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](#)

Two Notes on Lucan

Alex. Waugh Young

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 02 / March 1905, pp 112 - 112

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00991637, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00991637

How to cite this article:

Alex. Waugh Young (1905). Two Notes on Lucan. The Classical Review, 19, pp 112-112
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00991637

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

TWO NOTES ON LUCAN.

Book I. ll. 121-4.

Tu, nova ne veteres obscurant acta triumphos,
 Et victis cedat piratica laurea Gallis,
 Magne, times, te iam series ususque laborum
 Erigit, impatiensque loci fortuna secundi.

A comparison is here instituted between the motives, which actuated Pompeius and Caesar, respectively, in entering upon war. The words of the first member, *Tu nova . . . Magne, times* refer to Pompeius. In the second member, *te iam . . . secundi*, the reference is necessarily to Caesar; for (1) the co-ordinate object of comparison is required, and (2) Pompeius could not be described as *loci secundi impatiens*, inasmuch as he undoubtedly held the first place and is represented (ll. 125-6) as unable to brook an aspirant to equal fame. Since the name of Magnus is inserted in the first member, the omission of Caesar's in the second is inadmissible: in such a connection either both names must be omitted or both inserted. In a passage of Book IV. (ll. 112-3) an invocation to Jupiter and to Neptune occurs:—

Et tu perpetuis impendas aera nimbis,
 Tu remeare vetes quosunque emiseric
 aestus:

where the first *tu* refers to Jupiter, the second to Neptune. Here no ambiguity exists, because neither name is expressed.

In view of the doubtful application of the pronoun *te* in our passage, Bentley proposed *hunc* in its place.

In another direction the third line is open to suspicion—the phrase *series ususque laborum* being overweighted and redundant, since *series laborum* implies naturally *usus laborum*.

Caesar's incentives to war were his vast resources, his military experience, and his

ambition; and in a passage of Florus (iv. 2. 14), based upon these lines and quoted by Mr. Haskins, we find the statement—*iam Pompeio suspectae Caesaris opes et Caesari Pompeiana dignitas gravis. Non hic ferebat parem nec ille superiorem* (cf. Lucan i. 125-6) *Nefas! sic de principatu laborabant, tamquam duos tanti imperii fortuna non caperet.* (Cf. Lucan i. 109-11.)

I am disposed to think that in the place of the third line given above we may read—

Magne, times: te, Caesar, opes ususque laborum
 Erigit,

the predicate agreeing with the nearest subject.

Book II. ll. 665-8.

Ut maris Aegaei medias si celsus in undas
 Depellatur Eryx, nullae tamen aequore
 rupes
 Eminant, vel si convulso vertice Gaurus
 Decidat in fundum penitus stagnantis
 Averni.

The position of Mt. Gaurus in the neighbourhood of Lake Avernus is here exactly indicated. But Mt. Eryx has no near connection whatever with the Aegean Sea; and to speak of that mountain as being cast into the waves of the Aegean is much the same as if we should describe Snowdon as falling into the Bay of Biscay. Close to the shore by Mt. Eryx, however, were the Aegates Insulae, the largest of which was Aegusa. The first line of our passage should, therefore, run thus:—

Ut maris Aegusae medias si celsus in undas

The sea is not named after Aegusa: so, the possessive genitive is used; just as (ii. 427) we have *vicinae aequora Lunae* and (iv. 256) *undis Massiliae*.

ALEX. WAUGH YOUNG.

SOME FAULTS IN OUR LATIN DICTIONARIES.

THERE can be no doubt that every teacher of Latin in our country has long felt the need of a new dictionary adapted to the requirements of our American students

Our largest and most complete dictionary is sadly behind the times in very many directions. How long we shall have to wait for a thorough revision of this work, or whether