

SOME NOTES ON THE SO-CALLED CARMEN DE
BELLO ACTIACO (PAP. HERC. 817)

EGIL KRAGGERUD

University of Oslo

This article contains various comments upon text and interpretation. The author turns *inter alia* against the view that there is an anti-Augustan bent of mind to be ascertained in the poem as we have it.

The following comments arose above all from my review work on G. Zecchini's recent study *Il Carmen de bello Actiaco: storiografia e lotta politica in età augustea*.¹ Zecchini bases his text of the *Carmen*² on the editions of Garuti,³ Herrmann,⁴ Benario⁵ and the interim report of Immarco Bonavolontà.⁶ So far I have had no opportunity myself of investigating the Papyrus Herculaneensis 817, but taken into account its bad state of preservation and the lack of finality in much of what competent palaeographers have achieved through autopsy, I thought that even questions and comments not based upon that prerequisite of serious papyrology might have some value for future editors and commentators.

Like Garuti, Zecchini⁷ identifies **fragment 7**,⁸ as well as the two following fragments, with Antony's hapless naval operation at Paraitonion. This incident was described by Cassius Dio in the following passage (51, 9, 3–4):

Moreover, Antony ... suffered a reverse with his ships as well. Gallus, it seems, caused chains to be stretched at night across the mouth of the harbour under water, and then took no measures openly to guard against his opponents but contemptuously allowed them to sail in with perfect immunity. When they were inside, however, he drew up the chains by means of machines, and encompassing their ships on all sides – from the land, from the houses and from the sea – he burned some [τὰς μὲν κατέπρησε] and sank others.⁹

On the basis of the text so far established the evidence pointing to the Paraitonion incident is not exactly overwhelming. The "fire" (*ureret* 1.3) could equally well, or even better, be taken as referring to Actium.¹⁰ And the interpretation attached to the word *discrimen* (1.5) I find artificial in Garuti's comment: "providebant [i.e. Gallus and his men] fore ut naves in artum compellerentur, ut nullum inter eas intervallum superesset, ideoque minime amoveri possent."¹¹ However, the more likely meaning of *discrimen* in such a context of naval encounter would be "dangerous or critical situation" or "critical point".

In view of these doubts there are no strong reasons for placing the colloquy between Cleopatra and Antony in fragments 10-12 and 16 immediately after the Paraitonion setback of Antony, the view advocated by Zecchini.¹² Immarco Bonavolontà¹³ bases her interpretation on Plutarch's account (*Ant.* 69, 1), according to which Antony, on reaching Libya, sent Cleopatra on to Egypt: "After Antony had reached the coast of Libya and sent Cleopatra forward into Egypt from Paraetonium, ...".¹⁴ Plutarch evidently believes that Antony and Cleopatra went together to Africa. Dio Cassius (51, 5, 3), on the other hand, reports that they only went as far as the Peloponnesus together, whereupon Cleopatra hastened [*ἠπειχθη*] to Egypt "for fear that her subjects would begin a revolt if they heard of the disaster before her arrival", while Antony headed for the army under Pinarius Scarpus' command in Africa.

Anyway, it is difficult to reconcile these accounts with Zecchini's order of chronology, placing Antony's and Cleopatra's parting with each other, not after their landing at Paraitonion in September 31 B.C., but on the eve of the catastrophe next summer when Antony sailed westwards to meet Cornelius Gallus. According to Zecchini the sequence of events is as follows. First Antony went to Paraitonion and Cleopatra to Alexandria, whereupon both of them went back to Paraitonion to meet Gallus after a stay in Alexandria. It was then that Antony gave Cleopatra the advice to go back to Alexandria. The sources frankly give no support to such an interpretation and in itself it is hardly probable that both of them set out on the expedition against Cornelius Gallus.¹⁵ The only merit of

Zecchini's interpretation is to save the traditional order of fragments on the assumption that they have to form a chronological sequence of events.

Plutarch obviously thought that they took leave of each other immediately after they had landed at Paraitonion in September 31. On the whole it is more likely that the author of the *Carmen* has placed this discussion after Actium, i.e. in accordance with Cassius Dio probably somewhere on the coast of Peloponnesus. On such an occasion, after having obtained a little respite from the flight it would have been natural for Antony to try to persuade Cleopatra not to go with him to Libya, but to hasten directly to Alexandria. As to the sequence of events it makes little difference whether we follow this version or the one that could be based on Plutarch, i.e. after their first landing on the African coast. At all events the colloquy should be anterior to Cleopatra's landing at Alexandria and the festival that took place there (fr. 1–6).

I would not deny the possibility, even the probability, that fragments 1–6 refer to a public celebration at Alexandria in order to create the impression that a victory had been won.¹⁶ But I would maintain that those who with Zecchini believe that the fragments make a chronological sequence get into trouble placing fr. 10–12 & 16 after the defeat at Paraitonion.

Fragments 13–15 are taken by Garuti and Zecchini¹⁷ to refer to a naval battle outside Pharos for which only Orosius is our witness (6, 19, 15): *ipsumque* [sc. Antonium] *continuo* [i.e. shortly after the victory at Paraitonion] *apud Pharum vicit* [sc. Cornelius Gallus]. I cannot disprove this, but should like to remind how often the adjective *Pharius* is used for "Egyptian" in poetry (cf. in our poem probably col. I, line 3).¹⁸

With **col. I** we are on less slippery textual ground not only because the columns are generally somewhat more substantial than the fragments but above all because we can identify the episode in the sequence of events. Col. I describes the siege of Pelusium by Octavian:¹⁹

[hor]tans ille [petit] nato cum [pro]elia por[t]am,
 5 quem iuvenem [g]ran[d]a[e]vos erat per [c]uncta [sec]utus
 bella, fide dextraque po[t]ens rerumque per usum
 callidus, adsidu[us tra]ctando in munere [Marti]s.
 Imminet opsessis Italus iam turribus [ho]stis,
 a[ut d]oma[t] obstanti]s, nec defu[it] impetus illis.

In Benario's translation this is (with some indications added by me of how he seems to have understood the text syntactically):

... when (*cum*) he, urging battles on his son (*hortans nato proelia*), seeks the gate (*petit portam*), the young man whom he, aged, had followed through all wars, powerful in allegiance and his physical powers, skillful through his experience of things, constantly busy in handling the business of Mars. The Italian enemy now threatens the besieged towers or conquers those who resist, nor did the besieged lack spirit.

I doubt if *portam* (1.4) can be correct and would suggest instead (with Kreyssig)²⁰ *porta* (abl.). *Petit proelia* should rather be taken together and *cum* should preferably be understood as a preposition with *nato*. *Nato cum* is admittedly first found in Iuvenecus²¹ among the preserved Latin texts, but long before that it would have been a natural way to express "with his son" in poetry. In this case we have the influence of the "Stellungsregel von Marx"²² to reckon with as well.

The expression *Italus hostis* (1.8) is Zecchini's main piece of evidence for the alleged anti-Augustan tendency in the poem: "è difficile ammettere che un autore filaugusteo potesse adoperare una simile terminologia per designare il futuro *princeps*."²³ But the word *hostis* is far from incriminating in such a context. It is a neutral designation for one or the other of two antagonists/belligerent parties, regardless of where the author's sympathies may have lain. A number of instances in the *Aeneid* can testify to this: Priamus is *hostis* to Achilles (2, 541), Lausus meets Aeneas as *hostis* (10, 438), the Trojans are *hostis* in relation to Camilla (11, 764), Turnus throws a stone at his foe (*hostem* 12, 901), Turnus *pergit in hostem* (12, 456, cf. 9, 692; 10, 882; 12, 917).

We find even *hostis magnanimus* (10, 771), Aeneas is *hostis* to Mezentius and Lausus (10, 801). And in a situation similar to that of the defenders inside Pelusium Queen Amata catches sight of Aeneas as her foe (12, 595): *regina ut tectis venientem prospicit hostem*. The queen's subjective point of view gives edge to an otherwise natural expression in martial contexts.

Immarco Bonavolontà now rejects Garuti's *aut domat obstantis* and suggests instead *ante omnis milites*,²⁴ without perceiving, however, the metrical impossibility of the last word. The suggestion of Immarco Bonavolontà could easily be remedied by means of *comites*, but so far I see no reason to commit myself to a definite solution.

According to the interpreters I have consulted, the last part of the same line 9, *nec defuit impetus illis*, is unanimously taken to refer to the *defenders*. I find this syntactically more harsh than to apply it to the *attackers* as an elaboration on the previous clause. This would be an example of the so-called "theme and variation" so common in Vergil. *Illis* would then refer to both Octavian *and* his followers.

If one asks whether the poet's representation of Octavian in this passage is pro- or anti-Augustan, there is, as far as I can see, no decisive argument for either view;²⁵ and why should there be?

Neither does **col. II** suggest anything in the way of deceitful surrender of Pelusium on the part of Cleopatra. One should beware of interpreting into the legible parts of the account anything on a par with Cassius Dio's *ἔργω δὲ προδοθὲν ὑπὸ τῆς Κλεοπάτρας* (51, 9, 5, cf. Plut. *Ant.* 74, 1-2) by way of referring to *nec defuit impetus illis* as "coraggiosa resistenza degli assediati"²⁶ and to the peremptory way Octavian holds back his soldiers from plundering the town. It is arbitrary to interpret the lenient attitude towards the Egyptians on Octavian's side as a reflection of a secret agreement between Octavian and Cleopatra. This attitude should instead be interpreted on its own background.

The text of **col. II** can in my view be improved on in l. 9 and 10. The speech of Octavian to his soldiers is presented like this by Garuti:

“Quid [c]apitis iam [ca]pta iacen[t] quae [praemia belli?]
 subruitis ferr[o me]a moenia: quondam er[at h]ostis
 haec mihi cum d[iv]a plebes quoque: nu[nc sibi] victrix
 10 vindicat h[anc fa]mulam Romana pote[n]tia ta]ndem.

And this is the translation Benario offers on *quondam etc.*: “Once this people, along with the goddess, was an enemy to me; now victorious Roman power at last claims her as a maid servant for itself.”

Immarco Bonavolontà, however, wants to change this text in three places: For *diva* she substitutes *causa*, for *nunc sibi* she reads *denique*, and for *potentia tandem* she offers *tot ensis gentem*, translating the text as: “Un tempo anche questa plebe, *non senza motivo*, mi era nemica: finalmente le arme romane, vincitrici, rivendicano questa gente come schiava.”²⁷ My immediate impression as an outsider is that the new text (and translation) are inferior to the traditional one, perhaps even self-contradictory in so far as it amounts to: The people of Egypt were for good reason Octavian’s enemy once, i.e. from about the year 34 (or to be on the safe side: from 32 B.C.). Eventually the Roman army, according to Octavian, is about to reduce the Egyptian people (*gens = plebes*) to slaves. This seems to me to leave something to be desired in the line of thought.

Cum causa seems to be suggested by Col. III, 1. 3 where these words are beyond dispute, *cum* being a conjunction and *causa* (nom.) meaning “cause”. Not so in col. II, however. Immarco Bonavolontà cannot account for the “quoque” going with *plebes*, but this very “quoque” points to the solution. Its function is not seldom, somewhat redundantly, to lend emphasis to *cum*, and *cum ... quoque* is virtually equivalent to *et ... et*: “both ... and”.²⁸ The reference to Cleopatra in the traditional text is in my view beyond dispute (*in Cleopatrae ludibrium* as Garuti rightly remarks). With Ciampitti and Ellis I would suggest *domina* as the most likely substitution.²⁹ This has been rejected by Garuti because the empty space in the papyrus does not allow of a word as long as this: “quamvis”, as he concedes, “*domina* aptissimum verbum sit”.³⁰ In so far as Immarco Bonavolontà finds room enough for *c[aus]a*, the argument from space is perhaps not as

decisive as Garuti believed it to be. Only a person quite familiar with this hand will be able to tell (one should for instance measure the length of *a[ni]mu[s]* col. IV, 1.7, *nomine* col. IV 1.6 etc.).

At any rate a reference to Cleopatra is very much called for just here: she was the principal *hostis* of the whole war. What Octavian really seems to object to in his speech is that the whole people of Egypt should too rashly be lumped together with their queen. It would not be in his own interest, of course, to harbour hostile feelings towards the Egyptian people in the long run, but to forgive them as soon as the queen was removed. There is an element of pity in his address to the soldiers. This had been aroused, it seems, by the slaughter going on inside Pelusium: *ipsoque infecta cruore/funera succedunt patriis deformia terris,/et foeda ipsa magis quam si congesta laterent* (1. 2–4).

As to the following sentence, *ensis gentem* is not the kind of verse ending one would gladly impute to an author of the first century A.D., well versed in the best tradition of Latin hexameter poetry. *Romana potentia* should not be abandoned unless for cogent reasons: besides, *Romana ... ensis* is impossible because of the gender of *ensis*. If *-entem* is correct, *gentem* seems to be a good suggestion (Ellis), but if the microscope cannot prove a *t* instead of a *d*, *tandem* should probably be kept as well. What Octavian maintains, then, is that Cleopatra, the real *hostis*, is now being rendered slave to Roman power. It is time, then, to end the war and condone the people. Some words about this must have followed in the next sentence. *Vindicat* anticipates the outcome: it is only a matter of time before the queen will fall into their hands. They should therefore adopt a more lenient attitude towards the Egyptian people, and the sooner the better. If this renders the line of thought tolerably well, the author's attitude towards Augustus can at least not be hostile. I would so far rather call it benevolently neutral.

Col. III is perhaps the most intriguing part of all. The first legible line is *cessit Alexandro thalamos onerare deorum* (e.g. Benario), *[n]u[mi]ni Alexandro tha[la]mos in[t]r[a]re de[a]rum* (according to Immarco Bonavolontà). If the elided cretic *numini* is accepted it would say something about the metrical niveau of this

composition (for elisions of such a kind cf. Lucilius 61, 113; Catullus 97, 6; perhaps Horace sat. 1, 1, 59).

What follows is less uncertain, however, and according to Zecchini and Immarco Bonavolontà to be read like this:

di[co] etiam no[l]uisse deam vidiss[e t]um[ultu]s
 5 Actiacos, cum [c]ausa fores tu ma[xi]ma [be]lli,
 pars etiam im[per]ii. quae femina t[an]ta, vi[r]orum
 quae serie[s] antique [f]uit? ni gloria mendax
 multa v[et]us[t]atis nimio c[ing]ebat honoris!

Who is the speaking *persona* in these lines? According to Zecchini,³¹ the last one to discuss this question in detail, it is Antony who addresses Cleopatra with words of consolation. Now Zecchini refers both *causa ... maxima belli* and (*maxima*) *pars ... imperii* to Cleopatra, the Egyptian queen being notoriously the *causa belli*. According to this interpretation she aspired by means of Antony to become also “la parte principale dell’impero romano”.³² Cleopatra is in the eyes of Antony the principal cause of the war and the principal component of the imperium Romanum in her capacity as the queen of an Orient allied against Rome. This reasoning seems to me to be mistaken both in detail and in sum. Cleopatra was not *maxima causa*, she was the sole cause according to the official propaganda. And in what sense can it be meaningful to say that she is *maxima pars imperii Romani* at Actium when she demonstrably represents the hostile forces outside of that *imperium*?³³

Zecchini bases his interpretation in part on phraseological similarities to be found in Propertius’ elegy I 6 and the Gallus papyrus from Qasr Ibrîm. A glance at these parallels will be useful:

Propertius 1, 6, 33f.:

seu pedibus terras seu pontum carpere remis
 ibis, et accepti pars eris imperii.

This means that the person addressed, by following his uncle to his proconsulship in Asia, will be a member of his staff and thus “take part in a beloved *imperium*”,³⁴ i.e. the government or rule that is exercised by the proconsul in that province.

In the Qasr Ibrîm papyrus, on the other hand, Octavian is hailed as *maxima Romanae pars ... historiae*: i.e. the most important politician in Roman history. So much is fairly evident that neither Propertius nor our poet can be said to be under the influence of the Gallus papyrus on the basis of such slight similarities. The contexts are quite different. In one case (Propertius) the poet talks of the popular rule of a proconsul he wants to flatter, whereas in the Gallus papyrus Octavian is destined to play the most important part in Roman history. As there can be no question of derivation on the part of neither Propertius nor Gallus, the expression had better be interpreted everywhere in its own right. Then it will probably be clearer that our text does not actually say *maxima pars imperii*: *maxima* can only qualify *causa* in the previous sentence: *causa maxima belli, pars etiam imperii* would normally in prose be rendered by *son solum, sed etiam*: "you were the principal cause for the war, even part of my rule."

What, then, does *pars imperii* mean in this specific context? This depends very much on the question we started with: Who is speaking to whom?

Let us start with *dico etiam noluisse deam vidisse tumultus Actiacos*. The goddess can scarcely be Cleopatra herself as she did attend the battle, albeit only a part of it. So the *dea* whose absence is deplored must be a real goddess. Of course she cannot be a Roman deity, but must be an Egyptian one whose absence indicated an estrangement on her part. The goddess is in all probability to be identified as Isis, the tutelary goddess of Cleopatra and the Ptolemaic dynasty.³⁵ This has already been suggested by many commentators. That Isis was absent meant that the battle was lost and that Cleopatra could do nothing better than withdraw as quickly as possible.

The obvious answer to the question of the speaking *persona*, then, is Cleopatra. *Cum* with the subjunctive should here be taken as causal. Cleopatra can offer an explanation as to why the goddess kept out of the battle: because Antony was the principal cause of the war. This seems to be a fairly realistic assessment of the war declared against Cleopatra. The author does not seem to be too dependent on the propaganda of that

time. Then *pars etiam imperii*, like the similar expression in Propertius (see above), has nothing to do with the *imperium Romanum*, but is Cleopatra's own *imperium*, i.e. her rule as a Ptolemaic queen. Antony could be said to have a share in her rule,³⁶ and this fact could scarcely be acceptable to Isis. So these lines are not far from putting the blame on Antony for the lost war. Antony was indeed responsible for the catastrophe that was a result of the absence of Cleopatra's tutelary goddess on the battlefield. In the first line of this column it may be that the reference to Alexander implies a contrast with Antony: whereas Alexander was a favourite of the goddess, Antony enjoyed no sympathy in those quarters.

So I would propose to read, though hesitatingly as often in this lacunose text, *quae femina tanta* as a proud self-appraisal by a queen conscious of her rank and might. *Quae femina tanta* might well enough have been said by a man in a condescending manner, something in the vein of: "You should be grateful: not only did you share my command with me, but you have actually surpassed all women in might." Coming to the next sentence, however, which is closely attached to *quae femina tanta*, the poet must refer to the pride of a queen belonging to the most ancient dynasty known to the ancient world: the kings and pharaohs of Egypt. In the context *quae femina tanta* should be read *quae antiqua femina tanta fuit*, taking *antiqua* from the following sentence; and this in turn should be read *quae antiqua series virorum tanta fuit*. Not only has she been the most powerful queen ever, but even among kings, if one can trust tradition, her power has been pre-eminent.

Col. IV contains a reference to Antony on the part of Cleopatra which in Benario's presentation runs like this:

Est mihi coniunx,
[Part]h[os qu]i posset [P]hariis subiungere regnis,
qui s[pre]vit nostr[ae]que mori pro nomine gentis

with the alleged meaning: "I have a husband, who was able to subject the Parthians to the Egyptian realms and to die for the fame of our race, who scorned to do so." Zecchini would

rather prefer *statuit* with Hermann and Frassinetti³⁷ because only the observation that Antony has decided not to desert the Egyptians, but is ready to die for them, can give Cleopatra hope of escaping with him. This would signal a positive view of Antony: he would have been able to bring the Parthians under Egyptian rule if he had not been interrupted in his great enterprise by the rupture with Octavian. This would amount to a sort of apology for Antony and reveal hostility towards Octavian on Cleopatra's part. Her point of view would otherwise, in this interpretation, coincide with the author's own.

Both text and interpretation need some further consideration. Whatever may be the correct wording of the text I doubt if the syntax of the sentence has been correctly understood, in so far as one tends to take *est mihi coniunx qui posset* together. The sentence is instead probably to be construed like this: *est mihi coniunx* attached to the *qui* with the perf. indic. Otherwise it would be difficult, if not impossible to account for the *-que* connecting the two infinitives *subiungere* and *mori*. Then *qui posset* can hardly be correct. I can see two possibilities which can make the syntax of the sentence somewhat smoother: either with *sprevit* to read *cum* or if the *i* is certain to read *si* and a verb like *statuit*. In my view the latter course is on the whole more satisfactory; and the sentence can syntactically be explained by means of the following simplified prose: *est mihi coniunx qui statuit, si posset* ("if possible") *subiungere Parthos* (or: *Parthica [sc. regna]*) *Phariis regnis et mori pro nomine nostrae gentis*.

I do not believe that this can possibly be a reference to the Parthian campaign of Antony in 36 B.C. even in the cosmetic translation of B.: an Antony who "was able to subject the Parthians to the Egyptian realms and to die for the fame of our race" is hardly to be reconciled with the Antony who returned from that expedition.

Garuti connects this, convincingly in my view, with the events just before the outbreak of war in 32 B.C., leading eventually to the battle at Actium.³⁸ After all Antony is still a general to be reckoned with, a galant husband and a protector not to be dismissed in a crisis like the present one.

Col. VIII describes the final attack on Alexandria (1. 1ff.):

nec urbem
opsidione tamen n[e]c corpora moenibus ar[c]ent
castraque pro muris atque arma pedestria ponunt.

Garuti paraphrases this in the following way:³⁹

quamquam facillime e rerum statu Alexandria capi posse videtur, "tamen" Caesaris milites neque urbis obsidione abstinent neque suos moenibus arcent ("corpora" reflexivo fere sensu ...⁴⁰) sed etiam omnia ad diuturnum bellum parant.

On the other hand Zecchini extricates this meaning from the same passage:⁴¹

egli [sc. Octavian] si guardo dallò stringere d'assedio Alessandria e dall' obbligare i suoi soldati a combattere tra le mura [taking *corpora* evidently as *suos*] ..., ma si limitò a piantare il campo *pro muris*.

Benario: "they nonetheless neither keep the city from siege nor their own bodies from the walls and they place their camp and their infantry weapons before the walls."

The simplest way to understand the passage is in my view to treat it as a "theme and variation" nexus and to refer both objects (*urbem* and *corpora*) to the Egyptian side (i.e. Alexandria and its population): "They don't keep the city shut⁴² by means of siege nor the population⁴³ behind the fortifications, but⁴⁴ place their camp before the walls and lay down their infantry weapons."

NOTES

1. *Historia*, Einzelschriften 51. Stuttgart 1987. My review will appear in *Gnomon*.
2. *Ibid.*, 95–100, printed as 'Appendice' and without a proper critical apparatus. In all fairness it should be mentioned that the author has printed what he considers the best possible text at the present stage of enquiry and that he has no critical pretensions.
3. *C. Rabirius, Bellum Actiacum e papyro Herculansenis 817* ed. I. Garuti (Studi pubblicati dall' Istituto di Filologia classica V), Bologna 1958.

4. L. Hermann, *Le second Lucilius*, Bruxelles 1958.
5. H. W. Benario, "The *Carmen de bello Actiaco* and Early Imperial Epic", *ANRW* II, 30, 3, Berlin-New York 1983, 1656–1662. As this presentation of the poem is probably the one most easily accessible to most readers, I take special account of it, though it has little new to offer.
6. Rosanna Immarco Bonavolontà, "Per una nuova edizione del *PHERC* 817", *Atti XVII Congr. Papir.*, Napoli 1984, 583–590.
7. Zecchini, *Carmen*, 15; Garuti (above n. 3), 56.
8. The "fragments" numbering 26, as distinct from the "columns", were first published by G. Ferrara (as *Poematis Latini, Fragmenta Herculansia*, ed. I. Ferrara), Papiæ 1908, and are now to be found both in Garuti's, Hermann's and Zecchini's editions, but not in Benario's.
9. Cited after E. Cary's Loeb-ed. (1917).
10. On 'fire' in connection with the naval battle at Actium cf. my *Horaz und Actium*, 122, n. 26 with further references. Here, of course, *ureret unda* would refer to the battle itself.
11. Garuti (above, n. 3), XX. For the alleged meaning Garuti refers to *Lucr.* 5, 690 (*aequato ... discrimine*) and *Verg. Aen.* 5, 154 (*aequo discrimine*), both of which refer to "distance". *Discrimen* seems a less appropriate word in a description of ships packed together.
12. Zecchini, *Carmen*, 16.
13. Immarco Bonavolontà (above, n. 6), 586f.
14. Cited after the Loeb-ed.
15. Zecchini (*Carmen*, 15) claims that our poet follows the same source as Cassius Dio in the case of the Paraitonion incident and seems to imply that he might have followed the same common source also in the case of fragments 10–12 (and 16), but this is unfounded.
16. Cf. *Cass. Dio* 51, 5, 4. There is the difference, however, that in *Cass. Dio* there is evidently a festal landing only, whereas in the *Carmen* there is a great festival on land.
17. Garuti (above, n. 3) 62f.; Zecchini, *Carmen*, 17.
18. For example in *Lucan*: 2, 636; 733; 3, 260; 4, 257; 724; 6, 308; 7, 692; 704; 8, 546; 555; 574; 596; 611; 624; 675; 681; 712; 9, 1; 53; 74; 134; 141; 209; 1005; 1012; 1068; 1096; 10, 65; 86; 126; 171; 177; 184; 269; 277; 343; 406.
19. Text according to Benario and Zecchini.
20. On Kreyssig's editions (1814, 1835) cf. Garuti (above, n. 3), XVIIIIf.
21. Cf. *Thes.l.L.* s.v. *cum* IV 1341, 68.
22. Cf., for example, H. Drexler, *Einführung in die römische Metrik*, Darmstadt 1967, 99ff.
23. Zecchini, *Carmen*, 19.
24. Immarco Bonavolontà (above, n. 6), 588.
25. Zecchini (*Carmen*, 29f.) supports his theory by referring to col. VII, 1.6ff.:
 Ter fuerat revocata dies: cum parte senatus
 et patriae comitante suae cum milite Caesar
 gentis Alexan[d]ri c[u]r[r]ens ad m[o]jen[ia] venit.
 According to Zecchini the poet reveals a polemical attitude towards Vergil's account 8, 678–680: *Hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar/cum patribus populoque, penatibus et magnis dis,|stans celsa in puppi*. Whereas Vergil represents Augustus as a general leading the whole class of senators and the unanimous people of Rome without defections, he is in the *Carmen* more of

factio leader and the reader is accordingly reminded that the war is really a civil one. It may be, however, that our poet is simply more attuned to the factual side of the expedition. Even a pro-Augustan historian could well have said so.

26. Zecchini, *Carmen*, 18.
27. Immarco Bonavolontà (above, n. 6), 588. The italics are mine.
28. Cf. OLD s.v. *quoque* 2b.
29. Cf. Garuti's app. crit. on col. II, 1.9, (above, note 3) 74.
30. Garuti (above, n. 3), 75 referring to *Aen.* 11, 803 and Seneca *Troad.* 80. More relevant is Lucan 10, 356f.: *cessas accurrere solus/ad dominae thalamos?* (i.e. Cleopatra).
31. Cf. Zecchini, *Carmen*, 19ff.
32. Zecchini, *Carmen*, 20. On p. 23 he paraphrases the words like this: "Cleopatra è la principale componente dell'impero romano in quanto regina dell'Oriente ..." and on the same page he draws the inference: "Sembra cioè di cogliere in questa sopravvalutazione della componente orientale e degli interessi orientali di Roma un nuovo atteggiamento polemico verso la politica del regime e la cultura fiancheggiatrice ..."
33. This is admittedly, according to Zecchini, the view of Antony, but even so it is a gross overestimation of Cleopatra's part in the conflict; cf. Plut. *Ant.* 54 with C. B. R. Pelling's commentary (Cambridge 1988), 249f.
34. Zecchini interprets this as Augustus' *imperium* (as does Enk in his commentary (1946) *ad l.*), but it is rather a handsome tribute to the *imperium* of the proconsul (thus W. A. Camps (1961) *ad l.*).
35. On Isis cf. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford 1972, I, 240ff.
36. Cf. Plut. *Ant.* 54, 6 (on Antony's throne).
37. P. Frassinetti, "Sul "Bellum Actiacum" (Pap.Herc. 817)", *Athenaeum* 38, 1960, 305.
38. Cassius Dio 49, 44.
39. Garuti (above, n. 3), 86.
40. Referring to Livy 7, 36, 7; 25, 14, 9; 35, 49, 13.
41. Zecchini, *Carmen*, 30.
42. For this meaning of *arcere* = *coerceo*, *contineo* cf. Thes.1.L. s.v. 1.
43. For *corpora* with this meaning cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 1,70 *submersasque obrue puppes aut age diversos et disice corpora ponto.*
44. For adversative *-que* cf. OLD 6b.