begins with Hecuba's lament for her fallen city, whose lost glory she evokes by an enumeration of the far-flung peoples that came to her aid:

> columen eversum occidit
> pollentis Asiae, caelitum egregius labor;
> ad cuius arma venit et qui frigidum
> septena Tanain ora pandentem bibit
> *et qui renatum primus excipiens diem*
> *tepidum rubenti Tigrin inmiscet freto,*
> et quae vagos vicina prospiciens Scythas
> ripam catervis Ponticam viduis ferit,
> excisa ferro est;   (Sen *Tro.* 6–14)

Fantham is undoubtedly right to see here highly stylized references to Priam's three most famous foreign allies.[7] The drinker of seven-mouthed Tanais is Rhesus, king of Thrace, 'he who first catches the new dawn and sends the warm Tigris into the reddened sea (the Persian Gulf)' is clearly Memnon son of Aurora, king of the "Ethiopians" in the far East',[8] and the leader of the Amazons is Penthesilea. Geographical precision is not highly prized by the Roman poets, and if Thrace is a very long way from the Don (Tanais) and tradition appears to make no particular close connection between Memnon and the Tigris, that is of no real consequence. The Tanais stands for the extreme North and the Tigris for the extreme East: Hecuba's hyperbole is intended to show that Priam's influence extended to the ends of the earth. If Nero's *Troica* did include such a catalogue of Priam's allies, the reference to the Tigris, far from being out of place, would thus conform with both the poetry and the scientific prose of his tutor. A last point is that such a lengthy description of oriental troops fighting for Troy would surely have invited comparison on many other points with Lucan's list of Pompey's eastern forces. The rivalry – friendly or hostile – between the two poets may well have centred on the competitive composition of such set pieces.

The University of Calgary   MICHAEL DEWAR

[7] E. Fantham, *Seneca's Troades* (Princeton, 1982), ad loc. (p. 208).
[8] Ibid.

NOTES ON LUCAN[1]

3.696f.

> pugna fuit unus in illa
> eximius Phoceus animam servare sub undis

'Phoceus' is ambiguous. It could mean 'Phocian, of Phocis', and thus 'Massilian'. Massilia was founded by refugees from Phocaea; but Latin writers sometimes put instead *Phocis*,[2] a name which Lucan also used for Massilia.[3] Alternatively it could be a proper name appropriate to a Massilian.[4] It is difficult to decide between the two readings: while no other participant is mentioned simply as a Roman or a Greek, some do appear unnamed.[5] I prefer to see 'Phoceus' as the swimmer's name. It seems

---

[1] Professor R. G. M. Nisbet and Dr D. P. Fowler kindly read parts of this article and made many helpful suggestions. I should also like to thank the anonymous referee for bringing to my notice a number of points needing clarification.
[2] Sen. *Cons. Helv.* 7.8; Luc. 3.340; 5.53; Gell. 10.16.4.
[3] Luc. 4.256; cf. Sid. Ap. *Carm.* 23.13.   [4] Cf., e.g., Tyrrhenus in 3.709ff.
[5] E.g. 603ff.; 652ff.

attractive to divide off the four lines describing his life in peacetime (697–700) from 'pugna fuit unus in illa' in 696; and this cannot be done if we must take 'unus' with 'Phoceus'.[6] Secondly, it seems strange of Lucan to give the swimmer four lines of description and Homeric pathos, and then not give him a name.

But whichever is the primary meaning, we may see a secondary suggestion here: 'Phoceus' suggests the Massilian's seal-like aquatic ability. The link of Phocaea and *phocae* is a natural one, reflected in some derivations of the place and in Phocaean coinage.[7] If this suggestion is present, it should encourage us to see 'Phoceus' as the diver's name; if 'Phoceus' is put in part to suggest the individual's particular (if typically 'Phocaean') qualities, it should belong to the individual.

4.19ff.

> explicat hinc tellus campos effusa patentis
> vix oculo prendente modum camposque coerces
> Cinga rapax vetitus fluctus et litora cursu
> Oceani pepulisse tuo; nam gurgite mixto
> qui praestat terris aufert tibi nomen Hiberus.

Lucan is describing the battleground of the Spanish campaign, here coming to the Cinga, the river which forms the western limit to the plains around Ilerda. The problem is one of repetition: 'campos' in line 19 and 'camposque' in line 20, harsh even by Lucan's standards. Bentley of course[8] tried to tackle it, with 'ripisque'[9] for 'camposque'; but emendation of either word is not the solution. The idea of 'campos...coerces' is the antithesis of the idea of 'explicat...tellus campos'; and the two need to be set properly in opposition.[10] The abruptness of this change is heightened if we accept the apostrophe in lines 20–2.[11] Even if we could understand '-que' as adversative[12] or replace it with an adversative conjunction, thus giving purpose to the repetition, the gap between the words still would seem too small. The solution that recommends itself is to suppose the loss of a line between 'modum' and 'campos' in line 20, lost perhaps through homeomeson. I give, merely for example, 'sed limite longo | opponis flumen rapidum'.

---

[6] *Unus* is clearly contrasted with the other drowning combatants 'pugna in illa'. 'eximius' explains why he was remarkable; but we do not find a clear statement of the uniqueness referred to in 696 until 701f. I take 'unus' as substantive, in apposition to 'Phoceus', 'There was *one* man [i.e. one man alone] in that fight, Phoceus...'

[7] Steph. Byz. s.v. Φωκαία; *FHG* ii.223, 35, attributed by Muller to Heraclides Ponticus, now more commonly attributed to Heraclides Lembus – see M. R. Dilts, *Heraclidis Lembi excerpta politiarum* (Durham, 1971), pp. 36, 13f.; B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (Oxford, 1911), pp. 587f.; O. Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, i (Leipzig, 1909), p. 407.

[8] See Housman, p. xxxiii.

[9] In the margin of the 1627 edition of Grotius, British Library 684. b.12 ('ripasque' reported by E. Hedicke, *Studia Bentleiana*, vi (Freienwald, 1910), seems to be a misreading).

[10] Duff translates 'but the rushing Cinga bounds the plains'.

[11] The manuscripts give: 20 coerces ζ, -ens Ω, -ent U, -et M²U²; 22 tuo ζ, suo Ωc, 'TUO legitur et suo' a; 23 tibi. Housman comments 'cum aeque a traditis distent *coercent...suo* et *coerces...tuo*, utrum alteri praeoptandum sit ex 23 discere nolle cuius est perversitatis'.

[12] In Lucan 'adversative' *-que* occurs when giving the positive aspect to a previous negative statement. Of the examples of adversative *-que* in Lucan provided by O. Schonberger, *Untersuchungen zur Wiederholungstechnik Lucans*, diss. (Heidelberg, 1961), pp. 213–15, almost all are of this kind. The other instances he claims are 3.569, 4.519, 1.510, 4.20 and 7.676. In this last instance (with an unemended text) the usage seems impossible, with 'adversative' *-que* immediately following a copulative *-que*. 3.569 and 4.519 are both rather to be regarded as 'theme and variation'. At 1.510 the 'que' links a combination of two circumstances that arouses the writer's anger.

6.274ff.

> succubuit siqua tellus cumuloque furentem
> undarum non passa ruit, tum flumine toto
> transit et ignotos operit sibi gurgite campos

276 operit ζ; aperit ΩC

Pompey, hemmed in by Caesar at Dyrrachium, has broken out; and this escape is compared to the Po bursting its banks and flooding the plains of its valley. Housman justifies his choice of 'operit' in 276, 'non aperit gurgite campos sed riparum ruina iam apertos inundat. itaque ordo est *campos sibi ignotos*, quocum confer IV 374 *parvo contenta paratis*, VI 435sq. *vicinaque moenia castris | Haemonidum*, locosque ad I 262sq. adlatos.' We may, however, ask whether Housman's objection is sufficient reason to reject the far better attested reading. 'Crossing over' and 'opening places to itself' express in theme and variation the action of the river, paralleling the paired 'gives way' and 'falls' of the action of the earth. While logically the plains must be open to the river, it seems reasonable to describe the river's departure from its boundaries as 'opening to itself new lands'. 'ignotos operit sibi...campos' seems an odd expression; while 'covering' is certainly what floods do,[13] the verb's lack of connection with the adjective appears to leave the latter isolated and ineffective. 'aperit sibi' on the other hand has a clear association with 'ignotos'.

That flooding is described in the following lines, 277f., 'illos terra fugit dominos, his rura colonis | accedunt donante Pado', should not have too much influence on our choice of reading in 276. These lines describe metaphorically the complete change that Pompey's successful outbreak effects: while before Caesar's siege works enclosed the whole of Pompey's army, now these are empty and Pompey's army is spread out freely on the plains beyond, cf. lines 269ff., particularly 271, 'mutandae...iuvat permissa licentia terrae.' In accordance with the narrative that the simile is describing, the emphasis is not on the flooding itself (note 'his rura colonis | accedunt'), but on the drastic change caused by the river's breakthrough. Consideration of the narrative of course favours 'aperit', cf. 'laxat' in 270 and 'permissa licentia'[14] in 271.

9.604ff.

> iam spissior ignis,
> et plaga, quam nullam superi mortalibus ultra
> a medio fecere die, calcatur, et unda
> rarior

Lucan describes the waterless deserts beyond Ammon's temple, preparing us for the snake-filled fountain of 607ff. In this description, the link of the outer two parts, 'spissior ignis' and 'unda | rarior' (the former preparing the latter), is confused by the central one, 'plaga...calcatur', bizarrely put as if of similar nature; this might be improved by reading 'ut' instead of 'et' in 605.

York   NIGEL HOLMES

---

[13] *T.L.L.* ix (2), p. 686, 1ff.

[14] 'permissa', as elsewhere in Lucan, combines the ideas of permission (with 'licentia') and geographical openness, cf. 10.330f. 'prima tibi campos *permittit* apertaque Memphis | rura modumque *vetat* crescendi ponere ripas.'