

Mariusz PLAGO

Uniwersytet Wrocławski

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6545-1492>

AT VOS ... PRIMUS IN EPIRUM BOREAS AGAT! **THE CONSULS'** **SEA-PASSAGE TO GREECE** **IN LUCAN'S *CIVIL WAR* (2.645-648)**

This article analyzes lines 2.645-648 of Lucan's *Civil War*. These four lines contain Pompey's command for the consuls to sail from Brundisium to Epirus, and from there to proceed to Greece and Macedonia, where they were to gather reinforcements. According to the historical sources available to us, the consuls crossed to Dyrrachium, transporting the majority of the army and possibly civilians staying in Pompey's camp. However, the issue lies in the north wind, Boreas, mentioned in line 2.646, where we would expect a south wind. The first part of the article examines various proposed solutions to this issue, which aim to reconcile Lucan's lines with historical accounts. The second part offers an alternative interpretation: the consuls' destination is not Dyrrachium. Instead, the analysis suggests that Lucan's narrative assigns the consuls a new mission and alters their route for poetic purposes. This change stems from Lucan's intertextual engagement with Virgil's *Aeneid* and enhances the metaphorical dimension of the narrative. It helps establish a stronger parallel between Pompey's departure from Brundisium and Aeneas's flight from Troy.

***AT VOS ... PRIMUS IN EPIRUM BOREAS AGAT!* IL PASSAGGIO MARITTIMO DEI CONSOLI VERSO LA GRECIA NELLA *GUERRA CIVILE* DI LUCANO (2.645-648)**

Questo articolo analizza i versi 2.645-648 della *Guerra Civile* di Lucano. Questi quattro versi contengono l'ordine di Pompeo ai consoli di salpare da Brindisi verso l'Epiro e, da lì, proseguire per la Grecia e la Macedonia, dove avrebbero dovuto raccogliere rinforzi. Secondo le fonti storiche disponibili, i consoli attraversarono il mare fino a Durazzo, trasportando la maggior parte dell'esercito e, possibilmente, anche civili che si trovavano nel campo di Pompeo. Tuttavia, il problema sorge con il vento del nord, Boreas, menzionato nel verso 2.646, dove ci si aspetterebbe un vento del sud. La



© by the author, licensee University of Lodz – Lodz University Press, Lodz, Poland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Received: 20.12.2024. Verified: 22.12.2024. Revised: 20.04.2025. Accepted: 06.05.2025.

Funding information: University of Wrocław. **Conflicts of interests:** None. **Ethical considerations:** The Authors assure of no violations of publication ethics and take full responsibility for the content of the publication. **Declaration regarding the use of GAI tools:** not used.

prima parte dell'articolo esamina varie soluzioni proposte a questa discrepanza, volte a conciliare i versi di Lucano con i resoconti storici. La seconda parte propone un'interpretazione alternativa: la destinazione dei consoli non è Durazzo. L'analisi suggerisce che la narrazione lucanea assegna ai consoli una nuova missione e modifica il loro percorso per ragioni poetiche. Questo cambiamento deriva dall'intertestualità con l'*Eneide* di Virgilio e accresce la dimensione metaforica della narrazione, stabilendo un parallelo più forte tra la partenza di Pompeo da Brindisi e la fuga di Enea da Troia.

Parole chiave: Lucano, *Guerra Civile*, consoli, Mare Adriatico, Brindisi, Durazzo, Borea

Keywords: Lucan, *Civil War*, consuls, Adriatic Sea, Brundisium, Dyrrachium, Boreas

Ślowa kluczowe: Lukan, *Wojna domowa*, konsulowie, Morze Adriatyckie, Brundyzjum, Dyrrachium, Boreasz

Introduction: The consuls' sea crossing in Lucan and in historical sources

At the end of Book 2 of Lucan's *Civil War*, Pompey successfully evades Caesar's blockade of the harbor at Brundisium. This event is dated to 17 March 49 BCE in the Roman civil calendar, corresponding to 26 January in the Julian calendar (Ramsey, Raaflaub 2017: 190). The opening lines of Book 3 depict Pompey already aboard a ship, sailing – driven by the south wind (Auster) – towards the Greek coast (3.1). Before departing from the Calabrian (modern Apulian) port himself, Pompey dispatches his elder son, Gnaeus, along with the consuls L. Lentulus Crus and C. Claudius Marcellus (neither of whom is mentioned by name), ahead by sea to muster additional troops. He first addresses his son, instructing him to mobilize the entire East, while recounting an extensive list of his own triumphs (632-644). In contrast, his directives to the consuls are markedly succinct: in just four lines, he commands them to proceed to Epirus and subsequently to Greece and Macedonia, taking advantage of the temporary suspension of warfare due to the winter season:

at vos, qui Latios signatis nomine fastos,
primus in Epirum Boreas agat; inde per arva
Graiorum Macetumque novas adquirite vires
dum paci dat tempus hiemps.
(Lucan. 2.645-648)

Gnaeus' mission is poorly documented in the historical record. Only Plutarch reports that Pompey sent his father-in-law, Scipio, and his elder son from Brundisium to Syria to organize a fleet (*Pomp.* 62.2).¹ By contrast, the consuls' crossing of the Adriatic is well attested. The transfer of troops to Dyrrachium had been

¹ Caesar, on the other hand, notes that Gnaeus brought A. Gabinius' 500 soldiers, Gauls and Germans, and a fleet to his father from Alexandria (*Civ.* 3.4). On Gnaeus' mission, see Frère 1910: 171–172 (he points to the Livian tradition of this mission).

Pompey's plan since the outbreak of the war with Caesar, as evidenced by a letter he sent to the consuls early in the conflict (Pomp. *ap.* Cic. *Att.* 8.12a.3; this letter is dated to around 18 February 49 BCE; see Shackleton Bailey 1968: 453). Caesar recounts (*Civ.* 2.25.2-3) that upon his arrival in Brundisium, the consuls had already departed for Dyrrachium, taking most of the army with them. Pompey remained in the city with twenty cohorts. Caesar was unsure whether his opponent had deliberately stayed to hold the port or, lacking a sufficient number of ships to transport his entire force at once, was compelled to wait for the return of vessels from Greece (which was true). Additional references to the consuls' crossing to Dyrrachium, accompanied by part of the army, appear in the accounts of Appian (*App. BC* 2.38-40), Plutarch (*Pomp.* 62.2, *Caes.* 35.2), and Cassius Dio (41.12.1, 12.3, 14.1).²

Although ample evidence supports Dyrrachium as the consuls' destination, Lucan avoids naming the city explicitly. Instead, Pompey, in his command, vaguely refers to Epirus (2.646) as the region to which the consuls are dispatched in winter with the first blast of Boreas. In this respect, Lucan aligns more closely with Cicero's letter to Atticus 9.6.3 from March 11, 49 BCE, where it is stated that the consuls, along with the army, plebeian tribunes, senators, and their families, set sail for Epirus, driven by a north wind (Lucan. 2.465: *primus Boreas* ~ Cic. *Att.* 9.6.3: *ex ea die fuere septemtriones venti*). The consuls embarked in the early days of March.³ Because the Roman calendar was ahead of the solar calendar by about six weeks, the event can be dated to mid-January in our calendar.⁴ Nevertheless, "Epirus" in the *Civil War* may still refer specifically to Dyrrachium, a reading supported by Lucan's commentators, who consistently invoke Dyrrachium in their analyses.⁵

Epirus, Dyrrachium, and Boreas: Geographical and textual boundaries in 2.646

The term "Epirus" is often used imprecisely by ancient authors. The lands across the sea from the eastern coast of the Italian peninsula encompassed both Epirus and Illyria, with the Acroceraunian Peninsula (modern Karaburun Peninsula) marking the boundary between the two. This headland encloses the present-day Bay of Vlorë, which was home to the coastal city of Oricum. Epirus

² See also Vell. 2.49.4: *Cn. Pompeius consulesque et maior pars senatus [...]* transmisere Dyrrachium; Oros. 6.15.4: *Pompeius atque omnis senatus [...]* in Graeciam transvecti, Dyrrachium gerendi belli sedem delegerunt.

³ 4 March: Rawson 1994: 424; Ramsey, Raaflaub 2017: 190; 8 March: Leach 1978: 183.

⁴ Ramsey, Raaflaub 2017: 190 – 13 January, according to the Julian calendar.

⁵ Cf. Francken 1896: *ad* 2.646; Ehlers 1978: *ad* 3.1-45; van Campen 1991: *ad* 2.645ff.; Fantham 1992: *ad* 2.646; Viansino 1995: *ad* 2.646 (but he adds: "Lucano non sembra conoscere con esattezza il luogo dello sbarco"); D'Urso 2022: *ad* 2.646-648.

stretched southward to the Ambracian Gulf, while Illyria extended north of the peninsula, incorporating cities such as Apollonia, Dyrrachium, Lissus, and Nymphaeum (Strab. 7.7.5; Plin. *Nat.* 3.145, 150).⁶ However, this ethnic distinction did not correspond to Roman administrative divisions. The *Lex Vatinia de imperio Caesaris* (59 BCE) designated much of Illyria as *Illyricum*, combining it with Gallia Cisalpina into a single administrative unit (which was assigned to Caesar as a *provincia*). Meanwhile, Epirus was incorporated into the province of Macedonia, which also included parts of southern Illyria, such as the area around Dyrrachium.⁷ As a result, the ancients often referred to southern Illyria as Epirus.⁸ Thus, when Pompey instructs the consuls to sail for Epirus in Lucan's narrative, he may actually be referring to Dyrrachium, a fortified city with vital military connections to the hinterland by the Via Egnatia.

The term "Epirus" appears only three times in the *Civil War*. Besides Pompey's commands in Book 2, it surfaces in Book 5, where a gathering of the 'senate' is held in Epirus (5.9), likely near Dyrrachium, and where Caesar, addressing Antony, refers to the region between Apollonia and Dyrrachium as Epirus (5.496). If "Epirus" in 2.646 indeed refers to Dyrrachium, a problem arises with the north wind accompanying the consuls, as Dyrrachium lies to the north of Brundisium. Lucan describes three other sea crossings from Brundisium to Greece, each of which specifies a particular wind. At the beginning of Book 3 (1-45), Pompey leaves Italy, aided by the south wind (Auster), a detail that typically elicits no objections.⁹ In Book 5, both Caesar (403-460) and later Antony (703-721) undertake sea voyages. Caesar sets sail with the north wind Aquilo (Latin for Boreas), which raises no concerns, as he lands at Palaeste (near modern Palasë), south of Brundisium (Lucan. 5.460; Caes. *Civ.* 3.6¹⁰). However, Antony's journey proves more problematic: he initially departs with Boreas, which later shifts to Auster

⁶ Cf. App. *Ill.* 2.1: Ἰλλυριοὺς Ἕλληνας ἡγοῦνται τοὺς ὑπὲρ τε Μακεδονίαν καὶ Θράκην ἀπὸ Χαόνων καὶ Θεσπρωτῶν ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Ἰστρον; thus, the northern border of Epirus is established by the river of Aous (Vjosë); see also Kaerst 1905: 2719; Hammond 1967: 133-134; Wilkes 1992: 92-93.

⁷ See Vanderspoel 2010: 258-259, 269 (he also briefly presents further administrative changes in the area).

⁸ See., e.g., Livy on the location of Apollonia: 31.18.1, 35.24.7 and, in particular, 42.18.3. Apian first says that the consuls, along with part of the army, sailed to Epirus (*BC* 2.38), and later specifies that they arrived in Dyrrachium. Cassius Dio, on the other hand, initially refers to the consuls' and Pompey's destination as Macedonia (41.10.3, 12.3), but soon after also states that Pompey reached Dyrrachium (41.14.1).

⁹ But the author of *Commenta Bernensia* disagrees, noting that the north wind should be mentioned in 3.1: *aquilone usus poetica licentia. aquilone enim ab Italia ad Epirum navigatur* (*Comment. Lucan. ad loc.*). A similar view has been articulated by Bentley (1760: ad 3.1), who quotes all the other passages about sailing off from Brundisium in Lucan and Cicero's letter to Atticus (9.6.3), as well as Strabo (6.3.8), which talks about setting sail with the south wind from Brundisium to Barium on the same coast (for this passage, see below). This juxtaposition makes Bentley conclude that to reach the opposite shore, one had to sail with the north wind.

¹⁰ According to Longhurst 2016 Caesar in fact landed in the Bay of Vlora.

(5.720-721), though Caesar himself (*Civ.* 3.26.4) reports two days of south winds before an improbable shift (*incredibili felicitate*) to Africus, the southwest wind.¹¹ Antony eventually lands at Nymphaeum, a port near Lissus, north of Dyrrachium (*Lucan.* 5.719-720; *Caes. Civ.* 3.26.4).

Sailing directly northward toward Dyrrachium with Boreas would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible. Ancient square-rigged ships, like their later counterparts, could sail into the wind to a limited extent, but their “no-go zone” was considerable. According to L. Casson (1971: 274), drawing on J. Smith (1848: 83, 177–178), ancient ships could sail “no closer to the wind than seven points” (78.75° off the wind direction; one point equals 11.25°). Even if this is a conservative estimate, windward sailing, as J. Beresford (2013: 165–166) notes, was time-consuming and generally avoided, even in the later centuries of grand sailing ships.¹² The emphasis on the north wind in the consuls’ voyage and Antony’s sea passage is therefore surprising. Regarding Antony’s crossing, A.W. Lintott (1971: 491–492) was perhaps the first scholar to suggest that the change of winds in Book 5, compared to the historical source (which may not have been Caesar directly), may have been deliberate and driven by poetic purposes. Instead of the south and south-west winds, two opposing winds – north and south – are depicted, a contrast that highlights the *fortuna Caesaris*.¹³ Lintott’s reasoning seems convincing. In the case of the consuls’ crossing, which is the focus of this article, some scholars simply noted *Lucan*’s error.¹⁴ However, others gave more attention to this issue and proposed explanations.

¹¹ The same wind directions are referred to by *Plut. Ant.* 7.4: λαμπροῦ νότου κῦμα μέγα and πολλὸν ἐκπνεύσαντος λίβρα.

¹² The issue is extensively discussed; see, e.g., Holmes 1909 (ancient ships could sail upwind under certain conditions), Pryor 1988: 34–38 (no closer than 90° to the wind), Tilley 1994 (some ability to sail against the wind did not serve long upwind voyages, but rather made it possible to go to sea without oars, allowing for the construction of large cargo ships with small crews), Roberts 1995: 312 (“Although the ability to sail close to the wind was well known in the ancient Mediterranean, it would be a misconception to think that this led to the regular undertaking of long courses to windward involving much tacking.”), Palmer 2009 (while ancient sailing ships were to a degree capable of sailing into the wind in moderate conditions, this capacity considerably decreased when the wind and the sea conditions worsened), Davey 2015 (a more optimistic suggestion that ancient sailing ships could go upwind almost as effectively as the those at the end of the Age of Sail), White-wright 2011 and 2018: 39 (“[...] although the Mediterranean square sail had some ability to sail to windward in good conditions, such a capability seems highly unlikely to have facilitated continuous upwind sailing on extended voyages”), Gal, Saaroni, Cvikel 2023 (a pessimistic view of this issue: not only did ships have limited windward sailing capability, but mariners were also unwilling to undertake this task).

¹³ Lintott’s idea was picked up by Matthews 2008: *ad* 5.703-721. The direction of the winds in 5.720-4721 is defended by Pucci 1938: 66–77; Vitelli Casella 2016: 71; see also Weber 1831: 386–388.

¹⁴ Francken 1896: *ad* 2.647 and *ad* 3.1 (see also his comments *ad* 5.414 and 703); Fantham 1992: *ad* 2.647; Ussani 1903: 66.

Interpretative approaches to Boreas's appearance in 2.646

A.E. Housman (1927: *ad* 7.871), in his edition of the *Civil War*, interpreted the incorrect naming of the winds as a form of poetic *pars pro toto*. From this perspective, Boreas can refer to any wind. We may further note that the presence of Boreas in 2.646 can be justified by the fact that, firstly, south and north winds prevail in the Adriatic, and secondly, Boreas is often identified with winter in poetry (as early as in Hes. *Op.* 505-508).¹⁵ It is precisely during this season that the consuls set off to Greece. Housman's interpretation was recently revisited by P.H. Schrijvers (2010: 21).¹⁶ R. Pichon (1912: 121), on the other hand, argued that Lucan mistakenly believed the entire Illyrian-Epirot coastline to be located southeast of Brundisium. This claim is relatively easy to substantiate, given that the poem contains numerous geographical errors and misrepresentations. Pichon further suggested that Lucan's misrepresentation may have been influenced by Livy. A similar stance was taken by A. Bourgery (1928: 26), who noted that this is a particularly curious mistake – not only because it conflicts with the opening of Book 3, but also because Suetonius's biography of Lucan records the poet's voyage to Athens (Suet. *Vita Lucani* 47.9-10).¹⁷

A poetic explanation for this error was proposed by W. Ehlers and later endorsed by V. Hunink. Hunink writes that: “*Auster* is the normal wind on the Adriatic, and Lucan probably uses *Boreas* in BC 2 and 5 to suggest ‘adverse wind’ and ‘peril’”. This interpretation implies that Pompey, who sails with *Auster*, “is lucky at least in this detail.”¹⁸ Thus, Ehlers and Hunink regarded the presence of the south wind in 3.1 as a symbol of Pompey's *felicitas*.¹⁹ However, the departure of the consuls is not a particularly significant event in Lucan's poem, making it unnecessary to suggest impending doom or destruction in connection with them.

¹⁵ See, e.g., Verg. *Georg.* 2.315-318; Ov. *Trist.* 1.2.29, 3.10.9-14; Sen. *Phaed.* 935-937; *Tro.* 394-395.; Stat. *Theb.* 1.193; *Silv.* 5.1.82; Val. Fl. 2.515-517; Quint. Smyrn. 5.409-410, 8.50-52.

¹⁶ Cf. Viansino 1995: *ad* 2.646 (on different winds in 2.617, 2.645, 3.1, 5.417): “i venti hanno solo funzione di ‘abbellimento poetico’.”

¹⁷ Pichon's view is also rehearsed by Barratt 1979: *ad* 5.403-460; cf. Lintott 1971: 492, n. 1: “Lucan at first seems to have thought that the whole coast of Illyria and Epirus was south-east of Brundisium (2. 645-6) but later he was better informed (3.1).”

¹⁸ Hunink 1992: *ad* 3.1; cf. Ehlers 1978: *ad* 3.1-45 (pp. 520-521: “Der Dichter scheint sich vorzustellen, dieser beherrsche in den Wintermonaten die Adria (noch heute ist der Bora für sie charakteristisch), und er löst damit einen Affekt des Lesers aus: beim *primus boreas*, d.h. selbst bei widrigem Wind, der ja wie 5,721 umschlagen kann, müssen die Konsuln abfahren [...]. Welches Glück Pompejus hat, sollen wir auch bei seiner Landung spüren: als Sturm war Südwind hier gefährlich (6,27 f.).” Hunink also refers to remarks of Norden 1903: *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.336 (the voyage from Troy to Lycia with *Auster* instead of the expected *Aquilo*) and Williams 1960: *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 5.2 (Aeneas sails from Carthage towards Sicily, which means from south to north with *Aquilo*, the north wind, though it should be *Auster*) – details of this kind were purely conventional. Mohler (1948: 60-61), however, stands up for Virgil, seeking to prove that the poet in 5.2 made no mistake and knew about the winds blowing in this part of the Mediterranean Sea.

¹⁹ On Pompey's *felicitas*, see, e.g., Cic. *De imperio Cn. Pompei* 47.

Pichon's assertion that Lucan incorrectly located the Illyrian-Epirot coast too far south of Brundisium was refuted by E. de Saint-Denis (1935: 426–427) and later by F.H.M. van Campen (1991: *ad* 2.645ff.). Pompey's instructions to his son and the consuls are directly preceded by a depiction of Brundisium as a safe and convenient port, culminating in a description of the routes leading from there to Greece:

hinc late patet omne fretum, seu vela ferantur
in portus, Corcyra, tuos, seu laeva petatur
Illyris Ionias vergens Epidamnos in undas.
hoc fuga nautarum, cum totas Hadria vires
movit et in nubes abiere Ceraunia cumque
spumoso Calaber perfunditur aequore Sason. (Lucan. 2.622–627)

The narrator mentions two major routes: one leading to the ports of Corcyra and the other to the port of Dyrrachium, referred to by its Greek name, Epidamnos. To sail to the latter from Brundisium, one must turn to the left. This detail suggests that Lucan had a general understanding of the geography of the Greek coastline. The routes he described are confirmed by several other authors, including Strabo (6.3.8): one route leads to the Ceraunian Mountains and down to the nearby shores of Epirus and Greece (and also to Corcyra); the other, longer route goes to Epidamnos, which has “now” become a frequently used passage for the Romans (τέτριπται δὲ καὶ οὗτος) due to the city's favorable connections with the mainland and the tribes of Illyria and Macedonia.²⁰

Mapping Lucan's geography

Let us take a closer look at the lines quoted above. Lucan describes Dyrrachium/Epidamnos with the adjectival modifier “Illyrian” (*Illyris ... Epidamnos*, 2.624), aligning with the ethnic divisions of this part of the Greek coast. However, some confusion may arise from the names of aquatic areas. While the Ceraunian Mountains and the island of Sason (present-day Sazan), which form their extension, are associated with the Adriatic, Epidamnos, though located further north, is reached via the Ionian waves. The boundary between the Ionian Sea and the

²⁰ Ὁ δ' εἰς τὴν περαιῖαν ἐκ τοῦ Βρεντεσίου πλοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ Κεραῦνια καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς παραλίαν τῆς τε Ἠπείρου καὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ὁ δ' εἰς Ἐπίδαμνον μείζων τοῦ προτέρου· χιλίων γάρ ἐστι καὶ ὀκτακοσίων σταδίων· τέτριπται δὲ καὶ οὗτος διὰ τὸ τὴν πόλιν εὐφυῶς κείσθαι πρὸς τε τὰ τῶν Ἰλλυριῶν ἔθνη καὶ τὰ τῶν Μακεδόνων; cf. *Itin. Ant.* 317, 323; *Itin. Marit.* 497; *Plin. Nat.* 3.100–101: *Brundisium L M p. ab Hydrunte, in primis Italiae portu nobile ac velut certiore transitu sicuti longiore, excipiente Illyrici urbe Durrachio CCXXV M traiectu* (101). According to Morton (2001: 167–168), Strabo's passage shows that taking the shortest route when sailing between Italia and Greece was earlier a regular practice; Strabo believes that choosing a longer way now merits an explanation and cites the relevance of Epidamnos as a valid reason. The routes from Brundisium and Hydruntum to Greece are discussed in detail by Arnaud 2005: 199–203.

Adriatic ran from the city of Hydruntum (Greek Hydrus, modern Otranto, the easternmost point of Apulia) to Apollonia (Plin. *Nat.* 3.100) or to the Ceraunian Mountains (Strab. 7.5.8-9; Mela 2.54-56).²¹ This corresponds to what is known today as the Strait of Otranto. The Adriatic lies to the north of this line, while the Ionian Sea stretches to the south.

In antiquity, the waters adjacent to the Strait of Otranto, both to the north and south, were referred to by different names. The phrase *Ionias undas* in 2.624 likely does not denote the Ionian Sea in its customary understanding. Herodotus describes Apollonia as lying within the Ionian Gulf (6.127.2, 9.93.2).²² In Thucydides, Epidamnus is located on the right side when entering the Ionian Gulf (1.24.1).²³ Both Herodotus and Thucydides refer to at least the first part of the Adriatic Sea (if not the entire sea) as the Ionian Gulf. According to Strabo (7.5.8-9):

After Apollonia comes Bylliaca, and Oricum and its seaport Panormus, and the Ceraunian Mountains, where the mouth of the Ionian Gulf and the Adrias begins. Now the mouth is common to both, but the Ionian is different in that it is the name of the first part of this sea, whereas Adrias is the name of the inside part of the sea as far as the recess; at the present time, however, Adrias is also the name of the sea as a whole.²⁴

In another passage, the geographer places Apollonia on the Ionian Gulf (7, fr. 56 [57]).²⁵ When Appian mentions Pompey's crossing, he uses the form *Ἰόνιος* to denote the waters traversed (*BC* 2.49).²⁶ Cassius Dio does the same when writing that Pompey did not believe Caesar would cross the sea in winter (41.44.1).²⁷ Shortly afterward, Dio notes that the Acroceraunian Peninsula is the westernmost point of Epirus, situated near the mouth of the Ionian Gulf (41.44.3).²⁸ These are just a few of many examples.

²¹ Fantham (1992: *ad* 2.624) presents this traditional division and seems to suggest an error on Lucan's part.

²² 6.127.2: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ κόλπου τοῦ Ἰονίου Ἀμφίμνηστος Ἐπιστρόφου Ἐπιδάμνιος; οὗτος δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰονίου κόλπου; 9.93.2: μαντευομένου σφι Δημόφου τοῦ Εὐηνίου ἀνδρὸς Ἀπολλωνιῆτεω, Ἀπολλωνίης δὲ τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἰονίῳ κόλπῳ.

²³ Ἐπιδάμνός ἐστι πόλις ἐν δεξιᾷ ἐσπλέοντι ἐς τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον.

²⁴ Μετὰ δ' Ἀπολλωνίαν Βυλλιακὴ καὶ Ὠρικὸν καὶ τὸ ἐπίνειον αὐτοῦ ὁ Πάνορμος καὶ τὰ Κεραύνια ὄρη, ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ Ἰονίου κόλπου καὶ τοῦ Ἀδρίου. Τὸ μὲν οὖν στόμα κοινὸν ἀμφοῖν ἐστὶ, διαφέρει δὲ ὁ Ἰόνιος διότι τοῦ πρώτου μέρους τῆς θαλάττης ταύτης ὄνομα τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ὁ δ' Ἀδρίας τῆς ἐντὸς μέχρι τοῦ μυχοῦ, νυνὶ δὲ καὶ τῆς συμπάσης. (7.5.8-9). Cf. Strab. 2.5.20: ὁ δ' Ἰόνιος κόλπος μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ νῦν Ἀδρίου λεγομένου).

²⁵ τὸ δὲ σύμπαν μήκος ἀπὸ Ἰονίου κόλπου τοῦ κατὰ Ἀπολλωνίαν μέχρι Βυζαντίου ἐπτακισχίλιοι τριακόσιοι εἰκοσι.

²⁶ Πομπηίῳ δὲ πέντε [*sc.* legions] μὲν ἐξ Ἰταλίας, μεθ' ὧν τὸν Ἰόνιον διεπεπλεύκει.

²⁷ Πομπήιος [...] ἀλλ' ἐν γε τῷ χειμῶνι οὐχ ὑπόπτειυσεν αὐτὸν τολμήσειν τὸν Ἰόνιον διαβαλεῖν.

²⁸ Καῖσαρ [...] ἐπεραιώθη πρὸς τὰ ἄκρα τὰ Κεραύνια ὀνομασμένα: ἐστὶ δὲ ἔσχατα τῆς Ἠπείρου, πρὸς τῷ στόματι τοῦ Ἰονίου κόλπου. Pliny the Elder (*Nat.* 3.152) states that the island of Sason is situated in the Ionian Sea: *in Ionio autem mari ab Orico MM p. Sasonis, piratica statione nota* (cf. Plb. 5.110.2: καθορμισθέντες εἰς τὴν νῆσον, ἣ καλεῖται μὲν Σάσων, κείται δὲ κατὰ τὴν εἰσβολὴν τὴν εἰς τὸν Ἰόνιον πόρον).

Thus, Lucan's phrase *Ionias undas* in 2.624 likely refers to the first part of the Adriatic Sea, north of the Strait of Otranto. Similarly, the phrase *omnis in Ionios spectabat nauita fluctus* in 3.3 should be understood in the same way. When a storm arises and the sea rages, Lucan refers to *Hadria* (2.625), a term encompassing the entire basin.

Another riddle in Lucan's passage arises from the description of the (masculine-gendered) island of Sason as "Calabrian" (*Calaber*). Lines 5.650-653, detailing Caesar's struggle with the storm, indicate that Lucan was well aware of the island's location just off the Greek coast: *non humilem Sasona vadis [non litora curuae / Leucadiae saxosa pavent] oraeque malignos / Ambraciae portus, scopulosa Ceraunia nautae / summa timent*.²⁹ The islands of Sason and Leucadia (assuming L. Håkanson's (1976: 41–42) correction is accepted; the manuscripts contain *Thessaliae*, while Housman (1927: *ad loc.*), following F. Guetus and R. Bentley, deleted line 651 entirely) flank the entirety of Greece's western coastline "from-to," encompassing Ambracia and the Ceraunian Mountains. The sites are organized in an ABBA sequence, with A as the north end and B as the south end: Sason (A) – Leucadia (B) – Ambracia (B') – Ceraunia (A'). According to Strabo (6.3.5), moreover, Sason marked the midpoint of the route from Epirus (likely Dyrrachium) to Brundisium, via the Calabrian Hydruntum, allowing sailors to minimize the voyage across open sea. Strabo writes that while sailing to Italy, one would pass along the coast with Sason to the left, cross to Hydruntum via the Strait of Otranto, and continue to Brundisium with a favorable wind³⁰ – a south wind, which aided voyages from Brundisium to Barium (modern Bari; Strab. 6.3.8). The modifier *Calaber* in Book 2 can simply suggest that the island is situated opposite Calabria. After passing it, the sailors headed toward the Italian, Calabrian coast.³¹

²⁹ On the masculine gender of this island and the adjective *Calaber*, see first of all Trevaskis 1951–1952: 15–16 and van Campen 1991: *ad* 2.625ff.

³⁰ ἐκ δὲ τῶν Λευκῶν εἰς Ὑδροῦντα πολίχνην ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα· ἐντεῦθεν δ' εἰς Βρεντέσιον τετρακόσιοι· οἱ δ' ἴσοι καὶ εἰς Σάσωνα τὴν νῆσον, ἣτις μέση πῶς ἴδρυται τοῦ διάρματος τοῦ ἐκ τῆς Ἠπείρου πρὸς τὸ Βρεντέσιον· διόπερ οἱ μὴ δυνάμενοι κρατεῖν τῆς εὐθυπλοίας καταίρουσιν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ ἐκ τοῦ Σάσωνος πρὸς τὸν Ὑδροῦντα, ἐντεῦθεν δὲ τηρήσαντες φορὸν πνεῦμα προσέχουσι τοῖς μὲν Βρεντεσίωνων λιμέσιν... Even though Strabo does not specify what place was the starting point, it can be safely presumed that he means travelling from the north, from Dyrrachium. Sason is situated more to the north than Hydruntum, and when sailing from the south, one should steer off the shore towards Hydruntum earlier, before reaching the Acroceraunian Peninsula and the island. Cf. *Itin. Marit.* 489: *a Sasonis insula traiectus Hydrunto provinciae Calabriae stadia cccc*. See also Radt 2007: 213; Roller 2018: 326. According to van Campen (1991: *ad* 2.625ff.), the adjective *Calaber* stems from the fact that the ancients placed the island farther from the shore than it actually is (he also mentions Pliny). The accusation that Strabo incorrectly places this island in his description (also, e.g., Bernstein 2022: *ad* 9.468–9) seems to be unfounded when we consider sailing along the coast to the Ceraunian Mountains and the crossing of the Strait of Otranto.

³¹ According to Graves (1957: 63, n. 1), the adjective "Calabrian" was used because the islet was used by Calabrian pirates as a base (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 3.152, quoted above). In *Commenta Bernensia* and in *Adnotationes super Lucanum*, the name Sason in 2.627 is interpreted either as a town (port) in Calabria or as a Calabrian peak (cf. Trevaskis 1951–1952: 15–16).

Except for the puzzling adjective *Calaber*, the geography in 2.622-627 is entirely accurate. Lucan appears to have understood that Boreas would not direct the sailors straight to Dyrrachium, which lies north of Brundisium. If we dismiss the notion that Boreas represents any wind, the consuls in the poem sail south. De Saint-Denis (1935: 426-427) and van Campen (1991: *ad* 2.645ff.) suggested that the consuls' route mirrored Strabo's description in 6.3.5 but in reverse. Thus, the consuls likely first sailed southward along the Italian coast with the north wind. After reaching Hydruntum, they crossed to the opposite shore, arriving at the Acroceraunian Peninsula and the island of Sason, and then sailed along the coast to Dyrrachium. Pompey may have directed them through the Strait of Otranto to avoid exposing soldiers, civilians, senators, their wives, and children to the stormy open sea in winter. A coastal route was also safer, as Pompey had gathered all ships from the region and controlled Italian waters, while Caesar was still on route to Brundisium. The consuls could sail close to the coast without risking being chased or attacked.³²

An alternative interpretation of Boreas's appearance in 2.646

It seems that the explanation for the north wind in line 2.646, proposed by de Saint-Denis and van Campen, resolves all the issues. However, another explanation is possible, one that does not depend on information external to Lucan's text regarding the consuls' crossing. The key may lie in the letters of Cicero, briefly mentioned earlier. In his letter, Cicero quotes another letter he received from Capua, stating that Clodia informed her son-in-law, the plebeian tribune L. Metellus, that she had reportedly crossed to Greece with Pompey, the entire army (30,000 people), the consuls, the plebeian tribunes, the senators, and their wives and children. The ships that had to be left behind were burned:

Scripta iam epistula Capua litterae sunt adlatae hoc a exemplo: 'Pompeius mare transiit cum omnibus militibus quos secum habuit. hic numerus est hominum milia triginta et consules duo et tribuni pl. et senatores qui fuerunt cum eo omnes cum uxoribus et liberis. conscendisse dicitur a. d. IIII Non. Mart. [sc. 4 March] ex ea die fuere septemtriones venti. navis quibus usus non est omnis aut praecidisse aut incendisse dicunt. de hac re litterae L. Metello tribuno pl. Capuam adlatae sunt a Clodia socru, quae ipsa transit.' (Cic. *Att.* 9.6.3)

Some of the content in this letter does not correspond to the facts. Above all, Pompey himself, along with part of his troops, remained at Brundisium.³³ Cice-

³² Interestingly, Cicero observes that (before Pompey's cracked-down on the pirates) the troops would cross the sea in winter, as it was safer at the time (*De imperio Cn. Pompei* 31); cf. Plin. *Nat.* 2.125: *piratae primum coegere mortis periculo in mortem ruere et hiberna experiri maria; nunc idem avaritia cogit.*

³³ Cicero gives wrong information on Pompey's departure in several letters to Atticus: 9.6.3, 11.3, 13a.1, 14.3; the real date appears in letter 9.15.6: *Pompeium Brundisio a. d. XVI K. Aprilis cum omnibus copiis quas habuerit profectum esse.*

ro corrects certain pieces of information in a letter to his friend dated March 17 (*Att.* 9.9). Atticus seems to have doubted various details, as can be inferred from Cicero's response:

recte non credis de numero militum; ipso dimidio plus scripsit Clodia. falsum etiam de corruptis navibus. [...] de septemtrione plane ita est; metuo ne vexetur Epirus. sed quem tu locum Graeciae non direptum iri putas? praedicat [*sc.* Pompey] enim palam et militibus ostendit se largitione ipsa superiorem quam hunc [*sc.* Caesar] fore. (*Cic. Att.* 9.9.2)

Pompey's sea-passage is no longer mentioned. Atticus was right to question the earlier report regarding both the size of the army and the burning of ships. The wind issue resurfaces, with Cicero not correcting this detail, but rather reaffirming it: *de septemtrione plane ita est*. He also expresses concern about Epirus: *metuo ne vexetur Epirus*, likely referring not to Dyrrachium itself but to Atticus's property near Buthrotum (modern Butrint), opposite Corcyra.³⁴ The mention of the wind and, presumably, their past experiences lead Cicero and Atticus to worry that those departing from Brundisium might be headed toward Corcyra.³⁵ Notably, as discussed earlier, Strabo mentions that in his day, sailors typically sailed directly to Dyrrachium (using the south wind).

Cicero was familiar with these regions. In 58 BCE, when he was exiled, he crossed the sea from Brundisium to Dyrrachium, where he took the Via Egnatia to Thessalonica, only to return to Dyrrachium later that same year (*Att.* 3.22.4) and eventually back to Italia in August 57 BCE (by the Roman civil calendar; *Att.* 4.1.4). Cicero also sailed to and from Brundisium via Corcyra during his journey to the province of Cilicia and back. He recounts the route in detail: beginning in Brundisium, where he awaited favorable conditions for the sea passage (*cursum expectabamus*, *Att.* 5.8.1), he traveled through Corcyra and Sybota, eventually reaching Actium. From there, he journeyed overland to Athens, before continuing further eastward toward Asia (*Att.* 5.8-12).³⁶ On his return journey, Cicero sailed from Athens to Corcyra, departing from the port of Cassiope and heading to Hydruntum, finally arriving back in Brundisium³⁷. In a letter to Tiro recounting the leg of the voyage from Corcyra, which took place in December (the autumn of the solar calendar), Cicero references the wind under which he and his brother sailed. After spending a few days in Cassiope, waiting for favorable weather (*ibi retenti ventis sumus*), they set sail with the mild Auster (*austro lenissimo, caelo*

³⁴ Shackleton Bailey 1968: 373: "The Pompeians would be carried up coast in the direction of Atticus' property." Indeed, Pompey's fleet was actually stationed on the island later (*Caes. Civ.* 3.7.1).

³⁵ On the role of Corcyra in sailing between Greece and Italy, see Morton 2001: 171-172; Deniaux 2001: 98-99.

³⁶ See *Att.* 5.8, 9, 10, 12.

³⁷ See, in particular, *Att.* 6.7.2 and letters from the Cicero brothers to Tiro, who fell ill and had to remain in Patrae (*Fam.* 16, letters 1-7 and 9.1-2).

sereno), which carried them to Hydruntum. From there, they reached Brundisium the following day (*Fam.* 16.9.1-2). This is the opposite wind to that with which the consuls are to sail from Brundisium in Lucan's *Civil War*.

Since no other surviving records document the specific wind conditions during the consuls' departure, it is tempting to suggest that Lucan might have been inspired by Cicero's letters to Atticus (9.6 and 9.9) when he mentions *primus Boreas* in the *Civil War*. However, even if Lucan did not directly rely on Cicero's writings, they provide a valuable reminder against presuming that the consuls from the poem were necessarily sailing to Dyrrachium. These letters offer a glimpse into how Neronian readers might have interpreted Lucan's passage. Let us now take a closer look at lines 645-648 of the *Civil War*. Lucan omits several crucial details, suggesting that he deliberately alters the historical narrative. First, he omits any mention of the army or civilians, presenting the consuls as departing alone. This raises another issue: according to other sources, the consuls were sent ahead with soldiers (and, according to Cicero, with civilians) because there were not enough ships for a single crossing. In Lucan's account, their voyage is no longer tied to military movements in Brundisium; instead, their task is to gather reinforcements. Finally, Lucan never directly names Dyrrachium, referring only to Epirus (as Cicero does), a term that may or may not designate this specific city. Notably, in line 2.624, Lucan describes Epidamnus as an Illyrian city.

Scholars who discuss the consuls' passage to Dyrrachium with the troops in the poem draw on extratextual sources and seek to reconcile them with the remark about *primus Boreas*.³⁸ It is possible to assume that Pompey's words to the officials represent only part of the orders, and Lucan intentionally omits well-known information, bypassing the primary and most substantial task assigned to them at that moment, and instead focusing on what is more significant to the meaning of the whole episode. The orders would then concern only their mission upon arrival in Dyrrachium. In all probability, the consuls transported the troops and then proceeded to levy reinforcements (when writing about the army that Pompey gathered after crossing the sea, Caesar mentions two legions from Asia, recruited by consul Lentulus, *Civ.* 3.4.5). However, it seems methodologically preferable to remain within the text.

In 2.646, the adjective *primus* undoubtedly underscores speed, as the consuls are to set sail as soon as the conditions are favorable to their departure.³⁹ If they

³⁸ E.g. Fantham 1992: 22: "Lucan plays down the size of the main force leaving with the consuls, simply appending Pompey's instructions to them to the far more grandiose instructions to his son Gnaeus to rouse the oriental allies in his support (Lucan 2.632-44 and 645-8, probably the poet's invention)"; *ad* 2.610ff.: "[...] Pompey's instructions to his elder son Gnaeus [...] and to the consuls to cross to Epirus with half his force and raise troops. They embark for Greece"; and *ad* 2.648f.: "This line marks the departure of the main body of Pompey's force [...]. He himself remained with some twenty cohorts [...]."

³⁹ Pace Ehlers 1978: *ad* 3.1-45: "[...] beim *primus boreas*, d.h. selbst bei widrigem Wind, der ja wie 5,721 umschlagen kann, müssen die Konsuln abfahren."

were to go to Dyrrachium, they would not have to wait. Certainly, *Boreas* can be construed as having a purely poetic function at this point and standing for any opportune wind, with the central meaning conveyed by the adjective itself. However, since Pompey's speech is directly preceded by the depiction of the sea routes from Brundisium to Epidamnus to the left and in the direction of Corcyra, we can reasonably assume that the Roman reader would interpret the north wind as a course towards Corcyra (across the Strait of Otranto), as Cicero and Atticus did. Like Cicero and Atticus, Lucan's readers had probably voyaged from Brundisium to Greece. Familiar with sources such as Caesar, Livy, or Asinius Polio, and aware that the consuls had transported troops to Dyrrachium, such readers might interpret the north wind in the text as a deliberate manipulation, whose purpose requires interpretation.

Of course, there still remains the possibility that the consuls were heading to Dyrrachium via the Strait of Otranto, as proposed by de Saint-Denis, especially since this route was safer. However, minimizing the risk is not a pressing concern in the *Civil War*, since the consuls are set to sail alone. Moreover, in addition to the routes listed in the depiction of Brundisium, the direction of the wind, the absence of Dyrrachium, and the mention of Epirus alone in the order, which refers solely to the acquisition of military reinforcements, there is another clue pointing towards Corcyra. In his command, Pompey mentions Greece first, and then Macedonia. From Corcyra, one would sail into the Gulf of Corinth, from where one could, as Cicero did, proceed to what later became (post-27 BC) the province of Achaia (including regions such as the Peloponnese, Attica, Boeotia, Euboea, and part of Epirus), and from there further into Macedonia (which, after 27 BCE, as a province, also included Thessaly, parts of Illyria, Pannonia, and Thrace).

The imagined route taken by the consuls can be visualized based on journeys portrayed by Livy in his narrative of the Macedonian wars. In 169 BCE, consul Q. Marcius Philippus and praetor C. Marcius Figulus departed from Brundisium, arrived in Corcyra on the second day, and reached Actium one day later. From Actium, the consul sailed to Ambracia and then made his way to Thessaly overland, while the praetor sailed by Cape Leucate into the Gulf of Corinth, disembarked at the Boeotian port of Creusa, and then traversed Boeotia (which took one day if one traveled light) to Chalcis, where the fleet was stationed (44.1.1-3). In 167 BCE, L. Aemilius Paullus, the victor of Pydna, related his quick triumph to the people, also briefly recalling his journey from Brundisium to Macedonia. He set out at sunrise and reached Corcyra at nine. Five days later, he arrived in Delphi, and it took him another five days to reach the camp in Macedonia (45.41.3-4). Livy also describes journeys in the reverse direction. In 191 BCE, consul Acilius dispatched Marcus Cato to Rome with news of the recapture of Euboea. Cato departed from the Boeotian port of Creusa (the same port at which praetor C. Marcius Figulus arrived), sailed to Patrae and further along the coasts of Aetolia and Acarnania to Corcyra, whence he crossed the sea to Hydruntum. Whether the voyage continued up to Brundisium is not reported, but it is very likely, given that the port was connected to Rome through the Via Appia (36.21.4-5).

Argument and conclusion

In Lucan's version of events, the historical record yields to poetic design: the reader of the *Civil War* is led to envision Pompey remaining in Brundisium with his entire army and likely with the civilians as well. Lucan, of course, does not state this explicitly. Instead, he reshapes the role of the consuls, casting them as envoys sent to gather reinforcements. This maneuver allows readers to imagine Pompey, his troops, and fleeing civilians all boarding ships under cover of night. When Pompey departs "into exile," he is still described as great (an allusion, no doubt, to his epithet *Magnus*) because of the peoples accompanying him (*adhuc ingens populis comitantibus exul*, 2.730). The phrase *populis comitantibus* is far from univocal. It is typically read in connection with Pompey's charge to his son Gnaeus and the consuls to summon the peoples of the East, Greece, and Macedonia to the war effort.⁴⁰ All these peoples will later become Caesar's spoils after Pharsalus (3.296-297). Yet the same phrase may also resonate with the earlier exodus from Rome depicted in Book 1 (1.486-522); *populi* may equally refer to Romans, those who, in panic at Caesar's approach, abandoned a city still standing and intact.⁴¹ In this light, the sea crossing acquires an added metaphorical dimension. Pompey is recast as a commander and an epic hero – or, rather, an anti-hero – leading his people toward ruin.

Dispatching the consuls in another direction is thus pivotal to Lucan's poetic agenda and his widely discussed intertextual engagement with Virgil's *Aeneid*, a topic extensively debated among scholars.⁴² In Virgil's epic, Aeneas departs from the ruined Troy in search of his ancestral land, moving westward until he finally reaches Italy. There, after a victorious conflict with the inhabitants of Latium led by Turnus, he lays the foundations for what will become Rome. Yet the ultimate destination of Aeneas's journey is not merely Latium, but the future greatness of Rome itself – culminating in a new Golden Age under Augustus, Aeneas's descendant. Lucan's *Pharsalia*, by contrast, presents a grim inversion. After the outbreak of civil war, Pompey abandons Rome and sails eastward from

⁴⁰ Cf. Lucan. 8.208-209: *terrarum dominos et sceptrā Eoa tenentis / exul habet comites*.

⁴¹ Depicting the flight of citizens from Rome in Book 1, Lucan invokes the topos of the ship of state (1.498-504). In its traditional, positive sense, this image evokes the heroic endurance of a crew struggling to keep a sinking vessel afloat amid chaos. In the *Civil War*, however, the metaphor acquires a negative valence: the ship remains seaworthy, yet its passengers, including the helmsman, abandon it, rendering themselves shipwrecks. In Book 2, Brundisium, a secure harbor for sailors during Greek coastal storms, figures as Rome; the literal ships become the means by which the metaphorical ship of state is forsaken. In the last lines of Book 2, Pompey's corpse is cast ashore on the sands of the Nile, appearing as a shipwrecked figure – a castaway of civil war.

⁴² On Lucan's intertextual engagement with Vergil's *Aeneid*, see, e.g., Barnes 1995: 268–272, Rossi 2000 (Lucan. 2.728-730. 574-575); Narducci 2002: 75–87 (*L'“anti-Virgilio”*. *Allusione e ideologia*), 281–286 (*Pompeo ed Enea*; ll. 2.728-730, 283-285), Roux 2008; Casali 2011: 81–109.

Italy, seeking the place of his own destruction (*quaeritur indignae sedes longinqua ruinae*, 2.731). His downfall also marks the collapse of the Senate's power, as it had aligned itself with him. His defeat by Caesar, his flight from the battlefield of Pharsalus, and ultimately his death on the sands of the Nile signify the end of the Roman Republic, the collapse of Roman might, and, above all, the loss of liberty under Caesar's successors. Pompey's journey thus mirrors that of Aeneas – but in reverse.

The conclusion of Book 2 is crucial in this context, as it draws an explicit yet ambivalent parallel between Pompey and Aeneas, most notably in the narrator's apostrophe to Pompey (2.728-730), which strikingly recalls Aeneas's departure from Troy in *Aeneid* 3.10-12:

litora cum patriae lacrimans portusque relinquo
et campos ubi Troia fuit. feror exsul in altum
cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis.
(Verg. *Aen.* 3.10-12)

cum coniuge pulsus
et natis totosque trahens in bella penates
vadis adhuc ingens populis comitantibus exul.
(Lucan. 2.728-730)⁴³

The altered role of the consuls sharpens this parallel. Aeneas departs from a ruined homeland, sailing with the Penates, his child, and his surviving countrymen toward Latium, a destination still distant and unknown to him. Pompey flees from Rome and from Brundisium – cities still intact and unconquered – taking with him his army, his sons, his wife, and his own Penates, which – thanks to the Virgilian intertext – become Rome's Penates as well (the use of the adjective *totos* with *Penates* is deliberate). When the entire army and a group of civilians flee alongside Pompey – while the consuls, as suggested by lines 2.645-648, appear to sail alone toward Corcyra – readers would naturally imagine Pompey's wife and his younger son joining him aboard his ship, even though Lucan does not state this explicitly, merely using the form *natis* to refer to both of Pompey's sons, Gnaeus and Sextus, who will also sail from Italy to Greece. Of course, Creusa did not sail with Aeneas, but Ascanius (~ Sextus) was indeed a central figure. If Lucan had retained the episode of the consuls crossing the sea with the army, Cornelia and Sextus would likely have traveled with them, alongside other civilians (*cf.* Hadas 1930: 29–30). It seems highly improbable that Pompey would place his beloved wife at such grave risk during Caesar's blockade of Brundisium. In Book 5, he sends her away to Lesbos from the camp as soon as Caesar and Antony approach Epirus, before any fighting occurs.

No details are provided regarding where or with which wind Gnaeus is supposed to sail. It was probably apparent to readers of the poem that Gnaeus should

⁴³ Fantham (1992: *ad loc.*) also observes that ll. 2.719-725 allude to *Aen.* 2.801-802 and 3.521.

set out to Dyrrachium, given that the narrator distinctly outlined two routes, with the consuls heading south. Gnaeus does not need to wait for the north wind, so Lucan's readers might also assume the south wind is blowing. Moreover, he is tasked with mobilizing the peoples accessible along the Via Egnatia, such as those in the Bosporan Kingdom, along the shores of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, and in Armenia.⁴⁴ Dyrrachium as Gnaeus' destination neither disrupts nor undermines the poem's intended meaning. Unlike the consuls' crossing, his mission is not directly intertwined with his father's departure from Brundisium. Nevertheless, by entrusting the elder son with a mission to fulfill, the poet clearly signals that Pompey is accompanied by only one son, the younger Sextus (who, incidentally, will play a significant future role as a fierce adversary of the Second Triumvirate). This also reinforces the analogy between Pompey and Aeneas, who sailed with Ascanius.

In sum, Lucan clearly distorts history in lines 2.645-648, alters the role of the consuls, and sends them to a different shore alone, without their soldiers or civilians. This alteration serves to keep Pompey in Brundisium with his entire army, suggesting that they all cross the sea together with the civilians who had fled Rome. Lucan employs this narrative strategy primarily for poetic purposes, specifically to establish both the parallel and the contrast between Pompey and Aeneas, thereby transforming the former into both a hero and an anti-hero who leads his family, his people, and other nations to ruin.

Bibliography

- Appian. (1912). *Roman History*. Vol. II. B. McGing (ed. and trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Appian. (1913). *Roman History*. Vol. III: *The Civil War*. Trans. H. White. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Arnaud, P. (2005). *Les routes de la navigation antique. Itinéraires en Méditerranée*. Paris: Editions Errance.
- Barnes, W.R. (1995). *Virgil: The Literary Impact*. In: N. Horsfall (ed.). *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Leiden–New York–Köln: Brill. 257-292. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004217591_008
- Barratt, P. (1979). *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis liber V: A Commentary*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Bentley, R. (1760). *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia cum notis Hugonis Grotii, et Richardi Bentleii*. [Twickenham]: Strawberry-Hill.
- Beresford, J. (2013). *The Ancient Sailing Season*. Leiden–Boston: Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004241947>
- Bernstein, N.W. (2022). *Silius Italicus: Punica*. Book 9. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁴⁴ Cf. also Saint Paul's first journey to Greece from Troas: Troas, Samothrace, Neapolis, Philippi, Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, Beroea, Athens, Corinth (Acts, 16:11-18:1). Part of the journey – from Philippi to Thessalonica – led through the Via Egnatia. See McDonald 1940 and Davies 1963.

- Bourgery, A. (1928). La géographie dans Lucain. *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 54. 25–40.
- Campen, F.H.M. van. (1991). *M. Annaei Lucani de bello civili liber II. Een commentaar*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- Casali, S. (2011). *The Bellum Civile as an Anti-Aeneid*. In: P. Asso (ed.). *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. Leiden–Boston: Brill. 81–109. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004217096_006
- Casson, L. (1971). *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- D'Urso, V. (2022). Lucano. *La guerra civile o Pharsalia*. Saggio introduttivo a c. di P. Esposito, nuova traduzione a c. di N. Lanzarone, commento a c. di V. D'Urso. Santarcangelo di Romagna: Rusconi Libri.
- Davey, Ch.J. (2015). Sailing to Windward in Roman Times: The Spritsail Legacy. *Buried History* 51. 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.62614/xh6m5m02>
- Davies, P.E. (1963). The Macedonian Scene of Paul's Journeys. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 26. 91–106. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3210998>
- Deniaux, E. (2001). *La traversée de l'Adriatique à la fin de la République: dangers de la mer et affrontements politiques*. In: C. Zaccharia (ed.). *Strutture portuali e rotte marittime nell'Adriatico di età romana*. Trieste–Roma: Centro di antichità altoadriatiche / École française de Rome. 89–100.
- Dio Cassius. (1916). *Roman History*. Vol. IV: Books 41–45. Trans. E. Cary, H.B. Foster. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ehlers, W. (1978). Lucanus. *Bellum civile. Der Bürgerkrieg*. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von W. Ehlers. 2. Auflage. München: Heimeran Verlag.
- Francken, C.M. (1896). *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*. Cum commentario critico edidit C.M. Francken. Vol. I. continens libros I–V. Lugduni Batavorum: Apud A.W. Sijthoff.
- Frère, H. (1910). Recherches sur les sources historiques de la Pharsale. Le siège de Brindes. *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 30. 15–191.
- Gal, D., Saaroni, H., Cvikel, D. (2023). Windward Sailing in Antiquity: The Elephant in the Room. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 52/1. 179–194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572414.2023.2186688>
- Graves, R. trans. (1957). *Lucan. Pharsalia: Dramatic Episodes of the Civil Wars*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Hadas, M. (1930). *Sextus Pompey*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Håkanson, L. (1979). Problems of Textual Criticism and Interpretation in Lucan's De Bello Civili. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 205. 26–51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0068673500004107>
- Hammond, N.G.L. (1967). *Epirus. The Geography, the Ancient Remains, the History and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Holmes, R.T. (1909). Could Ancient Ships Work to Windward? *The Classical Quarterly* 3/1. 26–39. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838800018115>
- Housman, A.E. (1927). *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis libri decem editorum in usum*. Oxonii: apud Basilium Blackwell.
- Hunink, V. (1992). *M. Annaeus Lucanus. Bellum Civile*. Book III: *A Commentary*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- Kaerst, J. (1905). “Epeiros”. In: G. Wissowa (ed.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. 5/2. 2118–2731.
- Leach, J. (1978). *Pompey the Great*. London-Totowa (N.J.): Croom Helm and Rowman and Littlefield.
- Lintott, A.W. (1971). Lucan and the History of the Civil War. *The Classical Quarterly* 21/2. 488–505. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880003367X>

- Longhurst, I. (2016). Caesar's Crossing of the Adriatic Countered by a Winter Blockade During the Roman Civil War. *The Mariner's Mirror* 102. 132–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.2015.1054681>
- Lucan. (1992). *De bello civili*. Book II. E. Fantham (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, M. (2008). *Caesar and the Storm: A Commentary on Lucan, De Bello Civili, Book 5 lines 476–721*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.
- McDonald, W.A. (1940). Archaeology and St. Paul's Journeys in Greek Lands. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 3. 18–24. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3209217>
- Mohler, S.L. (1948). Sails and Oars in the Aeneid. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 79. 46–62. <https://doi.org/10.2307/283352>
- Morton, J. (2001). *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring*. Leiden–Boston–Köln: Brill.
- Narducci, E. (2002). *Lucano: un'epica contro l'impero: interpretazione della "Pharsalia"*. Roma-Bari: GLF editori Laterza.
- Ovid. (1924). *Tristia. Ex Ponto*. Trans. A.L. Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Palmer, C. (2009). Windward Sailing Capabilities of Ancient Vessels. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 38/2. 414–430. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-9270.2008.00208.x>
- Pichon, R. (1912). *Les sources de Lucain*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Pliny. (1942). *Natural History*. Vol. II: Books 3–7. Trans. H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Plutarch. (1917). *Lives*. Vol. V: *Agesilaus and Pompey. Pelopidas and Marcellus*. Trans. B. Perrin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Plutarch. (1919). *Lives*. Vol. VII: *Demosthenes and Cicero. Alexander and Caesar*. Trans. B. Perrin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pryor, J.H. (1988). *Geography, Technology, and War: Studies in the Maritime History of the Mediterranean, 649–1571*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press.
- Pucci, S. (1938). *La geografia di Lucano*. Palermo: Trimarchi.
- Radt, S. (2007). *Strabons Geographika. Band 6. Buch V–VIII: Kommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ramsey, J.T., Raaflaub, K.A. (2017). Chronological Tables for Caesar's Wars (58–45 BCE). *Histos* 11. 162–217. <https://doi.org/10.29173/histos369>
- Rawson, E. (1994). *Caesar: Civil War and Dictatorship*. In: J.A. Crook, A. Lintott, E. Rawson (eds.). *Cambridge Ancient History*. 2nd Edition. Vol. 9: *The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146–143 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 424–467. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9781139054379.014>
- Roberts, O.T.P. (1995). An Explanation of Ancient Windward Sailing – Some Other Considerations. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 24/4. 307–315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-9270.1995.tb00744.x>
- Roller, D.W. (2018). *A Historical and Topographical Guide to the Geography of Strabo*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rossi, A. (2000). The Aeneid Revisited: The Journey of Pompey in Lucan's Pharsalia. *American Journal of Philology* 120. 571–591. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ajp.2000.0057>
- Roux, N. (2008). The Vergilian Tradition in Lucan's Representation of Italy. *Vergilius* 54. 37–48.
- Saint-Denis, E. de (1935). *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine*. Paris: C. Klincksieck.
- Schrijvers, P.H. (2010). *L'espace géographique dans le récit lucanien. Lucain et Ératosthène de Cyrène*. In: O. Devillers, S. Franchet d'Espèrey (eds.). *Lucain en Débat: Rhétorique, Poétique et Histoire*. Paris: Ausonius Éditions. <https://books.openedition.org/ausonius/3195> [24.11.2024].
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1968). *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*. Vol. IV. 49 B.C., 133–210 (Books VII.10–X). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Smith, J. (1848). *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul: With Dissertations on the Sources of the Writings of St. Luke, and the Ships and Navigation of the Antients*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans.
- Strabo. (1924). *Geography*. Books 6–7. Trans. by H.L. Jones. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tilley, A. (1994). Sailing to Windward in the Ancient Mediterranean. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 23/4. 309–331. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-9270.1994.tb00476.x>
- Trevaskis, J.R. (1951–1952). A Masculine Island in Lucan. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 181. 15–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0068673500002558>
- Ussani, V. (1903). *Sul valore storico del poema lucaneo*. Roma: Ermanno Loescher & C.
- Vanderspoel, J. (2010). *Provincia Macedonia*. In: J. Roisman, I. Worthington (eds.). *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*. Malden (Mass.)–Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 251–275. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444327519.ch13>
- Vergilius, P. Maro. (1903). *Aeneis*. Buch VI. E. Norden (ed.). Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Viansino, G., (1995). *Marco Anneo Lucano. La guerra civile (Farsaglia)*. Libri I–V. Testo critico, traduzione e commento. Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori Editore.
- Virgil. (1916). *Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid*: Books 1–6. Trans. H.R. Fairclough. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vitelli Casella, M. (2016). *Gli eventi bellici della costa orientale dell'Adriatico nell'opera di Lucano*. In: F. Galtier, R. Poignault (eds.). *Présence de Lucain*. Clermont-Ferrand: Centre de Recherches A. Piganiol – Présence de l'Antiquité. 55–82.
- Weber, M.C. (1831). *De spuris et male suspectis Lucani versibus*. In: M.C. Weber (ed.). *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia, cum notis selectis H. Grotii, integris et adauctis R. Bentleii [...]*. Vol. II: *Continens Pharsaliae lib. IV–X et dissertationem*. Lipsiae: apud Gerhardum Fleischer. 373–644.
- Whitewright, J. (2011). The Potential Performance of Ancient Mediterranean Sailing Rigs. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 40/1. 2–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-9270.2010.00276.x>
- Whitewright, J. (2018). Sailing and Sailing Rigs in the Ancient Mediterranean: Implications of Continuity, Variation and Change in Propulsion Technology. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 47/1. 28–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1095-9270.12278>
- Wilkes, J. (1992). *The Illyrians*. Oxford–Cambridge (Mass.): Blackwell.
- Williams, R.D. (1960). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus*. Edited with a Commentary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dr Mariusz Plago is a classical philologist and assistant professor at the Institute of Classical, Mediterranean, and Oriental Studies of the University of Wrocław. His research focuses on Roman epic poetry from the Augustan period and the Imperial era. He is also engaged in studying Neo-Latin literature, with a particular emphasis on the Renaissance and Baroque periods. He is the co-author of *Maf-feo Vegio i jego Antoniada* (with Dr Elżbieta Górka, Warszawa, 2024) and the co-editor of *Ars Recusandi. Odmowa jako zabieg literacki w tekstach greckich i łacińskich od starożytności do końca XVIII wieku* (with Dr Ałła Brzozowska, Warszawa, 2022).

e-mail: mariusz.plago@uwr.edu.pl

