The poet says that long life, though one of the things men pray for, may bring many woes. He gives the instance of Priam. Had he died before Troy fell to the Greeks, he would have had a splendid funeral, with his sons as pall-bearers and his daughters leading the laments. The *ut*-clause in the fourth line quoted is taken by Duff as defining and amplifying *Iliadum lacrimas*—‘amid the tears of the Trojan women, that is to say, Cassandra and Polyxena would have begun etc.’ (my translation). But he adds, ‘Yet there is some awkwardness here, as this detail ought to be exactly parallel with *Hectore funus portante*: and it is possible that *ut* may be “when”, as the subjunctive is required by the conditional form of the whole sentence.’ I do not think this latter is likely. But surely the clause is a loose consecutive one, without antecedent to *ut*—‘so that C. and P. would have begun?’ These are common enough in Latin (e.g. *mons altissimus impendebat, ut perpauci prohibere possent*, Caes. B.G. I. 6) though our teaching habits usually emphasize the other type. So Hardy takes it ‘so that C. might have begun’.

But the ‘awkwardness’, i.e. lack of balance, to which Duff refers, could, it seems to me, be rectified by the simple expedient of reading *et* for *ut*. Had Troy not fallen Priam would have joined his ancestors with his sons as pall-bearers *and* his daughters would have led the laments. I suspect that Juvenal had some such scheme of sentence in mind, but that the introduction of the detail *inter Iliadum lacrimas* in the first part put it out of court, as *Iliadum* must of course include Cassandra and Polyxena. As the sentence stands, *ut* is more in Juvenal’s manner; cf. V 1-2 where *ut . . . putes* might have been *et . . . putas* as far as the sense is concerned. One might add that, without the *ut*, *Iliadum* might perhaps be taken to mean ‘Trojans’ (men or women), but there seems no parallel for this masculine use in the plural.

The poet has just said that every mother prays for beauty for her boys and still more for her girls. But Lucretia (by her fate, cf. Livy I 57) forbids us to wish for beauty like hers, and Virginia (Livy III 44ff.) would have been glad to
take the hump of Rutila (a hunchback) and give Rutila her — ? beauty, says Duff reading suum and understanding fæciunt from 293. But suum is the reading of much the best of the MSS., P, and this Bücheler retains, understanding gibbon, which seems right, but in the sense of papillas, breasts, which, as Duff says, seems impossible. Surely suum is the right reading and the hump referred to is the natural one of the 'lower dorsal curve', represented nowadays by the last set of figures given in the 'statistics' of contestants in our perhaps overdone 'beauty contests'? Hardy says 'supply vultum with suum', but this is very far-fetched. Why then did the poet not write suum, as the word he had already used was feminine?
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Gaius and the Sea-shells

Views of historians on the emperor Gaius are conflicting; some writers accept that he was a dangerous lunatic, as the sources portray him, others discount a hostile tradition and try to rationalize the deeds of his principate.

One story of the emperor which has caused particular difficulty is that of his British 'expedition'. Suetonius (Gaius 46) and Xiphilinus (166, 36ff.) describe a farce, and their account is accepted by some (e.g. Bury, Students’ Roman Empire, p. 225, considers the story possible). Balsdon, in his excellent book on Gaius (p. 88ff.) gives two rationalizing alternatives. Before considering them it is necessary to quote the relevant texts.

(a) Suetonius, Gaius 46: ‘Postremo quasi perpetraturus bellum, directa acie in littore Oceanis ac ballistis machinisque depositis, nemine gnaro aut opinante quid coepturus esset, repente ut conchas legerent, galeasque et sinus replerent imperavit, spolia Oceanis vocans Capitolio Palatioque debita.’

(b) Xiphilinus 166, 36ff. (= Dio 59, 25, 1-2): ‘He came to the Ocean as with the intention of campaigning in Britain also, and after drawing up all his troops on the shore he boarded a trireme, put out to sea a little way and returned. After this he took his place on a lofty platform and, after giving his soldiers the signal as for battle, and spurring them on by trumpet, then suddenly he bade them pick up shells.’ (Balsdon’s translation)

After dismissing the views of Willrich (that Gaius was frightened to put himself at too great a distance from a hostile senate by crossing the channel) and of Gelzer (that Gaius was informed of a change in the political situation in Britain) Balsdon suggests the following alternatives:

(i) Gaius gave the command to embark, and the troops refused. The emperor flew into a typical rage, and gave the order to collect sea-shells, in order to insult the soldiers’ dignity.

(ii) The absurd narrative results from a civilian misunderstanding of a rare and technical military term ‘musculus’ (mentioned by Caesar, B. G. 2. 10, and Vegetius, 4. 16). ‘Musculi’ were a kind of sappers’ huts, used in
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