

**Monica MATTHEWS (ed.), *Caesar and the Storm: A Commentary on Lucan, De Bello Civili, Book 5 lines 476–721***, Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 2008, 321 pp., ISBN 978-3-03910736-0, € 60.00.

Many studies on Lucan, including a few commentaries, have been published in the recent years. Among them is MATTHEWS' [= M.] commentary on book V, lines 476–721 (Caesar's night expedition to Rome during a storm and Antony's arrival to Nymphaion). This is only 245 lines and M. devotes to them 247 pages of comments – these numbers themselves prove how detailed the study is. Up until now, in the case of book V, we have used mainly notes by HASKINS 1887 and VIANSINO 1995 (both cover the entire poem, so naturally they are not extensive), HOUSMAN's text *editorum in usum*, as well as a separate commentary by BARRATT 1979. BARRATT, however, focuses primarily on language, style and metrics, and provides some comparative material while almost entirely ignoring the interpretative questions<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, M. fills, at least partly, the gap in Lucan studies. Not only does she develop some elements present in the work of her predecessor<sup>2</sup> but also dedicates a lot of space to completely different aspects, such as those concerning the sources, the intertextual problems, or the narrative technique, and gives an accurate interpretation of the analysed passages.

The work by M. contains an introduction (pp. 13–25), the text with a facing translation (pp. 27–41), and a commentary (pp. 43–290). The book closes with an extensive bibliography (pp. 291–303), two small maps of the Adriatic coast where the events described in book V take place (p. 305), as well as two appendixes in the form of extensive tables with short introductions: the first one (pp. 307–314) juxtaposes the historical sources with Lucan's version of events, and the second one (pp. 315–318) presents the ways in which Lucan employs the traditional *topoi* in the image of the storm (comparison to the relevant passages in Homer, Virgil and Ovid; highlighting of the new elements in Lucan's account). The commentary ends with a short all-in-one index (pp. 319–321).

M. starts with a brief introduction. Initially it is of a general nature: it discusses the division of the commented passage, Lucan's sources and his attitude towards them, as well as places particular emphasis on the poet's invention, the changes introduced and their significance for the narrative. Towards the end the author justifies in a few sentences the need for a new commentary (the limitations of BARRATT's work; new studies on Lucan that also contribute a lot to the discussion of this episode<sup>3</sup>). What is unfortunately missing is an attempt to put the entire episode into a wider context of book V and, at the same time, within the structure of the whole poem. At least an outline or an enumeration of the events the book describes is needed here. The content of ll. 403–475 ff. is indicated only at the beginning of the commentary (p. 43, ad 476–9).

The next part of the introduction is devoted to a number of detailed issues. Mainly by listing points, M. gathers the most important observations and conclusions which are thoroughly discussed

<sup>1</sup> This scope of her commentary is already defined in the first sentence of the *Preface*: "...I have attempted to examine certain aspects of the 'Sprachgebrauch' [...] as well as some stylistic and, to a small extent, metrical features..." (P. BARRATT, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis liber V: A Commentary*, Amsterdam 1979).

<sup>2</sup> M. notes that she usually omits comments on grammar and style, as they are present in BARRATT's work (p. 15, n. 2). However, many valuable and usually detailed comments devoted to Lucan's style and poetics are scattered throughout the entire commentary (often with quotes and various enumerations regarding the number of occurrences of specific words).

<sup>3</sup> The literary tradition of Lucan's storm was discussed by M.P.O. MORFORD (*The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic*, Oxford 1967, <sup>2</sup>1996, pp. 20–36, 37–44) and, of course, his book forms basis for M.'s commentary ad 504 ff.

in the commentary. These observations determine the quality of M.'s work and undeniably they are a valuable contribution to scholarship on the *Civil War* (however, it should be emphasised that there are numerous interpretive remarks in the commentary, and not all of them have been included in this short introduction). First of all, M. indicates the influence of love poetry on the two passages surrounding Caesar's night adventure (476–503; 678–702). Commenting on ll. 476 ff., M. underscores not only the use of phraseology but also shows how the situations in these lines are modelled on scenes from Roman love elegy. Describing Caesar's speech as a kind of *paraklausithyron* does not seem fortunate (p. 16), but particularly interesting are the remarks regarding association between Lucan's Caesar complaining on the seaside and abandoned lovers in Ovid's *Heroides* (esp. 18 and 19), as well as Ariadne in Catullus 64 (on Caesar ~ Ariadne, see p. 64, a brief summary of the similarities). Considering M.'s analysis, in this speech we can talk about *amor Caesaris*. Without setting the commented passage deeper within the context of book V, M. does not juxtapose *amor Caesaris* with the completely disparate *amor Pompei*, the motif which is developed in the scene depicting the parting between Pompey and Cornelia (V 722 ff.). The presence of the language of love elegy is seen again in ll. 678 ff. M., following FANTHAM<sup>4</sup>, also compares these complaints expressed by Caesar's soldiers with the speech of Craterus to Alexander in Curtius Rufus' *History of Alexander* IX 6 (see ad loc., where there is even an extensive table). M., identifying the erotic language in the leader's speech, at times does not thoroughly appreciate its political dimension (although it is closely connected with the erotic one). This is visible, for example, in her notes ad 495–497 (“non ex aequo divisimus orbem;/ Epirum Caesarque tenet totusque senatus;/ Ausoniam tu solus habes”). M. only signals the presence of the military language. Interestingly, Pompey is omitted in the phrase: “Caesarque tenet totusque senatus”. She writes (ad 496): “Caesar avoids mentioning the name of his enemy Pompey, referring to him and his supporters instead by the phrase *totusque senatus*. The ostensible meaning of *tenet* here is that of having (military) command over some territory...”. This remark does not exhaust the interpretational possibilities of Caesar's *vox doloris* and does not fully explain the reasons for the omission of Pompey (referred to in the phrase “*alieni iuris harenas*”, above, l. 489). What is significant here is the opposition to *solus* in the next line and the context of earlier events described in book V, passed over by M. In addition, two passages from the earlier books may serve as a point of departure for the discussion: II 519 ff. referring to Domitius where the republican camp is equated with Pompey and the Senate (“*poenarum extremum civi, quod castra secutus/ sit patriae Magnumque ducem totumque senatum;/ ignosci*”), as well as IV 791 f. (“*Romanam, superi, Libyca tellure ruinam/ Pompeio prodesse nefas votisque senatus*”). In his speech Caesar seems to be presenting himself (ironically) as the leader of the fatherland's army and someone who shares power with the Senate, also in the political sense. Thus Antony is transformed into an enemy of the state. Just before Caesar's speech, Lucan even hints that Antony's delay amounts to treachery, because he thinks about ultimate power for himself (“*iam tum civili meditatus Leucada bello*”, 479; see M. ad loc.). Book V opens with the “gathering of the senate” in Epirus (end of 49 BC). The war camp becomes a Curia which hands over the power to Pompey. However, in the same book Lucan depicts Caesar in Rome (49 BC), proclaimed the dictator and elected to the consulship for the following year (after receiving the consulship Caesar renounces the dictator's power). Surprisingly, M. does not mention these two passages. At that moment, Caesar is therefore a consul and he “legally” shares power with the Senate<sup>5</sup> as part of the existing system. Antony in turn, who stays in Italy with the army, *de facto*

<sup>4</sup> E. FANTHAM, *Caesar and the Mutiny: Lucan's Reshaping of the Historical Tradition in De Bello Civili* 5. 237–373, CPH LXXX 1985, pp. 127 ff., esp. 130 f.

<sup>5</sup> But cf. Lentulus' words justifying the meeting of the Senate in Epirus (V 30–34): “*maerentia tecta/ Caesar habet vacuasque domos legesque silentis/ clausaque iustitio tristi fora; curia solos/ illa videt patres plena quos urbe fugavit;/ ordine de tanto quisquis non exulat hic est*” (on the meaning of these lines, see BARRATT, *o.c.*, [n. 1], ad loc.; M. quotes V 30 ff. ad 529–31); on the whole passage:

has control over it (Caesar even refers to the army under Antony's command as *tua arma* – l. 486, even though the army is his; cf. *Caesaris arma*, l. 493). This is primarily the opposition between *solus* and “Caesarque totusque senatus”. M. rightly notices Caesar's jealousy in these lines. At this point the political and military meaning is perfectly combined with the erotic one. When we read this speech along with ll. 666–668 (“...me, quamvis plenus honorum/ et dictator eam Stygias et consul ad umbras/ privatum, Fortuna, mori”), we can make a connection especially between *solus* and *privatus*. As M. points out, *privatus* should be understood as ‘without attaining kingship’ (ad 668, following BENTLEY, DUFF, HOUSMAN, and GROTIUS)<sup>6</sup> – power which is not limited by law (this is the power held by Antony). These two speeches provide a framework for the episode and express similar desires of Caesar. This particular frame is overlooked in the commentary, even though it appears crucial for *amor Caesaris*. The passages which surround the storm emphasise Caesar's desire for unlimited power, while the storm itself, due to its symbolic dimension (thanks to imaging that draws on the Stoic view of *ekpyrosis* introduced at the beginning of the poem), presents the civil war as a cosmic catastrophe and in this way depicts the consequences of the leader's desires.

In the next part of the introduction, M. points out the intertextual relationship between Lucan and Virgil<sup>7</sup> (pp. 18–22). The discussion of the main references is preceded by a few introductory sentences. Eight lines of text for such an important problem seem insufficient. There is a mention of the importance of Virgil's model – the storm in *Aeneid* I 34–156, which provides the background for Lucan's episode and is crucial for its understanding. However, for details the readers are referred to Appendix I (which is probably a mistake; “Appendix I” instead of “II”, p. 18). M. focuses on several other reminiscences. First of all, she analyses the character of Caesar as anti-Aeneas (I). It is described in three points: (a) Caesar's unsuccessful journey – Aeneas' successful journey with minor references to *Aeneid* IV; (b) Caesar in Amyclas' house – Aeneas in Euander's house; (c) Caesar's speeches during the storm – speeches of Aeneas from *Aen.* I and V (578–593 ~ *Aen.* V 26–31; 654–671 ~ *Aen.* I 94–101). Then she highlights the influence of the episode about Nisus and Euryalus on the commented passage (II) and finally discusses the echoes from the *Georgics* (III): signs foretelling the storm, 540–559 ~ *Georg.* I 351–392 and 424–464. In her interpretation of the entire episode M. focuses on the motifs which participate in building the image of Caesar as anti-Aeneas and a new type of hero. On several occasions she stresses that the primary model for Lucan was the storm from *Aeneid* I. She meticulously notes all references and similarities, and emphasises the differences (the comments are additionally supplemented with a table that constitutes Appendix II). At the same time, M. appears to be forgetting about this. Lucan's intertextuality and the relationship between his text and the *Aeneid* requires a more lengthy discussion, as it is indeed much more complex than Virgil's dependence on Homer, more than it has been suggested in the short introduction. The polemical references to particular phrases and lines, and the play on major and minor motifs or entire passages (also in this case) should be seen in a wider context. It is therefore necessary to refer to the issue of Lucan's poem as an anti-*Aeneid*. This is obviously a matter well-known to Lucan scholars, yet it also constitutes a foundation of the commented episode. M.'s remarks, devoid of this wider context, sometimes appear to be “up in the air”. Since

---

E. FANTHAM, *Lucan and the Republican Senate: Ideology, Historical Record and Prosopography*, in: P. ESPOSITO, L. NICASTRI (eds.), *Interpretare Lucano. Miscellanea di studi*, Napoli 1999, pp. 118–120.

<sup>6</sup> In the narrator's text, *privatus* referred to Caesar occurs at 539 (“indocilis privata loqui”) as the opposition to *dux / imperator*; see M. ad loc. and esp. M. HELZLE, *Indocilis privata loqui: The Characterization of Lucan's Caesar*, SO LXIX 1994, pp. 122 f. and n. 6.

<sup>7</sup> She largely relies here (and, of course, wider in her commentary) on a paper by L. THOMPSON, R.T. BRUÈRE, *Lucan's Use of Vergilian Reminiscence*, CPh LXII 1968, pp. 10–16. See also E. NARDUCCI, *Lucano: un'epica contro l'impero*, Roma–Bari 2002, pp. 247–258 (Caesar and Amyclas ~ Aeneas and Evander, Aeneas and Palinurus, Nisus and Euryalus; also Philemon and Baucis from *Met.* VIII 618 ff. – on this model, M. ad 515–59, 516, 517 and ff.).

the storm is a metaphor for the civil war (on this topic, see e.g. M. ad 561–64, 596, 615–17), more attention must be paid (in the Introduction and in the commentary itself) to the problem of how Lucan subverts political and teleological meaning of the *Aeneid* encompassed in Virgil's passage. In both texts, the first similes in the poems are of great significance: political order vs. disorder, a cosmic disaster (*Aen.* I 148–153 vs. Lucan. V 630–637 ~ I 72–80; the echoes and similarities between the phrases and images from the storm and the first simile are noted throughout the commentary, see e.g. ad 596, 633, 634 *chaos*). In this context, more (than M. does) can also be said about the comparison to the great Flood (620–626). It is another intertextual reference but this time to the *Metamorphoses* – to Lycaon's crime and his punishment which affects the entire human race (I 163–347). Ovid's first simile in the epic (again a political one) appears in this very episode (200–205). A closer look at the relations that exist between Lucan and his predecessors is needed.

The following part of the introduction sums up the remarks from the commentary regarding the character of Amyclas (his speech, in turn, is modelled on Palinurus' speech, 568–576 ~ *Aen.* V 13–25) and his role in the episode (see below). The last part discusses the storm by listing ways in which Lucan adopts, transforms and supplements earlier descriptions with new elements. There is no mention of these passages, so we can only guess that the reference points mainly are the storms from the *Odyssey* (V 291 ff.), the *Aeneid* (I 34 ff.), and the *Metamorphoses* (XI 474 ff.)<sup>8</sup>. Unfortunately, we are not told what precisely are Lucan's models, because in point (f) which concerns innovations the gigantomachic imaging, general ideas taken from Ovid, and the tenth wave are listed. Thus, it seems that originally these enumerations referred only to the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*. As a matter of fact, the gigantomachic motif is clearly present in the *Metamorphoses* (XI 554 f.), which M. notes in the commentary herself (ad 615–167); similarly, the tenth wave (*Met.* 529–532; *Tr.* I 2, 49 f.; M. ad 672 *decimus ... fluctus*).

The Introduction would benefit from some additions. It is a shame that on the basis of the abundant material gathered, M. did not attempt to provide a more extensive interpretation which would go well beyond the commented lines and foreground the purpose the entire passage has within book V and within the structure and meaning of the entire poem<sup>9</sup>. The general discussions on individual parts of the episode, though usually extensive, do not fulfil this role well, because they do not constitute a coherent text.

The prose translation is clear and accurate, and numbered like the original text, i.e. every five lines. The text M. uses is basically that of HOUSMAN. It differs only in four places which are listed in the table preceding this part of the study (in the table M. compares her text to other editions: HOUSMAN, SHACKLETON BAILEY, BADALI). These disputable passages are widely discussed in the commentary and accompanied by a justification of the choices.

As mentioned before, the commentary is comprehensive and meticulous. The commented text, which is less than 250 lines, was divided into smaller passages preceded by separate discussions: from several sentences in length to extensive, multi-part sections with tables, points or block quotes (the observations included here have become the basis for the Introduction). Also smaller units, such as sentences or phrases (quoted *in extenso*), are supplied with general remarks followed by detailed notes. A certain dose of diffidence and indecisiveness regarding an intended reader (or

---

<sup>8</sup> In the introduction to the table of Appendix II: Hom. *Od.* XII 403 ff.; Virg. *Aen.* III 129 ff., V 8 ff. (p. 315); in the commentary ad 560–67 also Sen. *Ag.* 465 ff.

<sup>9</sup> See e.g. FANTHAM, *Caesar...* (n. 4), p. 121 f., for a brief overview of the book and themes that dominate it. FANTHAM esp. stresses the relationship between the mutiny of soldiers (237–373), a quiet sea (424–455) and the storm. Cf. M.'s remarks ad 571 *murmura*; referring to FANTHAM (who lists also the verbal echoes between these passages), she states: "It seems more likely however that these repetitions were unintentional, an indication rather of the relative meagreness of L.'s vocabulary". In the case of vocabulary, we can agree with M. but the thematic links undoubtedly exist in this book.

perhaps the willingness to comment on everything) is detectable in the commentary. What constitutes an important element of the commentary are lexical notes (with reference to *OLD* or *TLL* and often with *comparanda*). Yet, some of them appear to be redundant, e.g. ad 495 *divisimus*: “we have divided / shared out” – this meaning of the verb *dividere* seems to be obvious for students of Latin, and besides it is also present in the translation. Likewise, other explanations of words or phrases used in a typical context and meaning, e.g. ad 531 *pulsante*, ad 699 *nec* (cf. ad 605, where the comment is justified), ad 560 *solvensque ratem* (this juncture is rather familiar to Latin learners). Some notes repeat what was said earlier, e.g. ad 538 *sic fatur* and, at least partially, ad 568 *fatur* (cf. ad 523 *sic fatus*); cf. also ad 566 *incerta*, 570 and 602 (some observations can be joined and moved ad 566). Also redundant are several comments on the names of winds (e.g. ad 720 f.). A traditional reference to the lines where they were explained for the first time would suffice here (beside, there is a lack of consistency, cf. ad 721 “Boreae: the Nord wind. See on *Scythici ... Aquilonis*, 603” but ad 705 “Borean: see on *Scythici ... Aquilonis*, 603”). Due to the structure of the commentary, sometimes certain comments duplicate the content of the general discussion on particular phrases or sentences, e.g. a separate note ad 525 *scintillam* (a noun used in a rather basic sense anyway). The translations that appear from time to time (after all, the edition is supplied with a separate translation) and grammatical remarks like “nosse: = ‘novisse’” (ad 581) could have also been omitted.

The bibliography is traditional in character and has been divided into sections. Unfortunately, in the commentary a name/date system has been employed, which in some cases makes the process of looking up references difficult, especially for less advanced readers<sup>10</sup>. It would be understandable if the commentary were addressed to specialists. M.’s book is based on a dissertation submitted in February 2004 and contains only a few studies published after this date (I noticed only two such entries in Secondary Literature). Also, the commentary contains references to works that are not included in the bibliography or in the list of references and abbreviations, e.g. GROTIUS (ad 487–8, 639 *nautae*, 668) and VIANSINO (ad 704 *purumque*). Despite his brevity, VIANSINO’s commentary<sup>11</sup>, omitted by M. also in the introduction, provides quite a lot of comparative material.

Some more important comments ad locc.<sup>12</sup>:

**484–5:** M. notes that Caesar, recalling the Syrtis, speaks as if alluding to the *Aeneid*, to Aeneas in Carthage. The irony and the metatextual nature of these lines is worth mentioning. After all, Caesar (as Aeneas) will encounter a storm modelled on the storm of the *Aeneid* which drove the Trojans to Libya.

**494 naufragio:** a comment on the political meaning of this word is more essential here than on “erotic” one, but for this explanation we are referred ad 521. A part of the commentary ad 521 should be moved right here; the theme *naufragium / naufragus* will be present throughout the whole episode. The lines also require contextualization by reading them along with ll. 450–455 of

<sup>10</sup> There are, however, some inconsistencies, resulting probably from an earlier redaction of the text, e.g. ad 534–5a “Nutting (UCPPH.11.1931.125 and AJPh 52.1931.51ff)” vs. ad 606 *frangit* “Nutting (1931) 249–51” (the first item in the previous note); ad 482 f.: “P. Green *AJAH* 3 (1978)...” (like the papers of Nutting, listed in the bibliography). Some errors: ad 548 M. refers to “Paratore (1993)” – this item is not listed in the bibliography; it may be *La letteratura latina dell’età repubblicana e augustea*, also published in 1993, or it is an error and we should read e.g. “Paratore (1990)” (as ad 548, ad 497–503, ad 509); ad 510 *Fortuna*: “Dick (1937)” instead of “Dick (1967)”; ad 561–4: “Rist (1969)” = J.M. RIST, *Stoic Philosophy*, Cambridge 1969, not mentioned in the bibliography; p. 12: “Brumann” instead of “Bruman”.

<sup>11</sup> Marco Anneo Lucano, *La Guerra civile (Farsaglia)*, testo critico, trad. e commento a cura di G. VIANSINO, 2 vols., Milano 1995 (Classici greci e latini 89–90).

<sup>12</sup> See also comments in P. ROCHE’s review in *BMCR* 2009.09.45.

this book<sup>13</sup>, where Caesar's army is waiting for favourable weather to cross to Greece: "Nova vota timori/ sunt inventa novo, fluctus nimiasque precari/ ventorum vires, [...] caelo languente fretoque / omnis spes naufragii abiit". Besides, the poet's personal experiences, reported by M., probably does not matter, since the theme of the ship of state dates back to Alcaeus, as she notes ad 521.

**539–59:** two Amyclas' speeches are a prelude to the description of the storm. According to M., this unhistorical person, introduced by Lucan, "serves as a foil to the character of Caesar" (ad 515–59 and p. 22 f.). Both in the introduction and in the commentary, M. omits an important role played by the poor fisherman on the metaphoric plane – reading the sings of oncoming storm, he acts like as a *vates* foretelling disaster (of which fact he is obviously not aware). Political meaning of his *prognostica* is noted by M. ad 549–50. More on this topic would be desirable. The weather signs portend different things: for the fisherman and Caesar a storm, for the audiences outside the text the civil war and its consequences. Amyclas' speech can be compared to the poet's words from I 522 ff. In this very passage, Lucan for the first time draws from the signs listed in *Georgics* I 464 ff. and Ovid *Met.* XV 783 ff. (see esp. Lucan I 537–544 and M.'s remark ad 549–50 on evoking eclipse of the sun or moon). M., analyzing Virgilian echoes, never mentions these Lucan's *prognostica*. It is surprising as she notes: "The signs in Virgil lead into a list of portents foretelling [M. is not precise, strictly speaking, they follow] the death of Julius Caesar (*Georg.* I 465–97) and L. may have considered this a particularly relevant text to recall at the start of the storm" (the same idea on p. 22). This idea also needs to be developed further.

**568–76:** M.'s comments require some additions: (1) the symbolism associated with the ship of state is also relevant here (I. 570); (2) in the general introduction to these lines, M. could pay some attention to the relationship of the speech to the description of the presaged storm. The themes of this speech are developed or modified in ll. 597 ff. (the fighting winds, the ship tossed by the sea, uncertainty and hope, the problem of reaching the shore, the threat of disaster); (3) "murmura/ ponti consulimus" (571 f.) – this phrase emphasizes the prophetic, metaphorical dimension of Amyclas' advices, cf. for instance Verg. *Aen.* IV 65 "spirantia consulit exta", Ov. *Met.* XV 576 "trepidantia consulit exta" (see *OLD* 1 d); (4) taking into account that Amyclas' speech echoes that of Palinurus to Aeneas (*Aen.* V 13–25), the audience can read his words as an advice to Caesar to follow in the footsteps of Aeneas and abandon his journey to Italy in a storm – in this way he will save Rome. Caesar refuses, thus becoming anti-Aeneas.

**577–593:** this speech can be read not only as Caesar's reaction to Amyclas' reservations, but, curiously enough, also (and maybe even more) as a "direct" response to the words of Palinurus in the *Aeneid*. Such construction is, in my opinion, intentional and does not result only from the reason that Caesar's and Amyclas' speeches are modelled on the speeches of Palinurus and Aeneas. In the case of Caesar's reply (almost three times longer than its model, see M., p. 18), this relationship is looser and more based on the contrast of behaviour and personalities between Aeneas and Caesar than on common motifs (apart from two different orders). Instead, Caesar almost point by point refers to those topics which are present in the speech of Aeneas' helmsman, but do not appear in that of the fisherman (*Aen.* V 13–16 ~ 578 f.; 16 f. ~ 579–583; 18–22 ~ 583–588; 22 ff. ~ 588 ff.; on 579 f., see M. ad loc.).

**613–14:** the lines should be contextualized by the simile I 100–103 ("si terra recedat,/ Ionium Aegaeo frangat mare", 102 f.) and thus some comment on the political dimension of the image is needed.

**529–31:** these lines evoke the characteristics of Caesar in the *synkrisis* as lightning striking their own temples, I 151–157 (*Cesarea manus ~ flamma*), the echo is important in the context of *naufragus* at 521 (Caesar as a survivor of a shipwreck, who is also the schipwrecker; see M. ad

<sup>13</sup> On the relationship of these lines, see esp. D. HERSHKOWITZ, *The Madness of Epic: Reading Insanity from Homer to Statius*, Oxford 1998, p. 230, n. 130 (she is quoted by M. ad 521) and FANTHAM, *Caesar...* (n. 4), p. 122.

loc.<sup>14</sup>). The reference to Caesar as lightning goes well with a number of oppositions in the passage depicting the meeting of Caesar and Amyclas (e.g. *casa – templum*, *pauper – opes*) and creates a contrast to *scintilla* and, more generally, to ll. 523–525: Amyclas lighting a fire. M. (ad loc.) notes that the scene is simply in order to provide light for Amyclas; THOMPSON, BRUÈRE (*o.c.* [n. 7]), p. 12: “Amyclas’ fire is a purely poetic one; it serves no purpose and is at once forgotten...”. Caesar’s image as *flamma* in book V is also evoked in ll. 403–406: “ocior et caeli flammis et tigride feta”, 405 – Caesar on his way to Brundisium<sup>15</sup>.

There are also some conspicuous typographical errors: the remains of the Greek quotations in a not very clear set of Latin characters in the table of Appendix II (p. 311); similarly, in the bibliography, Greek ΑΥΩ appears as AUJW (E.K. BORTHWICK, *The Verb ΑΥΩ and its Compounds*). Besides, Hermann FRÄNKEL’s name occurs with a rectangle instead of ‘ä’ (ad 653–71 and p. 296).

In sum, M.’s accurate, insightful comments and observations are very valuable contribution to *scholarship* not only on this episode, but on the whole poem. They are an excellent basis for further studies provoking us to ask further questions. The commentary covers almost every aspect of the text, which makes it useful for students of all levels and scholars. The above criticisms do not detract from my generally positive appraisal of this work.

Mariusz Plago  
University of Wrocław

---

<sup>14</sup> Following HERSHKOWITZ, *o.c.* (n. 12), p. 230.

<sup>15</sup> J. ROSNER-SIEGEL (*The Oak and the Lightning: Lucan, Bellum Civile I. 135–157*, *Athenaeum* LXI 1983, p. 172, n. 9) notes that at the time of Caesar’s election to the consulship there are also thunders among ominous signs, V 395: “tonat augure surdo”.