STIMULOS DEDIT AEMULA VIRTUS: LUCAN AND HOMER RECONSIDERED

C. M. C. GREEN

THE LITERARY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN Lucan and Homer is a vexed question, and, despite considerable scholarly effort, apparently not a very profitable one. Yet Lucan himself makes his ambitions as an epic poet very clear in Book 9 of the Pharsalia. In this justly famous passage, Caesar, having left the battlefield of Pharsalia and the rotting piles of corpses, interrupts his pursuit of Pompey through the east with a stop at Troy to tour the ruins:

> *Sigeasque petit famae mirator harenas*
> *et Simoentis aquas et Graio nobile busto*
> *Rhoetion et multum debentis vatibus umbras.*
> *circumit exustae nomen memorabile Troiae*
> *magnaque Phoebei quaerit vestigia muri.*
> *iam silvae steriles et putres robore trunci*
> *Assaraci pressere domos et templa deorum*
> *iam lassa radice tenent, ac tota teguntur*
> *Pergama dumetis: etiam periere ruinae.*
> *aspicit Hesiones scopulos silvaque latentis*
> *Anchisae thalamos; quo iudex sederit antro,*
> *unde puer raptus caelo, quo vertice Nais*
> *luxerit Oenone: nullum est sine nomine saxum.*
> *inscius in sicco serpentem pulvere rivum*

I would like to thank Professor M. P. O. Morford, whose deep understanding of Lucan and of the Roman world was so generously shared with me as I was writing this paper. I am also grateful to the two anonymous readers for *Phoenix* for their helpful and perceptive comments. My greatest debt, however, is to Professor Jane Wilson Joyce, who introduced me to Lucan, and whose insights into Lucan's poetry first stimulated the thoughts that led to this paper.

Below is a list of scholarly works referred to frequently in the notes, and so cited there only by the author's last name: F. M. Ahl, *Lucan: An Introduction* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1976); M. von Albrecht, "Der Dichter Lucan und die epische Tradition," in M. Durry, *Lucain: Sept exposés* (Geneva 1970, Fondation Hardt Entretiens 15) 269–308; G.-B. Conte, "Il proemio della Pharsalia," *Maia* NS 18 (1966) 42–53; E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford 1989); M. Lausberg, "Lucan und Homer," *ANRW* 32.3 (1985) 1565–1622; W. D. Lebek, *Lucans Pharsalia: Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug* (Göttingen 1976, Hypomnemata 44); R. Pichon, *Les Sources de Lucain* (Paris 1912).

Editions used: J. D. Duff, *The Civil War* (Cambridge, Mass. 1938, Loeb Classical Library); A. E. Housman, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis libri decem* (Oxford 1926); D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili* (Stuttgart 1988).

PHOENIX, VOL. 45 (1991) 3.

transierat, qui Xanthus erat. securus in alto
gramine ponebat gressus: Phryx incola manes
Hectoreos calcare vetat. discussa iacebant
saxa nec ullius faciem servantia sacri:
"Herceas" monstrator ait "non respicis aras?" 9.961–979

This passage is characteristic of Lucan at his most problematical: that is, characteristic of Lucan on the occasions when he deflates the elevated epic tone with an unexpected and unexplained moment of comedy. He paints—beautifully—a scene of desolation. Caesar, the bloody victor of Pharsalia, strides triumphantly across the flattened and unrecognizable epic landscape. The walls of Troy were brought down by the Achaeans; time has since obliterated even the ruins—so Lucan provides a tour guide to tell us where we are, and Caesar is chivvied off Hector's grave by a nameless walk-on with half a line of dialogue.

This mixture of high pathos and humor may be bewildering, but it cannot diminish the significance of the place and Caesar's presence. It is at Troy (perhaps to our dismay, but surely not to our surprise) that Lucan has chosen to make his personal claim to enter the lists of epic poets:

o sacer et magnus vatum labor! omnia fato
eripis et populis donas mortalibus aevum.
invidia sacrae, Caesar, ne tangere famae;
nam, si quid Latiis fas est promittere Musis,
quantum Zmyrnaei durabunt vatis honores,
venturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra
vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aevo. 9.980–986

There is no conflict of tone, no touch of humor here. The majesty of epic and the enduring fame it confers are acknowledged by the poet in a grand apostrophe made directly to Caesar, virtually as he steps back off the invisible altar of Zeus Herceus. There is an implicit comparison between the fate of Troy (*etiam periere ruinae*) and the fame of the *Iliad* (*o sacer et magnus vatum labor! omnia fato / eripis*). Then Lucan measures his own and Caesar's fame to equal the *Zmyrnaei . . . vatis honores*. Eternal life for *Pharsalia nostra*, and for Lucan and Caesar, is assured. Lucan has linked his poem to Homer's, and on the very site of the *Iliad*.

That Homer and the *Iliad* are the object of Lucan's *aemulatio* is clearly affirmed in this passage. Yet, in literary terms, the actual relationship between Homer's epic and the *Pharsalia* has proved very difficult to assess.[1]

[1]Indeed, Pichon (217) has assessed it as non-existent. "Si, après avoir étudié les faits et les idées que renferme la *Pharsale*, on en examine la forme littéraire, et qu'on recherche quelles influences elle a subies, on s'aperçoit d'abord que, du côté de la Grèce, ces influences sont nulles ou à peu près. Je ne crois pas qu'on puisse citer un seul vers

In recent years, Professor M. Lausberg completed a most thoroughgoing survey and analysis of the scholarly work on this subject (Lausberg 1565–1622), but the very thoroughness of the survey inadvertently emphasizes the meager results and the intractability of the subject.[2]

The most rewarding approach has been that of M. von Albrecht (von Albrecht 269–308), who suggests that the key to understanding Homer's influence on Lucan is to recognize the connection that links Caesar to Achilles, and Pompey to Agamemnon, with Cato as Odysseus. Lausberg has since developed the comparison of Pompey and Agamemnon more fully (Lausberg 1576–1577).

These connections are at once convincing and yet unsatisfying. They connect Homer, the ancient literary tradition, and Lucan's text; but these connections do not lead anywhere. Lausberg's extensive comparison of Agamemnon's dream with Pompey's dream (Lausberg 1578), for instance, surely reflects Lucan's intentions, but in the end he shows no more than that Lucan borrowed a scene from Homer. This cannot be enough. If there is a significant relationship between Homer and Lucan, it must be, as it was for Vergil, in the poem as a whole: in its structure, its content, and its realization, not just in individual scenes. Homer's poetry must, in short, *mean* something to Lucan's poetry, and thus to our understanding of it.

But the *Iliad*, and to a lesser extent the *Odyssey*, do mean something for Lucan and his poetry. To uncover this meaning requires us to look rather more deeply at the comparisons now established, and to consider the significance of those comparisons in the overall pattern of the *Pharsalia*. Let us begin, then, at the beginning, with the proem.

THE PROEM

Conte has dealt thoroughly with the relationship of the proem of the *Iliad* to that of the *Pharsalia* (Conte 42–53) and the specific points of relationship that he noted are as follows:

---

que Lucain ait directement emprunté à un poète hellénique, sans que ce vers ait déjà passé par les mains d'un auteur latin."

[2]For example, Lebek in his register of parallelisms (279–302) can find only six parallels to the *Iliad* in *Pharsalia* 1–3 and 7, while he shows nearly forty parallels to the *Aeneid* in the same books. Conte (42–53) writes very perceptively about the relationship between the proem of the *Iliad* and that of the *Pharsalia*, but the actual parallels he demonstrates (see below) are few. While Pichon's complete rejection of the influence of Homer on Lucan (see above, n. 1) is no longer generally accepted (cf. E. Burke and W. Rutz, "Die Pharsalia Lucans" in *Das römische Epos* [Darmstadt 1979] 154–199, esp. 159–160), the change is due more to the changing perception of Lucan as a poet than to substantial evidence that would refute Pichon.

bella per Emathios plus quam civilia campos (1.1) fulfills the epic requirement that the first word of an epic be thematic. Lucan's proem is seven lines long, as are the proems of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Line 8 begins with an interrogative: τίς (*Iliad*) and *quis* (*Pharsalia*).

Moreover, in the eighth line of the *Pharsalia*, *quis* is followed by the word *furor*, recalling again the first word of the first line of the *Iliad*, μῆνιν.

These are relatively small points, but they are not minor. They assure us that Lucan was consciously using his Homeric model, and that we ought to expect more evidence in the rest of the poem.[3]

THE BEGINNING OF THE WAR

One of the best-known details of the *Iliad* is that it takes place in the tenth year of the war (e.g., 2.134, 295). The *Pharsalia* also opens in the tenth year of Caesar's war against the Gauls[4] (1.283, 299–300; 2.568–570). The Romans, like the Achaeans, have been fighting far from their homes. Caesar had received his first five-year command in 59 and had gone to Gaul in 58. In 55/54 his command was renewed for a second five years. Pompey opposed any further renewal of Caesar's command in 50, and in 49—the tenth year—Caesar's Gallic war became the Civil War. The epic resonance must not be discounted just because nature had imitated art.

[3]The absence of an invocation to the Muses is specifically un-Homeric. Conte says (47): "Lucano non invoca la Musa per conoscere i fatti del suo poema: la loro realtà è ancora vicina, vivo ne è il ricordo nella mente d'ognuno, attuali le tragiche consequenze." In essence, this is the explanation that has been given ever since Petronius (*Satyricon* 118), in an implicit criticism of Lucan, decreed *non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe melius historici faciunt, sed per ambages deorumque ministeria et fabulosum sententiarum tormentum praecipitandus est liber spiritus* .... In this same vein, Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.90) damned Lucan with uncomprehending praise: *magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus*: cf. E. M. Sanford, "Lucan and his Critics," *CP* 26 (1931) 233–257. Lucan was no atheist in epic clothing. Divine power in the universe is very much part of his narrative. What, in any case, is there about a historical topic that would prevent Lucan from observing the epic convention of an address to the goddesses of poetic inspiration? It is not the *historicity* of the *Pharsalia*, but its *subject—bella plus quam civilia*—that forbade the invocation of the Muses. Conte is very much on the right track (52) when he says of Lucan's *aemulatio* "si muove ancora all'interno di quella tradizione, ma solo per infrangerne i vincoli, per negarla." Part of Lucan's use of the epic form is to demonstrate how antithetical civil wars were to the heroic ideals of epic poetry.

[4]Lebek (139, n. 50) notes the parallel of the war in the tenth year but Lausberg (1581, n. 62) comments: "Lucans Beziehungen zur 'Ilias' sind nicht so äusserlicher Natur." This is to miss the point. Lucan is capitalizing on a historical fact—Caesar's nine years in Gaul—as one small aspect of a larger comparison. Taken alone, the parallelism is merely a nice (perhaps over-nice) point of reference. As part of the larger parallelism, it has considerable significance. In any case, no intelligent reader, ancient or modern, would overlook the comparison once Lucan had gone to the trouble to point it out.

THE LEADERS

Von Albrecht's essay has argued convincingly that an implicit comparison to Achilles stands behind Lucan's portrait of Caesar.[5] Now it is time to see how Lucan used Homer's Achilles to *shape* the portrait of Caesar, and his Agamemnon to shape that of Pompey.

The quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles is, in the first instance, between types of men, and the conflict is about their relative worth. Is the man with status—Agamemnon, the ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν—more or less important than the man with merit—Achilles, the ἔρκος 'Αχαιοῖσιν? The leader is, as a type, older, more experienced, more likely to direct a battle than to take part in it; the warrior is simply outstanding in his ability to fight. Nestor tries to calm the quarrel, reminding the assembled Achaeans that the heroic ethos dictates rank: Agamemnon is the one to whom Zeus has given the sceptre. Agamemnon is king over many, and so Agamemnon is the mightier.

μήτε σύ, Πηλεΐδη, ἔθελ' ἐριζέμεναι βασιλῆϊ
ἀντιβίην, ἐπεὶ οὔ ποθ' ὁμοίης ἔμμορε τιμῆς
σκηπτοῦχος βασιλεύς, ᾧ τε Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκεν.
εἰ δὲ σὺ κάρτερός ἐσσι, θεὰ δέ σε γείνατο μήτηρ,
ἀλλ' ὅ γε φέρτερός ἐστιν, ἐπεὶ πλεόνεσσιν ἀνάσσει. 1.277–281

But Nestor does not let Agamemnon escape rebuke either. Achilles is not just any warrior; Achilles is the warrior the Achaeans depend upon above all:

'Ατρεΐδη, σὺ δὲ παῦε τεὸν μένος· αὐτὰρ ἐγώγε
λίσσομ' 'Αχιλλῆϊ μεθέμεν χόλον, ὃς μέγα πᾶσιν
ἔρκος 'Αχαιοῖσιν πέλεται πολέμοιο κακοῖο. 1.282–284

Lucan has shaped the quarrel between Pompey and Caesar to the same pattern. The leader, Pompey, is older, more experienced, more powerful, and thus, less accustomed to actual fighting:

[5] "Im 10. Buche wird Alexander mit einem Unstern (*sidus iniquum gentibus*, 10.35 f.) verglichen; 10.89 f. nennt Cleopatra Caesar *gentibus aequum sidus*. Beides ist deutlich auf einander bezogen; hinter Caesar steht Alexander, hinter beiden Achilleus, der vor dem Kampf mit Hektor (*Il.* 22.25–32) mit einem Unstern verglichen wird," (276, n. 1). Lebek (70) has shown Caesar's poetic relationship to Achilles through the medium of Horace's description of Achilles in *Ars P.* 120 ff. Others accept an implied comparison, particularly Ahl (219): "And Caesar, as victor of Pharsalia, is, to Lucan, the agent of that destruction as surely as Achilles and Pyrrhus were the architects of Troy's annihilation." It is, nevertheless, by no means certain that Caesar actually modeled himself on Alexander, or that the tradition comparing him to Caesar antedates Lucan (see P. Green, "Caesar and Alexander: *aemulatio, imitatio, comparatio*," *AJAH* 3 [1978] 1–26). We know that Pompey compared *himself* to Alexander; we also know there is not a trace of this in Lucan.

> *. . . alter vergentibus annis*
> *in senium longoque togae tranquillior usu*
> *dedidicit iam pace ducem . . .* 1.129–131
>
> *nec reparare novas vires, multumque priori*
> *credere fortunae. stat magni nominis umbra . . .* 1.134–135
>
> *. . . (non) unum*
> *tot reges habuere ducem, coiere nec umquam*
> *tam variae cultu gentes . . .* 3.287–289

Caesar is the warrior, whose supreme glory is his ability to fight:

> *. . . sed non in Caesare tantum*
> *nomen erat nec fama ducis, sed nescia virtus*
> *stare loco, solusque pudor non vincere bello;*
> *acer et indomitus, quo spes quoque ira vocasset*
> *ferre manum et numquam temerando parcere ferro . . .*
> 1.143–147
>
> *. . . Romani maxime rector*
> *nominis, et ius est veras expromere voces,*
> *quod tam lenta tuas tenuit patientia vires,*
> *conquerimur.* 1.359–362

Further, Caesar's course, as the first passage makes clear, is defined by *ira*, just as that of Achilles is defined by μῆνις.[6]

A quarrel between two such men is invariably inflamed by mutual suspicion. The leader believes that the warrior acts out of ambition, the desire to rule, and a love of strife and contention. Agamemnon tells Achilles straightly that he, Achilles, is trying to surpass his leader (1.131–132), that strife and war are always dear to him (1.177), that Briseis will be taken from him so that he will well understand that Agamemnon is the mightier of the two (1.183–187), and finally, bitterly, Agamemnon accuses him of wanting to rule over them all (1.287–291). He is so angry that he restates the charge three different ways.

Caesar appears to Pompey (and to Lucan) just as Achilles does to Agamemnon. He is ambitious, he is in love with strife for strife's sake, and he wants to rule all:

> *quo potuit civem populus perducere liber,*
> *ascendi, supraque nihil nisi regna, reliqui.*
> *non privata cupis, Romana quisquis in urbe*
> *Pompeium transire paras. hinc consul uterque,*

[6]See Lausberg (1584) on Caesar's *ira*. Lebek (70) thinks Lucan borrowed it from Horace's Achilles. I accept Horace's influence on Lucan, but doubt that Lucan turned to him, rather than to Homer, for information on Achilles' character.

hinc acies statura ducum est. Caesarne senatus
victor erit? 2.562–567

. . . gaudensque viam fecisse ruina . . . 1.150

The warrior, too, has his grievance. Achilles accuses Agamemnon of being, *inter alia*, arrogant, old, tired, a coward, and greedy.

'Ατρεΐδη κύδιστε, φιλοκτεανώτατε πάντων 1.122

ἦ ἵνα ὕβριν ἴδῃς 'Αγαμέμνονος 'Ατρεΐδαο; 1.203

οἰνοβαρές, κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχων, κραδίην δ' ἐλάφοιο,
οὔτε ποτ' ἐς πόλεμον ἅμα λαῷ θωρηχθῆναι
οὔτε λόχονδ' ἰέναι σὺν ἀριστήεσσιν 'Αχαιῶν
τέτληκας θυμῷ· τὸ δέ τοι κὴρ εἴδεται εἶναι.
ἦ πολὺ λώϊόν ἐστι κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν 'Αχαιῶν
δῶρ' ἀποαιρεῖσθαι ὅς τις σέθεν ἀντίον εἴπῃ·
δημοβόρος βασιλεύς, ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις· 1.225–231

Caesar finds Pompey similarly oppressive because he is so unfamiliar with the warrior's life:

. . . veniat longa dux pace solutus
milite cum subito partesque in bella togatae 1.311–312

scilicet extremi Pompeium emptique clientes
continuo per tot satiabunt tempora regno? 1.314–315

nunc quoque, ne lassum teneat privata senectus
bella nefanda parat suetus civilibus armis . . . 1.324–325

quem tamen inveniet tam longa potentia finem?
quis scelerum modus est? 1.333-334

Curio reminds Caesar of the consequences of Pompey's inferiority—Pompey is jealous:

livor edax tibi cuncta negat . . . 1.288

Pompey, somewhat anxiously, defends his seniority even as he prepares to make war to to secure his seniority's pre-eminence:

. . . licet ille solutum
defectumque vocet, ne nos mea terreat aetas:
dux sit in his castris senior, dum miles in illis. 2.559–561

Lucan, with the authority of his voice as narrator, affirms these characterizations in the two famous similes of Book 1. Pompey is the oak-tree, huge, magnificent, loaded with honors, and all but dead (1.135–143),

while Caesar is the brilliant, terrifying, destructively powerful bolt of lightning (1.151–157). Lucan further underlines the nature of their characters through the reaction of the Roman people to each: Caesar's ruthless, teeming vitality creates in the minds of the Romans an image that is even more ferocious and threatening than the barbarians he conquered (1.479–480); and even Romans could not be expected to stand fast and fearless when Pompey is fleeing (1.521–522).

The characters of these two pairs of men, then, are brought into similar conflict. Lucan is remarkably accomplished at representing what Homer's Greek means, not through translation into Latin, but through translation into Roman terms. It is the very Roman-ness that is so persuasive, but we must not be so persuaded that we miss the Homeric pattern, the Homeric concept, that lies behind.

Now, between Agamemnon and Achilles, the immediate cause of the quarrel is a woman, or rather, two women: the one that Agamemnon must let go to appease Apollo, and the one he is compelling Achilles to give up to replace the first:

> βούλομ' ἐγὼ λαὸν σῶν ἔμμεναι ἢ ἀπολέσθαι.
> αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ γέρας αὐτίχ' ἑτοιμάσατ' , ὄφρα μὴ οἶος
> Ἀργείων ἀγέραστος ἔω, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ ἔοικε· 1.117–119

It is not a question of the daughter of Chryses, *per se*, but rather of the honor that she, as part of the division of the spoils of war, represents. Agamemnon's position as ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν requires that he be rewarded in a way that formally validates his pre-eminence among the Achaeans. When Achilles, on behalf of the Achaeans, refuses, because the spoils have already been divided, and because to replace Chryses' daughter would mean to take away a prize from another warrior, Agamemnon insists on the rights of his precedence even more. It is an injury to Agamemnon's position to do without, even temporarily (1.131–139).

Achilles, by speaking out against Agamemnon's demands, has focused Agamemnon's anger on himself, and is the one who must lose his prize (οὐ μέν σοί ποτε ἶσον ἔχω γέρας) to satisfy Agamemnon's need for adequate honors; and thus the warrior is injured at the behest of the leader (1.161–168).

Caesar complains that Pompey wants to take away the honors he, like Achilles, has earned as a warrior in Gaul:

> ... *mihi si merces erepta laborum est* ... 1.340
>
> *ille semel raptos numquam dimittet honores?* 1.316

Whether the leader is Agamemnon or Pompey, he must always be rewarded with more than the others, to validate his position. Without that validation, how can he be the leader? The question is, who shall rule?

Agamemnon says that he will rule over all the Achaeans, no matter what Achilles wants (1.287-289).

Curio makes the same point about Caesar's quarrel with Pompey:

> *. . . partiri non potes orbem,*
> *solus habere potes.* 1.290-291

Yet from the warrior's point of view, it is not that he wants to rule, but rather that he is fighting now for his just reward. Achilles complains bitterly (1.163–168) that Agamemnon's prizes are always greater, and Caesar, in his speech to his men, reminds them that the fighting in Gaul has earned them the insult of Pompey's hostility rather than his admiration. Like Achilles, he feels that his martial labors have not been adequately rewarded (1.301–302)

The upshot of it all is that the warrior rejects the leader's authority. Achilles refuses to obey Agamemnon any longer and withdraws his warrior's skill from Agamemnon's control (1.293–296; 1.302–303). Caesar likewise rejects Pompey's right to command him (1.338–340), and promises Pompey will never again gain anything from Caesar's accomplishments at arms (1.350).

Lucan sums up the situation for Caesar and Pompey, and so, by comparison, for Achilles and Agamemnon, in one of his most famous *sententiae*:

> *. . . stimulos dedit aemula virtus:*
> *tu, nova ne veteres obscurent acta triumphos*
> *et victis cedat piratica laurea Gallis,*
> *Magne, times; te iam series ususque laborum*
> *erigit inpatiensque loci fortuna secundi;*
> *nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarve priorem*
> *Pompeiusve parem.* 1.120–126

THE PETITION

After the quarrel, Achilles has withdrawn to his ships. He will not fight any longer for the Achaeans and he is threatening to go home (1.302–303). On the beach beside his ships he makes a petition as a suppliant to his goddess-mother, Thetis (1.365–412).

Caesar, because of his quarrel with Pompey, has abandoned the war the Romans have with the Gauls, and has come down *parvi Rubiconis ad undas*—"to the waters of the little Rubicon" (1.183–185). He is poised to "go home"—that is, to descend upon Rome. Roma, the goddess who is his mother-city, comes as a suppliant to *him* (1.186–190), and she petitions *him*.

Thetis, weeping for the fated early death of her son, advises him to stay by his ships. She will go to Zeus and petition him on Achilles' behalf (1.413–427).

In mourning (*caesarie lacera nudisque adstare lacertis / et gemitu permixta loqui*) for the fated destruction of her city, Roma begs Caesar to stay on the far bank of the Rubicon (1.186–194). He rejects her plea and makes a petition to Jupiter on his own behalf (1.195–203).

The wrongness of the civil wars, the legitimacy conferred on wickedness—*ius datum sceleri*—that Lucan has made programmatic for his epic, is here being worked out. The Roman Achilles has made himself greater than the mother-goddess. She is *his* petitioner, and *he* is the one who goes to *Jupiter* for what he wants. He does not wait by the river as Achilles waits by the sea; Caesar crosses the Rubicon. This terrible violation of Roman law is also, in Lucan's poetry, the violation of the epic story: *si iure venitis* . . . . But Caesar has not come in accordance with the law, not with the law of Rome, nor with the law of epic. The Roman Achilles is leaving Troy, and taking the war home with him.

THE SPEECHES

Agamemnon, after he has been visited by the false dream (2.23–24), decides to test the Achaeans: he tells them that it is Zeus' pleasure that they go home without the glory of defeating Troy (2.110–141). As a result the rush to get to the ships turns into a virtual rout. The four speeches that follow—by Thersites, Odysseus, Nestor, and Agamemnon—are a response to the retreat from Troy, Thersites encouraging it and the other three bringing it to a halt.

Roma, petitioning Caesar on the banks of the Rubicon, corresponds to Achilles' petition to Thetis, but, since the vision of Roma comes to him at night (*clara per obscuram vultu maestissima noctem* [1.187]), and is nightmarishly like a dream, there is a correspondence also to Agamemnon's false dream. More importantly, the night vision of Roma is, like Agamemnon's dream, a strange, still point in the epic universe. It is a private moment in the dark of night which provides a stark contrast to the brightness of daylight and the masses of soldiers and the war that will come in the morning. Caesar's vision and Agamemnon's dream are, also, the immediate cause of the rush for home, of the speeches that are made as a result, and last, but not least, they are the cause of that counting of forces we call the Catalogue.

The Rubicon is now in flood from the melting snows of the Alps and three days of rain (1.213–219). This provides the proper meteorological explanation for the flood and the opportunity for a brief, dramatic scene as a horse[7] is ridden into the river first, to break the force of the water

[7]The word Lucan uses is not *equus* but *sonipes*. Some eighty lines later (1.293–295) he calls Caesar a *sonipes*: *accenditque ducem, quantum clamore iuvatur / Eleus sonipes, quamvis iam carcere clauso / immineat foribus pronusque repagula laxet.* If we interpret this horse, the first to cross the boundary of the Rubicon in order to break the force of the flooding river, as Caesar, we may be reminded of the scene at the sacred grove

so the rest can cross (1.220–222). The Rubicon, as a river, is a *certus limes*, a fixed boundary. Caesar is crossing over boundaries in crossing the Rubicon. Lucan's repeated insistence that the Rubicon is a small river is deeply ironic. It is small in size, but not in significance.[8]

The image of the Rubicon in flood, however, is there for more than dramatic scene-making. Water in flood, in storm, or raging in any way beyond its natural bounds, will recur as a setting and a metaphor for Caesar,[9] most notably in the storm (5.560 ff.) during his crossing from Dyrrhachium. It is particularly significant that the melted snow flooding the Rubicon is from the Alps, for we will see, in the Catalogue, that water rushes down the other side of the Alps into France, water that is also forming rivers that are boundaries, water that will flow at last into the sea in various places. Caesar's abandonment of his position in Gaul leads to a release of great, sweeping natural forces on both sides of the Alps.

Once across the Rubicon, Caesar leads his men to Ariminum. The citizens of Ariminum are roused from their beds on a clouded and cold winter morning to the cry of war-trumpets and the glitter of legionary standards (1.231–261). To the noise and panoply of war they can respond only with the silence of experienced victims:

> *. . . pax alta per omnes*
> *et tranquilla quies populos: nos praeda furentum*
> *primaque castra sumus.* 1.249–250

The scene at Ariminum is one of Lucan's most empathetic and beautiful passages. We can feel the pre-dawn cold, the confusion and helplessness and the despair; but we also feel the terrifying beauty of the Roman legions massed before the gates:

> *ut notae fulsere aquilae Romanaque signa*
> *et celsus medio conspectus in agmine Caesar . . .* 1.244–245

---

in Book 3 (399–452). There, when his men have refused to commit another crime the equal of crossing the Rubicon, he takes the guilt on himself by being again the first to act: *primus raptam librare bipennem / ausus et aeriam ferro proscindere quercum* (433–434).

[8]For the relationship of the Rubicon to another small river, the Xanthus, see below, 251 ff.

[9]Lucan will also use water imagery for Pompey (6.265 ff.), who is compared to the Po in flood. It is probable that Lucan's water imagery depends upon the conventional Stoic view of the end of the world (cf. Seneca *QNat.* 3.27); Lucan certainly equated civil war with the end of the world by flood (1.72–96). Pompey, then, could be properly equated with the Po in flood at the moment, after the death of Scaeva, when he is actually committed to fighting, instead of retreating away from it, as he has been since he abandoned Rome (1.519–522). See also note 29 below, on the possibility of associating the destructive energy of water with Poseidon/Neptune, the destroyer of Troy.

When Homer wishes to express the brilliance of the Achaean army, his simile is a forest fire: dangerous, powerful, a glaring sight—but distant, on the peaks of the mountains (2.455–458). The Roman army is in the market-place (*capto iussus deponere miles / signa foro*), very close, and very frightening.

The cold, overcast winter dawn and the gathering of citizens whose weapons are both unused and useless should also be contrasted with the joyful, spring-time similes that Homer uses as the Achaeans make their way to hear Agamemnon (bees: 2.87–90), or as they gather before the great Catalogue (flocks of birds, flowers on the meadows, flies on the milk pails, flocks of goats: 2.459–475). The contrast says everything about the distance, psychologically as well as poetically, between Homer and Lucan. The Trojan war takes place in the spring-time of the imagination, the civil wars in a deep winter.

At Ariminum three speeches are given, by Curio, Caesar, and Laelius. Curio, who gives the first (1.273–291), is very like Thersites. Thersites, the rabble-rouser, takes Achilles' part, abuses Agamemnon, and urges the flight home. Curio takes Caesar's part, in terms that are coarse with personal ambition; he pours scorn on Pompey, and inflames Caesar's passion for civil war. If we see Curio as a Roman Thersites, it would explain the morally vicious—and historically unexpected—attack that Lucan makes on him:

> *. . . audax venali comitatur Curio lingua,*
> *vox quondam populi libertatemque tueri*
> *ausus et armatos plebi miscere potentes.* 1.269–271
>
> *momentumque fuit mutatus Curio rerum*
> *Gallorum captus spoliis et Caesaris auro.*
> *ius licet in iugulos nostri sibi fecerit ensis*
> *Sulla potens Mariusque feros et Cinna cruentus*
> *Caesareaeque domus series, cui tanta potestas*
> *concessa est? emere omnes, hic vendidit urbem.* 4.819–824

Thersites is a λιγὺς ἀγορητής; Curio is *venali lingua*. Curio is praised as *ausus et armatos plebi miscere potentes*. This should remind us of Thersites: οἷος ἐριζέμεναι βασιλεῦσιν (*Il.* 2.247). τῷ οὐκ ἂν βασιλῆας ἀνὰ στόμ' ἔχων ἀγορεύοις / καί σφιν ὀνείδεά τε προφέροις, νόστον τε φυλάσσοις is Odysseus' reproach to Thersites (2.250–251). Odysseus also says there is no worse a man than Thersites: οὐ ... χερειότερον βροτὸν ἄλλον / ἔμμεναι (2.248–249). Lucan, despite his praise for Curio, still depicts him as the worst of Caesar's men—worse, indeed, than any who came before or after, worse than Sulla, Marius, Cinna, worse than the whole line of Caesars (*Caesareaeque domus series*). And why? They bought the city, but Curio sold it. To be a tradesman (so, *venali lingua* and *vendidit urbem*) was very much a sign of low and vulgar station. And

what could be more vulgar, more Thersites-like, than to sell one's own country?

Caesar has his Thersites, but there is no Roman Odysseus, no Roman Nestor in Caesar's army. Caesar's speech (1.299–351), like Agamemnon's (2.370–393), recalls the cause and the course of the quarrel that brought them to this point, and then urges his men on to the coming battle. But unlike the Achaeans, the Romans are not convinced:

> *dixerat; at dubium non claro murmure volgus*
> *secum incerta fremit. pietas patriique penates*
> *quamquam caede feras mentes animosque tumentes*
> *frangunt ...* 1.352–355

So Laelius must come forward (1.359-386). He, like Nestor (2.336–368), stirs the men further, and challenges their courage to follow. But whereas in the *Iliad* Nestor is urging the Achaeans to stay, Laelius is urging the Romans to go. Indeed, he is the first actually to confront the true meaning of what they are about to do: *illa licet, penitus tolli quam iusseris urbem / Roma sit.*[10] The reversal is complete: what was ignoble in the *Iliad*—the retreat home—is the goal the soldiers cheer to the sky in the *Pharsalia*.

When Agamemnon speaks, seeming to send the Achaeans home (2.110–141), the crowd is stirred, and Homer uses two similes to describe their reaction. This is is the second:

> ὡς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήϊον ἐλθών,
> λάβρος ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπί τ' ἠμύει ἀσταχύεσσιν,
> ὣς τῶν πᾶσ' ἀγορὴ κινήθη· 2.147–149

When Caesar's men give their passionate approval to Laelius' speech to march on Rome, this is how Lucan describes them:

> *... it tantus ad aethera clamor,*
> *quantus, piniferae Boreas cum Thracius Ossae*
> *rupibus incubuit, curvato robore pressae*
> *fit sonus aut rursus redeuntis in aethera silvae.* 1.388–391

[10]Lebek (139, n. 50) sees the Thersites parallel in Laelius. The difficulty with Lebek's view is that Thersites speaks first (as does Curio), but Laelius is the last to speak. Thersites (as his instant acceptance of Agamemnon's proposal to abandon the war, his station in life, and his treatment by Odysseus all make abundantly clear) represents the ignoble, self-serving, and un-heroic (or perhaps anti-heroic) feelings among the Achaeans. Curio speaks of self-interest, rewards, prizes, envy, and greed. Laelius' speech recounts the familiar events that are the mirrors of the destruction of Troy—the victory, the slaughter of father, brother, wife, the destruction of the temples, and the leveling of the walls. Laelius' speech is not un- or anti-heroic. What is wrong about Laelius' speech is not what he is proposing that the Romans do, but the city he proposes that they do it to—not the enemy's city, but their own.

Forests, Thrace, and the North Wind are all harsher and more powerful than Homer's cornfield bending beneath a West Wind, and Lucan is emphasizing the sound as much as the sight; but underneath, they are the same image.[11] By taking us back to the simile that describes the Achaeans as they hear they are to go home, Lucan reminds us that the Roman soldiers are cheering because they are about to go home, to march against their own city.

THE CATALOGUE

Since the Roman soldier has committed himself to flight from the Gallic war, the catalogue that follows must be of a different kind than that of the *Iliad*. That this passage (1.392–465) is a catalogue, there is no real doubt, though there is much confusion over what, precisely, Lucan is cataloguing.[12] The greatest confusion arises if we fail to see that this passage differs from conventional epic standards for a reason. Pompey has already been cast

[11]Lebek (139) has noted a correspondence between this Thracian forest simile of Lucan's and Homer's simile of the sea beating on a headland (*Il.* 2.394 ff.). The correspondence here is the correspondence of sound, and, as Lebek notes, in each case it is the simile after the last speech and before the catalogue. However, I would point out that the images of a cornfield or a pine-forest bending before a wind are visually as well as aurally similar. The sea beating on the headland does not have that similarity. There is the additional fact that the image of the cornfield describes the Achaeans *as they head for the ships to go home*, and going home is just what the Romans also are about to do. I believe Lucan chose this image precisely to emphasize the nature of the Romans' actions. He is doing more than merely adapting a beautiful and evocative image; he is using the image as a commentary on the evils of the civil war.

[12]The scholarly discussion of this passage can be followed in the notes *ad loc.* in the various editions of Book 1, particularly those of R. J. Getty (Cambridge 1955), and P. Wuilleumier and H. Le Bonniec (Paris 1962). Pichon (above, n. 1), R. Samse, "Lukans Excurs über Gallien I 396–465," *RhM* (1939) 165–179, and A. Bourgery, "La Géographie dans Lucain," *RPhil* 54 (1928) 25–40, have taken up where the medieval commentators left off (J. Endt, *Adnotationes super Lucanum* [Leipzig 1909, repr. Stuttgart 1969]; H. Usener, *Commenta Bernensia* [Leipzig 1869, repr. Hildesheim 1967]; G. A. Cavajoni, *Supplementum Adnotationum super Lucanum* Books 1–5 [Milan 1979]). In essence these have been scholarly efforts to try to illuminate the passage through an examination of what we know or can deduce factually about each place and tribe Lucan mentions. Such investigations have invariably been defeated by Lucan himself. His apparent ethnic or geographical inaccuracies have led to unfair denigration of his competence as a poet. Bourgery (34) says, for instance, "... j'ai aussi bien l'impression que Lucain n'avait pas une idée fort nette de ce dont il parlait ...." L. Eckardt, *Exkurse und Ekphraseis bei Lucan* (Heidelberg 1936), though she approaches the passage from a more literary point of view, is limited because she likewise retains (36) the fundamental perception that this catalogue is an ethno-geography, for "... die wissenschaftliche Diskussion eines naturwissenschaftlichen Problems ist ein beliebtes Thema für rhetorische Exkurse." Modern scholars have not been able to muster a corresponding affection. Le Bonniec (164) states the general conclusion : "... En fait, il ne nous apprend pas grand-chose, et ce sont les *Commenta Bernensia* qui donnent des détails intéressants."

as the king who, like Agamemnon, πλεόνεσσιν ἀνάσσει. Any catalogue of Caesar's troops runs into several difficulties. If Lucan counts Caesar's legions only in comparison to Pompey's contingent of forces—the latter from every known city and land on earth—he will make Caesar's force appear less formidable just as he is emphasizing its fearfulness; if he increases the "barbarian" contingent, or adds slaves or other undesirable elements, he diminishes the horror of Romans marching on Rome; if he lists Romans, or Italians, who choose to follow Caesar, he suggests that Rome itself was divided in allegiance—which of course it was; but the effect is to spoil Caesar's maddened, renegade image.

This image presents a second difficulty for the poet seeking to create a catalogue for Caesar. Achilles' glory comes from his prowess as a single warrior, prowess which is, in the *Iliad*, crucial to the success of the Achaeans, whether they are many or few. This singleness, this terrifying, world-engulfing individuality, is central to Lucan's portrait of Caesar, a point most graphically demonstrated by the mutiny and the storm of Book 5. In the mutiny, Caesar scorns the assistance of man; in the storm, he defies the hostility of the gods. Caesar is alone and sufficient unto himself. The Roman army is essential to Caesar, but it is essential, not to his Fortuna, not to his achievement, but to his identity. As a thunderbolt is to Jupiter, so the Roman legionary is to Caesar. The army becomes, in Lucan's hands, a horrifying icon of Caesar's power; but it is not the power itself.

Another difficulty that Lucan must overcome is that a catalogue is part of the epic poet's record of κλέα ἀνδρῶν. By placing the catalogue exactly where a catalogue should be, but refusing to make it a catalogue of Roman heroes, Lucan deprives Caesar and the Romans who marched with him of their κλέα. Lucan is manipulating the epic form to make a commentary on the events he must include in his epic.

Lucan frames the catalogue with the word that expresses the utter shame that Caesar and his legions have brought upon themselves and Rome: *deseruere* (396) and *deseritis* (465) (the subject of both verbs is the Roman soldiery). The Romans are deserting their posts, and within the frame marked by the two forms of the verb *deserere*, Lucan presents a catalogue of the *consequences* of Caesar's action. Not the consequences for the Roman world—that will come in the poem proper—but rather the consequences to the world left behind, the world of the Gallic wars. Caesar and his troops rush down from the Alps like a great natural force pouring into Italy, and the catalogue begins with the rivers of Gaul, as though they too were let loose, rolling down from the mountains to the sea.

The catalogue of Book 1 is divided into three parts, like Caesar's Gaul: 396–419a, 419b–449, and 450–465. Each part concludes with a three-line apostrophe, in the second person plural.

The first section (396–419a) is a catalogue of rivers, and certain rivers, like the Rubicon, are boundaries. The Rubicon is the *certus limes* which separates Italy from Gaul (1.215–216); it is also the boundary that separates the Gallic war from the civil war, and the Homeric epic from the Lucanian epic. Lucan elsewhere uses rivers as boundaries of morality and culture; for instance, (7.433) *libertas ultra Tigrim Rhenumque recessit.* The Tigris and the Rhine are boundaries between the civilized and the barbarian world, as the Rubicon had been until Caesar crossed it, and the barbarians now have freedom. One consequence of the civil war is the liberation and civilizing of the barbarians, and by implication, the enslavement and barbarization of the Romans.[13]

The rivers of Gaul make a kind of a catalogue of boundaries that have been loosened, or broken, or lost. The first, the Lemanus, is the boundary for the Roman camp (1.396–398), which holds back the *pugnaces Lingonas.* The loss of this boundary frees the Lingonae and the Ruteni (402) from their long-held posts. Note that the Ruteni do not, like the Romans, desert *(deserere)* their posts, but are released *(solvuntur).* We are to reflect on their changed condition. Then, there is the Varus, with its *promoto limite*, a boundary that moves, the complete negation of a *certus limes.*

The rivers draw the image of dissolution away from the political, human scene, into the natural world. The rivers flow to the sea, to the Mediterranean and to the North Sea, and there water is in conflict with land, and wind, while the Ocean is leaping towards the sun. Just when we seem to be rushing towards some magnificent speculation on natural philosophy, Lucan interrupts himself and indignantly tells the reader to find some other poet for this sort of thing:[14]

[13]Cf. 1.479–480, where Caesar is said to be greater, wilder *(ferus)*, more savage *(inmanior)* than the conquered Gauls *(victo ... hoste).*

[14]Thus offering a new kind of *recusatio.* The epic poet is Lucretius, obviously, whose *De rerum natura* is firmly in the tradition of Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days* just as Lucan's epic is in the tradition of Homer's epics. The Stoics did not think that causes could be known: cf. A. A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*[2] (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1986) 219. Lucretius, as a good Epicurean, held that the fear of death was responsible for the avarice that led to civil war:

> *unde homines dum se falso terrore coacti*
> *effugisse volunt longe longeque remosse,*
> *sanguine civili rem conflant divitiasque*
> *conduplicant avidi, caedem caede accumulantes,*
> *crudeles gaudent in tristi funere fratris ...* 3.68–72

Lucan as a Stoic would not agree, but no doubt he looked to Lucretius' epic as a guide in his own epic on the civil war. Note also that the Gauls and Germans do *not* fear death (452–462); by implication, then, they are not subject to avarice and so to the fratricide of civil war.

quaerite, quos agitat mundi labor; at mihi semper
tu, quaecumque moves tam crebros causa meatus,
ut superi voluere, late. 1.417–419

For all the mock indignation, Lucan is quite serious about not being tempted into cosmological digressions—he has come to the boundary that marks off his kind of hexameter poetry from the hexameters of philosophical inquiry. He keeps within his boundary, as the Roman soldiery will not. The rivers are plunging towards the conflict of sea and sky as the soldiers are plunging towards the ultimate conflict of civil war; each is falling headlong into the state of ultimate chaos.

Lucan will use the metaphor of soldiers as rivers flowing into the sea again, very dramatically, in Book 5. His soldiers have mutinied and Caesar confronts them. He dares them to leave him, and taunts them with their insignificance without him:

Caesaris an cursus vestrae sentire putatis
damnum posse fugae? veluti, si cuncta minentur
flumina quos miscent pelago subducere fontes,
non magis ablatis umquam descenderit aequor
quam nunc crescit, aquis. 5.335–339

Here, Caesar's soldiers *are* rivers;[15] further, they have lost their names and boundaries, and have all been subsumed into the being of one man, Caesar. It is essential to Lucan's concept of Caesar that, once he has crossed the Rubicon, all boundaries are gone, all restraints—natural, psychological, legal, divine—have been removed. Caesar's crossing the Rubicon has at once dissolved the boundaries in Gaul, the boundaries between the civilized and uncivilized worlds, and the corresponding boundaries in himself. His army becomes more limited as a force in proportion as he becomes less limited. His army is insignificant now because he has crossed the boundary and is beyond limitation.

The second section (419b–449) of the catalogue is a list of Gallic and Germanic tribes, and they are rejoicing in the release they, like the rivers, achieve through the departure of the Romans. The exact ethnographical arrangement of the tribes is less significant that what the Gauls and the

[15]The verbs repeated at the opening and closing of the catalogue, apart from *deserere*, are appropriate to large amounts of water: *sparsas per Gallica rura cohortes* (394), and *Caesar ... per omnem spargitur Italiam vicinaque moenia complet* (466–468). *spargere* and *complere* convey the notion of Caesar's army as a flood, that had swelled over the banks of the Rubicon and spread throughout Italy. It is also significant that at the opening of the catalogue, before the great desertion, it is the soldiers who are dispersed: *sparsas ... cohortes*; but at the end they have been subsumed into Caesar, and it is Caesar who is dispersed throughout and fills Italy: *spargitur, complet.*

Germans are *doing*. Let us go back to Nestor's speech in Book 1 of the *Iliad*, when he is trying to stop the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles:

> ὦ πόποι, ἦ μέγα πένθος Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν ἱκάνει·
> ἦ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
> ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ,
> εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο μαρναμένοιϊν,
> οἳ περὶ μὲν βουλὴν Δαναῶν, περὶ δ' ἐστὲ μάχεσθαι. 1.254-258

The Trojans will rejoice, he says, because of this quarrel. This is precisely what the Gauls and the Germans are doing, rejoicing because of the quarrel between Caesar and Pompey. The governing verbs of the entire passage are *gaudet* (1.421–435) and *laetus* (*es*) (1.436–449). Moreover, although as barbarians they are unworthy of it (*Arvernique ausi Latio se fingere fratres / sanguine ab Iliaco populi nimiumque rebellis / Nervius et caesi pollutus foedere Cottae* [1.427–429]), they are the image of heroic warriors-in-training, with all the appropriate distinctions: they are charioteers and horsemen, distinguished in their warrior accomplishments: *optimus excusso Leucus Remusque lacerto, / optima gens flexis in gyrum Sequana frenis.* The full import of the implied portrait—that the barbarians have been freed by the Roman departure to act like Homeric warriors—is made perfectly clear at the very end of the section:

> *vos quoque, qui fortes animas belloque peremptas*
> *laudibus in longum vates dimittitis aevum,*
> *plurima securi fudistis carmina, Bardi.* 1.447–449

These *vates* and *Bardi* are the rhapsodes and epic poets of the Gauls and the Germans. The civil war has freed them to follow the heroic model of Homer, and pour out their own *carmina*. This is what Caesar's act has led to: the barbarians, the Gauls, have acquired that ultimate symbol of civilization—the epic poet and his poems.

The third section of the catalogue (450–465) is addressed to the Druids, whom Lucan calls Dryadae, a word which (whatever linguistic justification Lucan may have thought he had for the pun) can only suggest to the reader that the poet is making a connection between these priests of the forests and the wood-nymphs of Greece. Lucan is not a fool about words and their meanings, and he is not a hack versifier grabbing for a metrical equivalent. The Dryadae are there to do what they in fact accomplish—they connect the Druids and the Dryades, that is, they connect the Germans and the Greeks. The very improbability of the connection should be the signal that it is important to Lucan. I would argue that it is one more point in his commentary on barbarism, civilization, and the Greek and Roman literary tradition that he has been developing in this passage.

If we leave aside the epithets *barbaricos* and *sinistrum* until we can understand the rest of what Lucan has to say about these Druid-Dryades, we will see quite clearly that they are warrior-priests *(positis . . . ab armis)*. They have unique knowledge[16] that souls do not go to the underworld, but are translated to another sphere (*orbe alio*). Therefore, Lucan says, these northern peoples do not fear death but

> *. . . inde ruendi*
> *in ferrum mens prona viris animaeque rapaces*
> *mortis, et ignavum redituraе parcere vitae.* 1.460–462

The Druid-Dryades here are indistinguishable from Stoic philosophers.[17]

Let us now look more carefully at line 446: *et Taranis Scythicae non mitior ara Dianae*. The altar Lucan is referring to, the altar of Diana/Artemis among the Taurians, is famous as the cult site presided over by Iphigenia in Euripides' play. Lucan surely has Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* in mind, for it is a drama about human sacrifice, civilized and barbaric rites, and recognition and confusion about who belongs in each category.[18] Iphigenia, who has been rescued from the altar at Aulis where her father was going to sacrifice her, has been placed by Artemis among the Tauri where, as priestess, she presides over the sacrifice of any stranger who is found in the territory of the Tauri. The temples are stained red with the blood from the trophies—the heads impaled on poles—of the sacrificed victims (*IT* 38–41, 72, 276–278). Human sacrifice, both Agamemnon's of Iphigenia at Aulis and Iphigenia's of strangers at Taurus, was embarrassing to the Greeks even of Euripides' day.[19] *barbaricos ritus moremque sinistrum / sacrorum,*

[16]Or, alternatively, they, uniquely, do *not* have this knowledge: Lucan is playing with the boundaries that separate the civilized and the barbarian. The boundary that separates the barbarian from the "civilized" Roman has to be *knowledge*. As Lucan is about to demonstrate that the barbarian *knows* what is virtually Stoic orthodoxy, and practices it besides, the hidden implication is either that the Romans do *not* know, or the boundary separating them from the barbarians is non-existent—which, after Caesar has crossed the Rubicon and committed Rome to civil war, is the apparent case.

[17]Cf. Cicero *De republica*, particularly the section known to us as the *Somnium Scipionis*. For a general statement of Stoic ideas of death and the soul after death, see H.-A. Schotes, *Stoische Physik, Psychologie und Theologie bei Lucan* (Bonn 1969) 73–77, where he cites the relevant fragments. Schotes demonstrates (77) that the Druids cannot have believed what Lucan says, but this is to miss the point. The ethnography in this catalogue is as reliable as the herpetology in Book 9, that is to say, Lucan is constructing a landscape and its inhabitants according to his poetic need. It is a mistake to draw conclusions from this passage about anything except Lucan's poetry.

[18]Euripides *IT* 28–42. Seneca's influence on Lucan should be considered the decisive factor: allusions to Greek tragedy, and particularly to Euripides' tragedies can hardly be surprising in Seneca's student and nephew. The wonder is, rather, that the allusions are so inconspicuous and apparently infrequent.

[19]Cf. Hall 211: "In the *IT*, for example, Euripides uses imagery to link Agamemnon's sacrifice of his daughter with the human sacrifices practised by the Taurians, his choice

indeed. The point of this, again, is to emphasize the confusion of the boundary between the barbaric and the civilized, and to remind the reader that the heroic age had its human sacrifice, just like the Germans and the Gauls. On yet another level it serves not to justify the human sacrifice of the civil wars, but to place it in context. Human sacrifice, whether of Iphigenia, or of Rome and the Romans, is not appropriate for heroes, but it has a place, however regrettable and embarrassing, in the epic narrative.

There is, then, a carefully constructed sequence in this section:[20] the Gaulish warriors are very like the warriors of the heroic age (423–426); the Gauls fabricate a heroic descent for themselves (surely a neat hit at the Trojan myth the *Romans* had constructed for themselves) (427–428); the Ligurians had long hair (cf. κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί), but now cut it short, like Romans (441–443); their human sacrifice is no kinder than that of Iphigenia among the Scythians (445–446); the *fortes animas* (447) (μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί, *Il.* 1.123) and finally the *Bardi* and the *carmina* (449) complete the transformation from barbarism to civilization.

Now Lucan's Gauls, as barbarians, stood in the same relationship to his Romans as the Trojans to the Achaeans,[21] as the Persians to the Greeks, and as the historical Gauls to the Hellenistic kings and the Roman *Res publica*—that is, the Gauls were barbarians who threatened, and by threatening defined, a civilized society. This equation had been sanctioned by history, tragedy, and art for five centuries.[22] The Gauls were the barbarians

---

of language quietly undercutting the superficially jingoistic tenor of the play, implicitly deconstructing the orthodox polarization of Hellene and barbarian."

[20]I leave out lines 430–440. The major manuscripts omit 436–440, which are now considered a medieval interpolation. Schrader deleted lines 430–435 as also being suspect (cf. Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.*). Housman and Duff acknowledge Schrader's deletion, but print the lines. Shackleton Bailey thinks Schrader's deletion was wrong. If my analysis is correct, this part of the catalogue—minus the eleven lines—has a wholeness and continuity of purpose in keeping with the rest of the catalogue and the general intentions of Lucan in Book 1. This is not a decisive argument for the spuriousness of the eleven lines, of course, but it can be used to support the judgement of the textual critic.

[21]Herodotus 1.3 identified the rape of Helen as one of the causes for the hostility between Greek and Barbarian that had led to the Persian wars. The tragedians also (re)interpreted the Trojans as barbarians like the Persians (cf. H. Bacon, *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* [New Haven 1961] 101 ff., and Hall 68–69).

[22]The Hellenistic dynasties, particularly the Attalids, extended the existing myth of the civilized Greeks repelling the barbarian invaders. It made excellent propaganda. See J. J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge 1986) 85 ff., esp. 93–95, for his discussion of the Attalid dedication on the Acropolis: "Its designers blended mythology, legend, and history .... The battle of the Gods and Giants celebrated the foundation of Greek religion and moral law. The defeat of the Amazons, who had been allies of the Trojans ... commemorated the glories of the Heroic Age .... The defeat of the Persians celebrated the salvation of Greek culture as a whole .... The sculptors of the Attalid dedication thus subsumed the heroic past that was already celebrated on the acropolis, linked the new Attalid monument with it, and added a new chapter of their own. They

the Romans were supposed to fight. Yet Caesar had reversed the arrangement: by leaving his war against the barbarians (Trojans/ Gauls), he freed them to take on the civilized part. Caesar not only made the Romans the barbarians but also enabled the barbarians to usurp the Greek/Roman role—practising the skills of heroic warfare, listening to their poets and bards sing of the great deeds of great-spirited warriors, and pursuing, as free men, lives of Stoic honor. The civil war, Lucan implies, made the Romans the new barbarians, the new Trojans.

But of course the Romans were, not least according to Vergil, the old Trojans.[23] Caesar has brought them back full circle, and *deseruere* now takes on yet another layer of mythological meaning. The old Trojans had unwillingly and unwittingly, but inevitably, brought about the destruction of their own city, which they then had to abandon so that Aeneas could found the new Troy. That was Homer's story. Now, in an even more terrible way, they are going to bring about the abandonment and destruction[24] of Rome, in order that the new Aeneas—Augustus[25]—can refound Rome, and begin the dynasty of the Julio-Claudians.

On the first level, then, as long as Caesar and Pompey remain on the same side, Lucan likens the Romans to the Achaeans of the Homeric epic and identifies the two leaders as an Achilles and an Agamemnon. The crossing of the Rubicon transforms everyone and everything. Civil war makes the Romans barbarians, Trojans again.[26] Until Pharsalia is past, the poem is an extended exposition on the horror of the destruction of Rome, of the Republic. Pompey is transformed from the leader of a successful army to

---

were saying in effect that the Gallic victories of the Attalids were of the same magnitude as the earlier battles depicted in the monument . . . ." It is of no little significance for our understanding of Lucan that the designers of the allegory of the Attalid monuments were Stoics (Pollitt 101).

[23]Cf. Hall 21: "The authors of the Hellenistic and Byzantine commentaries and scholia on the poem, up to and including Eustathius, were unanimous in their condemnation of the barbarism of the Trojans and their praise of the nobility of the Achaeans." *We* know that Homer did not portray the Trojans as "barbarians," but Lucan would have accepted the common contemporary interpretation of Homer that made the Trojans "barbarians" to the Achaeans' "Greeks." The Romans, of course, as a result of this interpretation, confronted some awkwardnesses in claiming descent from Aeneas: the ancestry at once included them in the heroic myth cycle and yet within it, it relegated them to the same position they occupied when the Hellenistic kingdoms were supreme and they were an ambitious Italian city-state—the Romans were, in short, barbarians.

[24]Note that Lucan goes to great trouble to create a poetic fall of Rome through the portents and *nuntia . . . falsa* that complete Book 1. He goes to even more trouble to create the abandonment of Rome, by the Senate (487–489), the people (490–498), and by Pompey (521–522).

[25]Cf. Vergil *Aeneid* 6.789–795; *Pharsalia* 1.33–35.

[26]Note that the Trojans are among the nations making up Pompey's army (3.211–213).

the king of the Trojans, the helpless, and ultimately headless, Priam—thus linking Lucan's Pompey to Vergil's Priam through the headless corpse left on the beach (*Aeneid* 2.557–558; *Pharsalia* 8.663–711), Vergil having already suggested the link by bestowing the real Pompey's death on Priam. Caesar after the Rubicon is neither Greek nor Roman nor Trojan. He is inhuman, a creature entirely of unbounded passion, an expression of, as well as the means of, the disaster that must destroy Rome.

THE NEW TROY

Let us return now to Book 9, when Caesar is touring the ruins of Troy (9.961–979). He has been brought here by the poet to contemplate the tumbledown ruins, the rank and rotting vegetation, and the stones, each of which is named but unrecognizable. Ahl ([above, note 9] 214–219) saw that the desolation of Troy was connected with the desolation of Italy in Book 1:

> *at nunc semirutis pendent quod moenia tectis*
> *urbibus Italiae lapsisque ingentia muris*
> *saxa iacent nulloque domus custode tenentur*
> *rarus et antiquis habitator in urbibus errat,*
> *horrida quod dumis multosque inarata per annos*
> *Hesperia est desuntque manus poscentibus arvis . . .* 1.24–29

But now we see that the connection between Troy of Book 9 and Italy of Book 1 is more than an implication. It is implicit in every event in Book 1. Moreover, the desolation is not just the desolation of war. Lucan is looking further than the end of the civil war, perhaps as far beyond that as the civil war was beyond the Trojan war. Lucan is hinting that Italy, like Troy, will feel the desolation of time.[27]

At Troy Caesar once again strides unheedingly across a small river, but this small river is not in flood. This is the Xanthus, and it is no more than a trickle in the dust. He steps in the high grass: *securus in alto / gramine ponebat gressus* (9.975–976), and immediately a *Phryx incola* appears and chases him off Hector's grave. For all its undeniable humor, the image of Caesar walking over the Trojan hero's grave is meant to send a shiver up our spines. The glorious and tragic funeral of Hector, which ends the *Iliad*, is lost in the grass under the unconscious feet of the successor to Achilles. Having caught Caesar off guard, and unnerved us, the *monstrator* points out the altar of Zeus Herkeus.

Who is this character, this local who recognizes the unrecognizable and identifies the scattered stones and knows so well the ground hidden under

[27]For a fullest and most recent statement of the orthodox analysis of this passage see O. Zwierlein, "Lucans Caesar in Troia," *Hermes* 114 (1986) 460–478.

the tall grass? Who is this inhabitant of a ruined and desolate Troy? Why does he speak a line and a half and disappear? Does he disappear? Or does he go on speaking, in his own voice?

> *o sacer et magnus vatum labor! omnia fato*
> *eripis et populis donas mortalibus aevum.*
> *invidia sacrae, Caesar, ne tangere famae;*
> *nam, si quid Latiis fas est promittere Musis,*
> *quantum Zmyrnaei durabunt vatis honores,*
> *venturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra*
> *vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aevo.* 9.980–986

The Phrygian native can only be Lucan himself. The poet of the *Pharsalia* has lived in the Greek poet's ruins of Troy as no one else can. He has come to meet Caesar, to take him by the elbow, show him around, and to tell him how he now stands, not just on the stage of history but on the stage of myth and epic poetry.

It can be no accident, either, that the poet—walking on stage and taking over the action like some Tranio, a good Plautine *servus callidus*[28]—makes the general look a little foolish, putting him at a disadvantage. For all his comic παρὰ προσδοκίαν, the poet humbles Caesar. Caesar's conquests will disappear, be overgrown and become unrecognizable, without the poet as *monstrator*, to point out the ruins, name the stones, and remember the graves and altars for the generations to come. For all his famous—and infamous—deeds, Caesar's κλέος depends on the poet Lucan.

The promise of eternal fame thus marks the transition between the Caesar who crossed the Rubicon and the Caesar who makes his dedication for the renewal of Rome on the ruins of Troy. I take the crossing of the Xanthus as the transition of Caesar from the boundless, inhuman force of destruction, the personification of *ira* that he became upon crossing the Rubicon, to the Caesar who can and will re-dedicate Rome.[29] Now that Pharsalia is past and Pompey is dead, now that he has crossed the Xanthus, Caesar has become a mythic figure capable of carrying out a task of mythic dimension. This does not mean Caesar has undergone a *moral* change. There is no moral aspect to Caesar's character: he acts out the part he must in order

[28]It may not be what Lucan was thinking of, but I could not help but be reminded at this point of Tranio's speech as he prepares to guide Theopropides away from the "haunted" house and into the new house next door:

> *Alexandrum magnum atque Agathoclem aiunt maxumas*
> *Duo res gessisse: quid mihi fiet tertio,*
> *Qui solus facio facinora inmortalia?* Plautus *Mostellaria* 775–777

[29]Note that while Poseidon/Neptune (the destructive water force that Caesar's previous imagery has suggested) was hostile to *Troy*, he nevertheless was the god who saved *Aeneas* from death, and so preserved him as the future founder of the Roman people (*Iliad* 20.318–339). Thus the figure of Caesar, destroyer of Rome and yet re-dedicator of the new Rome, is not wholly without Homeric precedent.

to bring about a necessary development—in this case the fulfillment of the program announced at the beginning of the *Pharsalia*:

> *quod si non aliam venturo fata Neroni*
> *invenere viam magnoque aeterna parantur*
> *regna deis caelumque suo servire Tonanti*
> *non nisi saevorum potuit post bella gigantum,*
> *iam nihil, o superi, querimur; scelera ista nefasque*
> *hac mercede placent . . .*
>
> *multum Roma tamen debet civilibus armis,*
> *quod tibi res acta est.* 1.33–38, 44–45

Caesar's invocation on the banks of the Rubicon (1.195–203) and his re-dedication of Rome on the banks of the Xanthus (9.990–999) together bracket the destruction of Rome. As the destruction and abandonment of Troy had to be completed before the new Troy—Rome—could be founded, so Rome must be abandoned and destroyed before Caesar can refound her. Rome must be destroyed to be renewed.

THE CONCLUSION

Lucan used Homer, in Book 1 especially, as a pattern for, and as a commentary on, the characters and the action of the *Pharsalia*, and he exploited his Homeric model with great sensitivity and subtlety. The opening of the *Iliad* sets the moral and poetic standard by which the opening of the *Pharsalia* must be judged, and the horror of the civil war must be measured against the glory of the Trojan war. Lucan begins his poem by using the pattern of the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon to shape the conflict between Caesar and Pompey. Caesar's desertion from the war in Gaul must therefore be understood in a heroic context, as though Achilles in his rage at Agamemnon really had, in the end, left Troy to return home.

As the Achaeans were to the Trojans, Lucan suggests, the Romans were to the Gauls. In this, he was exploiting a literary and artistic tradition that dated from the fifth century and had been adapted repeatedly to validate new norms of political "civilization" and "barbarity." Through a careful manipulation of the conventions of the epic catalogue, Caesar's abandonment of the Roman position in Gaul becomes a freeing of the barbarians, and the Gauls, thus endowed with freedom, are then transformed into the likeness of the Greeks of the heroic age—that is, to inhabitants of the most glorious age of civilization and therefore worthy of a catalogue—and the Romans transformed into barbarians, into the participants of a fratricidal war. The Romans have once more become the Trojans, just as they were at the beginning of their epic existence.

All this is necessary in order to accomplish the destruction and refoundation of Rome, and to bring about the foundation of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, as Lucan announces in his programmatic statement in Book 1.8–66.

After the destruction of Republican Rome at Pharsalia, Caesar goes to Troy, where the epic existence of the Romans was born, and there the poet Lucan, who has claimed the epic landscape as his homeland, promises Caesar fame to equal that of the Homeric heroes. At the altar of Zeus Herkeus, the altar where Priam was slaughtered (*Aeneid* 2.550–557), Caesar makes his vow for the re-dedication of Rome.

Thus the opening of the *Iliad* sets the moral and poetic standard by which the opening of the *Pharsalia* must be judged, and while the horror of the civil war must be measured against the glory of the Trojan war, the consequences of the Trojan war—the foundation of Rome—must be compared to the consequences of the civil war—the refoundation of Rome under the Julio-Claudians. Lucan has recognized what we would call the "archetype," the quality possessed by certain characters, like Agamemnon and Achilles, and certain events, like the Trojan war, and he has recognized also that these archetypes express a fundamental human truth. The archetype changes in detail, but never in essence.

Lucan has also realized—as we do—that one of the great strengths of Homer's epic is that the human truths shine through the Mycenaean, Dark Age, and Archaic Greek layers, and make even the most unfamiliar details, the most unrecognizable scenery, part of the mental and emotional landscape of all who read the *Iliad*. He knows that if he is to write an epic he too must write of such truths, but also in accordance with the details and the inherited material of his subject. Thus we find him, again and again, expressing not just in the Latin language, but *entirely in Roman terms* the vision of human nature he shares with, and learned from, Homer. As von Albrecht has observed,[30] Vergil knew he was writing myth, but both Homer and Lucan believed they were writing history.

Battlefields are only plots of land, and men are not immortal. It is the epic poet who grants eternal fame to those who fought, and it is the epic poet who gives names to the stones that mark their altars and remembers the heap of earth that covers their graves and makes their battles and their cities and their lands live forever. It is the epic poet, after all, who makes the re-dedication of Troy, and Rome, not only necessary, but possible.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
146 CABELL HALL
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22903

[30] "Nur rückblickend erscheint ja Homer als 'mythologischer Epiker'; für den homerischen Dichter selbst jedoch ist der Mythos Geschichte. Blicken wir auf das dichterische Selbstverständnis, so is überraschenderweise Vergil in dieser Reihe der einzige, der bewusst und aktiv einen 'mythos' gestaltet . . ." (277).