



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Classical Studies: Faculty Publications and
Other Works

Faculty Publications and Other Works by
Department

1975

A Note on Lucan 8.860-1

John F. Makowski

Loyola University Chicago, jmakow1@luc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/classicalstudies_facpubs

 Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Makowski, JF. "A Note on Lucan 8.860-1". *Classical Philology* 70(3), 204-206.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications and Other Works by Department at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classical Studies: Faculty Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
© 1975 The University of Chicago Press.

making prerogatives of the senate and to enact in its despite, by a coalition of dissentient elements and a measure of forceful intimidation, significant political change.

The course of Sulpicius' confrontations with the conservative *nobilitas* exemplified the many serious threats to internal stability endemic in the Late Republic. It dramatized the anomalous character of the republican system, which tolerated a wide gap between the letter and spirit of the constitution, and which made possible anarchic conflicts between the well-established, long-accepted conventional power of the senate and the latent legal power of magistrates and people. It dramatized the class tensions and social unrest which had emerged in the latter half of the second century and had destroyed the cohesiveness on which the working of senatorial *auctoritas* was founded, making possible the assemblage of powerful coalitions of the disenfranchised. It dramatized the disastrous consequences of the tradition of political violence which had been fostered by the *nobilitas* itself and which was inevitably growing in intensity as divisions sharpened.

But above all it dramatized the dangerous tendency of idealistic and self-willed *nobiles*, however firmly attached to the traditionalists, to resort, when affronted or impeded by their fellow oligarchs, to the explosive weapons of

demagoguery and to an extremism characteristic of embittered defectors. This tendency was partly the result of the individualism of Roman politicians, who were seldom willing to subordinate personal goals and *dignitas* to the interests and objectives of any group, but it was also a product of angry impatience with the unrelenting and myopic conservatism of the great bulk of the *nobilitas* and with the pragmatic, utilitarian mentality which directed its efforts to preserve the status quo. The oligarchy of the Late Republic failed to make room for the aristocratic idealists and reformists "qui veram gloriam iniustae potentiae anteponebant"; it ignored both their ideals and their sensibilities, and it thereby encouraged repeated outbreaks of the most bitter and divisive form of political confrontation—a trial of strength between former friends and political allies.

These various political ills, long untended and aggravated by successive domestic crises, combined in 88 through the agency of Sulpicius, who was intent on exploiting to extreme limits every weakness of the republican system, to drag the state into calamitous civil war and to set a pattern of unrestricted force which finally resulted in the collapse of the *respublica*.

THOMAS N. MITCHELL

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

A NOTE ON LUCAN 8. 860–61

As it now stands in current editions of Lucan, the sentence contained in 8. 860–61 makes little or no sense. In dealing with it editors have resorted to emendation and various manipulations of punctuation, while commentators and translators have unsuccessfully attempted to wrench some meaning out of it.¹ Two versions of these lines have gained overwhelming acceptance by editors of Lucan. The first reads *es* of manuscript U and takes *Fortuna* as vocative. Thus Hosijs and Bourgy: "nunc es pro

numine summo / hoc tumulo, Fortuna, iacens." The other version—and indeed the more popular of the two—reads *est* with manuscripts ZMPGV and understands *Fortuna* as the nominative subject of the verb: "nunc est pro numine summo / hoc tumulo Fortuna iacens." So Weber, Haskins, Postgate, Housman, and Duff—except that Weber inserts a comma after *summo* and Postgate one after *iacens*.

Whether one reads *es* or *est*, however, the meaning of both texts is practically the same:

1. Editions and translations cited are: A. Bourgy and M. Ponchont, Tome II, Livres 6–10 (Paris, 1929). J. D. Duff (London, 1928). C. M. Francken (Leyden, 1896). R. Graves (Harmondsworth, 1957). C. E. Haskins (London, 1887).

C. Hosijs (Leipzig, 1892). A. E. Housman (Oxford, 1926). F. Oudendorp (Leyden, 1728). J. P. Postgate, Book 8 (Cambridge, 1917). C. F. Weber (Leipzig, 1821).

Fortune is said to be a supreme deity lying in the tomb. Now, since Pompey has just been buried in that tomb, the statement that Fortune lies there also is rather odd and requires clarification. Grotius' explanation, adopted by Haskins, Housman, and others, is: "Fortuna quodam modo cum ipso Pompeio sepulta, cui semper adfuerat." Presumably, the goddess of luck has died along with her favorite and now the two of them share a single grave. Haskins in a note admits that this interpretation is harsh, but sees no way out of the difficulty, given the present text. Postgate takes the whole phrase to mean "he whose portion it is to lie in so poor a grave." Such an elaborate periphrasis, however, is too artificial even for Lucan and represents a usage of *Fortuna* unparalleled elsewhere in the poem. Housman, too, seems somewhat unsure of the sentence's exact meaning. After citing the explanation of Grotius, he adds: "maioris numinis instar habere ait cum Pompeio iacentem Fortunam quam cum staret; quae quam uera sit sententia, ne quaeramus." The single certitude that Housman is prepared to offer is the assurance that Pompey is in no way to be identified as the *summum numen*: "Pompeium ipsum pro summo numine esse, quod quidam dici uolunt, nimis apertum esset mendacium."

Translators of Lucan, however, even when they use Housman's text, cannot help but express the identity of Pompey, Fortune, and the *summum numen* which is implicit in the above version of the sentence. Graves's translation of the sentence ignores altogether the phrase *pro numine summo* and equates the dead man with the goddess of luck: "There lies Pompey, Fortune incarnate." Duff, who renders the lines "Fortune, lying in this tomb, is now at last a supreme deity," explains that "Fortune is here identified with her favourite, Pompey." The statement implies, however, that Fortune became the supreme godhead only with the death of Pompey.

Some earlier editors of Lucan felt uneasy about forcing such a multiplicity of identities into a single phrase and attempted to solve

the difficulty through emendation. Oudendorp's version of the lines is: "at nunc pro numine summo / hoc tumulo, Fortuna, iacens." Francken rightly refused to accept the equation of Pompey with Fortune which he said could be achieved only *incredibili artificio*. His emended text reads: "nunc es [*sc.* Pompei] pro numine summo. / Hoc tumulo, Fortuna, iaces." This, however, is really no improvement, since it only says that Fortune is buried *in the company* of Pompey rather than *in the person* of Pompey.

The truth is that Fortune is not buried in the tomb in any way. The source of this misunderstanding is that editors have failed to read these lines in the context of the whole passage and have overlooked a very simple matter of punctuation. First of all, from the context it should be clear that Pompey and only Pompey can be the *summum numen* of line 860. A careful reading of the passage will show that almost every detail in it implies the divinity of the man buried in the tomb. At line 841 Lucan speaks of his shade as worthy of worship, *sacris dignam umbram*. Later he says that some day, when Rome is beset by some great natural disaster, she will find her salvation only when the supreme pontiff brings back the ashes contained in this tomb (846–50). Even now travelers will pause to worship at this sepulchre and give it preference over the altar of Casian Jupiter (851–58). This stone beaten by the Libyan sea is said to be more august than the altars set up by the victorious Caesar (860–62). The closing lines of the book draw a comparison between Magnus buried in Egypt and Jupiter buried in Crete (869–72). This theme of deification continues on into Book 9, whose opening lines describe the apotheosis of the dead man's spirit as it flies heavenward and finally settles in the breasts of Brutus and Cato (1–18). In short, everything both before and after lines 860–61 indicates that Pompey must be the *summum numen*. The subject of the verb *est*, then, cannot be Fortune, but Pompey understood. What Housman termed a *nimis apertum mendacium* is the truth after all.

Given that Pompey is the subject of the verb, the function and case of *Fortuna* become readily apparent. The word is in the vocative case and should have commas on either side of it. Thus, the correct reading of the sentence must be: “nunc est pro numine summo / hoc tumulo, Fortuna, iacens.” It is somewhat remarkable that so many editors of Lucan should have missed this simple solution of adopting Housman’s text and Hosius’ punctuation.

The above text accords well with the superior manuscripts which read *est* and affords an interpretation which is compatible with certain themes in the epic. For while there is no thematic warrant for the joint burial of Fortuna and Pompey, there is ample precedent for the poet’s direct address to Fortuna at this point in the poem. Throughout the *Bellum civile* and especially in Book 8 there is a close connection between the goddess of luck and her former favorite Pompey. For example: “hac facie, Fortuna, tibi, Romana placebas” (8. 686); “hac Fortuna fide Magni tam prospera fata / pertulit” (701–702); “semel inpulit illum / dilata Fortuna manu” (707–708). Especially remarkable is the frequency with which the poet refers to Fortuna throughout

the burial sequence. To begin with, Lucan prefaces the entire passage with the statement that the funeral was the doing of Fortune (712–14):

ante tamen Pharias victor quam tangat harenas
Pompeio raptim tumulum Fortuna paravit,
ne iaceat nullo vel ne meliore sepulchro.

When Cordus prays for some sort of tomb in which to bury the remains of Pompey, the object of his prayer significantly is Fortuna (729–30): “non pretiosa petit cumulato ture sepulchra / Pompeius, Fortuna, tuus.” After the completion of the pitiable funeral rites, the poet directs against the goddess of chance a bitterly ironic reproach (792–95):

placet, hoc, Fortuna, sepulchrum
dicere Pompei, quo condi maluit illum
quam terra caruisse socer?

The poet has made it clear that it is Fortune who gave Pompey his tomb. And it is she whom he confronts in lines 860–61 with the declaration that Pompey is now at last the supreme deity. No, Fortune is not buried in the tomb; it is only editors who have put her there, and it is time she were exhumed.

JOHN F. MAKOWSKI

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

BEDE’S *DE ORTHOGRAPHIA* IN CODEX VAT. OTTOB. LAT. 687

According to E. Dekkers¹ and M. Manitius,² there are very few manuscripts of Bede’s *De orthographia*. Their listing of manuscripts, along with those of M. L. W. Laistner,³ Charles H. Beeson,⁴ and H. Keil,⁵ does not include a sizable fragment contained in Codex Vat. Ottob. lat. 687 (34^v–36^v, saec. ix^{ox}). The selection is headed “Incipit Liber Hortographia Bedae Presbiteri,” and extends through the entry *Balvae, id est thyrae*. This manuscript deserves

attention in the constructing of a critical edition of the text. I propose to add its evidence, under the siglum O, to the apparatus with which Keil equipped his edition: Codex Parisinus 7530, saec. viii (P); Codex Montepessulanus H 306, saec. ix (M); Codex Leidensis bibliothecae publicae 122, saec. x (L); and “lectio vulgata exemplaribus olim impressis propagata” (ε).

Codex Vat. Ottob. lat. 687 is a parchment manuscript of forty-one folios,⁶ containing

1. E. Dekkers, “Clavis patrum latinorum,” *Sacris Erudiri*, III (Steenbruge, 1951; rev. 1961), Item 1566.

2. M. Manitius, *Gesch. der lat. Lit. des Mittelalters*, I (Munich, 1911), 75–76.

3. M. L. W. Laistner and H. H. King, *A Hand List of Bede Manuscripts* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1943), pp. 137–38.

4. C. H. Beeson, “The Manuscripts of Bede,” *CP*, XLII (1947), 73–87.

5. H. Keil (ed.), *Grammatici Latini: Scriptores de orthographia*, VII (Leipzig, 1880), 261 ff.

6. Foliated 1–39. There are two unnumbered leaves, one following fol. 6 and a second following fol. 12.