The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes on Lucan I. and VIII

W. B. Anderson

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 10 / Issue 02 / April 1916, pp 100 - 105

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800009411, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800009411

How to cite this article:

W. B. Anderson (1916). Notes on Lucan I. and VIII. The Classical Quarterly, 10, pp 100-105

doi:10.1017/S0009838800009411

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTES ON LUCAN I. AND VIII.

I. 167-170:

tunc longos iungere fines
agrorum et quondam duro sulcata Camilli
uomere et antiquos Curiorum passa ligones
longa sub ignotis extendere rura colonis.

THIS well-known passage refers to the growth of *latifundia*, a symptom of Rome's decadence. In v. 170 *ignotis* is generally taken to mean 'unknown to the owners,' and thus, it seems to me, the point of the passage is missed. There is a double antithesis; *longa* is contrasted with *breuia*, *parua*, and *ignotis* with *notis*, *inlustribus*, or the like. The latter antithesis is implied in *Camilli*, *Curiorum*; the other is left to be understood. In the good old days farms were small, but were cultivated by the most eminent citizens, men like Camillus and Curius Dentatus; now these small farms are combined to form *latifundia*, managed by nobodies (*ignotis*), whether slaves or tenant farmers. The juxtaposition of *longa* and *sub ignotis* is intentional.

No one who knows Lucan will be troubled by the repetition *longos—longa* (See C.Q. VIII., p. III).

I. 291-295—The effect of Curio's speech on Caesar:

sic postquam fatus, et ipsi
 in bellum prono tantum tamen addidit irae
 accenditque ducem, quantum clamore iuuatur
 Eleus sonipes, quamuis iam carcere clauso
 immineat foribus pronusque repagula laxet.

The last two lines of this passage have caused some trouble, though the general sense is quite clear. The eager racehorse is pictured as stretching his head over the top of the barrier and impatiently striving to burst open the door. Hosius in his first edition printed his own conjecture *pedibus* for *pronus*, and he has been followed by Lejay. The emendation was suggested by Ov. *Met.* II. 155 *pedibusque repagula pulsant*, and the 'correctors' of some of our MSS. actually give us *pulset* for *laxet* in the above passage of Lucan. But Lucan must be allowed some originality even in his imitations, and in any case it is not easy to see why a scribe should have changed *pedibus* to *pronus*. As Hosius still thinks his conjecture worthy of mention in the *apparatus*, it appears that the meaning of *pronus* is not quite clearly understood. It may be well,

therefore, to cite Stat. *Th.* X. 509 sqq.: tandem umeris obnixus Acron et pectore toto | pronus Achaemenides ferratae robora portae | torserunt. Here, as in Lucan, *pronus* means 'throwing his weight forward,' 'pushing hard.' Lucan has such a habit of repeating words at short intervals that the occurrence of *prono* in v. 292 is actually a confirmation of the reading *pronus* in v. 295.

Francken finds it impossible to accept the traditional reading *iam carcere clauso*, owing to the difficulty of taking *iam* with *immineat* when it would naturally go with *clauso*. This objection comes unexpectedly from the editor of a poet, especially of a poet such as Lucan. In III. 184 sq. we find *iam dilecta Ioui centenis uenit in arma* | *Creta uetus populis*, where *iam* goes with *uenit*, not with *dilecta*; yet Francken finds no fault with the reading. *Semper* is similarly used in III. 21: *semperque potentis* | *detrahere in cladem fato damnata maritos* | *innupsit* . . .; here *semper* goes, not with *potentis*, but with the main verb. To pass from temporal adverbs, we find a still more awkward use of *paene* in V. 242, *cum paene fideles* . . . *manus destituere ducem*; cf. Hor. C. III. 6. 13. We may compare also the use of *frustra*, IX. 952. Lucan seems to take a malicious delight in placing *non* ambiguously before an adjective when it really modifies the verb or the whole sentence, e.g. I. 339, 455, V. 541, VI. 107, 120, 166, VII. 44. He also has *iam* in stranger positions than it occupies in the instances cited above, e.g. IV. 652, *Alcides medio tenuit iam pectora pigro* | *stricta gelu*, where *iam* modifies *stricta*. Nor is Lucan alone in his treatment of this word.

I. 303 sqq.—Caesar tells his soldiers of the preparations which are being made to resist him:

non secus ingenti bellorum Roma tumultu
concutitur quam si Poenus transcenderit Alpes
Hannibal: implentur ualidae tirone cohortes;
in classem cadit omne nemus; terraque marique
iussus Caesar agi.

The reading *ualidae* is much better supported than *ualido*. Lejay, who, like Francken, rightly refuses to take *implentur* in the sense of *augentur*, explains *ualidae* with good reason as an instance of Prolepsis, but he does not tell us why Pompey's *tirones* are said by Caesar to make strong cohorts. Francken (who, however, reads *ualido*) talks of the *robusta rustica inuentus*, and thinks that Caesar is wilfully exaggerating the gravity of the preparations which are being made by his enemies. But that is precisely what Caesar does not wish to do, and does not do: see vv. 311 sqq.: *ueniat longa dux pace solutus* | *milite cum subito partesque in bella togatae*, etc. The preparations are represented as being brisk and noisy, but not formidable. Surely *ualidae tirone* is a contradiction in terms, used with grim irony. Pompey, says Caesar, is busily raising fresh forces—fine, strong battalions—of raw recruits! For other instances of the ironical use of adjectives in Lucan, see V. 227, *en improba uota*! IX. 1108, *O bona libertas*!

I. 540-544:

ipse caput medio Titan cum ferret Olympo,
 condidit ardentem atra caligine currus
 inuoluitque diem; qualem fugiente per ortus
 sole Thyestae noctem duxere Mycenae.

The mythological allusion in vv. 543 sq. does not require explanation, but the precise meaning of the lines has been the subject of dispute. Francken objects to *duxere*, and reads *induxere* (sc. *sibi*). 'Non agitur,' he says, 'de longa h.l. sed de alta caligine.' But it is surely quite natural to compare the darkness at Rome, when the gloom of night 'enshrouded the day,' with the prolonged night inflicted on Mycenae. In each case night usurped the place of day. *Qualem . . . noctem duxere Mycenae* means 'twas like the prolonged night which Mycenae suffered,' not 'twas like the night Mycenae prolonged.' *Ducere* often means, not 'to protract,' or 'to prolong,' but 'to experience a prolongation of,' or 'to endure for a long time.' Such must be the meaning here, for if we take *duxere Mycenae* in the sense of 'Mycenae prolonged' (by its crime), we shall have to adopt an unnatural view of *fugiente per ortus sole*; the crime of Atreus' feast surely occurred before the punishment, not simultaneously with it! The same objection applies with perhaps even greater force to Francken's *induxere*, which will be intelligible only if we take *fugiente . . . sole* as an attribute of *noctem*, a construction which cannot be called impossible, but which is less simple and natural than the other. Thus there is no need to alter the traditional text.

I. 688-690:

nunc desuper Alpibus
 nubiferae colles atque aeriam Pyrenen
 abripimur.

These words are uttered by the Roman matron who in a state of inspired frenzy seems to be carried through the air to the various parts of the world where the chief events of the Civil War are destined to happen. First she is snatched away in spirit *super aethera*, and as she feels herself being lowered to earth she exclaims (678 sq.):

quo feror, O Paean? qua me super aethera raptam
 constituis terra?

She is wafted to the region of Pharsalia, to Egypt, and then to Libya; from Libya she is borne away to the Alps and to the Pyrenees, where she beholds fresh horrors.

The use of *desuper* in v. 688 is very puzzling. The prevalent view seems to be that the word is used as a preposition with the sense and construction of *super*. This use would be absolutely unique, and probability and reason are entirely against it. On the other hand, if we take *desuper* as an adverb and *colles* as Acc. of Motion To (like *Syrtim* and *Libyen* in the preceding sentence),

we are faced with the question why the woman is said to go *down* from Africa to the Alps and the Pyrenees. Emendation has, of course, been attempted, but the results have not been encouraging. Lemaire supposes that as the matron is carried from place to place *super aethera* (v. 678, already quoted) she would of course land on the Alps from above (*desuper*). This is true enough, but it is not what Lucan makes the woman say. If the verb modified by *desuper* were *aduenimus*, such an explanation would hold good, but the verb unfortunately is *abripimur*, 'I am being snatched away' (from Africa). It would seem, then, that Lucan conceived the Alps and the Pyrenees as lying lower than Africa.

The explanation of *desuper* is, I think, to be sought in the crude language of popular physical geography which Lucan is not ashamed to reproduce in IX. 351, where he says that Libya is of all lands the nearest to the sky :

nam proxima caelo est,
ut calor ipse docet.

With this conception in one's mind, one might well imagine the journey from Africa to any other part of the world, even to the towering Alps, as a journey downwards. Lucan was no doubt glad to use the idea, for it gave him an opportunity to introduce a paradox ('down to the Alps and the Pyrenees'), one of those cheap devices which delighted the rhetorically trained Roman.

I regret that I recently took Hosius to task for not branding the traditional reading of v. 688 as impossible (*Class. Rev.* XXVIII. p. 236). Needless to say, the explanation given above had not then occurred to me.

VIII. 192 sqq. :

sic fatur : at ille
iusto uela modo pendentia cornibus aequis
torsit, et in laeuum puppim dedit, utque secaret
quas Asinae cautes et quas Chios asperat undas,
hos dedit in proram, tenet hos in puppe rudentis.

Pompey has sailed from Mytilene, taking Cornelia with him. When evening comes on the sight of the stars suggests some questions on navigation. The skipper replies to these, and then asks Pompey in what direction he is to go. Pompey answers that he does not care, provided that the ship avoids Italy and those fatal shores of Thessaly from which he has just fled (189-190).

The boat had obviously rounded the south-east corner of Lesbos, and was therefore in the strait between that island and Chios when Pompey was asked for instructions. The skipper then turned to the left (194), i.e. to the south. The course decided upon may well have lain between the Oenussae islets and the west coast of Chios, as Dr. Postgate believes (*C.Q.* I., p. 77). But the readings of the MSS., *Asinae*, *Sasinae*, are impossible, and the familiar conjectures *Asiae* and *Samiae* are little better. Dr. Postgate therefore suggests that 'until something better be proposed' we should delete *quas* at the beginning of v. 195 and read :

Oenusae cautes, et quas Chios asperat undas.

This conjecture is somewhat bold, as the author admits, but it at least gives us something which is intelligible. It seems not unlikely, however, that the meaningless *Lasinae*, mentioned as a variant at the end of Stephanus' edition (1545) may point the way to a solution of the difficulty. If we read *Lasiae* we obtain excellent sense. *Lasia* was another name for Lesbos, according to Pliny, *H.N.* V. 139. 'The waters ruffled by the rocks of Lasia and of Chios' will then be the channel between Lesbos and Chios. The skipper turns to the south and cuts across (*secat*) these waters.

The reading *Lasinae*, as far as I am aware, rests solely on the authority of Stephanus, but it is not likely to have been invented, and it (or, better still, *Lasiae*) may yet be found in some of the numerous extant MSS. of Lucan.

VIII. 637-639—Cornelia, seeing the murder of Pompey, cries out in agony.

At non tam patiens Cornelia cernere saeuum
quam perferre nefas miserandis aethera complet
uocibus.

This sentence has troubled the commentators sorely. 'But Cornelia, not having so much strength to behold the cruel outrage as to endure it, filled the air with pitiable cries'—such is the usual rendering of the passage. Obviously this will never do, and we need not wonder that emendation has been attempted. It certainly looks at first sight as if *perferre* were wrong. Heinsius most ingeniously conjectured *uir ferre*, which gives good sense at the expense of smoothness and palaeographical probability. Haskins would understand *patiens fuisset* with *perferre*, and one might be thankful to acquiesce in this if no other explanation of the traditional text were possible. But with two inveterate misconceptions removed the meaning of the sentence will become quite clear.

In the first place, *saeuum nefas* means 'cruel wrong,' not 'the cruel wrong'; it is quite general in meaning, and covers many tragedies besides the murder of Pompey. In the second place, *non tam patiens* = *quae non tam patiens erat* (or *esse solebat*): it denotes not a temporary but a habitual state. Cornelia is the Griselda of the poem. Her life, from the battle of Carrhae onwards, was full of tragedy and sorrow, but as depicted by Lucan she thinks of her troubles in the most unselfish manner, scarcely considering her own sad plight, but always considering how each blow affects Pompey, or later, Pompey's memory. This is the Cornelia whom the poet describes as 'ever stronger to endure cruel wrong than to witness it.'

The use of the Present Participle as an attribute expressing a constant characteristic is occasionally found in the classical period (e.g. Cat. LXII. 8, Hor. C. II. 14. 15: *ib.* 16. 23), but did not become common till post-Augustan times. Lucan, like Seneca, has many examples; to those cited by Mr. Heitland (Haskins' ed. p. cvi) add I. 104, 358, 529; IV. 189; V. 6, 619. If Lucan had written *numquam tam patiens* his commentators would probably have understood him better: cf. II. 650:

at numquam patiens pacis longaeque quietis
 armorum, ne quid fatis mutare liceret,
 adsequitur, generique premit uestigia Caesar.

VIII. 767-770 :

Fortuna recursus

si det in Hesperiam, non hac in sede quiescent
 tam sacri cineres : sed te Cornelia, Magne,
 accipiet nostraque manu transfundet in urnam.

These words are spoken by Cordus, the soldier who gave Pompey's body a hasty burial on the Egyptian shore. He hopes, if he should be so fortunate as to return safe to Italy, to convey the ashes to Cornelia. The difficulty involved in *nostra manu* has been well explained by Dr. Postgate (*C.Q.* I., p. 221), and has been noticed by many others, giving rise to various conjectures, such as *propriaque*, *castaque*, *maestamque*, for *nostraque*. Dr. Postgate ingeniously suggests *nostroque sinu*. We should certainly have expected *sua*, not *nostra manu*, for *nostraque manu transfundet in urnam* cannot mean 'and shall pour them into the urn, taking them from my hand.' If we retain the traditional reading we must follow Francken in explaining *nostra manu* as equivalent to *nostra ope*, but this is unnatural; the context justifies us in believing that *manu* here means 'hand.' Discussions of the passage seem to have given too little attention to the fact that *manu* in v. 770 is contrasted with *manu* in v. 767. Almost the saddest feature of Pompey's end, from the ancient point of view, was the fact that no relative was near to light the pyre and to gather the ashes and give them due burial (cf. IX. 56-68, which deserves to be studied in connexion with the passage under discussion). The soldier realizes this. Apostrophizing Pompey's shade he pleads that his service may be accepted, urging that the hand that lights the pyre is at least a Roman hand, *Romana succensa manu est*, i.e. if it is not the hand of a near relative, it is at any rate not the hand of a foreigner (*manus Aegyptia*, IX. 63). But he does not rest content with this. His hand, though *Romana manus*, is the hand of a humble stranger. The last sad office should be performed by the hand of one whom Pompey knew and loved, and Cordus promises that it shall be so, if only he be spared to return to Italy with the hero's ashes. The kind of epithet required for *manu* in v. 770 ought now to be fairly obvious. Surely Lucan wrote :

sed te Cornelia, Magne,
 accipiet, *notaque* manu transfundet in urnam.

It is scarcely necessary to cite examples of the confusion of *nota*, etc., with *nostra*, etc., but one may refer to Markland's interesting note on Stat. S. II. 2. 142.

W. B. ANDERSON.