = 'towards', not 'to') simply means 'eastwards' (so R. Graves),<sup>23</sup> = *in ortus* (9. 419, 10. 50, 279, 290), the epithet *primos*, as Getty suggests, being pleonastic (cf. 3. 8 *soporifero somno*, 7. 546 *errore uago*, etc.); contrast

<sup>15</sup> *CR* 11 (1897), 41.

<sup>16</sup> *reuocant Cybeben* is very different from the cited Virg. *G.* 4. 282, *A.* 1. 214 *reuocant uires* and 235 *reuocato a sanguine Teucris*.

<sup>17</sup> For this usage, cf. 2. 150 'certatum est, cui ceruix caesa parentis | cederet' (i.e. *caesio ceruicis*), 3. 125, 738 'uox fauces nulla solutas | prosequitur' (*faucium solutionem*), etc.

<sup>18</sup> The sacred implements (cf. Ov. loc. cit. *sacra*), of which the knife, *ferrum*, was one, were included in the washing ceremony.

<sup>19</sup> Contrast Virg. *A.* 4. 118 f. 'ubi *primos* crastinus *ortus* | extulerit Titan', i.e. 'at tomorrow's early sunrise'.

<sup>20</sup> Translation of Lucan (*Bohn's Classical Library*, 1853).

<sup>21</sup> Many of Sulpitius' notes are recorded in the 1551 (Frankfurt) edition of Lucan and in Oudendorp.

<sup>22</sup> See *OLD* s. *primus* 6; Vollmer on Stat. *S.* 1. 4. 73; H. Heuvel (ed.), Statius, *Thebais* Book 1 (Zutphen, 1932), on 1. 200.

<sup>23</sup> Translation of Lucan (*Penguin Classics*, 1956).

7. 360 '*primo gentes oriente coactae*', where *primo* = *extremo*. A further instance of *primus* = 'eastern' is 4. 65 f. '*quidquid condescere primus | sol patitur*', where the context shows that the meaning is 'the eastern sun' (Duff),<sup>24</sup> not 'le soleil levant' (Bourguery-Ponchont), 'bei Sonnenaufgang' (Ehlers).

2. 198–201            tot simul infesto iuuenes occumbere leto  
                         saepe fames pelagique furor subitaeque ruinae  
                         aut terrae caelique lues aut bellica clades,  
                         numquam poena fuit.

Though the general sense of these lines is clear, the structure has caused some doubt: the language of 198–200 might suggest the propriety of a verb of effecting instead of *fuit*, hence *dedit* (Burman, hesitantly), *tulit* (H. C. Nutting).<sup>25</sup> Yet the writing is characteristic. Dilke<sup>26</sup> on 7. 61 comments 'Lucan is fond of making one noun predicate to another in a compendious sense', citing e.g. 7. 693–6 '*Thessalicae post te pars maxima pugnae | non iam Pompei nomen popolare per orbem | nec studium belli, sed par . . . libertas et Caesar erit*', where *erit* may be rendered 'will centre around', 'represent'. With 198–200 cf. 9. 595 f. '*quidquid laudamus in ullo | maiorum, fortuna fuit*', 'has been due to F.'. Thus for 198–200 *fuit* may be rendered 'has been due to', but 201 'has been' or 'has represented'; the Zeugma, acceptable to Helm 194, does not seem improbably 'harsh' (Nutting).

2. 365–71            sicut erat, maesti seruat lugubria cultus  
                         quoque modo natos hoc est amplexa maritum.  
                         obsita funerea celatur purpura lana,  
                         non soliti lusere sales, nec more Sabino  
                         excepit tristis conuicia festa maritus.  
                         pignora nulla domus, nulli coiere propinqui:  
                         iunguntur taciti contentique auspice Bruto.

On the death of Hortensius, Marcia remarries Cato. The disjointed sequence of thought in the lines may possibly represent unusually careless writing,<sup>27</sup> but Cortius' transposition of 367 before 366 is a great improvement.<sup>28</sup> There is, however, further trouble, which has attracted little comment. The only natural sense of 366 is 'embraced her husband just as she did her sons' (Duff, similarly Ehlers). But were there any sons present to embrace? We learn from 370 that no *pignora domus*, no *propinqui* assembled; *pignora* obviously cannot exclude sons,<sup>29</sup> and with the addition of *domus* it is clear that no sons of Cato and Marcia were present (so understood by Sulpitius). Accordingly, the *nati* mentioned in 366 would have to be those of Hortensius and Marcia. Yet it seems very strange that these should be present to the exclusion of all the members of Cato's family. The context and language, moreover, strongly imply the presence of no one but Brutus (as *auspex* 371) and the gods (as *testes* 353). It is hard to believe that sons of any sort were present (any more than in Sil. 10. 565 f., at the funeral of Paulus, '*non coniux natue aderant, non iuncta propinquo | sanguine*

<sup>24</sup> Otherwise 10. 435 '*Aegyptum primo quoque sole calentem*', Virg. *A.* 6. 255.

<sup>25</sup> *AJP* 55 (1934), 51 f.

<sup>26</sup> J. P. Postgate (ed.), *Lucan* 7 (1913<sup>2</sup>), revised by O. A. W. Dilke (Cambridge, 1960).

<sup>27</sup> The passages appealed to by Ehlers (p. 516), 6. 122 ff., 10. 295 ff., do not seem to me of comparable oddity.

<sup>28</sup> Note the curious reading of P in 367, viz. *non hic* (*hic* in ras.) for *obsita*: the relic of a marginal comment such as *u(ersus) non hic aptus*?

<sup>29</sup> We cannot accept Bourguery-Ponchont's unnatural interpretation of *pignora d.* as 'garants de leur union' (thus explained: 'il s'agit . . . des témoins du mariage').



Note also 7. 740 f. *cunctis*, en, plena *metallis* | castra patent' (again in a harangue – Caesar's), 'filled with all the metals in the world' (cf. 741 ff., 752 f.), where some, apparently to elude the hyperbole, believe that *cunctis* is or may be dative with *patent* (e.g. Postgate–Dilke, Gagliardi),<sup>36</sup> so enfeebling the rhetoric. Cf. Stat. *S.* 5. 1. 9 '[maritus] curas...fatigat | artificum inque *omni* te quaerit amare *metallo*'; and contrast Virg. *A.* 10. 161 '[Pallas] iam quaerit *sidera*' with Luc. 8. 167 '[Pompeius] de *cunctis* consulit *astris*'; note too 6. 779 'quod...e *cunctis* mihi noscere contigit *umbris*'.

Housman's objection to the language, i.e. *fluctuat unda aequoraque*, seems reasonable, and others too have doubted the text (*permiscent . . . sulci* Guyet,<sup>37</sup> Burman, Bourgery–Ponchont). His solution is the assumption of a line missing after 703 such as *eruta feruescunt litusque frementia pulsant*, and the notion has won favour.<sup>38</sup> It is noteworthy, however, that, feeble as is the style in the transmitted text, the essential sense is present. What we might expect instead of *fluctuant* understood is another verb for *aequora*,<sup>39</sup> but it is questionable whether, merely to provide one, Housman's additional frills are justified and do not in the context overload the description. A more economical yet satisfactory reading, I suggest, would be *fluctibus undant* in 702. If the rarer word *undant*<sup>40</sup> were reduced in transmission to *unda* (cf. the verse-endings 5. 644 *fluctibus unda est*, Virg. *A.* 4. 628 *fluctibus undas*), the need for a verb could readily suggest *fluctuat* for *fluctibus* (cf. the verse-ending Catull. 64. 62 *fluctuat undis*).

664 *indulsit castris* has been misunderstood by many commentators<sup>41</sup> including Housman, who explains ‘nimum permisit priore fortuna inuitantibus ad desidiam’.<sup>42</sup> read rather *ad temeritatem*, as the following words make clear (so taken by Ehlers

<sup>42</sup> Similarly, *TLL* s. *indulgeo* 1252. 10 ff.

p. 528). No lover of *desidia*, Curio was naturally *audax* (l. 269) and his *audacia* is indicated in 583 and 702, his *ferocia* 730. We have learnt (589 f.) that Curio has reached the rocky heights ‘Antaei quae regna uocat non uana uetustas’ and (656) that Scipio ‘maiora dedit cognomina collibus istis’, but Lucan refrains from specifying the *cognomina*: to this name, viz. *Castra Cornelia* (Caes. *B.C.* 2. 24. 2), he is clearly alluding in *castris* (664). Thus ‘seduced by <the lucky associations of> the Camp, Curio deprived the heights of their propitious repute by challenging a ferocious and more powerful enemy’ (665 *que* adding explanatory clause as in 3. 114, 126, 9. 763), and meeting with disaster for doing so.

5. 216–18

nec fessa quiescunt

corda, sed, ut tumidus Boreae post flamina pontus

rauca gemit, sic muta leuant suspiria uatem.

On 10. 323 f. ‘Abaton quam nostra uocat ueneranda uetustas, | terra potens’, Housman comments ‘*ueneranda*... aptius γαῖα πολύσεμνος quam uetustas (i.e. traditio) appellaretur’; though *ueneranda uetustas* is not inept, the turn is, and is doubtless intended to be, a surprise;<sup>43</sup> it has a bearing on the use of *leuant* above. The obvious sense ‘relieve’, ‘ease’ (Sulpitius, Farnaby, Burman), being contradictory to *nec f. quiescunt corda*, may be ruled out, and Housman acutely explains ‘*leuant* uatis pectus ut undae mare’. The natural place for *leuare* = ‘lift up’, ‘raise’, is in the preceding simile,<sup>44</sup> but, by a striking abnormality, Lucan chooses to express this idea by *tumidus* and to reserve *leuare* for the main clause = ‘cause to heave or swell’, of the priestess, i.e. her breast.<sup>45</sup> Note the close correspondence: *leuant uatem* = *tumidus pontus*, *muta suspiria* = *rauca gemit*. Without the simile *leuant* would not be intelligible.<sup>46</sup>

The poet springs another surprise in 9. 843. Cato’s men, we read, had no rest at night, ‘suspecta... in qua tellure iacebant’ (840), for there were no beds to lie on, ‘sed corpora fati | expositi uoluuntur humo’ (842 f.); they rolled, it seems, on the ground; why ‘rolled’ (cf. *iacebant* 840)? The explanation follows (843–46), but is not made clear till the last three words: ‘calidoque uapore | adliciunt gelidas... pestes, | innocuosque diu rictus... inter membra fouent’. *uoluor* may be used of the sinuous movement of snakes (*OLD* s.v. 1d), but is here applied to the men who kept the snakes warm with their bodies. Thus *uoluuntur* denotes in advance the convolutions of the man-snake partnership and may be best translated perhaps by ‘writhed’.<sup>47</sup>

A more elaborate specimen of the style occurs in Statius, *Theb.* 1. 663–6, where the Argive Coroeus, bent on a glorious death, peremptorily demands of Apollo that the god accept the sacrifice of his life as a price for the citizens’ release from the plague. Apollo is impressed ‘*tristemque uiro submissus honorem | largitur uitae*’ (663 f.); he then dispels the plague (664 f.), ‘at tu [Coroebe] *stupefacti* a limine Phoebi | *exoratus* abis’ (665 f.). The god ‘*submits to the hero* and bestows on him the *disagreeable* reward of his life’. Apollo is ‘stunned’ by the experience, while the disgruntled Coroeus leaves his shrine only ‘upon (the citizens’) entreaty’. The words *submissus* and *stupefactus* would normally be applied to the man, *exoratus* to the god (hence, presumably, its

<sup>43</sup> I commented on 10. 323–6 in *AJP* 97 (1976), 134–7, where I compared Sidon. *Carm.* 13. 1–2.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Val. Fl. 8. 352 ‘[Medea] leuat maria ardua’, Curt. 4. 3. 17; likewise, *tollere* and *erigere* Luc. 5. 599 f., 6. 27.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Virg. *A.* 6. 48 f. ‘pectus [Sibyllae] anhelum, | et rabie fera corda tument’.

<sup>46</sup> Contrast the routine language of [Sen.] *H.O.* 710–12 ‘ut fractus austro pontus etiamnum tumet, ... ita mens adhuc uexatur excusso metu’.

<sup>47</sup> Duff, with ‘they lie down upon the ground’, seems to have missed the point.

misinterpretation as though deponent, 'thy prayer heard' Loeb, similarly Heuvel op. cit.); *tristem h. uitae*, not as normally *laetum*.

6. 48–50            nunc uetus Iliacos attollat fabula muros  
                      ascribatque deis; fragili circumdata testa  
                      moenia mirentur refugi Babylonia Parthi.

48 *nunc*, 'now, in view of Caesar's marvellous wall'. 'attollat, "laudet" *a*, recte, ut ostendit *mirentur* 50' Housman, 'exalte' Bourgery-Ponchont, 'praise' Duff, 'preisen' Ehlers.<sup>48</sup> It is doubtful whether the language can be so simple and clear-cut. Only a few lines earlier (33), 'subitos attollere muros', the verb bears its literal sense (note too 20 '[opera] ardua tollat', Virg. *A.* 11. 130 'murorum attollere moles', Sil. 3. 384 'attollens... muros'); and such a natural and basic sense can hardly fail to persist above. Nevertheless, the meaning 'exalt' certainly fits the context, and the truth seems to be that the word is intended to imply the two meanings, the literal and the figurative, 'raise' and 'exalt'; it is a combination not easy to reproduce in translation: perhaps 'elevate' or 'build up'.<sup>49</sup>

6. 780–3            effera Romanos agitat discordia manes  
                      inopiaque infernam ruperunt arma quietem;  
                      Elysias alti sedes ac Tartara maesta  
                      diuersi liquere duces.

782 Housman reads *Latii* for *alti* ZM, *alii* Q, *alii* Z<sup>2</sup>. The reading *alii...ac...diuersi* (previous edd., at Bentley) taken as = *alii-alii* (so Bourgery-Ponchont) seems unexampled and yields no other satisfying sense. Housman objects that 'altos Lucanus homines non dicit, neque hic aptissimum epitheton est'. His conjecture *Latii* (with *diuersi* = *ex separatis regionibus accedentes*) is approved by Fraenkel 509, Duff, and Ehlers. Yet his objections to *alti* do not convince. The implication that a single occurrence in a writer of a well-attested usage is necessarily suspect is refuted by both reason and evidence<sup>50</sup> (note, moreover, 2. 509 f. 'alta...nobilitas...ferrum...poposcit', i.e. *uir altus et nobilis*); and the epithet appears very apt, while *Latii* adds nothing. Helm 171 defends *alti*, but implausibly takes *diuersi* (like Housman) predicatively, thus applying *alti* to all the *duces*. Preserving *alti*, I interpret differently. We have here two contrasted groups, the good in Elysium (*felices* or *piae umbrae* 784, 792), i.e. the senatorial party's forbears, and the rotters in Tartarus (*turba nocens* 799), the popular party, between whom civil war has broken out (780 f., 798 f.). The *alti duces*, true inmates of the *Elysiae sedes*, are those of lofty and noble character<sup>51</sup> (cf. 807 f. *magno superbi animo*, of the Pompey family), like the *magnanimi heroes* of Virgil's Elysium (*A.* 6. 649); the *diuersi duces* are those either of the opposite character or of the opposite side (cf. 2. 275, 3. 264). For the use of *altus*, cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 5. 31 'quae sunt magni...et alti uiri', Sen. *Tro.* 327 'est regis alti spiritum regi dare', etc.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Similarly, *TLL* s.v. 1152. 24 f., *OLD* s.v. 10b.

<sup>49</sup> For the use in Virgil of words which may suggest a twofold meaning, see K. Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid, A Critical Description* (London, 1968), 394 ff., e.g. *A.* 3. 94–6 (*ubere laeto*), 12. 85 f. (*laccassunt pectora plausa*).

<sup>50</sup> Livy uses the word *gladius* ninety times, *ensis* once only, 7. 10. 9; Statius uses *ensis* ninety-nine times, *gladius* once, *Th.* 3. 583 (see *TLL* s. *ensis* 608. 38 ff.). Note indeed Housman's comment on the abl. sing. form of the comparative adjective at 9. 996: 'semel Lucanus 7. 162 metri causa *maiori*'. In 5. 240 'nullo nam Marte' we have the only instance in Lucan of postponed *nam* (P. Barratt's commentary on Lucan 5 (Amsterdam, 1979) *ad loc.*). See too my note in *CQ* 30 (1980), 127.

<sup>51</sup> *alti* cannot here refer to high birth, as the specified members of the *turba nocens* include patricians (e.g. Catiline).

<sup>52</sup> See *TLL* s.v. 1776. 72 ff.





(3. 721) 'sic fatus'. Housman's objection to *indignatur* (no mention of *indignatus* = *i. est*), viz. 'non bene ex aequo positus inuoluendi indignandi premendi uerbis', is baseless and points to the shortcomings of 'non bene' as a critical criterion: cf. 9. 481 f. 'sic orbem torquente Noto Romana iuuentus|procubuit *timuitque* rapi; constrinxit amictus...', where for *timuit* Ω, *metuens* is ineptly read by G and most edd. ('concinnitatis causa' Housman);<sup>61</sup> note too 10. 297 f. 'amouit [natura]...sinus *et* gentes *maluit* ortus|mirari quam nosse tuos [Nile]'. As in these two passages L. has preferred to employ two co-ordinate clauses (parataxis) for the more usual principal clause and its dependent participial clause (*timens* *rapi* and *uolens* *potius*, so above *atque indignatus* (*est*)) is used for *indignatus*. It is not true to say with Håkanson that *atque*, if right, must be taken 'almost as = *nam*', any more than must *que* or *et* in the other two sentences: any causal significance in the clauses they introduce is merely implied. Closely akin is 8. 667 ff. 'in ipso|Septimius sceleris maius scelus inuenit actu,|ac reteggit sacros scisso uelamine uultus [Magni]'.<sup>62</sup> For such language, see Hofm.-Szant. 784, OLD *atque* 8a. For *inuoluit uultus*, cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 79. 4 τὴν τήβεννον ἐφελκυσάμενος κατὰ τοῦ προσώπου, and Luc. 8. 663 ff.; for *fortunaē praeberē caput*, Lucr. 3. 1041 'sponte sua leto caput obuius obtulit ipse [Democritus]', etc.

9. 37–9                    inde Cythera petit, Boreaque urgente carinas  
Creta fugit, Dictaea legit cedentibus undis  
litora.

Cato voyages from Greece to Africa. For *Creta* Ω (*et* in ras. P), *Graeca* ed. pr., Housman conjectures and reads *Graia*; the alteration is approved by Duff, Ehlers, and Helm 172, who states, somewhat surprisingly, that the transmitted text 'einen Unsinn oder eine Tautologie enthält'; other suggestions are *subit* Guyet, *Barcaea* Schrader. Housman's objections to *Creta* are three-fold. (i) 'absurde Creta ante fugere quam litora eius legantur dicitur'. But 'les deux détails *Creta fugit et Dictaea legit litora* sont simultanés; le deuxième précise le premier', very justly comment Bourgery–Ponchont (p. 131, n. 3): i.e. 'Crete flies past, he hugs Dictae's shores as the waters make way'. The two clauses represent variations of the same idea;<sup>63</sup> cf. the similar language in Sen. *Tro.* 1045 f. '[cum] *simul uentis* properante remo|prenderint altum *fugietque litus*'.<sup>64</sup> (ii) 'neque in breui narratione bis eam et uariato nomine appellari consentaneum erat'. Our criterion of consentaneity can only be Lucan's usage: cf. 2. 610 f. 'urbs est *Dictaeis* olim possessa colonis,|quos *Creta* profugos uexere...puppēs', 6. 214 f. '*Dictaea* procul, ecce, manu *Gortynis* harundo|tenditur', 8. 443 'petimus *Pharon* aruaque *Lagi*' (= *p. Aegyptum*; cf. 802 f.), 546 'est locus *Aegypto Phariusque* admittitur ensis?', 10. 4 f.<sup>65</sup> (iii) 'molestissime autem bis mutatur subiectum senten-

<sup>61</sup> Arguing, no doubt, 'non bene ex aequo positus procumbendi timendi constringendi uerbis'.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. too 3. 542 f. 'tum caerulea uerrunt|atque in transtra cadunt et remis pectora pulsant', where the last two clauses are in sense subordinate to and illustrative of the first.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. 5. 381–4 '[Caesar] petit trepidam...Romam|...summo[que] dictator honori|contigit et laetos fecit se consule fastos', where the last two clauses both denote that C. was made consul; 9. 324–7 'tum [Auster carbasa] eripuit nautis...[uelaque] spatium uicere carinae|atque ultra proram tumuit sinus', both clauses = 'the sails stretched out in front of the ship'.

<sup>64</sup> The poets like to use *fugio*, *recedo*, and other verbs to denote the disappearance of land from sight (in Val. Fl. 4. 645 'uident discedere montes', sometimes cited, the *montes*, sc. *Symplegades*, do move). In Luc. 5. 457 '[dies] mouit...Ceraunia nautis', the land seems to come nearer.

<sup>65</sup> A pretty example of tautological language is Stat. *Th.* 1. 573 f. 'felix [filia regis], si *Delia* numquam|furta nec occultum *Phoebo* sociasset amorem' (*Delia* codd., *dulcia* Müller, *deuia* Baehrens).

tiae': cf. the frequent changes of subject in a similar context, Virg. *A.* 3. 268–77, also Val. Fl. 2. 621–6. Lucan is liable to sudden changes of subject, at times leaving the new subject unspecified, e.g. 8. 66–71 'quam [Corneliam] pectore *Magnus* ambit... coeperat [*Cornelia*]... Pompei sentire manus...: prohibet... *Magnus*', 9. 449–54 'non... ortum [Austrum]... frangit *Libye*... nec ruit [*Auster*]... patet omne *solum*, liberque [*Auster*]... exercet'.<sup>66</sup> These features of the passage dubbed by Housman as *uitia* are in fact characteristic of the poet: their merits or demerits do not concern the textual critic.

10. 20–4            illic Pellaei proles uaesana Philippi,  
                      felix praedo, iacet, terrarum uindice fato  
                      raptus: sacratis totum spargenda per orbem  
                      membra uiri posuere adytis; fortuna pepercit  
                      manibus, et regni durauit ad ultima fatum.

One odious tyrant (Caesar) inspects the tomb of another (Alexander). The impropriety of the words *terrarum uindice fato raptus*, pointed out by Guyet (cf. '[Alexandri] mors inepte poena dicitur', Francken), has not been explained away. They are contradictory to the whole tone of the passage, to the preceding and prominent *felix*, and to the following remarks, which successively emphasize (i) the perpetual good fortune and esteem enjoyed by A. even after his death,<sup>67</sup> and (ii) the world's failure ever again to recover its freedom: 25 f. 'nam sibi libertas umquam si redderet orbem, | ludibrio seruatus erat', 43–5 '[mortuus] secum inuidia qua totum ceperat orbem | abstulit imperium... lacerandas praebuit urbes'. A. rampaged through the world and his death brought the world no satisfaction. The sense demanded may be achieved by the addition of a letter: read *terrarum* <e> *uindice fato raptus*, 'saved from a doom that avenged the world', i.e. the scattering of his limbs *per orbem* (22) and his exposure to *ludibrium* (26). Similar language occurs in 9. 1053–5 'quererisque [Caesar] *perisse* | *uindictam* belli *raptumque e iure* superbi | uictoris generum'; cf. too 9. 980 'omnia fato eripis' ('from destruction'). The error may be just the simple omission of one letter, like that of *a* by *U* in 10. 7 'tui socerum rapuere a sanguine [i.e. *gladio*] manes'; but the copyist may have been misled by the expression *fato raptus*, cf. 9. 825 '[Paulum] rapuit cum uolnere fatum' (*OLD* s. *rapio* 5).

10. 491–95            piceo iubet [Caesar] unguine tinctas  
                      lampadas inmitti iunctis in uela carinis;  
                      nec piger ignis erat per stuppea uincula perque  
                      manantis cera tabulas, et tempore eodem  
                      transtraque nautarum summique arsere ceruchi.

486 f. 'nec non et ratibus temptatur regia [in qua erat Caesar], qua se | protulit in medios audaci margine fluctus'. I have seen no satisfactory exposition of the passage: there has been uncertainty both over the meaning of *iunctis carinis* (492) and over the rival claims of the readings *uela* Ω and *bella* MU. The latter reading has been favoured by most editors, the former by Weise, Haskins, Ehlers, together with Housman, who

<sup>66</sup> Here belongs too 9. 773–6, where Sabellus, the victim of a *seps*, dissolves into a small puddle of slime. Housman and Ehlers (p. 556) fret unduly over 774 f. 'nec, quantus toto de corpore debet, | effluit in terras'. The subject can only be *Sabellus* (763–5), or rather what now represents S., a flow of corruption, yet still S.; he is regarded simultaneously as both. The description has a worthy successor in 796 'ipse [Nasidius] latet penitus congesto corpore mersus' (considered by Housman less *durum*).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 18. 1, where Augustus visits the tomb of Alexander: 'conditorium et corpus Magni Alexandri... corona aurea imposita ac floribus aspersis ueneratus est'.

comments 'bene lampades *inmitti in uela* (ignem raptura) *carinis* dicuntur, quas *iunctas* esse ideoque incendium continuaturas apte commemoratur'. An order to direct fire-missiles at ships' sails instead of the inflammable parts actually specified as first catching fire in 493 f., viz. the cordage of tow and the wax-caulked decks, in itself seems eccentric (no parallel offered); cf. 3. 683 f., where again it is the *pix* and *cera* that catch fire.<sup>68</sup> But were there any sails to aim at? Would craft be likely to make an attack on the palace under sail? If indeed they chose to do so, why should they be *iunctae* and thereby, one would suppose, made incapable of sailing? For *iunctis* c. Duff has 'crowded ships', a rendering which involves both unsuitable sense and dubious latinity.<sup>69</sup> Naturally interpreted, the phrase must mean 's. fastened together' (so Haskins; see *TLL* s. *iungo* 654. 61 ff.), and that is the meaning required.

We learn from other sources that pairs of ships were lashed together at the siege of coastal towns and their purpose was to facilitate the discharge of heavy missiles. This is well illustrated in Livy's description of the siege of Syracuse by the Romans, viz. 24. 34. 6–7 (see Weissenborn-Müller *ad loc.*): '*iunctae* aliae binae quinqueremes demptis interioribus remis ut latus lateri applicaretur, cum exteriore ordine remorum uelut una nauis agerentur, turres contabulatas machinamentaue alia quatiendis muris portabant' (similarly, Polyb. 8. 6. 2). Curtius 4. 3. 14–15 attributes a bizarre elaboration of the device to Alexander at the siege of Tyre, which has been ridiculed by W. Rutz;<sup>70</sup> Diodorus, 17. 43. 4, states simply that Alexander τὰς τριήρεις ζευγνύων καὶ μηχανὰς παντοδαπὰς αὐταῖς ἐπιστήσας κατέβαλεν ἐπὶ πλῆθρον τοῦ τείχους (17. 46. 1 τριήρεις ἐζευγμένας). Note too Sil. 14. 417 f. (here in a naval battle) 'turrim appulerant *nexae* ferri compage *triremes*'.

It seems reasonable to suppose that Lucan's *iunctae carinae* were put to a like use; and they were propelled by oars, not by sails. The true reading can only be *iunctis in bella*, 'linked together for the fray' (sim. Haskins); *bellum* (-a poet. plur.) here = *proelium*, as e.g. 8. 301 *in bella uenire* (*OLD* s.v. 3); *in* final, as 3. 311, 5. 742 *in proelia*, 3. 674 *in pugnam*, so 5. 325 *ad bella*.

Aberystwyth

A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

<sup>68</sup> 'faciles praeberere alimenta carinae | nunc pice, nunc liquida rapuere incendia cera'.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. 'the ships which came crowding in to the assault' (Graves), 'den dicht aufgeschlossenen Booten' (Ehlers): ships under sail would be worse than useless if crowded together.

<sup>70</sup> See his discussion in *Hermes* 93 (1965), 378 f.; also J. E. Atkinson's commentary on Curtius, Books 3–4 (Amsterdam, 1980), *ad loc.*