

NOTES ON LUCAN 10¹

10.149ff.

non sit licet ille nefando
 Marte paratus opes mundi quaesisse ruina...
 optabit patriae talem duxisse triumphum.

Describing Caesar's feast in Alexandria, Lucan comments on the folly of the Egyptians in displaying their riches to him, an armed guest already waging civil war, when even the more virtuous and austere Roman generals of antiquity – Fabricius, Curius and Cincinnatus – would be tempted to take such wealth in triumph for their country.

It may be worth stating that 'mundi... ruina' is not just 'the havoc of the world' (Duff) but an image of its final destruction (cf. Lucr. 6.607; Luc. 2.253; 4.393; 5.637; Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 1150); this is, of course, one of Lucan's central images for the civil war.

Some² take 'mundi' as going with 'opes' as well as with 'ruina'. Despite the apparent parallel of line 169, 'discit opes Caesar spoliati perdere mundi', this is undesirable for two reasons. Firstly, if 'mundi' goes only with 'ruina', we have a better contrast between Caesar's motive in waging civil war, wealth, and the consequences of this pursuit, the destruction of the world.³ Secondly, a sufficient motive would here be provided for Caesar's actions if we took 'mundi' with 'opes'; and this is not what we want when we are contrasting the greater motive he has for war against Egypt. The occasion for Lucan's comment here is the fineness of the citrus-wood tables that the Egyptians foolishly set before their guest (145f.) 'quales ad Caesaris ora / nec capto venere Iuba'. Similarly in line 154 the 'talem... triumphum', which would seduce a more patriotic and austere Roman than Caesar, would seem less remarkable if the wealth that Caesar is already pursuing by civil war has been described in such hyperbolic terms.

10.165ff.

multumque madenti
 infudere comae quod nondum evanuit aura
 cinnamon externa nec perdidit aera terrae,
 advectumque recens vicinae messis amomon.

166 quod Ω schol. Stat. *Theb.* 6.61; cui Heinsius (quoi Burman)

167 externae GC; externa Ω a.

terrae GC; terra Ω c; 'TERRAE legitur et terra' a

¹ These notes derive from the work for my D.Phil thesis, 'A Commentary on the Tenth Book of Lucan'; they owe much to the guidance and advice of my supervisors for these sections, Prof. R. G. M. Nisbet and Dr D. P. Fowler. I owe a double debt to Dr G. O. Hutchinson for his warnings and suggestions as an examiner of my thesis and for his comments on this article. Quotations given at the head of each note are from Housman's text.

² G. Luck, *Lucan, der Bürgerkrieg* (Berlin, 1985), 'sich an den Schätzen der Welt durch ihren Untergang zu bereichern'; M. G. Schmidt, *Caesar und Kleopatra, philologischer und historischer Kommentar zu Lucan, 10, 1–171* (Frankfurt, 1986), ad loc., 'Die ambivalente Stellung des Genetivs *mundi* scheint nicht unbeabsichtigt: Für Caesar zählt einzig der Bürgerkrieg... zu dessen Fortführung er bisher die Reichtümer dieser Welt gesucht hatte (*opes mundi quaesisse*), ohne deren Zerstörung zu achten (*mundi... ruina*). Der Genetiv *mundi* in seinem Bezug zu *opes* und *ruina* konstituiert also eine paradoxe Pointe.'

³ Cf. 2.251ff.

quemque suae rapiunt in proelia causae,
 hos polluta domus legesque in pace timendae,
 hos ferro fugienda fames mundique ruinae
 permiscenda fides.

Housman's text (above) and explanation, essentially following that of the *adnotationes*, is that the cinnamon has not yet evaporated 'novitate aeris externi' ('aura...externa') or lost the 'odorem quem in patria habuerat' ('aera terrae'). His interpretation has been rejected with good arguments by Håkanson,⁴ who notes that, as with 'amomon' in 168, the distance travelled and hence time stored is what effects loss of scent; change of air is then an irrelevance here and it would be better to replace 'quod' with 'cui' or 'quoi',⁵ allowing 'aura' to have its expected sense of scent⁶ and 'externa' to be taken with 'terra', where it most naturally belongs.

With Heinsius' 'cui' we notice also Lucan's use of 'theme and variation' here, and its parallel in line 168. The basic sense is that the cinnamon (and the amomon) has kept its scent since it has not had to travel for long. This is divided into two parts: they have not had *time* to lose their scent; they have not had *far* to travel. The variation is clear in its repetition in 168: 'advectumque recens', 'vicinae messis'. In addition, in 166f. Lucan varies the idea 'it still had its scent' with two different expressions of the same idea: its scent had not yet evaporated (with 'aura' nominative); it had not yet lost its scent (with 'aera' accusative). This first theme and variation in negative terms ('nondum', 'nec') is itself given a positive variation by line 168, where the important point – the retention of scent – is understood from the previous lines.

It remains, however, to choose between 'externa...terra' (i.e. 'mutatione terrae') and 'externae...terrae' (i.e. 'quem habebat in Arabia'). Housman claims that 'aer', only found in the sense of 'odor' in two other passages,⁷ needs a genitive to give it meaning. But as Håkanson points out, it is difficult to draw such a conclusion from two passages alone; and the sense of 'aera' is here helped by the theme and variation with 'aura'. Nonetheless, I think 'externae...terrae' helpful to the sense here, particularly if we remember that it was said that all Arabia gave off a scent of spices, warmed by the noon sun, an air that first told Nearchus he was nearing that land,⁸ so that the scent of cinnamon is here the same as the *aer* of the foreign land. In addition, the parallels of the repeated theme and variation in 168f. are clearer if we have 'externae...terrae' referring, like 'vicinae', to the land it came from, rather than 'externa', referring to Egypt.⁹ A further point in favour of 'externae...aera terrae' may be the passage in Sid. Ap. *Epist.* 2.13.7, where the description of the feast of Damocles seems clearly to borrow details from Lucan's feast scene here,¹⁰ 'suffita cinnamo ac ture cenatio spargeret peregrinos naribus odores'.

⁴ *PCPhS* 205 (1979), 48–9.

⁵ For the usage 'quoi', see Håkanson, loc. cit.; Quint. *Inst.* 1.7.27. As Housman notes, 'quod' can be understood from 'cui' for line 167; cf. Luc. 10.456f.

⁶ *O.L.D.* s.v. (6).

⁷ Luc. 6.437 'odoratae...aera pinnae'; Auson. 82.4 'Seplasiae aere'.

⁸ Plin. *Nat.* 12.86; Herodot. 3.113; Diod. Sic. 3.46.4.

⁹ Schmidt, ad loc., argues for 'externae' on the similar grounds that both 'externae' and 'vicinae' are genitive.

¹⁰ Compare particularly Sid. Ap. *Epist.* 2.13.7 'spumarent Falerno gemmae capaces inque crystallis calerent unguenta glacialibus' and Luc. 10.159ff.:

manibusque ministrat
Niliacas *crystallos* aquas, *gemmaeque capaces*
excepere merum, sed non Mareotidos uvae,
nobile sed paucis senium cui contulit annis
indomitum Meroe cogens *spumare Falernum*.

10.194ff.

fas mihi magnorum, Caesar, secreta parentum
edere ad hoc aevi populis ignota profanis.
sit pietas aliis miracula tanta silere;
ast ego caelicolis gratum reor ire per omnis
hoc opus et sacras populis notescere leges.

195 edere Ω ; prodere MU

The Egyptian priest Acoreus here opens his lecture on the Nile, promising to reveal its secrets to Caesar. In line 195 Housman favours 'edere', noting '**prodere** ... fortasse ob 181 *prode* aut 285 *prodam*'; but while 'edere' is an apt enough word for the publishing of divine wisdom (like 'notescere' in 198), 'prodere' offers more. With its nuance of betrayal, it allows a paradoxical coupling with 'fas'¹¹ and works more actively with 'secreta' – 'what my ancestors concealed, I shall reveal'. 'prodere' then, allows an emphasis on the greatness of Acoreus' revelations appropriate to the opening lines and creates a paradox which the following lines explain by their emphasis on legitimate publication. Note also the similarity of 1.631f. 'vix *fas*, superi, quascumque movetis / *prodere* me *populis*'.

10.239ff.

Zephyros quoque vana vetustas
his ascripsit aquis ...
vel quod ab occiduo depellunt nubila caelo
trans Noton et fluvio cogunt incumbere nimbos,
vel quod aquas totiens rumpentis litora Nili
adsiduo feriunt coguntque resistere fluctu.

245 fluctu ZGC; fluctus Ω ; flatu M²V²Q

Acoreus describes two theories that derive the Nile's summer flood from the blowing of the etesian winds. Lucan's principal source for his subject matter here is known to be Sen. *Nat. quaest.* 4a; the last sections of this book, unfortunately, are lost and for the theories that were in these sections we know of what Seneca wrote only from the report on them in Joannes Lydus, *De mensibus* 4.107.¹² The first theory here uses the etesians as a means of bringing rain-clouds to the Ethiopian mountains; the second sees them as blowing against the mouths of the Nile and thus damming up its outlets to sea.¹³

¹¹ Lucan uses *prodere* to similar effect in 10.179–81:

quodcumque vetustis
insculptum est adytis profer, noscique volentes
prode deos.

Hieroglyphic inscriptions, unreadable to Greeks and Romans, were paradoxically both published and concealed. It has been pointed out to me that the same paradoxical use of 'fas' with betrayal can also be found in the reminiscence that Guietus detected in our passage of Virg. *Aen.* 2.157 where Sinon claims 'fas mihi Graiorum sacrata resolvere iura'.

¹² For the dependence of Lucan and Lydus on *Nat. quaest.* 4a, see H. Diels, 'Seneca and Lucan', *Abhandlungen der Kgl. Pr. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1885 (= H. Diels, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. W. Burkert (Darmstadt, 1979), pp. 379–408). Lucan's use of the *Nat. quaest.* is denied, unconvincingly, by R. Pichon, *Les Sources de Lucain* (Paris, 1912), pp. 42ff.; A. Eichberger, *Untersuchungen zu Lucan, der Nilabschnitt im zehnten Buch des bellum civile* (Diss., Tübingen, 1935).

¹³ The rain theory is in the lost portion of the *Nat. quaest.*; cf. Lyd. *De mens.* 4.107, p. 106.8ff. (Wuensch); p. 106.16ff. (Wuensch). The damming theory is at *Nat. quaest.* 4a.2.22. For details

In line 245, out of many possible readings and interpretations, 'fluctu' has generally been followed by editors since its defence by Heitland,¹⁴ and by Housman, who cites the following parallels: Sen. *Nat. quaest.* 4a.2.22, 'cursum eius acto contra ostia mari sustinet'; Plin. *Nat.* 5.55, 'etesiarum eo tempore ex adverso flantium repercussum, ultra in ora acto mari'. To these may be added Anon. Flor.,¹⁵ τὸν μὲν οὖν ἄνεμον, ἐξ ἐναντίας πνέοντα, κωλύειν τὴν ἐπιρροὴν αὐτῶν: τὸ δὲ κύμα, προσπίπτον τοῖς στόμασι, καὶ οὕριον ὄν, ἀνακόπτειν τὸν ποταμόν, and most strikingly Sen. *Nat. quaest.* 3.26.2, 'si crebrioribus ventis ostium caeditur et reverberatus fluctu amnis resistit, qui crescere videtur, quia non effunditur'. To this Heitland adds an argument from the balanced structure of 242f. and 244f.: 'There are two ways in which the etesian winds cause the Nile to rise: by bringing the rain-clouds over its catchment-area [*fluvio cogunt incumbere nimbos*], and by piling up a water-barrier against its mouths. Hence 246-7 *ille mora cursus adversique obice ponti aestuat in campos*. In both cases the winds operate through the agency of something set in motion by them.'

'fluctu', however, has some difficulties. The essence of these is that 'fluctu' comes at us out of nowhere; easy enough for Housman to understand it with the parallels collected by Diels before him, but not for a reader to whom the theory was unknown.¹⁶ In comparison to this, the other expositions of the theory – even the apparently similar Sen. *Nat. quaest.* 3.26.2 – let us know better the part that the *fluctus* is playing; in Lucan it drops in at the last moment, when up to that point we had thought we were dealing only with winds. This difficulty is made worse by 'adsiduo'. As adjective it gives one problem: 'fluctu' is applied further back, demanding greater reinterpretation when the reader reaches it. With 'adsiduo' as adverb the last three words of 245 are awkwardly asked to express two new aspects of the theory – that the river stops, and that this is effected by waves.

A far preferable reading is that chosen by Weise,¹⁷ taking the equally well attested 'fluctus', understood as object rather than subject. Heitland supported 'fluctu' by claiming that both 242f. and 244f. had the winds working through the agency of, respectively, clouds and waves; but the grammatical structure of these lines, which gives reason for seeking such parallels, does not emphasize this one. If we look at lines 242-3 we get a quite different model: the object of the driving winds is 'nubila', and in the first line and a half we are given the main part of the theory; in the last part of 243 a second main verb, 'cogunt', gives us the subsidiary and consequent development, and with it, marking the slight change of direction, a rephrasing of the object, 'nimbos', a variation of 'nubila'. If we now look at 244f. with this in mind, we find the following: the object of the winds is 'aquas', and again in the first line and a half we are given the main part of the theory; in the last part a second verb, 'cogunt', gives us the subsidiary and consequent development. It would be quite

and parallels, see D. Bonneau, *La Crue du Nil* (Paris, 1964), pp. 152-9; pp. 195-208; Diels, pp. 11-13; Rehm, *R.E.* XVII, p. 584, 49ff.

¹⁴ W. E. Heitland, 'Notes on the Text of Lucan', *CR* 9 (1895), 156.

¹⁵ A text of Anon. Flor. can be found at the end of Book 2 of Athenaeus in the edition of J. Schweighaeuser (Strasburg, 1801).

¹⁶ Lucan certainly knew of and used this aspect of the theory, as we see in 246f. (cited above). Here, however, the reference explains itself and has purpose in pointing a contrast between the river's expected outlet ('ponti') and its forced direction ('in campos').

¹⁷ 'litora enim intellige maris, per quae Nilus effluit, quaeque fluctibus suis perrumpit. Venti igitur feriunt ostia Nili, ex adverso flantes, atque ita fluctus eius resistere h.e. longius morari cogunt.'

reasonable for Lucan to repeat the variation of 'nubila' / 'nimbos' with a second of 'fluctus' for 'aquas' (like 'nimbos' at a line ending). 'fluctu' is only dry scientific fact that adds nothing to the interest of the line; 'fluctus' has an attractive tension with 'resistere'.¹⁸

10.287

medio consurgis ab axe.

With these words, after admitting the impossibility of knowing the Nile's source, Acoreus begins his description of its course as far as it can be known. Commentators and translators have readily taken 'medio consurgis ab axe' to mean that 'the Nile rises at the equator' (Duff), an interpretation which has allowed Eichberger¹⁹ to accuse Lucan of inconsistency, since after claiming here that the Nile flows from its source at the equator, he then (298–302) has it travelling between both hemispheres. Consistency is probably not a quality much sought after by Lucan; but we need not so casually put on him such errors. There is after all a more immediate clash; after Acoreus has taken seven lines to say that the Nile's source is and must be unknown, is he then to begin his limited account of what may be revealed of the river's course with a direct statement of the precise location of this source?

The first point is the assumption that 'consurgis' refers to the source; the *T.L.L.* gives no comparable usage to support this, and we may better understand, 'you rise into view'. There are comparable uses in military / historical writing of appearing from ambush or from hiding²⁰ and the verb is often used in contexts where the idea of rising into view is clearly present.²¹ Such is the interpretation of Helm,²² although he understands *medius axis* as the equator, 'Du trittst mitten am Äquator in die Erscheinung'. Clearly if we take *consurgere* as 'rise into view', *medius axis* should not be the equator: what barrier does the equator provide?

medius axis occurs five times in Lucan. At 2.586 it appears as the southern part of Pompey's description of his successes north, south, east and west. At 3.69 the north wind drives the clouds 'medium ... sub axem'. At 10.250 water is called back from the cold of the north 'medium ... sub axem'. In all these, the natural interpretation is that *medius axis* means the south,²³ and the origin of this usage is clear in the last instance, 3.423, 'medio cum Phoebus in axe est';²⁴ it is southern because that is the position of the sun at midday.²⁵ For this section, Lucan was probably using a source much like Diod. Sic. 1.32.1, which gives no warrant for seeing mention of the equator here, ὁ γὰρ Νεῖλος φέρεται μὲν ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ἐπὶ τὴν ἄρκτον, τὰς πηγὰς ἔχων ἐκ τόπων ἀοράτων, οἳ κείνται τῆς ἐσχάτης Αἰθιοπίας κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον, ἀπρὸς τὸν τῆς χώρας οὐσῆς διὰ τὴν τοῦ καύματος ὑπερβολήν. The Nile emerged from a zone of burning waste to the south, a limit to human knowledge of the river.²⁶ It is surely this that

¹⁸ For the use of 'fluctus' of the river's waters, cf. in a similar context Luc. 3.230ff.:

Ganges, toto qui solus in orbe
ostia nascenti contraria solvere Phoebo
audet et adversum fluctus inpellit in Eurum.

¹⁹ Op. cit., pp. 58f.

²⁰ *T.L.L.* iv, p. 620, 76ff.; particularly Liv. 10.4.11.

²¹ Val. Flacc. 2.478 'ecce'; 5.91 'emicuit'; Luc. 1.580 'visi'; 2.481 'conspexit'.

²² R. Helm, *Lustrum* 1 (1956), p. 203.

²³ As it does unambiguously at Sil. 8.650.

²⁴ Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.536.

²⁵ See *T.L.L.* viii, p. 585, 36ff.; cf. Lucr. 6.723 (also describing the Nile's origins) 'exoriens penitus media ab regione diei'; Virg. *Georg.* 3.303 'ad medium conversa diem'.

²⁶ Cf. also Herodot. 2.31; Plin. *Nat.* 5.51; Luc. 10.274f.

Lucan is talking of, emphasizing the unknown nature of the Nile's sources. Claudian shows the influence both of Lucretius (6.721–3) and of Lucan, when he writes, in his own poem on the Nile, *Carm. min.* 28.8ff.:

rapido tractu mediis elatus ab austris,
flammi feræ patiens zonæ Cancricæ calentis
fluctibus ignotis nostrum procurrit in orbem
secreto de fonte cadens.

10.353ff.

'tu mollibus' inquit
'nunc incumbere toris et pingues exigue somnos:
invasit Cleopatra domum, nec prodita tantum est
sed donata Pharos. cessas accurrere solus
ad dominae thalamos?...

Cleopatra, exiled by her brother Ptolemy, has secretly returned and seduced Caesar into restoring her to joint rule of Egypt; Pothinus, the guardian of Ptolemy, writes to the general Achilles, urging him that Caesar and Cleopatra must be killed. The opening lines of the letter have raised three questions of interpretation, each adding to the difficulty of the others. These problems are removed if we pay attention to the sequence of ideas in the exhortation.

Haskins interprets 'invasit...domum' in line 355 as 'has seized upon the palace', comparing 1.242; 9.198; 9.410; Suet. *Iul.* 9, 'dictaturam Crassus invaderet'. In this he is followed by Duff and other translators;²⁷ but clearly we are nearer to the primary meaning here, 'to enter in a hostile fashion' *O.L.D.* (1). If we understand that Cleopatra is seen as an invading enemy, the sequence of thought in 353–5 becomes clear – 'you are idling at peace? the enemy is within the walls'. Thus 'invasit' works in two ways: 'mollibus...toris' and 'pingues...somnos' are contrasted with the (metaphorical) violence of 'invasit'; and Cleopatra is compared to an invading army, a rhetorical joke, implying that she is equally dangerous, in her own way.²⁸

Our interpretation of this sentence must influence that of the next, since the structure 'nec...tantum...sed...' surely demands that the first verb, 'prodita', refer to what has just been said and that the second, 'donata', add something worse. These conditions, however we interpret the previous sentence, are not met by Haskins's explanation, 'i.e. Egypt is not only betrayed to Caesar by Cleopatra, but given by him to Cleopatra', an interpretation which has again been widely accepted.²⁹ The betrayal of Egypt to Caesar by Cleopatra is something that Achilles, just now woken from his ignorance, can scarcely be supposed to know or deduce; but it is treated as a given fact to set off worse news, and a fact, at that, of which the previous sentence has informed him ('nec'). How, besides, is Pharos 'donata' to Cleopatra so much worse than Pharos 'prodita' to Caesar? Whatever the sentence means, it clearly has an air

²⁷ Duff, 'Cleopatra has seized the palace'; A. Bourguery/M. Ponchont, *Lucain, La Guerre Civile II* (Paris, 1929), 'Cléopâtre s'est emparée du palais'; W. Ehlers, *Lucanus, Bellum civile, der Bürgerkrieg* (Munich, 1973), 'Kleopatra hat den Palast besetzt'; Luck, 'Kleopatra hat sich des Palasts bemächtigt'; R. Badali, *La Guerra Civile* (Turin, 1988), 'Cleopatra si è impossessata del palazzo'.

²⁸ Cf. 10.360 'expugnare'; Pelling on Plut. *Ant.* 28.1 ἡρπασεν; App. *Bell. civ.* 5.8.

²⁹ Duff, 'i.e. betrayed by Cleopatra to Caesar, and then given away by Caesar to Cleopatra, who had only a disputed right to share the throne'; Bourguery/Ponchont, 'Pharos n'a pas été seulement livrée à César: il en a fait cadeau'; Luck, 'Kleopatra hat Ägypten an Caesar verraten, und er hat es ihr dann zum Geschenk gemacht'; Badali, 'Non soltanto è stata consegnata con il tradimento da Cleopatra a Cesare, ma da questo addirittura donata alla regina'.

of epigrammatic wit about it; this is hard to find in Haskins's interpretation, unless it is in the reversal of the understood subject and indirect object of the two verbs, which might rather seem the most awkward thing about it. Finally, it is clear that Caesar can be seen as giving away Egypt to Cleopatra,³⁰ but in what way has Cleopatra 'betrayed' Egypt to Caesar, who was in power there already?

All these problems are removed if we take 'proditā', as Weise understood,³¹ to mean that Egypt has been betrayed by those who allowed the enemy Cleopatra to gain entrance.³² The choice of Pharos as metonymy for Egypt has clearly been influenced by its significance as the guarded gateway to and from Alexandria.³³ 'proditā Pharos', taken in this sense, is introduced naturally as growing out of the previous phrase; and the progression 'nec prodita tantum... sed donata...' becomes clear, 'she has not only been let into Egypt, she has been given it'.

'cessas accurrere solus / ad dominae thalamos' has caused still greater confusion, with five lines of interpretation offered us, dividing into two groups that take 'solus' with 'cessas' or with 'accurrere'. Dorville and Weise (taking 'solus' with 'cessas') think that Pothinus is ironically urging Achilles to hurry to salute Cleopatra as queen. Housman interprets "'tu solus cessas cum tot virorum femina concumbere?'" planius loquitur 379sq.' Others take this as a call to arms.³⁴ So too, but taking 'solus' with 'accurrere', does Haskins: 'the words may be intended to be ironical, "do you hesitate to hasten by yourself to your mistress's chamber" i.e. to rush into the very jaws of danger with none to help you.' Francken interprets the lines much as Haskins does, but does not find them ironical, explaining *solus*, 'cum comitibus suspicionem Caesarianis fecisset'.

Of these, the line followed by Haskins seems clearly preferable. If we look at the sense of the previous lines – 'Are you resting idle? The enemy is within the walls. Worse, she has control of the town' – it is clear that what we are expecting here is a call to arms. Housman's interpretation presumably sees the structure differently, looking forward rather than to 357–9; but although there are links between the two sentences, 356–7 clearly belongs to the introductory lines, reflecting as it does the first sentence, 353f. Housman's suggestion makes the sentence irrelevant, led up to by nothing and leading up to nothing (357ff. is not interested in Cleopatra's promiscuity in itself, but in the connection between her promiscuity and her power). The interpretation of Dorville and Weise – 'come, why don't you hurry to congratulate your mistress like everyone else?' – is, in view of the military tone of the previous lines, similarly irrelevant. That Achilles is being urged to an attack is confirmed by the similarity between 'accurrere... ad dominae thalamos' and the more explicit 374, 'crudelem... toris dominam mactemus in ipsis'.

With the call to arms, 'solus' cannot comfortably go with 'cessas', since no attack is underway. Against Francken's belief that Pothinus is urging Achilles to strike with no companions in case they alarm Caesar, there are several arguments. Certainly it

³⁰ Cf. 10.81, 'dum donare Pharon, dum non sibi vincere mavolt'; Dio 42.41.1.

³¹ 'Nec solum prodita est Aegyptus, quatenus Ptolemaeo nobisque competit, eo quod intromissa est in regiam Cleopatra, sed etiam eidem Cleopatrae ab Caesare dono data.'

³² Cf. 10.56–8:

se parva Cleopatra biremi
corrupto custode Phari laxare catenas
intulit Emathiis... tectis.

³³ Cf. Luc. 10.509 'claustrum... pelagi Pharon'; Caes. *Bell. civ.* 3.112.4 'iis... invitis, a quibus Pharus tenetur, non potest esse propter angustias introitus in portum'; *Bell. Alex.* 26.2.

³⁴ Weise, ad loc.: 'verum reliqui interpretes sic: tu vero solu cessas armatus accurrere et opprimere Cleopatram.'

is not an interpretation of 'solus' that would come to us naturally, particularly not with 'accurrere', which hardly suggests the appropriate stealth. Besides, it turns out that Achilles is not expected to attack 'solus' after all.³⁵ Finally, the ironic tone is established, if by nothing else, by the clear parallel with the certainly ironic 353f.; we are not to expect literal and specific instructions here.

With Haskins, the evident irony of the question works very well. 'accurrere solus' – 'to rush single-handed upon' – conjures up a picture of Scaeva-like courage, to be punctured after the line-division by 'dominae thalamos', 'your lady's chamber'. 'dominae' transforms the warlike picture into one of slavish subjection; and the peculiarly unmilitary target makes Achilles' fear to attack ridiculous and turns Cleopatra in her bedroom into an absurdly alarming force, an effect much like the sarcasm of 'invasit Cleopatra domum'.

10.540ff.

non acie fusa nec magnae stragis acervis
vincendus tunc Caesar erat sed sanguine nullo.
captus sorte loci pendet; dubiusque timeret
optaretne mori respexit in agmine denso
Scaevam...

With Housman's punctuation, 'sed sanguine nullo' in 541 makes rather a flat ending to the sentence, a particular anticlimax after the preparation of 540. Might it be better to remove the stop at the end of the line? 'sanguine nullo' of course would make no sense with 'pendet', but would be perfectly suited to 'captus'.³⁶

York

NIGEL HOLMES

³⁵ 10.393; 10.402ff.

³⁶ This might in turn make a somewhat weaker punctuation after 'pendet' desirable; a comma rather than a semicolon would avoid leaving 'pendet' isolated within the sentence.