ABSTRACT

Nigel Patrick Holmes
Balliol

n Ph i 1
Michaelmas 1989

Cominentary on the Tenth Book of Lucan

The commentary is intended to provide information and arguments useful to understand and appreciate the poetry on a line by line basis. For this purpose it deals with a wide range of questions (of e.g. text, interpretation, sources, history, geography, astronomy) , rather than investigating a single aspect the poem. To cover the 546 lines of Book 10, it has been ecessary to be a little selective. While 1 have, 1 hope, looked major problems of text and interpretation, I have not
with every point of interest or debated every variant

of

at most
dealt

interpetati on of other scholars. Silence on textual matters may be taken to indicate acceptance of Housman's choice of reading. There is no introduction. A short appendix examines
sources and purpose in the Nile section of lines 194-331.

Lucan * s

CONTENTS

Bibliography 3
Preface 7
Map of E^ypt and Alexandria 0
Commentary 10
1-103 Caesar's arrival in Alexandria 10
104-171 Cleopatra's feast 82
172-193 Introduction to the Nile discourse 119
194-218 The time of the flood 129
219-267 The causes of the flood 161
268-331 The sources and course of the Nile 201
332-433 The plot of Pothinus 234
434-546 The Alexandrian war 274
Appendix 321

- 8 -
this in Book 10.) Given the currency of Roman history in Roman thought, it would be surprising if the poem did not contain non-Livian elements {the use of Seneca's historical exempla is one obvious example). Since, in addition, we cannot know what Lucan found in Livy (for an attempted reconstruction of a Livy tradition using Caesar and Dio, see Syndikus, chapter 1), no ancient account can be disregarded.
The question of Lucan's sources for his section on the Nile has been
dealt with before by Diels and Eichberger. I have felt it necessary to re-examine the evidence in an appendix, which also looks at the purpose of the digression.
My research also overlaps with the commentary of Schinidt (1986), on the first 171 lines. I learnt of this a year after beginning my own thesis. Although it is a detailed and wide ranging work, it will be seen that we consistently differ in evidence cited and interpretations followed.
Finally, I must acknowledge the assistance that I have had in writing
this thesis. In particular the help given me by my supervisors, Prof. R.
G. M. Nisbet, Dr. R. O. A. M. Lyne and Dr. B. P. Fowler, has saved me from countless errors and guided me towards man;/ interesting discoveries. On specific points, references have been suggested to me by Dr. P. V. Jones and Dr. R. Lane Fox. Some last minute proof reading by friends in Holywell Manor removed a number of misprints and errors; iny thanks to Sukumar Periwal, Hugh Wark, Manuela Tecushan Smith, Allie Dreier and particularly Arthur Burns. A final debt of gratitude is owed to Bill Newton Smith, who rescued a large chunk of my thesis which had been eaten by the computer a couple of days before printing.

— i i»./ n —

Lucan: De Bella Civili. X

1-103 Caesar's arrival in Alexandria

1-2 In Book 0 a servant of Ptolemy has brought Pompey's head to Caesar's ship offshore, and Caesar has ordered that the head be properly buried. The opening lines of Book 10 now describe Caesar's landing in Egypt, and prepare us for its implications. His arrival on shore is described in two phrases {'terras Poinpei colla secutus / attigit' and 'diras calcavit Caesar harenas') which make up what has been called 'theme and variation' (see Henry on Virg. Aen. 1, 546-551; K. Quinn, 'Virgil's Aeneid, A Critical Description', London 1968, pp.423ff.}; here the repeated idea sets up the alternatives in lines 3-6.
The first words of the book, *ut primum', tell us that Caesar's actions
now described will be the starting point for some new and important matter, and focus our attention on the decisive moment. Even if we ignore the distinctions and resemblances between the two phrases, the repetition of the same action serves to heighten the suspense and to emphasise the importance of this moment. (A decisive moment might similarly be signalled in a film if we were shown the same action twice from different angles.}
As Quinn {op. cit. p.426) rightly observes, 'The basis of theme and variation is some kind of contrast, two ways of dealing in words with the same phenomenon or situation.' The variation often works by turning round an element of the expression, from negative to positive for example. Here the distinction between the two actual descriptions is not obvious: one might suggest two stages, the boat touching land and Caesar stepping on to the shore; one might also see a move from a generalising and distanced

- 11 -
view, 'reached the lands'; to a vivid close up of the acf.ua! step involved,
f calcavit...harenas*.

We should also note here the words 'Pompei eolla secutus'. These do nol describe anything in Caesar's behaviour; they simply slate that Pompey's head was brought to shore before Caesar. Their purpose is in part to provide a conspicuous link back to the events at the end of Book 9, but essentially to compare, through the verb 'secutus', dead Poinpey and living Caesar. Thus, with the complementary phrase 'diras calcavit Caesar harenas', we are prepared for the climax of the sentence - Victoria victique caput'. The comparison of Pompey and Caesar comes together in the second phrase, and with it the preparation of the twro alternatives that a} Rome will
conquer Egypt, or b) Egypt will decapitate both Pompey and Caesar.
'Caesar' is of course common subject to both phrases; but with 'Pompei colla secutus' contained within the first phrase, 'Caesar' stands out in the
second {'following the severed head of Pompey, Caesar set foot upon those dreadful sands'}. Similarly 'diras' picks up the reference to Pompey's murder contained within the first phrase.
If a comparison is thus set up between the two generals, it is one that works two ways. Caesar may be following Pompey to a similar death, and the sands dreadful not just for Pompey's murder, but also for their threat to him. But certain differences also seem clear. Caesar is alive and in
control while Pompey is a severed head. One might even claim in this a subdued contrast between 'Pompei colla' and * calcavit Caesar'; Caesar has
at least reached dry land in a fit state to tread it. There may also, bearing in mind the suggestion of line 4, be in 'calcavit' the suggestions of arrogance, supremacy, trampling down, that the verb often has (as at e.g. 6, 809; 7, 293).

the two verbs its natural place would be before the f el.' rather than after-it (where it half suggests a second subject}.

3 fortuna and fatum, concepts which recur constantly throughout the poem, have attracted much attention and discussion from interpreters of Lucan, arid are commonly regarded as Lucan's replacement for the Olympian gods of conventional epic {see e.g. W.-H. Friedrich, 'Cato, Caesar und Fortuna bei Lucan', Herman 73, 1938, pp.391-423 f=Rutz, pp.70-1071; for recent
literature see W. Rutz, Lustrum 26, 1984, pp.!86ff.}. The two are not regarded as incompatible or opposed, but as agents of the same process (as too the gods, see Friedrich, pp.405ff. f=Rutz, pp.Slff.l); their purpose is largely hostile to the good order of Rome and to its champions and in favour of Caesar and the crime of civil war, but not consistently so. C. Williams, 'Change and Decline', California 1978, p.173, writes 'most often
in Lucan Fate is best regarded as a sort of literary device for foreshadowing future events: Fate is what is going to happen before it happens, and the poet exercises his superior knowledge over the reader' (cf. 'Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid', New Haven 1983, pp.Sff.}. Here certainly the concepts of destiny are used to heighten interest in the events to come. Elsewhere they may be used to bring out aspects of the events that Lucan is describing, allowing him to react to and comment on what happens, by putting the meaning he finds in this onto powers that control the universe.

Although generally not differentiated in purpose, the different natures
of fortune and fatum are reflected in slight distinctions in their treatment (see below on 23-24; 485). faium tends to be impersonal destiny, fortuna a more personal force, sometimes a tutelary goddess. Also, Caesar and Fortuna have in Lucan a special relationship {already at 1, 226, 't.e,

1 i)

with its own murderous internal struggles. Rome got its first real experience of Egypt during Auletes' stay there, marked by bribery, intimidation and murder (see below on 10, 474}; and anti-Egyptian feelings were further heightened by Augustan propaganda over Actium. On Egypt's reputation generally, see K. A. B. Smelik / E. A. Hemelrijk, in ANRW 17.4, 'Egyptian Animal Worship in Antiquity' particularly pp.1870-1873;
1876-1879; and chapter V.

4 regnmn Lagi Romany* sub arma is chiastic so as to juxtapose 'Lagi' and 'Romana'; 'regnum* is paired with 'arina'. The weakly Ptolemies will be subjected! by powerful Rome; the abstract constitution will be subjected to concrete force. (A rather similar effect is achieved at 7, 227 'Latio...servit purpura ferro' - royal purple obeying Latin steel; 'servit purpura' is paradox - kings that serve - but the contrast in 'purpura ferro' explains this - the superiority of Roman might to foreign luxury.} A Roman contempt for royalty is of course felt, particularly with the degenerate court of Ptolemy, cf. e.g. 8, 606ff. Lagus, as the father of Ptolemy I Soter, gave his name to the Ptolemaic dynasty, of which the present Ptolemy's was the last generation to rule Egypt, cf. 8, 692 'ultima Lageae stir pis perituraque proles'.

5-6 an eriperet mundo Memphiticus ensis / victoris victique caput has 'mundo' and 'Memphiticus' in emphatic juxtaposition, reinforced by alliteration. The thought it suggests, common enough in the Egyptian books of the Pharsalia, is that Egypt is venturing beyond its proper sphere in presuming to control the affairs of Rome and the world, cf. 8, 542ff. {'Pharius...ensis 1 8, 546); 9, 1071 ff. {'Pellaeo...gladio' 9, 1073f.). Of
course the primary meaning of 'mundus' here is 'the world of the living',

- 16 -

for which see Luc. 5, 229f.; 6, 760 {a man restored from the dead) 'sl.upet. inlatus mundo'; and the Christian uses of the word at T.L.L. VIII, p.1639, 4ff.
Schmidt sees the oppositions in these lines differently, contrasting 'Romana...arma' with 'Memphiticus ensis', 'regnum Lagi' with 'mundo'.
Clearly the two courses of history are contrasted, and this is well signposted by the alternation of Roman and Memphitic weapons; but it seems more natural to understand each clause in itself than to elaborate oppositions between them, especially when this involves limiting the meaning of mundus to 'die "romische Welt'".

6 victoria victique caput: presumably on the principle that two heads are better than one. We might expect to find the more surprising ' victor's* second; for l/ucan's order, cf. anth. Lat. 462, 36; Liv. 1, 23, 9.

tua profuit umbra! 'tua* is emphatic to introduce the apostrophe, and also because Pompey is paradoxically helping his enemy, 'profuit umbra' is likewise paradox, in that a ghost might be expected to be more ineffectual.

7 tui...manes: anaphora of *tua...tui', a neat variation of gender and number being given to it by the change from 'umbra' to 'manes'.

socerum: the feelings behind 'socer* and 'gener* were stronger than those of our 'father-in-law* and 'son-in-law' {cf. Ovid met. 1, 144 'non hospes ab hospite tutus / non socer a genero'}. The phrase was first used of Pompey and Caesar satirically by Catullus (29, 24; see Ellis ad loc.} t and later by Virgil to bring out the extra guilt of a civil war fought by relatives (Aen. 6, 830). Lucan's frequent use of the thought (recognised

Of

lines 6-7. Not, clearly, the actual physical intervention he pretends to be describing. This leaves three interpretations: i} some more vague intervention in the balance of the fates; ii) that Caesar took warning by Pompey's death; iii} that Pompey fs death bound the Egyptians to Caesar as partners in crime.
The first alternative takes its meaning from the first sentence. It
seems difficult to fault and is the answer that I prefer. Line 8, if it is accepted, would then take the reader away from alternatives ii) and iii} - i.e. those who took *tua...umbra* to be a poetical way of saying 'Pompey's death* will have to rethink when they get to line 8.
The second (favoured by most commentators) has the problem that without line 8 its sense seems immediately contradicted by an alternative
explanation of Caesar's safety in lines 9-10; and it cannot very well go
with line 8.

The third, if it were right, would demand the removal of line 8. Ita
sense would then be clearly connected with that of lines 9-10. This explanation, though, does not fit very well with the first sentence ('The moment Caesar came ashore, the fates hung poised between death and victory...but Pompey's death meant that he had never been in any danger at all*); the weakness of this against the first two alternatives is, I hope, clear.

A variation on this third alternative may be noted in passing. Schmidt supposes that lines 6f. mean that Pompey's death bound the Egyptians to Caesar, but supposes that this is not Lucan's belief but Caesar's. His justification for supposing that the apostrophe {which calls attention to the narrator's presence and claims to be an expression of his emotions) can express Caesar's point of view is not explained, nor how the reader is supposed to divine that these are Caesar's thoughts. A further objection

•oo

securus: may perhaps be deliberately ambiguous, ac-> Si is only as the lines progress t.hat we realise Caesar is not safe but only 'free from care' (Duff).
Schmidt sees in this line an agreement with the report of the same events in Dio Cassius 42, 7, 3, where Caesar hesitates to go ashore until he has been shown Pompey's head, GUTU; 6r, fes jiev inv n'neipcv dapoouvTius upoGEGA'Ev. Schmidt sees 'inde' as equivalent to OUTUI on, 'securus' to viipaoiivTtus, 'in urbem' to es THV ffrei-pov, and 'fertur' to iipoae'cryev. It is not improbable that Lucan would have found something similar in Livy; Caesar (bell. civ. 3, 106, 4} similarly reports not coming to shore until
he learnt of Pompey's death. But Schmidt's view of the correspondences between Dio and Lucan must be mistaken in equating 'inde' with OUTW An. While it is reasonable in Dio to speak of Caesar going confidently to land after seeing Pompey's head, in Lucan Caesar is already on land and confronted by a threat so that the city is neither more nor less dangerous than where he already is, and no new reason presents itself for his safety. Rather 'inde' must have the sense we would naturally expect of it in the company of a verb of motion, i.e. 'from there', 'from the shore'. This highlights the fact that lines 1-8 of Book 10 seem to offer an episode omitted by other reports: Caesar (loc. cit.} mentions the arrival on shore, but does not distinguish between this and the arrival in the city; similarly Dio; only Lucan gives first Caesar's landing and the threats to him there and then his entry into the city, as two separate events. I think we should see lines 1-8 as an addition by Lucan, but not one that invents any action to falsify the historical truth. Rather Lucan is focusing on that moment when Caesar puts himself into the hands of the Egyptians, and considering the possibilities that the moment holds, particularly the possibility that at this moment, when Caesar's position

- 29 -

again comparing Caesar and Alexander and indicates that he was influenced by the Alexander comparisons of others. Although if. is not clear that Lucan has not invented the visit (see Zwierlein op. cit. pp.465f.}, the passage in Strabo (loc. cit.) which compares Caesar's and Alexander's dealings with Troy, and attributes Caesar's kindness towards Troy to, among other things, his admiration of Alexander, must surely show the origin of what inspired Lucan there.
One should perhaps also note Lucan's lesser borrowings from Alexander description applied to Caesar: Hosius, 'Lucanus und Seneca' p.345, notes
the likeness of Luc. 3, 82f. 'gaudet tamen esse timori / tarn magno populis et se non mallet amari* (of Caesar) to Sen. ben. 1, 13, 3 'summum bonum duceret terrori esse cunctis mortalibus' (of Alexander); see also notes on 33 and (a reverse example) 456 below.

19 effossura tumulis cuptde descendit in antrum: it is unclear whether or not Lucan had authority for his account of Caesar's visit to the tomb of Alexander. Unlike Schmidt (pp.40fv), I think it probable that the account is an invention, perhaps, as Christensen {'Alexander der Crosse bei den romischen Dichtern', NJhrb. 12, 1909, p.122, n.l) suggests, inspired by the visit of Augustus to the toinb (Suet. Aug. 18; Dio 51, 16). It is not of course improbable that Caesar's tour of the city should have included a visit to the toinb of its renowned founder; but the accounts of the tour
that have survived in Frontinus and Appian do not refer to specific places. Christensen's argument from the silence of other sources does have some weight: why (p.122, n.2) does Suetonius not mention this when he knows of Augustus* visit, and when he shows an interest in the parallel of Caesar arid Alexander in the story (Suet. JuJ. 7) of Caesar and the statue of Alexander at Cades? {The same question might also be asked of Plutarch and

- 36 -

(they put the hero's body in the shrine}.

pOBuere: ponere, like componere, is used particularly of burial and the arrangement of the dead, cf. anth. Lat. 437, 3 'Alexandri poaitum memorabile corpus'; OLD s.v. 'pono* 8b.

23-24 fortune pepercit / manibus, et regni duravit ad ultima fatum: this sentence, and particularly its last part, presents another problem of interpretation. Haskins gives three alternatives: i) 'the good fortune of his kingdom has lasted to the latest times' (Weise); ii) 'his good fortune lasted to the last days of his kingdom* (Cornm.)', iii) 'his good fortune has lasted till these last times of tyranny ' {Haskins}. The sense we require is given by lines 25f.: his good luck was that tyranny was not driven from the world. More than that, 'orbem* suggests that Lucan is not just talking about Egypt, and 'uinquam' that he is not just talking about the Ptolemaic dynasty. This disposes of i) and ii); but I am not happy with Haskins* interpretation. It seems to me that 'fatum' goes most naturally with 'regni', and 'duravit' with 'ad ultima*. Admittedly 'ultima* is generally
found with a genitive in Lucan; but this is not (as Schmidt claims) always the case. (At 5, 122, 'Appius Hesperii scrutator ad ultima fati', we
cannot, as Barratt does, interpret ' "probing to the last details of the
fate of Italy" '. An agent noun governing a clause with preposition and object would be surprising enough; with a transitive verb like scrutsri this becomes even more questionable.) If we then take the more general meanings suggested by 25f., we can read, 'the destiny of his tyranny has endured to the last', which still gives acceptable sense. The second half of the sentence mirrors the first: the sentence begins and ends with 'fortuna' and 'fatum'; the two related benefits of destiny, 'manibus' and 'regni' (the

- 47 -

tells of l.he fate of Cambyses' army, buried by the later traditional sandstorm as it marched against Ammon's oracle. More recently the reader would remember Cato'a journey past Siwah (Lucan 9, 444-510} the description of which makes several tacit parallels with Alexander (see note on 19ff. above).

39 isset in occamis mundi devexa secutus: Housman interprets 'tellurem circumnavigando ab oriente usque ad occasum pervenisset'; Haskins, *he would have marched to the west following the world's downward slope.' Haskins must be preferred, I think, since there is not sufficient information in the text to justify Housman 'a interpretation, 'mundi devexa secutus' could as well describe a voyage to or beyond the Pillars of Hercules as a complete circumnavigation.
Other arguments for Housman's interpretation seem unsatisfactory. That Alexander had wished to journey further into the east is of course true (Plut. Alex. 62; Arr,5,25ff.); but Alexander died in Babylon, already returning from the east. And if the contemplated journey has any relation to the supposed plans of Alexander, it would be more natural to see an exaggeration of the mythical western campaign that Alexander was believed to be planning, to match his eastern advances {see Schinidt on 36f.). That Housman's bolder idea would be more typical of Lucan's rhetoric is possible; but if he had intended this, would he have described it so vaguely? The idea would have been a quite startling paradox, and Lucan would surely have made more of it, as well as ensuring that his readers knew1 what he was talking about. Schmidt follows Ehlers in seeing a literal reference to the sunset here; this is possible, particularly with the reference to the curve of the earth. This does in any case highlight another problem of Housman's interpretation. The *occasus' would not

r.o

cause of Paetus' failure seems to have been his pursuit of the plunder and slaughter whose absence he had noted in Corbulo's campaigns, at the expense of effective action against the enemy or consolidation of his own position {e.g. Tac. ann. 15, 8). Whatever final objective Paetus was pursuing, his procedure was surely his own.
Turning now to Lucan, we may wonder whether reference to Parthia as a province of Pella would really lead one to think of Rome's failure to make Armenia a province. If there had been such a policy it would be as reasonable (perhaps more so) to suppose that Lucan'a anger is directed at the failure of the policy than at the policy itself.
It may be useful to look at Lucan's statements on Parthia elsewhere in
the poem. Although few would imagine that Lucan's reference to the Parthians in 1, 19 is a celebration of their expected conquest by Nero (the view of A. D. Nock, 'The Proem of the Pharsalia', CR 40, 1926, pp.lTff.),
it is clear that when throughout the poem Lucan regrets Rome's failure to tackle Parthia (e.g. 1, lOff.; 19; 7, 427ff.), he could scarcely without hypocrisy attack Nero for doing ji^st that. It is perhaps dangerous to seek to draw conclusions from passages whose content is tied to their literary and historical context; but one comparison is difficult to resist. In Book
8, written perhaps late in 63 or in 64 A.B., Lucan gives Lentulus a speech of 122 lines against Pompey's plans to form an alliance with Parthia. This is of course only the speech of a character, and one whose arguments lead to disaster; this does not however mean that the views expressed are not those of the poet, who expresses himself similarly later (cited above). Rather we are probably meant to see an irony of right views with wrong results like that of Brutus in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. The speech gives a variety of arguments against the alliance, some closely linked to the context, but all filled with contempt and hatred for Parthia; and

- 61 -

closing of harbour mouths with chains (a procedure intended for defence)

58 Emathiis ignaro Caesare tectis parallels 'Pellaea...aula'. (Emathia,
like Pella, was part of Macedonia.) Ostentatious narrative progression seems to be the effect achieved.

That Cleopatra enters the palace by boat is perhaps intended to surprise; for the topography see below on 487-488.

ignaro Caesare. According to Plutarch {Caes. 48, 9) it was in fact Caesar who had summoned Cleopatra. Schxnidt notes that Livy probably told of Ptolemy's ignorance (Die, 42, 34, 6 eg ia tfaoiXEia Xa'dpa TOU
ev, a comparison already made by Ehlers, p.559).

59 dedecus Aegypti, Latii feralis Erinys: the juxtaposition of the two nations gives the line the same force as 'Romano non casta malo*. She is one thing with the result of the other - 'the shame of Egypt and the doom of Rome*. The first part is unsurprising and typical {'dedecus 1 is what you expect of Egyptians, even if Cleopatra is disgraceful even for them). The second presents an alarmingly new group of ideas: i) Cleopatra who as an Egyptian has every right to be a 'dedecus Aegypti* is now exerting an influence upon Latium, which is monstrous; ii) from sexual unchastity we move to the destructive force of the 'Latii feralis Erinys' (the contrast
with the first part of the line is heightened by the stylistic imbalance
with the abstraction of the first metaphor 'dedecus').
It should be noted that the combination of sexual misconduct and harmful political results is a recurring theme in this section (cf. 61 with notes;
68f.; 74f.; 78ff.). The theme is taken up again from a different angle in the speech of Pothinus (cf. 358f.; 365 with note).

oo

Bailey}, is unquestionably wrong. The meaning given with 'ducis* is supposed to be 'when the general's favour had been won and bought with great gifts' (by Cleopatra it is understood, except by Housman). But pa.v in the sense of favour is only used of gods (OLD 2; Lewis £-. Short 2E1), and it is of gods that those claiming 'duels' give instances (Plaut. Amph. 1127 from Bentley; Virg. Aen. 3, 370 from Housman}. Secondly as we know from Plutarch (see below on 108) the feast is a celebration of the peace between Ptolemy and Cleopatra; and that is the natural Interpretation of pax here (even on internal grounds, see Lundquist, p.217).
The reading 'duci* becomes less puzzling if we know the historical
events that Lucan is so compressing. Schmidt rightly follows Graindor (p.40, n.l} and Heinen (p.89, n.l} in referring the line to the events described in Dio 42, 35. Here when Caesar tries to bring about a reconciliation, Ptolemy causes a riot which is only quieted when Caesar makes concessions to Egypt, giving the kingdom to both Ptolemy and Cleopatra and Cyprus (then in Roman hands) to their younger brother and sister Ptolemy and Arsinoe (42, 35, 5). So great was Caesar's fear, comments Dio (42, 35, 6), that he took nothing of Egypt h\\u xat TUJV

toV TL CrUTGLS TlpOw OGiiVCtL.

108 epulae: in the description of the feast, Lucan is mixing two
traditions, the epic feast scene and the attack on luxury.
The clearest source for Lucan's feast scene is obviously that of Dido
and Aeneas in Aeneid 1. The parallels between the two passages have been drawn out by O. Zwierlein, 'Caesar und Kleopatra bei Lucan und in spaterer Dichtung', A&A 20, 1974, pp.54-73; but the tradition goes back almost to the beginnings of epic. Behind later feast scenes lie those of the Odyssey, notably of Menelaos in Odyssey 4, and Alcinous in Odyssey 7ff.

- 84 -

The magnificence of the palace is described to make the poem's subject matter more interesting, grand, exotic (Horn. Od. 4, 43-6; 71-5; 7, 51ff.;
Ap. Rhod. 3, 210ff.; Virg. Aen. 1, 697ff.}; the audience takes a
sympathetic pleasure in the riches described.
The second tradition, the rejection of luxury, is widely represented in Roman literature. Virgil compares unnecessary luxury to the 'secura quies' of the farmer (georg. 2, 461ff.), and behind this is Lucretius' description of luxuries inferior to the tranquil pleasures of the Epicurean lifestyle
(2, 24ff.). In the historians similarly a moral historical tradition is
given; very close to our purposes is Sallust hist. 2, f.70 M., a
description of a banquet given for Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius in Spain in 74 B.C. In philosophical writing, Seneca provides many parallels (see Hosius, *Lucanus und Seneca', pp.342f.}, particularly in his catalogue of contemporary luxury at de ben. 7, 9 {as Schmidt, p.204, notes). In all
these writings the trappings of luxury are described in considerable
detail, as things which the reader should wish to be without.
This application of a moralistic element to such scenes of epic
magnificence is not unique in Lucan; Homer's Phaeacian episode had met with similar treatment, from moralists unwilling to accept that the Phaeacians' pleasures could really have been admired by Homer, as Epicurus thought (see F. Buffiere, 'Les Mythes d'Romere', Paris 1956, pp.317-321). As Lucan adapts didactic to epic, so Lucretius had adapted epic to didactic in the passage cited above, using details of Alcinous* palace in his list of unwanted luxuries. Schmidt, pp.lSOf., points out that Lucan's epic feast scene, with its moral viewpoint, is imitated by Silius Italicus in his description of Hannibal's stay in Capua (11, 270ff.}, as also is the plot of Pothinus against Caesar recalled by the plot of the son of Calavius against Hannibal.

94 -
their HERAuLOL fjiipiiCipGlCJ i.«

J. T. Wild, 'Two Technical Terms used by Roman Tapestry-weavers', Philologus 111, 1967, pp.151-154, interprets polymita similarly, with reference to definitions of the Latin equivalent multicia (= muiti-licia},
as 'with tapestry-woven decoration in many colours'.

127 turn famulae numerus turbae populusque minister! corresponds to the fifty serving women of Horn. Od. 7, 103, and the 250 servants of Yirg. Aen. 1, 703ff. Lucan has typically lifted their numbers into a serving nation again reflecting the luxury of his own times (see R. H. Barrow 'Slavery in the Roman Empire', London 1928, pp.23-26 and 43).

128 discolor hos sanguis, alios distinxerat aetas: lines 129-132 show a distinction of race, 133-135 a distinction of age (for the grouping by age cf. Virg. Aen. 1, 705 'pares aetate ministri'}.

discolor...san|guis: for blood as a cause of complexion, cf. Ov. ars 2, 658 'fusca vocetur / nigrior Illy* Co. car pice sanguis erit*.

129-132 The distinctions drawn here are puzzling: a group with African hair is mentioned, then one with Germanic blond hair, then again an African group. Schmidt takes the third group to be identical with the first, a more extended description of what had till then only been mentioned with 'Libycos...crines*. Another possibility would be to suppose that the first group is not described since it has the hair typical of the North African that one might expect to find in Egypt, while the third group has more unusual Ethiopian hair.
Perhaps too the original 'Libycos* is intended to contrast with the

- 102 -

try translating 'they set each table down on its legs'; but cf. Mart. 2, 43, 9 (cited above), and Mart. 9, 59, 7f. shows that legs and table would be separate when bought.

146 nee capto venere luba: since Juba ruled over the territory where the trees grew. A number of the remarkable citrus tables of which Pliny tells us (nat. 13, 92; 93} belonged to .Tuba's successors.
In fact Caesar never did capture Juba. He committed suicide after the defeat at Thapsus in 46 B.C. (as Lucan knew, 6, 309 *nec luba Marmaricas nudus pressisset harenas 1); but he left a son behind him, and so Caesar was able to lead a Juba in his African triumph.

147 civffia bella gerenti: there are two points here: i) 'civilia* is
contrasted with 'suas* - he is fighting his own people, the Egyptians give him cause to fight theirs; ii) he is fighting a civil war, and therefore a man to stop at nothing (cf. 'nefando marte') and not to be trusted.

149-150 The mention of civil war (cf. 'belli...nefandi' 1, 21;
' bella... nefanda* 325) of course prepares the contrast with the corruption of a more virtuous Roman in 154, in that Caesar is conducting 'bella...nullos habitura triumphos* (1, 12; cf. 3, 73ff.; 6, 261).

150 mundi...ruina! 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. Here. Oat. 1150); this is of course one of Lucan's central images for the civil war.

Some (Luck and Schmidt) take 'mundi' as going either by deliberate ambiguity or apo koinou with 'opes* as well as 'ruina'. Although this may

-ion

Lucan's inclusion of didactic elements may be seen in Ovid, who likewise includes in direct speech (rather than simply reporting) a discourse, that of Pythagoras at met. 15, 75-478. Songs to entertain guests are a feature of epic banquets (Od. 8, 61-82; 266-366), and so too are personal stories from the banqueters (Od. 4, 235-264; 9-12). Both features were of course to be found at contemporary banquets (J. P. V. D. Balsdon , 'Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome', London 1969, pp.44ff.}.
Appian gives what may be the basis for Lucan's inclusion of the discussion here, in Caesar's attendance at lectures to calm the Alexandrian populace, App. bell. civ. 2, 89, cited above on 14ff., and similarly at
bell. civ. 2, 154 (cited below on 184ff.) where we are told that Caesar used his time in Egypt to question the wise men there. In another direction the continuation of the celebration long into the night recalls Suet. Jul. 52, 1 (cited on 108).

173 nocteml it was typical of symposia of convivia to run long into the night, till dawn indeed (Hor. carm. 3, 8, 14f.; 21, 23f.; Prop. 4, 6, 85f.)
so that Mucernae' came to stand for the symposion (Nisbet / Hubbard on carm. 1, 27, 5). Although some parties were fairly wild affairs, serious Romans were also ready simply to talk far through the night, e.g. Horace epist. 1, 5, 11 'aestivain sermone benigno tendere noctein'; Cic. de sen. 46 'conviviiuni...ad multam noctein...vario sermone produciinus'.

174 summaque in sede! corresponding perhaps to 'toro...alto* of Virg. Aen.

2 2.

175 linigeruml a priest, since the priests of Egypt wore linen (Herodotus 2, 37). Linen was associated particularly with Isis and her devotees, to

- 124 -

to Greeks and Romans, were paradoxically both published and concealed.

181-183 The important point is that Acoreus' ancestors taught foreigners, since they taught Plato (this is the reason for 'Cecropium' and its juxtaposition with 'sua'), therefore Acoreus can teach Caesar, though a visitor {'hospes'), since he is without parallel worthy to hear such

secrets.

181 Platona: the story of Plato's journey to Egypt, after the death of Socrates and before his visit to Sicily and Italy, is first recorded in
Cicero (rep. 1, 16); it may perhaps be true, although it could very well be no more than another example of the tendency to trace the sources of every kind of learning to the ancient culture of Eg;rpt (e.g. Diogenes Laertius 1, 1, the Egyptians claimed that Hephaistos was the son of the Nile and that he created philosophy which was expounded by priests and prophets).
The story appeared more credible from Plato's numerous references to Egypt and the myths he sets there, e.g. Critias llOa-b, 113; Timaeus 22ff. (Atlantis); laws 2, 656 (age old rules written on the temples to confine
art to allowed forms); Phaedrus 274b ff.; Philebus 18b (Theuth, inventor of letters). These (mostly, it is certain, inventions of Plato) were given an Egyptian setting because great antiquity was necessary; but they, and the knowledge and interest in Egypt they reveal, would have helped belief in an Egyptian connection.

182 sua sacra...maiores,..tui: Plato has Critias tell that the legend oif
Atlantis was taught to Solon by an Egyptian priest (Timaeus 22ff.; Critias 108), like Acoreus eu yaXa naAoao'v (Timaeus 22a). Such tales would have encouraged the belief that Plato himself learnt sacral knowledge from the

- 127 -
187 meus...annus: it was after Thapsus in 46 B.C. that Caesar instituted his calendar; as Haskins notes, while the future tense may refer to the intended change, it is as likely that Lucan is ignoring the historical order of events and letting Caesar say simply that his calendar will prove itself {through the test of time) superior to that of Eudoxus.
Before 46 B.C. the Roman year had consisted of twelve months and 355 days, with an intercalary month being added every other year after February. Since the system did not exactly match the solar year, priests had discretion to interfere with further intercalary months of their own; the haphazard nature of this interference meant that by 46 B.C. the calendar was two months out of step with the solar year. Caesar intercalated the necessary months to bring 45 B.C. into line, and then began his system of a year of twelve months and 365 days, with (he intended) an extra day every four years (Suet. Jul. 40).
'metis...annus' has two effects here. Caesar was genuinely a man of learning; but Lucan portrays the natural embarrassment of a Roman confronted with a learned foreigner, trying to establish his own claims to be a thinker with uneasy boastfulness. He has Caesar put himself (literally) next to the great Creek astronomer Eudoxus, a laughable comparison in real terms. More sinisterly, Caesar's phrase 'my year* suggests his incredible ambitions, over even the calendar, and the movement of the seasons; Plutarch, describing the reaction to Caesar's calendar
(Cses. 59) gives a joke of Cicero, who, being told that Lyra would rise tomorrow, said 'Yes, by decree'.

190-192 Caesar's interest in the Nile here is perhaps inspired by the tale that he with Cleopatra 'eadein nave thalamego paene Aethiopia tenus Aegyptuin penetravit, nisi exercitus sequi recusisset', Suet. JuL 52, 1; App. bell.

- 128 -
civ. 2, 90. Another influence for Caesar's pursuit of geographical
knowledge here might be the survey of the world that Caesar commissioned in 44 B.C. (see O. A. V. Dilke, 'Greek and Roman Maps', London 1985, p.40).

190 causa8...1atentis: 'latentis' of course goes with 'causas*. Although
the Nile was naturally and constantly characterised as 'hiding', the verb's association with 'causas' is equally natural (see T.L.L. Ill, p.666, 25ff.;
Stat. Theb. 3, 473; 8, 250).

- 131 -

'polus' is used for the vault of heaver, to which the stars are fixed,
as opposed to the lower sphere of the planets, cf. 9, 12f. 'stellasque vagas...et astra / fixa polis*. Here 'polus* retains the idea of rotation,
from its original meaning of the celestial pole, the axis around which the heavens turned, cf. Ov. met. 2, 74f. (of Phaethon) 'poterisne rotatis /
obvius ire polis...?'

201-209 The order in which Lucan puts the planets has its own reasons, although it is not the order of their distance from earth, in which they
are commonly grouped. There were two common arrangements of the planets in Greek and Roman times {Bouche-Leclercq, pp.104-110; Boll, R.E. VII,
2561ff.). The earlier, which comes to us first in Plato (Timaeus 38)
arranged around the earth in ascending order: the moon; the sun; Venus; Mercury; Mars; Jupiter; Saturn. Within this system there was some debate
as to the relative position of Venus and Mercury, with some putting Mercury closer to the earth {Bouche-Leclercq p. 107). This was replaced around the time of Hipparchus with an order, commonly attributed to the Chaldeans (see Bouche-Leclercq pp.lOSf.), which put the sun above Mercury and Venus {i.e. moon; Venus; Mercury; sun; Mars; Jupiter; Saturn). Again the relative positions of Venus and Mercury were disputed {Bouche-Leclercq p.110, n.l). We should consider Lucan's list as three groups: i) sun and moon; ii) Saturn, Mars, Jupiter; iii) Venus and Mercury. The sun and moon are put first since they are not properly to be considered as planets, but as
q>biiu {Bouche-Leclercq, p.88, n.3). Ptolemy's tetrabiblos 1, 4 similarly
puts the sun and moon first in its list of planets {in fact his catalogue follows exactly the same order as Lucan's, doubtless for similar reasons, see Boll, R.E. VII, p.2569, 48-58). Saturn, Mars and Jupiter form the next group, the outermost planets of either order, especially distinct in the

- 133 -

presumably divides the times of the year with the solstices and the equinoxes; but, as Housman says, its annual revolutions, that is the years themselves, divide up the 'tempora aevi*. A champion of 'anni* might argue that this makes a very disparate pair: dividing up the times of eternity and alternating night and day. But we should not consider the ideas of 201 and 202 as a closely linked pair; and in that it leads us to do so 'anni'
is harmful. By having the sun make two specific divisions of time, the reading trivialises both (the alternation of night and day is something larger than a process of the calendar) when the context (199-201 e.g. 'priina / mundi lege') demands something greater. We can perhaps better appreciate the dignity of 'sol tempora dividit aevi* if we compare with it the idea in Plato, Tiznaeus 38c that God created the sun, moon and five planets ELS Stcpic/ycv xat <puAaxrrv a

202-203 As Housman observes, Lucan is referring to the theory that the 'stations' ('stationes'; uTripi.-fHoO of a planet were caused by the sun (see Bouche-Leclercq pp.HTff.; Gundel R.E. XX, p. 2084, 53ff.). A planet normally appears to be travelling west to east as measured against the stars; but when - from a heliocentric point of view - a planet such as the earth 'overtakes* a superior planet (Mars, Jupiter, Saturn), and passes between it and the sun, the superior planet appears to stop and go backwards.

The observation, apparently astrological in origin (thus the 'trigonal* power of the sun*s rays, i.e. at 120 degrees from the planet, e.g. Plin
nat. 2, 59), was well enough known (e.g. Cic. de nat. deor. 2, 9 , and other instances collected by Bouche-Leclercq, p.118, n.l); Pliny, nat. 2, 59-60, 69-71 and Vitruvius 9, 1, 11-13 (cited by Housman) provide the most detailed accounts, and attempt explanation. Lucan is describing the sun's

- 135 -

diss. Halle-Wittenberg, 1911, pp.393-395; M. Haupt, 'Gpuscula', Leipzig 1875, pp.74f.}. Here it gives pleasing alliteration, and the slight
stylistic surprise of mixing the Greek mythological personification and the Latin neuter plural adjective conveys the separateness of the two realms 'mixed 1 by the moon's power.

miscet: Duff's unhelpful translation ('bring the sea and the land into contact') is an indication of the difficulties of Viiscet' here. The
T.L.L. does not give any examples of the use of the word for tides, or anything to support the sense of 'alternates' which we might expect of it here. Rather our example is found under the heading 'ordine naturae Jocis distinctas perverse et tuinultuarie...turbando' (T.L.L. VTII, p.1089,
49ff.); indeed it sounds more like a description of the end of the world than of alternating tides (cf. Lucr. 3, 842 'terra mari miscebitur et mare caelo'). We must suppose that the idea of confusion is uppermost: with the shifting tides what is land and what is sea is no longer distinguishable - the 'litus dubium' as Lucan calls it in his discussion of tides (1, 409). (Luean has used language more suitable for a more total elemental confusion to describe a partial alternation - the moon puts land where sea was and then sea where land was.) Although the Atlantic was doubtless fairly familiar by now, and tides were a phenomenon long known of, they were still regarded with some awe; Mela 3, 1 provides a good example, *pelagus...modo inundat campos, modo late nudat ac refugit...tanta vi super inmissum, ut vasta etiam flumina retro agat et aut terrestria deprehendat animalia aut marina destituat.' It may also be noted that the moon is grouped with and compared with the sun: the sun's influence is over celestial events, and this influence orders and regulates; the moon has an earthly influence, manifested here in confusion.

(and unscientific) ideas and details. It certainly does not seem impossible that the writings of 'Timaeus mathematicus' should be works claiming to originate from Plato's character
TLpcii.cs, attribute's to him M«dr,p«T.LKa).

reference, s.v.

T.T. Ive return now to the first part of this section (210-214) which gives in

astronomical terms the date of the Nile flood. It should be remembered (see above) that Mercury has replaced the sun in this description; in further discussion I shall refer to the sun and not Mercury. Lucan gives three details to identify the 'pars caeli' which the sun will have reached at tiiis time OA year; unfortunately the details are obscure in themselves and do not all refer to the same parts of the sky. Much has been done to explain the passage by Housman (pp.334-337); but certain modifications to his comments seem needed.
For Rousman the three descriptions indicate: i) the sun's entry into Leo (210f.); ii) the position (and perhaps the morning rising) of Sirius
\211f.); iii) the colure of the solstices. A brief digression may be
helpful here. We can mark on the celestial sphere the poles, the tropics and the celestial equator, and the course of the sun (the ecliptic) across the sphere through the signs of the zodiac (fig. 1). The equinoctial and

- 1 1C

TO

solstitial colures are drawn about the celestial sphere (like lines of longitude on the earth) between the poles (fig. 2). The colure of the

solstices cuts through the ecliptic at its northernmost and southernmost points (respectively the tropics of Cancer and Capricorn). When the sun crosses the colure at the tropic of Cancer the summer solstice takes place; when it crosses it at the tropic of Capricorn it is the time of the winter solstice. (The equinoctial colure, at 90 degrees to the solstitial,
similarly marks the time of the spring and autumn equinoxes, at the points where it crosses the ecliptic, in both cases at the equator.) We are concerned with the area of the sky which the sun is in at the summer

1 -1O — L-ttJ —

Housman points out that the sun's crossing of the colure of the
solstices occurs at a different time (the summer solstice in late June) to the sun's entry in Leo (about a month later}; the two details were used to date two different stages of the Nile's flood which Housman believes Lucan has confused {p.335). He then gives his explanation of how Lucan came to confuse the two dates a month apart, as follows. 1} His description is an inaccurate expansion of Sen. nai. qus.esi. 4a, 1, 2 'Nilus ante exortum Caniculae augetur mediis aestibus ultra aequinoctium'. 2} He took this to mean not that it rose some time before, but that it rose immediately
before, or at, the rising of Sirius. 3} He knew: a) 'that Sirius was nearly upon that meridian line which is called the colure of the solstices*; b)
that the rising of Sirius occurred at about the same time as the sun's entry into Leo. 4} He wrongly thought that, as it rose at the same time as the sun when the sun was in the first point of Leo, it most be on the same meridian line as the first point in Leo. 5} He therefore transferred
Sirius, and with it the solstice, to the first point in Leo, '30° out of
its true place.'
Points 3-5 of the argument may benefit from explanation. By 'meridians' Housman means lines drawn on the celestial sphere between the two poles, like the r.olures. If we (we, that is, in the northern hemisphere) could
see the meridians marked on the sky, then our view looking south would be like that in figure 4. The point where the meridians meet, the south pole,

- 149 -
is cut off from our view by the horizon. Let us now draw in the lines of latitude on the celestial sphere (fig. 5} and draw in i.wo stars rising

together, K and p. Clearly they cannot be on the same meridian. What Rousmart claims that Lucan imagined as the normal situation is that in fig.
6. This, incidentally, is the view from the equator; the southern pole is

on the horizon, and the heavens revolve around it. If two stars rise together (as -,• and 6 in the diagram) then clearly they are on the same

meridian.

Such is Housinan's explanation; iny quarrel is essentially with points 3-5 (although it may be said that points 1 and 2 are not quite fair to Lucan). That Lucan had a vague or inaccurate knowledge of the position of the colure would not be surprising; that he came to it by such a process of incompetence as Housman suggests, is more difficult to believe. Housman, with what might be taken as polemical cunning, gives as confirmation for his view what would otherwise clearly be a proof against it, the passage at 6, 337f. which shows that Lucan could misplace the solstice in Leo with no help from Sirius, 'Leonis / solstitiale caput*. Even without this it would be doubtful whether such a complex association were the cause of the error here; and there are certain problems to Housman's theory.
If we look back to figure 3a, we see that although the colure of the solstices cuts through Canis Maior it is not really so very close to
Sirius. This, however, is taking the best case. Housman gives the Hipparchan coordinates for the colure, by which it cuts through the first point in Cancer; the Julian calendar, as Housman notes, 'placed the solstice at the 8th. point of Cancer*. This puts Sirius even further from the colure. (Housman, noting the two different dates, commented, p.334, 'this difference does not materially affect the questions here arising.'
This is true only in that Lucan is wrong by either system, although less wrong by the Julian; Housman's theory relies on the Hipparchan system.} I do not know which position for the colure Lucan held to; but that he could have placed them in the eighth point of Cancer is shown from the similar case of Pliny (nst. 18, 22!}, who does so, and is also one of the authors cited by Housman as evidence that the Nile began to rise at the solstice

6, 338? We might take Leo's solstitial head as referring to the high point of the ecliptic; but with nothing else for it to relate to grammatically
its primary meaning must he 'Leo's head'. Now the head of the constellation of Leo was not in the first point of the sign of Leo but extends some way into Cancer - in other words 'where the stars of Leo are mixed with Cancer' (it would be dangerous to make too much of the distinction between simple 'Cancro' and the 'sidera Leonis', cf. 364 below; but it does reinforce a point that would have been made even had Lucan written only 'where Leo is mixed with Cancer'). There is still some slight inaccuracy, but it seems to me quite credible that Lucan believed that the {'Julian'} colure of the solstices passed close by Leo's head.
2. Standard descriptions of the time of the flood. Housman's
introduction to the problem, pp.334f., tells us that Lucan confused the two datings of the flood, that of the summer solstice, and that of the sun's entry into Leo and the rising of Sirius; but his explanation makes no use of the possible effect of these conventional datings on Lucan. The instances of these datings are conveniently gathered for us in Bonneau, pp.42-45. The first point to be made is that, with the exception of Pliny nat. 5, 57, the accounts do not distinguish the true beginning of the rising in late June (when it reaches Lower Egypt) and the stage in late July when the Nile overflows. Mostly they give either one date or the other as the beginning of the flood. This has implications for the source of the confusion here, and for the cause of Lucan's misunderstanding of Seneca pointed to by Housinan, p.335.
The rising of Sirius {Bonneau, p.43, n.4), as Housinan fails to mention, was one of the standard dates for the Nile's rising. The coincidence of the two had led to the Egyptians' basing their calendar on the rising of Sothis, i.e. Sirius {Bonneau, pp.SOff.), and it had been readily taken up

1 c

The confusion is now more understandable: i) he thought that the colure of the solstices cut through the ecliptic a little further into Cancer than it actually did, near the head of the constellation Leo; ii) he then
thought that the solstice and the sun's entry in Leo / the rising of Sirius were referring to roughly the sarae point in time. He could not have thought, on this argument, that they were precisely the same, since he would know that the solstice was in the constellation but not in the sign of Leo; but since constellation and sign normally cover roughly the same section of the zodiac, he could easily have thought that they were two points a small distance apart. The 'pars caeli' would then be, in Lucan's mind, a small section of the ecliptic (although in fact a whole, or almost a whole, sign).
He would have had some encouragement for this in the Seneca already quoted, nai. qusast. 4a, 1, 2 'Nilus ante exortum Caniculae augetur mediis aestibus ultra aequinoctium'. Here 'mediis aestibus' could be taken as referring to the solstice, with the common use of the solstice to date the flood, and with Seneca's use of the equinox immediately afterwards to date the end of the rising. If, already believing that the Nile rose with the rising of Sirius, Lucan understood 'ante exortum' as 'immediately before
the rising', this would seem to him to show both the rising of Sirius and
the middle of summer being used to time the beginning of the Nile's flood. Indeed, Seneca seems to be of the same opinion. Housman, criticising Lucan for having misunderstood his source, does not ask why Seneca himself brings in the rising of Sirius. Seneca is stressing how long the flood lasts, and for this purpose how long before the autumn equinox it starts. If he chose the rising of Sirius to signify this, he did so (a) because of its
traditional connection with the Nile flood and (b) because it was the first significant astronomical marker after the beginning of the Nile flood at

- 156 -
the solstice. In other words he is using the rising of Sirius and the solstice as alternative dates, treating them as nearly simultaneous. (Of course 'nearly simultaneous' would have meant something different to Seneca, who is thinking in terms of the whole duration of the flood, than it would to Lucan, who is only concerned with pointing to its beginning; but we can see how Lucan could have been misled.)
Lucan's description then has its share of error and imprecision {which
may fairly be held to be faults in the poem), though perhaps less of serious incompetence than Housman claims - rather a number of small errors fostered by the nature of the Nile flood literature that he was working with. We should however note the aims that he had in this passage. As mentioned at the beginning of the note, Lucan is here trying to emphasise the regularity and precision of the flood, which was a part of the Nile's marvellous nature just as its unusual season was (Bonneau, pp.29f.); the three different astronomical phenomena all marking the time of the flood serve this purpose. Also they - and their difficult expression - help to heighten the impression of Acoreus' great learning and of the mystery of the Nile flood. The complex nature of the sentence after the simply expressed catalogue of planets (210-209) adds to the effect; it also adds to Lucan's suggestion of the regularity of the Nile flood, and (as with the list of planets) of how the Nile rises almost as part of the order of the universe, through the number of relations and subordinations built into it grammatically: 'ubi'; 'qua'; 'qua'; 'cui'; 'quae'; 'cum1.
As regards the latitude given by these lines, Housman (p.336) is right that Lucan'a data are inconsistent with what he says elsewhere. Probably they are inconsistent with what Lucan is imagining in these lines; 'latent' in 214 suggests the unknown regions in which the Nile's source is usually placed, not those at or just south of Syene. The explanation is that Lucan

- 171 -
context, and the facts of the Nile flood (see above on 227} demand that Lucan should be describing the autumn equinox, the end of the Nile flood, to correspond to its beginning with the sun over Syene, in 234. In Syene at the summer solstice, there are no shadows at midday, because the sun is directly overhead. In Meroe, further to the south, this same absence of shadows occurs twice, once before the solstice (as the sun passes overhead on its northward course to the tropic), and once after it (as the sun returns to the south). (This discrepancy between the shadowless days at Meroe and Syene had been made famous in antiquity by Eratosthenes* use of it in determining the size of the earth, see Thomson, p. 138.)
Before the sun first passes Meroe, the midday shadows there are cast to the north, the normal direction for inhabitants of the northern temperate zone like Lucan and us. Once it has passed overhead for the first time (and is now to the north of Meroe) the shadows are cast to the south, until the sun returns from the tropic, and again passes over Meroe. Once more Meroe briefly casts no shadows, and then returns to casting its shadows to the north. It is this second point, some time after the summer solstice, when the shadows are again cast to the north, that Lucan is indicating. This involves two problems.
Firstly as indicated above, Meroe already is casting a shadow when the sun is over Syene, but one to the south; it only ceases to cast a shadow for a few days, later, as the sun again passes overhead. Lucan must mean 'casts a shadow to the north', the only direction in which a Roman would ever see his shadow fall, since Syene was the southernmost limit of the empire. Pliny, similarly, seems to talk of areas where shadows are being cast to the south for a period, as though they were shadowless: nsL 2, 185 'Onesecritus...scripsit, quibus in locis Indiae umbrae non sint...ea loca appellari ascia1; 5, 56 (umbrarum defectus iis diebus et locis sine fine

- 182 -
adverb or adjective. That it is the adverb is shown by the passages in Seneca and Anon. F3or., describing the effects first of the wind (TOV p£v...fivepov), then separately of the wave (10 &E x-oya); 'feriunt* and
'cogunt' cannot be linked by sharing the 'assiduo fluctu'.
However, 'fluctu*, although it may well be right, is not without its difficulties. The first problem is that 'fluctu* comes at us out of
nowhere; easy enough for Housinan to understand it with the parallels collected by Diels before him, but not for a reader to whom the theory was unknown. 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 till then we had thought we were dealing only with winds. In this, 'assiduo' as adjective gives one problem - 'fluctus* is applied further
back demanding greater reinterpretation when the reader reaches it; with 'assiduo' 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 the waves.
If we read instead 'fluctus*, again understanding it as referring to the action of the sea in holding up the river, the problems of 'fluctu' are lessened, if not. entirely removed; but we are faced with a different problem - if it is the waves that force the 'aquas' to halt, what is the part of the winds? The connection between the winds and the fluctus is lost. A better alternative may be to consider 'fluctus' as accusative. Heitland (loc. cit.} supported 'fluctu' by claiming that both 242f. and
244f. had the winds working through the agency of respectively clouds and waves; but this parallelism is misleading, since it involves taking
'assiduo' as an adjective; nor is it emphasised by the grammatical structure of the lines. If we look at. the parallel verses in 242f. we get

- 195 -
implication is present (Bourgery / Penchant translate 'tandis que la longeur du trajet fait perdre aux flots marins, avec leur force, leur

s

saveur salee'); while the T.L.L. (VIII, p.1145, 21ff.) can parallel the meaning 'to make fresh / sweet' with Curt. 6, 4, 18, its use for softening anger and violence must be far more prominent {calming the anger of the sea, T.L.L. VIII, p. 1146, 20ff.). The same thought occurs in a slightly different context in Pliny (nat. 5, 54) describing not the cause of the flood but the river's course; after the cataracts, he says, the river is gentle, 'confractis aquis domitaque violentia, aliquid et spatio fessus'. (Compare also Luc. 5, 466 'neuter longo se gurgite las sat'; Ov. met. 1,
581f. with Bonier ad loc.}

258-261 (Diels, pp.16-17 = Kl. pp.39-40; Rehm, p.589, Iff.). Interpreted
as a second rain theory this seems clear enough: the sun draws up wrater from the Ocean; at the height of summer it draws up more than the atmosphere can hold; this excess falls back to earth in the night (when the cooler temperature no longer sustains it). (This would be as close as ancient speculation came to the true cause of the flood: H. E. Hurst, 'The Nile', London 1952, p.4 'Its annual cycle is produced by...the sun, which evaporates water from the South Atlantic Ocean and this, by pressure differences and the earth's rotation, is driven 2,200 miles across Africa
to the highlands of Ethiopia, where it falls as rain'.) The theory uses annual and diurnal cycles of precipitation and evaporation such as were put forward by Aristotle (see O. Gilbert, 'Die Meteorologischen Theorien des Griechischen Altertuins', Leipzig 1907, pp.461f.) both dependent on the movement of the sun, cf. Aristot. m&teor. 359b, 34ff. ospopevou 6r, TOU
hXtou xuxXijj, itat Slav pev rt Xr,aLat;ri, T?) aepiiotnTL kvayovros TO uYpov,
iioppwte'pu) 6E YLYVOJJEVOU 6La inv *ii£.LV auvLOTajJE'vns naXLV ins nva*x«ELans

- 200 -

266 creator: despite its later Christian usage for the creator of the universe, this is the first instance recorded by the T.L.L. {TV, p.1114, 43), although the word is used before this for 'father of the gods' {Cic. div. 2, 64; Sen. Phaad. 888); the idea of the begetter of the universe exists before with expressions such as 'genitor' (T.L.L. VI, p.1823, 26ff.J cf. also Luc. 2, 7 'parens rerum').

266-267 iHe...opifex rerum: a common translation for the 6nytoup-fos of Greek philosophy from Cicero (de nat. dear. 1, 18) onwards (see T.L.L. IX, p.704, 62ff.). The phrasing here (see Schotes, p. 177) is influenced by Ovid met. 1, 79 'ille opifex rerum'.

- 205 -

are sent out to the Macrobii to report back on them to Cambyses (Herodotus 3, 19ff.); and from this Lucan could have transferred the detail to 'Aethiopum lectos' in the lines on Alexander.

272 quoa: 'quern' ZU; 'quos' ft. 'quern* is interpreted by some as referring to Alexander; but Diels, p.19, n.2 (=Kl. p.395), followed by Housman (and Hosius 'Zu den Handschriften des Lucanus' p.351}, saw it as belonging with 'Nilo', justifying this with reference to the well known Egyptian reverence for the Nile, in particular Luc. 8, 477f. 'custos Nili...Memphis vana
sacris'. This does not seem reasonable to me, without some explanation of the logical connection of Egyptian Nile worship to the context; that provided by Diels - Alexander's envy is explained by Egypt's worship of the Nile - is unsatisfactory. This motive for envy is petty in Alexander,
which with Lucan's attitude to him is hardly surprising; but this smallness applies also to the Nile - the trait that the world's conqueror begrudged
is Egyptian worship, characterised by Lucan as (loc. cit.) *vana sacris'.
We can provide a better explanation for Alexander's envy, in line with his need to conquer every natural obstacle, to know the unknown; it was its apparent boundlessness that he envied, that it seemed greater than him. If we ignore 'quein Memphis adorat* we see a clear contrast between Alexander's worldly greatness and the Nile which still had something which he did not; the adoration of the Egyptians would be ludicrous in this place.
The more natural explanation of 'quern' to which we return makes good sense: that Alexander was worshipped as a god (on that point at least he had no need to envy the Nile) was noted by Lucan, see on 22-23 above; the honour heightens his greatness, which is then shown as nonetheless leaving him in envy of the Nile. This would also apply to 'quos', which may have certain advantages to 'quern*. 'Memphis' here is doubtless chosen largely

O1 1
Cj A J.

flood or of the 'sources' in the first cataract region. Lucan's unnamed god is another mystery, adding to the mystery of the Nile it conceals.

287-294 begins the description of the Nile's course, here telling of its first stages as far as we can know them. 287-291 are, as Eichberger has noted (pp.57f.), clearly related to the report in Diodorus Siculus 1, 32,
1-2 (1, 32, 4 is also relevant, but not 1, 32, 5 which Diels, p.21 = Kl.
p.397, cites); 292-294 retire from geographical precision and return to the theine of the ultimate unknowability of the Nile. Lucan first describes the Nile's emergence, 287-289, then the nature of its course (curving to east and west), then shows its great length by specifying in this course distant peoples with whom we might think that it began.

287 media consurgis ab axe: commentators and translators have readily taken 'inedio consurgis ab axe* to mean that 'the Nile rises at the equator*
(Duff), an interpretation which has allowed Eichberger, pp.SSf., to accuse Lucan of inconsistency, since after claiming here that the Nile flows north 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. It seems to me that the interpretation both of 'consurgis' as 'rise from its source'
and of 'medio...axe> as the equator are unacceptable, not because of Eichberger's complaint, but because of a more immediate clash. Lucan has just previously given Acoreus seven lines (282-287) to tell Caesar that the Nile's spring is unknown, and that he can only tell him of its course, as far as he has been allowed to know it. Is he then supposed to begin his limited account of what of the river's course he may tell with a direct statement of the precise location of its source?

01 r-

margin of its model into the wrong position in the text. The omissions might indicate: i) a spurious verse; ii) (so Francken) that 296 was a doublet of 295, one of which Lucan would have published {the tradition might then have followed the course imagined by Fraenkel, pp.520ff., for unfinished parts of Lucan's work); iii) the line, though genuine, having once (by whatever cause) got into the margin, was restored, if at all, in the wrong place (so Bentley, transposing it to before 295); iv) it is genuine and missing in some manuscripts through the carelessness of a scribe (Housinan admittedly fails to give a paleographical explanation here) or through exciting suspicion from its apparent interruption of the flow of the sentence.

Against the line in this position (and thus pointing to one of the first three situations above), there are the following arguments: i) the lines
are disturbed by the change of subject; ii) *prodidit' (295) and *amovit* (29?) when not separated by 296 seem clearly intended to be set against each other, so that the removal of 296 once again provides a better flow of sense. The first point is of little weight, especially since we understand nature's hand behind the *nec licuit populis', cf. 169-171. The point behind the second objection may be incorporated into a text that keeps 296 in its position. We then have the sentence divided into two halves, 295-296 and 297-298; 'prodidit' and the negative formulation in 295 are varied with a positive restatement and 'amovit' in 297, with their similarly varied expansions (296 negative, 297f. positive) being linked by the emphasis on 'populis' and Rentes'. In addition, against Bentley's transposition, the phrasing of the apostrophe, *te, Nile', seems less appropriate directly after 'te' in 294. In favour of the line's genuineness there are the similar thoughts in Luc. 1, 20 tnascenti...Nilo' and Claudian carm. win. 28, 13 'fertur sine teste creatus' (compare also

- 218 -

12f. cited above on 284-285); this imagery is also a further link between 296 and 297f., with 'ortus'. (Francken sees the connection of imagery differently, arguing against Berkley's transposition from the link of 'parvujn'and 'sinus quibua parvulus alitur'. This seems to me both too explicit (elsewhere we get only images of the river's birth and childhood, corresponding to its first rising and smaller stages, adding the idea of feeding turns the image into a conceit) and too vague - who is nursing the a Nile? On what? Rather, 'sinus1 picks up the idea of secrecy in 'arcanum...caput' of 295.)

298-302 Behind the thought of these lines there lies (as Eichberger, p.59, points out) the theory of the inversion of the seasons. This theory {Eichberger pp.59-62; Bonneau pp.!99f.; Rehm p.585, 32ff.) is attributed by Aristotle to a Nicagoras of Cyprus (Aristot. frg. 248, p.195, 14ff. Rose), elsewhere to Egyptian priests (Diod. Sic. 1, 40 TUV .*•' ev Me'y<p£i. TLVES vpiXoao'tpu/v; and vis Eudoxus, Plut. plac. phJL 4, 1, cf. Schol. Horn. Od. 4, 477). It accounted for the summer flood by placing the Nile's sources in the southern temperate zone, in which winter would come at the time of our

summer.

Eichberger tries to argue that this theory is Lucan's original
explanation of the Nile's flood, and that the discussion in 194-267 is a
later addition. This seems improbable to me. The emphasis in the lines is not on explanation but on celebration of the Nile's privileged position in
the world; the theory is not of interest in itself, but as an expression of
the Nile's uniqueness, specifically of its geographical uniqueness as a
river so distantly rising.

The passage does present some problems. That Lucan should have used the theory to give expression to the unknowable distance of the Nile's source

invading army, a rhetorical joke, implying that she is equally dangerous, in her own way. Haskins' unnecessary misinterpretation obscures, as we shall see, the sense of the rest of the sentence.

355-356 nee prodita tantum est / aed donata Pharos: Haskins writes 'i.e. Egypt is not only betrayed to Caesar by Cleopatra but given by him to Cleopatra*, an interpretation widely accepted, but surely wrong. Whatever the sentence means, it has clearly an air of epigrammatic wit about it. This is hard to find in Haskins* interpretation, except in the reversal of the understood subject and indirect object of the two verbs, which might rather seem the most awkward thing about it. How, besides, is Pharos 'donata* to Cleopatra so much worse than Pharos 'prodita* to Caesar, as the sense and the structure of the sentence demand it to be? Finally, we understand that Caesar is seen as giving away Egypt to Cleopatra (cf. 10, 81 *dum donare Pharon...mavolt*), but in what way has Cleopatra 'betrayed* Egypt to Caesar, who was in power there already?
Bourgery / Ponchont, following Haskins with slightly different emphasis, translate 'Pharos n'a pas ete seulement livree a Cesarl il en a fait cadeau*. This is slightly epigrammatic and has the right progression; but it is achieved by an emphasis on Caesar which is not there in the original, and the problem of 'prodita* still remains.
These problems are avoided if we take 'prodita...Pharos* to refer to the events of line 57, where the guard of the harbour {'custode Phari*) is bribed to loose the chains across it. 'prodita...Pharos* is introduced naturally, as growing out of the previous phrase {thus 'nee...tantuin'}, 'invasit Cleopatra doinum*. The two uses of 'Pharos* (Pharos and Egypt) are part of the effect of wit {'Pharos* meaning 'Egypt*, just coming in in Lucan*s time, would normally be the secondary meaning); and the progression

promiscuity aa Housman interprets.
Francken complains that we already know who is with Cleopatra, i.e. Ptolemy. This highlights a problem, but not that which Francken recognises. The problem is that Caesar is the intended victim (347f.>, and there is no real question of them killing Ptolemy {425-427}. All this, then, of interrupting the nocturnal nuptials of Ptolemy and Cleopatra is therefore nonsense. For explanation we must look to the structure of the speech, which can be set out as follows: a) 353-357 introductory; bl) 357-370 arguments for action; b2) 370-375 exhortation to act; cl) 375-393 arguments for action; c2) 393-398 exhortation to act. Section b is concerned with Ptolemy and Cleopatra, section c with Caesar.
That this structure is conscious and deliberate is suggested by the indicated change of subject in 376 (*Hesperii for tuna ducis') and the parallel between 374f. in b2 and 396 in c2. In section b, the considerations of killing Ptolemy are not genuine, but serve several purposes in the speech. Firstly the section provides the reason why Cleopatra should be killed, the real concern of Pothinus; secondly it provides urgency {361}. Finally these ideas of killing Ptolemy lead in to the clear idea of killing Caesar, a kind of unstated priaroel; but clear rejection of the idea of killing Ptolemy is passed over in favour of a shift of attention by way of the joke 'cum quocumque viro*.

376 Hesperii: 'Hesperia* {for both noun and adjective see Austin on Virg. Aen. 2, 781} is found already in Latin epic with Ennius, ann. 23V (=20Sk.). Originally a Creek poetic name for Italy, it offers clearly both in origin and in meaning {'the western land') an outsider's view. As such it was used for Italy by Roman poets as an alien and therefore presumably more elevated term {Albion offers similar effects, cf. Spenser F.Q. 2, 10, 6}.

particularly p.51, denies that Dio ia correct in describing Caesar as mounted on the globe; rather, he claims, the globe would be at his feet, i.e. at his side, or under his foot.)

378-382 Three parallel sentences of increasing length, linked by three imperatives, and varied with a noun in apposition, a subordinate clause and a separate sentence ('quern metuis' etc.), each expressing the encouragement that Pompey's murder gives them in their plots against Caesar; each sentence is more specific than the last in the treatment of Pompey's death
- the shore, the bloodstained waves, the tomb of Pompey. The problem here is the repeated 'aspice' in 381. Lucan, we know, was 'almost insensible'
to repetitions (Kousiaan, p.xxxiii); but this is a more severe example than most, separated by only three lines, and in a context where variation seems demanded. No completely satisfactory emendation occurs to me. 'adice* might be tried (it is rare in poetry and not found elsewhere in 1/ucan; but it is frequent in Ovid and found several times in Seneca's tragedies), but is less vivid and striking than 'aspice'. 'respice' is possible, but scarcely a great improvement. Against these speculations the use of aspice in funerary inscriptions (see T.L.L. II, p.830, 62ff.; Prato on
anih. Lai. 437, 3) may protect it here.

380-381 Pompey's lack of proper burial is mentioned early in the poem {1, 685f.; 2, 731ff.) and forms a major theme in these later books, notably 8, 692-872 (on which see Mayer, pp.!67ff.). For the historical accounts see Plut. Pomp. 80; App. ball. civ. 2, 86; Postgate on Lucan 8, pp.lxiff.
After the triumphs of his life, Pompey's death at the hands of the Egyptians, and the indignities that his corpse had suffered, made a strong and lasting impression on Rome, already shown in Cic. div. 2, 22 'an Cn.

- 260 -

'miles'); his reputation as a general, now that he has no forces to lead, becomes irrelevant. The 'nomina* are not 'left behind' like the 'vires 1;
but their irrelevance must be implied by the absence of the forces. If not they lack an explanation of why the conspirators need not fear them. (Bentley's 'nomina vana' would also provide a solution; but the emendation is unnecessary.)

391 miles: Farnaby compares 5, 365 'iuventus / privatum factura'.

391-393 Three contrasts of large scale and small scale: one short night will end the whole civil war; offerings will be given not to one dead man, or to a few, but to nations; and all the world waits for vengeance on one man (for this last point compare 21f. above).
The lines take up again the sacrificial imagery of 385-387, but with a
new idea. There the Roman people were to be placated in their anger over Pompey's death; here the dead of Pharsalia are to be given revenge by the death of Caesar. The metaphorical idea of death as a sacrificial revenge offered to the dead of past defeats is discussed by H. Dahlmann, 'Zu Horaz, c.2, 1, 25-28% RhM 108, 1965, pp.142-146, who notes that. Horace's idea of Thapsus as revenge for the defeated Jugurtha recurs in Lucan (1, 38f.; 4, 788ff.; 6, 310f.) with the idea of Thapsus as revenge for Hannibal and the Carthaginians (we may also note that Lucan's theme of civil war providing revenge for Rome's earlier conquest appears again in Oros. 6, 17, 4). The description of revenge killings as sacrifice can of course be paralleled in epic, cf. Virg. Aen. 10, 451; 12, 949 ('immolat'); Ov. mat. 8, 490 {cf.
483; 510); 11, 381; 12, 367 (inferi&e). In these cases the metaphor reflects the heroic world of which human sacrifice is part; this is less true of the world described in Lucan (but see Weinstcck, pp.398f.), where

on 'in partern...venit' (and on 'Rornani'} could have led to {.he reading of

MU.

42O-421 A new idea, expanded on in 421-424; the change of direction partly excuses the confusing and inelegant repetition 'partern' / 'partes' of 419 and 421.

422ff. Compare 396 and note on 332-333 above.

423 insidias: see above on 332-433.

423-425 Lucan's fondness for intervention in the narrative and weaker-interest in the narrative itself leads to many such speculations on what could have but did not happen. One may compare the Homeric formula X.EV...EI, \j(\ (II. 3, »<73f.; 5, 31 If. etc.) or VKI.' vu x£v...oLAAtt (Gel. 9,
79f.; 11, 317f.; Ap. Rhod. 4, 1305ff.), often used of a threatened death
{e.g. Horn. IL 8, 90f.); see also Hollis on Ov. met. 8, 347-9.

AV.Hl. V (J

423-424 The shock of violence interrupting the celebration and apparent security of a feast is here realised through the contrast with the apparatus of the feast {the goblet and the table). The best known example of this is the slaughter of the suitors in Homer (Odyssey 22, 8ff.): the suitor Antinoos lifts a {closely described) goblet to his lips; he has no thought of death; Odysseus shoots him and the cup falls from his hand, and his feet kick over the table with all its food. The same treatment can be found in Ovid's description of the battle of the lapiths and centaurs: the centaurs' overturning of the 'positis ex ordine rnensis' {met. 12, 211 and
222) signals the start of the fight, fought with furniture of the feast;

rMi -T-

434-546 The Alexandrian war

434f. On dawn and dusk in Latin poetry, see H. Bardon, 'L'Aurore et le Crepuscuie', R.E.L. 24, 1946, pp.82-115 {on Lucan pp.95f.). Epic descriptions of dawn were frequent in Roman poetry, and a somewhat hackneyed theme (Seneca, ep. 122, llff.; Apocol. 2). Lucan in his descriptions makes a clear effort to avoid mere combinations of stock motifs and phrases, and to relate the material to the narrative. 'Periphrases' (Quint, inst. 8, 6, 59ff.) of dawn allow the poet to vary
and control the narrative. As in geographical ekphrases, the reader is entertained by the description, while at the same time the poet makes him try to guess how much of that description is relevant to the action, and in what way; the attention seems to have shifted from the protagonists to a broader view - of movements of stars and planets, of a time of day over a whole countryside, of the lives of mankind in general, or of different groups of men. (To give a simple example, on the dawn of a sea battle, the peaceful dawn is described in delightful detail - sunlight on the waters, cloudless sky, *pacem...tenentibus Austris' - until the last part of the description tells us the significance of all this 'servatum bello iacuit mare', 3, 521ff.) In our case the significance of dawn as bringing the attack on Caesar's life has already been given in lines 432f.; and then when dawn comes, Lucan takes us away from the scene of the action, to describe the dawn itself. What is happening on the ground? What is happening to Caesar? Lucan encourages our speculation and keeps us waiting.

434 Lucifer a Casia—.nipe: Lucifer rising over mountains (Ap. Rh. 1,

- 279 -
Off., 'As used by Richards, the tenor is "the underlying idea", and the vehicle the other idea, the one brought in from outside so to speak, the one to which the tenor is, in logical terms, compared'. In our case 441-444 is the tenor, 445f. the vehicle. Our other terms will deal with
the relationship between the two.
Every simile is made up of likeness and difference. The difference can
be distinguished as of two separate kinds. When the vehicle contains
details which do not correspond to anything in the tenor, there is a difference which we shall call 'independence*. 'Difference' we shall
reserve for the gap between the worlds of tenor and vehicle. When Johnson writes ('Addison', 'Lives of the English Poets' ed. Hill, Oxford 1905, II,
pp. 129-131) 'It is not a simile to say that the Thames waters fields as the
Po waters fields' - there is a lack of difference (the Thames and the Po
are things 'of the same kind'); when he complains that every detail of the simile of the angel in Addison's 'The Campaign' is given in both tenor and vehicle - e.g. 'Marlborough stands "unmoved amidst the shock of hosts"; the angel rides "calm in the whirlwind'" - it is a lack of independence (storms and battles are not things of the same kind; but we have a complete repetition of details in the same relation). We shall look at the place of independence in a simile as part of the way we understand likeness. First we must ask what purpose does difference serve; why do the poets tell us that something from a completely different world is like their subject? It may be so, but why do they need to tell us?
'Mere poetic ornament* may be in itself an important reason. More specifically, the simile allows the poet to introduce a different world
into the narrative: this gives variety in a number of ways; and the actual finding of relationships between different spheres is itself poetically interesting. But we expect the simile to tell us something about the

- 280 -

narrative; even if a simile could be introduced -without, such an intention, the reader would impose one on it unconsciously.

Of possible purposes, the most general would be to make the idea of the tenor more vivid, more alive to us. It could, as the word 'image 1
suggests, offer us something less abstract, more 'of the senses, something that we can see, hear, etc. - a wild lion shut in a tiny cage can be 'seen' more easily than Caesar besieged in his palace. But more importantly the simile isolates in a few lines an incident complete in itself which can
have a more direct intellectual and emotional impact on us. The wild lion, caged, and breaking its teeth in fury on the bars is not otherwise known to us: we have only the few facts that Lucan gives us about the situation; it

affects us almost as a tiny two line poem.

Is vividness in itself sufficient reason for a simile, or do we look
for a further purpose, for some kind of information conveyed by the simile? Possibly the distinction is not a real one, and when we say a simile makes a thing more real or more vivid we expect some kind of clarification of the nature of the tenor; and this information may be given in the same way as the vividness. This is surely so with comparisons of degree. Heitland (p.lxxxix) commented on the general fault of Lucan's similes that they were all 'quantitative* and 'the rhetorical simile fails when applied to exact mensuration*. In part Heitland*s objection stems from simple distaste for hyperbole; in part it is puzzlement as to how, usefully, one can measure something against a thing only metaphorically similar - with what scale do we measure a volcano's anger against Caesar's anger? But 'exact mensuration* is unreasonable; rather, the comparison lets us feel and experience the anger of the lion and the volcano more directly, by sensory evidence, and by giving us something that we can experience completely in itself - in other words degree is very frequently, and certainly here, a

- 281 -

question of 'vividness'.

Is degree the ostensible purpose of these similes? To illustrate the
scale of Caesar's rage is certainly important to them; but it may well not be their primary apparent purpose. 'Fremit' in 445 is not a simple verb of anger although we understand anger from it. {We could of course translate 'quantum fremit fera tantum indignatur Caesar'; but since 'fremit' relies for its meaning on the rest of the situation in the vehicle, it is more likely that the comparison is one of situation and situation, rather than of one aspect as part of the situation.) 'Fureret' in 447 provides the direct comparison of 'rages'; but here the verb comes later and is again bound in with the whole situation of the vehicle. More importantly the lines introducing the similes do not give a simple expression of anger at being shut in - only ' indignaturque timere'« and that balanced with 'timet
incursus'.

The nature of Caesar's feelings or of his situation can doubtless also
be made clear being put in a more simple, concrete or easily grasped form, although it is not clear to us as we read just what new information the similes give us. But beyond the particular aptness of any vehicle, the very use of analogy may in itself have meaning. It may be that the analogy claims to show that the situation of the tenor is natural, what you would expect. By adducing parallels, in which we see that the same is the case, Lucan proves that Caesar's behaviour or feelings are normal. But the need to use analogy signals to us that in some way they are abnormal - that we are in a new situation for Caesar, that this is something out of the ordinary for him.

Finally, the 'difference* between tenor and vehicle may itself be the point of the comparison, as in 458f. If this were the case here it would be a judgement on Caesar. This is probably not the ostensible reason for

- 282 -

the simile, although some such judgement may be there, given indirectly b;, the argument; Lucan says 'We find that such occurs in similar cases' with the implied assumption that Caesar is a similar case. The difference will almost certainly play some part in the poetic simile, most commonly as a contrast, emphasising the unexpectedness of the tenor subject: we expect, countless bright lights in the sky, but not in the plain at Troy; we expect frenzy from a semi-mythical 'Edonis* in 'vertice Pindi', but not from a 'matrona' in the city {'urbem') of Rome {1, 674ff.}.

One might distinguish three different approaches to the 'likeness' part
of a simile. Firstly there is the 'Vergleichungspunkt', single point of comparison between vehicle and tenor; in any extended simile it is unlikely that the 'Vergleichungspunkt' will be the only correspondence. Secondly one can look for a series of correspondences between the two, where individual details are translated between vehicle and tenor (see D. West, 'Multiple Correspondence Similes in the Aeneid*, JRS, 59, 1969, pp.40-49); these correspondences may be in both vehicle and tenor, 'bilateral', or only on one side, 'unilateral' (West p.40). Thirdly one can look for a general resemblance of the complete pictures of vehicle and tenor. The 'Vergleichungspunkt' may simply provide a link or it may have formal importance for the logic of the simile. But the area between multiple correspondence and complete picture is doubtful.
A useful example of this is 'C my love's like a red, red rose'. The 'Vergleichungspunkt' is given in line 5 'As fair art them, my bonny lass'; in this case the 'Vergleichungspunkt' - fairness - is also the purpose of the simile (though this is not always so). It is in the overlap between the multiple correspondences and the complete picture that definition is difficult. The first line presents no problem: we do not take the red,

- 283 -

redness of the rose as a unilateral correspondence to describe the girl, no more than we would take 'nobilis' apart from its context as a description of Caesar; a certain rosy cheeked charm may be in the back of Burns's mind, if so it is an 'irrational' correspondence ('a correspondence which does
not fit the main comparison', West p.40) - the 'red, red1 that would be beautiful in a rose is not the colour that would be beautiful in a girl's face. The second line presents more complex problems. 'That's sweetly sprung in June* subordinated to the complete picture means 'my love is like a rose (of perfect colour) at a time when its flower is most perfect' (the paraphrase is more lifeless than the sentiment). But our natural instinct is to take this as a unilateral correspondence - telling us that his love is, say, between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one or whatever. Comparison (demanded by the parallel structure) with the image of lines 3 and 4, however, reinforces the 'complete picture1 interpretation, since 'That's sweetly played in tune' hardly has any relevance in itself to the girl - at best a very irrational correspondence of the sweet playing and her presumably sweet voice. Perhaps Burns is here playing with the two different ways of reading a simile, and line 2 does indeed mean 'in the prime of her youth' as well as being subordinated to the complete picture

of the simile.

The distinction between the complete picture and the multiple correspondence approach is not absolute. Since we decide how small a unit makes up a detail ('red* or 'red, red' or 'red, red rose / That's sweetly sprung in June'), each detail will be to some extent related to its context in the vehicle before being translated into the tenor; and frequently the final interpretation of each detail may not be very different. Still it is worth recognising them as opposite trends. The complete picture interpretation makes sense of that detail which seems irrelevant to those

- 284 -

hunting for multiple correspondences (e.g. f et frangit rabidos praemorso carcere dentes'; but examples in Homer are more striking). This independence, where the vehicle seems to have life of its own, rather than only details translatable to the tenor, plays an important part in making us experience and respond to the simile. Even where every detail corresponds (unilaterally or bilaterally) to a detail in the tenor, those details in the vehicle must cohere in a complete picture or the simile is senseless. The complete picture approach, however, is liable to miss particular correspondences of detail, and certain to pick up neither verbal nor irrational correspondences, all of which were used by ancient poets (see West passim).
In our case the search for individual correspondences gives here only
* minima... par te domus' to equal 'parvia...claustris'. More generally we know that the lion is Caesar, the lion's anger Caesar's. Beyond that it is hard to state relationships of detail. We might be tempted to say that 'nobilis' applied to Caesar. But Lucan would clearly not think of Caesar as simply 'noble'; and we cannot tell how the adjective translates from vehicle to tenor without looking at the complete picture of the vehicle. Thus in 445 the nature of the lion is brought out in contrast to its present situation - it is a 'fera nobilis' but in 'parvis...c!austris': it
is too great for this narrow space, too wild to be caged in. The enclosing word order reinforces the point by shutting within the cage the animal that should be free - a similar, although less striking, effect to that in 22-23 above. 'Nobilis' in various ways contrasts the creature's natural greatness and nobility with its present constriction and subjection; further, the comparable passage in 6, 487f. shows Lucan thinking of the lion's nobility as something that puts it above taming - its own master, a thing we do not expect to bow to others - 'has avidae tigres et nobilis ira

leorium / ore fovent blando'.

In 446 the simile moves away most clearly from corresponding details,
and develops independently. We neither imagine that Caeaar is biting the window-frames to the palace, nor try to directly translate the action into some human equivalent. Rather the simile seems to have fulfilled with 'freinit' and line 445 the analogy, and 446 adds a comment on the lion; the sense of going beyond what was required makes the addition more forceful. But of course it is this detail that makes the simile so striking. Its
anger or desperation is so great that it mutilates itself in hopeless attempts to escape; its teeth, that were its strength when it was free, are now useless, breaking on an obstacle they have never encountered before. The beast's fury is unstoppable, but cannot get it past the cage, can only

destroy itself.

It is easy to understand how the complete picture reading applies to the tenor. We feel, in the lion shut (literally) within the cage - in the contrast of its wildness and greatness with its constriction and subjection
- the contrast of Caesar's nature and his present position - a man like an unstoppable natural force (1, 155f. 'nullaque exire vetante / materia'), whose nature is to be controlling the battlefield, now forced within a house. When we feel the simile move on from an apparently simple analogy to the non corresponding detail 'et frangit rabidos praemorso careers dentes', we feel the shock of the lion's anger being more than we expected to hear, and expressed more forcefully; and this power of feeling we transfer to Caesar. Its self mutilation lets us feel Caesar's anger and desperation. The uselessness of its anger and the failure of its former strength correspond clearly to Caesar's baffled fury, the unbeatable general no longer able to fight as a general. But even now to attempt to translate from a complete picture reading (unlike from a multiple

- 302 -

of warships in the siege of coastal towns (Liv. 24, 34, 6f.; Polyb. 8, 62; Curt. 4, 3, 14f.; Diod. Sic. 17, 43, 4), as a platform from which to
discharge missiles.

The strongest argument against this is that it does not agree with the historical accounts of the events in the harbour. According to Caesar
(bell. civ. 3, 111), the fight over the ships was not an attempt to storm
the palace by the besiegers, but a contest to gain control of the ships themselves. Since there were too many ships for Caesar to guard he ordered them to be burnt. We have no other account than Lucan of these attacks on the palace by sea. Lucan's account undoubtedly does differ from that of Caesar ('ratibus temptatur regia* in 482); but it is very hard to believe that this detail of ships lashed together for war appeared (in flat disagreement with Caesar's account) in Livy, and was then taken up only by Lucan. But if Lucan added this detail himself (from his knowledge of other such engagements), it is strange that he should have given it so little space or explanation. Strange too, that he should have allowed the Egyptians such a complicated siege device so shortly after commenting on the 'caeca iuventus / consilii* for whom there is *non ulla...machina

belli'.

Nor does 'vela* seem to ine so unreasonable (certainly a more natural target than the ropes), 'vela* and 'carina' are often found making up a line ending such as this (Ov. met. 3, 639; Ib. 495; Manil. 1, 298; Luc. 8, 48; 9, 45; Stat. sn']v. 5, 3, 238; Val. Fl. 5, 150; Sil. 2, 25); they have a certain attraction to each other as opposites (cf. Luc. 5, 642) with the same metonymical meaning of 'ship*. In this they reflect an opposition of rigging and hull, high and low, in the rest of the passage, with 'stuppea vincula' and 'tabulas', 'transtra' and 'ceruchi' (what these are doing if there are no sails is not explained); this opposition possibly recalls Ov.

114 -

534ff. The action described here is Caesar's attempt to gain control of the Heptastadium, the mole linking Pharos to the mainland, and dividing the Eunostoa harbour from the Great harbour (see Rice Holmes III, pp.194-196; bell. Alex. 19-21). The importance of the Heptastadium to Caesar came from its two arches, one towards the northern end and one towards the southern, which gave access between the two harbours, allowing enemy ships through into the Great harbour, which was otherwise under Caesar's control. Having gained the northern arch, he attacked and gained the southern arch from the Great harbour, and proceeded to block it to ships (be/7. Alex. 19, 3-5).
As he did so the Alexandrian forces were attacking him from the southern end of the mole, and from ships in the Eunostos harbour (bell. Alex. 19,
6). Meanwhile the remainder of Caesar's forces, which he had left on board, disembarked onto the mole of their own accord, eager to watch and take part in the fight (bell. Alex. 20, 1-2); but when the enemy ships put their men onto a more northern part of the mole, behind the Caesarian forces, the soldiers who had joined the fight now broke and ran back to the ships (20, 3-4). Caesar's original forces, seeing the boats departing,
also began to desert their post, lest they be left with no escape (20,
4-5), and the masses climbing on board each ship so overloaded them that

they sank (20, 8),

The military details are of little importance to Lucan; rather he is interested in the consequence that Caesar himself was forced to swim for safety, from the sinking ships by the mole to those farther out (bell.
Alex. 21, 1-2). This swim provided a favourite anecdote for historians
and biographers (doubtless for the reasons given by Lucan in 532f.), with a varied tradition of legendary details: that he was carrying important papers which he kept dry all through his swim; that his cloak, which he

O1 «J i
is much more effective - Caesar looks over the mass of his men , and then \stepping across the line break) Scaeva stands out amongst them, a man with the courage to fight an army single handed.
Given the known ending to this episode, it may be difficult to see what
part Scaeva could play. But. even the historical accounts show the ease with which a little ingenuity could find heroism in a rout; and doubtless Lucan could have allowed Scaeva to fight a single-handed battle protecting the backs of his flying compatriots, before Horatius-like escaping himself (Cic. AtL 14, 10, 2 shows him alive, and prospering, after the civil war).

544 Scaevam: the hero of an episode in Book 6 (140-262), where Poinpey's forces, trying to break out of Caesar's entrenchments around them at Petra near Dyrrachium, are held back by Scaeva, who sustains with no apparent effect incredible injuries. Some - e.g. Haskins on 10, 543, and instances noted by W. Rutz in Lustrum 26, 1984, p.183 - assume that Scaeva's death is implied by 6, 246-262; but 6, 260ff. are senseless if we do not suppose him to have survived.
Scaeva is a real historical character, M. Cassius Scaeva (see R.E. III,
p. 1744, no.87), and his courage was often cited as an example of the courage of Caesar's soldiers (Val. Max. 3, 2, 23; Suet. lul. 68, 4; Plut.
Caes. 16, 2; Flor. 2, 13, 40). There is no record of his presence at Alexandria.

famae: recalls the Scaeva episode, 6, 257 'felix hoc nomine famae'.

545-546 A problematic imitation is claimed for these lines by K. P. C.
Rose, 'The Date and Author of the Satyricon*, Leiden 1971, p.65 and P. C. Walsh, 'The Roman Novel', Cambridge 1970, p.246, who see the final lines of

- 320 -

place can have: such apostrophes are provided by itineraries (Virg. Aen. 3, 705; Ov. fast. 4, 502; Stat. Theb. 2, 382) or other such lists (Sil. 8,
490; 517).
One possible explanation for such apostrophes is that by ad/ressing the

j\

places, existing now as they did then, the survival of the great events
that the poet is describing is emphasised, by their connection with the place (this would be similar to the - otherwise reversed - idea of places
as witnesses of past events, for which see Nisbet / Hubbard on Hor. carm. 2, 1, 30). Certainly it would be easy to see a claim that Phaselis is still
to be associated with Poinpey's travels, particularly with the comparison of the man and the town that received him, 8, 251f. fte primuni parva Phaseli / Magnus adit*. If something similar is going on here, then the apostrophe
is also supporting the claims of Scaeva's *perpetuae...famae' in line 544.

- 322 -

information on the Nile expedition of Nero also in the nat. quaest. (6, 8f 3f.) is not used by Lucan (this is puzzling; but the problem remains whether or not Lucan was using Seneca; and the same problem recurs with nat. quaest. 4a, which also fails to mention the Nile expedition).
Pichon's explanation of the similarities is that Lucan is using Seneca's early work, the de situ et aacris Aegypiiorum (as had earlier been suggested by Grotius). This work is known to us only from some details on Philae and Abaton in Servius on Aen. 6, 154: its date is unknown to us, although some have supposed that it was written shortly after his return from Egypt in 31 A.D.; certainly it is reasonable to assume that in nat. quaest. 4a, Seneca reused to some extent the material of his earlier work. Pichon's attack on Diels, as indicated above, is based on unsatisfactory arguments; but these were used to support the not unattractive thesis that the de sit. et sacr. Aeg. was one of Lucan's sources for his information on Egypt. By contrast A. Eichberger, 'Untersuchungen zu Lucan, der Nilabschnitt im zehnten Buch des belluro civile', diss. Tubingen 1935, gives a more sophisticated criticism of Diels in support of a less credible
thesis. His belief was that Lucan originally composed the Nile excursus in praise of Nero, then planning his Nile expedition; this must have been before Seneca had written the nat. quaest.t for by that time Lucan had already broken with Nero. This supposed panegyric purpose has, unsurprisingly, been generally rejected (the arguments concerned will be discussed in section 2); but his attempts to disprove the close connection between nat. quaest. 4a and Lucan's Nile excursus need examination. Unlike Pichon, he compares in detail the two works in the light of other ancient Nile literature that has come down to us, finding for the most part non-Senecan elements throughout all the speech, except in the last section on the Nile's course through Egypt; the similarities there he explains,

•JOQ

like Pichon, by supposing that Lucan's source for that part was the de sit. et sacr. Aeg. Much of his argument against Diels is unsound; but there is enough of importance to make a re-examination of the question necessary. To look first at lines 194-218, we have a clear indication that nat.
quaest. 4a cannot be Lucan's only source. While no conclusion can be drawn from lines 194-200, the methods of dating in 210-218 use data not given in Seneca, that the sun is in Leo at the Nile's rising. This does not rule
out use of Seneca (Diels and others claim to see nat. quaest. 4a, 1, 2
behind the passage); it does, however, suggest that he cannot have been Lucan's only source. This in fact is implied by my interpretation of the origin of the confusion of dates in the passage (see note ad Joe.). It is possible to find different dates combined in one reference (Sen. nat. quaest. 4a, 1, 2; Ptol. tetrab. 2, 10); but this is rare, and the use of a whole variety of means of dating the flood must suggest that Lucan is using more than a single source here.
Diels 1 arguments for the nat. quaest. as the source in 219-227 are as follows. 1) The theory of Anaxagoras is placed first, whereas in most accounts that of Thales precedes it (Diels, p.8 = Kl. p.384; a flawed argument, since Mela who likewise puts Anaxagoras first has even closer similarities than Seneca in his ordering of the theories, see below). 2)
The first two arguments of the heat in Ethiopia also occur in Seneca (derived from Herodotus 2, 22, 2); in both Lucan and Seneca they are in the reverse order to that in Herodotus (Diels, p.10 = Kl. p.386). This is stronger, but again it is flawed in the very point in which Diels puts his trust. Seneca's evidences of Ethiopian heat are numerous: the burnt skin of the natives; the troglodytes; burning rocks; the ground too hot to tread; silver unsoldered; joints of statues melted; that the Auster. which blows from that region, is the hottest of winds; that animals do not

- 325 -
occur*. If Seneca ia not Lucan's source here, then Lucan must be working from a source close to that of Seneca. Diels tries to prove that Seneca is the source by verbal similarities; but these are not convincing {'prima aeslate intumesunt' / 'ingresso vere tumescit'; 'tune enim maxime integrae adhuc nives ex molliaaimoque tabes est' / 'priina tabe nivis', Diela, p. 10 = Kl. p.386). On the other hand nor are discrepancies of detail between Seneca and Lucan as damaging as Eichberger supposes, p.36; they are consistent with a simplification of the argument by Lucan, better stressing the difference of date.

The same is partly true of the dating of the Nile flood in 225-227.
This Diels derives from Sen. nat. quaest. 1, 2. The discrepancy that Housman complains of is readily explained, nor is it out of step with the theory as Lucan is putting it forward (see note ad Joe.}. But there is another discrepancy that works against the theory that Lucan is expressing: the Nile does not bind its stream to its banks until the equinox, in Libra. This is wrong: according to Bonneau, p.112, the Nile flood only begins to fall at the equinox; the passage in Seneca which we suppose to be influencing Lucan even writes that the Nile increases beyond the equinox. If this is not simply careless expression from Lucan, there may be another influence here. Plin. nat. 5, 57 writes 'in totu in... re vocatu r intra ripas
in Libra1, a passage which shares with Lucan: the too early dating of the end of the Nile flood; the mention of returning within the banks; the mention of the sun in Libra. This is not conclusive: Lucan might mean 'begins to confine its stream to its banks'; the reference to Libra could be his own (he often accompanies mention of the autumn equinox with reference to Libra). If there is a link between Lucan and Pliny, it

1 A similar argument is given in Claudian, carm. min. 28, 24-29; but this is probably taken from Lucan, see note on revocata in 250.

- 337 -
similar feature in nat. quaest. 4a, 2, 7, where we know that Seneca is abbreviating his earlier work. In that, such a pairing is ruled out by the amount of detail that Seneca there gives on Abates. This does not mean that Lucan could not also be using the de sit. et sacr. Aeg. Some better source for the border at Philae than 'egressus Aethiopiam' (if that is the correct text) in Sen. nat. quaest. 4a, 2, 3, seems needed; and Mela and Pliny, but not Seneca, tell of the Nile's quieter passage mentioned by Lucan in 329.
Our final judgement on Lucan's use of his sources must leave some uncertainties. That Lucan was using nat. quaest. 4a seems unquestionable; but of what importance it was to him is less obvious. Certainly it was his main source: he uses it throughout his discussion of the causes of the flood; he abandons a different source to return to it as soon as he can at 308ff. But it was not his only source: throughout his discussion of the rising there are other influences; the whole of 268-306 is independent, or almost independent, of it. What was the further source? An interesting speculation is the possibility that this could have been the de sit. et
sacr. Aeg. On certain points it is well qualified: verbal parallels demand
a Latin writer; if Lucan was not using Herodotus, the Herodotean arguments used against Anaxagoras could derive from Seneca's earlier work; nat. quaest. 4a in its description of the Nile's course through Egypt is related to Diodorus, as is Lucan's account of the Nile's earlier stages. As Pichon saw, Lucan was clearly wrell informed on Egypt and the de sit et sacr. Aeg. would certainly be a likely source for such information 1. Further many

1 There are of course other possibilities, such as Chaeremon, Nero's tutor, who wrote on his native Egypt.

oon
5

successfully discovering the Nile's sources. This is clearly unreasonable. The great rulers into whose company Nero is put are hostilely portrayed, as hubristic tyrants (even in the case of Sesostris who is normally portrayed sympathetically or neutrally, the most unappealing aspect of his story is chosen). If Nero's Nile expedition is to be recalled in these lines then
it seems natural to see (as many since have) a hostile comparison of Nero to the world's tyrants.
It would be difficult not see an element of such criticism of Nero here;
the connection must have been unavoidable to the contemporary reader. But this element cannot be seen as the key to the inclusion of the Nile
section, since only 269-282 directly contribute to this.
The problem of the digression here is one common to Lucan's other numerous digressions; and it may be that it is wrong to seek a simple explanation to bring the Nile discourse into unity with the themes of the epic. Indeed variety rather than unity is presumably what Lucan is seeking, even to the extent of a change of genre, didactic rather than epic narrative (on didactic in epic see note on 173-174 above). A point brought out more than once in Caesar's speech to Acoreus is that with this lecture we are leaving the world of civil war for one quite different.
The picture that the Nile section presents is one of providence and
order, and of a divine greatness contrasted with the smallness of human understanding. Thus (as Syndikus remarks, pp.GSf.) the survey of theories in lines 21 Off. serves a different purpose to that in Seneca. At first examined and refuted, then characterised as false, finally simply catalogued, they are not here for Lucan to eliminate the false and thus arrive at the truth. Rather their variety illustrates the greatness of the Nile before the struggles of mortals to comprehend (while, irrationally, their erroneous opinions add their own mystery to the river). The

o.in «JTVJ —

expeditions of the tyrants illustrate the same vain human endeavour. Clearly such a section can serve an immediate narrative function and at the same time can more indirectly serve the theme of the epic by showing a world or regularity and providence which is not that of the civil war. Within its immediate context it provides contrast and variety with the scenes on either side of it: the higher plane gives a moral contrast with the feast scene1, and our removal from worldly matters makes the abrupt entry of the conspiracy of Pothinus in 332ff. a greater dramatic surprise.

1 Eichberger, pp.67f., sees the purpose of the Nile excursus as being to set the scene for the Egyptian narrative, by taking up the most important and alien feature of the land. Such an interpretation seems reasonable, although it comes rather late in the account of events in Egypt; but we should note that if this is part of Lucan's intent, the implications of his scene setting are deliberately misleading.