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](#)

Pharsalia Nostra

J. P. Postdate

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 05 / June 2005, pp 257 - 260

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00992771, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00992771

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postdate (1905). Pharsalia Nostra. The Classical Review, 19, pp 257-260 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00992771

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

for a raised door in the wall of the Homeric megaron, and for a passage at a higher level to which this raised door gave access.

Compounds of ὄρνυμι, however, whether in ὄρσι- or ὄρσο-, appear to have an active sense: so the only real instance of ὄρσο-, Pindar's ὄρσοσπρίαινα. Döderlein therefore seems to have formed the word more easily when he took it as = ὄρροθύρη. Ὀρρος appears not to be found, but the compound ὄρροπύγιον occurs in an inser. ap. Hoffmann, *Ionie*, No. 169, p. 72 as ὄρσοπύγια, and the ρσ is of course guaranteed by the cognates in English and German. A good parallel to ὄρροθύρη both as to formation and meaning appears to be ὀρρόβηλος (δδός: Ἰταλιῶται, Hesych.). Till some inscription yields this word we cannot be certain of its meaning; but whether it means 'back-step' or 'back-

way' (δδός is given by Hesych. as a meaning of βηλός), it illustrates ὄρροθύρη. Further the ambiguous use of the word in Simon. Amorg. 17, with the parallel adduced by Bergk and the Latin equivalent which I need not quote, are inconsistent with any reference to ὄρνυμι.

Like the Latin posterula, postica, posticum the word meant simply 'back-door'; and lest Mr. Myres should be unable to locate one in the Odyssean house, I may point out that as a 'postern' is not confined to the back of a building, so ὄρροθύρα may have early come to mean merely a postern; and indeed Simonides' τῆς ὀπισθεν ὄρροθύρης shews that this was so.¹

¹ Ὀρρόλοπος has been explained, and ὄρροδάκνη may be, on the same system.

T. W. ALLEN.

PHARSALIA NOSTRA.¹

sero iam emendatur antiquitas.

CICERO *Orator* § 155.

Classical scholars, it is notorious, are often accused of pedantry; and it must be owned that there is something incidental to these studies that develops a small and inconsequent precision. Why otherwise are we breaking with the traditions of our literature to put an *e* for an *i* in the English name of the poet of the Aeneid while on the other hand we spell the Latin name with a letter that no Roman used? And for a similar reason the battle of Pharsalia is being erased from the pages of history and over it a multitude of scribes are writing the battle of Pharsalus. To discover whether this change of name has the merit of a mere exactness may now seem a trivial and a not altogether novel investigation²; but it is one that may at least be brought to a conclusion. For though, *pace* Baron Stoffel and Mr. Peskett, the place of the great engagement will never be ascertained until the tumulus that holds the bones of the Caesarians has yielded to the excavator's pick, its proper name or names there is, and has been, ample evidence from contemporary witnesses to determine.

¹ With apologies to the shade of Lucan, ix. 985, and Professor Housman, *Classical Review*, xiv. p. 129.

² I have indicated its lines in the Historical Introduction to my edition of Book VII. pp. xxxv. sq.

To clear our ideas of confusion, let us examine the expressions used for another conflict which Lucan (7. 408) asserts to have been a less disaster to his country. *Cannae* was to the Roman imagination the central spot in the scene of that great defeat. And the connexion takes three alternative forms in Roman writings. The battle is called

1. Cannense proelium or the like.
2. Cannarum pugna or the like.
- or 3. simply Cannae.

Now Cannae was a town, and Pharsalus (by which we understand the new Pharsalus) was a town, and if the latter had been associated with a battlefield in the same manner as the former, the uses of the town-names should reflect this correspondence. In other words we expect to meet *Pharsali pugna* (2) and *Pharsalus* (3) as equivalents of *Pharsalica pugna* (1).

Caesar and Cicero may be cited first. Do they, these witnesses of the first order, use a single expression to link the battle to the town Pharsalus? Not one. For Caesar it is the 'proelium in Thessalia factum' (B.C. iii. 100. 3, 101. 5, 111. 3). For Cicero it is the *Pharsalicum proelium*, the *Pharsalica acies*, the *Pharsalia pugna*, the *Pharsalia fuga*, and so on. It has been observed that Caesar's expression is 'singular.' Singular indeed it is, if the proper

name of his great victory was the battle of Pharsalus.

With Caesar and Cicero we place another contemporary witness whose location of the site of the battle is more precise. The author of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* states in c. 48 that the *proelium Pharsalicum* (as he calls it in c. 42) was fought at *Old Pharsalus, Palaepharsali*. His statement, repeated in Frontinus *Strat.* 2. 3. 22, Eutropius 6. 16 and Orosius (inf.), who no doubt got it from a good and ancient source, conflicts with nothing that we learn from elsewhere and may be, as hitherto it has been, unhesitatingly accepted. If now we only knew where Old Pharsalus was! But we do not. Baron Stoffel, who is quite certain where the battle was fought, is only 'tempted' (vol. ii. p. 244) to identify Old Pharsalus with some ruins which he found near the site which he fancies. He helps himself towards this conclusion by the following argument:

De tous les auteurs anciens Appien est celui qui fixe le mieux l'emplacement du champ de bataille. 'Pompée, dit-il, rangea ses troupes en bataille dans la plaine entre la ville de Pharsale et le fleuve Enipée' (*Guerres Civiles*, ii. 75). Longtemps avant Appien l'auteur de la *Guerre d'Alexandrie* avait déjà dénommé la bataille une première fois d'après la ville de Pharsale et une seconde fois d'après celle de la vieille Pharsale 'Octavius ex fuga Pharsalici praelii' (*Guerre d'Alexandrie* 42) et 'Iis temporibus quibus Caesar ad Dyrrhachium Pompeium obsidebat et Palaepharsali rem feliciter gerebat' (*Guerre d'Alexandrie* 48). Cette double citation montre clairement que les deux Pharsale étaient peu éloignées l'une de l'autre, opinion confirmée d'ailleurs par le témoignage de Strabon écrivant que le Thetidium se trouvait près les Pharsale.'—*Histoire de Jules César, Guerre Civile*, vol. ii. p. 244.

Appian apart, Baron Stoffel relies on a 'clear proof' from a contemporary Roman writer and a corroboration from a Greek one. The proof I must pass over for the moment; but the corroboration may now be examined.

The geographer says ix. c. 5 § 6 οἱ δ' ὕστερον τὴν Ἑλλάδα οἱ μὲν εἰπόντες χώραν διατετάσθαι φασίν <eis> τὰς Θήβας τὰς Φθιωτίδας ἀπὸ Παλαιφαρσάλου, ἐν δὲ τῇ χώρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ τὸ Θετιδεῖον ἐστὶ πλησίον τῶν Φαρσάλων ἀμφοῖν τῆς τε παλαιᾶς καὶ τῆς νέας καὶ τοῦ Θετιδεῖου τεκμαιρόμενοι τῆς ὑπὸ τῷ Ἀχίλλει μέρος εἶναι καὶ τήνδε τὴν χώραν. 'In this district is the Thetideum which is near to both Pharsaluses, the Old and the New.' Upon which it is observed that it confirms the opinion that 'les deux Pharsale étaient peu éloignées l'une de l'autre.' Things, that is to say, that are near to the same thing are near to

one another; and, so since St. Denis and Versailles are both of them near to Paris, St. Denis must be near to Versailles.

Of later writers the poet Lucan, whom Baron Stoffel, and not without a certain justice, ranks among the historical authorities for the Civil War, demands a special mention. He makes more frequent reference to the battle than any other extant writer and his nomenclature is most instructive. The noun *Pharsalia* occurs 15 times in the poem. Twice it means the district, 7. 175 and 535 (seemingly), once, 9. 985, Lucan's own poem or a portion of it. In the other 12 places it is the name of the battle. For Lucan the poet the word *Pharsalia* was practically a monoptote. The laws which regulated his verse confined his use of it to the nominative or vocative case. To eke out the declension, did he turn to what we are required to regard as the proper name of the battle? Does he who uses *Utica Munda* and *Cannae* for the battles summon to his aid the obvious and convenient *Pharsalus*? He does not dream of it. *Pharsalus* he mentions once 6. 329 'melius mansura sub undis | Emathis aequorei regnum Pharsalos Achillis.' That *Pharsalos* here is not the battle needs of course no demonstration. It may conceivably be a town or its site. In that case it is of course Old *Pharsalus*. But it is far more likely to be the district used deliberately by Lucan in order to avoid the use of *Pharsalia* in application to Achilles.

In Lucan's metrical declension, as we may call it, of *Pharsalia* the cases are N.V. *Pharsalia*, G.D. *Thessaliae*, Acc. *Thessaliam*, Abl. *Thessalia*. I cite two or three examples: 7. 164 'usque ad *Thessaliam* Romana et publica signa'; 8. 45 '*Thessaliam* nox omnis habet' (of Cornelia in Lesbos); *ib.* 510 '*Thessaliae* aequae reus,' 10. 412 '*Thessaliae* subducta acies.' And so with the corresponding adjectives: 8. 507 '*Thessalicas*—uolucres'; *ib.* 516 '*Pharsalica* fata'; *ib.* 529 sq. 'cineres—*Thessalicos*,' just as the metre requires. Lucan then agrees with Caesar in thinking that our battle may be appropriately called the Thessalian battle or the battle of Thessalia.

This is a convenient place to enumerate the admitted or reputed significations of *Pharsalia*. It means (1) the country of *Pharsalus*, i.e. the district in which lay the two *Pharsaluses*, Old and New: (2) the battle whose title we are investigating. (3) It is said also to mean the town of New *Pharsalus*, modern *Fersala*. For this third use I can find no evidence. Two places of

Pliny *N.H.* 7 § 94 'captis apud Pharsaliam Pompeii Magni scriniis' and *ib.* 26 § 19 'cur Caesaris miles famem ad Pharsaliam sensit?' have been cited; but here the word clearly means no more than the place of the battle. Florus also is pressed into the service. But his evidence tends to show the exact opposite. In *iv.* 2 §§ 66 and 89 *Pharsalia* is the battle and is contrasted with 'Thapsus,' 'Munda,' and so forth. In § 64 'in Pharsalia' (the place) is opposed to 'in Africa'; and Florus' idea of the battle's place is made evident from § 43 'proelio sumpta est Thessalia' immediately followed by 'Philippicis campis' with the common substitution of *Philippi* for *Pharsalia*.¹ The notion then that *Pharsalia* might be employed as a loose substitute for *Pharsalus* receives no countenance from the actual usage of Latin authors.

One possible objection it yet remains to consider. It might be argued that the adjectives *Pharsalicus* and *Pharsalius* must mean 'belonging to *Pharsalus* the town,' and that this ends the matter. No doubt *Pharsalici Campi* means 'the plains of *Pharsalus*.' But derivatives of this kind have an elastic meaning. *Romanus* is the adjective of *Roma*; yet no one contends that *Romana uirtus* means 'the valour of the city of Rome.'

Baron Stoffel's use of the language of the author of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* to bring the two *Pharsalus*es close together is an odd variety of this argument. The 'Pharsalian plain' was so named from old *Pharsalus*. The foundation of a new town could only effect its sense of 'Pharsalian plain' to the extent of giving it the meaning 'the plain in which were both *Pharsalus*es.' But Baron Stoffel, in the words which I have put into spaced type, would limit its reference to the newer *Pharsalus*, and this in a writer who shows that he was aware of the existence of both and for whose purpose only the first was of the slightest importance. The true significance of the variation, which occurs again in Orosius 6. 15. 27 'ad Palaepharsalum,' *ib.* 25 'in campis Pharsalicis,' is pointed out below.

No Roman writer that I have examined affords any indication whatever that he placed the battle at or near *Pharsalus* or *Fersala*. You have to go to late Greek writers such as Plutarch, Appian, Dio

Cassius, and Polyaeus, to find this town expressly associated with the engagement.² Appian *Civil Wars* ii. 75 ventures on the statement that the opposing armies were ranged ἐς τὸ μεταξὺ Φαρσάλου τε πόλεως καὶ Ἐνιπέως ποταμοῦ. But the rest do not go beyond such vague phrases as ἡ κατὰ Φάρσαλον μάχη (or ἡττα) or οἱ κατὰ Φάρσαλον ἀγῶνες Plutarch *Cic.* 39 fin. or περὶ Φάρσαλον (Plutarch *Caesar* 62, Polyaeus 8. 23, 25). Plutarch in two places (*Caesar* 51 and *Ant.* 8) and Polyaeus in one (8. 23. 29) have the inaccurate expression ἐν Φαρσάλῃ. The circumstance that in the narrative of the Greek writers their town emerges into prominence is of course just what we should expect.

In the Roman view of the engagement then it was either (1) the battle at Palaepharsalus, or (2) the battle of the Pharsalian or of the Thessalian district. These two latter designations were less definite than the former one, but they were not less correct. Let me illustrate by an assumed analogue from English. Suppose the plain in which lies the modern city of Salisbury and, at a distance from it of six or seven miles, the site of the ancient city, Old Sarum, had been designated by a special name, say, Sarisberia. Then a battle fought at Old Sarum would be correctly called the battle of Old Sarum, the battle in the Salisbury Plains or the battle of Sarisberia, but not with the same correctness the battle of Salisbury.

Among the facts to which I have drawn attention are two which may seem to call for further explanation. The first is the use of *Thessalia* as an apparent synonym of *Pharsalia*. When Caesar says that the battle was fought on the plains of *Thessalia* he does not mean, I take it, that it was fought on the plains of Thessaly (he might almost as well have said that it was fought on the plains of Greece); but that it was fought on the plains of the district that we know otherwise as *Thessaliotis*, in which were *Pharsalus*, *Metropolis* and other places. This district is called the Thessalian plain by Strabo: ix. c. 5 § 3 ἔχει δ' ἡ μὲν Φθιώτις τὰ νότια τὰ παρὰ τὴν Οἶτην ἀπὸ τοῦ Μαλιακοῦ κόλπου καὶ Πυλαϊκοῦ μέχρι τῆς Δολοπίας καὶ τῆς Πίνδου, πλατυνόμενα δὲ μέχρι Φαρσάλου καὶ τῶν πεδίων τῶν Θεσσαλικῶν.

The second is the rather curious punctiliousness of the Roman usage. Why should mention of the town have been eschewed,

² The passages are cited in Pape's *Dictionary of Proper Names*, s.v. Φάρσαλος.

¹ The origin of this confusion I have discussed at length in my note on Lucan vii. 872. It is possible that amongst the contributory causes was a misunderstanding of the restricted meaning of *Thessalia*, for which see below.

almost studiously one might suppose, in the designations of the battle? The question is as natural as the answer is easy. The silence of our authorities shows that the town itself had no connexion with the battle with the operations that preceded it or with the operations that followed it. Had an earthquake swallowed it up, its disappearance would not have made a jot of difference to a single combatant on either side. This surely is a fact which should be noted by our historians, and, if noted, then not obscured by the invention of a battle 'of Pharsalus.'

This punctiliousness of usage warrants yet another deduction. When the freemen of Old Salisbury or Sarum met under the trees which marked the place of the ancient borough to elect their parliamentary representatives, the election might properly be described as taking place in the Salisbury district, and when the same battle is represented as being fought now at Old Pharsalus and now on the Pharsalian plain, we may conclude without rashness that this Old Pharsalus was then no more than an insignificant hamlet.

The noteworthy alternation of *Pharsalia* and *Thessalia* in the hexameters of Lucan provokes a further observation. There are three verses in Roman poets where a scribe's *Pharsalia* makes the metre halt.

Catullus 64. 37 :

Pharsaliam coeunt, *Pharsalia* tecta frequentant.

Here Professor Ellis in his commentary defends the MS. reading by the statement, already refuted, that '*Pharsalia* is the name of both a town and a district.'

So then the acknowledged sense of the verse requires the change to '*Pharsalum*' or '*Pharsalon*.'

Statius *Achilleis* 1. 152 :

nunc illum non Ossa capit, non Pelion ingens
Pharsaliae niues.

This is the reading of the best MS. (P); but the others are united on *Thessaliae* which we have seen may stand for its equivalent. Baehrens' *Pharsali* would also remove the difficulty, were it necessary to resort to conjecture.

The third passage is

Calpurnius Siculus 4. 101 :

Pharsaliae soluerunt sibila cannae.

The allusion here is to Pan; and *Parrhasiae* 'Arcadian' is the easy and necessary correction of Heinsius.

This trio of cripples a number of scholars have propped back to back in the hope that they might thus retain their position. If this gallant endeavour is to be successful, it must in addition be provided with an answer to the question: 'If it is allowable to force the syllables *Pharsali* into a single foot of a hexameter, why has Lucan studiously avoided the forms *Pharsalia* and *Pharsalius* in such a position and used instead *Thessalia* and *Thessalius*?'

Note.—The above article is a development of a paper read before the *Cambridge Philological Society* on May 7, 1903. A brief abstract of it was published in the Society's *Proceedings* in 1904.

J. P. POSTGATE.

VIRGIL AEN. IV 225.

Vade age, nate, uoca zephyros et labere
pinnis,
Dardaniumque ducem, Tyria Karthagine
qui nunc
expectat fatisque datas non respicit
urbes,
adloquere et celeris defer mea dicta per
auras.

'*expectat*, moratur, deterit tempus' says Servius; and the context will allow the

verb no other meaning. But from Servius' day to ours there has been no authority forthcoming for this use of *expectare*, and, what is a graver matter, there is no affinity between this use and its established use, nor even any road discernible by which it could arrive at a meaning so unlike its own. Its own meaning is here out of the question, for Aeneas was not *waiting* nor *awaiting* anything; 'qua spe inimica in gente moratur?' asks Jove in 235, 'qua spe Libycis